Gender and Education: An Encyclopedia, Volumes I & II

Barbara J. Bank
Editor

Praeger

Gender and Education

Gender and Education

An Encyclopedia

Volume I

Edited by
Barbara J. Bank

Sara Delamont and Catherine
Marshall, Associate Editors

PRAEGER

Westport, Connecticut
London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gender and education : an encyclopedia / edited by Barbara J. Bank ; associate editors Sara Delamont and Catherine Marshall.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978–0–313–33343–9 (set : alk. paper)
ISBN-13: 978–0–313–33344–6 (vol 1 : alk. paper)
ISBN-13: 978–0–313–33345–3 (vol 2 : alk. paper)
1. Educational equalization–Encyclopedias. 2. Women–Education–Encyclopedias. 3. Sex discrimination in education–Encyclopedias. I. Bank, Barbara J. II. Delamont, Sara, 1947- III. Marshall, Catherine, 1946-
LC213.G425 2007
370.8203—dc22 2007023758

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data is available.

Copyright © 2007 by Barbara J. Bank

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be
reproduced, by any process or technique, without the
express written consent of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2007023758
ISBN-13: 978–0–313–33343–9 (set)
ISBN-13: 978–0–313–33344–6 (vol 1)
ISBN-13: 978–0–313–33345–3 (vol 2)

First published in 2007

Praeger Publishers, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881
An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
www.praeger.com

Printed in the United States of America

∞

The paper used in this book complies with the
Permanent Paper Standard issued by the National
Information Standards Organization (Z39.48–1984).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Preface xi

Introduction xv

Volume One

Part I: Gendered Theories of Education 1

- Overview 3
- Academic Capitalism 7
- Black Feminism, Womanism, and Standpoint Theories 15
- Cultural Capital Theories 23
- Feminist Reproduction Theory 31
- Liberal and Radical Feminisms 39
- Multicultural and Global Feminisms 47
- Postmodern and Poststructural Theories 55
- Queer Theory 63
- Relational-Cultural Theory 71
- Sex Role Socialization 79
- Social Capital Theories 87
- Social Constructionism 93

Part II: Gender Issues in Educational Research 101

- Overview 103
- Feminist Critiques of Educational Research and Practices 107

International and U.S. Data Sources on Gender and Education 117
Methodological Problems in Gender Research 125

Part III: Institutional Contexts for Gendered Education 131
Overview 133
Alternative Schools 139
Coeducational Colleges and Universities 147
Community Colleges 155
Distance Education 163
Historically Black Colleges and Universities 171
Home Schooling 179
Men's Colleges and Universities 185
Military Colleges and Academies 193
National School Systems 201
Private Single-Sex and Coeducational Schools 209
Public Single-Sex and Coeducational Schools 217
Tribal Colleges and Universities 227
Women's Colleges and Universities 235

Part IV: Gender Constructions in the Official Curriculum 243
Overview 245
Biological and Physical Sciences 249
Black Studies 257
Early Childhood Education 263
Family and Consumer Sciences (Historically, Home Economics) 269
Health and Sex Education 275
History Lessons about Gender 281
Mathematics 287
Men's Studies 295
Multicultural Education 303
Music 309
National Curricula 315

Physical Education 321
Queer[ing] Curriculum 327
Social Studies 331
Teacher Education 339
Technology and Computer Science 345
Theatre and Drama 351
Visual Arts 357
Vocational Education 363
Women's and Gender Studies 369

Part V: Gendered Achievements in the Official Curriculum 375
Overview 377
Academic Majors 381
Attrition from Schools 389
College Student Attrition and Retention 395
Curricular Tracking 401
Educational Achievements in International Context 407
Graduate and Professional Education 415
Intelligence Tests 421
Literacy 427
Mathematics Performance 435
Reading 443
Science Achievement 449
Writing 457
About the Editors and Contributors 463

Volume Two

Part VI: Gender Constructions and Achievements in the Extracurriculum 473
Overview 475
Academic, Arts, and Service Clubs 479
Femininity, Cheerleading, and Sports 485
Fraternities 491

Teacher Burnout 691
Work-Family Conflicts of Educators 701

Part X: Gender and Educational Policies 709
Overview 711
The “Boy Problem” 717
Evaluation Policies for Academics 723
Feminist Pedagogy 731
Gender Equality Policies in British Schooling 739
Gender Equality Policies in Canadian Schooling 747
Gender Equity and Students with Disabilities 755
International Policies 763
NGOs and Their Impact on Gendered Education 771
Pregnant and Parenting Teens 779
School Choice and Gender Equity 787
Sexual Harassment Policies and Practices 793
Students’ Rights in U.S. Higher Education 801
Title IX and School Sports 809
Women’s Educational Equity Act 817
Work-Family Reconciliation Policies 823
Name Index 831
Subject Index 845
About the Editors and Contributors 853

Masculinity and School Sports 497
Service Learning and Activism 503
Sororities 509
Student Government 517
Women's Centers 523

Part VII: Gender Constructions in the Hidden Curriculum 529
Overview 531
Educator Sexual Misconduct 535
Expectations of Teachers for Boys and Girls 541
Heterosexism and Homophobia in the Hidden Curriculum 549
Managing "Problem" Boys and Girls 555
School Counseling 563
Teacher-Student Interactions 571

Part VIII: Gender Constructions in the Peer Group 577
Overview 579
Bullying, Harassment, and Violence Among Students 583
Gangs and Schools 591
Heterosexism and Homophobia in the Peer Group 597
Peer Cultures and Friendships in School 605
Playgrounds and Recreational Activities 613

Part IX: Gendered Teaching and Administration 621
Overview 623
Advising and Mentoring in Graduate Education 627
Career Patterns in Higher Education 635
Career Patterns in Schools 643
Faculty Workloads in Higher Education 653
Feminization of Teaching 661
Leadership Styles 669
Masculinity, Homophobia, and Teaching 677
Salaries of Academics 683

Preface

The aim of this encyclopedia is to reflect the current state of scholarship and research on gender and education. Although there have been long-standing interests in and debates about the suitability of various amounts and types of education for men and women, the rapid development of research on gender and education had its beginnings in the 1960s and 1970s. Stimulated by the social movements of that period, particularly by what we now call second-wave feminism, much of this research focused on girls whose education many viewed as inferior to that of boys. Indeed, had this encyclopedia appeared in the 1980s or 1990s, its title probably would have been *Women and Education*. Already in those decades, however, theoretical developments within feminism and education, as well as debates about the "boy problem," were turning scholarly attention from women to the broader, more complex issues surrounding the many social meanings of gender and the many ways gender is embedded in educational practices and in the institutional structures of schooling. It is these broader, more complex issues that are illuminated by this encyclopedia.

The encyclopedia consists entirely of articles prepared expressly for it at the invitation of the editor; no articles have been reprinted from other encyclopedias or any other publication. Although all authors were asked to focus on gender, no single definition of that term was imposed on them. Some authors provide their own conceptualization of gender, but many use the term in an unexamined manner to refer simply to boys and girls, men and women, or even males and females. Also, the amount of attention paid to gender varies as one moves across the essays. This reflects the current state of educational research. Although there are some topics, such as coeducation, that have gender as a central focus and have yielded a large amount of scholarship concerned with gender and education, there are other research topics, such as college student attrition, in which even the more elaborate theoretical models have largely ignored gender. Hopefully, this encyclopedia will stimulate future studies on such topics that move gender toward the center of the research and analyses.

To help readers find essays of interest, the Contents, complete with a List of Entries, appears in both volumes. It is divided into ten topical parts with the list of essays in each part arranged in alphabetical order. All essays appearing in the same part are relevant to one another, and the overview of each topical part ends with cross-references to relevant essays in other parts. Comprehensive person and subject indexes are located in Volume 2 and provide more options to access information quickly. Because a person or a subject is often discussed in more than one essay, the indexes provide a complete listing of the pages on which that person or subject is mentioned.

The essays in Part I are focused on gendered theories of education. This term is used to encompass theories that have something to say about gender and education, although some essays put gender in the center of their theories and have much less to say about education while others focus on educational structures and processes for which gender is relevant but not central. Whereas the first set of essays shows readers how scholars conceptualize and theorize gender and education, those in Part II reveal the methods scholars and researchers use to gather and interpret information about gender and education. This second set of essays should be of particular interest to educational researchers who are considering putting more emphasis on gender in their own research as well as students who want to develop their skills in reading and evaluating research.

The essays in Part III focus on the different kinds of schooling that men and women experience at the present time or have experienced in the past. Several of the essays in this third set review the extensive literatures concerned with the benefits and shortcomings of coeducational versus single-sex schooling.

Parts IV and V are both focused on the official curricula of educational institutions, a term that refers primarily to their accredited courses and to the formal testing procedures associated with those courses. Authors who wrote the essays in Part IV were asked to focus on the way in which the curricular area that is the topic of their essay has been gendered. In particular, they were asked to discuss ways in which their curricular area is gender exclusive, as well as the ways in which it is gender inclusive. To supplement these essays, authors whose writing appears in Part V were asked to focus more on the achievements of boys versus girls and men versus women in curricular areas that are the topic of their essays.

Whereas the curricular areas discussed in Parts IV and V tend to be found in many national contexts, the officially sponsored or recognized extracurriculum is most elaborated in—and in many ways unique to—the United States. As a result, the essays in Part VI, which is devoted to gender constructions and achievements in the extracurriculum, have less to say about countries outside of the United States than the essays that comprise any other part of the encyclopedia. As the authors of Part VI essays show, components of the extracurriculum, such as school sports, cheerleading, fraternities, and sororities, have had major influences on the ways in which dominant forms of masculinity and femininity have been constructed among young people in the United States, but alternatives to these dominant forms of gender construction have been offered by other components of the extracurriculum such as service clubs and, more recently, women's centers.

Behind and below the official curriculum and extracurriculum lies the hidden curriculum that is described and analyzed in Part VII. For purposes of this encyclopedia, the hidden curriculum is defined as the messages about gender that are conveyed informally—and sometimes unintentionally—by teachers, academics, and educational administrators without specific reference to the official curriculum or extracurriculum. These are not the official school rules about appropriate dress or deportment but rather the interpretations and elaborations of such rules that flow from assumptions teachers and school officials have about what kinds of students are "good," what kinds are "problems," and how to interpret the self-presentations of boys and girls. As the essays in Part VIII reveal, students also have expectations for themselves and one another that are linked to gender. Readers concerned about gender constructions in school-based peer groups, particularly at the elementary and secondary level, will find essays in this eighth set especially interesting and useful sources of information about a broad range of peer group relationships and behaviors, including bullying and peer violence, gangs, heterosexism and homophobia, peer cultures and friendships, and recreational activities on school playgrounds.

One of the interesting anomalies of educational institutions is that they are places where boys and girls are often officially exhorted that they can and should become “all that they can be.” Yet, when they look about them, schoolchildren observe a workplace that is highly sex segregated with females concentrated in teaching positions and men in administration. This division of labor is examined in Part IX, which contains essays that focus not only on teachers and administrators at the primary and secondary school levels, but also on faculty, advisors, and administrators in higher education.

Much of the controversy about gender and education concerns the kinds of policies, or official actions, that have been or should be implemented to promote gender equity, foster the highest levels of educational achievement among boys and among girls, and deal with specific gender-related problems, such as sexual harassment or student pregnancies. The essays in Part X examine a broad range of such policies both in the United States and in other countries and provide a large number of insights into the conditions under which policies concerning gender and education are more or less likely to be successful.

Throughout all ten parts, the essays are meant to convey information to an educated audience without research experience or expertise in the subject area of the individual essay. Authors were asked to limit their citations and references to only a necessary few. This proved a difficult task for many who were used to giving generous credit to almost all who have written on the topic of their essays. Nevertheless, the editor stood firm (or tried to) and is willing to take criticism from those readers who do not find the expected citation to themselves or others. What all readers will find after every essay is a short, helpful list of references and recommended readings that are meant to direct them to works from which they can obtain more detailed information about the topic of the essay as well as more extensive citations and references.

The name or names of the author or coauthors of each essay appear after the references and recommended readings for that essay. More information about the authors is given in the section titled “About the Editors and Contributors” that appears at the end of each volume. I would like to thank the associate editors listed there for the support they gave to this project and the authors for their cooperative spirit, excellent essays, and good cheer. Together we have produced a work that provides readers with an intelligent and interesting review of research, scholarship, current information, issues, and debates about gender and education.

Introduction

In the past 40 years, there has been an enormous increase in the amount of research and scholarship exploring gender and education. New journals have emerged, and older journals have devoted special issues, first to women and schooling or sex equity in education and, more recently, to gender and educational achievement or gender equity in schooling. Many new books have appeared, the earlier ones often having titles that included the terms "women" or "sex equity" and "education" and the more recent ones building titles out of the terms "gender" or "gender equity" and "education." Similarly, on college campuses, courses on such topics as women in higher education, women in educational administration, and sex inequalities in education that first appeared in the 1970s and 1980s have been retitled or restyled as courses concerned with gender or gender inequities or social inequalities (including gender) in education or schooling. What accounts for all the interest and for the changes in wording?

In the decades leading up to the 1970s, there had been a considerable amount of writing and research concerned with what was then called sex differences in education. Should males and females attend the same schools? Should they be classmates? Do they need the same amount of education? Should they take all of the same courses or should they take courses tailored to their special interests? Do they have the same amount of intelligence? Do they perform equally well in different subject-matter areas of the official curriculum? How close are their test scores? Do they want the same kinds of extracurricular activities? Are their peer groups and friendships similar or different? Should they have the same rights and privileges, or do females need more protection, such as curfew hours at college? Some of these questions could be answered with findings from well-conducted research, but many were based on, and answered with, untested or poorly tested assumptions about the essential differences between males and females.

Even in this early period, there were educators and social scientists who were uncomfortable with these assumptions about essential differences and the language by which they were constituted. *Male* and *female* carried too much of a biological connotation, they argued, and writing about *sex differences* ran the likely danger of being read as talk about biologically based and determined differences or the less likely danger of being confused with differences in sexuality. To these educators and social scientists, however, many of the differences in interests and performance and even test scores of boys and girls or men and women were due wholly or primarily to social circumstances. To call attention to the social origins of sex-linked preferences and behaviors, many adopted the language of role theory.

To role theorists, much of human behavior could be understood as the result of the social positions or identity labels that people assumed in society. Attached to these social positions or identity labels were certain prescriptive or proscriptive expectations for behaviors, usually called social norms. When a person assumed or aspired to a particular social identity, that person had to learn the appropriate norms, preferably to internalize them as self-expectations, and to use those norms as a guide for his or her behaviors. This process of role learning, known as socialization, sometimes took a long period of time, and some people learned their roles better than others. Those who took up a particular position, but failed to conform to the social norms attached to that position, were likely to receive negative sanctions, and if their nonconformity persisted at a high level, they were likely to find their right to a particular position or identity claim challenged or even abrogated. Although role theory worked particularly well when applied to occupational positions, such as teacher, it also had some advantages in research and scholarship concerned with what came to be known as *sex roles*.

Talk about sex differences easily implied biological causality, but talk about differences in sex roles forced hearers to consider the social nature of what was being discussed. The term “role” came from the theater, and just as it would be difficult to assign biological cause to the different roles that people played on the stage, so too the language of sex roles made it harder to assign biological causality to the different role behaviors of males and females. Standing alone and apart from the language of roles, the terms “male” and “female” still seemed to carry too many biological assumptions. As a result, sex-role theorists tended to use terms like “male sex role” or “female sex role” or to drop the male/female nomenclature entirely in favor of writing about boys and girls or men and women, terms that are better than male and female at implying social positions. Much attention was given to research and scholarship concerned with the ways in which boys and girls learned their sex roles at home and in schools; the role conflicts (i.e., contradictory expectations) experienced by students caught between the sex-role norms of their teachers and their peers; and the ways in which sex roles changed as students moved up through the school years. The roles of teachers and educational administrators also attracted researchers, though much of this work had more of an occupational role focus than a sex-role focus.

When second-wave feminism emerged and flowered in the United States and around the world in the 1960s and 1970s, the focus quickly shifted from sex roles to sex equity. What had previously been viewed by role theorists as predictable—and fairly benign or even beneficial—sex differences in classroom behaviors, course choices, academic achievements, and educational outcomes were now reconceptualized as unjust, unfair, and unacceptable sex inequities, most of which favored boys over girls and men over women. A policy agenda for eliminating these inequities was developed for education, as for other social institutions. Tracking of boys into certain kinds of courses and girls into others should be eliminated, and the entire curriculum should be equally available to both sexes. Women should be admitted to male-only colleges and universities, including those in the Ivy League, on the same bases as men. Curricular materials that ignored or denigrated women should be replaced with materials that were free of misogynistic biases. Teachers at all levels of education should be made aware of their different behaviors toward males and females and should be required to treat students in an equitable manner. Schools that put resources into extracurricular activities for boys, such as athletic teams, should put equivalent resources into extracurricular activities for girls. Secondary school teachers, school counselors, and faculty in higher education should make certain that their advice to students about academic matters, personal life, educational plans, and occupational goals is completely free of traditional, stereotypic assumptions about appropriate roles for men and women.

In the early years of second-wave feminism, much of the research documenting unequal educational opportunities and outcomes between boys and girls and many of the arguments favoring equity continued to use the language of role theory and of sex inequalities (see, e.g., Stacey, Béreaud, & Daniels, 1974; Weitzman, 1979). As time went on, however, that language was gradually superseded by the language of gender. Sex differences became gender differences or gender inequalities. Sex equity became gender equity. Male and female sex roles became masculinities and femininities. Socialization, role-learning, and role-playing became processes of gender construction.

There were many reasons for these changes. One was the fact that sex-role theory put such a heavy emphasis on early childhood socialization as the time when people learned their sex roles. This emphasis led to a form of social essentialism that was objectionable to second-wave feminists, including activists seeking sex equity and participants in the emerging discipline of women's studies. Social essentialism was the notion that because boys and girls were socialized into different sex roles at very early ages, they internalized essentially different identities, beliefs, preferences, and behaviors. Because these differences were so deep-seated, they were the source of much social stability and continuity. This argument was not much different from the arguments about essential biological differences between the sexes that sex-role theory had rejected. Although *social* essentialism did leave open the possibility that what was socially induced could be socially changed, the internalization of sex roles deep inside of (properly socialized) boys and girls meant that change was likely to be a long and psychologically difficult process of resocialization. This was not an image of men and women compatible with a feminist movement seeking rapid social change. A focus on the socially constructed nature of gender was much more in tune with the times.

Another reason for moving away from the language of sex-role theory was its tendency to focus on one type of appropriate male sex role, usually styled as instrumental and task oriented, and one type of appropriate female sex role, usually styled as expressive and nurturant. Within the theory, it was assumed that these sex roles were normative in the sense that they were consensually agreed upon standards for behavior. All boys were taught to conform to the expectations of the male sex role, though some did so better than others, and all girls were expected to internalize the female sex role. At the societal level, the two roles were thought to be complementary and to provide stability to institutional life, especially in the family where the complementary roles of nurturant mother and work-oriented father modeled the explicit sex-role socialization of their daughters and sons. While some feminists did not want to give up their claim to expressiveness and nurturance, and a few exalted these kinds of "female" behaviors, most advocated a more historically and culturally informed understanding of the many lines of behavior that had been, were currently, and could be characteristic of men and women. From this perspective, there was not just one appropriate and consensually supported male sex role and one complementary female sex role, but rather many masculinities and femininities, some of which were more oppositional than complementary.

Even though some of these masculinities and femininities were more socially acceptable than others, these evaluations varied across time and place. The most admired, honored, and dominant form of masculinity, conceived as hegemonic masculinity by R.W. Connell (2005), was not enacted by or expected to be enacted by all men even at a single time and place, and it was subject to resistance and change as well as complicity and support. Similarly, societies advanced a model of what Connell calls emphasized femininity as an admired and honored ideal, but most women are not expected to conform to this type of femininity, and some resist it strongly. It was this recognition of variation, change, and resistance that made the concept of gender, a term that encompassed multiple masculinities and femininities, so much more acceptable to historians, international comparative scholars, and feminists than the concept of consensual and complementary sex roles.

This emphasis on multiplicity and the effort to avoid universalizing claims about the categories of men and women has also been particularly important in the emergence of Black, multicultural, and global feminisms, in the formulations of postmodern and queer theories with their insistent rejections of either/or dualisms, and in the development of the academic fields of Black Studies, Women's and Gender Studies, Multicultural Studies, and Men's Studies (see essays in Parts I and IV). Among the many kinds of masculinities and femininities one might consider are those that intersect with different social classes, race-ethnicities, and sexualities. And, certainly, when one's eye is on inequalities, this list would have to be extended to include religion, age, and physical disabilities.

One important thing that gender theories share in common with sex-role theory is the firm assertion that gender (sex roles), and the masculinities and femininities that comprise it, are not simply characteristics of individuals, but are also embedded in social interactions, social structures, and cultural forms. Although the two theories do not conceptualize interaction, structure, and culture in the same way, they both insist on the externality of gender (or sex roles) as well as its internality in the form of self-identities. Some gender theorists (e.g., Risman, 2004) insist that gender is not only embedded in the division of labor, tasks, goals, and social relationships that define institutional structures, such as education, but also that gender is a social structure in its own right because it is a socially constructed hierarchy of power and status. In this view, hegemonic masculinity entails dominance not only over women but also over other forms of masculinity. And, although hegemonic masculinity may be embodied in specific individuals, such as the star athlete in a secondary school, its power derives not from the athlete himself but from the authority accorded to that form of masculinity in the structure and culture of the school in which that masculinity is socially constructed. It is this gender hierarchy of authority and power built into structures and cultures by interaction processes and, in turn, shaping how people think about and present themselves that readers should have in mind when they encounter the language of "gendered" education throughout this encyclopedia.

The language of gender and gendering has not totally eclipsed earlier ways of talking and writing about differences between boys and girls or men and women in education and other social institutions. While I was writing this introduction, I received requests to renew my memberships in two different professional organizations. The form supplied for this purpose by one organization asked that I indicate my "sex" as either male or female, and the form supplied by the other asked that I use those same choices to indicate my "gender." Not only did these renewal forms assume that people could be easily divided into two contrasting categories, seemingly rooted in biology, but one form used the term gender as a label for this dualism. Clearly this was not what scholars had in mind when they developed theories of gender encompassing multiple, intersectional masculinities and femininities in opposition to theories concerned with male/female dualism and sex differences. Yet, one can hardly object when an organization asks simplistic questions about sex or gender because it wants to pursue greater gender equity, perhaps by determining whether it no longer has proportionately more females among its members than among its officers. Similar questions and goals characterize some of the research summarized in this encyclopedia. Students are assigned to one of only two gender categories (male or female) on the basis of teacher observation, self-reports, or parental reports, and that assignment is used to calculate gender differences in classroom behaviors, academic performance, educational attainments, or test scores. Or, if the researcher's interest is in school personnel, teachers and administrators may be separated into males and females and this dichotomy used to contrast their behaviors, career patterns, salaries, and other work outcomes. Research of this type is one of the major foundations on which claims about gender (in)equities in education are based, and readers will find a good deal of it summarized and analyzed in Parts V and IX.

Even in those two parts and more so in the others, readers will find attention being paid to the insights of gender theories. In particular, many authors give attention to the variability among men and among women, with several essays focusing on the intersectionality of gender with race-ethnicity, social class, and/or sexuality and some essays examining changes in gender-related behaviors or outcomes over time or across nations, types of schools, and other sociocultural contexts. Many of these essays also look at the ways in which gender is constructed and built into the social structures and cultural forms of education including institutional contexts (Part III), the official curriculum (Part IV), the extra- and hidden curricula (Parts VI and VII), the peer group (Part VIII), and official policies concerned with education and educational equity (Part X). The extent to which specific essays examine the ways in which gender is embedded in intersectional identities, in social interactions, in institutional structures, and in cultural images and values varies considerably. This variation depends on the topic of the essay, the kinds of research that are available concerning that topic, and the judgment of authors about how best to characterize the current state of scholarship on gender and education for the topic with which their own essays is concerned.

This is an exciting time to be involved in the study of gender and education. It is a time in which this broad topic is the focus of multiple theories and interesting theoretical debates (see Part I); is characterized by a vast reservoir of data, improved research methods and procedures, along with greater tolerance of research alternatives (see Part II); is producing interesting research findings, many of which are presented throughout this encyclopedia; and is witness to the enormous changes in the status of girls and boys, women and men, in educational institutions around the world that are mentioned and analyzed by many contributors. Even the recent conservative turn away from the goal of gender (and racial-ethnic) equity—in favor of an educational policy agenda based on a "back to the basics" narrowed curriculum, high-stakes testing, and teacher/school accountability—can be viewed as a challenge, one that has already produced some exciting policy debates and more sophisticated scholarship about the gendered consequences of global capitalism.

To characterize these times as exciting is not the same as calling them happy. For those with a commitment to deepening their knowledge about and understanding of gender and the ways in which it shapes their schools and is shaped by them, this encyclopedia answers many questions but also raises many. For those with a commitment to gender equity in education, the good news about the elimination of many forms of gender bias contained in this encyclopedia is tempered with a lot of depressing information about the many kinds of gender inequities that continue to exist in the institutional and organizational structures and cultures of education both in the United States and around the world. But, rather than arguing about whether the glass of knowledge about gender and education and the glass of gender equity in education are half full or half empty, this is a good time to think about how to fill both glasses to the brim. This encyclopedia contains a very large number of suggestions about the kinds of theories, research, scholarship, policy initiatives and implementation, and educational practices that can help accomplish these two tasks.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Connell, R.W., & Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829–859.

Koch, J., & Irby, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Defining and redefining gender equity in education*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Risman, B. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & Society, 18*(4), 429–450.

Stacey, J., Béreaud, S., & Daniels, J. (Eds.). (1974). *And Jill came tumbling after: Sexism in American education*. New York: Dell Publishing.

Weitzman, L.J. (1979). *Sex role socialization: A focus on women*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Part I

Gendered Theories of Education

Overview

Not every theory of education concerns itself with gender, and some theories of gender have nothing to say about education. The essays in Part I are focused on theories that have something to say about both education and gender. This does not mean that they all define education and gender in the same way or that they give equal attention to education and gender. Instead, what makes these theories important and exciting are the different ways in which they conceptualize education and gender and their interrelationships. These differences, in turn, have implications for how gender inequalities are understood, for the role of education in maintaining or undermining those inequalities, and for the ways in which equity or equality without gender might be achieved.

All of the essays in this section are written by authors with expertise in the theory or theories they are writing about. Many of the authors also are advocates for that theory. As scholars or advocates or both, the authors are aware of the fact that there are other scholars and advocates who disagree with, or even strongly oppose, the theory or theories on which the author is focused. As a result, several of the authors take the time to compare their chosen theory with other theories; some even discuss the shortcomings of the theory they prefer. Readers can make additional comparisons and evaluations of specific theories by reading not only the essays focused on those theories but the other essays in this section as well.

Although there are probably hundreds of ways in which the theories discussed in this set of essays can be compared and contrasted, two questions are central: How is education conceptualized in the theory? And, what is the nature of gender?

To answer the first question, it is useful to ask another question: Does the theory look at education primarily as something that happens to learners or is education viewed primarily as an institutional structure that shapes learners and others involved in it? Of course, a theory does not have to choose one or the other of these perspectives, and it is not surprising to find some attention to both learners and institutional structure in the same theoretical formulation, especially when learners are conceptualized as categories or groups or people, rather than as individuals. Yet, there are some theories that pay much more attention to education as a learning process than to the structure of schooling. Perhaps the leading proponents of the learning process approach are sex-role socialization theorists whose focus is on the ways in which humans learn what it means to be male and female in their society. Schools help to shape this learning but so do families, peer groups, churches, and all the other groups and organizations that are called socializing agents within this perspective. Although socialization theory gives little attention to the structure of schooling, what a student learns about gender in school and elsewhere is considered to be crucial to the development of self-identity and to the ways in which students evaluate and relate to others in society. Many of these same themes can be found in relational-cultural theory, although this theory gives more emphasis than sex-role socialization theory to the impact of oppression, privilege, and marginalization on human development; to women's ways of being; and to the kinds of therapy that can promote psychological growth and well-being.

An emphasis on individualism, including individual learning, is often said to be a characteristic of liberal feminism, and there is some truth in this characterization because liberal feminism, like all forms of liberal theory, does place an emphasis on individual effort and competitive achievement. However, liberal feminism draws attention to group differences, particularly gender differences, and to the ways in which some groups, particularly women, have systematically been discriminated against and denied equal opportunities. Thus, the analyses of gender and education conducted by liberal feminists lead from individual to social structure and back again. To make individual competition fair, there must be a structure of equal opportunities, especially in the schools where individuals obtain the knowledge, skills, and credentials that allow them to compete effectively in the job market. To its many critics, liberal feminism is regarded as politically naive in its failure to recognize the ways in which gender oppressions are intertwined with other forms of oppression, such as those of race and class; in its tendency to draw a line between public and private life; and in its simplistic notion that individual learning and achievement depend on educational and job opportunities, along with reproductive choices, rather than on institutionalized arrangements of economic, social, and political power.

In contrast to the emphasis on individual learning, a more structural approach to education is taken by academic capitalism, a theory focused on recent changes in contemporary colleges and universities in the United States, Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom. The central argument is that colleges and universities have undergone a shift from a public good knowledge/learning regime to an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime with the result that patriarchy is becoming further entrenched in higher education institutions by the rational economic agenda characteristic of this newer regime. The resource imbalances across departments and units that are now becoming commonplace in institutions of higher education disadvantage women faculty and students who tend to be concentrated in academic fields with fewer economic resources and market opportunities than those available in predominantly men's fields.

The arguments developed in academic capitalist theory are also found in contemporary versions of feminist reproduction theory. This is not too surprising, given that both theories have roots in Marxist and neo-Marxist theories with their emphases on social class dynamics, social change, and the ways in which power plays out in schools and society. The stress in academic capitalist theory on economic resources as a basis for gender and other forms of inequality is also echoed in the essays about cultural capital theories and social capital theories. Although these forms of capital are different from the economic capital stressed in academic capitalism, they also are bases for differences in social ranking and power, and they often are distributed or validated by educational institutions. It is not these theories, however, that Metcalfe and Slaughter find to be most similar to their theory of academic capitalism. Instead, they call attention to the link between their theory and radical feminism, suggesting that both theories point to the likelihood that a radical restructuring of colleges and universities may be necessary to abolish the patriarchy that is embedded in Western systems of higher education.

Questions about the nature of gender are answered by the theories described in Part I using the different languages of sex, sex roles, and gender discussed in the Introduction to this encyclopedia. Not surprisingly, the view of sex as an individual attribute and gender as a sex-appropriate identity is embraced most fully by liberal feminism, relational-cultural theory, and sex-role socialization theory, the same theories that take an individual learning approach to education. These theories generally accept sexual dualism, or the notion that almost everyone can be divided into two sexes (male and female), and that certain kinds of gender identities are more appropriate for males (masculine identity) and females (feminine identity). Although each of these theories is sensitive to the ways in which individual identities are shaped by social interaction, interpersonal relationships, cultural education, and opportunity structures, they see these identities as relatively fixed by the time a person enters adulthood.

It is the matter of fixity that is most sharply challenged by social constructionism, a set of theories that views gender and sexuality as situated, interactional accomplishments. A shift in focus from socialization to constructionism is also a shift from viewing gender primarily as a social outcome toward more emphasis on human agency. Through what they say and what they do, people construct themselves and one another as gendered subjects in a system of gender stratification. To say that people have agency and engage in construction does not mean that gender is simply a matter of free choice. In the nineteenth century, Karl Marx wrote that, although men make their own history, they do not make it just as they please or under circumstances chosen by themselves, but rather “under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past.” The same has been said by social constructionists about gender identities. Although people construct them, they do so *not* under circumstances that they choose, but rather under the conditions of a patriarchal culture and social institutions, including schools, that are stratified by gender.

As indicated above and in the relevant essays that follow, it is this patriarchal culture and these gender-stratified institutions that are of major concern to feminist reproduction theory, radical feminism, and academic capitalism. It is the construction processes themselves, however, that are of major concern to postmodern, poststructural, and queer theories. Poststructuralism and queer theories, in particular, are concerned with how the human subject is constructed in and through the structures of language and ideology. In the case of gender, a central poststructural concern is with the ways in which power arrangements in contemporary society create systems of discourse, such as literature or art or law or research reports, that create particular versions of human subjects. Most of these versions, such as male and female, are dichotomies, and queer theorists and other postmodernists argue that these dualistic categories are never natural or neutral. Instead, they create and maintain power relations. Whether the dichotomy is male and female per se or some other dualism related to gender, such as masculinity/femininity, rationality/emotionality, or heterosexual/homosexual, the underlying assumption is that one side of the dualism is superior to the other. Women will never attain equality with men as long as language and ideology continue to constitute them as inferiors.

Advocates of poststructural and queer theories argue strongly against other theories that view maleness or heterosexuality or femaleness or homosexuality as fixed identities attached to individuals because of their socialization. Instead, they want people to recognize the ways in which language is used to construct dichotomous ways of looking at gender and sexuality that benefit some people and disadvantage others. In response, many of the other theorists represented in this section would argue that there is more to gender than language and other texts, and they would call attention to the structurally embedded material conditions, such as various forms of capital, that benefit men in comparison to women.

A different kind of criticism of male-female dualism has been raised by the theories known as Black feminism, multicultural feminism, and global feminism. To these theorists, a major problem with the male-female dichotomy is that it tends to lump together all males and all females. Instead of talking about differences between men and women, they ask, "What men and what women are you talking about?" This question immediately calls attention to the enormous variation among women and among men. Black feminism draws particular attention to the intersectionality of gender, race-ethnicity, and class, and reminds other feminists, as well as educational researchers more generally, that the world looks quite different to White, middle-class women than it looks from the standpoint of poor, Black women. Like Black feminists, multicultural and global feminists also reject female chauvinism by which they mean the tendency for relatively privileged women—most often, White, Western/Northern, middle-class, heterosexual, and well-educated women—to assume, incorrectly, that their way of seeing the world is the way all women see it.

Although Black, multicultural, and global feminists reject the notion that all women are basically alike, a position sometimes called female essentialism, they do not want to turn women of different social classes, race-ethnicities, nationalities, and sexual orientations against one another. Instead, they want women of different backgrounds to come together in mutually respectful alliances to fight against social inequalities not only across gender lines, but also across all the lines that separate "us" from "them." It is the desire to expose, deconstruct, and oppose power and other resource imbalances, along with a preference for social justice over traditional social hierarchies, that unite the very different theories of gender and education described in this section.

Additional essays that explicitly discuss theories of gender and education are "Feminist Critiques of Educational Research and Practices" in Part II; "Early Childhood Education" and "Queer[ing] Curriculum" in Part IV; "Managing 'Problem' Boys and Girls" in Part VII; and "Feminist Pedagogy" in Part X.

Academic Capitalism

Academic capitalism refers to the market or market-like behaviors of institutions of higher education and those working within them to secure external resources. At the heart of academic capitalism is the notion that, in times of financial stress or uncertainty, individuals and organizations often adopt market-based strategies to strengthen or bolster their relative position in the economy. At times, these actions contradict nonprofit status and allow market values to enter the public sector. Articulated first in the work of Slaughter and Leslie and later by Slaughter and Rhoades, academic capitalism is not a gender theory per se, but it does highlight aspects of resource imbalance that have plagued women in academe for as long as they have been permitted by men to participate in coeducational higher education.

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITY

Academic capitalism was first explored at length in Slaughter and Leslie's *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* (1997). In this book, the authors drew upon the work of sociologists of science and economists to foreground their examination of the forces that drove the restructuring of higher education in the 1980s and 1990s in four English-speaking countries (Australia, Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom). The study included three levels of inquiry: international, national, and institutional. At each level they employed a different theoretical framework and data collection method, with concepts ranging from globalization to professionalization.

At the international level, they looked to theories of global political economy to help explain shifts in resource allocation for higher education. They found that the move from an industrial to a postindustrial economy had and continues to have repercussions for the process of worker education (from basic education to just-in-time and lifelong learning), the process of production (from physical to mental), the location of managerial power (shifting from oligopolistic corporations tied to the nation-state to multinational corporations that are still largely oligopolies), and the role of innovation in pursuit of profit. They also found that globalization has four primary implications for higher education: (a) the constriction of monies available for discretionary activities such as postsecondary education; (b) the growing centrality of technoscience and fields closely involved with markets, particularly international markets; (c) the tightening relationships between multinational corporations and state agencies concerned with product development and innovation; and (d) the increased focus of multinationals and established industrial countries on global intellectual property strategies. As time spent in the latter phase of research and development (R&D) decreased, the differences between basic and applied research became less salient and all research had entrepreneurial potential. In short, growing global markets, also known as the process of globalization, led to the development of national funding policies that targeted university-based entrepreneurial research (which is research that has market relevance and commercialization potential) while simultaneously reducing block grants (undesignated funds that accrue to universities, often according to formulas) to higher education institutions, thus leading academics to increase their direct engagement with the market. At the national level, Slaughter and Leslie examined the higher education finance data of the four countries, using Pfeffer and Salancik's (2003) resource dependency theory as an interpretive lens. Resource dependency theory contends that organizations are influenced by external agents that provide support in the form of money or other assets. The degree to which this occurs depends upon the relative magnitude of the resource exchanged and the criticality of the resource to the functions of the focal organization. Using this framework, they found that changes in national policies had measurable effects on spending patterns for higher education in the four countries. The relative decline in block grants from national governments to institutions (compared to other sources of support) resulted in a shift of expenditures from areas not likely to be able to generate their own revenues (e.g., libraries, building maintenance, on-campus instruction) to areas of potential income growth (such as sponsored research, continuing education, and student services). Although Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) have reconsidered resource dependency as a central tenet of academic capitalism due to the realization that higher education is much more involved in the external environment and not nearly as dependent as previously portrayed, the notion that organizational behavior and values can be understood through patterns of revenue generation and expenditure still holds.

Finally, at the institutional level, Slaughter and Leslie examined the ways that faculty and administrators engaged in market-like behaviors and how this affected their concept of their profession and their labor. Qualitative interviews with academics were analyzed using a conceptualization of professionalization as a process in which organizational, political, and economic skills are equally as important as, if not more important than, knowledge, theory, expertise, and altruism. They drew from Weber's (1958) notion of "state capitalism" to understand publicly paid university employees as "state-subsidized entrepreneurs," who implement their academic capital by engaging in production. Although they focused primarily on technology transfer activities in the sciences and engineering, Slaughter and Leslie concluded that the faculty role is changing as a result of national policy shifts regarding the ways in which the State distributes funds to higher education. In the 1980s and 1990s, resource allocation patterns changed so that higher education institutions could no longer rely on unrestricted block grants from government and, therefore, had to encourage academics to pursue competitive research grants and other sources of revenue. In many instances, tuition restrictions were also lifted and students bore more of the cost of their education than before. This final section of Slaughter and Leslie's book served as a foundation for the development of a fully conceptualized theory of academic capitalism that appeared in Slaughter's collaboration with Rhoades.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE NEW ECONOMY

In *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, States, and Higher Education* (2004), Slaughter and Rhoades explored the internal organizational dynamics of revenue-seeking behavior in higher education. Building on their previous work, the book continues to develop the thesis of academic capitalism by situating state-sponsored academic entrepreneurialism in a networked, global political economy. Like descriptions of the increasingly global and interconnected New Economy, the theory of academic capitalism includes the ideas of flexibility, risk, and entrepreneurial behavior seen by economists as particularly salient to success in global markets.

Slaughter and Rhoades theorize that colleges and universities are shifting from a public good knowledge/learning regime to an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. The notion of a "regime" as a dominant discourse or paradigm comes from Foucault's (1977, 1980) use of the word to describe the intersections between power and knowledge.

In the public good knowledge/learning regime described by Slaughter and Rhoades, academic research is considered to be collective labor toward a common good. This way of thinking about academic production is in keeping with Robert Merton's norms of disinterested science (communalism, universality, free flow of knowledge, and organized scepticism) and Vannevar Bush's social contract model in which government funds universities to pursue "basic" science in a discovery-oriented environment that, once released into the knowledge commons, provides the foundation for product development in the consumer market. In the public good knowledge/learning regime, the academic production process is removed from the market, buffered by government laboratories and corporations that developed basic science into applied science. Implicit in this concept of academic research is the notion that the social sciences, and particularly the arts, although contributing to the public good, are not in the foreground of knowledge production. That position is taken by the sciences. This hierarchical conception of disciplines is reinforced by the State through research funding patterns that favor science and engineering and the lack of government articulation with the social sciences and arts. However, as long as state-government funding to institutions of higher education continues to support the social sciences and the arts through faculty positions in order to maintain the largely undergraduate educational functions of the university, these areas survive, but they are somewhat isolated from entrepreneurial departments and colleges that are close to the market.

In contrast to the public good knowledge/learning regime is the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime that Slaughter and Rhoades describe as valuing knowledge privatization and profit taking in which institutions, inventor faculty, and corporations have claims that come before those of the public. Higher education becomes more connected to the marketplace in this regime, often in the form of partnerships with industry, start-up companies, equity interests, distance learning activities, strategic alliances, and idea laboratories. The values that drive the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime do not replace Mertonian norms and the notion of basic science, but the public good is redefined as what is good for economic development as the public sector (institutions and governments) takes an even stronger role in shaping local, national, and global economies. However, academic freedom and the knowledge commons (peer review), which were critical values for the public good knowledge/learning regime, are interrupted by knowledge claims that occur through intellectual property agreements and the commercialization of research products in the new regime. In other words, the academic profession is weakened as individual or corporate (private) ownership of knowledge capital is asserted.

Yet the privatization of knowledge, meaning the shift from serving the public good to the private good, is not reserved for the sciences and applied fields in the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. The social sciences and the arts are afforded more contact with the market as education itself becomes commoditized in the form of distance education, prepackaged curricula, and continuing/contract education programs. In the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime, all disciplines become open markets, including the traditional teaching, research, and service functions of the university itself.

The process by which the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime becomes ascendant is further theorized by Slaughter and Rhoades as having four components: the development of new circuits of knowledge, interstitial organizational emergence, intermediating networks, and extended managerial capacity.

Universities create new inter- and intraorganizational linkages when knowledge no longer moves primarily within scientific/professional/scholarly networks. The rise of information and communications technologies has aided in the formation of alternative circuits of knowledge, where academics are connected to others outside higher education on a scale never seen before. In addition, the increase in the number of technology administrators on campuses to aid in the installation and support of these electronic networks has itself created a new knowledge domain in academe, where technical expertise is often a pathway to organizational power and influence (as seen in the executive cabinet role of the Chief Information Officer).

As aids to the formation and sustainability of these new circuits of knowledge, interstitial organizations emerge to manage new activities related to generation of external revenues. Examples of these new organizations, found within higher education institutions, are economic development offices, trademarks and licensing offices, and technology transfer offices. These interstitial organizations at the boundary of higher education are often tied to networks that intermediate between public, nonprofit, and private sectors.

Intermediating organizations that exist between the public and private arenas are independent entities such as foundations, professional associations, consortia, and think tanks. These organizations are in the position to bring together boundary-spanning individuals from the State, market, and higher education (often from the interstitial units) to work collectively toward expanding the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime.

The new circuits of knowledge, interstitial organizations, and intermediate organizations are populated by academic managers, whose numbers and influence increase in the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. These managers have increased their capacity to engage the market, redrawing the boundaries between universities and the corporate sector. As these academic managers become more professionalized, their positions in the academy are strengthened, and their impact on the direction of higher education is increased.

ACADEMIC CAPITALISM AND FEMINISM

Slaughter and Rhoades drew upon the work of several social theorists concerned with social class hegemony because the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime is central to the production of the middle and upper middle classes. Women were not foregrounded as a group in constructing the theory of academic capitalism in large part because men were seen to be the most active in constructing the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. Indeed, this regime is in part constructed to continue to give men some of the privileges they have historically held as a result of higher education. As such, academic capitalism can be used as a gender theory because it explains how patriarchy is becoming further entrenched in higher education institutions by a rational, economic agenda, despite the modest or significant gains of individual women.

The theory of academic capitalism draws heavily upon theorists who have been influenced by the economic inequality theories of Karl Marx and are also concerned with how power plays out in organizations and society. They do not focus on what to Marx was the central dynamic of social change, the struggle between capital and labor, with labor understood as the working class. Rather, these theorists see actors and organizations as players in the power dynamics that constitute societies. Gramsci (1971), for example, saw the State as more than the executive committee of the bourgeoisie; indeed, he saw the State as a (relatively) independent sector, in which class dynamics played out in a variety of unexpected ways. Gramsci also theorized ideological hegemony, which went beyond Marx's concerns with consciousness/false consciousness. Although these theorists understand the power of capital arrayed in global corporations and would at least acknowledge a business class and the power of elites, they look beyond the raw power of capital concentrating on ideology, hegemony, and the normative and technical power held by the upper middle class. They see the upper middle class, whether deployed in academe, the bureaucratic State, or a small, innovative corporate sector, as fluid, strategic, and self-interested, able to wield power in ways that further the organizations and groups with which they are involved.

Traditionally, higher education served middle and especially upper middle class men as a form of credentialization that allowed them to occupy professional, scholarly, and managerial positions in society. Until the 1970s, women were either excluded from many professional schools or were subjected to admissions quotas that severely limited their numbers. Other than at women's colleges, only small numbers of women were professors in the 1950s and 1960s; and almost none were to be found at research universities. As women's social movements gained them space in the academy, men were forced to share their privileges. This was not a win/win situation unless the professional, scholarly, and managerial positions expanded by the number of women seeking these positions, which did not occur.

As women made gains in higher education—and indeed they did, now constituting over half of all graduates—men became active in constructing the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime as a strategic effort to continue their historic privileges. They were the leaders and the beneficiaries of the market and market-like activities that are the hallmark of academic capitalism. For example, men lead women in the number of patents derived from academic labor, are more often than women the CEOs of spin-off companies created from academic pursuits, and are more likely to benefit from the licensing of university research products. This is not to say that women were or are not actors in the new circuits of knowledge, interstitial and intermediating organizations, and expanded managerial sector through which academic capitalism has become incorporated in colleges and universities. They study and work in these sectors, but they are more often handmaidens to entrepreneurial men than entrepreneurs themselves. Of course, given the complexities of third-wave feminism, there are some women who are highly successful in the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. But even among the highly successful women, almost none are as successful as men, and most women do not do as well in the new roles made possible by the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime as do men. In other words, the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime has allowed men to recapture the historic benefits they received from an exclusively male higher education system.

Therefore, by including academic capitalism in a feminist theoretical framework, one is able to examine the historically imbedded and actively reinforced patriarchy of academe. Academic patriarchy has resulted in areas of the college or university that are closer to the market being predominantly male while the areas with stronger ties to the social welfare function (social work, education, nursing) contain more women. Salaries in the feminized fields are lower (for both men and women), and the social sciences and humanities receive far less governmental funding and support than male-dominated areas like science and engineering. In many cases, this has led enterprising educators in various nonpreferred fields (e.g., education professors who copyright tests and measurements, learning enhancement devices and techniques, distance education modules; fine arts faculty who copyright web design, electronic art, graphic design) to increase revenues through market activity. However, this has generally benefited relatively few individuals in nonpreferred fields because of: (a) the lack of external infrastructure such as federal mission agencies that fund research in these areas, (b) the feminization of these fields, and (3) the ensuing low stature of these fields in status and prestige hierarchies. In other words, despite market activity, there has not been widespread salary improvement in these areas. While these disparities have been explained as functions of the external labor market, academic capitalism can be used to highlight the active marginalization of fields that are not central to international competitiveness and global capitalism, which has subjugated women's work and women's epistemology throughout the world. Because of the social reproductive function of higher education, the relative position of women and their value in the academic arena is critical and, to a large extent, foreshadows the future place of women in society, politics, and economics. As such, academic capitalism theory is particularly well coupled with radical feminism because both theoretical approaches agree that "revolutionary" restructuring of the academy may be necessary to redress the historical patriarchy that is imbedded within the systems of higher education.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bush, V. (1990). *Science—the endless frontier: A report to the President on a program for postwar scientific research.* Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. (Original work published 1945.)

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, Trans. & Ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell-Smith, Trans. & Eds.). New York: International Publishers.

Merton, R.K. (1973). The normative structure of science. In N. W. Storer (Ed.), *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations* (pp. 267–278). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1942.)

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1978.)

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism in the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Academic capitalism and the new economy: Privatization as shifting the target of public subsidy in higher education. In R. A. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 103–140). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Weber, M. (1958). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills, Trans. & Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Amy Scott Metcalfe

Sheila Slaughter

Black Feminism, Womanism, and Standpoint Theories

Black feminism is the nexus between the Black liberation and the women's liberation movements, but it has its own distinct ideologies. Black feminist thought consists of specialized knowledge created by African American women that clarifies a standpoint of and for Black women. In other words, Black feminist thought encompasses theoretical interpretations of Black women's reality by those who actually live it. Black feminist perspectives stress how various forms of gender, race, and class oppression work together to form a matrix of social domination. These oppressions are deeply interwoven into social structures and work together to define the history of the lives of Black women in America and other women of color worldwide. The history of these cultural oppressions can be traced back to the era of United States slavery during which time a social hierarchy developed locating White men at the top, White women next, followed by Black men, and finally, at the bottom, Black women. Because of the wide scope of these oppressors and the 400-year history associated with them, Black feminist writers and theorists reason that Black women have developed a distinct perspective and cognizance that provides them with keen social and economic survival skills, including utilizing everyday strategies of political resistance.

The particular interactions of oppressions faced by Black women daily have forced particular perspectives on social reality. Black feminists are highly critical of oversimplified models of oppression that suggest that Black women must identify as either Black or women, women first and Black second, or Black first and women second. Black feminists believe that when the lives of African American women are improved, there will be progressive development also for African American men, their families, and their communities. Black feminism can be identified with the celebrated historical tradition of Black female activists' commitment to empowering themselves to create a humanistic community for all.

Because middle-class White women within the traditional feminist movement have been accused of focusing on oppression primarily in terms of gender while paying scant attention to issues of race or class, theories of Black feminism were forged in resistance to this felt marginalization. It has been argued, too, that often times Black women had avoided the women's movement based on fear of interrogation by their own community members who linked racism with the women's movement. Articles in the anthology *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African-American Feminist Thought* (Guy-Sheftall, 1995) contain some examples of this. Michelle Wallace, in her article, "Anger in Isolation: A Black Feminist's Search for Sisterhood," suggests that the women's movement simply exploits Black women to help it build integrity. bell hooks, in "Black Women Shaping Feminist Theory," complains of the assumption in the women's movement that all women share a common oppressor. The Black feminist critique of racism has demanded that White women claim responsibility for their own racism and not require Black women to either educate White women on issues of race or to applaud their efforts at becoming less racist.

BLACK FEMINIST ACTIVISM AND SCHOLARSHIP

The Black feminist movement developed in the United States during the late 1960s and early 1970s as groups like the Combahee River Collective (which emphasized capitalism as the primary source of oppression for Black women) and the National Black Feminist Organization (NBFO) reacted to the sexism and homophobia of the male-dominated Black civil rights movement and the racism of the White feminist movement. In 1977, the Combahee River Collective, a grassroots Black feminist organization in Boston that had begun as a chapter of NBFO, issued a position paper that analyzed the intersection of oppression in Black women's lives and asserted the legitimacy of feminist organizing by Black women. The Collective's work broke significant new ground because it was explicitly socialist, addressed homophobia, and called for sisterhood among Black women of various sexual orientations. In fact, the early commitment of Black lesbian feminists was crucial to building the movement in the 1970s, at a time when many heterosexual Black women were reluctant to identify themselves as feminists.

The National Black Feminist Organization emerged from meetings held among African American women at the New York offices of the National Organization for Women in May and August 1973. The NBFO pledged itself to address problems of discrimination faced by African American women due to their race and gender. The NBFO sought to change the portrayal of African American women in the mass media, raised consciousness about sexual abuse in the African American community, and fought for higher wages and greater political influence for African American women. Chapters were organized in several major U.S. cities including Chicago and Detroit, but the national organization dissolved in 1977. *SAGE: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women,* the first explicitly Black feminist periodical devoted exclusively to the experiences of women of African descent, was founded in 1984 at Spelman College, a traditionally Black women's college in Atlanta, Georgia. Barbara Smith and Audre Lorde were cofounders of Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press, the first independent press to focus on the work of feminists of color. Among its publications were the now-classic *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology* and *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*.

Patricia Hill Collins, a major thinker in Black feminist theorizing, in her landmark 1990 book, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment,* describes major themes in the construction of Black feminist thought, all generated from a Black woman's point of view. Most importantly, Black women empower themselves by creating self-definitions and self-valuations that enable them to establish positive self-images and to repel negative, controlling representations of Black womanhood created by other people. Some of these negative, pathological, controlling images are known as “mammies,” “matriarchs,” “welfare queens,” and “Jezebels.” Such racist stereotypes are operative myths in the minds of many, allowing an easy disregard for the extent to which Black women are victimized in society. Black feminists stress the importance of positive self-definition as part of the journey toward social and political empowerment.

In order to help alleviate the psychological and economic suffering of Black women and to help them gain political power, Black feminists advocate a separate area of academic study that focuses exclusively on articulating and understanding the lived experiences of Black women. A typical contemporary Black feminist can be broadly described as an African American woman academic who believes that female descendants of American slavery share a unique set of life experiences importantly distinct from that of Black men and White women. The emergence of Black women’s studies in colleges and universities during the 1980s and the creation of a community of African American women writers such as Toni Morrison, Alice Walker, and Gloria Naylor, among a great many others, have created institutional locations where Black women intellectuals can produce specialized thought. One style of scholarship, for example, first describes activist traditions dating from abolitionist times and then investigates instances of contemporary activism in formal organizations and in everyday life and work. Black women’s history, documenting social structural influences on Black women’s consciousness, and Black feminist literary criticism, exploring Black women’s self-definitions, constitute two focal points in Black women’s intellectual work. However, the suppression of Black feminist thought in mainstream scholarship and within its Afrocentric and feminist critiques has meant that Black women intellectuals have traditionally relied on alternative institutional locations to produce specialized knowledge about the Black women’s standpoint. While Black women can produce knowledge claims that contest those of mainstream academia, academia often does not grant that Black women scholars have competing knowledge claims based in another knowledge validation process. Thus, any credentials controlled by mainstream academia can be denied Black feminist scholars on the grounds that their research is not credible. Many Black women scholars, writers, and artists have worked either alone, as was the case with Maria W. Stewart, or within African American community organizations, like Black women in the historic club movements and in contemporary churches. In terms of professional advancement in an academic career, a focus on helping the socially and politically disadvantaged become self-determining usually lies outside the definitional boundaries of traditional disciplines like psychology, for example, so a Black feminist orientation is not very likely to enhance one’s career.

Black feminists combine academic intellectual thought and political activism. Black women intellectuals use examples of lived experiences like working in factories, working as domestics, obtaining good health care, organizing communities, and mothering in their theorizing and written scholarship. They have the job of reinterpreting experiences so that African American women are aware of their collective knowledge enabling them to feel empowered instead of oppressed. The Black feminist movement does not mobilize through an institutionalized formal organization. Black feminist collectives operate through local communities in decentralized, often segmented, ways referred to in the literature as ”submerged networks.” Such gatherings of women with Black feminist views have existed throughout the history of Blacks in America, but the label of feminist was rarely attached to the activity. Some informal networks include self-help groups, book clubs, “sistah” parties and gatherings, and explicit political education groups.

WOMANISM

Novelist and essayist, Alice Walker, in 1983, introduced the term "womanist" as a more culturally acceptable label for people uncomfortable with the label of Black feminist. Walker first used the term in context in her collection of poems *In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens: Womanist Prose.* The need for this term arose from the early feminist work that advocated social change such as the right for women to move from the domestic sphere to the working and professional spheres away from home. This feminist agenda ignored the fact that many Black women were not housewives and had, in fact, been working outside the home most of their adult years to help support their families. Black women were already working women outside the home, but not out of personal choice, and certainly not usually as a matter of personal fulfillment. Similarly, the Black liberation movement focused largely on equality first for African American men, while the community's women were inadvertently (and temporarily) left in the background. With the increasing use of the term, both African American studies and women's studies programs began to incorporate womanism into university courses, and historians, for example, are regarded as womanist historians if they have incorporated the views and experiences of African American women in their accounts of history. Another term, "Africana womanism," places Africa at the center of analysis as it relates to women of African descent, wherever in the world they may live. Thus, the terminology Africana womanism, not Black feminism, womanism, or any other term, perhaps more appropriately fits the woman of the African diaspora.

BLACK FEMINISM AND STANDPOINT THEORY

A standpoint is a particular intellectual place from which people see and understand social reality. A related metaphor is that of a "lens" through which we view the world differently depending on which lens we happen to be looking through. A standpoint helps in articulating a social group's perspective about its lived experiences and in mapping the practices of power structures that oppress them. Standpoint theories, like that of Black women, claim to represent the world from a particular socially situated perspective that can lay a claim to special kinds of knowledge, an epistemic privilege or authority.

Black feminist standpoint theories reject the notion of an unmediated truth, arguing that knowledge is always mediated by myriad factors related to an individual's or group's particular position in the sociohistorical landscape. The basic insight of standpoint theories is that members of oppressed groups, like Black women, have special kinds of knowledge in virtue of their marginalized status in society. From knowledge gained via their particular standpoint, Black women can best embark upon political empowerment achieved through a raised group consciousness. Even if Black women cannot make good on the claim that it has privileged access to reality, it may offer alternative representations of reality that are more useful to the group than are other truthful representations. As feminist standpoint theory developed, it focused more on the political nature of the standpoint, and it has attempted to attend to the diversity of women by incorporating the standpoints of other marginalized groups like those of Black women. Black feminist standpoint theory is a type of critical theory, whose aim it is to empower the oppressed to improve their situation. It is a position from which emancipatory action can be taken.

Feminist standpoint theory derives from the Marxist position that the socially oppressed classes can access knowledge unavailable to the socially privileged, that different social groups have different points of view for gaining knowledge, particularly knowledge of social relations. It appropriates the Marxist belief in the epistemological superiority—or at the very least, equality—of the perspective of the oppressed classes. In the Marxist view, workers do not have this standpoint to begin with. They attain it by gaining collective consciousness of their role in the capitalist system and in history, since several aspects of the workers' social situation enable them to attain an epistemically privileged perspective on society. Workers are oppressed, central to the capitalist mode of production, and endowed with a cognitive style based on their practical productive material interaction with nature. Oppression gives them an objective interest in the truth about whose interests really get served by the capitalist system. They have a special view of capitalism. Because under capitalism the standing of all other classes is defined in relation to them, in coming to know themselves, and their class position, workers come to know their society as a totality.

Marxism offers the classic model of a standpoint theory, claiming an epistemic privilege over fundamental questions of economics, sociology, and history on behalf of the standpoint of the proletariat. And so, feminist standpoint theory considers knowledge of marginalized groups as equally important as that produced by dominant groups. A marginalized standpoint like that of Black women is not only important because it can view the dominant group from unflattering angles but can view many other different standpoints and critique them. When these situated facts from different standpoints form a pattern, the patterns themselves could be seen as knowledge. The epistemic privilege of the oppressed is sometimes cast, following W. E. B. DuBois, in terms of "bifurcated consciousness," the ability to see things both from the perspective of the dominant and from the perspective of the oppressed and, therefore, to comparatively evaluate both perspectives.

Black women are oppressed and, therefore, have an interest in representing social phenomena in ways that reveal rather than mask certain truths. As in Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's description of the master-slave relations, the subordinate slave is dependent upon the dominant master; it is in his or her interests to understand the master. Likewise, a subordinate group's standpoint is more complete as it has a greater reason to understand the dominant groups' standpoint and little reason to maintain the status quo. Black women also have direct experience of their oppression, unlike Black men or White women whose privilege enables them to ignore how their actions affect Black women as a class. Every standpoint theory must offer an account of how one gains access to its situated knowledge. This depends on whether membership in the group whose perspective is privileged is defined objectively, in terms of one's position in a social structure, or subjectively, in terms of one's subjective identification as a member of the group.

In the early 1980s, Nancy Hartsock developed what she called "the feminist standpoint," a concept that attempted to adjust the Marxist idea that one's perspective is dependent only on one of the two major class positions in a capitalist society. Hartsock suggested instead that the position of women is structurally different from that of men, that the lived realities of women's lives are profoundly different from those of men. She argued that the sexual division of labor forms the basis for a feminist standpoint. Just as Marx's understanding of the world from the standpoint of the proletariat enabled him to go beneath bourgeois ideology, so a feminist standpoint can allow us to understand patriarchal institutions and ideologies as perverse inversions of more humane social relations. Hartsock thus attempted to translate the concept of the standpoint of the proletariat, by analogy, into feminist terms.

There is no homogeneous women's experience and hence no singular women's standpoint since women see things differently from different social locations; different marginalized groups have different social, economic, and symbolic viewpoints. For Black women, the logic of an epistemology that grounds epistemic privilege in oppression is to identify the multiply oppressed as multiply epistemically privileged. Within feminist theory, this logic has led to the development of Black feminist epistemology. Thus, Collins grounds Black feminist epistemology in Black women's personal experiences of racism and sexism and in cognitive styles associated with Black women. She uses this epistemology to supply Black women with self-representations that enable them to resist the demeaning racist and sexist images of Black women in the wider world and to take pride in their identities. Black women are "outsiders within" having enough personal experience as insiders to understand their social place but also enough critical distance to empower critique.

Standpoint theorists argue about its history, its status as theory, and its relevance to current thinking, some arguing that standpoint theory provides a circular basis for deciding which standpoints have epistemic privilege. Considering many standpoints in the production of knowledge has been criticized on the grounds that it opens the way for relativistic knowledge. But, in fact, the collection of many standpoints works toward a more robust empirical representation of epistemology. The many different representations of a single phenomenon, such as an historical event, can be critically evaluated to determine what patterns arise out of the accounts of the phenomena as it happened. Many different standpoints are accessed in an attempt to create a more robust account of a phenomenon. The consideration of many different standpoints, including that of Black women, gives an opportunity for the entirely polemical or plainly false standpoints to be seen as nonobjective.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

In the history of White women's education in the United States, schools for women were shaped by notions of something called true womanhood, which were not applied to Black women. Schools were based, too, on perceived cognitive and intellectual differences between men and women, so women were educated primarily in the domestic arts. Black women, however, had no practices of separation from their men, so education for Black women came to emphasize education for men and women alike, with the ultimate goal of racial uplift. Feminist perspectives of nineteenth and twentieth century Black women originated in teachings that stressed how necessary it was for all of the community's members to be educated. White women who entered teaching jobs after graduating from high schools typically left their careers behind when they got married. Not so for Black women who continued to work, not always because of economic necessity, but of the need to participate in the empowerment of their community and to inculcate generations of students with Black feminist thought.

Black feminist pedagogy is dedicated to raising the political consciousness of all students by introducing an Afrocentric orientation to understanding the world, emphasizing the roles of race and gender as critical to understanding all social and historical phenomena, and instilling in students the motivation toward political activism. The presence of the Black feminist standpoint in education as an alternative epistemology is important because its existence challenges not only the content of what currently passes for truth but simultaneously challenges the process by which that truth was derived. Black feminist pedagogy as a philosophy of liberation enables students to take revolutionary action to change their communities, both local and global. To respectfully teach about theorizing from a Black woman's standpoint requires a rejection of the concept of education as value-free and instead demands an embrace of a pedagogy based on ethics and civic engagement. Presenting situatedness as the foundation of reality and knowledge rejects the elitism of academic thinking.

Since much of Black feminist thought is contained in the works of Black women writers, literary criticism by Black feminist critics provides an especially fertile source of Black women's ideas. Black feminist standpoint theories offer a critique of conventional epistemologies in the social and natural sciences. Ways of knowing informed by the motive of caring for the community's needs will produce more valuable representations than ways of knowing informed by the singular interests of the dominant. They will produce representations of the world in relation to universal human interests, rather than in terms of the interests of dominant classes, heretofore ideologically misrepresented as universal interests.

Black feminist research is conducted primarily to solve real-world problems. The researcher and the research participants become engaged in a dialogue, whereby the researcher uses her knowledge and skill to stimulate a new awareness within the community. An important aspect in this applied research is the respect given to the participants. Acknowledgment of their capability and potential to produce knowledge themselves is made. The standpoint theorist or activist should at any time *situate* herself within the plane of her research topic to validate or justify her knowledge claims. One's epistemological standpoint lends her authority when doing research in any field of the social sciences. Such a participatory approach to research requires a commitment to the empowerment of the people being studied.

Historical accounts of events are recorded and put forth as objective truths, but official accounts of events are rarely presented from a Black woman's standpoint. An African proverb describes this position well: Only when lions have historians will hunters cease being heroes. The dominant class writes history from its standpoint and the marginalized standpoint is oftentimes considered alternative, or indeed subversive, history. The dominant class considers its own standpoint history to be objective and correct, whereas the marginalized historical perspective is often deemed a subjective interpretation of the same events. According to standpoint theory, the closest an historical account can get to objectivity is to consider the many different standpoint perspectives of a single event and to deconstruct each account to derive the patterns that emerge. But, as critics would readily point out, the ethereal nature of objectivity arises upon realization that deconstruction is done from a particular standpoint and then reconstructed from another particular standpoint. Just as traditional European-American standpoint history (still taught in many United States public school systems) depicting the appropriation of Native American land shows White immigrants as diplomatic and considerate toward their fellow Native Americans, the Native American historical accounts tell quite a different story, instead depicting the systematic and cruel destruction of native civilization. Black feminist historians will take different accounts of Black women's history.

Black feminist standpoint theory is especially relevant in the scientific method. Validity in scientific method is created by the reproduction of results over many testings of a single hypothesis. To consider a single epistemological standpoint as universally valid is to test a hypothesis over and over again by the same standpoint in the same conditions. For science to proceed, and for scientific arrogance to be overcome, many standpoints must be introduced into the scientific community as valid modes to verification of a single scientific hypothesis. Many case studies in the sciences ranging from the field of pharmacology to sociology have fallen subject to being viewed by one singular epistemological standpoint, namely that of the dominant class. Scientific studies conducted solely on the dominant class and then generalized to Black women are often misapplied.

Gender theorists began by studying the concept of gender itself, ignoring issues of race, asking about the meaning of the differences between men and women in respect to several social and psychological variables. Many feminist proponents of gender theory rested their analysis on universal presumptions about the significance of gender and the specific characteristics of masculinity and femininity that were based on White women's experience of gender, which Black feminism argued against. Sojourner Truth, in her famous 1851 speech, "Ain't I a Woman?" made at a women's right convention, is used for this point. Truth argued that femininity conceptualized as passive and weak, like that described of White women in the constructed notion of true womanhood, did not apply to her and most other Black women, yet she and they could equally be called "woman."

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Collins, P.H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Guy-Sheftall, B. (Ed.). (1995). *Words of fire: An anthology of African-American feminist thought.* New York: New Press.

Harding, S.G. (2004). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies.* New York: Routledge.

Harding, S.G. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Perkins, L. (1993). The role of education in the development of Black feminist thought. *History of Education, 22*(3), 265–275.

Smith, B. (1977). *Toward a Black feminist criticism.* Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.

Evangeline A. Wheeler

Cultural Capital Theories

Cultural capital theories abound in educational research with references to cultural capital increasingly commonplace in writing on education. There is a growing tendency for cultural capital to be sprayed throughout academic texts like intellectual hair spray without doing any theoretical work. The concept itself first grew to prominence in the work of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu on the French educational system and has powerful explanatory force in relation to educational inequalities of social class. The notion of cultural capital insightfully draws attention to the power dimensions of cultural practices, dispositions, and resources in market societies and is especially powerful as a theoretical tool for understanding inter- and intraclass differences in educational achievement. However, in both Bourdieu's own writings and later applications by other academics, it is very difficult to gain an understanding of working-class academic success. Furthermore, a major concern about Bourdieu's own use of cultural capital has been his lack of clarity about its relationship with gender and ethnic divisions. Cultural capital theories have rarely been utilized to explain inequalities of gender or race and appear to have a theoretical gap where there should be an analysis of how class cultural practices are mediated by both gender and race. Relatedly, apart from the work of a small number of feminists, there have been few attempts to develop notions of gendered cultural capital.

WHAT IS CULTURAL CAPITAL?

The term capital is usually associated with a narrowly defined economic category of monetary exchange for profit. However, Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital is an attempt to expand the category of capital to something more than just the economic and to identify culture as a form of capital. Bourdieu includes social capital alongside cultural capital and has also written more generally of symbolic capital and more specifically of linguistic capital. However, what all Bourdieu's capitals share is that each requires, and is the product of, an investment of an appropriate kind and each can secure a return on that investment. As with all the other capitals, Bourdieu's concern in relation to cultural capital was with its continual transmission and accumulation in ways that perpetuate social inequalities. Bourdieu sees the concept of cultural capital as breaking with the received wisdom that attributes academic success or failure to natural aptitudes, such as intelligence and giftedness. Bourdieu explains school success by the amount and type of cultural capital inherited from the family milieu rather than by measures of individual talent or achievement. For him, ability is socially constructed and is the result of individuals having access to large amounts of cultural capital. Ability is itself the product of an investment of time and cultural capital.

Cultural capital encompasses a broad array of linguistic competencies, manners, preferences, and orientations, which Bourdieu (1977, p. 82) terms "subtle modalities in the relationship to culture and language." Bourdieu identifies three variants of cultural capital: first, in the embodied state incorporated in mind and body; second, in the institutionalized state, that is, in institutionalized forms such as educational qualifications; and third, in the objectified state, simply existing as cultural goods such as books, artifacts, dictionaries, and paintings (Bourdieu, 1986).

Cultural capital is not the only capital accruing to individuals. It is primarily a relational concept and exists in conjunction with other forms of capital. Therefore, it cannot be understood in isolation from the other forms of capital that, alongside cultural capital, constitute advantage and disadvantage in society. As well as cultural capital, these include economic, symbolic, and social capital. Social capital is generated through social processes between the family and wider society and is made up of social networks. Economic capital is wealth either inherited or generated from interactions between the individual and the economy, while symbolic capital is manifested in individual prestige and personal qualities, such as authority and charisma. In addition to their interconnection, Bourdieu envisages a process in which one form of capital can be transformed into another. For example, economic capital can be converted into cultural capital, while cultural capital can be readily translated into social capital.

According to Bourdieu (1993), the overall capital of different fractions of the social classes is composed of differing proportions of the various kinds of capital. It is mainly in relation to the middle and upper classes that Bourdieu elaborates this variation in volume and composition of the four types of capital. For example, individuals can be adjacent to each other in social space yet have very different ratios of economic to cultural capital. These differences are a consequence of complex relationships between individual and class trajectories. Moreover, the value attached to the different forms of capital are stakes in the struggle between different class fractions. Bourdieu (1993) uses the analogy of a game of roulette to describe how some individuals might "play." Just as those with lots of red tokens and few yellow tokens will not play in the same way as those with lots of yellow and few red tokens, so also those with lots of economic capital and little cultural capital will play differently than those with lots of cultural but little economic capital. And, just as people with more yellow tokens will stake more on the yellow squares, so also will people with more cultural capital stake on the educational system.

For Bourdieu, all goods, whether material or symbolic, have an economic value if they are in short supply and considered worthy of being sought after. He describes a process in which classes invest their cultural capital in academic settings. Because the upper, and to a lesser extent the middle, classes have the means of investing their cultural capital in the optimum educational setting, their investments are extremely profitable. From this perspective, educational institutions can be viewed as mechanisms for generating social profits.

Bourdieu argues that all his concepts should be regarded not as ideas as such but as a method and a way of thinking. He urges that it is better that concepts such as cultural capital be polymorphic, supple, and adaptable rather than defined, calibrated, and used rigidly. In Bourdieu's own work, there are a number of different understandings of cultural capital that span cognitive structures, knowledge generally, and behavioral dispositions. The concept can shift in meaning from one piece of Bourdieu's writing to another, at times conceived in terms of linguistic competencies and academic style and at other times as tastes and consumption patterns. The same diversity characterizes empirical work that attempts to examine the impact of cultural capital within education. As a result, there is a level on which cultural capital can be all things to all people, and this constitutes both its appeal and a danger.

WORKING-CLASS CULTURAL CAPITAL: A CONTRADICTION IN TERMS

Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital has been heavily criticized for producing the working classes as passive, even "culture less." He writes that working-class students are in a situation where the school remains the one and only path to culture at every level of education, and much of his work seems to be built on a perception that schooling is the only source of working-class cultural capital. This propensity of Bourdieu's work to produce the working classes as a by-product of middle- and upper-class cultural reproduction has resulted in trenchant criticisms of his work. It has been argued that he ignores working-class internal differentiation and underestimates the possibilities for class mobility.

Certainly, Bourdieu does seem to view the working classes as complicit in their own domination to the extent that they esteem and consequently legitimate the cultural capital they themselves do not possess. Cultural capital theories then are primarily theories of the reproduction of the upper and middle classes. The working classes are reproduced almost by default to the extent that cultural capital theory can be seen as yet another theory about what the working classes lack. Reinforcing this view of "lack" is the language Bourdieu uses to describe working-class behavior. Terms such as "negative predispositions to school" self-elimination and "resigned attitude to failure and exclusion" are all redolent of deficit model theses. So one of the main limitations of cultural capital theories is an inability to explain working-class educational success.

In one of his best-known works, "The Weight of the World," Bourdieu (1999) describes how working-class students, especially those from immigrant families, are often left to fend for themselves within the educational system. Because they are either obliged to rely on chance or the dictates of the school, their use of an already extremely meagre cultural capital is either untimely or inappropriate. This produces working-class students as "outcasts on the inside" within the educational system, relegated to educational courses and tracks that have lost much of the value they once had. The result is a difficult balancing act between "anxious submission" and "powerless revolt." Although Bourdieu does write that a minimal amount of social mobility serves to legitimate the educational system, it is difficult to see within his concept of cultural capital how any of the working classes with little or no cultural, social, or economic capital manage to succeed. There is no explanatory account for working-class students who succeed academically and reach university.

GENDER AND CULTURAL CAPITAL

While social class is foregrounded in cultural capital theories, gender is far more muted. This is because, for Bourdieu, gendered cultural capital is the most hidden and universal form of capital. Yet, as feminists have pointed out, gender just as much as social class provides the relations in which cultural capital comes to be organized and valued. For example, both masculinity and whiteness are valued and normalized forms of cultural capital that are frequently taken for granted and rendered invisible. However, this very invisibility generates power and social profits. It is more difficult to view femininity as a valued form of cultural capital. However, McCall (1992) argues that gendered dispositions are themselves forms of cultural capital and that there is an embodied feminine cultural capital. Skeggs (1997) develops this notion of embodied feminine cultural capital in her empirical study of White working-class women, and I discuss her work in more detail below. In two of the few other attempts to gender cultural capital, Hall (1992) explores the possibility that the cultural capital of women and minority ethnic groups is incommensurate with the cultural capital of the dominant culture, while Corson (1993) argues that the linguistic and interactional skills of girls and women—which he sees as part of gendered cultural capital—are largely unrecognized by the educational system.

More common than attempts to develop concepts of gendered cultural capital are the efforts to understand the ways in which class cultural practices are mediated by gender. The concept of cultural capital implies the centrality of the family. Cultural capital is transmitted primarily through the family. It is from the family that children derive modes of thinking, types of dispositions, sets of meanings, and qualities of style. These are then assigned a specific social value and status in accordance with what the dominant classes label as the most valued cultural capital. The accumulation of cultural capital begins in early childhood. It requires pedagogical action in the form of investments of time by parents, other family members, or hired professionals throughout childhood. Integral, therefore, to cultural capital theories is the potential for complex analyses of the interactions between home background, the processes of schooling, and children's educational careers.

It has been obvious to feminists working with Bourdieu's concepts that these interactions are powerfully gendered and, more specifically, point to the significance not just of the family but of the mother. Bourdieu also seems to recognize the centrality of the mother, arguing that the cultural capital that is effectively transmitted within the family depends not only on the quantity of cultural capital but also on the usable time, particularly in the form of mother's free time, available to it. So, in Bourdieu's own theory of cultural capital, women play a central role in the family by converting economic capital into cultural capital. Women, and particularly women in their role as mothers, play a key part in the accumulation of cultural capital and, thus, in the maintenance of class and other social boundaries. They are frequently charged with the upbringing and education of children and consequently have primary responsibility for the formation of the next generation. They also have a critical part in transmitting cultural competence by embodying it in their own person, in their manners, in their interactions with those outside the family, especially their judgments of others, and in their dress and deportment. However, as Lovell (2000) points out, this produces women as objects rather than subjects. For Bourdieu, women's status is as capital bearing objects whose value accrues to the primary groups to which they belong (for Bourdieu, the family) rather than as capital accumulating subjects in their own right. However, there is growing evidence that femininities, like masculinities, may be assets in the educational market. As Lovell points out, femininities as cultural capital are beginning to have broader currency in unexpected ways. For instance, feminine skills and competencies are increasingly yielding profits within schooling, while the demand for stereotypical feminine skills is growing within the labor market. The most dramatic sign of these changes is the gender reversal in educational achievement with girls and young women overtaking their male counterparts.

THE WORKINGS OF CULTURAL CAPITAL WITHIN EDUCATION

Within educational research, most conceptualizations of cultural capital have focused on high-status cultural participation. Such studies operationalize cultural capital primarily as knowledge of, or competence with, highbrow aesthetic culture such as classical music and fine art. In some examples, cultural capital is defined as the knowledge and competencies belonging to members of the upper classes while in others, cultural capital is seen as familiarity with the dominant culture in the society and especially the ability to use "educated language." However, as Lareau and Weininger (2003) argue, such conceptualizations of cultural capital overlook the full potential of cultural capital as a theoretical tool for understanding how inequalities are generated through schooling. They also neglect the full range of dimensions that Bourdieu himself attributed to cultural capital. They argue for extending understandings of cultural capital from a narrow focus on high-status cultural activities to include the full range of microinteractional processes through which individuals (and families) comply, or fail to comply, with the evaluative standards of dominant institutions such as schools. Such an understanding opens up conceptions of cultural capital to include any competence or skill that enables appropriation of the cultural heritage of a society. As long as such skills and competencies are unequally distributed within society, they offer the prospect of exclusive advantages and can, therefore, function as cultural capital.

In order to convey the full scope of cultural capital theories, it is useful to examine two educational research studies (Reay, 1998; Skeggs, 1997) that utilize cultural capital in this broader sense. In my own work on mothers' involvement in their children's schooling (Reay, 1998), I have used cultural capital to animate processes of social reproduction. Using cultural capital ensures a focus on particular types of resources women can draw on in their efforts to support children's schooling. It suggests questions that explore the differences among women but at the same time emphasizes the inequalities that permeate those differences.

As well as recognizing the importance of material resources, cultural capital provides a means of developing a more complex analysis that incorporates psychological aspects of women's involvement in schooling. These include confidence, ambivalence or a sense of inadequacy about providing support, the amount of expertise women feel in the educational field, and the extent to which entitlement, assertiveness, aggression, or timidity characterize women's approaches to teaching staff. It is these and other subjective aspects of cultural capital, just as much as the straightforward aspects such as educational qualifications and income level, that illuminate processes of social production and reproduction. Such a focus reveals how mothers, through taking responsibility for their children's educational success, are implicated in social class reproduction. In trying to support their children and gain the best for them, what made the differences apparent among mothers was not their activities but the context in which they took place and the activities underpinning them. Although many of the working-class mothers had fewer cultural resources than middle-class mothers, including far lower incomes, fewer educational qualifications, less educational knowledge and information about the system, this did not indicate lower levels of involvement in children's education. What it did mean was less effective practices, as working-class women found it difficult to assume the role of educational expert, were less likely to persuade teachers to act on their complaints, and were ill equipped financially, socially, and psychologically to compensate for deficits they perceived in their children's education.

The working-class mothers could not make the education system work for them or their children because they did not have access to the recognized cultural capital to make it work, no matter how strong their efforts. Working-class mothers who feel ill equipped to engage in educational repair work in the home and lack financial resources are reliant on the school to get the job done. School comes to be perceived as “the last and only resort.” Working-class mothers’ ambivalence about assuming a teaching role was rooted in a lack of dominant cultural capital and was related to a variety of factors: mothers’ own negative experiences of schooling, feelings that they lacked educational competencies and knowledge, and a related lack of confidence about tackling educational work in the home. Without these essential ingredients of cultural capital, their time did not count for anything to the same extent as that of their middle-class counterparts. So drawing on concepts of cultural capital can reveal both how processes of social reproduction are lived out in everyday lives and the ways in which they are gendered.

Bev Skeggs’ (1997) research also works creatively with concepts of cultural capital. She argues that gender can be a form of cultural capital but only if it is legitimated, for example, through class, and the example she provides is of middle-class moral femininity. In contrast, the White working-class women in her study were delegitimated, and she uses the concept of cultural capital to examine judgments of White working-class women, judgments not only made by others but often internalized by the women themselves.

For example, when these women entered posh shops, they were acutely aware of the way they were being read and judged by others. This made them feel out of place without access to the cultural capital of more privileged others. Skeggs writes about the myriad ways in which the working-class women in her study were judged as lacking. She describes these as judgments of taste and distinction that blame individuals for something that is determined by the economic, cultural, symbolic, and social capital to which they are allowed access. The White working-class women in her study tried to convert the limited cultural capital they accrued through caring work into educational qualifications with the hope of further conversion into economic capital. However, for much of the time, they did not have access to the sort of cultural capital that could be capitalized on. They were, thus, in a position of preventing losses rather than of trading up and accruing value.

What both these studies illustrate are the gendered ways in which the educational system tends to reinforce and consecrate initial inequalities that are generated through family practices. For the privileged students, cultural capital is added to cultural capital, while for working-class students, the only forms of cultural capital available to them rarely produce profitable returns. The two studies also demonstrate that only some forms of femininity operate as profitable cultural capital and that these are powerfully classed.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR CULTURAL CAPITAL THEORIES

Currently dominant educational discourses across the globe celebrate “the individualized, rational, self-interested individual,” and it is here that gendered notions of cultural capital that stress emotional, interactive, and collaborative resources and investments can subvert and challenge dominant notions of being and doing. Cultural capital theories have been especially useful for understanding how the upper and middle classes operate as classes for themselves. Relatedly, it is equally important to question mobilizations of cultural capital that are always about “getting the best for yourself and your own child.” Can there exist other more feminist and redistributory ways of “putting cultural capital to work”? Educationalists need to discriminate between educational standards that are intrinsically desirable and standards that are primarily about facilitating success in dominant institutions. A more critical, and historically sensitive, vision is required, and it is here that cultural capital theories could have particular efficacy. Cultural capital theories to date have powerfully focused attention on educational inequalities of social class. We now need to explore the scope within cultural capital theories for understanding how there might be both a revitalization of the common good and the establishment of fairer, more equitable educational processes and practices.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 71–112). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Robinson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question.* London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). The contradictions of inheritance. In P. Bourdieu et al., *Weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (pp. 507–513). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Corson, D. (1993). *Language, minority education and gender: Linking social justice and power.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hall, J. (1992). The capital(s) of cultures: A nonholistic approach to status situations, class, gender and ethnicity. In M. Lamont & M. Fournier (Eds.), *Cultivating differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality* (pp. 257–285). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and Society, 32*(5–6), 567–606.

Lovell, T. (2000). Thinking feminism with and against Bourdieu. In B. Fowler (Ed.), *Reading Bourdieu on culture and society* (pp. 27–48). London: Blackwell.

McCall, L. (1992). Does gender fit? Bourdieu, feminism and conceptions of social order. *Theory and Society, 21*(6), 837–868.

Reay, D. (1998). *Class work: Mothers' involvement in their children's primary schooling.* London: University College Press.

Skeggs, B. (1997). *Formations of class and gender.* London: Routledge.

Diane Reay

Feminist Reproduction Theory

Pierre Bourdieu, some might say, was not a feminist. Indeed, the now late French social theorist was often regarded by feminist theorists in France and beyond the borders of continental Europe as largely uninterested in questions of gender and social inequality. This broad claim notwithstanding, starting from the early 1990s and onward, Bourdieu did, in fact, argue that concerns over the nature and significance of *masculine domination*—a term closely aligned with symbolic domination and far more complex in nature and constitution than its wording suggests—can be identified to greater or lesser degrees in all aspects of social life. He went on to argue that masculine domination, as it pertains primarily to culture and social class, has its greatest impact in social institutions where the maintenance of an apparently stable and rational social order is a key national project par excellence. Consequently, he pointed particularly to education as a central and ideologically powerful site for the reproduction of gender inequality, as well as conceptualizing it as a spatially organized site for the accumulation of specific forms of gendered capital and the subsequent class formation of social stratification.

The efforts of gender theorists in education, especially *feminist reproduction theorists,* dating back to the 1970s, have reflected many of Bourdieu's concerns about masculine domination and the forms of educational control operating in relation to capitalist interests. Feminist reproduction theory, arguably the form of educational feminism aligned most closely with Marxist and neo-Marxist feminist thought, has therefore been most centrally concerned with what Bourdieu (1998) eloquently referred to as the "constancy of structure" in gender relations: a study of how "categories of understanding" about "sex" and "gender" and their material effects reproduce a *constant* and "deeply sedimented" gendered division of labor that is embodied in public consciousness and asserted through class relations in education.

Arguably, it has been the reproduction theorists, particularly those aligned with concerns about women's relationship to the political economy (such as Madeleine Arnot and Lois Weis) and, more recently, feminists interested in cultural theory (such as Beverley Skeggs, Diane Reay, Lisa Adkins, and Angela McRobbie) who have committed in part to Bourdieu's belief that education and other social forces in the cultural field (e.g., media) play a very substantial part in reproducing (not merely regulating) gender, race, and class divisions in the state. Feminist reproduction theorists have also struggled to unpack contemporary misconceptions, including those made by some gender theorists, such as liberal and maternal feminists, about the potential eradication of social inequality through liberal and relational models of educational access and opportunity. Following a Marxist interest in history, feminist reproduction theorists incorporated into their theory a social history of women's oppression in the nation-state (what might be seen as a feminist historical materialism). In this way, they were able to draw upon the heuristic principles of historical materialism to expose the relation between masculine hegemony and material interests. Feminists in this theoretical camp were therefore able to detach in part from nationalist loyalties as ultimately bound to a history of male interests. They also conceptualized the state as emphatically asserted from the viewpoint of a male history in the face of many other competing social interests.

It is for these reasons that reproduction theorists are often viewed as the critical consciousness of the field—providing a "critical political semantics" (see Fraser & Gordon, 1995) of a system that still largely privileges men over women, White students over minority ethnic students, and elite classes over the "working classes" and economically disadvantaged youth. As such, feminist reproduction theory, and the Marxist ideas it draws upon, have made major contributions to the study of gender inequality in schools. The theory has not been without criticism, however, and in the current political and policy contexts, limitations of the theory and related gender research have also emerged.

REPRODUCTION THEORY AND THE STUDY OF GENDER EQUALITY

In the second half of the twentieth century, largely following the work of European social theorists, sociologists in the United Kingdom and the United States, and the political force of the international second-wave feminist movement, researchers began to concern themselves with education's role in the reproduction of gender and class relations in the state (e.g., Arnot, formerly MacDonald, 1980; Bowles & Gintis, 1976). In particular, the rise in feminist social movements in the 1960s and 1970s played a critical role in allowing reproduction theorists to rethink the nature of egalitarian postwar aims of education and their significance in eradicating gender inequality. The historically derived argument raised by reproduction and neo-Marxist feminists was that national education systems were characteristically modeled on a classed notion of citizenship and civic participation reflecting a residual public/private split. The public-private distinction noted by reproduction theorists referred to the manner in which the liberal democratic nation-state and its associated national education systems had been built upon a division between the rational male citizen (i.e., legitimate public participant) and the ascription of women to the realm of the private (as caregiver, teacher). The basic premise of Marxist feminist critiques of the nation-state was, therefore, that liberal socialization theories and their implicit commitment to traditional gender roles implied an assumption of conformity to state ideals (traditional male and female roles) and a focus upon a male-centered economy rather than the recognition of gender equality and the dismantling of substantial class distinctions across and among women through education.

An emphasis upon the reproduction of the social and economic order by the educational Marxists of the 1970s thus led to a feminist version of *social reproduction* theory (MacDonald, 1980). Informed primarily by Bowles and Gintis (1976) and British and European Marxist movements, feminist sociologists conceptualized education as an institutional tool of capitalism that reproduced the positioning of women in the domestic sphere and, in particular, the classed subordination of working-class girls into a social status residing outside the domain of legitimate citizenship. In these conceptualizations, social class served as the social category that not only prefigured, but determined, girls' educational experiences, identities, and forms of consciousness. In this early version of gender reproduction theory, the study of school structures (e.g., curriculum subjects) and their links to the economy was privileged over issues of cultural identity, difference, and social agency (see Arnot & Dillabough, 1999, for an elaboration on these points). While such theories offered few practical suggestions in relation to girls' emancipation through education or to the corresponding need for a more egalitarian notion of education extending outward from an expanded democracy, the critique of the liberal state and concepts of "freedom" and "equality" through education were crucial to the critical power of reproduction theory to question the apparently egalitarian gender principles put forward in the Western liberal state.

At the level of sociological theory, then, many reproduction feminists were forced to reject Emile Durkheim's late nineteenth-century imagined concept of education for national stability because it inevitably raised problems of gender inequality and led to substantial economic instability for women, particularly if socialization into the realm of the domestic field seemed often to equate with substantial poverty, family violence, or single parenthood for women. Scholars concerned with gender equity would, therefore, need to recognize the significance of the economic sphere and its effects on the institutional culture of schooling as it pertained both to women's history in the liberal state and to girls' and women's employment futures. As Arnot and Dillabough (1999) argued following the insights of well-established Marxist feminists, this recognition of the political barriers to women's rights in the state led to an understanding of education as the site for the preparation (and reproduction) of a hierarchically stratified gendered workforce, with women being prepared for lower status, marginalized, or domestic/service positions in the labor market (see, for example, Spender, 1987).

Reproduction feminists were, therefore, the most obvious and sustained critics of both Durkheim's state socialization theory and liberal accounts of sex roles (including sex role theory), the socializing aims of which undermined women's claims for equity and emancipation. Not only did the public/private split pose problems for women in terms of access to a more diverse set of educational opportunities, but it also undermined the very premises of liberal equality in postwar democratic nation-states. From the perspective of reproduction and Marxist feminists, education could thus be seen to support a "patriarchal conception of civil society" (see Deitz, 2003), both founded upon and realized through the structural practices of education. Education feminism was heavily influenced by such currents and began to address what Dale Spender (1987) identified as the "patriarchal paradigm" of state education, focusing largely upon the constraining impact of social structures on girls' and women's lives (see also Arnot & Dillabough, 1999). As Arnot (2002) suggested, a key challenge facing reproduction theorists was to assess the degree to which education functions as a cultural force in the production of girls and women as "classed and sexed subjects."

Feminist reproduction theory, now well established, therefore stands in marked contrast to the liberal feminist account of sex differences, with its goal of challenging the liberal view that gender differences are somehow linked to individual traits and abilities or liberal equality practices rather than attributable to objective divisions in the social world and structural constraints in society (Dillabough, 2002). It also stands against post-structural accounts of power as located primarily in the functional manifestation of language because it remains concerned with materiality as playing a constraining role in women's lives.

Contrary, then, to liberal perspectives suggesting that gender equality has now been achieved or to poststructural accounts that focus upon linguistic forms of cultural power, feminist reproduction accounts have provided gender theorists with the theoretical tools for continuing to view education as a form of both institutional power and social constraint and, therefore, as central to the maintenance of an unequal gender/social order. For example, in recent years, critical feminist policy researchers have demonstrated that, despite the assertion of liberal claims of access and "equality of opportunity" policies, *White middle-class* girls and boys continue to dominate the higher echelons of academic achievement and the labor market. It is therefore ongoing class stratification and the reassertion of middle-class ideals through education policy that largely explain social differentiation, not perceived individual differences, the apparent abilities of children, or equity policies per se. *Achievement, performance, and school choice* in education therefore serve as "markers of economic privilege" (Reay & Lucey, 2003) and are fundamentally tied to issues of power, social mobility, and the historical division between the public and the private spheres. What might then sometimes be seen as advancements in girls' educational performance (and it is clear that gender performance patterns have changed in some national contexts over the past 30 years), feminist reproduction theorists argue, must therefore be understood and read within the larger context of social class relations. And, as long as a concern with gender differences and performance remains at the center of equality debates, gender will continue to emerge as a determining force for the achievement of equality irrespective of other social relations. This singular emphasis in much of the equality literature ultimately prioritizes gender above all other categories thus obscuring the significance of other factors such as economic changes, the rise in standardized testing, female employment, retrenchment, migration patterns, and the elimination of ESL training, in shaping students' educational experiences.

In more recent years, while many liberal feminists have continued to claim that gender equity policies explain girls' exemplary post-1980 achievement results from K to 12 cross-nationally, feminist reproduction theorists have assessed the changing nature of economic capital and its broad and largely negative impact on male and female youth in schools (cross-nationally and in the developing world), as well as its influence over the current configuration of teachers' work and educational policy. To my mind, it is this *critical consciousness* or *critical political semantics* that puts into question the success stories that are often told by liberal feminists and the media about girls' and boys' achievement in schools and higher education, as so many of these success stories are contingent upon performing in a highly competitive masculine/colonial system of education that is largely neoliberal in form. According to a reproduction approach, it is still evident that social differentiation, and not the democratization of social relations, remains at the heart of the liberal democratic project. Here, then, is one of the central contributions of feminist reproduction theory to the sociology of education—an ability to question the line dividing the colonial public and the private in schools and to expose the class mechanisms by which such gendered and racialized divisions are reproduced. Liberal feminism had proven to be fundamentally ahistorical and failed to acknowledge the state-related barriers to girls' successes in schools and the labor market. By contrast, and somewhat paradoxically, the postmodernists and poststructuralists have also failed to acknowledge the part played by materiality in the formation of gender inequality.

LIMITATIONS OF FEMINIST REPRODUCTION THEORY AND ITS ACCOUNT OF EDUCATION

What might be some of the shortcomings in and objections raised to the fundamental presuppositions of the type of project feminist reproduction theorists have undertaken in education? The first, originating paradoxically in the work of postmodern, poststructural, and postcolonial/cultural studies approaches, is that reproduction theorists have been seen to devalue the part played by diverse women's movements and broader elements of, for example, culture, race, and sexuality in the recontextualization of gender relations and social inequality. The primary explanation for this shortcoming is that they may be too constrained by metatheoretical explanations of social inequality, such as class conflict. The key problem, then, was that feminist reproduction accounts had raised a seemingly narrow perspective on gender and class to preeminent status and reduced the multiplicity of potential social processes and identity issues shaping gender inequality in schools (such as compulsory heterosexuality) to single-factor explanations tied to the political economy.

Yet, while the pressure to conceptualize "gender" more broadly was crucial to more ethically conceived gender theories, some aspects of this pressure also discouraged some reproduction theorists from continuing to study macrolevel concepts of education and their complementary impact on differently positioned girls' and boys' educational experiences. By the end of the 1980s, government initiatives seemed to be the prime motivation behind many gender equity research projects. Some reproduction theorists, while still concerned with the state, suddenly seemed trapped in the liberal rhetoric (e.g., voice research as individual liberal narrative, performance studies) and, therefore, left behind many of the macro issues that had once so concerned them. This reality was further compounded by the fact that postmodern and poststructural feminists were far less focused on issues of class and social structure or had left class culture out of the equation altogether. The most obvious and somewhat paradoxical outcome of this dual framing of equality outside of a structural paradigm was that novel structural mechanisms (associated with globalization) shaping inequality in the late twentieth century went largely unassessed and still remain hidden from public view.

A second and related objection finds its most forceful formulation in neoliberal political policies rather than in theory or research per se. For example, the ongoing pressure for researchers extending from larger neoliberal research agendas in the 1990s has meant that *sometimes* the work of gender researchers aligns with government policy rhetoric by endorsing, even if tacitly and unintentionally, some of its alarmist and essentialist claims about gender inequality (e.g., "boys' underachievement," "disruptive masculinities," "girls' global academic successes"). Precisely because class stratification had not managed to retain its dominance in social theory, many gender researchers, including some reproduction theorists, ultimately conflated their equity concerns with the school effectiveness/performance agenda and an overwhelming concern with gender differences.

The preoccupation with universal gender differences in achievement, much of which seems driven by larger concerns about student success in a global economy, has diminished the status of feminist sociological theories of the state in the study of gender inequality. Although concerns about gender and achievement need not be unrelated to equity or the moral concerns of a state, the sociological explanations for reported differences in achievement and other equity concerns are diminishing not only in status but also in currency. Particularly in the United States, there is a peculiar tendency within some reproduction approaches to turn toward liberalism and neoliberal practice as a response to changing political economies and global demands rather than toward ethical and sociological questions about girls' and boys' engagement with education as class and racialized expressions of their social location in the state.

A third objection, what might be seen as theoretical or epistemological, can be derived from an analysis of the presuppositions of some reproduction accounts in explaining how social change has influenced men and women's experiences of, successes within, and barriers to, education. This objection questions whether reproduction theory (in its efforts to secure a theory of the "constancy of structure") may, despite its own sustained critiques of liberalism, have inadvertently obscured an analysis of the relationship between gender equality and social change. In earlier moments, the project of feminist reproduction theory was to secure an account of how education, as a contradictory and complex social structure, subordinates girls and women. Yet, objectors might ask if reproduction theorists have failed to acknowledge the late modernizing influences and geographical changes that continue to transform the micro- and macropatterns of educational experience and exclusion for diverse girls, women, boys, and men over time. Nor have reproduction theorists adequately assessed the role that girls' and women's agency has played in mitigating structural barriers to gender equality. The most obvious late twentieth century example might be the ways in which more fluid gender identifications (e.g., sexuality) have reconstituted the very meanings of gender relations in schools and its impact of equity on a larger cultural scale (see Rasmussen & Harwood, 2003). The consequence of this potential failure has been that some of the most important questions about young peoples' differential relationship to novel social and structural arrangements remain substantially unanswered, as do questions about youth agency and identity.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, during and after the rise of the civil rights movement, reproduction theorists were faced with the reality that educational expansion for girls and women (a key argument of the Marxist feminists)—as the primary mechanism for responding to broader social problems rooted in gender and class inequalities—was a necessary but insufficient strategy for addressing those inequalities reflected within the operation of the education system itself. Against a background of the rise of migration racism throughout Europe, North America, and the Antipodes and clearer feminist recognition of other forms of social inequality, class egalitarianism came under greater academic scrutiny. Clearly, the study of gender and class conflict "was not enough." Feminist sociologists began to turn to the development of analytical frameworks sufficiently sophisticated for addressing the complex and interrelated issues of culture and gender and identity together with their role in shaping educational/social exclusion. Together with the challenges presented by a range of influential social theorists (including, for example, Judith Butler, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida), educational scholars began to build a systematic agenda through which to critique the Marxist/reproductive projects of education, particularly in their failure to sufficiently contribute to social justice and to larger identity debates about the "self" in social theory. At the center of this critique lay the charge that the reproduction theorists had devoted themselves to charting the outcomes of educational inequality rather than exploring gender identity and the subtle microcultural processes of exclusion operating through schooling. The exposure of such cultural processes have brought to the fore the problems raised by egalitarianism as the defining premise for the success of gender equity. It also became clear that gendered conceptions of education articulated by reproduction theorists sometimes remained too narrowly conceived in addressing the demands of the labor market rather than confronting larger and burgeoning questions of culture difference.

Many of these limitations have emerged as a result of a return to an emphasis upon gender differences and achievement rather than determining, as an interdisciplinary and cross-national project, how diverse education systems function in a changing global, market-oriented, and highly unequal social order. Such limitations have also emerged in part as a failure to respond to compelling and widespread theoretical changes in the social sciences.

To remain committed to an understanding of how education produces gender differentiation (as an expression of other social relations), we would, as many feminist sociologists have argued, need a "generative theory" (see Arnot, 2002; McNay, 2000) that could account for the contemporary relationships among, for example, gender, culture, history, social formations, education, and the economy. Such a theory would need to address microlevel concerns raised about gendered discourse (e.g., racialized constructions of masculinity and femininity in schools), discursive identities, risk, biography, and culture while at the same time ensuring a commitment to a critical assessment of the role of education as a movable and changeable apparatus of the state. This work would also need to consider more seriously what contemporary feminist debates in social theory have to offer to education principally in relation to a study of human agency, culture, and identity, such as a much more sophisticated account of how contemporary male and female youth read, internalize, and respond to the changing economic and cultural order. If theorists and researchers were to focus their sights on the development of such a generative framework, gender differences in education would not be constructed as essential, as purely successful, or as the only equity issue on the podium but rather as markers of economic, cultural, and social privilege that are far more complex than liberal accounts or the media suggest.

In moving forward to create a complex theoretical framework for understanding how schools and society in late modernity continue to shape gender relations, theorists and researchers must be certain to avoid the mistakes of the past, particularly the failure to be more comprehensive in their ethical reach. If "class stratification" and "gender" stood at the center of the project of feminist reproduction theorists in earlier years, these now need to be seen as conceptual tools that remain necessary but could never be seen as sufficient or representative enough for the present theoretical landscape.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Arnot, M. (1982). Male hegemony, social class and women's education. *Journal of Education, 164* (1), 64–89.

Arnot, M. (2002). *Reproducing gender.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Arnot, M., & Dillabough, J. (1999). Feminist politics and democratic values in education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 29*(2), 159–190.

Bourdieu, P. (1974). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In J. Eggleston (Ed.), *Contemporary research in the sociology of education* (pp. 32–46). London: Methuen.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Masculine domination.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Deitz, M. (2003). Current controversies in feminist theory. In N. W. Polsby (Ed.), *Annual review of political science* (Vol. 6, pp. 399–431). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Dillabough, J. (2002). Gender equity in education: Modernist traditions and emerging contemporary themes. In B. Francis & C. Skeleton (Eds.), *Investigating gender: Contemporary perspectives in education* (pp. 11–25). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Dillabough, J. (2003). Gender, education, and society: The limits and possibilities of feminist reproduction theory. *Sociology of Education, 76*(4), 376–379.

Fraser, N., & Gordon, L. (1995). A genealogy of dependency: Tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state. In J. Brenner, B. Laslett, & Y. Arat (Eds.), *Rethinking the political* (pp. 33–60). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MacDonald, M. (1980). Socio-cultural reproduction and women's education. In R. Deem (Ed.), *Schooling for women's work* (pp. 13–25). Boston & London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

McNay, L. (2000). *Gender and the subject.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Rasmussen, M.L., & Harwood, V. (2003). Performativity, youth and injurious speech. *Teaching Education, 14*(1), 25–36.

Reay, D., & Lucey, H. (2003). The limits of choice: Children and inner city schooling. *Sociology, 37* (1), 121–142.

Spender, D. (1987). Education: The patriarchal paradigm and the response to feminism. In M. Arnot & G. Weiner (Eds.), *Gender and the politics of schooling* (pp. 143–154). London: Hutchinson.

Jo-Anne Dillabough

Liberal and Radical Feminisms

Since the 1700s, liberal feminists have been important advocates of women's education, campaigning for equality of access and provision. Liberal feminism has argued that women are as rational as men and that gender should not affect the forms that education takes. In the late 1960s and 1970s, radical feminism criticized existing educational provision as part of a patriarchal order that served men's interests and imbued women with knowledge and ideas that perpetuated their subjection to patriarchy. It argued for education for women that would enable them to understand the working of patriarchal power and heterosexism in order to resist and transform the patriarchal order.

LIBERAL FEMINISM

Since the 1700s, liberal feminism has fought to extend the rights and duties of liberal political discourse to women focusing on civil rights, education, political and religious freedom, individual choice, and self-determination. It has addressed gender inequalities through campaigns for inclusion within civil rights legislation, access to education, and equality of opportunity. The defining feature of individuals for liberal theory is rational consciousness. Liberalism has thus tended to legislate for abstract individuals, taking little account of the unequal power relations of class, gender, and race that structure societies and work against equality. As many feminists have pointed out, liberal ideas have also perpetuated a dualism based on a mind/body split. Indeed, it was the meanings ascribed to the bodies of women and people of color that were, and in some societies still are, used to justify their exclusion from education and other human rights. Such practices often appeal to the idea of women as equal in worth but naturally different in their biological and social roles.

The liberal feminist struggle for inclusion goes back to the early 1700s when British feminist Mary Astell voiced women's demands for equality with men. Writing in the 1790s, at the time of the French Revolution, Olympe de Gouges in France and Mary Wollstonecraft in Britain argued powerfully for rights for women. In *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman,* Wollstonecraft (1792) suggested that, given comparable education and socialization, women would be as rational and capable as men. This exemplifies the discursive framework within which subsequent liberal feminist activism can be located.

Over the past few centuries, liberal feminism like liberalism more broadly has been a force for positive social change. Today, it is still the intellectual basis for a wide range of social and cultural practices that constitute individuals as apparently free, autonomous, and rational subjects. Moreover, as a political and moral philosophy, liberalism continues to offer the promise of self-determination and freedom to people who are denied education and civil and political rights.

Over the centuries, liberal feminists have campaigned for equal access to education and the professions, property rights, the vote, and all other rights enjoyed by men. They have argued for women's equality on the basis of sameness insisting that, given equal education, women are as rational and capable of holding public office and administering property as men. To make these arguments, liberal feminists have inevitably played down women's differences from men—whether these differences are understood as biologically determined or as socially produced—arguing that gender difference should neither determine how one is regarded as a human being nor how one is educated. In the fight for equal access to education and jobs, the liberal feminist strategy of disregarding differences that result from women's roles as child bearers and carers made it difficult to attend to the structures producing women's dual role. Only in moments of crisis, such as war, have liberal democracies given meaningful attention to this problem.

The failure of liberal feminism to tackle structural problems impeding women's equality, combined with the liberal tendency to view interpersonal and domestic issues as private, helped give rise in the late 1960s to new and more radical forms of feminism. Critiques of liberal feminism took issue with its failure to challenge a normative dualism that defines human beings as rational entities. This view of human beings tends to be at the expense of their bodies and emotions, masking the structural power relations that continue to govern women's lives, in particular those governing the control and exploitation of women's reproductive capacity and sexuality. The forms of feminism that challenged liberal feminism from the late 1960s onwards included radical feminism, lesbian feminism, new forms of socialist feminism, as well as Black, Third World, postcolonial, postmodern, and queer feminisms.

Critiques of liberal feminism argue that it is weakest when addressing issues of women's sexuality and reproductive power within a discourse of individual rights. Contemporary liberal feminism, like its historical antecedents, tends to retain the public-private divide in which issues to do with sexuality and reproduction are viewed as private questions of individual choice. The main strategy adopted by liberal feminism is to create the conditions for such choices, and here education is seen as crucial. The failure to give due attention to other forms of power—in particular, class, race, and heterosexism as they affect choices—limits liberal feminism's potential effectiveness in bringing about change. For example, having children and a career are seen as basic liberal feminist rights. Yet, such a lifestyle can usually only be achieved at the expense of other women—usually working-class women—who are forced to work in domestic and child-care jobs at low rates of pay. Fundamental changes in the structures of working life, the sexual division of labor, and provisions for domestic and child-care responsibilities would be necessary to enable all women to have children and acceptable paid work.

While the case of child rearing may be relatively straightforward, the issue of sexuality raises much more difficult questions. For example, most liberal feminists oppose censorship, arguing that adults should be allowed to choose whether or not to participate in pornography and prostitution. It is the implicit theory of subjectivity, underpinning liberal feminism, which sees women as rational, knowing, sovereign subjects formed by good education, that is at issue here. This raises the question of how to account for the internalization of oppressive gendered forms of subjectivity and women's apparent complicity in the exercise and reproduction of oppressive patriarchal practices. How does one deal with the rights and choices of prostitutes and other sex workers in industries that, other feminists argue, are profoundly detrimental to all women? It is necessary to move outside liberal feminist discourse into radical feminism or poststructuralist feminism with their different ideas of education for alternative ways of approaching these issues. Challenges to the liberal feminist discourse of educated free choice have come from a range of alternative feminist perspectives. Thus, for radical feminists, both prostitution and pornography are best understood as part of a broader strategy of male control of women's bodies, which a radical education should be able to unmask. Sexuality and reproduction are, however, precisely those areas that liberalism had tended to place beyond politics in the realm of the private and the personal (i.e., beyond politics and power).

Feminists of all types have challenged this assumption, insisting that the personal—the sphere of private life—is a site of political struggle. Radical feminists have put much of their energy into fighting for women's autonomy in the areas of sexuality and procreation. This has included campaigns against pornography and prostitution. Contemporary socialist feminists also see control of sexuality and procreation as fundamental to women's oppression but tend to focus on the economic aspects of the problems. It is perhaps poststructuralist feminist critiques that have raised the most fundamental questions about these practices and the liberal feminist assumption of educated, free individual choice. They challenge the very notion of the individual that lies at the heart of liberalism, decentering the primacy of rational consciousness and offering radically different models of subjectivity, contesting views of meaning that see it as a mirror of reality.

The example of biology can throw light on what this means. Biology has long been used to define and justify women's inequality as natural. It has been used to prove the inevitability of the sexual division of labor and of gender roles, from nineteenth and twentieth century attempts to deny women education and the vote to recent sociobiology, which sees women as naturally subordinate to men by virtue of their genes. Whereas liberalism disregards biological difference and radical feminism gives it new meanings, postmodern approaches seek to deconstruct the various meanings of biological difference and their role in constituting gendered subjectivity. Here biological theories are seen as a field of competing discourses seeking to define, in this instance, the meaning of womanhood. These discourses structure institutional practices and shape the subjectivities of women and men. In doing so, they produce and reproduce power relations that, from a feminist perspective, are patriarchal. Poststructuralists would thus argue that pornography is a powerful cultural form that helps shape sexual identities and sexual practices in profound ways that liberal feminism does not address. The liberal individual whose education has provided her with the ability to make choices about pornography is already shaped by discourses of gender and sexuality that preclude objective free choice.

RADICAL FEMINISM

The emergence of radical feminism in the late 1960s was, in part, a reaction to the liberal feminist failure to challenge many aspects of women's oppression and to Marxist attitudes toward women. The sexist structures of both traditional left politics and of the key mobilizing struggles of the 1960s (the anti-Vietnam and civil rights movements) were also the springboard for the new women's movement that was partially formed in answer to the prejudice and sexism experienced by women in these campaigns.

Radical feminism rejects both the theoretical frameworks and political practice of liberalism and orthodox Marxism. Radical feminists argue, on the one hand, against liberalism —that women's liberation cannot be achieved by a theory and practice that make provisions for the rights of abstract individuals, irrespective of social class and gender relations. On the other hand, radical feminism argues that women's oppression cannot be reduced to class oppression and the economic and social structures of the capitalist mode of production. In opposition to Marxism, radical feminism regards women's oppression as the primary and fundamental form of oppression. Gender is seen as an elaborate system of male domination, which is at the basis of all social organization. The term used to signify this universal system of male domination is *patriarchy.* While both radical and socialist feminisms use this term, in radical feminism it refers to a system of domination that pervades all aspects of culture, education, and social life and can be found in all cultures and at all moments of history. Patriarchy in radical feminist discourse stresses the common oppression of women irrespective of historical, cultural, class, or racial differences.

Early radical feminist writing developed explicitly in relation to Marxism. For example, Shulamith Firestone's influential text, *The Dialectics of Sex,* used a Marxist framework but replaced the key Marxist terms with those concerned with sexual oppression. As radical and revolutionary groups developed, however, they became divorced from left-wing politics, drawing in women who were not already socialists, and became increasingly separatist, placing greater emphasis on critiques of heterosexism.

Education in radical feminism is a process of unmasking the ways in which patriarchal institutions—including schools, universities, and mainstream scholarship—have colonized women's minds in the interests of patriarchy. Radical feminists have looked to history and anthropology to gain evidence of the universality of women's oppression. A particularly powerful and influential example of such work is Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology.* Part of the project of this book is to show the connections between women's oppression across a range of cultures and history and to unmask how male dominated scholarship has sought to deny the universal oppression of women. Daly rejects arguments that hide women's shared oppression by insisting on cultural relativism and argues that all these practices are examples of the universal repression of women. Like most radical feminist writers, Daly does not speculate on the cause of women's oppression beyond its necessity for the maintenance of male supremacy and power. Like other radical feminists, she locates the primary mechanisms of male control of women not in male ownership of the means of production but in male control of women's minds and bodies, in particular their sexuality and their reproductive powers. Where women elude such control, they are destroyed as, for example, widows and spinsters who are burned as witches or Indian brides who outlive their husbands and then are subjected to sati. Much male energy, however, goes into preventing women from ever becoming a threat, and patriarchal education plays a key role here.

Radical feminism theorizes patriarchy as an all-encompassing set of power relations aimed at securing male control of women's minds and bodies. In early radical feminist thought, women's bodies were given a foundational status as both the focus of women's oppression and the basis of women's positive difference from men. From the early radical and revolutionary texts of the late 1960s and 1970s through to the present, radical feminists have privileged issues of women's sexuality, control of fertility, violence against women, and sexual exploitation. The liberation of women from patriarchal power requires learning to see these areas of women's experience differently. Radical and revolutionary feminist politics breached the public/private divide, focusing on the personal as a key site for political action. The personal for women under patriarchy is inevitably bound up with the meaning, status, and control of their bodies, issues that soon became the unifying focuses in radical feminist analyses.

Radical feminism aims to enable women to decolonize their minds of patriarchal meanings. Taking as role models marginalized figures such as witches, mystics, goddesses, Amazons, wise women, and healers, radical feminists created a discourse of strong and resistant women throughout history. These are women who refused to submit to the power relations of an all-pervasive patriarchy. These inspirational figures, who elude patriarchal control, are seen to embody strength, wildness, and self-determination together with traits more usually ascribed to women such as intuition, emotion, and fertility. In radical feminist discourse, traditional female traits and values are given a new and positive status, which challenges the supremacy of traditionally male traits such as reason and objectivity. The devalued qualities, which are central to traditional ideas of femininity, are seen as necessary to the wholeness of both women and men. To reinstate their importance is a first step toward radically transforming patriarchal understandings of reason and emotion.

With its emphasis on the female body, radical feminism placed the question of difference in sharper focus than previously. Endorsing the binary oppositions between woman and man, radical feminists seek to transform and revalue the meaning of the terms "female" and "woman," celebrating the female body as a site of strength, endurance, creativity, and power. Knowledge and education are central to this project. In her powerful and poetic text, *Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her,* Susan Griffin, for example, exposed how man has used science and religion over the centuries to colonize both woman and nature and to shape them in his own interests. Man, she argues, has sought to gain ascendancy over woman and nature by separating himself from them and cultivating forms of rationality denied to women. The themes of Griffin's work have subsequently become central to a broad-based ecofeminist movement, which takes issue with many of the assumptions and practices of modern science. From an ecofeminist perspective, political and social issues ranging from AIDS and reproductive technology to nuclear weapons and Third World poverty are seen as related, and this holistic approach encourages new forms of spirituality.

In the 1970s, radical feminist writing attempted to develop a universally valid and transhistorical account of women's oppression under global patriarchy, which could be the basis for a universal sisterhood. In doing so, it privileged a particular interpretation of gender relations over all other forms of power. Differences of class, race, and ethnicity became less significant or sometimes invisible. Founded on theories of female difference that were often grounded in women's biology, radical feminism, particularly in the 1970s, proved both inspirational and empowering for many women. It celebrated what had previously been denigrated: women's bodies, sexuality, traditionally feminine qualities, and women's capacity for motherhood. Subsequent critiques of the failure of much radical feminism to pay attention to differences of class, race, and culture have led to greater attention to these issues on the part of more recent radical feminist writers (see Bell & Klein, 1996).

Heterosexuality as an Institution

A primary focus of radical feminist critique is heterosexuality. In her influential essay, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," American lesbian feminist and poet Adrienne Rich argued that heterosexuality is an institution and cornerstone of patriarchy, not a natural preference. She asked how and why lesbians have been forced into hiding and why even feminist scholarship has neglected their existence. This, she suggested, weakens its accuracy and transformative power.

Rich developed an analysis that starts from the proposition that, far from being innate, heterosexuality is systematically imposed on women via wide-ranging forms of mental and physical violence. Patriarchal education and the control of knowledge play significant roles in securing the reproduction of the institution of heterosexuality. Included among the ways in which male power has denied women their own sexuality over the centuries are both repressive practices—such as genital mutilation—and male-defined forms of knowledge and science—such as psychoanalysis and sexology. Culture and education also play a key role, for example, through images of lesbianism in the media and literature and the exclusion of the history of lesbianism. All this works to ensure that female sexuality is expressed only in the interests of male pleasure and reproduction.

Rich's argument shares much with other radical feminists. It offers a global account of the institution of patriarchy, which is both cross-cultural and transhistorical, drawing on examples from a range of cultures and historical moments. As in Daly's work, this strategy results in male power appearing monolithic and all encompassing. Yet, unlike much radical feminist writing, Rich does not limit the female and the feminine to those areas traditionally so defined. She argues that it is patriarchy itself that limits women to traditionally feminine areas—restricting women's access to education, the professions, and public life. Male power seeks to withhold knowledge by means of the noneducation of women. For example, education reproduces sex-role stereotyping that discourages women from working in science and technology, while the informal structures of educational institutions also work to exclude women.

As in much radical feminist analysis of heterosexuality's role in securing global patriarchy, questions of how class, race, and cultural difference affect the meaning and materiality of patriarchal practices are not addressed. Social practices are interpreted only in terms of their role in the reproduction of heterosexuality. In the process, the cultural specificity of particular practices is rendered invisible. For example, few postcolonial feminists now would accept interpretations of arranged marriages, purdah, and the veil as simple expressions of global patriarchal power. Their functions are much more complex and context specific; and this needs to be understood in order to realize possibilities for resistance and transformation, which might be undertaken from within the patriarchal order. What Rich's analysis does make clear, however, is the role of these practices in upholding norms of heterosexual marriage that reinforce patriarchal power.

The radical feminist critique of compulsory heterosexuality is taken up and theorized differently in the work of Judith Butler (1990, 1993) who focuses on embodied subjectivity and theorizes the ways in which the materiality of the body is gendered according to a heterosexist matrix. Starting from the premise that bodies are part of certain highly gendered regulatory schemas, Butler suggests a way of theorizing these schemas via the concept of performativity. In other words, gendered subjectivity is acquired through the repeated performance by the individual of discourses of gender. Moreover, Butler argues that there is no gender identity behind these performances of gender. Performativity is, for Butler, a reiterative and citational practice. Drawing on Foucault (see Foucault, 1981), Butler insists that the body is an effect of power, that embodied subjectivity is discursively produced, and that there is no sex outside of culture. This involves a decentered notion of the subject and of agency very different from those of radical feminism. Butler locates resistance and the possibilities of transforming the status quo within the discursive field, which produces both existing power relations and forms of subjectivity. Education thus has a key role to play in the transformation of patriarchal, heterosexist power, and it is a precondition for new forms of agency that can transform aspects of material discursive practices and the power relations inherent in them.

A central tenet of radical feminist thought is that existing theory, education, and scholarship—like the academy more generally—are both male defined and patriarchal. They are male defined in their norms, values, and objects of study, which exclude women's history, experience, and interests. They are patriarchal in the meanings and values that they produce and reproduce. As such, they cannot serve as a source of useful knowledge for women. To develop useful and self-affirming knowledge, women need to start from their own experience of their personal lives, of politics, and of their own history and cultural production.

PROBLEMS OF EUROCENTRISM

In their different ways, both liberal and radical feminisms appeal to what they see as universal norms and values. Liberalism maintains that all people share essential human qualities and deserve respect, full access to human rights (including education), and the opportunity to realize their full potential. Radical feminism promotes the idea of essential oppressed womanhood and a resistant global sisterhood. Both have been accused of Eurocentrism based on an uncritical assumption that Western norms, values, and ideas of progress are the realm of feminism. Eurocentrism implies that Western feminist aspirations should be the measure for all societies. Third World and postcolonial feminists have challenged the Eurocentrism of both liberal and radical feminist theory and politics. The central issues that they have raised are the terms on which non-Western women are included and the class and racialized interests represented in particular forms of education, scholarship, political strategies, and campaigns. In critiques of feminist scholarship and colonial discourses, postcolonial feminists argue that both liberal and radical feminisms demonstrate how much Western feminist writing about Third World women depicts them as a singular category defined by their victim status. In Western feminist writing, this effect is achieved by the implicit assumption that Western feminism is the best judge of the cultural practices of other societies. The universal aspirations of liberal feminism, like those of radical feminism and Marxism, are called into question because they render invisible historical specificity, agency, and the localized operations of power, both negative and positive, wherein lies the potential for resistance.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bell, D., & Klein, R. (Eds.). (1996). *Radically speaking: Feminism reclaimed.* London: Zed Books.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble.* New York & London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter.* New York & London: Routledge.

Daly, M. (1979). *Gyn/ecology.* London: Women's Press.

Firestone, S. (1972). *The dialectic of sex: The case for feminist revolution.* London: Paladin.

Foucault, M. (1981). *The history of sexuality. Vol. 1: An introduction.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Griffin, S. (1984). *Woman and nature: The roaring inside her.* London: Women's Press.

Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs, 5*(4), 631–660.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1975). *A vindication of the rights of woman.* Harmondsworth: Penguin. (Original work published in 1792.)

Chris Weedon

Multicultural and Global Feminisms

Multicultural and global feminisms are two related modes of feminist thinking that emphasize women's differences, disagreements, and situated identities, even as they strive to identify both commonalities in women's experiences and opportunities for women to work together to achieve shared goals. Although the terms multicultural feminism and global feminism are often used interchangeably, strictly speaking, multicultural feminism focuses on the different kinds of women living within a nation-state, whereas global feminism highlights the intricate relationships between women in one nation-state and women in other nation-states. Common to both multicultural feminism and global feminism, however, is resistance to two key ideologies that feminists have identified and subsequently rejected: so-called female essentialism and so-called female chauvinism. Female essentialism is the view that there exists some sort of platonic form, "Woman," which each woman in the world either embodies or should strive to embody in precisely the same way. Female chauvinism is the tendency for relatively privileged women—most often, White, Western/Northern, middle-class, heterosexual, and well-educated women—to assume, incorrectly, that their way of seeing the world is the way all women see it.

MULTICULTURAL FEMINISM

Although some of the world's nation-states have fairly homogeneous populations, very few of them have populations that are as homogeneous as the population of Iceland. Most nation-states are very multicultural. Within their historically constructed boundaries are a wide variety of peoples who, as a result of migration, immigration, forced resettlement, territory seizure, or enslavement are now located in one or another of the world's geographical areas. Among these multicultural nation-states is the United States where, in large measure, the concept of multicultural feminism first arose in self-conscious form. It is, therefore, as good a context as any in which to analyze the assumptions and development of multicultural feminism.

In order to appreciate the significance of U.S. multicultural feminism, it is necessary to understand the reasons for its emergence and rapid ascendancy. Throughout the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, U.S. feminists focused mainly on the gender differences between men and women. They stressed the degree to which, in the West, qualities such as self-assertion, rationality, a sense of justice, physical strength, and emotional restraint were associated with masculinity, whereas qualities such as connectedness to others, emotionality, physical weakness, and caring were associated with femininity. They also debated the extent to which these traits were biological givens or social constructions and whether masculine traits were better than feminine traits or vice versa.

Some feminists tried to prove that women had the same intellectual, physical, and moral capacities as men and that, if women were given the same educational and occupational opportunities men had, women could be men's full equals. Like men, women could be chief executive officers of large corporations, army generals, neurosurgeons, and football players. Other feminists countered that it was a mistake for women to try to be like men because women's ways of knowing, doing, and being were just as good as, if not better, than men's. They argued that equal treatment of men and women requires equal recognition of men and women's different needs, interests, and values. Women should not strive to become like men. On the contrary, they should celebrate their difference from men.

Both sameness feminists and difference feminists had crucial points to make about the relationship between men, maleness, and masculinity, on the one hand, and women, femaleness, and femininity, on the other hand. For sameness feminists, the primary enemy of women was sexism—the view that women are not able to do what men do and are appropriately relegated to the domestic sphere. In contrast, for difference feminists, the primary enemy of women was androcentrism—the view that men are the norm for all human beings and that women should become like men (Fraser, 1997, pp. 48–49).

Importantly the debate between sameness and difference feminists was never resolved because by the mid-1980s, feminists' exclusive focus on the category of gender came into question. Lesbians, women of color, and other marginalized women pointed out that official feminism—the kind of feminism that held sway in the academy and determined which issues counted as feminist—was not a feminism for all women but a feminism for a certain kind of woman, namely, White, heterosexual, middle-class, and well-educated women. Gender is neither the only nor necessarily the main cause of many women's oppression. Depending on her race, ethnicity, class, religion, sexual orientation, age, health status, or level of education, one woman's oppression, they claimed, may be another woman's liberation. Just because college-educated housewives in suburbia seek release from their domestic duties so they can get jobs in corporate America does not mean that female assembly-line workers do not yearn to be stay-at-home wives and mothers. More generally, just because some women find that matters related to their sexuality and reproductive capacities and responsibilities play the greatest role in their oppression does not mean that all women find this to be the case. For some women, not sexism, but racism, ethnocentrism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, and/or ageism are the major contributors to their low status.

Repentant about its relative neglect of women's differences and its failure to push marginalized women's concerns to the forefront of its agenda, U.S. academic feminism determined to reorder its priorities. Discussions of sexism and androcentrism were replaced by discussions of interlocking systems of oppression (gender, race, and class) and the multiple jeopardies of women of color and other marginalized women. Although a privileged White woman may hit her head against a glass ceiling or two in her lifetime, she will not have to face the kind of obstacles a Native American woman with few or no job skills, severe diabetes, clinical depression, and an alcoholic husband has to face. Nor will she have to contend with the kind of hardships that an undocumented Mexican woman in the United States accepts as her lot—as the price of admission to a better life for her children. As multicultural feminists see it, sexism, racism, classism, ableism, elitism—indeed all the "isms" that divide people—interlock and choke whomever they catch in their grip. Oppression is a many-headed beast capable of rearing any one of its heads depending on the situation. The whole body of the beast is the appropriate target for multicultural feminists who wish to end its reign of terror, and, depending on her situation, each woman must pick and choose her battles.

In an attempt to give voice to women whose voices have been previously silenced, multicultural feminists have urged disadvantaged women to educate advantaged women about their concerns. But women of color and otherwise marginalized women have not always welcomed these gestures of welcome. They claim that it should not be their responsibility to explain themselves to privileged women in terms that privileged women can understand, thereby ironically contributing to the reigning state of affairs in which relatively privileged women are "us" and underprivileged women are "them." On a related issue, many disadvantaged women point out that they do not want to join feminist groups that are populated by mainly advantaged women. They prefer starting their own organizations and working on behalf of women whose condition and experiences are most like their own. Finally, many women of color and other previously marginalized women eschew the label feminist either because of popular misconceptions about it or because they prefer to identify themselves as womanists rather than feminists. Conceived by Alice Walker, the term "womanist" refers to a certain kind of feminist, one who is committed to helping an entire people, men as well as women (Walker, 1983, p. xi).

For all its virtues, there are some problems with multicultural feminism. First, it is not clear precisely what is meant by the term culture. Sometimes the term denotes a group of women who, on account of their race or ethnicity, share a tradition or history that distinguishes them from other groups of women. But at other times, the term "culture" is used more expansively to include groups of women who feel that something about them—for example, their sexual orientation to women or their disabled physical condition—is the glue that holds them together and makes them a "we."

Second, the differences among women within a culture may be just as great or even greater than the differences between some of them and the women in another culture. For example, a well-educated Asian American woman, whose millionaire great-grandparents immigrated to San Francisco from Hong Kong, may have far more in common with an Anglo American woman, whose millionaire great-grandparents made a fortune on Wall Street, than with an Asian American woman, newly immigrated to the United States, who spent her childhood in a struggling Laotian village tending to her large extended family's scrawny chickens.

Third, and related to the second point, it is not clear which characteristics make a woman a true or authentic representative of her culture. Must she be an average or typical woman in her culture? Or must she, instead, be a disadvantaged as opposed to an advantaged woman in her culture? These questions are perceptively addressed by Uma Narayan, an Indian woman, who immigrated to the United States and now teaches at a prestigious U.S. university. She claims that her opposition to women-harming Indian cultural practices are often dismissed as the views of a Westernized woman who has betrayed her culture when, in fact, they are the views of many women (and men) who live in India and want to reform their native culture (Narayan, 1997, p. 128).

Fourth, to the extent that culture is linked with race and/or ethnicity, an increasing number of people in the United States (and, of course, elsewhere) are members of more than one culture. In the 2000 U.S. Census, about 7 million people identified themselves as belonging to more than one race or some other race than the racial categories used in the Census. Increasingly, people wear their multiracial and multiethnic backgrounds proudly. Specifically, parents of children whose race and/or ethnicity is blended report that their children find White/non-White oppositions of little, if any, interest, meaning, or concern to them. Race and ethnicity take a backseat to the kind of music, clothes, foods, and lifestyles a person prefers. Although personal anecdotes are no substitute for empirical studies, my own two sons are the product of an Asian father (he grew up in China) and a White mother with a Czech ancestry. One looks Hispanic, the other looks Native American. One describes himself as "nothing in particular, but everything in general . . . all American, I guess." The other laughingly categorizes himself as "Chi-Czech."

Fifth, and somewhat by way of a summary of the points raised above, if it is to be fully successful, multicultural feminism needs to examine more carefully the concept of whiteness. If by "white" is meant a living, breathing, organic tradition that weaves together customs, religious beliefs, musical, artistic, and literary works, family stories, and so forth, then there is no unitary white culture. People with white skins do not belong to one white culture. Rather, they participate in, or at least have their roots in, for example, Italian American, Irish American, Czech American, Hispanic American communities. Much the same can be said about people with black skin or yellow skin. Depending on whether a Black person's family has recently immigrated to the United States from Haiti or has been here since the first of the slave days, that person will identify their culture as Caribbean rather than African American or vice versa.

In contrast, if by "white" is meant not a nonexistent white culture but a hegemonic power structure that will do whatever it has to do to retain and increase its privilege, then multicultural feminists still need to rethink this use of the term "white." In the United States, "white," as a hegemonic power structure, is the result of the intersection of two facts: namely, which kind of people were most populous in the United States for nearly two centuries (they happened to have white skins) and which kind of people initially gained control of U.S. society's economic, political, and cultural institutions (they also happened to have white skins). But today (as in the past, though to a far lesser degree) having a white skin is neither a sufficient nor a necessary condition for membership in the U.S. power elite. For example, poor White women surviving on Social Security checks too paltry to cover both their prescription drug bills and their food costs are not members of the power elite, though well-heeled African American lawyers and Asian American businesspersons probably are. There still is an "us" and a "them," but the composition of this hegemonic dichotomy is starting to change in response to U.S. demographics and attitudinal shifts.

Whatever conceptual problems multicultural feminism may have, it has enriched U.S. feminism. Women's studies courses and texts no longer present gender issues in abstraction from race and class issues. Thematic courses on women as workers may include articles on White teenaged girls from Minnesota who have run away from their homes and now must eke out a living in Atlanta's seamy sex industry; upper-middle-class African American women working in Fortune 500 companies; and undocumented Mexican American women working as nannies or maids for Texas legislators. Gender issues will be discussed in each of these articles but in ways that show how a woman's age, race, and/or class shape them. Similarly, discussions about reproduction-controlling technologies (contraception, sterilization, and abortion) and reproduction-aiding technologies (donor insemination, in vitro fertilization, and cloning) stress that whether one or more of these technologies is or is not oppressing depends largely on a particular woman's race, class, age, sexual preference, religion, marital status, and so forth. For some women, the right not to reproduce is most important to them. They either do not want children or they want to control the number and spacing of their children. For other women, however, the right to reproduce is their major concern. Pressured to be sterilized or to use long-term contraceptives by policy makers and/or health care professionals who view them as unfit to be mothers, poor women who want large families may feel aggrieved. Moreover, poor women with infertility problems may wish that they, as well as rich women with infertility problems, could afford steep, out-of-pocket in vitro fertilization costs. As they see it, their desire to have children is no less intense than rich women's.

Convinced that women (and men) must understand the ways in which their own and others' race, class, and gender empower or, alternatively, disempower them, multicultural feminists have sought to transform the curricula of women's studies, feminist studies, and gender studies programs to achieve this educational goal. Increasingly, the materials and texts used in these curricula are thoroughly hyphenated to reflect the fact that, after 2030, people with white skins will no longer constitute the majority of the U.S. population. At least with respect to sheer numbers, the "them"—the people of color—will have become the "us." Multicultural feminists live in happy anticipation of this major social shift, seeing in it opportunities for women to break out of all the bipolar patterns of human domination and subordination that have restricted their thought and action.

GLOBAL FEMINISM

Global feminism differs from multicultural feminism because it focuses not on women in any one nation-state but on how the condition of women anywhere in the world affects the condition of women everywhere else in the world. Agreeing with multicultural feminists that feminism cannot ignore women's cultural differences, global feminists nonetheless strive to create alliances among women worldwide. They share two goals in common. The first is to convince all nations to honor women's rights to make free choices about matters related to their reproductive and sexual capacities and responsibilities. Without the ability to control their own bodies and the course of their destiny, women cannot feel like full human persons. The second, coequal goal of global feminists is to bring women (and men) together to create a more just social and economic order at the global as well as national level. Global feminists are activists as well as theorists; they are bent on creating a new world order in which all people, no matter where they live, have enough food, shelter, clothing, health care, and education to live full human lives (Bunch, 1984, p. 250).

Global feminists realize that women must forge strong global networks in order to eliminate the disparities that exist between the world's wealthy people and the world's poor people. For them, universal sisterhood is not a natural state of affairs but an ideal to achieve. Before women can embrace each other and work together as a team, they must do the hard work of confronting each other. Among the biggest walls to tear down is the wall between women in the so-called First World and women in the so-called Third World.

The First-World/Third-World opposition, which has increasingly been replaced by either the developed nations/developing nations contrast or the North/South contrast, bears the stamp of the world's colonial past. Because of their power, people in developed nations view themselves as the Self—progressive, literate, and enlightened—and people in the developing nations as the Other—backward, illiterate, ignorant. Having given up their aspirations to control the world's developing nations militarily and politically, the world's developed nations seem bent on controlling them economically and culturally.

Among the ways the developed nations control developing nations economically is related to what is now referred to as the Southern debt. About 30 years ago, when interest rates were relatively low, many developing nations borrowed large amounts of money from developed nations. Unfortunately, interest rates rose steeply, and the developing nations were unable to pay the interest on their loans. In order to prevent the world economic system from crashing, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank rescheduled the debts of many developing nations. As part of this bailout scheme, they required the affected developing nations to adjust the structure of their economies to facilitate their integration into the global economic system. In order to earn enough foreign currency to finance their rescheduled external debts, however, developing nations have had to export as many inexpensive goods as possible and/or work for large transnational companies located in their boundaries. As a result of this state of affairs, most developing nations have not been able to produce their own consumer goods and are forced to import them from developed nations (Jaggar, 2002, pp. 119–121). Not only are these goods costly, they bear the cultural imprint of the world's developed nations: Nike sneakers, Camel cigarettes, Coca-Cola, Ford cars, Levi's blue jeans, and Dell computers. The so-called MacDonaldization of the world seems harmless enough on the surface; yet it may signal the recolonization of the South by the North (Bunch, 1984, p. 249).

Global feminists think that women, even more than men, are used to service the Southern debt, thereby participating in their nations' continuing plight. Nevertheless, many women in developing nations decide to work for relatively low wages in the multinational companies located in their homelands. They do so to help support their struggling families and/or to avoid having to work in the sex tourism industry, which caters to men from developed nations. These men pay for the sexual services of women in the developing countries that they visit.

Because of their nations' condition, women in developing nations are often much more focused on economic, social, and political issues than on the sexual and reproductive issues that have tended to preoccupy the interest of women in developed nations. As a result of women's different priorities, women's conversations at international conferences have sometimes degenerated into shouting matches. In fact, at each of the three international women's conferences the United Nations sponsored during the International Decade for Women (1975–1985)—in Mexico City (1975), Copenhagen (1980), and Nairobi (1985)—as well as at Forum 85, a loosely confederated group of 157 nongovernmental organizations, problems emerged among women who were variously labeled as First-World, Western, Northern, or from developed nations, on the one hand, and women who were variously labeled as Third World, Eastern, Southern, or from developing nations, on the other. Fortunately, by the 1995 women's conference held in Beijing, global feminists had helped women to resolve some of their cross-cultural differences and to appreciate some of their commonalities. Typical of the kinds of educational tools global feminists use to draw women together are studies such as one done on low-income urban women in Brazil, Egypt, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, and the United States. Despite their differences, all the women who were studied used their status as mothers to justify their sense of reproductive entitlement. They reasoned that because they, and not the men in their lives, bear the greatest burdens and responsibilities of pregnancy, childbearing, and child rearing, they have earned the right to make the crucial decisions in these areas (Petchesky & Judd, 1998, p. 362).

Although global feminists think it is vital to acknowledge that political, religious, and cultural contexts make the situations of women different around the world, they also think it is vital to acknowledge that the biological characteristics of females make *some* situations of women similar around the world. Global feminists urge women to read books about and by each other, to see films and documentaries that reveal each other's everyday lives, and, if possible, to travel to each other's nations to meet each other face-to-face. In recognizing each other's shared frailty and mortality, global feminists think women will be inspired to care enough about each other to produce globally just policies aimed at eliminating the patterns of domination and subordination, of arrogance and cruelty, that have characterized human relationships for too long.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bunch, C. (1984). Prospects for global feminism. In A.M. Jaggar & P.S. Rothenberg (Eds.), *Feminist frameworks: Alternative theoretical accounts of the relations between women and men* (3rd ed., pp. 249–252). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition.* New York: Routledge.

Jaggar, A.M. (2002). A feminist critique of the alleged southern debt. *Hypatia 17*(4), 119–145.

Narayan, U. (1997). *Dislocating cultures: Identities, traditions, and third-world feminisms.* New York: Routledge.

Petchesky, R., & Judd, K. (Eds.). (1998). *Negotiating reproductive rights: Women's perspectives across countries and cultures.* London: Zed.

Tong, R. (1998). *Feminist thought: A more comprehensive introduction* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tong, R. (with G. Anderson & A. Santos). (2001). *Globalizing feminist bioethics: Cross-cultural perspectives.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tong, R., Donchin, A., & Dodds, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Linking visions: Feminist bioethics, human rights, and the developing world.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Walker, A. (1983). *In search of our mothers' gardens: Feminist prose.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Rosemarie Tong

Postmodern and Poststructural Theories

Postmodern and poststructural theories have presented a strong challenge to the humanist perspectives in which "Second Wave" feminist thinking tended to be couched and have inspired the powerful and insightful research of many contemporary feminist scholars in the field of education. To understand this challenge and the contributions of these theories, it is useful, first, to understand that poststructuralism is a branch of postmodernism that places particular emphasis on the ways in which socially and culturally produced patterns of language, known as discourses, construct people and the power relationships among them in particular ways.

Poststructuralism has had particular appeal and implications for feminist research in gender and education because it explicates the ways in which the gendered nature of society is caused by discourses that position all people as male or female and present these gender categories as relational. Despite its appeal and contributions to the exploration of some of the theoretical complexities of feminism, poststructuralism has also challenged feminism, particularly its tendency to categorize people by gender and its claims to being a movement that will emancipate women. Poststructuralism aims to deconstruct such feminist claims that are seen as oppressive productions of a singular, powerful truth. In response, feminists have criticized poststructuralism for being apolitical and morally vacuous while at the same time recognizing that it has provided innovative and valuable understandings of gender performances and power relations.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN POSTMODERNISM AND POSTSTRUCTURALISM

Although the terms "postmodernism" and "poststructuralism" are often conflated in the literature and key poststructuralist and postmodernist thinkers have been influenced by each other's work, there are distinctions between the two theoretical movements. "Postmodernism" is an umbrella term incorporating those theorists who critique modernism and the enlightenment philosophical positions and assumptions that underpin it, such as the progressive nature of history; the prevalence of reason; the discoverability of scientific and philosophical "truths"; and the humanist view of the self as a rational, agentic, coherent subject. Key thinkers influencing this broad movement have been Baudrillard and Lyotard, whose works have had particular impact in art, film studies, and cultural studies. Postmodernism with its critique of accepted "rational" narratives and positions has also provided foundational inspiration for theoretical movements such as queer theory.

While far from being a unitary or unified theoretical position, poststructuralism has a more specific referent than postmodernism in that it emerged in response to the structuralist movement in literary criticism and its semiotic analysis of "signs." The best-known pioneers of poststructuralist theory—Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Juliet Kristeva, and Michel Foucault—were all strongly influenced by structuralism and in many cases adopted aspects of structuralism in their early work. But, disillusioned with the "science of signs," as with the inadequacies and effects of ideologies, these theorists began to work against the apparent certainties of structuralism by, for example, revealing how the text can "play" free of the intentions of the author. In this sense poststructuralism is a specific branch of the postmodern movement. It has developed a particularly challenging (both intellectually and politically) corpus of theoretical work, and the works of Derrida and Foucault, especially, have been highly influential in the political and social sciences. Foucault's work was particularly applicable in the social sciences because, in developing his "genealogical" approach to the study of institutions and values as changing due to socio-economic transformations in particular historic periods, he elaborated the poststructural view of text and language as *discourse.* "Discourses" are socially and culturally produced patterns of language that constitute power by producing objects (or subjects) in particular ways (a housewife, for example, could be positioned as fulfilling her natural role through traditionalist discourses of gender essentialism, or could be positioned as a victim of oppression in some types of liberal feminist discourse).

Whereas much poststructuralist scholarship develops the deconstructive element so central to Derrida's position, Foucault's work has been particularly influential among Western feminists due to its contribution of theoretical tools applicable in social science research and its ability to address specific conundrums that have confronted feminist theory. Judith Butler has drawn on his work in her development of the concepts of subjectivity and performativity, and in education his ideas have inspired exciting new explorations and theorizations.

THE APPEAL OF POSTSTRUCTURALISM FOR RESEARCHERS IN GENDER AND EDUCATION

"Second Wave" feminist researchers were quick to identify the powerful role that educational institutions played in the reproduction of gendered inequalities. During the 1970s and 1980s, feminist researchers created a body of challenging and influential work that drew on social learning theories to explain women's lack of power in society as resulting from a process of socialization beginning in the family and reinforced in schools. It was argued that education taught girls to "know their place" in the gender order via a hidden curriculum of taught sex roles and assumptions concerning the comparative inferiority of girls. However, there was growing criticism of social learning theories and the notion of a "reproduction of roles." Research began to illustrate how young people do not simply take up roles in any passive or uniform way but are active in constructing their own positions. Concepts of resistance and analysis of change in social relationships over time were used to challenge notions of social reproduction and debate the perceptions of a fixed subjectivity that underpinned such understandings.

Poststructuralist theory offered an alterative position that provided a radical critique and rereading of enlightenment, humanist views of subjecthood. In some areas there were already overlapping ideas between feminist and poststructural positions, and in others poststructuralism offered exciting readings that addressed problems facing feminist theory in the late twentieth century. There were five key elements contributing to poststructuralism's appeal to feminists: skepticism toward enlightenment concepts of reason and objectivity, a new view of the self, discourse and power, deconstruction of sex/gender, and the emancipatory potential of discourse analysis.

Like feminists, poststructuralists are skeptical of the discourses of scientific enlightenment that maintain a rational approach and the possibility of analytical objectivity. They share with feminists a strong objection to the separating off of the reasoning mind (constructed as male) from the emotions and body (constructed as female).

With regard to the self, poststructuralism offered a view of selfhood that was radically different from that produced in socialization and sex role theories and that addressed some of the limitations identified in notions of "reproduction of roles." Poststructuralism saw the self (and behavior) as produced by text, as fragmented and fluid rather than fixed and rational. Foucault sees the self as positioned and positioning others in discourses, shifting in construction depending on the discursive context. This theory appears to offer an explanation of selves and behaviors that can incorporate the notions of resistance and contradiction that proved so problematic for sex-role theory. The self is passively positioned in certain discourses, but is at the same time active in *positioning* in other discourses. According to Foucault (1980), wherever there is discourse there is resistance: For instance, if a self is positioned as powerless by one discourse, it is possible that she/he may position her/himself as powerful via an alternative discourse. Moreover, discourses themselves are not static but alter over time as the social institutions that produce them change.

This poststructuralist discourse analytic position offered a new perspective on power and power relations that was highly attractive to feminists. Particularly, it provided an explanation for some of the theoretical complexities that have challenged feminism, such as the ways in which power is constituted between women (and between men), as well as between men and women. In the late twentieth century women of color, working class, gay, and disabled feminists drew attention to the dominance of feminist agendas by White, middle-class, heterosexual, and able-bodied women and the ways in which these women's practices were often marginalizing or silencing the issues faced by women from less-advantaged sections of society. Hence, feminists were made aware that oppressive power relationships are not only dependent on gender but can occur due to a host of other factors and can exist between women. Foucault's view of power as operated via discourse rather than existing as the possession of particular groups or individuals was able to address this theoretical problem. Foucault (1980) saw individuals as constantly both undergoing and exercising power via discourse.

If selves are constructed through ever shifting and competing discourses, gender/sex positions are also deconstructed by this poststructuralist approach. Poststructuralism can explain the gendered nature of society as caused by discourses that position all people as male or female and present these categories as relational. This not only answers some of the previously discussed questions concerning resistance to gender roles, inexplicable by sex-role theory, but challenges gender essentialism. Radical and difference feminists have sometimes maintained that an "essential feminine" exists linking all women as a group. In contrast, other feminists have critiqued essentialist positions as self-subverting because they effectively explain and therefore, in a sense, *legitimize* the difference between women's and men's social power. Poststructuralist theory can challenge and deconstruct essentialist binary dichotomies of masculine/feminine.

The emancipatory potential of discourse analysis is embedded in the notion that people are not only positioned in discourse but also active in positioning others, and this emancipatory potential of discourse analysis has been interpreted as positive and embraced by some feminists. For instance, Davies (1989, 1997) argues that the analysis of gender discourse will provide us with a new understanding of the way in which power is constituted and the ways in which we are positioned within that discourse. She and others maintain that this raises the possibility of our creating *new* gender discourses and, thus, reconstituting ourselves through discourse. (Such interpretations have been contested, however, by those who stress the deterministic aspects of poststructuralism.)

THE DECONSTRUCTIVE CHALLENGE TO FEMINISM

Despite the apparently beneficial contributions of poststructuralist discourse analysis and theories of power and subjectivity for feminist research, there are important epistemological tensions between notions of feminism as a "movement" and poststructuralist positions. These emanate from feminism's origin as an emancipatory movement in contrast to poststructuralism's deconstructing tendencies. For example, although feminism is a notably "broad church" in terms of the theoretical positions and aims of its proponents, feminists share a focus on gender, usually framed by an understanding of gender inequalities, and an intention to challenge and change such inequality. As such, feminism constitutes an emancipatory movement, and its origins are lodged in liberal conceptions of "rights," which are arguably imbued by "enlightenment" humanist views of selfhood and agency. The feminist narrative can then be understood in postmodernist terms as a truth narrative or "meta-narrative," which bears a "will to truth" and the evocation of a progressive history in the belief that the world can be improved via human project. Postmodernism aims to deconstruct such meta-narratives, which are seen as oppressive in their apparent tantalization and production of singular "truth," and hence their exercise of power.

Some feminists have argued that because feminism is so multifaceted and has not sought to claim coherence in the same way as many other ideologies, it should not be read as a metanarrative. Others have argued fiercely that the retention of the underpinning feminist narrative as an emancipatory movement rooted in liberal humanism is essential to the coherence, positivity, and power of feminist discourse. Some theorists have argued that feminism's focus on gender difference is founded on the notion of a universal female (and a universal male) subject—a position that would also be challenged by poststructuralist theory that deconstructs totalities and illuminates difference. However, while liberal and radical feminist positions have often alluded to the experience and/or oppression of all women based on their gender (even if recognizing inequalities between different groups of women), feminists drawing on poststructuralist theory are arguably developing a position that goes beyond "founding subjecthood." For example, in the work of key poststructuralist feminists such as Judith Butler and Bronwyn Davies, there is no founding male or female subject—rather, subjects are constituted as male or female, masculine or feminine via gender discourses, which subjects take up as their own and reproduce in performances of gender.

There is continuing dispute as to whether feminism's broadly emancipatory position renders poststructuralism a fruitless, even dangerous, theoretical pursuit for feminists. These issues have been debated vigorously in the field of gender and education. Some feminists have identified the potentially conservative and reactionary threads of poststructuralist theory and the articulation of such aspects by some of postmodernism's key proponents. These feminist critics maintain that poststructuralism undermines the feminist movement and robs feminists of their most effective conceptual tools. They assert that the label "poststructuralist feminist" is an oxymoron, the combination of such oppositional positions being theoretically untenable.

Conversely, a further line of critique of much "poststructuralist feminist" work has stemmed from "strong" poststructuralists within this field, who observe humanist (modernist) notions of agency and "choice" resurfacing within this work. An example is provided by the optimistic position noted above—that subjects can be encouraged to reflect on discourses and understand the ways in which they are positioned and, in turn, learn to take up alternative discourses with which to challenge oppressive ones. This perspective has been criticized as evoking a humanist understanding of subjectivity in assuming the potential for "rational" choice, agency, and coherence of action and, hence, to be at odds with dominant poststructuralist theory (see, for example, the debate between Bronwyn Davies and Alison Jones in *Gender and Education,* 1997).

In addition, there are further specific criticisms with which feminists have charged poststructuralism, for example, that it has not provided an adequate explanation of the nature and source of power and the way in which it is exercised against women. But, it is undoubtedly the poststructuralist deconstruction of metanarratives and "truth discourses" that has aroused most anxiety among feminists and deliberation as to the value of poststructuralist work for feminist positions. The two key criticisms are, first, that poststructuralism is profoundly apolitical. Poststructuralism's rejection of truth discourses, and its dispersal of identity, renders it a negative/nihilistic theory unable to engage in theoretical or practical work for social change. This focus on deconstruction rather than construction results in political nihilism and fatalism, thus causing political and ethical paralysis.

The second criticism concerns poststructuralism's inability to judge the value of discourses. Specifically, it has been observed that without "grand narratives" it becomes impossible to generalize about power relations. As noted above, the identification of discourses and interrogation of their powerful effects on subjects and society at large (exemplified in the work of Foucault) is one of poststructuralism's most influential contributions in the social sciences. However, while poststructuralist discourse analysis is useful for "opening up" or deconstructing discourse, it is theoretically unable to privilege one reading over another. Likewise, the poststructuralist refusal of truth claims or "totalizing" statements leaves political researchers bereft of the ability to evaluate the *relative* importance and influence of different discourses. In order to circumvent this problem, some political researchers have adopted terms such as "prevailing discourse" or "dominant discourse" in order to construct political interpretations; yet, often it is noticeable that the methods by which such categorizations have been formulated go unarticulated.

Deconstruction does not necessarily constitute *opposition,* only critique (see, for example, Foucault, 1990). Yet, some have queried whether a theory that deconstructs other theories, but appears to provide nothing with which to replace them, can be relevant to emancipatory positions. Other writers argue that, more than simply failing to help feminism, poststructuralism is an androcentric, even reactionary, theory because it undermines the arguments and "truth claims" of oppressed groups and incapacitates movements by infecting them with theoretical paralysis, hence protecting the status quo.

Feminist theorists have been at the forefront of those attempting to articulate satisfactory accommodations of these theoretical tensions and/or to develop new theoretical pathways that address such tensions. Particularly, such writers have attended to issues of agency and to reclaiming notions of solidarity as well as difference.

PRODUCTIVITY OF POSTSTRUCTURALIST RESEARCH IN GENDER AND EDUCATION

Poststructuralist theory, and indeed postmodernism more generally, has had a profound effect on gender research in education. Feminist researchers in the 1970s and early 1980s spoke confidently of "the girls" and "the boys" as two distinct groups in schools, but researchers drawing on poststructuralist theory have critiqued such homogenizing labels. They have pointed to the immense difference and diversity between different subjects labelled "boys" or "girls," and documented the shifting power positions between these pupils depending on the discursive context. Such analyses have also reinvigorated more structuralist approaches in gender and education, with researchers drawn to identify the ways in which factors such as social class and ethnicity inflect power relations and resources within and across gender groups.

Researchers have applied discourse analysis to education policy documents, illuminating the gendered assumptions and powerful gender discourses at work in these texts. Poststructuralist researchers have inverted the traditional view of gender as "given" and naturalized in the classroom, identifying instead the ways in which schooling creates and heightens gender difference by obsessively delineating pupils (and teachers) according to "random" categories of gender and instilling gendered practices and behaviors through institutional and curricula practices and constructions. Such research has documented the ways in which pupils and teachers take up gender discourses and make gender their own and the myriad ways in which these subjects are "gendered" in educational discourse and via classroom dynamics. Such research has developed a particularly rich vein of poststructuralist or poststructuralist-influenced work in education. The work of Bronwyn Davies provides an excellent example of this approach. From her examination of gendered interaction and gender discourse in the preschool and primary school (1989), Davies concluded that gender discourse presents the social world as split into a clear, relational dichotomy of male/female duality. Children construct the taking up of these relational gendered positions as vital for social competence and identity and, thus, engage in "gender category maintenance work" in order to visibly demonstrate their gender allegiance. Hence, poststructuralist research has provided explanations for processes (such as the development of gender identity and the incentive for girls to adopt gender identities if they are not inherent), which had previously puzzled researchers of gender and education.

Following from this deconstruction of gender categories, some feminists argue that the terms "woman" and "girl" may be misleading and redundant, implying a fixity and homogeneity that do not exist. It has been argued, therefore, that such terms should be jettisoned, or at least used with far more care, in gender and education research. However, it may be said that gender categorization remains a conundrum for researchers in the field. This is partly because gender difference/inequality is generally felt to be the central theme of feminist work and, hence, relinquishing those categories might mean abandoning a central point of analysis and partly, perhaps, because the use of gender categorizations is so ubiquitous in schooling. It is common practice in schools to evoke gender categories in speech and in practice and to delineate between "the girls" and "the boys." Feminist research has shown how such gender distinctions permeate diverse aspects of school life including aspects as disparate as classroom management, seating arrangements, expectations and interests, friendship groups, use of playground space, and so on.

An obvious criticism of such analytical work is that it pleasures in critique and in the identification and deconstruction of current discursive practices but suggests or builds nothing in their place. This argument applied widely to poststructuralism might be seen as particularly pertinent in education, which is, at least ostensibly, a constructive program to which change (i.e., increased education) is integral. There are exceptions, however. To refer again to Bronwyn Davies' important work as an exemplar, Davies has been a pioneer in attempting to apply poststructuralist theory to classroom practice for emancipatory (feminist) purposes. Following her study with preschool children (1989), she concluded that it is only through the deconstruction of the "gender dualism," which assigns traits and modes of behavior to one gender or the other (and which children take up as fundamental to their gender identities), that children will be able to break from the rigid, gendered positions to experiment with different ways of being. In her further work, she embarked on an ambitious program to actually teach children about poststructuralism in order to enable children to understand the nature of gender discourse and its restrictions on their lives and provide them with the tools to deconstruct the gender dichotomy themselves. Her book *Shards of Glass* (1993) describes her endeavors in this area.

Of course, without a feminist "regime of truth," which states that gendered behavior is an (erroneous) social construction leading to inequity, children would be provided with no reason or incentive to deconstruct current discourses or to challenge the gender dualism. Hence, the *feminist* aspect remains imperative in such action research and pedagogical practice. Without the addition of such emancipatory position, apolitical poststructuralism, which joys in deconstruction and textual play, cannot, by its very nature, be used for *reconstruction* in the sense that many feminists would wish to attempt. However, the combination of these two theoretical positions—though not without its theoretical permutations and challenges—has opened up fertile paths in gender and education research and provided innovative new readings of gender performance and power relations in educational contexts.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble.* New York: Routledge.

Davies, B. (1989). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Davies, B. (1993). *Shards of glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Davies, B. (1997). The subject of post-structuralism: A reply to Alison Jones. *Gender & Education, 9*(3), 271–283.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977.* New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1990). *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings, 1977–1984.* New York: Routledge.

Jones, A. (1997). Teaching post-structuralist feminist theory in education: Student resistances. *Gender & Education, 9*(3), 261–269.

Nicholson, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminism/postmodernism.* New York & London: Routledge.

Simons, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Contemporary critical theorists: From Lacan to Said.* Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Becky Francis

Queer Theory

Queer theory is a field or approach of study that was named in the early 1990s and entered the field of education over the following years. Informed by lesbian and gay studies, as well as feminist and poststructural theorizing, queer theory is less a systematic method or framework than a collection of approaches to questioning normative assumptions about sex, gender, and sexuality. Queer theory challenges assumptions that homosexual and heterosexual are fixed, discrete categories; that sex is biological and gender is its cultural manifestation; and that sexuality constitutes identity. It frequently draws on feminist analyses of gender; however, queer theory centers sexuality as its object of study, recognizing that gender and sexuality are inextricably linked but not synonymous. As a term of affiliation, queer understands both identities and affiliations among subjects as partial, temporary, and contextual. Queer theory seeks to take into account the intersections of race, class, gender, and ethnicity, as they constitute the subject of sexuality and the power relations within which he or she is constituted. In the field of education, queer pedagogy does not teach for or about identities but studies processes that differentiate subjects as "normal" or "deviant," seeking to disrupt categorization and foster new forms of relation and affiliation.

Queer politics developed in the late 1980s partly as a rejection of the assimilationist politics of the mainstream gay and lesbian movement. Activist groups such as Queer Nation brought attention to the proliferation of a variety of queer sexual practices, identities, and identifications that subvert and challenge traditional beliefs about gender and sexuality. This activism, which included not only lesbians and gay men but also bisexual, intersexed, transgendered, and transvestite subjects, dramatized both gender and sexual fluidity. While often discomforting for many, the term "queer" is intended to invoke a past of bigotry and hatred and to rewrite a present that affirms a variety of nonnormative expressions of sexualities and genders. Even as identity could be said to be sedimented in the term "queer," queer theory and activism use the term to work against stasis and normalization associated with the naming of identities.

Drawing from political movements, feminist and poststructural theory, and lesbian and gay studies, queer theory initially developed primarily in the humanities, including history, cultural, and literary studies, although numerous fields, such as legal studies, the social sciences, and education increasingly engage with its critique of the normalization of heterosexuality and corresponding sex and gender roles. For example, as (homo)sexuality entered public, legal, and policy discourse in the 1990s, educational research turned attention to inquiry into (homo)sexuality and the use of queer theory. After three decades of educational research into gender and schooling, scholars have begun to draw on queer theory to understand the workings and implications of sexuality and gender in school practices, pedagogy, and curriculum.

A central aim of queer theory is the denaturalization of what appear to be stable categories by studying the construction of sex and gender and how these categories have produced and affected differently positioned subjects. Unlike lesbian and gay studies, which sought to create a distinctive history, tradition, and body of knowledge about gay and lesbian individuals and cultures, queer theory seeks to disrupt ideas of discrete, fixed identities by underscoring the ways in which sexuality and its meanings are constructed, contingent, and relational. Queer takes up poststructuralism's conceptualization of identity as unstable, relational, and changing to refuse the normalization that a fixed definition would confer on sexual subjects. For queer theory, categories such as man, woman, homosexual, or heterosexual are never natural or neutral. In this sense, it questions heteronormativity, or the idea that heterosexuality is natural.

While recognizing a need for the interrogation of normalcy, critics of queer theory contend that its emphasis on sexuality over gender runs the risk of ignoring gender differences and returning the universal male subject to the center of theorizing. Others question whether its refusal of a foundation for identity or community limits its political potential.

ESSENTIALISM AND CONSTRUCTIONISM

Queer theory intervenes in debates regarding whether gender and sexuality are essential or constructed. Essentialists consider identity to be natural, innate, and fixed over the course of one's life, as suggested by ideas that people are "born that way." Essentialists understand homosexuality as a universal phenomenon that has existed across time and cultures. Essentialism can lead to views that sexual identity is attached to certain behaviors, such as "coming out" as gay or lesbian, which serves as a marker of authenticity as one takes up a gay or lesbian identity. Although some argue that it constitutes a conservative stance, essentialism has been used as a strategy to secure civil rights for gay men and lesbians. Activists have drawn on essentialist discourses to argue that if homosexuality is a historical constant that is biological or innate and cannot be changed, gay men and lesbians should be conferred rights.

Constructionists, on the other hand, understand gender and sexuality to be "made" rather than "born," a creation of cultural and social contexts. While they may not argue against a biological basis of sex, they often separate gender as a cultural phenomenon that is not essential to one's identity. Thus, constructionists posit that homosexuality is not universal but has different cultural meanings in different sociohistorical contexts. Constructionists contend that their analysis of social and cultural variation offers a means of political intervention in that the social and cultural can be changed. At the same time, its critics argue that constructionism sends a message that homosexuality can be changed because it is cast as a "choice."

Both views, but particularly essentialist stances, can be attached to an "ethnic model" of gay and lesbian politics, which positions lesbians and gays as an identifiable minority population, different but equal, that can demand recognition, equal rights, and legal protections. Identity politics, the idea that a personal identity converges with a group identity to constitute identifiable needs and concerns, has enabled collective representation for women, gay men and lesbians, and African Americans. However, the representation of a coherent, unified community has also revealed profound divides along lines of race, ethnicity, nationality, class, and gender with, for example, women and African Americans arguing that their needs are excluded and that the community that is represented is largely White and male. Thus, queer theorists have suggested that the use of identity as the grounds to constitute a community or a politics is of limited value in that it excludes other elements that contribute to subjects' sense of identity. For queer theorists, community is provisional and politics coalitional. Each depends on interests and connections in a context.

QUESTIONING CATEGORIES OF IDENTITY

While queer theory shares affinities with constructionism, it takes its critique of essential identities further by questioning the very attachment of sexuality to identity. Queer theory criticizes an "ethnic model" of sexual identity due to its underlying acceptance of the logic that sexual orientation is determined by the gender of one's sexual object choice and that this orientation constitutes an identity.

In a move that breaks with essentialist and constructionist understandings of identity, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick pointed to two contradictory views, minoritizing and universalizing, of homosexuality. A minoritizing view understands homosexuality as the identity of a small, consistent, and discrete population. A universalizing view understands same-sex desire as relevant to people across a spectrum of sexualities. The second, less common view suggests that homosexuality is not the property of an individual or a group but is implicated in the definition and production of all subjects, regardless of identity. While a minoritizing view defines identity categories as discrete, a universalizing view argues that homo/heterosexual definition is intertwined and constitutive of all subjects. This relational view of the meanings of sexuality and identity leads queer politics and theory to shift their focus to difference rather than identity. Difference precedes identity and is constitutive of subjects' positions.

Following from the insights of deconstruction, queer theory understands binary oppositions as sets of categories that are inherently unequal. Heterosexual, for example, is valorized and homosexual subordinate. Just as an opposition such as man/woman sustains its hierarchical structure through such oppositions as rational/emotional, active/passive, and strong/weak, heterosexual/homosexual is implicated in a number of oppositions, such as, to borrow from Sedgwick, natural/artificial, health/illness, majority/minority, public/private, and innocence/initiation. Because the valorized term in a binary opposition depends on the subordinated term for its meaning, the meanings of the dominant term shift in relation to changes in the subordinated term's meanings. In this way, homosexual is always both internal and external to heterosexual. Thus, following a universalizing view, homosexual definition affects individuals across a range of genders and sexualities.

Queer theory denaturalizes categories of homosexuality and heterosexuality by revealing their contextual, historicized nature as they are constituted through relations of power. For example, a number of historians have pointed out that in the late nineteenth century, the field of sexuality experienced a significant paradigm shift when medicine, the law, and the state ceased to focus on identifying homosexual acts and began to name homosexual identities. Some have called this shift from naming "behaviors" to codifying the homosexual as a "type" of person to be the founding of modern homosexual—and, by corollary, heterosexual—identities and the basis of minoritizing views of homosexuality. Yet, queer theory goes beyond constructionist stances that point to historical variation by deconstructing the operations of power that create knowledge of constructed categories rather than discovered identities.

Much of queer theory's emphasis on power and knowledge in constructing the "truth" of the homosexual is based in the work of Michel Foucault. In his first volume of *The History of Sexuality,* Foucault questioned what he called the "repressive hypothesis," or the belief that in the nineteenth century there was a prohibition against speaking about sexuality. He argued instead that the "prohibition" functioned as an "incitement to discourse," or a proliferation of discourses about sexuality. Part of this incitement to speak of sexuality was a belief that in revealing the secrets of their sexualities, subjects could produce a knowledge that would reveal the "truth" of who they were. For example, psychoanalysis as a practice asks subjects to speak of their sexuality in the search for an underlying truth of the self. Drawing a link from Christian confessional practices to modern psychoanalysis, Foucault argued that as subjects are called on to confess their emotions, thoughts, and desires, they are placed in a power relation to an authority figure who interprets speakers' narratives seemingly to reveal, but actually to produce, a "truth" of the self. And this "truth" is an effect of power.

In tracing the workings of power and knowledge, Foucault conceptualized three pro cesses of objectification that are integral to the ways in which one becomes a (sexual) subject: dividing practices, scientific classification, and processes of subjectification. Dividing practices categorize subjects, such as the homosexual and the heterosexual; scientific classification creates modes of inquiry that claim scientific status and create expert knowledge about these subjects; and subjectification refers to the meaning-making processes through which subjects form the self. Queer theorists argue that as educators and educational researchers seek to understand subjects, their capacities, and their cultures, they create scientific "knowledge" to classify individuals and corresponding practices that divide and regulate subjects who come to know and understand themselves through these discourses.

Following from Foucault, queer theorists argue that the contemporary imperative for lesbians and gay men to "come out" is a relic of this confessional impulse and maintains systems of power that would divide the heterosexual from the homosexual to produce "truths" about each. Even as coming out serves an important function of disclosing what Sedgwick (1990) has called the "open secret"—unacknowledged knowledges of the existence of nonheterosexual subjects—it also reinforces the homo/heterosexual binary.

Queer theory, then, breaks with feminist and lesbian and gay identity politics based on voicing and making visible identities to question the very formation and basis of identities. By positioning queer not as a noun or identity but as a verb—an ongoing process of identification with or against others—queer seeks to open up alternatives to processes of normalization. To understand queer as a "doing" rather than a "being," queer theorists argue, creates possibilities for new forms of relation.

GENDER AND SEXUALITY AS CONSTITUTIVE PERFORMANCE

Compulsory heterosexuality assumes a linear congruence, or causality, among a subject's sex (male or female), its gender identity (masculine or feminine), and its (opposite sex) sexual object choice. Homosexuality deviates from this normative sex-gender-desire system through same-sex sexual object choice. At the same time, inappropriate gender expressions for a certain sex—what some call gender inversion—can be conflated with homosexuality. For example, a "sissy boy's" feminine behaviors, even if his desires are heterosexual, often result in homophobic taunts or diagnoses of gender identity disorder, which is thought to lead to adult homosexuality.

Judith Butler's analyses of compulsory heterosexuality—or the heterosexual matrix's normative regulation of gender, sexuality, and identity—has had an influence across fields, including education. Butler extends Foucault's work to include gender, demonstrating how the regulation of gender enforces heteronormativity. She cautions that the claiming of marginalized identities, such as woman or lesbian, is complicit with the very heteronormative regimes identity politics seeks to resist. Fundamental to her argument is that feminism should not take "woman" as a foundational category, not only because its meaning is not universal or transparent, but also because the use of the category reinforces binary views of gender relations and of the categories male and female. By arguing that gender is a cultural expression of biological sex, she says, feminists reiterate patriarchy's determinism and leave little room to account for change or resistance.

Butler (1990) demonstrates that the continuity of sex-gender-desire is regulated by a system of compulsory heterosexuality that demands that subjects express appropriate, intelligible behaviors. For Butler, gender is an effect of repeated gendered performances. In other words, gender is not authentic but must be repeatedly performed or expressed in order to seem real. Behaviors are not an expression of a gender identity; rather, subjects attain a gendered identity through their gendered behaviors. Expressions or performances of gender, which are said to be its natural results, are instead its constitution. They do not express an inner core or essence; rather, a gender identity is the effect of a subject's performances. To understand gender as a fiction focuses on the potential for agency as individuals create their own practices and identities. Yet, performativity is not a voluntary performance, as subjects' performances and their intelligibility to others depend on the terms of the heterosexual matrix. Thus, the proliferation of subversive performances of gender and sexuality reveals that they are not natural or foundational, but contingent.

PRESENT EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Queer theory has slowly entered educational research and practice. Increasing attention to the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth in the media and among educators during the 1990s precipitated interest in issues of sexuality and schooling. For several decades, researchers, activists, and youth development workers have documented ways in which LGBT youth are at risk for suicide, verbal and physical assault, drug and alcohol abuse, sexually transmitted diseases, homelessness, dropping out of school, and depression. Advocates have used these depictions of victimized LGBT youth to justify inclusive practices, such as curricular change, the formation of Gay Straight Alliances, and the creation of "safe space" programs in schools. Thus, educational practice related to sexuality focuses on supporting and offering resources to LGBT teachers and students, enabling LGBT individuals to "come out" of the closet, and teaching positive images of LGBT individuals and cultures.

Queer theorists have challenged prevailing images of queer youth as victimized by society, family, and educational institutions. Lost in these depictions, they argue, are understandings of queer youth that include pleasure, agency, and creativity. In response, activists argue that with such a controversial topic as schools and (homo)sexuality, the suffering of LGBT youth offers an important fulcrum to focus attention on the need to combat homophobia and its effects in schools.

These corrective approaches are informed by ethnic models of identity and multicultural inclusion. Educators argue that offering positive representations through the curriculum and role models through teachers will build self-esteem for LGBT youth and tolerance among non-LGBT youth. Queer theorists critique such projects as perpetuating divisions of "queer" and "straight" people and cultures. These divisions participate in normalization by codifying LGBT and non-LGBT identities as stable, separate, and predictable by constructing particular types of knowledge about and for each group. Because curricular approaches must decide what kinds of representation, how much, where, and for whom, the naming of difference runs the risk not only of being prescriptive rather than descriptive but also of failing to challenge norms. While recognizing these dangers, some educators express reticence to pursue a queer critical analysis or deconstruction of LGBT images, identities, and representations in schooling as efficacious when there has previously been little positive mention of such identities.

Queer theorists also express concern that positive representations and programs make a further division between those who are and are not "out" of the closet. They argue that being "in" or "out" in educational contexts is more complex than these dichotomies reveal. The valorization of "coming out" and speaking the truth of the self can function as a White middle-class norm that ignores ethnic and racial community and family ties that mediate the desires of youth to "come out." It further reinforces ideas that sexuality reveals a "truth" of the self.

Queer theorists argue that inclusive educational practices predicated on identities are limited in their transformative potential. For example, efforts to create gender equity do not challenge inequitable gender structures or the ways categories of identity themselves can be oppressive. Similarly, efforts to offer LGBT students resources, support, safety, or inclusion focus on mediating the effects of the interpersonal marginalization of the "other" rather than the privileging of the "normal," thereby leaving intact structures of privilege and oppression. Conversely, efforts that would teach accurate images and tolerance presume that education should offer knowledge to counter stereotypes or myths due to exclusion or distortion in the curriculum. While such approaches have the potential to expand knowledge, they presume that accurate portrayals of the LGBT individuals are possible and can be received rationally, regardless of students' implications and investments in the knowledges being studied. In other words, while these approaches may help students understand others, they may not challenge the ways in which they understand the dynamics of their own positioning, particularly in relation to systems that privilege some and marginalize others. Fundamentally, education predicated on models of ethnic identity fails to examine how processes of differentiation and subordination work as norms are constituted.

QUEER PEDAGOGY

At this early stage of its development, queer theory offers a trenchant critique of traditional, identity-based models of inclusion as well as some ways for educators to approach subject matter and processes of teaching and learning differently. Consonant with queer's refusal to fix itself or its subjects of study, queer pedagogy offers no codified method or content.

Queer theory argues that mainstream approaches that seek to function as an antidote for homophobia or a cure for low LGBT self-esteem are tantamount to assimilationist demands for equal cultural representation that will expand ideas of normal to include gay and lesbian people. Traditional pedagogies target heterosexual ignorance—assuming that knowledge will stop homophobia—and homosexual isolation—presuming that curricular images and faculty role models will enhance self-esteem. They reinforce binary oppositions of tolerated and tolerant, or oppressed and oppressor.

Rather than replacing absences or distortions with accurate representations that would normalize queer subjects, queer pedagogy works against the constitution of knowable or known subjects and instead prizes unintelligibility, or the impossibility of knowing homosexual or heterosexual. Queer pedagogy rejects the notion that curriculum can appeal to rational subjects who will cognitively process information that leads to tolerance. Knowledge and the "transmission" of knowledge are not something to be mastered. Instead, queer pedagogy focuses on how individuals come to know—how knowledge is produced through interaction. Pedagogy becomes a problem of knowledge, of how students learn or read, and what relations they form to knowledges. Queer pedagogy draws from the psychoanalytic insight that learning involves an "unlearning" in which ignorance is not necessarily a lack of knowledge but an attachment to certain forms of knowledge and a resistance to new knowledges. Thus, queer pedagogy takes into account how students learn from or refuse to understand their implications in new knowledges. It asks students and teachers to study their own learning and relations to texts and to inquire into their resistances, identifications, and disidentifications. The problem, then, is not filling in accurate information but engaging students in conversations about their own subject formation and the identifications they take up or refuse.

Queer pedagogical approaches ask students and teachers to consider their own complicity with and relationships to oppression. Through a curriculum that includes multiple voices, students do not search for a "truer" story but for multiple, often contradictory, stories that might destabilize and change dominant narratives. Integral to such education is participants' rethinking the self in relation to binaries of normalcy/deviance. As they deconstruct privilege and marginalization, students must engage affect and cognition in reading their own locations and the implications of their actions. For example, autobiographical work as a queer curriculum practice involves studying one's own narratives to examine differences within oneself and in one's relations with others. Rather than repeating comfortable narratives and categories of identity or resisting new narratives, students must work through an "unlearning" in order to create new knowledges.

As part of a project of studying processes of differentiation and normalization, queer theorists ask for curricular and pedagogical approaches that highlight the relational and unstable nature of identity. Thus, rather than teaching about sexuality as attached to specific acts or discrete identities, teaching and learning focus on sexuality as implicated in social relations and in pleasure. In decentering the homosexual/heterosexual binary, queer curriculum focuses on understanding differences within and among persons rather than differences in categories of persons. For example, a "queering" of the traditional curriculum, such as the literary canon, investigates usually invisible and potentially queer pleasures and desires in seemingly "straight" texts. Heterosexuality itself can then be revealed as unstable and as sometimes queer.

Refusing to objectify difference, queer pedagogy is not interested in who or what lesbian and gay people are but in examining the social relations that create and result from divisions of heterosexual normalcy/homosexual deviancy. Following queer theory's questioning of binary oppositions, queer pedagogy asks for rethinking the stable identities upheld by gender and sexual dichotomies and encourages the formation of identifications beyond given binaries. With a goal of disrupting processes by which some subjects are normalized and other subjects marginalized, queer pedagogy seeks not to produce identities and knowledges about identities but to foster recognition of teaching, learning, and social relations themselves as fluid and variable. A goal is not the formation or recognition of identities but the proliferation of new relations and affiliations.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity.* New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: An introduction* (Vol. 1) (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage.

Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction.* New York: New York University Press.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and antioppressive pedagogy.* New York & London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Rasmussen, M.L., Rofes, E., & Talburt, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Youth and sexualities: Pleasure, subversion, and insubordination in and out of schools.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, W.F. (Ed.). (1998). *Queer theory in education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sedgwick, E.K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Talburt, S., & Steinberg, S.R. (Eds.). (2000). *Thinking queer: Sexuality, culture, and education.* New York: Peter Lang.

Susan Talburt

Relational-Cultural Theory

Relational-cultural theory (RCT) offers that those activities essential to the survival of the human species—namely, fostering the growth and development of others in a relational context—are misunderstood, devalued, and pathologized within traditional models of development and mental health. As a result, individuals yearning to establish and to participate in growth-fostering relationships over the life span are seen as "defective" or "dependent" in that they are not following the approved path of separation and individuation indicative of emotional maturity in Western psychology.

In reframing relationships as the context in which we experience optimal psychological development and emotional well-being throughout our lives, RCT articulates a means by which we can create and nourish mutually empathic growth-fostering relationships in therapy and in life. Creating the kinds of relationships in which we can experience psychological growth, healing, and mutual empathy involves naming and deconstructing interpersonal and sociopolitical obstacles that serve to keep us disconnected from each other, such as ableism, ageism, classism, heterosexism, racism, and sexism. Relational obstacles include all the sources of stratification in our culture whereby individuals feel more or less important, visible, heard, and able to promote and seek justice for their individual and collective interests.

ORIGINS OF RELATIONAL-CULTURAL THEORY

RCT was conceived after the publication in 1976 of *Towards a New Psychology of Women* by Jean Baker Miller, MD, a traditionally trained psychiatrist. As Miller began her clinical work with women, she began to realize that what she was learning about their lives did not fit into the traditional models of development she had been taught in medical school. These early observations prompted the ideas in her revolutionary book, including her point that our understanding of much of life had been skewed and was biased because the way we had come to understand "the nature of things" reflected only the stereotypical experiences and developmental patterns of privileged White men, which precluded our potential for understanding the other half of the human species—namely, women—and all the other experiences along the gender continuum including those of marginalized men and people of color.

Miller also named sex role socialization, power, dominance, marginalization, and subordination as overlooked yet essential guiding principles of relationships and traditional models of development and mental health. After the publication of her groundbreaking book, Western psychology was challenged to understand women's "ways of being" contextually, as well as to understand the impact of privilege, oppression, and marginalization on human development in general in order to deepen and expand our understanding of the nature of *all* of our lives and our relationship(s) to and with each other.

After the publication of her book, Miller, who was residing in the Boston area, decided to meet this challenge by inviting a group of local psychologists—namely, Dr. Judith Jordan, Dr. Alexandra Kaplan, Dr. Irene Stiver, and Dr. Janet Surrey—to begin meeting on Monday nights at her home. The purpose of those Monday night meetings was to collectively begin rethinking how traditional models of human development failed to capture, understand, and articulate the relational experiences of their female clients and to begin constructing an alternative model of women's development and a new approach to therapy that fit their needs. This small group of women eventually came to be known as the "founding scholars of RCT."

During this time, Miller was invited to be the first director of a new counseling center, the Stone Center, on the Wellesley College campus, which was named after the parents and family who founded the center to help students like their daughter who had tragically committed suicide. Under Miller's directorship, the Stone Center became the source of many scholarly works that have been published through the years, the earliest of which were the fruits of those Monday night meetings. Because the development of their ideas was framed as "a growing understanding" of relationships, their writings emerged into a collection of papers called "Works in Progress" to which nearly 100 diverse scholars and clinicians have contributed over the years.

At the time the founding scholars began their Monday night meetings, the most prevalent theme in theories of human development in Western psychology was that of individualism demonstrated through a consistent focus on the "self." Ideal self-development and emotional maturity were characterized by individuation, separation, autonomy, rationality, and independence and also required a practice of resisting the influence of others through a degree of unresponsiveness. Being responsive indicated a lack of control of one's self and of others and signified weakness and a loss of power-over by having "given in" to dependency needs.

From the perspective of "self-development," it appeared that men had been doing a much better job at achieving developmental milestones than women, who seemed to struggle with definitive self-interests and their personal identities, which they could not seem to manage independent of "relationships." Miller had elaborated in her book that many of the activities central to a woman's life and to her identity involved tending to the needs and to the psychological growth and development of others, including men. Along those same lines, traditional models of development failed to address the relational and emotional support men received in pursuit of individual accomplishments and, in turn, neglected the reality of this aspect of their development. As a result, the founding scholars found that a contextual and relational conceptualization of human development would enable a deeper understanding of all of life and laid the foundation for a new approach to therapy, now known as "relational-cultural theory."

WOMEN'S GROWTH IN CONNECTION

The founding scholars' initial work in the area of women's identity formation and relational development was published as a collection of "Works in Progress" in a book published in 1991 titled *Women's Growth in Connection: Writing from the Stone Center.* This early scholarship was well received and provided answers to some crucial questions about the complexities of women's lives and relationships it seemed no one had ever bothered to ask including: What kinds of vulnerabilities do women incur as a result of being assigned a role essential to the survival of the human species that involves facilitating and supporting the psychological growth and emotional well-being of others, and having their "life's work" devalued, invisibilized, and pathologized by the larger culture, the field of mental health and, sadly, often by those in whom they have invested a lifetime of support and care?

This collection of works addressed these complex issues by providing (a) an exploration of the mother/daughter relationship as a key relational context in which women learn accurate empathy; (b) a description of the processes of women's identity formation termed "Self-in-Relational" theory; (c) a description of the processes in sex role socialization that discourage mutual empathy, mask underlying processes of support that foster an illusion of independence and autonomy, and encourage the devaluation of women; and (d) an alternative model of development termed "Relationship-Differentiation."

In traditional models of development and psychotherapy, relationships were often cited as sources of pathology and were sometimes framed as dangerous to healthy development. Simply put, women's ways of being and relating were often viewed as "fundamentally flawed," while paradoxically being essential to the survival of the human species. Women and their behavior, examined through a traditional lens, were often labeled as too "emotional," "needy," "dependent," and "enmeshed," all of which cast a negative light on relationships, and women. Most of the scholarship that had addressed the necessity of relationships to development was found in the early childhood and parenting literature, most readily as it applied to "mothering."

The founding scholars' initial work illuminated that women, including mothers, are designated as the "keepers of connection" in our culture and that participating in relationships is an organizing feature of women's lives and development. Mothers, as those most often responsible for fostering the psychological growth and well-being of infants and children, are the individuals with whom humans seek their first connections, a desire that gradually comes to include other adults present in the earliest stages of life. They observed that while girls are encouraged and taught to engage in a continued interest in the feeling states of others, beginning with those of their mothers or primary caregivers, boys are "disencouraged" from doing so and pushed to pursue their self-interests, a task that involves a gradual disattunement and disconnection from others beginning with their mothers or other primary caregivers. These patterns of engagement, which serve as the foundation for empathy skill in girls and independence in boys, are reinforced over the life span.

Mothers, and their feeling states, are the persons and feelings with which infants are first attuned. The mothers' mirroring of the feelings states of infants serves to emotionally regulate their affect in a reciprocal process that is refined over time. Interestingly, for over 25 years (Coll, Surrey, & Weingarten, 1998), mothers have been nominated five times more frequently in the mental health literature than fathers as the root cause of mental illnesses in their children, including poor body image, eating disorders, violence, psychosis, developmental disorders, compulsions, and addictions, to name just a few. Scholars have only recently begun to consider the father's role in the development of pathology in their children (Maine, 2004), but the majority of such scholarship is based on the assumption of heterosexual partnered parenting contexts. In any case, bad mothers are often described as being overinvolved, uninvolved, enmeshed, unable to "cut the cord," unreasonably critical, all of which suggest flawed relational styles.

The founding scholars made the point that, in essence, the field of mental health has perpetuated the idea that the very individuals on whom the continuation of our species depends are, in fact, our greatest threat. They also suggested that perhaps the mental health field's obsession with the impact of "bad mothering" was an indicator of the importance of relationships. With no map for understanding relational competencies over the life span within traditional theories of development and mental health, the only option was to "write them out" of development needs as soon as humans could conceivably do without them until, of course, it came time to develop a heterosexual relationship in early adulthood.

As a part of the ongoing socialization of girls, emotional attunement with their mother's feeling states marked the beginning of their training in empathy skills. In *Women's Growth in Connection,* the founding scholars elaborate on the complexities of accurate empathy and state that empathy involves both affective and cognitive functioning and is a far more complex, developmentally advanced, and interactive process that we might have ever understood it to be. They also point out that both male and female infants are born with empathic capacities, but the ongoing refinement of this skill is nurtured in girls. A facet of developing empathic capacities involves a fluid process of responsiveness *between* individuals, one that they describe as involving a "mutual" interest between people and requiring an ability to build on the experience of identification with the other person to form a cognitive assimilation of this experience as a basis for response, a process that requires "practice, modeling, and feedback in relationships."

As a part of their socialization training, girls are also encouraged to identify with their mothers, a process that has the potential to be wrought with complexities and ambivalence. The complexities of the mother-daughter relationship are most often framed as stemming from "bad mothering" rather than from the "catch 22" sociopolitical context in which mothers and daughters are challenged to develop a positive sense of self-worth and an appreciation for each other and for their relationship in a context of ongoing devaluation and invisibility. The devaluation of women and/or feminine ways of being is part and parcel of our cultural education and sex role socialization, which unfolds under the guise of compulsory heterosexuality and homophobia.

"Manhood," which Miller noted in her book had come to mean "mankind," as defined in the context of individualism, begins with boys' early separation from their mothers; comes to be characterized by competitiveness, toughness, aggressiveness, and emotional control; and is generally thought of in opposition to femininity. Young boys, for example, are subject to ridicule, rejection, humiliation, shame, or, at worst, violence and bullying if they are accused of being a "sissy" or of doing anything "like a girl" (or like their mothers). These social mandates serve as early lessons in the devaluation of anything feminine, which, in full form, are referred to as "misogyny."

In adolescence and adulthood, feminine, "sissy boys" and gay men are vulnerable to victimization through hate crimes, physical violence, even murder as are many others marginalized by their sexual orientation. The founding scholars noted that women are socialized to anticipate the needs of men and, in doing so, they covertly protect their undesirable vulnerabilities and needs from expression or exposure. Through this process, men and women learn relational dynamics based on dominance, subordination, power-over, entitlement, access, and privilege with the support flow coming from women, to and for men.

While boys' separation from their mothers is an expected outcome on their path to independence, girls and women experience relationships, including their relationship with their mothers and other primary caregivers, as central organizing features of their identity, a phenomenon, which is the heart of "Self-in-Relation" developmental theory. "Self-in-Relation" theory suggests that, over the life span, women become increasingly relationally competent or, simply put, "better at relationships" and that "growth-fostering relationships," those in which women feel understood, cared for, respected, and heard, are the context in which they experience psychological growth, self-confidence, maturity, and a sense of groundedness throughout their lives. On a related note, contemporary scholars on male development have named the early separation from mother as a source of trauma in the lives of men (Pollack, 1998) for which they blame mothers and, in doing so, neglect the idea that it is the relationships in men's lives, which are often nonmutual due to socialization mandates, that are the real source of their psychological distress.

In *Women's Growth in Connection,* the challenges of relationships across the life span are described in a new development model that founding scholar Janet Surrey termed "Relationship-Differentiation," which expounds on the notion that we grow in and through relationships. By "differentiation" the scholars do not imply a gradual "cutting off" from relationships but rather suggest that relationships are fluid versus stuck or static throughout our lives, meaning they grow and change for many different reasons. In order for relationships to grow and change, people are challenged to adapt and respond to the ways in which they change and grow in their lives. There will be times in their lives that people need more or less support from others, particularly during the times in which they feel most vulnerable. As people take on more varied roles, their relational networks will expand, their relational responsibilities will vary from one context to another, and developmental traumas, hardships, and other challenges unique to their lives will impact their relational capacities and tolerance for closeness and vulnerability.

Through the years, the founding scholars began a more in-depth analysis of relationships to answer such questions as: What differentiates relationships that foster growth versus those that impede growth? What kinds of relational dynamics lead to connections and disconnections in relationships? How do experiences of connections and disconnections in relationships contribute to one's sense of agency in relationships or to experiences of chronic disconnections or condemned isolation? What does growth in connection really feel like? How do social, cultural, and political contexts play into all of this? And, lastly, and probably most importantly, how can the therapeutic relationship be constructed to foster relational competence and growth?

A MODEL OF GROWTH AND HEALING IN LIFE AND THERAPY

According to RCT, therapeutic goals should focus on expanding one's ability to create, participate, and sustain growth-fostering relationships over the life span. Based on their earliest work, psychological well-being and emotional maturity involve an increasing capacity to be authentic and fully present in relationships along with a growing capacity to be responsive to others who are struggling to represent their experiences in the relationship. As such, the therapeutic process is about developing *relational competence* or, more simply stated, therapy is about getting better at relationships.

RCT posits that the process of becoming relationally competent involves the ability to become increasingly able to fully represent oneself both honestly and authentically in relationships. It also involves feeling “effective” in relationships by being able to impact the other (Miller & Stiver, 1997). Ideally, there is a mutually empathic responsiveness, characteristic of the reciprocal responsiveness between mothers and their infants. In adulthood, this translates to each person feeling as if they have been heard and that their experiences matter. This experience, which is referred to as *mutual empathy* in growth-fostering relationships, leads to a sense of connection, which is experienced as what has been referred to as the “five good things.”

These five good things are (a) a greater sense of zest, energy, or vitality; (b) an increased sense of effectiveness or agency in relationships; (c) a feeling that we clearly understand ourselves, others, and our relationships with others; (d) an experience in which each person in the relationship shares a sense of feeling valued and worthy; and (e) a feeling that one’s relational capacities have grown and, as such, there is a desire to expand one’s relational networks with others (Miller & Stiver, 1997). RCT also posits that experiences of connections are very powerful and impact one’s ability for creativity and productivity, for example, and energize individuals even when they are not necessarily with another person.

In reality, relationships are characterized by periods of connection *and* disconnection. In fact, RCT emphasizes that disconnections are inevitable in even the healthiest relationships. Disconnections can result from a myriad of circumstances that include everything from simple misunderstandings to abuses and violations and can be periodic or chronic, the worst of which begin in early childhood when individuals feel most vulnerable and helpless. Disconnections are also experienced in relationships as the opposite of the five good things. In a disconnection people feel (a) depleted of energy; (b) helpless; (c) confused and unclear; (d) unworthy and bad; and (e) forced to turn away from relationships (Miller & Stiver, 1997). Much as connections fuel the ability to be fully present in one’s own life, disconnections can feel nearly debilitating and make handling the responsibilities in one’s life feel burdensome. At worst, disconnection will drive people toward isolating themselves, an emotional state referred to as “condemned isolation” in which people are vulnerable to self-destructiveness and self-blame. Disconnection is more common among women than men because women carry more responsibility for the well-being of their relationships.

In the face of a disconnection, it takes a certain type of courage and vulnerability for individuals to authentically express their hurt, disappointment, or needs, especially if they are the less powerful (subordinate) one in the relationship. This capacity is directly affected by sex role socialization, making it more difficult for men to express their hurt, for example, which is often masked by anger, and to also respond to others when traditional models have encouraged unresponsiveness as a means of asserting one’s strength and autonomy. On the other hand, women are often “over responsible,” which makes them vulnerable to being emotionally exploited in relationships. When people are responded to empathically, then a sense of connection can be restored, and both parties grow and experience a sense of relational competence/confidence (the feeling that “Hey, I’m pretty good at this!”) and transformation.

If, on the other hand, individuals are responded to in a way that is injurious or somehow denies their experience, they will begin to leave aspects of themselves out of the relationship in order to play by the relational rules. In RCT, this is referred to as the *central relational paradox,* which plays itself out when, in the face of yearning for connection, individuals leave authentic parts of their experiences out of the relationship in order to somehow "keep" or "fit" into the relationship and to avoid repeated injurious consequences (Miller & Stiver, 1997).

The efforts made to play by relational rules in order to maintain the relationship and to avoid injurious consequences are thought of as a process by which one exercises strategies of disconnection. Individuals exercise strategies of disconnection leaving parts of themselves out of relationships in order to avoid potential pain or, at worse, a complete relational rupture. What is left is only an illusion of a connection. RCT posits that people develop certain patterns of disconnection that are developmental in nature. In other words, many strategies of disconnection are guided by a person's *relational images* or expectations of how others will respond to him or her based on his or her familial experiences and personal experiences in the larger culture (Miller & Stiver, 1997).

If developmentally one has had to repeatedly exercise strategies of disconnection to avoid being abused or to avoid random acts of racism, for example, then these strategies of disconnection become *strategies for survival.* In this context, one's yearning for connection is experienced as a heightened and frightening experience and, in order to restore a sense of safety, one ultimately and paradoxically turns away from relationships and possibilities to heal and into isolation, a dynamic in response to past relational violations captured in the characteristics of borderline personality disorder, for example.

It is important to remember that the degree of safety one feels to express one's authentic feelings is directly related to how much power or mutuality one experiences or expects, and often these expectations come from family experiences or from one's sense of being marginalized from the larger culture. As such, individuals feel varying degrees of freedom to express themselves and have varying expectations they will be heard, both of which are directly related to the degree of privilege or marginalization one experiences. Feelings of privilege and marginalization are the result of the stratification that occurs around "difference" in our culture and include the degree to which one might experience ableism, ageism, classism, heterosexism, racism, or sexism, for example.

RCT has been influenced by feminist scholars including Peggy McIntosh, bell hooks, and Patricia Hill Collins. For therapists who train in this model, creating connection and mutual empathy requires a degree of thoughtful responsiveness to clients, a stance that is not advocated by most approaches to therapy. The notion of mutual empathy and connection as healing forces in relationships have been incorporated into the fields of counseling, education, medicine, nursing, social work, theology, and psychotherapy as a model for psychological growth and well-being of individuals of all walks of life.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Coll, C.G., Surrey, J.L., & Weingarten, K. (Eds.). (1998). *Mothering against the odds: Diverse voices of contemporary mothers.* New York: Guilford Press.

Comstock, D.L. (Ed.). (2005). *Diversity and development: Critical contexts that shape our lives and relationships.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.

Jordan, J.V., Kaplan, A.G., Miller, J.B., Stiver, I.P., & Surrey, J.L. (1991). *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center.* New York: Guilford Press.

Maine, M. (2004). *Father hunger: Fathers, daughters, and the pursuit of thinness.* Carlsbad, CA: Gurze Books.

Miller, J.B. (1976). *Toward a new psychology of women.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J.B., & Stiver, I.P. (1997). *The healing connection: How women form relationships in therapy and in life.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Pollack, W.S. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood.* New York: Henry Holt.

Dana L. Comstock

Sex Role Socialization

The term socialization refers to how individuals learn about the roles and expectations that they play within a society and the way in which they develop a sense of self. The process of socialization occurs throughout the life span and involves virtually all areas of our lives. Whenever we encounter new situations, we learn about the roles associated with these situations and develop views of how we fit within them.

Sex role socialization, also termed gender socialization, involves developing beliefs about gender roles, the expectations associated with each sex group, and, also, gender identity, an understanding of what it means to be a male or female. Gender socialization is probably one of the most basic aspects of the general socialization process. Research suggests that children learn that the world is gendered at a very young age and, soon after, develop a sense of their own gender identity.

Theoretical understandings of gender socialization have become more sophisticated over the years as empirical data have accumulated. Early approaches tended to emphasize the role of a child as a target of socialization and adult and media influences as agents that influenced the child's development. More recent approaches have emphasized children's cognitive awareness and active involvement in the development of their gender roles and understandings as well as the centrality of peer groups. Biological differences between the sex groups that influence temperament, behaviors, aptitudes, and interests have been increasingly documented.

While much popular writing regarding gender and education suggests that teacher behaviors and school curricula disadvantage females, empirical evidence does not support this view. Instead, children's experiences with teachers and other adults in schools appear to counter detrimental aspects of peer group interactions, especially for boys. In addition, substantial data suggest that girls have more positive experiences within the educational system than boys through all levels of education. The differences between males and females appear to be stronger with minorities than the White majority, and the advantage of females in educational attainment has widened in recent years. Some scholarly work is addressing the role of gender socialization in these differential patterns of achievement.

SCHOLARLY VIEWS OF GENDER SOCIALIZATION

Theories of gender socialization developed from general understandings of socialization, largely based in the traditions of academic psychology and sociology. The earliest theoretical approach stems from the broad area of social learning theory, which developed from the behaviorism tradition that focuses on reinforcements. This approach suggests that children develop sex-typed behaviors because other people reinforce behaviors that conform to expectations for their sex group and do not reinforce nonconforming behaviors. Within the family, this approach suggests that parents, as agents of socialization, interact with boys and girls in ways that reinforce sex-typed behaviors. Within education, the theory suggests that teachers differentially reinforce sex-typed behaviors of children.

Empirical tests of this theory have produced little support. Most of the research has involved parent-child interactions. While parents may reinforce some sex differences in toy selection, they tend to treat boys and girls similarly in most other areas, including encouraging achievement or dependency, warmth of interactions, restrictiveness, and disciplinary practices. The vast majority of the literature also suggests that teachers treat boys and girls very similarly.

By the 1960s, the social learning tradition had broadened to include the idea of "modeling," the notion that children copy or model the behaviors of others. While the idea of reinforcement tends to imply that the targets of socialization (such as children) simply respond, apparently unknowingly, to the actions of the agent of socialization (such as parents or teachers), the notion of modeling implies that the targets of socialization are more involved in the process by actively imitating the agents. Again, however, there has been little support for modeling theory as the sole explanation of the development of gender roles and gender identity. A long tradition of studies has found little evidence that children of parents with highly sex-stereotyped behavior exhibit such behavior themselves. Similarly, experiments that have involved altering gender-related models (or reinforcements) that children receive have produced only temporary changes in their behaviors.

As social learning theory failed to gain empirical support, researchers looked to other explanations of gender socialization. The most important aspect of the new approaches involved the notion that children's active involvement in the socialization process must be more fully considered. Cognitive developmental theory builds on the work of Jean Piaget and his discovery that children gradually develop more complex understandings of the world and interactions with others. Lawrence Kohlberg applied these views to gender socialization, suggesting that children develop more complex views of gender roles as their cognitive capacities become more complex.

Cognitive developmental theory presented important advances over social learning theory by stressing the active involvement of children themselves in developing their views of gender roles and their gender identity and, also, by explaining why young children have more rigid and inflexible views of sex roles than older children. At the same time, however, empirical evidence did not support some crucial elements of the theory, especially Kohlberg's suggestion that children become most interested and actively involved in developing gender-typed behavior only after they have developed a strong notion of "gender constancy." Gender constancy, the understanding that one is a boy or a girl and that this categorization will not change, appears by about six years of age. Yet, gender-typed differences in choices of toys and playmates consistently appear by the age of two or three. By that point, boys and girls fairly consistently choose different toys and play activities, prefer same-sex playmates, and exhibit differences in aggressive behavior.

In terms of gender socialization in education, it is important to note that these sex differences occur long before children enter elementary school and even before they enter nursery school. Even more important, the focus of cognitive development theory on children's interpretations and understandings of their environment and the social world shifts attention away from the focus of much of the popular literature, such as teachers' actions and the content of school curricula.

In more recent years, scholars have used the notion of "schemas," or cognitive frameworks, to help understand the very early appearance of gender differences and gender-typed behavior. Schemas are cognitive structures that people use to organize and process information to which they are exposed. Psychologists believe that people use schemas as an efficient way to organize new knowledge and information; they help us maintain consistency and predictability in new situations. Gender schemas are used to organize information on the basis of gender categories.

As children come across information or new situations that pertain to gender, they tend to use their gender schemas as a guide for interpreting this information. This can help them simplify information and decisions. Research suggests that children can discriminate males and females and link characteristics such as hair and clothing styles to these differences by one year of age, indicating that rudimentary gender schemas have developed by that point. Research also suggests that children use this gender schema as an "in-group/out-group" model. They then categorize information as to whether it involves their own sex group (the in-group) or the other (the out-group) and use this categorization as they choose toys and behaviors or decide whether to attend to new information.

In line with cognitive development theory, scholars suggest that children develop increasingly more elaborate gender schemas as they develop their gender identity and their understanding of gender roles. Data indicate that there is a clear developmental pattern in children's understandings of gender: an early phase, during the toddler and preschool years, where children begin learning about gender-related characteristics; a second phase where this knowledge is consolidated and children display their most rigid views of gender roles, typically between the ages of five and seven; and then a phase of relative, and growing, flexibility.

A long tradition of research, beginning with "masculinity-femininity" tests from the 1950s and 1960s, also indicates that gender schemas are complex and multidimensional and that children acquire gender schemas in a variety of ways. Data suggest that these various components of gender schema may involve not just cognitive knowledge and stereotypes but also affective and evaluative components, and even metaphoric qualities, such as strength, danger, or gentleness.

Researchers are also exploring the ways in which the notion of gender schemas can help us understand how reinforcement, modeling, and cognitive development work. For instance, the idea of gender schemas can help explain why children choose to attend to some reinforcements or model certain behaviors rather than others. Similarly, the way in which children attend to various stimuli and interpret them can involve both the nature of their gender schema and their stage in cognitive development.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the more contemporary work on gender socialization is the attention to the peer group and peer group culture. A large body of work demonstrates that children prefer to play with others of the same sex. These preferences appear when children are very young and are especially strong in settings that are not monitored by adults. Clearly, situations can be structured where boys and girls interact comfortably together and children can maintain cross-sex friendships, but the preference for sex-segregated interaction appears to be very difficult to change. Cross-sex friendships occur within homes or neighborhoods and are often hidden from the larger peer group. Research suggests that the preference for sex-segregated interaction appears as early as three years of age and increases in strength over time, maintaining a high level until at least age 11.

Studies suggest that a great deal of gender socialization occurs within peer groups and a "culture of childhood," for peer groups are highly gendered. Patterns of games, activities, roles, norms, even jokes, pass on from generation to generation of children with relatively little active involvement by adults. As cognitive development theory would predict, the gendered nature of children's peer groups is quite different from that of adults. Distinctions between appropriate roles for males and females are extensive and much more rigidly enforced. In addition, studies indicate that the amount of time children are engaged in same-sex play is related to their gendered behavior, with greater time with same-sex partners related to more sex-differentiated behavior, even after controlling for initial differences in these behaviors.

As research in this area has progressed, scholars have developed more extensive understandings of the differences between boys' and girls' peer group interactions. Boys are more likely to engage in "rough and tumble" play, with more physical fighting and contact, and to play with toys that require more physical action (e.g., toy cars and trucks or blocks). Girls' groups tend to be quieter and less physical, with toys that require more verbal interaction (e.g., playing house) and interactions that tend to emphasize cooperation among play partners. The fact that these differences appear in primates, humans' closest relatives, leads scholars to believe that they reflect, at least to some extent, biological differences between the sex groups.

In addition, boys prefer to be in situations with less adult attention and supervision. Girls are more likely to select activities that include adult structure and have rules that govern play. In general, boys' peer groups seem far less amenable to direction and supervision by adults than do girls' peer groups.

Schools are, of course, a major arena in which peer socialization occurs, as young people develop friendships and interact with others. Many of these interactions receive relatively minimal adult supervision and involvement. At the same time, schools provide the most important structure that counters the peer group and promotes interaction between the sex groups, providing structures in which males and females work together and norms under which they operate.

A great deal of speculation has occurred regarding the way in which the different patterns of boys' and girls' childhood play and interaction might affect later life, such as different behaviors, interests, and learning styles. Empirical research in this area is gradually developing. Preliminary evidence suggests that children's experiences with same-sex peers can influence their school behavior, but that the nature of this influence varies between girls and boys and also varies between children with different types of temperaments and other characteristics. Unfortunately, much of the popular writing regarding sex role socialization in education has not encompassed these contemporary understandings.

POPULAR DESCRIPTIONS OF GENDER SOCIALIZATION IN EDUCATION AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

Research fields in academia tend to be relatively separate. For instance, developmental psychologists publish in some journals, scholars concerned with educational achievement in others, and feminist researchers in still others. Some of the researchers who examine gender development and socialization also address issues related to education. While some authors who study gender and education utilize contemporary understandings of gender socialization and social psychology, popular writing and the works in feminist outlets often do not.

The popular interest in gender socialization in education coincided with the development of the feminist movement in the 1970s. Much of the focus of this literature was on understanding why women were underrepresented in positions of prestige and power in the adult world. At that time, women were slightly less likely than men to finish college. There were also large differences in the areas that men and women chose to study, with men much more likely to be enrolled in areas that led to more lucrative positions in the world of work. Much of the feminist writing on gender socialization in education focused on these issues, looking to schools and interactions with teachers as possible sources of these problems.

Social learning theory was still commonly used at this time, and it is understandable that authors turned to notions of reinforcement and modeling to account for gender inequities in the adult world. Even though, as explained above, theoretical understandings of socialization have changed markedly since that time, popular discussions of gender socialization in education have maintained many of the characteristics first used in the 1970s. Popular works suggest that girls are systematically disadvantaged in schools through mechanisms such as differential reinforcement and expectations or exposure to gender biased media and become passive and deferential. Some who write in this vein suggest that classrooms and schools are structured and operate in ways that are gender biased and work to girls' disadvantage. Mechanisms that are cited for this effect include giving boys extra attention, using curricular materials that feature males more than females, and even choosing assignments of classroom tasks. Writers suggest that children are affected by this gender bias in ways that impact their future lives, including aspirations and self-esteem, and call for changes in teacher behavior and curriculum.

Importantly, contemporary research and theoretical understandings of gender socialization generally do not conform to these notions. Research indicates that children's understandings of gender are well established by the time they enter school and, in fact, become less rigid as they become older. Extensive analyses of sex differences in behaviors find no evidence that girls are more passive or deferential than boys. The major area of well-replicated sex difference in behavior is boys' higher levels of activity and aggression, and evidence strongly suggests that schools and teachers actively discourage both of these behaviors. In addition, if schools, teachers, and curricular materials were important instruments of gender socialization, we would expect children to exhibit more rigid sex role expectations and behaviors as they got older. In fact, however, as noted above, just the opposite occurs, largely, researchers believe, because children's growing cognitive sophistication and understandings promote greater flexibility.

As noted above, peers are a very important area for children's developing views of gender. Again, much of the popular literature fails to incorporate contemporary understandings of the role of peers in children's gender socialization. While popular writings suggest that teachers and schools promote gender stereotyping and inequities, the research evidence suggests that, in fact, just the opposite probably occurs. Schools and teachers provide an important, and possibly the most important, arena in which adults structure children's interactions and counter aspects of the peer group that may promote behaviors and attitudes that are gender stereotypic.

A very important aspect of gender socialization not discussed by much of the popular literature until recently is the fact that males experience more difficulties in most areas of education than females. Males have lower grades than females at all levels of education; they more often need special education services; and they are more likely than females to "underachieve," to have grades and to attain levels of education that are lower than would be expected given their ability. In addition, since high schools were first established in the nineteenth century, males have been more likely than females to drop out and not finish school.

Until the 1970s, men were more likely than women to complete college, although the extent of this sex difference varied somewhat over time. Since the early 1980s, however, women have been more likely than men to receive bachelor's and master's degrees. Data from the United States Department of Education show that, by the start of the twenty-first century, women received 57 percent of all bachelor's degrees and 59 percent of all master's degrees awarded in the United States, in contrast to 46 percent and 47 percent in 1976 to 1977. Increases have also been strong at the highest levels of education. The proportion of women receiving PhDs from U.S. institutions of higher education rose from 24 percent to 46 percent from the mid-1970s to 2001–2002. If foreign students, who comprise a large proportion of students at the graduate level, are omitted, the differences are even stronger than at lower levels. Among U.S. residents, 64 percent of all doctoral degree recipients in the United States in 2001–2002 were women. The extent of women's representation varies across disciplinary areas, with men still receiving a majority of degrees in some areas in the sciences and in professional fields such as dentistry. Very large changes have occurred, however, in these fields as well.

Women's representation, and men's relative disadvantage, are strongest among African Americans. Among African Americans, women earn 70 percent of all bachelor's degrees. Over the past 40 years, the sex difference in high school drop-out rates has been more than twice as large, on average, among African Americans as among the White majority.

In short, these data suggest that, contrary to much of the popular literature regarding gender socialization in education, males, rather than females, are disadvantaged. This educational disadvantage is more severe among minorities than the White majority. The cumulative impact of these lower levels of educational achievement and attainment represent the loss of a great deal of potential talent for the society as a whole as well as diminished opportunities and potential future income and occupational success for many young men. While practitioners and scholars concerned with understanding educational achievement have voiced concerns over these patterns, this area of work has rarely engaged the research literature on gender socialization. Some recent scholarship, however, points toward ways in which understandings of gender socialization can help scholars and practitioners provide settings that help all children reach their full educational potential.

Current scholarly understandings of gender socialization would suggest that a focus on peer group interactions and children's cognitive processes could be most fruitful in understanding sex differences in educational achievement and attainment. One potentially important line of research involves understanding the interaction between children's temperament, their cognitions, their peer group interactions, and their success in school settings. As noted above, preschool and kindergarten-age children have very strong preferences for same-sex play groups. While girls' peer groups provide more opportunity and support for positive adult interactions, boys' groups tend to avoid adult supervision and encourage interactions that are less conducive to positive academic experiences.

At the same time, children also have different temperaments and personalities. One attribute especially relevant to school success is "effortful control," the ability to self-regulate and control one's behaviors. Children who are better able to self-regulate have more academic success. Some researchers are exploring the ways in which peer group interactions differentially affect children with different abilities to self-regulate. Some evidence suggests that higher levels of peer interaction may be more detrimental to boys with low levels of self-regulation than boys with higher levels. At the same time, some evidence suggests that girls with lower levels of self-regulation may benefit from greater interactions in their same sex peer groups, because they tend to encourage structure and interactions with adults.

As should be clear from the discussion of changes in theories of socialization above, academic understandings gradually accumulate; and work on the relationship of peer interactions, gender socialization, and academic success is at its beginning stages. As these understandings progress, they may, however, provide guidance for teachers and policy makers interested in structuring classroom interactions to help all children reach their full potential.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Fabes, R.A., Martin, C.L., Hanish, L.D., Anders, M.C., & Madden-Derdich, D.A. (2003). Early school competence: The roles of sex-segregated play and effortful control. *Developmental Psychology, 39*(5), 848–858.

Martin, C.L., & Ruble, D.N. (2004). Children's search for gender cues: Cognitive perspectives on gender development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13*(2), 67–70.

Stockard, J. (1999). Gender socialization. In J.S. Chafetz (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of gender* (pp. 215–227). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Stockard, J., & Johnson, M.M. (1992). *Sex and gender in society* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jean Stockard

Social Capital Theories

The concept of social capital has become widely used in a variety of fields in recent years. Theorists and researchers have found it useful as a way to capture the value of relationships among actors in markets or fields of interaction. It has been used in political science, business, sociology, public health, anthropology, and economics as well as education. The concept has drawn attention to the important ways in which human relationships provide access to valuable resources. The major theorists who have written on the topic of social capital and are used in educational research include Nan Lin, Robert Putnam, James Coleman, Alejandro Portes, and Pierre Bourdieu.

Social capital is rooted in wider notions about capital. Capital consists of resources invested or expended in order to generate profit. Various forms of capital are widely used in sociological research including social capital, cultural capital, human capital, and, of course, economic capital. All refer to some valued commodity or resource that can be invested in a market to benefit the actor making the investment. However, there are significant differences among these forms of capital. Human capital refers to an investment of training or education in a person that results in increased value of that person in the marketplace. Thus, the capital resides or is located within the person and typically has value in a particular company or labor market. The benefits of human capital to the individual and society are vast, ranging from improvements in health and quality of life to an improved ability to participate in democratic government. With the roots of the concept stretching back to Adam Smith in 1776, the concept of human capital has provided a theoretical framework for understanding and measuring the effectiveness of investing resources in people for some time and has been widely applied in educational settings.

Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital refers to cultural resources such as knowledge about high status art or music as well as mannerisms and practices that have value and distinguish an individual as a member of a particular status group. An example of this would be using the correct fork at a formal table setting, holding that fork in the correct manner, or expressing a fondness for escargot. Such actions can be seen as marking or signaling an individual's membership in a legitimated and distinguished social class. The cultural capital resides in the individual and is displayed or invested in a defined context or market.

Social capital shares many similarities with these other forms of capital, yet there are important differences as well. Like other forms of capital, social capital can be seen as an investment of a resource with an expectation that there will be a return on this investment. Theorists' definitions of the concept have varied. Lin (2001) defines social capital as "the resources, real or potential, gained by the relationships." Bourdieu's (1986) definition is similar in that he focuses on resources available to individuals in a "durable and institutionalized set of relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition . . . which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity owned capital," which provides them with a credential. Coleman (1988) defines social capital by describing its function. He holds that social capital exists within a particular social structure that facilitates the actions of actors. While Coleman's work has been widely recognized in the field, particularly in education, this definition of social capital has presented problems in that it is characterized by a tautological flaw, namely, the failure to separate the definition or nature of social capital from the outcomes or results of its investment.

Coleman and Putnam both define social capital by its function or consequence. Further, it has been argued that both Putnam's and Coleman's conceptualizations of social capital do not take into account the gender, ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic realities of lived experience. In addition, Coleman, in particular, treats social capital as something characteristic of the nuclear family to which children belong, and he largely ignores wider familial relations. Because the social capital of the nuclear family is seen as determinative of children's outcomes, Coleman has been criticized for seeing children as merely passive pawns rather than actors in social settings. Unlike Coleman and Putnam, other theorists—including Bourdieu, Lin, Portes, and Stanton-Salazar—recognize and attempt to account for the complex contextual dynamics that govern interaction in social settings. In addition, they do not view students as merely passive pawns in school settings but rather as actors who invest or expend social capital.

Despite their differing definitions of social capital, all major theorists' definitions include a focus on relationships and the access to resources that these relationships provide. Social capital can be seen as residing outside of individuals in the relationships individuals form and maintain. It can also be seen in the access to valued resources that the relationships provide. Similar to other forms of capital, social capital is invested in a particular market or context that has its own system of valuation and practice. Thus, one set of relationships might be important in securing a job in a particular industry while another set of relationships might be essential to arranging for low-cost, high-quality child care.

This focus on the importance of the market in determining the value or utility of social capital is shared among many of the major theorists. Bourdieu refers to the market as a field of interaction. Various forms of capital, including social capital, can be invested in a given field and have value depending on the dynamics of the field. Others describe the places where capital is displayed or invested as markets or contexts. The essential point is that the value of social capital is dependent or contingent on the context, market, or field in which it is invested or displayed.

The nature or architecture of social networks is critical to the functioning of the networks and the types of resources to which they allow access. Some social capital is situated in dense, closely knit networks, small immigrant communities, for example. These networks typically have strong levels of embeddedness. The members of the network all know one another and have high levels of trust and reciprocity. They understand one another, know other members of the group very well, and can rely on predictable patterns of behavior and outcomes from certain actions. However, this type of network often does not have many ties to others outside of the network, thus limiting the utility of the network in the larger social structure. There are many strong and close ties but fewer weak ties that reach outside of the network. These strong and close ties are referred to as bonding capital by Putnam.

This type of dense and highly embedded network may be a very useful one for mothers who will watch one another's children, for example. They know they have similar standards of child rearing and discipline; they can call on one another on short notice; and they can be certain that if they watch their friend's children, their friend will return the favor. This type of network is not useful, however, for accessing other types of resources that reside outside of the network, like finding a job. Weak ties or those more peripheral ties with a wide net of individuals outside of a primary network are more useful in accessing some resources. While these ties do not come with the shared norms and values associated with strong ties, they do allow actors to access a wider net of resources that are different from the resources contained within their own primary network. This type of social capital is referred to as bridging capital by Putnam.

This notion of the architecture or structure of the networks is critical to understanding how social capital functions. While some argue that valuable social capital is shared among the members of a group, others focus on the specific nodes or locations in a network that provide access to information, resources, or other networks that would otherwise be unattainable. Thus, one's position in the network—the proximity to an individual or location that has access to another valuable set of network ties or resources—is a valuable asset as well.

The generation and maintenance of social capital requires interaction among actors in a network in a market or context. While there are several different ways in which social capital has been defined and its functions have been articulated, the fourfold typology proposed by Lin (2001) provides an inclusive articulation of how and why social capital functions. First, Lin points out that social capital facilitates the flow of information. Social capital allows for information to be communicated and shared among members in a group. Information regarding opportunities, processes, or scarce resources can be shared among members of a group and between members of different network groups. Second, social ties may exert influence on agents. Because of particular social ties, key individuals may be influenced to carry out particular actions, make key decisions, or share specific information. Third, the existence of particular network ties may provide an individual with a social credential, such as credibility or legitimacy, and may signal the types of social capital or access to particular networks or resources an individual may have. Fourth, the recognition of an individual's network ties and social capital reinforces identity and recognition by providing not only emotional support as a member of a group but also an acknowledgement of the access to resources that network or group membership provide.

According to some viewpoints, social capital is seen as a public good. Putnam has chronicled the decline of social capital in American society pointing to what he sees as the erosion of public life—fewer people joining social and civic clubs. This vision of social capital conceives of it is a public good generated by connections and associations among individuals and held collectively. Putnam is far less concerned with the differential access to networks or resources for individuals occupying different locations in the network. He is more concerned with the trust and norms that the group holds and the ways in which these norms and trust grease the wheels of social interaction. Likewise, Coleman focuses on the role of parental relations as a way of monitoring children and youth and providing a sense of shared norms that facilitate success in educational settings. The capital is here again largely viewed as a collective asset, and little attention is paid to differential access to this capital or its activation.

Neither of these theorists recognizes the negative consequences of social capital. This is due in part to the fact that they see it as a public good held by all in the network and pay less attention to the location of individuals in a network and the resources to which each of them therefore has access. However, as Portes and Landholt (1996) point out, social capital exists in poor communities, but the goods or other assets that these networks enable individuals to access are not valuable in the middle-class economy. For example, a poor mother may rely on an extensive extended network of family and friends to provide child care for her children so that she can work. This network is critical to her economic survival, allowing her to bring money (economic capital) into her home. But, these ties likely will not provide her access to information on a new and better job outside of her social circle. This mother's social capital is critically important to her economic survival but does not assist her in altering her material conditions or providing access to other more valuable networks. All networks are not equally valuable in terms of providing bridges to new or different networks or in terms of the type of information or other assets they provide. Coleman and Putnam do not focus on this inherent inequality among networks or provide a way to understand how and why these unequal networks of social ties matter in reproducing social inequality. Bourdieu's model, with its focus on unmasking inequality, makes transparent the ways in which the social capital held by different individuals is valued in particular contexts.

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY

Theories of social capital are widely used in educational research. This research can be parsed analytically into two differing orientations—studies using Coleman's notion of social capital and studies using other theoretical orientations. Coleman's seminal research and writings on the topic provided the groundwork used by most early research that examined social capital. He focused on relations within the family and the degree of access children had to parents, their parents' attention, and resources. In addition to focusing on the quality and amount of interactions between parents and children, Coleman also attended to the normative ties or closure in a community of parents. He referred to this as intergenerational closure. He was concerned about the degree to which norms and expectations were shared among parents because he believed that parents who share expectations and norms reinforce one another's ideas about child rearing and therefore strengthen prosocial and proschool attitudes and practices.

Research using Coleman's notion of familial social capital, defined as the time parents spend with children and the access children have to parents and their resources, has shown only modest effects on student performance. Much of this research has used quantitative designs to measure achievement in the form of test scores, grades, and progress through the educational pipeline. Some studies find an effect of social capital on dropping out of high school only when social capital is combined with social class background.

Other studies have focused on Coleman's notion of intergenerational closure, the connections made among parents of school peers. This research has shown quite modest effects of intergenerational closure on high school drop-out rates and class cutting. Interestingly, despite Coleman's overall lack of attention to differences in the type of social capital held by members of varying social classes and their ability to invest that capital in an educational marketplace, social class appears to affect closure and some outcome measures. Some studies using the notion of intergenerational closure have found significant relationships between the social class background of the parents and dropping out of high school as well as the degree of intergenerational closure found among the parents of school peers. In general, studies relying on Colemanesque definitions of social capital neglect the culture and process of schooling in their approach, thereby rendering social capital a characteristic that is measured independent of other inequities that might affect the influence of social capital on student achievement or progress in educational settings more generally.

Recent work has recognized these shortcomings and has relied on alternative theoretical formulations of social capital. Research using Bourdieu's notion of social capital focuses on the reproductive nature of valuable middle-class social ties in school settings (Horvat, Weininger, & Lareau, 2003; Stanton-Salazar, 2001). This approach highlights a critical theoretical difference between Putnam and Coleman on the one hand and Bourdieu, Lin, and other theorists on the other. Coleman and Putnam make no contextual distinction in their conceptualizations. Other theoretical perspectives see social capital as being invested or spent in a particular market, field, or context. It is the field, market, or context that determines the value of a particular social tie. Moreover, these theorists recognize that in schools not only middle-class behavior and knowledge (cultural capital) are valuable but also middle-class ties (social capital). The critical difference here between these theoretical perspectives is the understanding that all social capital is not created equal. Networks as well as individual social ties have a differential value that is dependent not only on the context within which they are displayed or played but also the skill with which the actor plays them. Increasingly, researchers who are using social capital as a theoretical tool to understand student's experiences in schools as well as differences in achievement incorporate an understanding of the way in which social capital and an individual's ability to effectively use his or her social capital are affected by race and class inequality in school settings.

Researchers using this notion of social capital that accounts for inequality have found that social capital is positively implicated in poor and minority parents' ability to manage problems at their child's school, and that some immigrant families are able to use the wisdom of uneducated elders in guiding children. Others have found that the parental ties of school-age children tend to be class distinct. That is, middle-class parents tend to have ties with other middle-class parents while the networks of working-class parents are similarly limited to other working-class parents. In addition, these class differences in network architecture are closely associated with the way in which parents handle children's problems at school. Bourdieu's and Lin's attention to the inequality among different networks and different positions within a network is critical in revealing these important social class differences in the way that social capital affects students' experiences in school.

This focus on inequality in the way that social capital functions in educational settings to reproduce existing inequality provides a promising pathway for future research. Rather than merely allowing researchers to describe social ties, this line of research allows researchers to reveal how networks function to advantage and disadvantage particular individuals or groups of people in educational settings.

Research examining the intersection of social capital and gender in educational contexts is thin. To date, no major studies have explicitly examined this intersection of factors. However, some scholars have begun to examine how a gendered analysis influences notions regarding the distribution of social capital, its nature, and its use. These gendered examinations of social capital highlight the differences between the two theoretical traditions previously identified. Conceptions of social capital based on Coleman and Putnam have been critiqued for their silence on the issue of gender while the conceptions based on the theoretical basis provided by Bourdieu and Lin have been viewed as providing more opportunities for a gendered analysis due to their fundamental focus on inequality and power relations.

Both Putnam and Coleman link a decline in social capital to the entrance of women into the workforce. As previously noted, they view the nuclear family as the norm. Women are viewed both as the keepers of the familial flame and as agents who, previous to women's entry into the workforce, had time to associate in voluntary organizations and create reserves of social capital. The capital generated by reciprocal interchanges with other women around child care and child rearing goes largely unrecognized while women's participation in voluntary organizations and its demise are highlighted. Little attention is paid to the nature of capital women were able to generate, or how it might have been used. Moreover, parents are treated as an undifferentiated unit in this tradition when, in fact, mothers are more active and important as parents than fathers, especially in guiding their children's educational careers (Morrow, 2006). In addition, children and youth are not viewed as social agents capable of maintaining social ties of any consequence. The approach explicitly ignores the value of peer relations and networks as sources of valuable social capital for both children and youth as well as their parents.

Promising directions for future research on social capital that incorporates a gendered perspective can be found in work that relies on Bourdieu's more differentiated and context cognizant perspective. Bourdieu's method, with its fundamental focus on inequality of power relations and its attention to the market or context within which capital is deployed, provides a much more fertile theoretical formulation of social capital for researchers interested in revealing the ways in which gender influences the distribution, definition, and use of social capital. This theoretical formulation enables researchers to examine the ways in which children and youth use social capital as they function as social agents and also allows researchers to explore how parents' and caregivers' use of social capital is influenced by the power of gender in social settings.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital and the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94* (Supplement), S95–S120.

Horvat, E.M., Weininger, E., & Lareau, A. (2003). From social ties to social capital: Class differences in the relation between school and parent networks. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(2), 319–351.

Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Morrow, V. (2006). Conceptualising social capital in relation to children and young people: Is it different for girls? In B. O'Neill & E. Gidengil (Eds.), *Gender and social capital* (pp. 127–150). New York: Routledge.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24,* 1–24.

Portes, A., & Landholt, P. (1996). The downside of social capital. *The American Prospect, 26,* 18–21.

Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Stanton-Salazar, R. (2001). *Manufacturing hope and despair: The school and kin support networks of U.S.-Mexican youth.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Erin McNamara Horvat

Social Constructionism

The social constructionist approach has become increasingly popular in educational research. In sociological, social psychological, and cultural studies that focus on schooling, social constructionism occupies an important position in questioning the so-called positivist research paradigm in which the world is understood as something that can be known by being analyzed, explained, and comprehended through specific scientific methods that are associated with a realist research. In contrast to realists, constructionists argue that the world can be understood only through the ways in which it is mediated by culture and through ways in which people understand and interpret their experiences.

Debates about ways of seeing and knowing the world are part of research on gender and education. Research guided by social constructionism questions innate, stable ways of being and doing gender. No longer are categories such as “women” or “men” and “girls” or “boys” taken for granted. These categories have come to be seen as less stable. Through constructionism, it is possible to understand personal and social change and ways in which people become persons (Burr, 2000). Taken-for-granted gender characteristics, dispositions, interests, and preferences are no longer assumed. Such a way of making sense of schooling and femininities and masculinities within it is contextualized within a wider frame. Moreover, if knowledge is socially constructed, it can also be reconstructed.

Social constructionism incorporates many approaches including social interactionism, ethnography, ethnomethodology, and conversation analysis. These all seek to understand how people come to act in the ways that they do by examining what meanings people construct of their world and their place in it out of the discourses that are available to them.

Like all theories, social constructionism has its critics. Some argue against its emphasis on qualitative research methodology in favor of a more realist or multimethod research strategy. Others suggest that too much emphasis is placed upon the construction of microstructures, such as dyads or small groups or classrooms, while the larger sociopolitical structure is ignored. Ian Hacking (1999) criticizes social constructivist approaches as too unspecific and poses a challenge by asking “the social construction of what?” Despite such criticisms, social constructionism has become a popular way of thinking about the nature and meaning of gender in education as well as in other institutional contexts. Moreover, the idea that education is socially constructed provides the possibility of reconstruction so that a more equitable and inclusive school can be developed.

DEBATES ABOUT WAYS OF SEEING AND KNOWING

The ways in which the world is interpreted and understood are based on assumptions about knowledge: how people make sense of the world and how they interpret it and act upon it. Most extreme forms of social constructionism would argue that "words" define "things," because people cannot know their surroundings except through language. Therefore, words and ways of speaking that are available to people influence their understanding of the world. The world and knowledge about it are seen, then, as socially constructed. On the other end of the spectrum is a realist approach that suggests that "things" in the world influence the way in which people see the world and objects and practices within it. Feminist social constructionist research has been influenced by Foucault (1995), who has emphasized the socially constructed nature of discourses.

In research practice, there is rarely a strong dichotomy between constructionist and realist approaches. Instead, a majority of educational studies and analyses are positioned somewhere between these two orientations while strong dichotomous stances are less likely to be expressed. Accordingly, issues involved in the "words" or "things" debates are not totally oppositional, but there are differences in emphasis. In social constructionism, discourses are examined in order to analyze how the formation of structures and practices of gender relations are formed. A more materialist approach argues that things in the world influence the way in which they are understood. Many researchers combine features from such approaches, and a continuum is constructed between them, rather than a strong dichotomy. Although "realist" research is still ongoing, cultural studies, women's studies, and feminist research have been greatly inspired by social constructionism. Hence, there has been increasing interest in "words" rather than "things."

Social constructionism is not only juxtaposed with materialism but also with essentialism. *Essentialism* means that people are in many ways determined by their gender, their age, and their ethnicity in particular. Citizenship and nationality also have an impact on people, but these categories are not embodied in the same way that gender, age, and ethnicity are. Hence, they are socially constructed in a rather malleable way. For example, characteristics of previous nationality can be shed in new circumstances and with the adoption of a new nationality. Particularly gender and age are less malleable categories, even though gender can be performed in diverse ways, and age as a social category can be molded through health regimes or surgery. One reason gender is less malleable is that it is constructed from such an early age onward and it is so central to the ways in which people perceive, understand, and interpret their surroundings and the actions of people around them, as well events in their own lives.

In a classic text, Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966) focused on the ways in which reality is known. They suggested that the process of making sense of the world is socially constructed but, at the same time, there is a dialectical process between the real and the ways in which what is "real" is interpreted by people in their everyday encounters. Berger and Luckmann also acknowledged the significance of gender in the social construction of everyday life. In their view, gender is socially constructed rather than based on biological, embodied sex differences. When they discuss the socialization of children, they suggest that, because women and men inhabit different kinds of social worlds, they also convey divergent conceptions about the world to children. Therefore, children learn "appropriate" gendered versions of knowing. These ways of knowing have implications for schooling.

Generally, children who arrive at school already have expectations about the ways in which the classroom is organized, how school students are expected to behave, and how teachers are assumed to act and to position themselves in the classroom. Many of them have encountered representations of school in the media, in children's games, in older children's school talk, and in memories recounted by parents of their own school days. Thus, the apparently self-evident order in the classroom is seen by social constructionists as a result of the ways in which schooling is culturally represented. No longer are categories such as "women" and "men" or "girls" and "boys" taken for granted as innate, fixed ways of being and doing gender. Instead, these categories have come to be seen as discursive and, therefore, less fixed.

This way of making sense of schooling and femininities and masculinities is contextualized within a wider frame. Interest in social constructionism has been inspired by a desire on behalf of researchers and educationists to understand how girls and boys are expected to learn appropriate gendered ways of behaving. Through different ways of seeing and constructing the world, women, and men also, come to position themselves in the world in gendered ways. Such gender differentiation was argued to have negative effects, particularly on girls and women. The socially constructed positions of boys have also been examined. The analysis has extended to dimensions such as social class, "race," ethnicity, and sexuality. The socially constructed categorizations were argued to produce differentiations among girls and among boys as well as between them.

Social constructionism seeks to render the produced nature of everyday interaction intelligible. Words, then, are formidable in the struggles between structure and agency at school. However, things are also durable and intertwine with the words. An examination of an empty classroom is likely to provide clues about the ways in which pedagogical principles are embedded in the everyday practices of teachers and students who work there. A social constructionist may observe the artifacts in the classroom and consider how student centered or teacher centered they are. A more materialist observer may consider how the layout of the classroom reproduces or deconstructs power relations between adults and children as well as between teachers and students.

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM IN GENDER AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

The so-called "new sociology of education" (Young, 1975) in Britain was important in questioning the taken-for-granted social hierarchies at school. What counts as knowledge was an important question that problematized what is "known" at school. Research conducted in the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in the University of Birmingham questioned education that remained irrelevant for working-class boys. In such studies, gender as a social category remained unexamined, and girls were either marginalized or totally invisible. In an early critical contribution (Wolpe, 1974), feminists suggested that girls, as well as working-class boys, constructed their own cultures. However, as girls have traditionally been more strictly controlled than boys, they engaged in more hidden practices, such as bedroom cultures, where they withdrew into their own safe space where at least a limited form of agency was possible.

Dutiful or nonrebellious ways of asserting themselves into social relations provided girls spaces of safety. Within these spaces, they were able to generate their own cultures beyond the controlling practices of parents, teachers, or boys. Moreover, overt acceptance of authority relations at school has provided girls the opportunity to concentrate on learning that, in turn, has contributed to their educational results. These results have been used by girls to improve their position in the labor market. Their submission at school has created opportunities for exercising agency in their adult lives.

Social constructionist studies have criticized the tendency of quiet girls to be forgotten in educational research. Studies that have focused on practices of girls, and on ways in which they construct their own understanding of their schooling, have suggested that silence can be a form of protection that enables learning to take place. Silence can, however, also mask pain and anxiety that particularly well-achieving middle-class girls may experience (Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001). Feminists have argued that social constructionism provides tools for the changing of the gender relations. If they are socially constructed, this means that they can be deconstructed and reconstructed on the basis of critical theorization of gender and analysis of the spaces for changes in social relations.

Social constructionism is concerned about understanding how the order that is found in the educational system has been shaped and, also, how practices of schooling and discourses embedded in them have come to be. Many social constructionists have drawn on the work of Judith Butler (1990) who suggested that gender is located in the actions of people—the ways in which gender is performed and argued to be more important than any feminine or masculine essence that is already there. Butler's influential work has been criticized for not taking into account that established relations of gender and, in particular, gender difference may not merely be performatively produced through "acting" gender rather then "being" gender.

The social constructionist approach has been increasingly popular in educational research because it contains the potential for social and cultural change. It became possible for teachers to work for such change and to encourage school students to rethink their future. Humanities, social sciences, cultural studies, gender research, and feminist educational debates have shared concerns that address ways in which the world can be known, analyzed, and understood, as well as changed. Previous research has been critically examined in order to suggest ways in which concern about gender can be incorporated. Educational and pedagogic studies were criticized for gender blindness connected to approaches that did not problematize social relations, in general, and gender relations, in particular. Social constructionism has contributed to the ways in which gender relations in education are explored.

Overall, social constructionism has successfully countered gender-neutral empiricism that has been prevalent in educational research. It creates, as Mary Gergen (2001) has suggested, an intellectual position that is strong and flexible and provides a useful approach to the study of gender. At the same time, it encourages methodological innovation and dialogue.

DIFFERENT APPROACHES

Social constructionism incorporates a range of approaches including social interactionism, ethnography, ethnomethodology, and conversation analysis. These all seek to understand how people come to act in ways that they do by determining what discourses are available to people when they make sense of the world and their place in it. Discourses, here, are ways of characterizing such sense making. The available discourses influence opportunities to exercise agency while also serving to restrict such opportunities. People act in ways that are intelligible to them. Such intelligibility is argued to be socially constructed, based on ways of knowing that can be expressed through available languages.

Social interactionism is a contemporary, broadened extension of symbolic interactionism, an approach to understanding social behavior that has its roots in the writings and teachings of American pragmatic philosophers such as William James and George Herbert Mead at the turn of the twentieth century. Their focus was on the ways in which people construct meanings, including self-concepts, and the ways in which those meanings shape and are shaped by processes of social interaction. In contemporary applications, social interactionism often employs the research methods of observation or participation or a combination of both in which the researchers enter the field they are studying. In the study of education, the focus of social interactionism is often on ways in which order in the classroom is produced or undermined, and researchers pay attention to the range of ways in which such production/disruption takes place. When social interactionism employs a gender lens to study interaction, attention is given to the ways in which interactions in classrooms and other venues produce different meanings for masculinity and femininity and assign different valuations to these different constructions.

Ethnography combines a plethora of research methods ranging from observation to participant observation and interviewing. In observation studies, researchers endeavor to be as invisible as possible, and their aim is to intervene as little as possible in the site that is studied. A more participant approach involves the researcher interacting with people in the field, joining in their discussions and their informal activities, and recording these in fieldwork diaries. Usually ethnographers need to find a particular role or a location in the field in order to be able to make sense of the social and cultural orders and ways in which they are produced and reproduced in daily life. Often ethnographers use a range of methods that assume a somewhat different form when used in the context of fieldwork. Ethnographic interviewing, for example, shares common features with other interview methods, but the mutual familiarity that the researchers and the participants have established during the process of participation influences ways in which they interact. Therefore, interviews assume a particular character because shared knowledge is assumed, and both the interviewer and the interviewee can make references to shared experiences and discuss ways of making sense of them. In ethnography, the site that is studied and the process of studying it are constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed, often several times over (Gordon, Holland, & Lahelma, 2001).

Increasing focus on words has been referred to as a linguistic turn in ethnography, where particular emphasis was paid to textual production of the ethnographer's story rather than searching for realist tales that endeavored to analyze the field as accurately as possible. Such a turn has emphasized the importance of writing ethnographies. However, a strand that emphasizes the contextual nature of ethnographic research has maintained its significance, too. As a result, ethnography is still part of the "thing" tradition despite the popularity of the "word" approach. Particularly, feminist ethnographers have sought to analyze and represent patterns of inequality and ways in which such patterns are embedded in power relations. Their focus has been both on "words" and "things."

Common to *ethnomethodology, discourse theories,* and *conversation analysis* is an interest in naturally occurring uses of communication. The aim has been to consider ways in which the social order is established in the microprocesses (e.g., conversations, gestures) between the participants. Interviewing came to be seen as a rather artificial method of research. In its place, specific methods were developed in order to record more naturally occurring microprocesses, often by using audio and video electronic recordings. Such data are then carefully transcribed in great detail and reliability using jointly established conventions in the transcriptions. The analysis concentrates on small sections of the data whereby, for example, turn taking in speech is considered or the processes of interrupting others in conversation are considered. Gender is not a preexisting category in the research but, rather, needs to be inserted into the analysis. The goal of feminist constructionists who use these research strategies is to examine how gender and sexuality are constituted in daily communications (see Wooffitt, 2001).

CRITICISM OF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM

Social constructionism has generated criticism. Some of that criticism has taken the form of a return to more realism often coupled with greater reliance on "objective" research methods and quantitative analytic techniques. Statistical analyses of, for example, the effectiveness of education are prevalent. The No Child Left Behind policy, instituted in the United States under the auspices of the Bush regime, has increased testing and quantitative analysis of the results. Similarly, the Program for International Assessment bases its studies of the educational achievement of school students on survey methods.

Even among those who do not want a total reliance on quantitative studies of "what is out there," more realist or materialist approaches are still used. There is an ongoing interest in participatory studies and ethnographies in which data are gathered and carefully analyzed using a plethora of methods. Some of these studies have encompassed a strong identification with social constructionism. Others adopt a more multimethod and multilayered orientation. Among the latter, a social constructionist approach to the way of knowing the world is almost always taken for granted, but critical or doubtful discussions can also be found.

On a discursive level, there has been a focus on the ways in which power is embedded in the administrative, textualized planning of education and schooling. This planning both hides the political nature of the texts as well as reproduces the power that is embedded in the texts. In this situation, for example, child-centered research on schooling has become more scarce; school-effectiveness research has become increasingly popular. Studies based on this approach do not address social construction of knowledge. A more realist approach is adopted. At the same time, school students are expected to be able to exercise agency in ways that are suited to the order that is constructed in the daily life at school. Yet, the pedagogies that are promoted may contain a limited idea about agency of school students. However, there has also been an increasing interest in spatiality and embodiment at school. Research has focused on ways in which agency of school students is constricted, facilitated, or restricted (cf. Gordon, Holland, & Lahelma, 1999). Similarly, a focus on policies and politics of schooling has rendered tensions between the possibilities and limitations of teachers' work to the forefront.

Posing the question—"The social construction of what?"—as Ian Hacking (1999) does, suggests that theories, methods, and methodologies are ways of seeing. It is argued that the dichotomy between constructionists and nonconstructionists is not as wide as is often argued. Few constructionists would claim that social constructions have no material basis whatsoever. However, it is often emphasized that access to understanding that reality is located within the realm of constructions that have become socially possible in current discourses (Hacking, 1999). The aim is to conduct critical research and analyze the social, cultural, and pedagogic practices that are embedded in education. Additionally, constructionism contains strands that endeavor to render visible the taken-for-granted order of everyday life.

However, a focus on one microlevel social order may obscure the visibility of some other order. It has been suggested that schooling reproduces the power relations of the society that it is embedded in. Thus, there is a sense in which schooling is always a process of domestication. However, societies that are characterized by a relatively high degree of transparency in decision making and equitable distribution of material and cultural goods are generally likely to be more socially just than societies with less transparency. Transparent societies are also likely to promote more equitable educational policies. Social constructionist approaches are useful when examining both obstacles and achievements in the context of education.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality.* Harmondsworth, United Kingdom: Penguin Books.

Burr, V. (2000). *An introduction to social constructionism.* New York & London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity.* New York & London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Vintage.

Gergen, M. (2001). *Feminist reconstructions in psychology: Narrative, gender, and performance.* Thousand Oaks, CA, & London: Sage.

Gordon, T.O., Holland, J., & Lahelma, E. (1999). *Making spaces: Citizenship and difference in schools.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Gordon, T.O., Holland, J., & Lahelma, E. (2001). Ethnographic research in educational settings. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 188–203). London: Sage.

Hacking, I. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge, MA, & London: Harvard University Press.

Walkerdine, V., Lucey, H., & Melody, J. (2001). *Growing up girl: Psychosocial explorations of gender and class.* Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave.

Wolpe, A.M. (1974). The official ideology of education for girls. In M. Flude & J. Ahier (Eds.), *Educability, schools and ideology.* London: Croom Helm.

Wooffitt, R. (2001). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction.* London & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young, M.F.D. (1975). *Knowledge and control.* London: Macmillan.

Tuula O. Gordon

Part II

Gender Issues in Educational Research

Overview

Most of the authors of the essays about gendered theories of education, appearing in Part I, used research evidence as a basis for their theoretical claims and, sometimes, as a way of testing their theories. Similarly, the authors of the essays in the following eight parts of the encyclopedia also draw upon research findings to formulate or substantiate the claims that they make about gender and education. Unlike the other parts of the encyclopedia, this section is less concerned with research findings than it is with research as a process and a set of tools whereby people can learn more about gender and about the relationships among gender and various aspects of education. Thus, the question that the three authors whose essays appear in this section are trying to answer is not *what* do researchers know about gender and education, but rather *how* do researchers gather information about gender and education. Related to this question are questions about the ways in which information is interpreted and the uses to which these interpretations can and should be put.

One of the common ways in which researchers gather information about gender and education is by asking questions of students, teachers, or other people. Some of these questions are open-ended requests ("Tell me about your experiences at school today") that allow respondents considerable latitude in determining what they want to talk about. Other research questions take the form of highly structured interviews or survey questionnaires in which respondents are asked specific questions about themselves, their environment, or some other topic that interests the researcher. Teachers themselves often ask questions to determine whether students have done their assignments and how much they have learned. Often, these questions take the form of tests or examinations, are assumed to measure student achievements, and are used as a basis for assigning student grades. Some of these examinations are devised and standardized by state, national, or international testing and research agencies so that the test scores of students can be compared across school districts, states, and nations. Increasingly, such tests are used not only to evaluate and compare the performance of students but also to evaluate and compare the performance of teachers and entire schools in an accountability scheme known in the United States as "high-stakes testing" and mandated by the Bush administration's educational policy known as No Child Left Behind.

Because of the existence of research results, often called *data,* from large-scale tests of student achievements and opinions at both the national and international levels, researchers interested in these achievements and opinions do not have to spend the large amounts of time and money necessary to construct and administer their own interviews and questionnaires. Instead, they are able to engage in a form of research known as *secondary analysis.* Secondary analysis does not refer to a particular type of analysis, but rather to any analyses of data that have been gathered by others. So, whereas primary analysis involves both data collection and analysis, secondary analysis involves the analysis of data but not its collection. Secondary analyses of already-collected research data save time and money. In addition, secondary analyses are the only way in which researchers can compare contemporary research findings (collected either by themselves or by others) with findings from past research. Such comparisons are particularly helpful to researchers interested in gender differences in academic performances as these differences are unlikely to be the same now as they were 20 or 30 years ago.

In recent decades, it has become increasingly common for large data sets concerned with gender and education to be preserved and stored in academic archives. A helpful description of these data sets and the archives where they are located is contained in the essay by Kevin Payne on "International and U.S. Data Sources on Gender and Education." Even those who have no plans to do their own secondary analyses will benefit from the information in this essay because such a large amount of the research summarized throughout this encyclopedia and in other books and articles concerned with gender and education is based on primary or secondary analyses of the data sets that Payne describes. If you want to learn more about these frequently used data sets, Payne's essay instructs you how to do so.

Like all research findings, those concerned with gender and education are not capable of speaking for themselves. Even when these findings come from well-conducted studies and are correctly reported, they require careful examination and thought to avoid misinterpretations. One example of a common misinterpretation concerning gender effects is the tendency to exaggerate between-group differences and to ignore within-group differences. Say, for example, that a researcher administers a 100-item mathematics test to thousands of students in dozens of countries. The researcher then summarizes the test scores of all the boys and all the girls who took the test, divides these two summaries by the numbers of tested boys and of tested girls, respectively, and finds that the average score for boys was 66.7 and the average score for girls was 64.2. Is the researcher correct in concluding that boys do better in mathematics than girls?

Some would say that the answer is "yes" as long as the difference is statistically significant, by which they mean that it is a reliable finding that is highly unlikely to be due to chance. Others would say that the answer is "yes" if the difference is statistically significant *and* the researcher honestly admits that the conclusion is based on only one test given to one sample of students at one point in time. Critics would point out, however, that the difference between the average score of girls and boys is not very large, and that with very large samples even tiny differences are likely to be statistically significant. In addition, these critics would probably note that the researcher's focus on average scores for girls and boys hides the fact that there are large within-group differences. In other words, there is considerable variation in the scores of the girls, with the highest scoring girls getting scores of 97 and the lowest getting scores of only 12 points. Similarly, the highest scoring boys achieved 99 points, but the lowest scored only 8 points. Instead of focusing on the girl-boy differences, these critics might suggest that it makes more sense to try to focus on the reasons for the *huge* differences among girls and among boys. And, even those educators who are more interested in the boy-girl differences than the larger within-group differences might want to know if those between-group differences occur in every country where the test was given or in only a few and, if the latter, in what countries and why did girls score higher, on average, than boys? All of these critical questions should be kept in mind when one reads about differences in the academic achievements or school-related behaviors of boys and girls or men and women.

As Martyn Hammersley points out, there are other "Methodological Problems in Gender Research" that arise when efforts are made to describe or account for sex differences. Depending on how research findings are interpreted, these differences may seem quite large and important or quite small and trivial. Also, as Hammersley indicates, observers who see a boy or group of boys perform a particular behavior in class must not jump to the conclusion that gender is the (only) reason for that behavior. On the other hand, it would be a mistake to assume that gender does not matter and that it is simply an accident or irrelevant that it was boys, rather than girls, who were observed to behave in a particular way.

A failure to take gender—and especially women—seriously was one of the criticisms of educational research and practice made by participants in the second-wave feminist movement of the late 1960s and 1970s. According to these critics, much of the attention of educational researchers and practitioners was directed toward the educational achievements and problems of boys and men. Underlying these male-centered practices and research projects were assumptions about the greater importance of education for men rather than for women who were often assumed likely to "waste" advanced educations either by becoming full-time homemakers or by putting family ahead of careers. Thus, it was considered neither surprising nor important during this historic period that women were less likely than men to complete undergraduate degrees or to enroll in graduate and professional degree programs. Instead, it was deemed far more important that men, rather than women, receive the kinds of education that would allow them to be productive, successful members of the workforce, and it was generally accepted that research should be focused on the ways to increase the likelihood of this outcome.

Feminists of this period considered the assumptions about women that underlay so much of educational research and practice to be nothing more than prejudice. Their commitment to social change led these feminists to advocate the kinds of education for women that would allow them to qualify for all of the jobs currently available to men, not just those traditionally considered appropriate for women. Women should have equal educational and occupational opportunities with men. To these ends, second-wave feminists turned the research lens away from a focus on men's greater educational achievements than women's and toward the barriers preventing women from the greater achievements of which feminists assumed they were capable. This led to a large body of research evidence concerning the ways in which gender and other social identities, such as race-ethnicity, social class, and sexuality, affected the ways in which students were treated in schools and the ways in which they experienced schooling. And since schools are also major employers, researchers also increasingly concerned themselves with the ways in which gender affected the occupational lives and prospects of teachers, academics, and administrators at all levels of education.

It was not just the content of research that underwent changes, however. It was also research methods and procedures that were challenged and altered. The terms *feminist research, feminist scholarship,* and *feminist methodology* appeared with increasing frequency from the mid-1970s to the present time, although the meanings of those terms were constantly being interrogated. Central to the feminist critique and reformulation of research methodology and procedures were the beliefs that much of so-called "objective" research was really male centered; that male-centered research either omitted women from study or presented a distorted view of them; and that women's experiences could better be understood by researchers who are reflexive about the research process, adopt the standpoint of those they study, and are sensitive to the ethical and political implications of their research. Additional information about feminist research methodology can be found in Lu Bailey's excellent essay, "Feminist Critiques of Educational Research and Practices," and in the references she cites.

For more on feminist methodology and practice, see "Black Feminism, Womanism, and Standpoint Theories" in Part I and "Feminist Pedagogy" in Part X. For more on data sources and interpretations, see "Educational Achievements in International Context" and "Intelligence Tests" in Part V and "Faculty Workloads in Higher Education" and "Salaries of Academics" in Part IX.

Feminist Critiques of Educational Research and Practices

Feminist critiques of traditional approaches to educational research and practice surfaced in the eighteenth century and emerged with greater vigor and variety in the 1960s and 1970s. They have expanded today into a substantive, diverse body of scholarship that questions and revises what it means to produce knowledge about education and the social world. Broad in scope and diverse in expression, feminist research draws from an array of methods, philosophies, models, and disciplines to pursue questions about educational knowledge and schooling processes. Central to such pursuits is the conception of education as a social system with profound power and possibility to shape human lives. As such, it is a crucial arena for feminist work. Researchers with varied goals have worked within and against conventional approaches to analyze male power and demonstrate the centrality of gender to education, social life, and the creation of knowledge. Early feminist critiques focused on the varied effects of historically male-dominated social and educational systems on women's opportunities. More recent critiques encompass a wider array of topics ranging from policy inequities, to the underrepresentation of women in administration, to the subtle ways gender and race infuse educational theory.

Despite the growth and diversity of feminist inquiry since the American civil rights and women's movements, the visibility of feminist methodologies in some educational fields and their near invisibility in others speak to still untapped potential in researchers' use of this resource. This disparate use also reflects a certain degree of unfamiliarity with, confusion about, or reluctance to engage with feminist methodologies that merits redress. Indeed, the complexity of contemporary educational concerns necessitates that researchers utilize an array of tools and techniques to approach their work effectively. Although feminist priorities are revised as educational issues emerge and recede, scholars with diverse goals and orientations nevertheless share a number of characteristics in their work: a spirit of critique, recognition of the centrality of gender to social life, the promotion of equal educational opportunity and practice, and principles of feminist methodology that guide the vision and practice of research. These "guiding principles" (Fonow & Cook, 1991) continue to offer hopeful and concrete grounding for traversing steadily shifting and uncertain educational terrain.

Contemporary feminist critiques of educational research and thought have antecedents visible since the eighteenth century. Upper-class Anglo-European women protested the practice of excluding women from equal education based on their perceived intellectual and physical inferiority to men. Arguing that education, law, government, and other social institutions were androcentric—centered on men's needs, aspirations, and social roles—women advocated for formal education to raise future citizens, to carry out domestic and social responsibilities, and to serve as moral guides for others. Some held more radical visions for the time, refuting male philosophers' claims that women were inherently too emotional and passive to bear the responsibilities of citizenship. Such beliefs carried into scientific research arenas in which scientists struggled to pinpoint the root cause of women's presumed inferiority in the fibers and processes of the body. Skull size, brain weight, genitals, and menstrual cycles were variously examined for evidence of women's arrested and inferior development.

Indeed, women's assumed emotionality was the basis for excluding them as researchers as well. Considered "unreliable witnesses" for verifying scientific experiments believed to require an objective and neutral stance, women were barred from the National Academy of Sciences until the twentieth century. Yet, as early as the mid-1700s, some men and women questioned the presumption that research approaches based on such beliefs and exclusions could be considered neutral, objective, or value-free. This important critique of claims to objectivity in traditional research approaches remains central to contemporary feminist thought.

Long-standing beliefs in women's inferiority led early feminists to focus their philosophical and investigative energy on demonstrating girls' and women's intellectual abilities and their right to access forms of schooling deemed appropriate to their abilities, race, ethnicity, and class. Advocates for women's education proposed and pursued an array of schooling visions, from public "common" schools for working- and middle-class girls, to industrial and housekeeping training for African American and Native American youth, to finishing schools focused on social graces and fine arts for the upper classes. Women also turned to informal networks, Bible study groups, and quilting circles to discuss ideas and pursue knowledge. Although such visions varied dramatically for different groups of women and none equaled in content or rigor those for men, all were concerned with providing previously inaccessible forms of education to females so they could best serve the social roles prescribed for their race and class.

In the early twentieth century, feminist researchers in education, anthropology, and psychology revisited the powerful notion of "sex difference" that had long been presumed as fact in social thought. Researchers questioned the attribution of intellectual, personality, and behavioral differences between men and women solely to "natural" (biological) causes rather than family and educational (social) experiences. Feminists thought the belief in "natural" differences was important to examine systematically given its continued use to justify the exclusion of women from a range of positions in society, including equal education. Investigating this issue from a variety of angles, researchers discovered social causes for differences that appeared to exist across sex and race. This pioneering group of studies collectively contributed to undermining the notion of absolute biological differences and highlighted the role that research can play in questioning commonly held beliefs used to limit human potential. If difference has a social basis, this research suggested, the social institution of education can contribute to changing the direction of human lives.

More recent feminist critiques arose as part of a larger surge of academic revision in the wake of the civil rights and women's movements. During the 1960s and 1970s, scholars across disciplines in the United States began questioning with greater intensity the traditional content, processes, and techniques that constituted knowledge in their fields. The development of women's studies in higher education and the establishment of a special interest group called Research on Women and Education in the American Educational Research Association, the country's largest educational association, testify to the growing salience of gender in education at that time. In this spirit, feminist researchers scrutinized the methods for conducting research and establishing knowledge in education. A key critique centered on the claim that educational research and practice proceeded from a "disinterested," "objective," or "value-free" stance. Feminists noted that excluding women historically from research samples, generalizing results to women from research conducted with men, or seeking explanations for women's presumed inferiority are neither objective nor value-free processes. Indeed, research conducted in this vein not only contributes to maintaining women's inequality and male power but does so in the powerful guise of scientific and "disinterested" knowledge.

Feminists suggested the numerical dominance of White men in research positions, in doctoral programs, and as university professors influenced the direction and analysis of educational research. This position captured a growing belief at the time: that all research is laden with the subjective beliefs of the researcher, social ideas prominent in the time period, and prevailing assumptions about the best way to conduct research. These factors influence what we study, how we study it, and what we conclude. For example, analysis of research during this period found male researchers more likely than female researchers to judge women as susceptible to influence. Female researchers were more likely to ask questions about sex differences in psychological research. Similarly, pioneering psychological research by White women included primarily White participants, overlooking race and class differences that may have altered research findings.

Feminist scholars also questioned assumptions of "universality" in educational research and university-based practices. Such assumptions overlook gender as a central force shaping social organization and the research process. For example, psychologist Carol Gilligan's work challenged Lawrence Kohlberg's foundational research on moral development that proposed a "universal" model (a model applicable to all) but found girls' behavior to be less moral than boys when judged by that model. Approaching her research with consciousness of gender, Gilligan found that females were not less moral than boys but had different conceptions of morality based on an ethic of care and connection. Her findings suggested that theories such as Kohlberg's are often based on male norms and thus not only have limited use in evaluating female experience but also threaten to distort understanding of the social world when taken as universal. Subsequent work on caring, nurturing, and reproduction emphasized such sex/gender difference. Similarly, feminist research on social security, workplace policies, and higher education has shown that policies considered "gender neutral" in such systems are nevertheless oriented to male career patterns. For example, university tenure-track timelines do not necessarily take into consideration gendered elements of lived experience such as kinship work and reproductive labor. Although universities generally provide professors between five to six years from their hiring date to achieve tenure, this timeline is at odds with research findings on female professors' scholarly productivity, which often intensifies later in their professional careers once childbearing and family responsibilities lessen.

Feminists continue to challenge claims of universality in research because they also render invisible racial, ethnic, and other differences *among* women—a key element of contemporary feminist thought. Though earlier feminists primarily focused on sex/gender difference with insufficient attention to other aspects of identity, recent feminist methodology emphasizes differences among women and their social creation as fundamental considerations in conceptualizing and conducting research. Class, race, ethnicity, sexuality, nationality, and ability intersect with gender to shape women's lived experience. Such diversity is erased by partial norms and universal claims. For example, research that revisited Gilligan's premise with the added analytic category of race found differences in the way African American women and White women conceptualized morality. Similarly, research with Latina mothers has shown they tend to be involved differently in their children's education than White, middle-class standards have dictated. The growing body of research into American girlhood has identified clear differences in the ways desire, anger, prom, peer culture, and cheerleading are expressed and experienced based on race and class.

Despite the salience of difference to education, conventional educational research continues to mobilize universal claims and initiate studies with little attention to difference. Even as the field of feminist methodology shifts from access and equity issues to more complex theorizing and contextual forms of analysis, these exclusions and biases continue to demand attention from researchers. Psychological research examining concepts such as achievement, motivation, and development have sometimes given no attention to the gendered threads of such concepts or their different expressions across social groups. Major textbooks intended to overview educational research do not include sections on critical forms of inquiry or feminist research. Methodological work has noted research patterns in which female victimhood is emphasized over success, findings on dominant groups are generalized to others, demographics of study participants are not mentioned, intersections such as sex and ethnicity are ignored, heterosexuality and Whiteness are presumed, and Western bias leads to culturally insensitive research practices and conclusions limited to a Western perspective.

Contemporary feminist research practices, both within and outside of education, are interdisciplinary, drawing from an array of methods, beliefs, models, philosophies, data sources, and disciplinary practices to seek and refine knowledge. Feminists use different theories (frameworks that explain and organize) and epistemologies (frameworks for coming to understand and know what we know) to approach their investigations. Such frameworks are often highly contested, fueling productive discussion and revision of existing approaches. For instance, acknowledging the ways women and men have been shaped differently by culture without simplifying and reinscribing such difference as absolute has been a delicate balancing act. Other debates have centered on the robust presence of poststructuralism and postmodernism in feminism, terms that refer to fields of thought that critique and unsettle concepts long assumed as fixed and foundational to human understanding of the world: science, reason, knowledge, truth, and progress. Tensions have surfaced between approaches that focus on women as subjects and agents and those that draw from poststructuralist thought to question basic categories of knowledge, including how the very category of "woman" is created linguistically, how the "field" in research is conceptualized, and how the body can function as a site of analysis. The contributions of poststructuralism and the resulting debates among scholars are complex, nuanced, and productive. They have fueled increasingly innovative and self-reflexive approaches that push the boundaries of what it means to produce knowledge about the social world.

Researchers generally distinguish between methods and methodology. Methods are commonly grouped in the broad categories *qualitative* methods (tools or techniques using words as data) and *quantitative* methods (tools or techniques using numbers as data). The specific purpose and goals of any research project determine which methods researchers use to collect and analyze information. For instance, even though some associate quantitative methods with male-centered approaches to research, feminist scholars have found quantitative methods particularly useful in obtaining grants and influencing public policy. Researchers may employ either quantitative or qualitative methods, or a combination of these, such as oral history, surveys, statistics, focus groups, ethnography, document analysis, participant observation, and autobiography—among many others.

The term "methodology," in contrast, refers to the theory of how research should proceed and the description and analysis of techniques used to conduct research. The contours of feminist methodology are revised as scholars debate central concepts and face new social complexities. However, researchers proceeding from a feminist methodological stance are governed by certain guiding principles. First, feminist research proceeds from the assumption that gender, race, class, and sexuality among other elements of identity are central to the organization of social life, to lived experience, and to the inquiry process. Researchers consciously ask questions and produce knowledge with gender, gender relations, and the nexus between gender and other social locations in mind.

Second, feminist research assumes that inquiry is not a value-free or objective process. Researchers are shaped by their social location, by their lived and embodied realities, and by ideas available to them in any given historical moment. This "post-positivist" position contrasts with conventional educational research and practice dominated by the scientific approach called "positivism." Only one way to understand the world and approach the knowledge-gathering process, positivism has nevertheless held a preeminent position in education and contributed to shaping ideas regarding what science can—-and should—look like. This preeminence is reinforced by current patterns of funding research in the wake of No Child Left Behind legislation (2001). Despite arguments for a more expansive definition of science from national organizations, governmental funding since 2001 has been directed almost exclusively to positivist, evidence-based research. The positivist paradigm emphasizes empiricism (sense experience) as the foundation of knowledge, researcher distance from and neutrality toward his/her object of inquiry, methodological objectivity, systematic data collection and analysis, and research goals of prediction and control. To feminist researchers, however, disinterestedness, neutrality, prediction, and control are neither attainable nor necessarily desirable stances for inquiry into the complexity of the social world and women's lives. They argue, as do others, that no one right method exists for conducting research.

A third element of feminist methodology is reflexivity. This concept, sharing some aspects with other research traditions, refers to researchers' responsibility to analyze and reflect upon their own research practices. The specific research project shapes what reflexivity looks like in practice. In its earlier formulation, feminist methodology asked researchers to maintain careful and continuous consciousness of their methods, to explore research participants' own reflections on the subject of research, and, significantly, to use these reflections to better understand how larger social forces such as gender, power, and hierarchy shape the research process. More recently, reflexivity has come to include additional elements. Researchers consider how their identities and commitments relate to the people and subject under investigation, how these features shape the research process and the knowledge created, how findings may influence social thought, and how audience/topic/form influence presentation and reception of findings.

The study of Patti Lather and Chris Smithies, *Troubling the Angels: Women Living with HIV/AIDS,* offers a clear example of the multilayered use of reflexivity in feminist work. The authors explore women's diverse experiences living with HIV/AIDS. Throughout the book, Lather and Smithies recount their own struggles during the research process, trace women's experiences with HIV/AIDS, incorporate participants' own reflections on the researchers' work, and ponder the possible effects their findings may have on social thought concerning HIV/AIDS. They emphasize this reflexivity using a split-text format, separating group interviews from their own reflections. This format highlights the centrality of researcher reflexivity to the knowledge created about women's lives—essential reflections in a project attempting to represent something as difficult as women living with a devastating virus. In contrast to research approaches in which the scientist appears as a "disembodied knower" who merely reports results with no personal investments in the research process, the methodological choice described above is explicitly feminist in that it approaches inquiry as a process imbued with gendered power and makes the researcher's process of meaning-making visible. Researchers, by their very disciplinary training and social location, shape the process of inquiry at all stages in rich and meaningful ways. Those committed to understanding knowledge as *constructed* rather than *found* must reflect consciously and continually on the ways their research practices shape knowledge.

A fourth principle of feminist methodology is its action orientation and commitment to social change. Feminist researchers are driven by the belief that fundamental inequities exist in society and that educational institutions reflect and perpetuate these larger social values. They share a common insistence that their work contributes to intellectual, social, and political transformation. Education is a central site for such transformation. This orientation differs from research designed to explain, predict, or simply explore phenomena. While explanation or understanding may be goals of feminist inquiry, they are accompanied by an explicit call to analyze power, change inequities, and promote agency. Feminist research practice, as a kind of social relationship, must also reflect this commitment to change. Specifically, feminist educational research may provide: a call to action; models for equitable research relationships; critique and interpretation of existing research, policy, or law; recommendations for and development of new research, policy, or law; greater understanding of an existing social or educational problem to effect address; greater understanding of racial and gender stratification in education and recommendations for change; visions for more equitable teaching practices; consciousness-raising; advocacy for underrepresented groups in curriculum and leadership positions; and guidelines for program development or revision.

Feminist educational researchers express this orientation to action and social justice in varied ways. Pioneering research that found widespread discrimination against people of color and other women in academic tracking, teaching practices, children's literature, and popular culture offered specific corrections for such inequities. Other scholars have focused on women's resistance efforts such as teacher unions, Chicana feminism, and working-class girls' anger in classrooms to raise awareness and encourage other forms of activism. In light of the male-dominated roots of contemporary educational practice, some researchers advocate radical, structural changes such as a return to single-sex schools or single-sex classes in such subjects as math and science. Some theorists and researchers propose new approaches to learning to address inequities. For example, in an incisive use of terms still potent today, feminist writer Adrienne Rich called for women to "claim" rather than simply "receive" their education. Rich argued that women's historically passive and yielding approach to their learning demonstrates the power of conventional sex-role socialization and male-centered knowledge to mute women's voices, usurp their agency, and divert them from accessing more affirming and transformative knowledge. Actively claiming one's education, Rich asserted, might be the very "difference between life and death" for women. Current research focusing on the body echoes this call for voice as scholars document the continued constraints teachers and parents place on girls' bodies and voices in classrooms and playgrounds.

This action orientation may also provide concrete resources to better women's lives. Lather and Smithies (1997) designed their text on HIV/AIDS in part as an educational resource to correct misconceptions about HIV/AIDS and to provide information vital to other women living with the virus. Researchers investigating sexual harassment and bullying in K–12 schools have reviewed legal cases, clarified terminology, and offered resources and curriculum for administrators to address this issue on their campuses. Feminists studying sex education have recommended comprehensive programs to better serve adolescents after discovering abstinence-only programs portray adolescent females as potential victims, suppress healthy female desire, and promote married heterosexuality as the only acceptable form of human sexuality. Autobiographical work has encouraged self-analysis in women's educational and teaching experiences. Legal and policy researchers have revisited Affirmative Action and Title IX of the 1972 Amendments to the Education Act to clarify differences between the vision and the application of these mandates. Demonstrating Title IX's applicability to sports, cheerleading, women's presence in science and engineering programs, and the schooling of pregnant teens has clarified the reach of the law and the changes school workers must make in their own practices to ensure equal educational opportunity.

A fifth element of feminist methodology is a concern with ethical and political implications of research and the research process. Central to this concern is the relationship of subject/participant and researcher: Who can speak for whom? Who is included and excluded? What kind of relationship should researchers have with participants? What role should participants play in conducting and analyzing research? Historically, some research practices have exploited and manipulated subjects. Others have assumed a hierarchical stance that privileges the authority and expertise of the researcher. Conventional practice continues to advocate that researchers hold a neutral, distanced stance in the conduct of research to prevent bias from influencing study results. In contrast, in feminist practice, researchers often seek ways to break down formal distances that position researchers as "experts" and participants as "objects of research." Caring, emotionality, and other affective elements are welcomed as potentially enriching experiences in the research endeavor as well as characteristics to analyze for knowledge about the social world. Like the conceptual difference between doing research "on" people and doing research "with" people, feminist researchers approach their participants as more than research objects—as potential collaborators, as rich sources of information, as partial experts on their own lives. This conceptual difference is not meant to cast research subjects in a net of romanticism that overlooks the tangible contributions researchers make to the research process or to sway subjects to participate beyond their abilities or desires. Rather, it strives to reduce social inequities in the research process and foreground the humanity and subjectivity of participants. Collaboration among scholars, collaboration with participants, democratic research designs, and feedback from participants on research design and analysis are common ways feminist researchers have worked to create more equitable research relationships.

Concern with the ethical and political dimensions of research also involves grappling with its representation. Contemporary feminist methodology has been influenced by the "crisis of representation," a phrase that refers to a period of intense questioning in the academy that began in the 1970s and centered on the degree to which research endeavors can actually capture and present accurately aspects of social life. Research is often conducted with the conviction that care in method choice, research design, and reporting will ensure that findings and their presentation in statistics, texts, graphs, films, or other forms reflect social reality as closely as possible. In contrast, feminist researchers and others influenced by the crisis of representation see any product of research as coconstructed in complex relationships between researchers, participants, and audiences.

Also, in studying marginalized groups and often sensitive issues, feminists are concerned with how to represent research findings. Anticipating how research results are circulated and consumed is part of a researcher's responsibility. For example, researchers studying gay students, people living with HIV/AIDS, school-aged mothers, and pregnant teens have recognized the groups they study are highly stigmatized in society—stigma to which research may unintentionally contribute. Thus, included in researchers' methodological considerations is reflection upon how to represent participants sensitively. Such issues have led to the development of experimental forms in representing data such as performance, poetry, drama, split-text formats, and photography. Regardless of chosen form, feminist researchers see inquiry as an inherently political process and strive to analyze the consequences of their representational choices.

Although feminist thought continues to influence educational practice, feminist theories and methodologies have not been fully incorporated across educational fields. Indeed, objections to feminist research as politically driven and not "real" research limit its use. Governmental initiatives that fund randomized experimental trials and other positivist scientific research to the exclusion of other forms of science may increase this pattern. For instance, feminist research has had few substantive effects in professional/vocational and adult education. Educational research in mathematics, social studies, and science studies has strong but limited examples of gender, race, and feminist-based research. Male critical theorists continue to overlook gender as a substantive category of analysis in the workings of capitalist power. Psychology has attended to sex roles, sex differences, and adolescent development while attention to feminist analysis in other areas is negligible. Educational leadership has used feminist methods since the 1980s to examine women of color in the superintendency, institutional factors that affect women's advancement, and notions of leadership as masculine, White, and heterosexist. Feminist pedagogy (studies on the science of teaching) offers strong, diverse scholarship on relations of power in institutions and classrooms. Across fields and disciplines, feminist methods remain a rich resource for educators to utilize in their shared quest for greater understanding of the social world. As pressing educational concerns continue to emerge, feminist approaches can contribute to the power and possibility of education to transform human lives.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Fonow, M.M., & Cook, J. (1991). *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fonow, M.M., & Cook, J. (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in the academy and public policy. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*(4), 2211–2236.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern.* New York: Routledge.

Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Reinharz, S. (with the assistance of L. Davidman). (1992). *Feminist methods in social research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

St. Pierre, E., & Pillow, W.S. (2000). *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural methods in education.* New York: Routledge.

Young, M.D., & Skarla, L. (2003). *Reconsidering feminist research in educational leadership.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Lucy E. Bailey

International and U.S. Data Sources on Gender and Education

Students, teachers, public officials, and even educational researchers who are interested in answering many different questions about gender and education do not necessarily have to design and conduct their own studies. Instead, they can often gain access to information in the form of representative data available from large-scale studies completed by other researchers that were designed to explore many research questions concerning gender and education. Existing data sets cover educational experiences at all levels and all stages of the life course. And, while most of these data sets do not permit a sophisticated analysis of gender identity components, such as sexual orientation, they do allow internal comparison of females and males on a variety of academic, cognitive, social, and other developmental outcomes as well as some study of gendered influences due to family members, teachers, caregivers, and other child and adolescent support personnel. And, an increasing number of data sets provide sufficient information to permit analyses of education within and across various academic and community contexts—or provide enough information to link data about individual students or schools with other contextual data sources.

Thus, in our age of information overload, the problem often is not that there are no data to answer particular research questions about gender and education but rather that the right data become lost in the mass of potential sources. A list of all of these sources would constitute a dizzying and confusing array and would probably include sources that have become obsolete. What is likely to be more useful is identification of several agencies and organizations responsible for collecting major educational data sets along with those well-established data repositories that commonly broker access to educational data; the names and descriptions of some major, representative national and international studies that contain useful information about gender and education; and the presentation of tools in the form of several search strategies for efficiently identifying the newest data as they become available.

To further increase the utility of the information presented, only stable Web sites (run by major organizations or having long been in operation) are mentioned. Although all Internet addresses (URLs) are current at the time of this writing, the internal configuration of any Web site undergoes periodic reorganization. As a result, the given Internet addresses have been limited to their second-level domains or to major internal divisions. If the URL does not function, you may "back truncate" the address (remove everything after the first "/" and search that site for the information's new location. Failing that, use the "advanced search" option in a search engine (such as Google) to limit your search to that domain. Finally, if that does not work, you can usually access a saved copy of previous versions of most Web sites through the "Internet Archive Wayback Machine" (http://www.archive.org/). All URLs in this article are also available through the "Links" section of the author's Web site (http://outopia.org).

DATA COLLECTION AGENCIES AND DATA ARCHIVES

In the United States, three federal government agencies collect most of the information available about education, including gender and education. They are the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, a division of the Department of Education, located at http://nces.ed.gov/—look in their "Surveys & Programs" section), the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS, located at http://www.bls.gov/nls/), and the U.S. Census Bureau (CB, located at http://www.census.gov/—look in "Data Tools"). The NCES also often works in concert with the other two on specific projects, such as an annual October supplement to the Current Population Survey (NCES, BLS, and CB) concerning educational attainment and school enrollment, and the Common Core of Data (NCES and CB), a decennial retabulation of census data along school district boundaries combined with the annual Census of Government Agencies—School Districts and other administrative data sources. Components of the latter are also updated annually with intercensus projections.

Many academic units and other organizations also collect and distribute educational data. One useful example is the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center (NORC at http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/—-in "Research Departments: Education and Child Development"). And, the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR at http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/—search "education"), hosted by the University of Michigan, is the major public access storehouse for thousands of secondary data sets. Also, see the ICPSR International Archive of Education Data (IAED) for a growing number of data sets from around the world.

In Canada, Statistics Canada (located at http://www.statcan.ca) is the government agency tasked with conducting their census and implementing hundreds of active surveys across a variety of topics. Data sets of particular interest to education research include Survey on School Enrollment and Graduates, School Leavers Survey, Youth in Transition Survey, and Adult Education and Training Survey, all of which include gender indicators.

In Australia, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (http://www.abs.gov.au) is the official statistical organization. It also administers a wide variety of national and regional educational surveys or works in concert with other agencies, such as the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training, and Youth Affairs (primary and secondary education) and the Department of Education, Science, and Training (vocational and higher education). The National Centre for Education and Training Statistics also serves as a clearinghouse for relevant data obtained from other Australian agencies, businesses, and private sector organizations.

In the United Kingdom, education data sets may be located through the Department for Education and Skills (DfES at http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/) and, since 2000, the newly created Statistics Commission (http://www.statscom.org.uk). Ongoing U.K. government data projects include the Common Basic Data Set (CBDS) and Pupil Achievement Tracker (PAT), among a wide range of data products.

Several agencies and organizations collect and compile data across nations in the European Union (EU). These include Eurydice (the information network on education in Europe at http://www.eurydice.org/Eurybase or Publications), which houses the European Commission's Eurybase, an integrated database of European education systems; the EU's European Schoolnet, for primary and secondary education; and the EU Education and Training Division, which primarily handles data regarding higher education and vocational training.

There are also many agencies gathering and warehousing *international* education data. Some of the primary resources in this area include: the United Nations Statistics Division (http://unstats.un.org), UNESCO Institute for Statistics (http://www.uis.unesco.org), World Bank (http://www.worldbank.org/—see "Data & Research"; and also http://genderstats.worldbank.org/home.asp), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (http://www.oecd.org/—see Statistics: Education and Training), Council of European Social Science Data Archives (CESSDA at http://www.nsd.uib.no/Cessda/—click on Data Portal), and the International Federation of Data Organizations for the Social Sciences (IFDO) at http://www.ifdo.org/.

There are, of course, many additional government agencies and other cooperative organizations collecting and distributing education data that may be useful for studying the intersection of gender and education through the entire life course. Most of them make their data available free or at greatly reduced costs to academic researchers. These data are usually available via anonymous download or through a simple e-mail request or online order form. A few are also available to qualifying researchers in their restricted formats —which contain additional identifying information usually necessary to link one data set with another for additional context. There are also a growing number of commercial data services, but most research questions can be adequately addressed through freely available data sources, and it is seldom necessary to pay for the data required by most research.

MAJOR U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL DATA SETS

Table II.1 presents the Internet addresses of the major U.S. and international data sets that contain recent information about gender and a broad variety of educational matters.

The most important administrator of U.S. educational data at all levels is the NCES, and it is often involved with the management or implementation of the American portion of international educational data gathering projects. However, many of their data products are aggregated to the district or state level, such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), or primarily concern institutional characteristics, such as the Common Core of Data (CCD), for primary and secondary schools, and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), for colleges and universities. These sets are useful for providing institutional and community context for gender research in education and contain data regarding aggregate gender ratios for schools, districts, communities, and other administrative units. The NCES also administers several large-scale,

Table II.1 Internet Addresses for Information about Major Educational Data Sets

Type of Data	URL
Common Core of Data (CCD)	http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/
School District Demographics System (SDDS, formerly SDDB)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sdds/
Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/
National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)	http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/
Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)	http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/
Early Childhood	
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Birth Cohort (ECLS-B)	http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/Birth.asp
Primary/Secondary	
Early Childhd. Longitudinal Study–Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K)	http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/Kindergarten.asp
National Longitudinal Study of the HS Class of 1972 (NLS-72)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nls72/
High School and Beyond (HS&B)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/hsb/
National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nels88/
High School Transcript Studies (HSTS)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/hst/
Private School Survey (PSS)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pss/
Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:2002)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/els2002/
Postsecondary/Vocational/Adult	
Baccalaureate & Beyond (B&B)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/b&b/
Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/bps/
Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED)	http://norc.uchicago.edu/issues/docdata.htm
Survey of Doctoral Recipients (SDR)	http://norc.uchicago.edu/issues/edudev5.asp
Data on Vocational Education (DOVE)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/dove/
National Assessments of Adult Literacy (NAAL)	http://nces.ed.gov/naal/
National Household Education Survey (NHES)	http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/
Current Population Survey (CPS)—October education Supplement	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/cps/

International	
Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)	http://nces.ed.gov/timss/
Program for International Student Assessment (PISA)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/
Program in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)	http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pirls/

individual level studies—most of which are longitudinal and include information about students and their families, schools, and community contexts.

Perhaps the most exciting new NCES data set is their Early Childhood Longitudinal Study—Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K). Beginning with a nationally representative sample of about 21,000 kindergarteners from 1,000 classes in 1998, it will eventually include eight follow-up waves, concluding in the spring of their senior year in high school (2011). ECLS-K includes data from students, families, teachers, and schools, and (as with most NCES sets) the restricted version may be linked with other NCES data (such as CCD and School District Demographics System or SDDS) for additional context.

The second prong of the ECLS initiative, the Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), began with 14,000 newborns in 2001. The design also features oversamples of several key demographic groups: Asian and Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native, Chinese extraction, twins, and low and very low birth weight babies. It includes data about children, parents, caregivers, teachers, and schools. It will conclude after six waves of data collection in the fall of 2007 as the youngest participants enter kindergarten.

The NCES has also conducted four longitudinal high school cohort studies: the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 (NLS-72), High School and Beyond: 1980—10th and 12th grade cohorts (HS&B-10 and HS&B-12), National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88), and Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:2002). All four studies include high school and (where applicable) postsecondary transcripts. NLS-72 began with over 21,000 high school seniors, with low-income and minority seniors oversampled, and encompassed five follow-up waves of data collection through 1986. From HS&B on, they also incorporate cognitive tests and an increasing amount of parental information. Beginning with HS&B-10, they included school administrator questionnaires, and NELS:88 and ELS:2002 include data from multiple teachers.

NELS-72 had five follow-up waves through 1986, HS&B-12 had three through 1986, HS&B-10 had four through 1990, NELS:88 began with eighth graders and had four follow-ups through 2000, and ELS:2002 began with 10th graders and is still ongoing, with the second follow-up scheduled for 2006. All four replicate many items for easy comparison among the studies.

There are also three NCES postsecondary studies that should be highlighted: Baccalaureate & Beyond (B&B), Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS), and Data on Vocational Education (DOVE). New cohorts to the B&B and BPS data sets are alternatively derived in three- or four-year intervals from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and include one or two follow-up waves for each cohort. The B&B samples begin with a baseline of around 10,000 baccalaureate degree recipients and follow them for their first few years in the workforce. The BPS samples start with a baseline of first-time college students in that year and follow up at two and five years to monitor their college or work progress. And, DOVE uses a similar design to study the progress of students in vocational and technical programs. All studies include interview, parental, transcript, and financial aid data on most participants.

The University of Chicago's NORC is responsible for the only two ongoing and comprehensive studies of those receiving academic doctorates in the United States: the Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED) and the Survey of Doctoral Recipients (SDR). All U.S. doctoral recipients in research fields are requested to fill out the SED around the time of their graduation and comprise two waves of data for each year (spring and fall semester graduates). Each year's SED is added to the Doctoral Records File (DRF), which has tracked terminal degrees awarded to scientists, engineers, and humanists since 1920. The SDR is a biennial survey of about 40,000 doctoral recipients at various career stages selected from the DRF.

There are also dozens of excellent international data sets. Three of the more widely cited are the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), and the Program in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS). Others can be easily found using the tools described in the following section.

TIMSS began as the "Third International Mathematics and Science Study" and has since been transformed into a regular assessment of mathematics and science attainment in 46 participating countries. Two samples (equivalent to U.S. fourth and eighth graders) participate every four years (1995, 1999, 2003, and 2007). PISA (2000, 2003) assesses the attainment of 15 year olds in literacy, numeracy, and basic science across 40 participating nations, with a shifting emphasis among those areas in each cohort. And, PIRLS (2001, with planned five-year cycles) collects data on U.S. fourth-grade equivalent students in 35 participating nations. Each of these includes some additional data on curriculum, classrooms, and other contexts.

TOOLS FOR LOCATING DATA SETS

As noted previously, finding the right data source for a project often becomes a matter of careful searching, particularly because old data sets become obsolete and new ones become available. The search process entails at least seven steps.

First, become familiar with existing major data sets by studying those currently available from the major national and international data gatherers and archives described above.

Second, contact authors, grant recipients, organizations, and agencies directly. Some data are not normally made publicly available, but special arrangements can often be made—especially if your research topic does not overlap with (or even complements) the goals of the researchers whose data you are trying to access. It never hurts to ask! You may be refused at the time, but the researchers may suggest you recontact them once they have sufficiently mined their data. This is also a great way to network with other researchers.

Almost everyone doing research has an e-mail address. These are increasingly given in the information about authors appearing in journals and reports. Failing that, most universities, agencies, and professional organizations provide searchable databases for their employees or members. Even when people change their affiliation, there are many resources to help you track them down. An advanced Google search for their name and variants (perhaps also with their discipline as an additional search field to narrow your findings), limited to recently updated Web pages, will often return new contact information.

And, there are several Internet e-mail lookup services (for example, AT&T's "Anywho:" http://www.anywho.com/) that may locate new or alternate e-mail addresses.

Third, research on gender and education occurs at the intersection of many disciplines but is mainly conducted by those trained in education, sociology, social psychology, psychology, economics, women studies, and statistics. Each discipline has professional organizations that provide resources for their field—for this purpose, mainly networking and information regarding data sets. The American Educational Research Association (http://www.aera.net), the American Sociological Association (http://www.asanet.org), the American Psychological Association (http://www.apa.org), the Association for Psychological Science (http://www.psychologicalscience.org), the American Economic Association (http://www.vanderbilt.edu), the National Women's Studies Association (http://www.nwsa.org), and the American Statistical Association (http://www.amstat.org) are starting points for information about U.S. research and some international data sets. Depending on the kind of information sought, international associations and those located in countries of interest may prove to be useful. Topical mailing lists and interest groups are also a good way to find knowledgeable communities willing to help locate just the right data set.

Fourth, listservs and message board archives are other excellent places to connect with those who might point you in the direction of the data you need. There are currently almost one-half million listservs (topical e-mail mailing lists), but because many are private or transitory, they have no complete directory. The largest single directory to public listservs is CataList, maintained by L-Soft (http://www.lsoft.com/catalist.html). Similarly, message boards (MBs) are proprietary and not comprehensively indexed. But, you might locate some popular MBs by searching the phrase "message board" along with "education" and/or "gender" and any additional qualifying terms that more specifically apply to your research topic. Start with specific searches and, if necessary, systematically remove highly idiosyncratic terms to widen your search.

Fifth, there are a number of Internet search tools that will help you locate available data. These may be categorized as search directories, search engines, and metasearch engines. A search directory, such as Yahoo! (http://dir.yahoo.com/), contains hierarchical menus of Internet links organized and checked by human editors. A search engine, such as Google (http://www.google.com/) uses automated "spiders" to troll the Web using various criteria in order to locate specific patterns of links or key words, while other search engines (like http://www.gigablast.com/ or http://www.altavista.com/) use different search strategies. And, a metasearch engine, such as Search (http://www.search.com/) simultaneously submits your request to multiple search engines and directories and then collates the results on one page.

There are a host of additional search tools available on the Internet. Some are general purpose, while many are targeted to a specific topical area. Since their availability and specifications change almost by the minute, it is best to start with one of the Web sites that monitor Internet search tools. The best are Search Engine Watch (http://searchenginewatch.com/) and Search Engine Showdown (http://www.searchengineshowdown.com/).

Some sites also conduct searches across a variety of related sites. For example, to search for U.S. government data sources, start with FirstGov (http://www.firstgov.gov/), FedStats (http://www.fedstats.gov/), or ChildStats (http://www.childstats.gov/). For United Kingdom data sources, begin at DirectGov (http://www.direct.gov.uk/). Other governments and NGOs with extensive Web presences and data offerings are also developing similar portals.

Sixth, several Web sites maintain categorized lists of links for social and behavioral researchers, including links for education research, for gender research, and to data repositories. Extensive and long-standing link directories useful for locating relevant data include UCSD Social Science Data Guide (http://odwin.ucsd.edu/idata/), Princeton Data & Statistical Services (http://dss.princeton.edu), University of Michigan Statistical Resources (http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/stats.html Main Index: Education), Bristol University Social Sciences (http://sosig.esrc.bris.ac.uk), University of Amsterdam Sociosite (http://www.sociosite.net), and AEAweb Resources for Economists (http://rfe.org).

Seventh and finally, because of changes in Web publishing technology, many Web pages are now constructed on demand from databases, which means that their contents do not appear in standard Web searches. This so-called "deep web" or "invisible web" represents an increasing proportion of available data on the Internet but is all too often overlooked even though there are tools being developed to help locate these data. CompletePlanet (http://aip.completeplanet.com/), Invisible Web (http://www.invisible-web.net/), and InfoMine (http://infomine.ucr.edu/) each identifies tens of thousands of such deep Web resources and includes specific categories for education and for the social sciences. SuperSearchers (http://www.infotoday.com/supersearchers/) also maintains a Web site with lots of information to help you locate the data you need.

Kevin J. Payne

Methodological Problems in Gender Research

While there is no doubt about the importance of sex/gender as a factor affecting educational processes and outcomes, the methodological problems involved in studying its role in education, or taking account of it in investigating other matters, have not always been recognized. Several of these methodological problems arise when efforts are made to describe or account for sex differences in educational outcomes, and others arise when gender is used to explain the behavior of students.

To solve these problems, researchers need to take considerable care in how they represent the performance of the two sexes and in how they go about the task of comparison. Similarly, in explaining differences in the experiences or behaviors of students, researchers must avoid allowing the obviousness of gender to result in exaggerating its role, overlooking the problems involved in providing convincing evidence for explanations employing it, or forgetting the difficult issues surrounding its conceptualization.

SEX INEQUALITIES IN EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Unlike most other key “face-sheet” variables, including social class and ethnicity, sex seems easy to measure. In practice, if not always in principle, there is usually little disagreement that the variable is dichotomous (but see Hood-Williams, 1996, and Kessler & McKenna, 1978). Nor, most of the time, is there uncertainty about the allocation of individuals to one or the other category. We can assign most people routinely, and without much apparent error, to one sex or the other on the basis of their appearance and/or on the basis of self-report. This is not true of most other social variables of general significance.

This is probably one reason why “sex” is often included in official educational statistics. For example, in the United Kingdom there is information about sex differences in the award of various educational qualifications and about changes in these over time. However, great care needs to be taken in interpreting information of this kind. General statements about relative levels of achievements or gender gaps must be treated with caution.

One obvious but important point is that average measures of performance across school or college subjects can hide considerable gender variation in performance *between* curriculum areas. Equally important, variation across different *levels* of achievement may be obscured. For example, in England, where most students take examinations around the age of 16+, a common measure of achievement is the proportion of students of each sex scoring the top four grades (A*–C) in the General Certificate in Secondary Education (GCSE) in five or more subjects. However, while this information is of great value, it does not always give us an accurate sense of all significant aspects of variation in the performance of boys and girls at 16+. For instance, one gender could be more successful in terms of this overall measure even though the other gender achieves more of the highest GCSE grades.

A third complication has to do with how the numbers of males and females getting particular grades are represented. One strategy is to use a common metric that separates out the effects of differences between the number of boys and the number of girls taking a test or examination each year. It is important to do this where the proportions of girls and boys, women and men, involved vary for different subjects or have changed over the period concerned.

Of course, any difference between the sexes in the numbers *entered* for an examination or test may be of interest in itself, perhaps being treated as inequitable. In England, this has been an especially significant issue in relation to advanced level GCSE examinations usually taken at the end of secondary school, around the age of 18, for which students choose a small number of subjects to study. Here, researchers need to measure any entry gap between the sexes as well as any achievement gap. Or, alternatively, a researcher might want to compare the proportion of the relevant age group of girls and boys who obtained a particular qualification, thereby combining entry and achievement gaps, on the grounds that this differential may affect gender patterns in future recruitment to high level occupational positions. Decisions are involved here about what to take into account and how to represent it that will have significant consequences for the picture that emerges.

An important problem involved in documenting trends in the relative educational performance of the sexes over time concerns changes in the number of students of *both* sexes entering an examination or achieving at a particular level. If the number of students entered for a test or examination has increased substantially over time, for example taking up a much greater proportion of the age group, this has important implications for measuring the gender gap. Some of the change here—if calculated in terms of *numbers* of boys and girls succeeding at the two levels—will simply reflect this overall growth, rather than any change in the *relative* performance of the two groups. One way of eliminating this distortion is by calculating the gap between girls and boys relative to the overall numbers who achieved at the relevant level in each year. Doing this provides a much better basis for comparison of the relative achievement of the two sexes over time.

One final technical point: There is a danger that the nature of changes in patterns of gender differentiation in educational outcomes will be misunderstood unless a distinction is made between measuring percentage point gaps and calculating percentage changes in these gaps. The first measure simply notes changes over time in the difference between the percentage of males and females achieving at a particular level. The second measures the direction and rate of change of any gap. We can illustrate this with the data presented in Table II.2.

One way of describing what this table shows is to say that, whereas in 1990 to 1991 there was a gap of 12 percent, in 1997 to 1998 there was a gap of 10 percent—a reduction in the gender gap of 2 percent. However, if we look at this in terms of percentage increase or decrease, then there has been a decrease in the gender gap of 2/12 or 17 percent. Which

Table II.2 Sex Differences in Performance on 16+ Examinations Taken in 1990 to 1991 and 1997 to 1998 in the United Kingdom

	1990–1991		1997–1998	
	Females	Males	Females	Males
Proportion achieving grades A*–C (Grades 1–3 in Scotland) on 5 or more GCSEs or equivalent subjects	56%	44%	55%	45%

of these measures should be used depends upon the purpose of the analysis (see Hammersley, 2001, for more details).

There are several further cautions, of a nontechnical nature, that need to be observed in interpreting data about gender gaps. The first concerns what is actually measured by achievement in examination or test terms. It is tempting to assume that the award of qualifications based on examination scores or grades captures the quality of the education that students have "received." However, while there may be a relation between the two, they are not the same. After all, if we were to ask people what they saw as the priority in a good education, we are likely to find considerable variation in response. And, while a set of assessment procedures may measure *some* of these priorities reasonably well, it will not measure them all. For example, those that relate to deep understanding or to changes in attitude are likely to prove particularly elusive in the face of any attempt to measure them.

Sometimes, what assessment scores or grades are taken to measure is life chances: the chances of obtaining high income, high social status, and perhaps "high powered" jobs. But this is not necessarily the same as getting a "good education." Furthermore, the relationship between school success and occupational destination is not a simple and strong one. Indeed, in the face of current public concern in some countries about male underachievement in education, some feminists have pointed out that females' relatively high level of educational success does not seem to have translated into a similarly high level of success in occupational attainment.

Another important point is that aggregate figures about the achievement levels of females and males hide both the variation within each category and the considerable overlap that exists between the two distributions. Moreover, some of the internal variation will be associated with other causal factors, such as social class and race-ethnicity. While it is tempting to focus on single variable contrasts in educational outcomes, and for some purposes this may be sufficient, the multivariable complexity of reality must never be forgotten.

It should also be noted that differences among the sexes in educational outcomes are not *in themselves* inequitable. A difference is a matter of fact; an inequity is a matter of value judgment. Yet, in the education literature and elsewhere, the term "inequality" is often used in ways that automatically imply inequity. This is an effect, perhaps, of the fact that most researchers in this area are strongly committed to the reduction or elimination of particular inequalities that they take to be obviously inequitable. Sometimes ignored here is the need to make clear the value assumptions on which judgments about equity are based (see Foster, Gomm, & Hammersley, 1996). For example, it is often assumed that a lower number of girls achieving high test or examination scores in mathematics and science represents an inequity. Yet, while this is true on the basis of *some* conceptions of social justice, it would not be in terms of all of them. Furthermore, in the United Kingdom and probably elsewhere, part of this inequality is an entry gap resulting from choices made by students themselves; and while their choices are open to evaluation, criticism of them needs to be made explicit if the evaluation is to be convincing.

Value judgments about equity and inequity are necessarily based on both factual and value assumptions about sex differences. Thus, whether variation in the numbers of boys and girls gaining qualifications in mathematics and science amounts to inequity depends, partly, on whether or not one assumes that there are systematic (albeit probabilistic) differences across the sexes in abilities relevant to these subjects and whether these differences should be allowed for in judging equity. This issue arises in other areas, too. Girls usually perform better than boys on reading tests, and this may reflect inherent differences, at the very least in speed of maturation. Again, it might be argued that such differences, if they exist, should be taken into account when judging whether the education system is treating the sexes equitably; or, alternatively, it could be claimed that the education system needs to compensate for these differences, or that it should change the mode of assessment to eliminate their effect. These arguments result from different value assumptions that need to be made explicit.

To show the ways in which broad generalizations about “the gender gap in educational achievement” are likely to be misleading is not to suggest that there are no gender differences in school achievement levels that pose problems for educators and their students. Rather, the point is that, in any analysis, careful specification is required of what is being compared, how, for what purpose, and in relation to what value standard.

EXPLAINING STUDENTS’ EXPERIENCES AND BEHAVIORS IN TERMS OF GENDER

Gender is clearly an important factor to consider in explaining differences in students’ experiences and behaviors. In an illuminating article, Lynda Measor (1999) has argued that there was a tendency in the past, in U.K. research on schools in particular, to interpret teacher-student interaction automatically in terms of institutional power relations and/or as generated by social class divisions. She shows how the same data could be interpreted, equally plausibly, in terms of sexual division. However, it might also be suggested that the main problem with earlier explanations was not just that they neglected the role of gender but also that they were often speculative in character: They were not systematically tested. And there is a danger of simply replacing them with a similarly speculative approach based on gender differences.

A tendency to move too rapidly to explanations based on gender, in efforts to understand what is going on in educational settings, and especially when interpreting student behaviors, is encouraged by the fact that gender is such an obvious characteristic that the gender of participants is often routinely used to characterize them in data. Yet, the same people will always have many other unmentioned identities and characteristics, some of which could be more relevant to explaining their behaviors.

Moreover, even where research has shown that there are systematic sex differences in, for example, key types of classroom disruption in schools, this does not establish that gender is the prime cause (see Hammersley, 1990). Researchers would need to examine the proportions of boys and girls who engage in these disruptive actions. It may be that it is a *minority* of boys rather than the majority who do this and that some girls engage in these activities as well. If so, then it is possible that there is some third factor, or set of factors, which is the cause, such as levels of confidence in public contexts, levels of aggressiveness, interaction between gender, social class, forms of pedagogy, and so on. Researchers also need to look at the targets of disruptive acts in terms of gender, not just at their sources. Is cross-sex disruption—especially boys against female teachers—more common than same-sex disruption? In short, before one can be sure about the validity of gender-based explanations, ways must be found of judging these explanations in relation to competing hypotheses.

Of course, such an analytic strategy could lead to more fundamental questions about the conceptualization of sex/gender: How far does any explanation of classroom behavior in terms of gender rely on an essentialist conception of that variable? The answer is perhaps that it can do so, but need not. Gender differences may be seen as fixed by biology or even by sociocultural forces, but they need not be. There may also be issues to be addressed about what does and does not count as essentialism and/or about which of its forms are and are not mistaken.

There are also some difficult questions about the relationship between sex/gender and other characteristics. For example, some male students may react antagonistically to particular male teachers, labeling them as effeminate. Here, perhaps, we have gender operating through different versions of masculinity, ones that are structured as hegemonic or dominant and subordinate (Connell, 1987). Alternatively, though, such antagonism, even if expressed in gender terms, may be seen as reflecting a particular view of power that treats it as only properly exercised by those who have authoritative personal characteristics, rather than merely occupying formal office. More specifically, for some students, perhaps especially for some working class boys, it may be that teachers are to be respected only if they can demonstrate the kind of "personality" that would give them high status in the students' peer group or in the local community culture (see Dubberley, 1988, and Willis, 1977). This might lead to some gender difference overall in terms of the prevalence of disruption, as regards both source and target; but, even if it did, the result is unlikely to be clear-cut. Moreover, it could be argued that gender is not central to the causal processes involved, even though it is implicated in them. The main point is, simply, that much depends on how we are conceptualizing gender and its relations with other features of the situation and the people in it.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power.* London: Routledge.

Dubberley, W. (1988). Humour as resistance. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 1*(2), 109–123.

Foster, P., Gomm, R., & Hammersley, M. (1996). *Constructing educational inequality.* London: Falmer.

Hammersley, M. (1990). An evaluation of two studies of gender imbalance in primary classrooms. *British Educational Research Journal, 16*(2), 125–143.

Hammersley, M. (2001). Interpreting achievement gaps: Some comments on a dispute. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 49*(3), 285–298.

Hood-Williams, J. (1996). Goodbye to sex and gender. *Sociological Review, 44*(1), 1–16.

Kessler, S., & McKenna, W. (1978). *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Measor, L. (1999). Looking back at the boys: Reflections on issues of gender in classroom data. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Researching school experience* (pp. 169–186). London: Falmer.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour.* Farnborough, England: Gower.

Martyn Hammersley

Part III

Institutional Contexts for Gendered Education

Overview

The essays in this section focus on the institutional contexts in which men and women obtain their educations both at the present time and in previous historical periods. When people think of educational institutions, they often think of physical locations characterized by certain kinds of buildings, furnishings, equipment, and supplies. Ask people, “Where did you get your education?” and most will answer by naming schools, each located in a particular place. This does not mean that everyone leaves home and goes to a school building or a campus of buildings for his or her education. Students who are home schooled or who participate in distance education certainly do not. As its name implies, home schooling usually takes place in the home of the student and his or her family, although laws that govern such schooling usually do not require a home venue for this kind of education. Home schooling could, for example, take place in a rented office, in residential space provided by a relative or friend, or in a space inside a family business. Whereas students involved in home schooling have face-to-face interaction with their teacher, who is usually also their mother, students enrolled in distance education can successfully pursue and complete courses, and sometimes entire degree programs, without ever being in the same physical location as their teachers. The furnishings, equipment, and supplies of home schooling and distance education also tend to be somewhat different from what is found in school buildings with contemporary distance education using media and technology to transmit content, and home schoolers using whatever resources they may have in the home plus those required by the state laws under which their form of schooling is permitted and regulated.

It is laws of this kind that turn educational practices into institutional contexts or formal education, as it is sometimes called. There is probably not a home in all the world in which parents or guardians have not taught their children something, and increasing numbers of people worldwide learn a great deal via the Internet and electronic mail. Although they may qualify as forms of education, these teaching and learning activities do not qualify as any of the kinds of formal education described in “Home Schooling,” “Distance Education,” or any of the other essays in this section. To be an educational institution, the teaching-learning relationships and processes must be legally recognized and regulated. In most countries, this legal framework for education is established at the national level, sometimes in response to international conventions, and in some countries, such as the

United States and Canada, states or provinces have most of the constitutional authority over education, some of which may be delegated to local public school districts, to state university boards, or to private schools and colleges.

Within the legal framework, educational institutions develop their own values, regulations, and social structure. Social structure refers to the different kinds of people who constitute an organization or institution; the activities of those people, sometimes called the division of labor; and the ways in which those people and their activities are linked or related to one another. The most important regulations and values are those that determine and evaluate the key components of the social structure: Who has *access* to what positions in a particular educational institution? What kinds of people are given the *opportunity* to perform what kinds of behaviors in that institution? How are different kinds of people *treated* and how are they and their behaviors *evaluated?* Although the treatments and evaluations may be prescribed and administered by those who participate in the institution, they are usually derived from values in the larger culture in which the educational institution is located. Similarly, institutional access and opportunities may depend upon the broader legal context or the customs of the population that the educational institution is designed to serve.

Educational access has been and continues to be an important goal for almost all groups of people around the world. The essays in this section give particular attention to access of girls and women and of students from minority backgrounds, especially African Americans and American Indian Tribes. Historically, in North America, White boys and men were more likely than girls and women to have access to institutionalized education, and this gender gap tended to increase as one moved up the educational ladder from primary through secondary to higher education. The reason had to do primarily with the linkage that was made in Europe and her North American colonies between formal education and other social institutions, particularly the economy. It was men, rather than women, who were expected to be the heads of households, family farms, and family businesses; the Protestant ministers and other religious officials; the occupants of other professional positions, such as those in law, architecture, medicine, and higher education; the military; the leaders and workers in the fields of trade and commerce and, later, of industry and business; the major writers, poets, artists, composers, and musicians; and the government officials. Although training for many of these positions was originally informal and remains so for some people to this day, formal education was seen as a great advantage especially for those who aspired to leadership positions in one institutional arena or another. Of course, the amount and type of formal education considered to be appropriate training for a particular job changed greatly over time, but by the twenty-first century, inabilities of men to find a good job were almost always blamed on not having enough of the right kind of formal education.

Because women were not expected, or even allowed, until fairly recently to take on most of the occupational positions expected of men, they were not thought to need the same amount or type of education as men. That they were thought to need any education at all is an idea that gained support originally from Protestant religious leaders who thought all people should be able to read the Bible and, after the American Revolution, from the belief, sometimes called the ideology of republican motherhood, that women's responsibility for child rearing could best be executed by those who were sufficiently well educated that they could instill in their children the civic virtues required of citizens in a functioning democracy. From advocating that they be teachers of their own children, it was not a big step to approving of women as teachers of the children of others, especially their younger children, first in privately subsidized dame schools and later in publicly established and funded primary schools. But, with that step from motherhood to schoolteaching came the advocacy of more years of formal education for women than the informal tutoring or primary schooling considered sufficient for Bible reading and good motherhood.

Perhaps because of the religious and familial justification, there seems to have been little opposition in the United States against basic education for women. Some did feel that this education should be in single-sex schools, but in many parts of the country there were not enough pupils or enough resources to establish separate schools for girls and boys, and coeducation became the common form of primary and secondary education in public schools in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Especially in rural areas, where most White American children of that period received their formal education, schools were regarded, along with family and church, as central institutions of the community, and coeducation in the school was probably accepted as an extension of gender integration in the home and church. There were some regional and social class differences, however. Proportionately fewer White children (and no slaves) received formal schooling in the South. Traditions of private schooling were strong among the more prosperous, and wealthy White southerners often sent their children to single-sex private secondary schools. Internationally, the differences were even greater. Totally accustomed to single-sex education, European visitors to the United States in the decades leading up to the Civil War were astonished to find boys and girls, even in their adolescent years, studying together in school.

Of course, before the Civil War, very few Americans went to secondary school and even fewer received education at the college level where single-sex education was far more common than at the elementary and secondary levels. In the decades following the Civil War, however, the numbers and proportions of boys and, especially, of girls attending institutions of secondary and higher education increased at a rapid rate. By 1870, girls comprised almost half (49 percent) of all White pupils in all public schools and one-fifth (21 percent) of all students enrolled in institutions of higher education. In that same year, there were more than twice as many coeducational colleges as there were women's colleges.

From Reconstruction onward, the Black common school was coeducational, as were most of the Black colleges and universities. This adoption of coeducation by Black schools probably resulted from two traditions, the mixed-sex form of informal education practiced in slave families and Black churches prior to the Civil War and the commitment to the tradition of coeducation carried by Northern missionary teachers who flocked South to teach former slaves after the War was over. The proportions of girls and women enrolled in the Black common schools was higher than the proportions of males, a pattern that continued into the twentieth century and may have resulted from a different relationship between schooling and jobs for the two sexes. It is possible, for example, that there was more demand for boys than girls in agricultural labor, and schoolteaching, one of the few nonmanual jobs open to large numbers of African- Americans, tipped from being a predominantly male occupation to a female one well before the end of the nineteenth century, just as it had tipped earlier in White schools.

The fact that formal education for women in coeducational institutions was so well established by the turn of the twentieth century did not stop critics from arguing in favor of more segregated education. Racial segregation across schools had been legally established throughout the Southern states, a process upheld by the Supreme Court in its famous *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of 1896, but gender segregation took a different form. Instead of legislating or simply establishing separate educational institutions for males and females, gender segregation took the form of separate places and spaces, classes, and curricula within shared institutions. At the secondary level, this often meant vocational curricula, with emphases on the industrial and mechanical arts, for the boys and either home economics courses or clerical curricula, with emphases on typing, shorthand, and bookkeeping, for the girls. Even in the general and college preparatory curricula, it was common for boys to take more mathematics and science courses than the girls. And as liberal arts colleges grew into universities containing not only an increasing number of academic departments, but also multiple colleges and schools, boys found themselves channeled and welcomed into business, law, engineering, and medical curricula while girls were encouraged to leave the college of arts and science (gateway to law and medical schools and to graduate work in mathematics and science) and to enroll in the now-separate college of education or the newly emerging colleges of home economics, library science, social work, and nursing.

By the 1950s and 1960s, racial and gender segregation were facing strong and vociferous challenges, but just as the two kinds of segregation took different forms, so did the challenges against them. Because racial segregation was established in law, it was challenged in court, and in 1954 the Supreme Court in its famous *Brown v. Board of Education* overthrew the *Plessey v. Ferguson* decision by declaring that "separate is not equal" and mandating racially integrated public schools. Although this legal decision did not apply to gender segregation, some people saw parallels between single-sex and single-race schools, and the process of converting the former into coeducational institutions began to accelerate, especially after 1964 when the Civil Rights Act, abolishing discrimination (but not segregation) by gender, as well as discrimination by race, color, religion, and national origin, was passed into law. And, when the governmental guidelines for the implementation of Title IX of the 1972 Education Act Amendments were finally made available in the mid-1970s, they had the effect of banning all single-sex public schools.

Simultaneous with these efforts to get a legal framework in place that supported coeducation against single-sex (or single-race) alternatives, there was also a growing movement of criticism against coeducational institutions of education for their failure to provide girls and women with the same educational opportunities and treatment as their male counterparts. The curricular tracking, popular since the Progressive Era, that channeled girls into different courses at the secondary level and different degree programs in higher education came under heavy attack. And, as the essays in this and the following sections of the encyclopedia document, feminist critics and researchers exposed and challenged the many ways in which coeducational institutions not only favored boys and men but also exposed all students to male-centered forms of thinking, knowing, and acting. Not surprisingly, the development of their critique of coeducation led some feminists to reassess single-sex schools and colleges as venues in which being separate might actually promote more favorable and equal (to men) outcomes for women than coeducational institutions.

Other feminists and educational reformers felt that the problem was broader than the choice between single-sex and coeducational institutions, especially if both had similar curricula, as had been true historically. These critics sought to establish alternative forms of schooling to meet the needs of students with different backgrounds and interests although, as Lisa Loutzenheiser points out in "Alternative Schools," many of the more innovative and open schools that emerged during the 1960s and 1970s were short-lived, and most alternative schools today are aimed at "at-risk" students. Nevertheless, they do broaden the scope of educational opportunities, thereby making formal education possible for students who are disaffected from conventional secondary schools. At the level of higher education, a successful new form of institution that emerged in 1968 and has been proliferating since then consists of the “Tribal Colleges and Universities” described by Wayne Stein who tells us that American Indian women have played an important role in their founding and governance. Also, all of the tribal colleges and universities are coeducational, as are all but three of the “Historically Black Colleges and Universities” described by Marybeth Gasman.

The decisions to make tribally controlled colleges and universities coeducational, rather than single sex, are hardly surprising since coeducation has been the dominant form of education in the United State for so many years. Yet, it does not seem likely that single-sex educational institutions will disappear soon, if at all. In “Private Single-Sex and Coeducational Schools,” Carole Shmurak documents the viability of single-sex private schools in the United States and other countries. In “Public Single-Sex and Coeducational Schools,” we learn that the U.S. Department of Education has recently reversed its earlier position against single-sex schooling by interpreting the No Child Left Behind Act, passed in 2001, as a law that allows school districts considerable flexibility in experimenting with single-sex education. As a result, public single-sex schools and classrooms are on the increase in the United States. As Rosemary Salomone points out, however, their legal status is not entirely clear given the Supreme Court’s “separate is not equal” decision in 1954 and their more recent decision in 1996 against the all-male admissions policy at the state-supported Virginia Military Institute (VMI). As its name implies, however, VMI belongs to the specialized group of institutions described in “Military Colleges and Academies”; so, it is not entirely clear whether the Court’s decision about VMI will be applied to all single-sex public institutions.

Outside of the United States, single-sex schools continue to receive government funding and strong support. As Alex Wiseman documents in “National School Systems,” they are the only form of public (or private) education available, especially beyond the primary level, in quite a few countries. When secondary education is both separate by gender and not legally required, girls tend to complete fewer years of education than boys. In addition, single-sex schools may, as Wiseman fears, have curricula that are designed to be “gender appropriate” with the result that they are male-dominated and disadvantage girls. Of course, as noted above and in most of the essays in this and the following sections, coeducation alone does not ensure that girls and boys will have the same educational experiences. Equal access to the same educational institution is no guarantee that girls and boys will have equal opportunities within that institution, will be treated equally while attending, or will have equally good educational outcomes.

See also “Teacher Education” and “Vocational Education” in Part IV; “Academic Majors,” “Curricular Tracking,” and “Graduate and Professional Education” in Part V; and “School Choice and Gender Equity” in Part X.

Alternative Schools

Alternative programs emanate from early tensions about teaching all (White) students in the public or common school system of the United States. In part, the common schools were built on idealistic hope for an education for all youth in a single system. This was juxtaposed with a need for educating those in need of "nonacademic" training. The tensions of teaching for learning as a goal in itself, or providing an educational placement for those unwilling or unable to learn in a traditional program, permeate the history and current incarnations of alternative education in North America and elsewhere.

The 1960s and 1970s were considered the halcyon days for alternative education because schools emerged out of the social movements involving race, class, and feminism. Open schools, community schools, and pedagogically innovative smaller schools were encouraged and supported. Alternative schools for students considered "at-risk" also regained strength during this period. However, the "back to basics" movement, and related concerns about the achievement of U.S. children in the 1980s, caused many innovative community and open schools to close. In large part, schools for unsuccessful youth remained. Even the very best of alternative schools are not without their critics who are concerned about the stigma attached to youth who attend alternative programs and the reinforcement and reproduction of gender, racial, and class inequities and dominant norms.

Girls in society and in schools, in particular, are caught in twin contemporary media creations, one of which trumpets the rise of "girl power" while the other creates a panic about the "bad" or deviant girl who acts more like a boy than a girl. Both male and female students who deviate from traditional femininity or masculinity are more likely to struggle in a traditional high school. Overall, alternative placements serve a number of purposes and goals, some of which are contradictory. However, it is within the tensions and contradictions that schools that serve students across differences are able to emerge.

HISTORY OF ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

From the first days of the public school systems in North America, educators began voicing concerns about children who were "different." As early as 1908, schools were developed for "blind, deaf, or delinquent" children coinciding with a growing desire to separate out students who did not fit the mainstream. Continuation schools (the precursors to alternative schools), or vocational schools as they were sometimes known, developed in reaction to societal and economic changes brought on by immigration, the end of the apprenticeship system, and the imposition of compulsory education laws and the resulting growth in the numbers of youth attending school.

With the increase in the numbers of school hours for 14 to 17 year olds, cities, in particular, began to need a placement for students who did not fit the mainstream but were required by law to attend school. The more academically inclined (and, one can assume, heavily merchant class) students enrolled in the "regular," common school programs and the working-class youth at continuation or vocational schools. The community, educators, and industry supported compulsory education and alternative programs because these programs forced, or at least gave the appearance of compelling, youth, who were often immigrant and no longer encumbered by the apprentice system, off the streets. The compulsory education laws were also positive for industry because they not only kept more youth out of the labor market, thereby retaining more jobs for adults, but also helped train the next generation of workers.

Although both males and females attended continuation schools, some historians have suggested that these early alternative programs also developed in reaction to the lack of educational success for males, in particular those who attended common schools. This is the first incarnation of what has historically been called the "boy problem." Not unlike the panic about the scholastic achievement of boys today, there was a growing concern at the turn of the twentieth century that males, especially those from immigrant or working-class backgrounds who achieved less success, were more likely to leave school in larger numbers and sooner than girls. As such, early alternative schools were an attempt to make schooling "work better" for boys and, some would argue, were used to control the behavior of boys. These were programs developed in response to the growing numbers of youth whose labor was unbound and whose self-discipline was suspect. This suspicion was incorporated into some of the very purposes of the school, such as the necessity of teaching obedience and diligence, which reflected a legislative assumption that the working classes could not instill these values into their own children.

The historical and developmental trajectory of alternative education reflected the sticky questions embedded within conversations about the purposes of education. As noted above, there was a strong movement toward an industrial model of education that encouraged the training of competent workers (and perhaps citizens) and allowed business leaders to direct the socialization process of a nation's children. Whether programs were called alternative, continuation, or vocational, the purposes of education for the majority of the alternative schools during the period before the 1960s were primarily focused on control and education of those who did not fit into the more traditional programs. The need for these programs increased again after World War II, as war veterans, many of whom had not graduated from high school, returned to obtain job training by finishing school.

Beginning with John Dewey and his Laboratory School faculty (1896–1903), educators also were developing theories that deliberately ran counter to the growing uniformity of the public school curriculum and were directed toward fostering child-centered learning and stimulation of the mind as an advantageous end goal. Contemporary (post-1965) alternative school programs often emulate the purposes and tensions evident within the disparate approaches to alternative schooling that emerged more than a century ago.

CONTEMPORARY ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

The social upheaval of the 1960s and 1970s gave rise to a wide variety of private and public alternative schools in an era that has been called the zenith of alternative education. During this period, researchers and educators wrote a great deal about the promise of alternative schools as an avenue to closing achievement gaps, inviting in alternative points of view, and establishing community control over curriculum and learning. Private, community-run Freedom Schools, situated largely in African American and Latino communities, were one type of program to emerge. These programs often developed as a reaction to an oppressive school system. While innovative in relation to pedagogical practice, many Freedom Schools languished when charismatic leaders left or community funding dried up. And, due to the focus on race, issues of gender were largely ignored.

There were also Free Schools or Open Schools that took Deweyian principles as their focus and centered on student-directed and individual learning. Students often chose what to do, when to learn, and how to learn without restrictions and often without formal learning. Many of those who taught in Open Schools were progressive and/or feminist educators or parents. As a result, egalitarian principles and attempts at gender neutrality were central to a number, but certainly not all, of the schools.

As social movements increasingly put pressure on school districts to try new pedagogies and be more open to change, the public school system also became a site of alternative programs based upon progressive ideals. The public school system supported open school movements in largely White and middle-class districts, as well as smaller schools and publicly funded community schools. A range of alternative programs were born and encouraged or tolerated during this period, including smaller schools, ethnic or multicultural schools, nonpunitive schools for teenage parents, mini-schools, et cetera. Concurrently, districts continued to build and retain continuation schools. However, these programs were designed and implemented for youth who were in conflict with the school, the law, or the community.

In the 1980s, the goals and purposes of schooling began to narrow as the political climate changed. While there was still a desire to close the ongoing achievement gap between White and East Asian students, on the one hand, and African American, First nations/Native American, Latino, and refugee students, on the other, there was also a harkening back to the industrial model through a “Back to Basics” movement that required all students to be taught in the same manner. Alternative education became less focused on community and collective decision making and, some have suggested, more centered on regulation and control, with the removal of disruptive influences or those who could not function within a standardized environment.

While some alternative programs with an open school or democratic school model survived, many of the alternative programs were developed for students who were labeled “at-risk,” a problematic label in and of itself as it presupposes that the problem is based in the individual. Those students classified “at-risk” included youth who dropped out of school, as well as those who were disruptive, depressed, underachieving, habitually truant, or alienated from the system but not overtly failing or having behavioral issues. Mary Raywid (1994), one of the first and most influential researchers on contemporary alternative programs, describes three types of alternative schools.

Type I programs are often schools of choice. Generally, students are not forced into the programs. The schools are truly voluntary and seek to make education challenging and to match the student to a program that fits her or him. Here there is an assumption that the problem is the mismatch between student and school and that a different match can be found with positive results for the student. Some Type I programs are charter programs or magnet schools, but there are also some Type I programs for students who fall outside the system or are perceived to be in danger of failing. Type I schools have the flexibility to take departures from traditional pedagogy and curricula in order to best meet the needs of students.

Type II schools have been called *last chance programs.* Students are enrolled in Type II schools as an alternative to expulsion or as a trial to keep them from dropping out altogether. These schools are often considered to be warehousing programs that do little to advance students academically or socially. The focus is on behavior modification rather than educational innovation.

The third type of program or school is geared toward those students in need of academic, social, and/or emotional remediation or rehabilitation. Unlike Type II schools where students are placed indefinitely, in Type III schools there is some assumption that if the individual student "sees the light" or is able to turn it around academically or behaviorally, she or he will be able to return to the traditional programs. Often girls who are pregnant are placed in Type III schools to learn how to be a good parent and then are allowed to return to the traditional program after the child is born. Type II and III schools assume that the educational dysfunction is the student's rather than the system's. Therefore, they focus on fixing the student.

Soon after Raywid conceptualized this typology, Lange (1998) added a Type IV school, which was a hybrid of Types I and III combining choice, innovation, and a remediation program that concentrated less on warehousing the students and was more committed to educational success. Loutzenheiser (2002) found that alternative schools are most often hybrid constructions of the three types that vary often as school faculty, leadership, and student population fluctuate and support for the goals of change in relation to the school district ebbs and flows. When considered in light of the early history of alternative schools and the tensions between schooling for assimilation and work skills versus learning-centered education, it is clear that Type I schools emanate from Dewey's Laboratory School, while Type II and most Type III schools are geared toward the remediation of the individual. As a hybrid, Type IV schools combine both purposes of education.

As is now clear, those schools and programs that carry the label of alternative have many different definitions and purposes. However, researchers find that *successful* alternative schools and programs of all types have common characteristics including clearly defined goals for enrollment and evaluation, implementation strategies, autonomy within the school district, student-centered learning, flexible curriculum and pedagogy, small size, caring staff with high expectations, and an integration of research and practice.

CRITIQUES AND CONCERNS ABOUT ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION

There are a number of different viewpoints on the strengths and weaknesses of alternative programs. Some critics of alternative education argue that contemporary alternative schools, like their earlier incarnations, are a response to public worries about "at-risk" or problematic youth. Among other things, these worries have produced a concerted movement to use some alternative programs, particularly Type I schools, as "dumping grounds" for the problem students from the regular schools.

Many scholars and policy makers have argued that alternative schools are designed as a means to keep "troubled youth" away from traditional school campuses. According to proponents of this isolation, if difficult students are excluded from traditional campuses, they are less likely to contaminate the more successful or borderline youth. In this scenario, school districts are more concerned with protecting and educating the "good students" than their less traditional peers. Instead of being concerned with how to reach and educate the less connected and less successful students, school districts focus on ways to advance the education of those students who remain connected in more traditional ways.

One example of the removal of students to alternative programs is pregnant teens who are often asked, or strongly encouraged, to voluntarily attend programs for teenage mothers or to switch to an alternative school. Some administrators state that the presence of pregnant girls or day-care sites on a traditional campus gives the impression that the school and/or community condone teenage pregnancy and adolescent sexuality. Often, teenage mothers-to-be are assured of their return to the traditional program after the birth of their child; but, upon requesting the return, many find that roadblocks are put in their way. They may be told, for example, that they are out of sync with the scheduling of the traditional program or that it would be impossible for them to follow that program because of the lack of day care in the traditional school.

An additional concern about alternative schools is that they function as a rudimentary form of academic tracking where those lowest in the hierarchy, in this case students in continuation schools, are stigmatized as misfits. Some researchers have argued that if the alternative school is perceived as second rate, which is how most are perceived no matter how innovative, the exclusion of students from the traditional program communicates a message to students that they are also second rate. In this critique, alternative programs are efforts at reform where the potential for change in academic achievement is illusionary.

A somewhat different concern is expressed by those who argue that alternative schools have many benefits for their own students but may undermine efforts to reform traditional schools. Because many alternative schools function independently of traditional restrictions, they may succeed in furthering the educational and social goals for their students; however, by their very existence, the racial, sexual, gender, and class normativities and the traditional pedagogies and curriculum of traditional schools and programs remain unquestioned and unaltered. For example, alternative programs have been found to have higher enrollments of students who identify as gay, lesbian, and transgendered. The need for supportive placements for queer youth is undeniable, and the placement becomes a "safety net" for students. However, the alternative program also becomes a safety valve for the school districts and their traditional schools and programs because they do not learn to alter their pedagogies and curricula to be less gender biased or heteronormative.

It is important to note that safety net/safety valve are not binary opposites and can and do exist side by side in most continuation schools. Kelly (1993), however, concludes that any "safety net" benefits are overridden by a tracking-like stigmatization and (from her perspective) lowered academic standards. Kelly also contends that her study supports notions that schools reproduce class and gender role structures and that, in particular, alternative schools relegate girls to working-class and sex-segregated jobs. Although it is undeniable that most schools reproduce the societal status quo, and alternatives fall prey to the same pressures of conformity that the traditional programs confront, it is also undeniable that the possibility of change and difference exists more readily in alternative programs.

Even though, or perhaps because, alternative programs are frequently viewed negatively, there often is within those programs an identity forged by staff and students based upon being "Other," or different from the norm. Unlike the difference they felt at the larger, more traditional schools, this difference tends to be prized. Part of the success of some alternative programs lies in this identity. A sense of community can be achieved as an outgrowth of this marginalized status. In one program studied by Loutzenheiser (2002), students simultaneously accepted and rejected the label of Other. While in some alternative programs, students stated a desire to demonstrate that they could succeed in education without giving up many of the nonconforming behaviors that they felt had been made unacceptable at the traditional, comprehensive schools.

GIRL POWER AND THE BOY PROBLEM

In recent years, both media and academics in the United Kingdom and North America have documented the rise of "girl power" by which they mean an increase in confidence, control, and capacity to effect change in their own lives among young women. Paralleling claims about this rise has been a somewhat contradictory concern about girls who do not fit the girl power model and, therefore, become increasingly deviant. Not surprisingly, the intersectional matrixes of gender norms, class, race, sexuality, and ability have an impact on which girls fall inside and outside the "girl power" image. On the outside, popular culture in England trumpets concerns about *ladettes,* that is, girls who are perceived as loutish, binge drinkers and are likely to behave in a manner that is antithetical to traditional femininity. In the United States, the media speak of "girls gone wild," the increase of girls in gangs who are dropping out of school and interacting with the juvenile justice system. Interestingly, the statistics do not bear out the representations. This is not to say that all girls fit the almost mystical ever-confident girl power model but that the numbers of young women who fit any negative or deviant definition has remained little changed over the past few decades.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Justice, in 2004, the rise in female prison inmates (juvenile and adult) was less than 1 percent from the previous decade. Similarly, the high school drop-out rate is declining for both males and females. In fact, the U.S. Census Bureau reports that 25 years ago, girls were more likely to drop out of school than boys. Today, fewer girls drop out than 25 years ago. Therefore, one can argue that the concerns over girls' behavior may have more to do with trepidation about alteration of societal norms than it does with evidence of deviance or criminality. However, the competing pressures and tensions surrounding the two constructions of "girl as powerful" and "girl as deviant" play out in the schools and on young women who attend schools. As repeatedly noted, most studies about alternative schools or educational programs conclude that youth enrolled are often those who diverge from the norms of the school district. These norms vary and may center on "giftedness," actions perceived as oppositional behaviors, mental health, style of learning, race, poverty, gender performance, sexuality, failing grades, or contact with the social welfare or juvenile justice system.

The rise of the girl power movement can encourage girls to question the structures of the school, which in turn can be perceived as oppositional behavior (laddish) if unsupported by teachers or administration. Similarly, there are tensions between the perception of girls' increased strength and the societal backlash that often results. If the student who is questioning or pushing the limits of perceived femininity at the school is already in a nondominant position in relation to the school norms, the likelihood of that student being disciplined, silenced, or pushed out of the school increases accordingly. Kelly (1993) suggests that alternative programs have worked with the same students throughout their history—those drop-outs, push-outs, and the social misfits who threaten the social order. Those pushed out often are placed or choose placement in alternative programs.

Further complicating the conversation about gender and alternative schooling are recent debates about underachievement in schools (but not necessarily deviance), which focus almost entirely on boys. According to contemporary understandings of the "boy problem," the culture of masculinity is represented by a "laddishness." Laddishness in relation to school means that boys underachieve because of the cultural demands for a form of hypermasculinity that precludes academic achievement and scholarly success. Schooling is constructed as feminine, and, therefore, succeeding in school means that a boy is "girl-like" or lacking in masculinity.

In this argument, boys and men are at the mercy of a cultural or peer-group system that requires a form of masculinity that is detrimental to the kinds of learning emphasized in school curricula. It becomes the schools' responsibility to support the masculinity of male students by making schools and education more attuned to boyishness. This argument relies upon a very essentialized notion of boys and girls in which masculinity and femininity have a single acceptable articulation and performance. Girls and boys exhibit gender in a variety of ways that correspond and deviate from normative gender representations. Also, within this matrix, the underachievement and, I would argue, disconnection of girls from traditional schools are ignored or, at the very least, left unnoticed.

In the early 1990s, Kelly argued that girls tend to slip in and out of the educational system more quietly than boys. She noted that girls were more likely to stay home or spend time with older boyfriends and boys were more likely to be engaged in what are considered delinquent acts. I would suggest that this is less true at the present time. While girls in more recent studies still report staying home to spend time with boyfriends, they are equally likely to be out in public with other young men and women when not attending school.

Recent studies suggest that a number of the reasons for students being pushed out of or avoiding school, such as teen parenting, responsibilities at home, and untreated depression, are most often in the purview of female students. Although both male and female students report that they feel a disconnection from school, in part through a disconnection with teachers, young women and gender nonconforming students often experience this relationship disconnect in ways different from many young men. Often both groups are sent to or "voluntarily" attend alternative programs due to a variety of disciplinary issues, but young women remain more likely to move to alternative programs because of truancy and school avoidance than young men. However, one must be careful not to paint young women as passive and young men as active resistors within the educational system. Not only is school avoidance a type of resistance, but many young women also engage in behaviors that are labeled behavioral, and many young men avoid school. Yet, it is important to note that school officials are more likely to read girls as passive and boys as active resistors. Exceptions to this reading are males and females who do not conform to traditional gender roles and performances. That is, female students who are read as tough or masculine are more often viewed as confrontational and disciplinary problems, while males who do not conform to high school notions of dominant masculinity are often painted as passive and weak.

Alternative programs that are more likely to meet the needs of students already disconnected from the educational system are often those that are most accepting of difference along myriad, interrelated constructions. These are schools and programs that have a faculty who are able to be flexible and alter pedagogy and curriculum to match the learning needs and backgrounds of students. In the case of issues of gender, it means school districts that recognize the importance of alternative programs that design curriculum and pedagogy with nonstandard notions of how gender and sexuality are constructed. In schools that entertain such notions, experienced faculty and staff are hired, program development is encouraged and supported, leadership is stable, and the learning goals held by faculty for students are expected to be high. Perhaps above all else, staff, faculty, and students, within the context of each subject area, must encourage the possibility of discussion of issues perceived as difficult. The development of said curricula and pedagogies are acknowledged to be integral to the overall mission of the school and, therefore, are integrated into the overall goals rather than being an add-on or happenstance. Larger, traditional schools do not, and perhaps cannot, have this type of small size, flexibility, and staffing. However, alternative schools that interrogate normative notions of gender, race, sexuality, class, ability, and their intersections as part of schooling across subjects have much to teach the larger schools, while also offering essential placement for youth who otherwise would remain disconnected from education.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Kelly, D.M. (1993). *Last chance high: How girls and boys drop in and out of alternative schools.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lange, C.M. (1998). Characteristics of alternative schools and programs serving at-risk students. *High School Journal, 81*(4), 183–198.

Loutzenheiser, L.W. (2002). Bein' seen and heard: Listening to young women in alternative schools. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 33*(4), 1–24.

Raywid, M.A. (1994). Alternative schools: The state of the art. *Educational Leadership, 52*(1), 26–31.

Lisa W. Loutzenheiser

Coeducational Colleges and Universities

Coeducation refers to the education of males and females at the same institution. The founding of Oberlin College in 1833 is generally recognized as the beginning of coeducational higher education in the United States, although it was not until 1841 that Oberlin granted to women the first college degrees equal to those granted to men. Prior to this time, men and women received their higher education at single-sex institutions, with male-only institutions greatly outnumbering those available to women. Some new small colleges, especially in the Midwest, quickly followed Oberlin's lead, as did the University of Iowa, which has continuously admitted women, as well as men, since its opening in 1855. However, coeducation was not adopted by already existing institutions until the Civil War when their shortage of students prompted some all-male institutions to admit women for the first time in their histories. Some of these institutions reverted back to male-only policies after the war was over, but there were economic, ideological, and political developments in the following 150 years that fostered both the trend toward coeducation in newly founded colleges and universities and the trend toward giving women access to what had formerly been male-only institutions. Chief among these were the larger enrollments and reduced costs that resulted from educating women in the same institutions as men; the struggles of feminist movements for gender equity; and the legal framework governing higher education in the United States.

Coeducation was not unopposed, however. From the early 1800s onward, controversy raged about what form of higher education, if any, was necessary or suitable for women. The exact content of these debates varied across place and time, but it is possible to identify three major themes that characterized most of the opposition to coeducation. These themes concerned women's access to higher education, women's place within coeducational institutions (once they gained access), and women's treatment within coeducational institutions—especially in contrast to the treatment of men. Opposition to women's access ranged from nineteenth-century arguments against allowing women to receive any form of higher education to subsequent attempts to bar them from specific institutions. Efforts to confine women to "appropriate" places within coeducational institutions began at the turn of the twentieth century and continued until the 1970s when concerns shifted to the ways in which women were being treated in those institutions. Although those who expressed these critical concerns have not stopped the trend toward coeducation, they have made it clear that gaining equal access to institutions of higher education and to all of their programs does not ensure that women and men are receiving equally good educations.

CONDITIONS FOSTERING COEDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Prior to the Civil War, most institutions of higher education were small, poor, and short-lived. Only two state universities—South Carolina and Virginia—received regular state appropriations. Their student bodies consisted of the sons of the planter aristocracy, rather than a cross section of young men from various social classes. In those two states, as in others, students from more humble backgrounds were more likely to attend denominational colleges established by a large variety of religious groups. These colleges proliferated from the 1850s into the 1890s, with many of them being established by missionaries along the ever-moving American frontier and, after the Civil War, in the South among former slave populations.

Because their goal was to provide higher education for all of their church members and converts, religious denominations often tried to provide education for both men and women. In older, more populated, and wealthier parts of the United States, this effort sometimes took the form of establishing separate institutions for men and, usually later, for women, but in the Midwest and West, and among ex-slaves in the South, denominational colleges were more likely to be coeducational and to have multipurpose curricula, including teacher training, that appealed to women as well as men. Coeducation was no guarantee, however, that denominational or even state institutions would be successful. Nevertheless, the growing demand for schoolteachers during and after the Civil War and the growing willingness of school officials to hire women for these jobs created a need for women's higher education that could not be met only by women's colleges which, already by 1870, were greatly outnumbered by coeducational institutions of higher education.

It would be a mistake to assume that the missionaries, religious groups, philanthropic donors, and state legislatures responsible for the proliferation of coeducational institutions were guided by ideologies that favored gender integration and equity. It is more likely that most of them held the traditional views of gender typical of their times and regarded coeducation as more of an economic necessity than a matter of justice. Even the strongest advocates for women's education often failed to embrace the political goals of the first-wave feminists who were active on behalf of women's rights, including suffrage, from the 1830s to the 1920s. While it is certainly true that these educational leaders championed women's rights to higher education, it is also true that they often accepted gender segregation and advocated more protective single-sex, rather than coeducational, colleges for women. To obtain support for their efforts to provide women with high-quality educations, these advocates for women's colleges often used traditional assumptions about gender differences such as the notion that women were naturally more pious, gentle, and virtuous than men. When coupled with a solid education, they argued, women's essential goodness could have beneficial influence on sons, husbands, and other men and, through them, on social and political life.

Even those who advocated or wanted access to coeducation made use of arguments based on assumptions about the essential nature of women. The presence of women on campus, it was claimed, would have beneficial effects, including a softening influence, on male students. Because of their daily interactions with women in an educational environment, college men would exhibit better manners than those of the rowdy fraternity boys at some of the established male-only institutions. And under the tutelage of their women peers, college men would also increase their appreciation of the arts, music, and other refinements.

This tendency to defend higher education for women on the grounds that it would improve the lives of men continued into the second half of the twentieth century. When Mabel Newcomer published her history of women's higher education in 1959, she expressed the belief of her contemporaries—as well as that of earlier historical periods—when she wrote that neither the advocates nor the opponents of college education for women seriously questioned that homemaking is woman's most important role and went on to claim that attending college actually made women better wives, mothers, housekeepers, and community workers than noncollege women.

Newcomer's congratulatory stance regarding higher education for women came under attack in the 1960s and 1970s when second-wave feminism emerged as a popular and powerful social movement. Feminists argued that women should not be required to put mothering and other family duties ahead of all other roles, and they should not live their lives through their husbands and children. Echoing a demand made by first-wave feminists more than 100 years earlier, the second-wave feminists said that the time had come to admit women to the elite male universities (and to all other male-only institutions). Once that happened, women's colleges would have no further justification because they were nothing more than a consequence of gender segregation and traditionalism and they had failed in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to embrace, let alone lead, the fight for political and economic equality for women. Single-sex colleges also were charged with creating an artificial world that prevented women from working closely with men on serious endeavors and from competing with men academically. Although they were viewed as far from perfect alternatives, coeducational colleges and universities were considered to be more reflective of the "real world." They also became, in the decades leading into the twenty-first century, the sites of much feminist activity and many successes in the battle for equal rights and opportunities.

These successes and the earlier successes of those who promoted coeducation in the 1800s and early 1900s were greatly facilitated by the legal framework for higher education that evolved after the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862. That act affirmed the importance of public higher education by making public lands available to states to endow colleges. Even though the legislation did not specifically list the education of women as one of the goals that public colleges should meet, most parents assumed that Land Grant institutions should educate their daughters as well as their sons, and women gradually established their right to attend. After the funding for public higher education was improved under the second Morrill Act of 1890 and was extended to African Americans, these public institutions underwent considerable expansion and went on to become the largest coeducational institutions in the country.

Legal changes concerned specifically with gender and schooling did not appear at the U.S. federal level until the 1970s. Most important to the struggle for gender equity within public institutions has been Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 which provided that no person in the United States could, on the basis of sex, be subjected to discrimination in any education program or activity receiving financial assistance from the federal government. Despite many efforts by educational institutions to interpret "program or activity" as narrowly as possible, and despite some support for these narrow interpretations by the courts, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, passed over the veto of President Ronald Reagan, specified that Title IX applied to all the operations of a college or university, not only those programs or activities that directly received federal funds.

Another important legal milestone on the road to gender equity in higher education was the law passed in 1975 directing that women be admitted to America's military service academies in 1976 and thereafter. Also put into the service of coeducation was the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. constitution, which the Supreme Court used as the basis for its decision in 1996 that the Virginia Military Institute (VMI) had to admit women. That decision, in effect, made all U.S. public colleges and universities coeducational and brought to an end the right of any public college or university to bar all women (or all men) from institutional access.

By the time of the VMI decision, almost all private colleges and universities that had begun as male-only institutions had already become coeducational, with Columbia University, in 1983, being the last of the Ivy League colleges to admit women to its undergraduate programs. As was true of most other major men's universities in the United States, Columbia had begun admitting women to graduate work back in the 1890s, a move that was justified largely on the grounds of the prohibitive cost of trying to establish separate graduate programs for women and was legitimated by the even earlier admission of American women to successful graduate work in Swiss and German universities that served as models for graduate education in the United States.

OPPOSITION TO AND CRITICISM OF COEDUCATION

The traditional assumption about their destiny as homemakers that was used to justify women's higher education was also used to oppose that education. Of course, opponents did not stress the essential goodness of women and their gentle, civilizing influence on men and children. Instead, they argued that women had physical and mental limitations that would be stretched to the breaking point if they attempted to undertake a program of higher education similar to that pursued by men. One of the more influential expressions of this prejudice was contained in *Sex in Education* published in 1873 by Dr. Edward H. Clarke, an eminent professor in the Harvard Medical School who warned about horrible outcomes—such as hysteria, uterine disease, and derangements of the nervous system—that higher education posed to women's health and well-being. In his history of women's education, Thomas Woody (1929) said that such arguments should have been laid to rest in the 1840s by which time many women had shown that they could master difficult subjects without ill effects, but the assertions of women's essential inability to do rigorous college work, and the inappropriateness of their attempts to do so, lasted well into the twentieth century.

Particularly concerned with gender improprieties, sexual temptations, and moral development was the Roman Catholic Church, which strongly resisted, first, all higher education for women and, later, coeducation. No Catholic college in the United States admitted women until 1895 when the first Catholic women's college was established. Catholic colleges for men did not begin to admit women until the second decade of the twentieth century, and then only on a limited basis, mostly for teacher training. Even by 1940, women had been admitted to only 10 of the 74 Catholic colleges and universities that had begun as male-only institutions, although by that time an equivalent number of Catholic colleges for women had been established. Most analysts attribute the resistance to coeducation of the Catholic Church to its tradition of training priests and the religious in sex-segregated monasteries and convents as well as to strong ideological concerns about sexual morality. It seems likely, also, that the cost of maintaining sex-segregated educational institutions was greatly reduced as long as they could be staffed primarily by nuns and priests.

Assumptions about women's essential weaknesses were also used as reasons for barring them from military academies and colleges which, as noted above, did not become coeducational until fairly recently and then, usually, as a result of legislative or judicial coercion. Prior to becoming coeducational, these institutions viewed themselves as male preserves and as proving grounds for a particular kind of aggressive, competitive, and militaristic masculinity. Admitting women, it was believed, would threaten masculine claims to superiority and destroy the culture of the institutions.

Similar fears were expressed as part of the "reaction against coeducation" that occurred during the Progressive Era, from 1890 to 1920. The years leading into that era had seen large increases in the numbers of women students, as well as major changes in the nature of higher education. Enrollment figures for 13 state universities in the Midwest and West in 1907, presented by Charles Van Hise, president of the University of Wisconsin, showed that women outnumbered men at seven of these universities, sometimes by a sizable margin. Although men outnumbered women at the other six institutions, the average size of the differences was considerably smaller. Clearly, women had become a numerical force on coeducational campuses, and many educators felt that something had to be done about "this problem."

The "reaction against coeducation," despite its name, was not an attempt to bar women from higher educational institutions on grounds of their intellectual or physical inferiority. Instead, it was an attempt to limit women's power and presence by finding a place for them in coeducational institutions where they would not be a competitive threat to men. The rhetoric of "essential inferiority" of women was rejected in favor of a rhetoric of "essential difference" between the sexes. This rhetoric was central to several speeches given by the president of Harvard University, Charles W. Eliot, including one at the inauguration of Wellesley's new president in 1899, in which he suggested that higher education for women should be different from that of men because it was likely that women's intellects were as dissimilar from men's as were their bodies.

Although Eliot spoke at a time when no women were admitted to undergraduate degree programs at Harvard, President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago, which had been a coeducational institution since its opening in 1892, used similar rhetoric to justify the decision to segregate men and women students for the first two years of their undergraduate education. Segregation, Harper argued, would improve coeducation by helping each sex develop "manly" or "womanly" ideals. He thought it was a pedagogical and social mistake to assume that men and women should be trained to be just as nearly alike as possible. Several other coeducational universities followed the lead of Chicago, segregating some undergraduate courses, especially those in the liberal arts and sciences that were offered in multiple sections. Still other universities dealt with the "women problem" by establishing various kinds of quota systems. Stanford University, for example, set a quota in 1904 of one female for every three males admitted to undergraduate degree programs, a practice they continued until 1933.

A more insidious solution to the problem was advocated by Wisconsin's President Van Hise (1908) who suggested that the best form of segregation was the "natural segregation" that occurred because of choices "freely made" by the students. Colleges of engineering, law, business, agriculture, and medicine at Wisconsin and other universities were open to women, he noted, but few women had taken advantage of their offerings. As a result, they were essentially men's colleges. In contrast, the newly established colleges of home economics had a strong appeal for women (but not men) and could serve as a model of professional education for women. Natural segregation, said Van Hise, would occur on all college and university campuses if they would develop more professional courses that appealed to one sex but not the other.

In the following decades, President Van Hise's proposal was to achieve considerably more success than President Harper's. Not only were students increasingly tracked by gender but also superbly trained women scientists were kept out of departmental faculties in chemistry, biology, and psychology in colleges of liberal arts and sciences and encouraged, instead, to teach in or to head departments of nutrition or household science or child development in colleges of home economics. Other career programs "for women" that were established on university campuses during this era included social work, library science, and nursing. The establishment of colleges of education, independent of colleges of liberal arts, also contributed to gender segregation and changed the nature of teacher training.

The tracking of men and women into separate "places" in higher education continued throughout the twentieth century, especially in such predominately "female" fields as education, health sciences, home economics, and library science where the proportion of bachelor's degrees awarded by U.S. institutions to men has never risen above 25 percent and has remained fairly stable over recent decades. The proportion of engineering degrees awarded to undergraduate women was far below that level throughout the century, but that proportion increased dramatically from less than 1 percent in 1970 to 1971 to more than 20 percent by 2001 to 2002. In other fields that were historically male dominated, American women have narrowed the gender gap even more, substantially increasing their annual proportions of business baccalaureate degrees, graduate degrees at both the master's and doctoral levels, and professional degrees in law to the point that they have either equaled or surpassed American men.

Despite substantial gains for women in higher-educational achievements, it is not uncommon to hear claims that American women are still far from catching up with their male counterparts. Undoubtedly, some of these claims are due to the speed with which changes in enrollments and degree completions have been occurring; there seems to be a time lag between what women are achieving in institutions of higher education and reports of their accomplishments. Another reason for these claims about women lagging behind seems to be a misunderstanding of what it means when government documents, such as those made available by the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, announce gender differences in degrees earned. Take, for example, the document showing that women and men earned 47.7 and 52.3 percent, respectively, of the doctoral degrees awarded by U.S. institutions of higher education in the 2003 to 2004 academic year. Reports of these figures in the media and elsewhere often interpreted them to mean that American women still had some catching up to do. That interpretation ignored the fact that more than a quarter of the doctoral degrees included in these calculations were given to international students, or what the U.S. government calls nonresident aliens, who are much more likely to be men than women. If one really wants to know whether more *American* men than women are earning doctoral degrees, these nonresident aliens would have to be removed from the calculations. When this is done, it turns out that in 2003 to 2004, women had already surpassed men, with 53 percent of all doctoral degrees awarded to Americans by U.S. institutions going to women and 47 percent of those degrees going to men.

Although some of the examples used to support claims about American women's higher-educational disadvantages when compared to American men do not hold up under careful scrutiny, there is some good evidence that gender inequalities in the distribution of students across courses and major fields can still be found, and most of these inequalities favor men over women. The women's fields that men continue to avoid are generally lower paying, lower prestige fields than engineering where women still lag far behind, despite steady increases, and computer and informational sciences where increases in women's degree attainments up to the mid-1980s have since been reversed. Even when women do enter very high paying "men's fields," such as medicine, they tend to pick specialties that pay less than those chosen by their male counterparts.

Such differences have been disappointing to those who thought that once women gained equal access to the best educational institutions and degree programs available to men, their educational choices and attainments would also equal those of men. Some of the explanations offered for why this has not happened focus on the unequal treatment of men and women in coeducational institutions. One kind of unequal treatment has been called "the chilly climate for women" (Hall & Sandler, 1982), a phrase that refers to the many ways in which male students demand and receive more attention than female students. Classroom observers have reported that professors take the comments of their male students more seriously, allow them to monopolize class discussions, make more eye contact with them than with women students, and are even more likely to remember their names. As a result, women are more likely to sit silently. When they do answer questions or make comments, they are far more likely than their male peers to do so in a soft voice or a hesitant manner, each of which makes it more likely that their ideas will be ignored or trivialized. While the "chilly classroom climate" has been accused by some researchers of silently robbing women of knowledge and self-esteem, it seems likely that it may be those women who already lack high levels of self-confidence and assertiveness who are deterred by the "chilly climate" from pursuing male-dominated fields of study in favor of retreats to traditional women's fields where they feel less "chilled."

Another drawback of coeducational institutions that has been found to interfere with the performance of women students is sexual harassment. Because the definition of sexual harassment includes a hostile environment, there is some overlap between harassment and the "chilly climate" for women. In addition to an intimidating environment, however, sexual harassment includes outright assaults, both verbal and physical. Many of these attacks come from male students, sometimes in the form of date rape or gang rape, but faculty have also been found guilty of soliciting sexual favors from their students in return for good grades or other academic favors. Like the assaults and rapes, most of these solicitations come from men and are directed at women. Although most colleges and universities enacted policies against sexual harassment in recent decades, most campus surveys support the conclusion that harassment of women students by male faculty is still occurring, albeit somewhat less blatantly than in the past, and harassment of women students by male peers continues to be widespread. Many women are too embarrassed, humiliated, intimidated, and afraid to report harassment, preferring instead to simply remove themselves from contact with the harasser even if this means dropping certain classes or avoiding certain campus activities that might have facilitated their academic success and future careers.

Although research has not appeared indicating the extent to which efforts to escape sexual harassment drive women out of "masculine" fields of study into traditionally women's fields, a mountain of evidence supports the conclusion that these women's fields have proportionately more women faculty, as well as students, than the traditional men's fields.

The lack of women faculty has often been cited as one of the reasons why women do not feel as if they belong or are welcome at certain institutions or in certain fields of study. Although the assertion seems to be based more on faith than on evidence, women's aspirations and achievements are predicted to be higher if they attend colleges or universities that provide them with successful female faculty who can serve as role models and mentors. This argument has been particularly common among advocates of women's colleges who point out, correctly, that those colleges have proportionately more women faculty and administrators than similar coeducational colleges and universities.

The gender of faculty may be less important than the kinds of expectations they have for their students and whether those expectations depend on the gender of their students. The same could be said about campus administrators and their expectations for their faculty members and students. Echoing President Eliot's speech in 1899, Lawrence Summers, the 27th president of Harvard University, opined in a speech given in January 2005 that essential, innate differences between women and men might be one reason why fewer women than men have successful careers in science and mathematics. Undermining subsequent claims by Summers's defenders that this opinion was just his way of stimulating discussion were the facts that the percentage of women offered tenured faculty positions at Harvard had declined every year since 2001, when Summers assumed the presidency, and that in the 2003 to 2004 academic year preceding his talk, only 4 of 34 tenured job offers for Harvard positions went to women. Not only did Summers endorse some of the same beliefs about gender differences that had kept women out of Harvard for more than 300 years following its founding in 1636, but his remarks and the hiring practices of the institution he headed also served as reminders that it would be wrong to assume that the admission of women to Harvard's student body and to its faculty should be interpreted to mean that women were truly the equals of men. At Harvard and throughout U.S. higher education, the fight for access and coeducation has been won, but the goal of gender equity has not yet been reached.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Gordon, L.D. (1990). *Gender and higher education in the progressive era.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hall, R.M., & Sandler, B.R. (1982). *The classroom climate: A chilly one for women?* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Miller-Bernal, L., & Poulson, S.L. (Eds.). (2004). *Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950–2000.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Newcomer, M. (1959). *A century of higher education for American women.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Solomon, B.M. (1985). *In the company of educated women.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Van Hise, C.R. (1908). Educational tendencies in state universities. *Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae Magazine, Series III*(17), 31–44.

Woody, T. (1929). *A history of women's education in the United States (Vol. II).* New York: Science Press.

Barbara J. Bank

Community Colleges

Community colleges have long served as the initial step in baccalaureate attainment for many women and minorities. They have also been considered diverting institutions that channel lower-income students, especially minorities and often women, into occupational programs rather than into transfer programs that lead to the baccalaureate or into four-year colleges and universities. At the faculty and administrative levels, there is a higher percentage of women faculty and women presidents than in any other institutional type. While their presence could be regarded as signaling institutional receptiveness to women faculty and leaders, some have interpreted their presence as a marginalization of women faculty and presidents. That is, they are consigned to teach and lead in the lowest tier institution in higher education.

Is the community college a ghetto for students, including women, from the lowest socioeconomic status (SES) quintiles and for women faculty and even women presidents or is it a paragon of opportunity? Because they offer education “higher” than secondary schools but “lower” than baccalaureate-granting institutions, community colleges are sometimes considered to be on the margins of higher education. These institutions are also considered marginal because they enroll a high percentage of students from low socioeconomic and weak academic backgrounds. Many of these students are women and minorities. Community college faculty are also considered marginal within the professorate because they work with many academically marginal students, do not teach upper-division courses, are not required to do research, and rarely have the doctorate (around 20 percent hold the doctorate, often obtained after starting to teach at the community college). The presidency of a community college could also be viewed as a less impressive accomplishment for women (and men) because of some people’s negative perceptions of the institution.

Such an interpretation ignores how community colleges have provided millions of women and minority students with the opportunity for higher education and consequent economic advancement. While it is true that community colleges, like all institutions, are gendered institutions whose practices have not always served and do not currently serve women as well as they could and should be served, it is also true that community colleges have, in their own way, enabled many women students and faculty and staff to achieve their goals. Largely due to the influence of women faculty and staff and as part of their orientation to the needs of their immediate community, community colleges have developed programs for particular groups of women students, such as adult women students and those needing child care. These institutional efforts have facilitated educational attainment for many individuals. Additionally, community colleges in general are known for their supportive, student-oriented environment designed to help students unsure of their abilities and often needing academic remediation. This kind of environment helps all students, including women and minorities.

Short of the country's economic structure being upended and its educational structure being radically changed, community colleges will continue to provide access to higher education, including baccalaureate attainment for millions of women students, a positive employment venue for many women faculty, and frequent leadership opportunities for women aspiring to be institutional presidents.

WHAT ARE COMMUNITY COLLEGES?

Positioned between high schools and four-year colleges and universities, community colleges are public two-year institutions whose highest degree offering has been the associate degree. As of fall 2001, more than 1,100 community colleges in the United States enrolled almost 6,000,000 credit-bearing students and over 5,000,000 noncredit students.

Community colleges have a comprehensive offering of programs, meaning they offer certificate and degree programs in occupational fields as well as the Associate of Arts or A.A. degree. As the first two years of a baccalaureate degree, the A.A. is termed the academic or "transfer" degree. It is this degree program that links community colleges to higher education since participation in it has historically been a step toward enrollment in a four-year college or university. Community colleges' other associate degrees are typically designed to lead to immediate employment upon degree receipt.

Female students have received the majority of associate degrees for the past few decades. Women students are more apt to be in the transfer degree program than are men students, and minority students are less apt to be in these programs than in occupational programs.

The curriculum of these institutions, like that of four-year colleges, is still dominated by gender-identified fields of study. For example, women are the majority of students in nursing and education programs, while men dominate enrollments in automotive mechanics and electronics. Also, women are more likely to be in the lower-status vocational programs such as child development and clerical and office support, whereas men are more likely to enroll in higher status fields such as criminal justice, information systems technology, and industrial technology.

According to recent research from the Community College Research Center at Teachers College, Columbia, women who do not earn an occupational credential such as a certificate or degree receive less benefit economically from their coursework than do men students. In other words, earning an occupational community college credential advantages women economically more than men, although it is not clear why. This situation is particularly true for female students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. There is some evidence that male community college students in occupational programs come from lower socioeconomic and weaker academic backgrounds than do female students.

GENDER COMPOSITION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

If judged by numbers alone, community colleges would seem to be receptive to, even embracing of, women. Like all of higher education, women students have dominated enrollments for almost three decades. In 2001, over 57 percent of community college students were female, according to U.S. Department of Education data. Many of the women (and men) who attend community colleges are “nontraditional” students, meaning they do not enroll immediately after high school graduation and attend full time. Rather, community college students are often older (currently the average age of first-time college goers at the community college is 24), have family responsibilities, attend part time, and work full time. Additionally, a large percentage of community college students are minorities. In fact, community colleges have a greater percentage of minority students than do four-year colleges.

Sensitive to the needs of their students, many of whom are working adults with children, community colleges have been higher education leaders in offering extended hours of operation, courses at locations other than the main campus, and courses throughout the day and evening, as well as on weekends. The availability of classes and services, combined with the low tuition, has meant that many women could afford to attend college, both financially and time wise. Additionally, community colleges have offered noncredit programs, often funded by federal programs, whose audience is primarily women, such as welfare-to-work and job training programs.

Women students who attend community colleges have many role models among community college faculty and administrators. In 2004, women faculty constituted 50 percent of the faculty at public two-year schools, according to American Association of University Professors (AAUP) data; around 40 percent of department chairs, according to a 1998 study by Miller and Creswell; and 27 percent of community college presidents in 2000, according to American Council on Education data. These percentages far exceed those in four-year institutions, where there are fewer women faculty, department chairs, and presidents, particularly at the university level. However, minority females still lack many minority role models, female or male. Only around 15 percent of community college faculty and approximately 20 percent of community college presidents are from racial and ethnic minority groups. Given the major retirements of faculty and administrators that are currently occurring and will occur over the next few years, there is even more opportunity for women, including minority women, to be hired as faculty and senior-level administrators.

The presence of women staff is also strong numerically in community colleges. Numerically, there is almost parity between female and male executive/administrative/managerial staff. As regards nonprofessional staff, women were 63 percent in fall 2001, according to NCES. However, these staff positions reflected the gendered nature of work: Women held 93 percent of the clerical and secretarial positions, while men held 91 percent of the skilled crafts and 74 percent of the service/maintenance positions.

A major reason for the large number of women among community college students and faculty is that the institution’s historical development has been conducive to admitting female students and hiring female workers. The two-year college was initially promoted at the beginning of the twentieth century partly to divert students from universities that preferred to focus on upper-division coursework and faculty research. Various university presidents such as William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago believed that the junior college, as it was initially called, could provide the general education generally offered in the first two years of college. It was thought that many students completing this junior college course of study would be satisfied and no longer pursue higher education, while the more academically talented and dedicated would transfer to four-year colleges and universities. Both public and private two-year colleges were created, with the public ones frequently developing as the 13th and 14th years of high school. With its roots in coeducational high schools, the public two-year college (then called a junior college) initially was a no or low cost education open to both female and male students desirous of inexpensive postsecondary education but perhaps unwilling to leave home to seek it. Many women students fit this profile, partly because families were more likely to invest in the education of sons than daughters and to be concerned about their daughters leaving home to go away to study. Thus, from the very beginning of public two-year colleges, women students were accepted, if not welcome.

Women students, like men students, chose to use these institutions for their own ends. While institutional leaders developed gender-based terminal curricula such as home economics and secretarial programs for women students, many women chose to enroll in the transfer program so that they could pursue the baccalaureate if they desired. Also, according to a 1995 study by John Frye, the initially gendered curricula frequently were transformed by infusion of more academic content sought by women students.

After World War II, the public junior college became known as the community college, and the mission of providing education to all who sought it, known as the "open access" mission, was emphasized. Consequently, many women (and minorities) began their higher education at the community college because of its low cost, geographic availability, and general lack of admission standards (e.g., no national standardized test scores were required).

Students were not the only women who increasingly joined the community college during this period. With the tremendous expansion in the number of community colleges, built at the rate of one a week in the mid-1960s, institutional leaders, desperate to fill faculty staffing needs, were willing to hire women as faculty. Since community college faculty during this time period frequently came from high school faculty, there was a relative abundance of available women to be faculty. The four-year sector was also expanding during this time period, so many men seeking faculty positions were wooed to four-year colleges and universities rather than to community colleges.

With the civil rights movement and the women's movement in the 1960s, community college women, just like women at four-year colleges and universities, began to press for gender equity in salaries and promotions as well as a positive environment free from sexual harassment and sexual stereotyping and discrimination. Some sought the creation of institutional day care and women's centers and women's studies courses and programs for their students. Consequently, under the rubric of meeting community needs, during the 1970s a number of community colleges began to offer reentry programs for older women students as well as women's and ethnic studies programs. Institutional leaders, motivated by concerns for enrollment and institutional growth, accepted the necessity for these programs as well as the growing enrollment of women and minority students.

While there is less institutional focus currently on reentry programs for women, given the younger age of the average community college student, courses focusing on gender issues, as well as studies focusing on racial/ethnic minority groups, are available at many community colleges nowadays. Day care is often available, particularly in institutions with an early childhood education program. Thus women's needs were addressed by community colleges when women mobilized to get them met.

Examples of national mobilization that have led to the increased presence of female faculty and administrators, especially presidents, include the development of the National Institute for Leadership Development (NILD) and the American Association for Women in Community Colleges (AAWCC). For over 20 years, NILD has emphasized the preparation of women community college administrators so that they could attain college presidencies. The AAWCC, created in 1973, has a broader focus. It seeks equity for all women in two-year colleges, including students. Thus, its members focus on such activities and issues as support services for adult women students as well as equal pay for equal work.

Organizations like AAWCC and NILD operate from a liberal feminist perspective that believes in improving women's situations so that they are on equal footing with men. Thus, these organizations focus on issues of equal pay for equal work, an environment free of sexual harassment and stereotyping, and so forth. They want to "level the playing field" rather than disrupt it or upend it, as socialist or radical feminists would wish to do. Undergirding these organizations' efforts to improve community colleges as educational and work sites for women students, faculty, and staff is the implicit assumption of capitalism as the appropriate economic system.

Although radical and socialist feminists may view these institutions as instruments serving to maintain the capitalistic structure with its inherent stratification by social class (a particularly popular interpretation in the 1970s and 1980s), doing so ignores the reality that individuals can derive great educational, social, and economic benefit from attending them. Often attending them is the *only* choice for some students, given their financial situation and family commitments and sometimes their academic background. At the curricular level, it is true that community colleges, like other higher education institutions, have curricula that are often stereotypical in their gender-based enrollment patterns, but they do provide curricular choice for individual students.

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT FOR WOMEN FACULTY

The environment of community colleges for women has primarily been studied in terms of women faculty. From a liberal feminist perspective, community colleges currently seem to be more positive workplaces than are four-year institutions, at least as measured by faculty salaries, faculty perceptions of work environment, and prominence of women faculty and senior-level administrative leadership. As regards salary, a 2004 salary study by the AAUP found that the discrepancy between full-time female and male faculty's salaries was only between 4 and 7 percent, as compared to four-year college women faculty, who earn from 11 to 22 percent less than male faculty, depending upon the type of four-year institution.

Recent national surveys of faculty members' perceptions about their work also indicate that female community college faculty, in the aggregate, are generally positive about their work environment. A 1998 national study by Huber indicated that 85 percent of women faculty (and 82 percent of minority faculty) believed they were treated fairly, as compared to 75 percent of faculty at other institutional types. Huber also found that only 17 percent of community college faculty perceived problematic gender issues among their students. In their 2002 national study, Hagedorn and Laden found that female and male faculty had similar, generally positive perceptions about the community college climate. However, women and minority faculty were more likely than male or White faculty to disagree that claims of discrimination were overstated.

Although community college women faculty may be generally pleased with the climate at the macro level, there may be more negative perceptions of climate at the micro or single-institution level. For example, Wolfe and Strange's 2003 qualitative study of a small rural two-year campus found that the few female faculty at the institution experienced a negative climate. The women attributed this climate largely to the lack of sufficient female faculty to present a counter perspective to the male-dominated culture. Similarly, Townsend and LaPaglia found in a 2000 study of faculty in Chicago city colleges that women and minority faculty were more apt to perceive discrimination on the basis of gender and race/ethnicity than were White, male faculty.

There are various reasons why community college faculty, both female and male, might be better satisfied than faculty at other institutions. Two major ones include belief in the community college mission of open access to those who might not otherwise participate in higher education and the lack of pressure to publish. In particular, many women community college faculty work there because of their need to balance family and community commitments with their professional work. Additionally, if it is true that women prefer teaching to research, as some studies indicate, then the community college is a good institutional fit because of its emphasis on teaching.

Another positive influence on climate is the less competitive nature of the institution as regards promotion and tenure. Not all community colleges have tenure; instead they offer faculty a series of long-term contracts. Additionally, not all have academic rank. In these institutions all faculty are labeled instructors. Even in those institutions with rank and tenure, the path to tenure is shorter (typically three years) and the granting of tenure and rank is dependent upon educational credentials, teaching, and institutional service. Thus, promotion and tenure are more easily earned in community colleges than in universities and in many four-year colleges. In spite of this, however, a greater percentage of men are tenured in those public two-year colleges with tenure: 68.3 percent of the men as compared to 62.2 percent of the women, according to data in the 2005 *Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac.*

Although there is much that is positive, relatively speaking, about community colleges as work sites for women faculty, there is little evidence that institutional leaders (who were almost exclusively male until the 1970s) took the initiative to make these institutions female friendly. Rather, it was women faculty and staff, especially in the 1970s and early 1980s and continuing into the present, who pushed for gender equity in hiring, salaries, and promotion and tenure. It was women faculty, staff, and students who pushed for women's studies and women's centers. As a 2005 study by Wolf-Wendel, Ward, Twombly, and Bradley indicates, even today, with women faculty in equal proportion to men faculty and with over one-fourth of presidents being female, there seems to be little, if any, institutional leadership in developing family friendly policies and practices such as rooms in which women faculty (or students) could use a breast pump or breast-feed their children. There is little institutional leadership in developing family leave policies so that faculty and staff would not have to use their accumulated sick leave when they need to give birth and recover from the birth.

Despite these shortcomings, community colleges provide in general a more positive work environment for faculty than do most four-year institutions. That is not to say that the environment is ideal. Its structural arrangements are often still marked by traditional views of faculty (e.g., it is assumed that their child-care needs will be met by stay-at-home wives). But the mere presence of so many women faculty and so many women presidents ensures that women's voices can and will be heard, even if at times they have to moderate their messages for colleagues (including women) still bound by gender stereotypes.

Given women's higher representation, greater salary equity, and higher levels of satisfaction in community colleges, compared with universities, it seems fair to suggest that university voices that claim women faculty are marginalized by working in the community college reflect an elitist assumption that the only acceptable institutional workplace is the research university. These voices devalue faculty who choose to value teaching and a set of professional responsibilities that enables them to balance work and family life in a somewhat manageable way. These voices also implicitly devalue the students served by these faculty.

WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD FOR WOMEN IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE?

For women students, certain trends in the development of community colleges may affect their access to the institution and to the baccalaureate degree. Many community colleges in the twenty-first century seem to be changing the extent to which they focus on open access for those students who would not normally attend higher education. There is a growing trend for honors programs, including the provision of free tuition for students in these programs. Also, postbaccalaureate students, those who already have a bachelor's degree or higher, are attending the community college to improve their current job skills or develop new ones. Additionally, because of escalating tuition costs in all of higher education, community college attendance is a fiscal bargain. Thus, many traditional-age students who would normally have started at four-year institutions are choosing (or being coerced by their parents) to attend community colleges. What these enrollment trends mean is that lower SES students, many of whom are first-generation college students, unaware of the need to register early for popular classes, may find there is no or limited space for them. Many low SES minority and women students may thus find access to higher education is more difficult.

Counterbalances to these enrollment trends are two important curricular developments. The first is the development of the baccalaureate degree offered by community colleges. Over 20 percent of the states have authorized selected community colleges in their state to create baccalaureate programs in vocationally oriented, high demand fields such as education and nursing. These two fields will increase the number of women in baccalaureate programs, while other fields such as applied and manufacturing technology and criminal justice will primarily increase the number of male students. A second curricular development is the growing willingness by some four-year institutions to accept the A.A.S. or "terminal" degree as equivalent to two years of the baccalaureate, whereas in the past many of the courses taken for this degree would not be accepted. Thus, women who have the A.A.S. in such fields as nursing or food services would be able to more easily obtain the baccalaureate at a four-year institution.

For women faculty and senior-level administrators, it is likely that even more will be hired due to major retirements of the faculty and institutional leaders who were hired during the great growth period of community colleges in the 1960s and early 1970s. Community colleges may well be the first (and perhaps only institutions) where female and male faculty reach parity in salary and rank.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Frye, J. (1995). Women in the two-year college, 1900 to 1970. In B. Townsend (Ed.), *Gender and power in the community college: New directions for community colleges, No. 89* (pp. 5–14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hagedorn, L.S., & Laden, B. V. (2002). Exploring the climate for women community college faculty. In J. Palmer (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges: New directions for community colleges, No. 118* (pp. 69–78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huber, M.T. (1998). *Community college faculty attitudes and trends, 1997.* Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Miller, M.T., & Creswell, J.W. (1998). Beliefs and values of women in community college leadership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22*(3), 229–238.

Townsend, B.K. (Ed.). (1995). *Gender and power in the community college: New directions for community colleges, No. 89.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Townsend, B.K., & LaPaglia, N. (2000). Are we marginalized within academe? Perceptions of two-year college faculty. *Community College Review, 28*(1), 41–48.

Townsend, B.K., & Twombly, S.B. (1998). A feminist critique of organizational change in the community college. In J. Levin (Ed.), *Organizational change in the community college: New directions for community colleges, No. 102* (pp. 77–86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., Twombly, S.B., & Bradley, S. (April, 2005). *Faculty life at community colleges: The perspective of women with children.* Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Wolfe, J.R., & Strange, C.C. (2003). Academic life at the franchise: Faculty culture in a rural two-year branch campus. *Review of Higher Education, 26*(3), 343–362.

Barbara K. Townsend

Distance Education

As distance education (DE)—often in the guise of e-learning—is on the rise, it becomes increasingly important to look at gender issues in this educational field. Even where a majority of distance students and teachers are women, they tend to have little or no representation in the definition of content and in shaping the teaching and learning process. In 1982, women distance educators initiated “WIN,” the Women’s International Network, within the International Council for Distance Education (ICDE) in order to address gender issues and redress the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions. The first tangible WIN product was the book *Toward New Horizons for Women in Distance Education* (Faith, 1988) with contributions from women from all corners of the world. Twenty years later, ICDE is once again a male-dominated organization, and WIN no longer exists as a recognized network within the established DE world. Nevertheless, the issues and comparative research initiatives as well as the networking of women in the field continue. In 2004, for instance, the United States Distance Learning Association launched the International Forum for Women in E-Learning. And, at the present time, gender continues to be an important category of analysis and action in distance education.

THE FIELD OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Essentially, “distance education” denotes a system of teaching and learning that does not require classroom attendance. The term literally refers to the geographical distance between teachers and students. Instead of meeting face-to-face on campus, they are in separate locations, the teaching and learning process usually occurring at separate times. The prominent characteristic of distance education, therefore, is the use of media and technology to transmit content and to enable interaction and communication between teachers and students and between students.

The use of media and technologies has contributed to the changes that the term “distance education” has undergone since its beginnings in the mid-1800s. Originally, letters were exchanged as teachers wrote down the subject matter and sent course “letters” to students in remote areas. Students worked through the written and printed materials, did the assignments, and mailed their solutions and possible queries to the teaching staff who, in turn, mailed back their comments and evaluations. Consequently, in the early days, distance education was called “correspondence education.”

As new media and technologies were developed, the printed course materials were increasingly supplemented and sometimes supplanted by these new teaching and learning tools. “Correspondence education” evolved into “distance education,” which made use of telephone, radio, audiocassettes, videocassettes, and television in order to enhance its teaching. Increasingly, elements of personal contact were introduced into the teaching and learning process. Audioconferencing and, to some extent, videoconferencing simulated person-to-person interaction.

From the 1980s onward, because of the advent of personal computers and information and communication technologies (ICTs), distance education experienced dramatic changes in its delivery and communication methods as well as in its image. By the mid-1990s, distance education entered the World Wide Web in a big way. The Internet seemed to offer unlimited possibilities not only for course delivery and for studying but also for interaction and collaboration and for administrative purposes. The terms “online education,” “electronic campus,” or “virtual university” became nearly synonymous with the term “distance education.” There is even a persistent tendency to argue that “distance education” is now obsolete and has been superseded by the more up-to-date “online education” or “e-learning.” On the other hand, it is argued that providing education online is just one of the ways of organizing a teaching and learning system at a distance and that the use of the Internet and other ICTs does not fundamentally change the character of distance education. In fact, there is now a trend toward “blended learning” which utilizes a mixture of media and technologies as well as some face-to-face events.

Issues of Equity

From the beginning, the world of distance education has been closely associated with issues of equal access to education. Originally meant to provide education for people in remote areas, distance education also became a means of extending educational opportunities to anybody who could not attend classes in person. Apart from geographical distance, reasons that prevent children or adults from attending traditional educational institutions may lie in social, cultural, or personal factors. Social class, for instance, may be a distancing factor, as people from a lower- or working-class background cannot afford better schooling for their children or traditionally do not value advanced education. Cultural factors may prevent people of certain religious or ethnic backgrounds from providing their children, especially their daughters, with higher education. Or, the mainstream culture may deny minority groups access to educational opportunities. Personal factors may be at work when a potential student is disabled, has to take care of children or other family members, works full time at a job, or is imprisoned or institutionalized.

This shift in focus was accompanied by a corresponding shift away from the original concept of “teaching at a distance” manifested, for instance, in the term “Distance Teaching University” (DTU) for providers of tertiary distance education. The new terms “open learning” and later “open and distance learning” (ODL) and finally “open, distance, and flexible learning” show a twofold commitment: an emphasis on open access and an emphasis on the learning process and the needs of learners.

International comparisons show that this redefinition process occurs at different speeds and in different ways as distance education providers start from different institutional premises and philosophies. Many DTUs, especially in Anglo-Saxon countries, explicitly started out as “open universities,” with few or no admission requirements, enabling students without formal educational prerequisites to study for a degree. The British Open University is a prominent and early example of this. Other DTUs, such as the German FernUniversität, require formal entrance qualifications of students entering a degree program. For these universities, the meaning of "open" may lie in the increased provision of continuing education and opportunities for professional development and lifelong learning.

Women and Distance Education

The goal of providing equal access to education through the provision of open and distance learning inevitably leads to a concern with gender. In countries and cultures the world over, including Western, industrialized societies, girls and women—especially those from a minority background—are educationally disadvantaged compared to their male counterparts. This may be attributed to material factors as well as to cultural or religious factors regarding the role of women and men in society, and often these reasons overlap. On the material level, for instance, it may be argued that a family lacks the money to cover the cost of sending all children to school or that the family income needs to be supplemented through putting children to work. Yet, where limited financial resources make it necessary to set priorities as to which child should get an education or attend secondary school and university, boys tend to be systematically preferred over girls regardless of intellectual ability and individual wishes. On the level of cultural and religious factors, it may be argued that a woman's place is in the home and that she does not need higher education or vocational training in order to fulfill her "natural" duties as housewife and mother. There may also be a concern that "too much" education could corrupt a woman's moral standing and make her unfit for her "proper place" in the private sphere of her future family. On the other hand, as future "head of household" and breadwinner, a boy is expected to get an education, possibly complete a degree, in order to obtain employment and start a career and take his "proper place" in the public sphere.

Looking at distance education as a second chance for people previously excluded from (higher) education, it is easy to see that women on the whole are more in need of such additional educational opportunities. This is especially true where gender discrimination meets discrimination based on class, race, or other factors affecting equal access. Women are also more likely to live in situations that make it difficult to impossible to attend face-to-face classes and/or to afford the direct (e.g., tuition fees, books) and indirect (e.g., child care) costs associated with attending classroom-based educational programs. It is therefore reasonable to expect that women are the larger target group of distance education. This is reflected in the fact that many distance teaching institutions such as the British Open University or the Canadian Athabasca University have a majority of women students. Yet, there are others such as the German FernUniversität or distance education programs in parts of Africa and Asia where women students are the minority.

THE NEW LEARNING ENVIRONMENT OF THE VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, both traditional and ODL institutions are increasingly concerned with ways in which the seemingly unlimited possibilities of ICTs and the new media can be employed to create new learning environments.

The past few years have seen rapid developments in ICTs, resulting in the widespread availability of multimedia computers and Internet access among the population of Western, industrialized societies. Also, ICTs are constantly improved and increasingly powerful. New features are developed allowing more data to be transmitted and handled at greater speed and creating new dimensions of interactivity and communication.

This has had profound effects on distance education institutions, both with regard to potential student populations and to the organization and delivery of ODL. For one thing, ICTs can provide the means to reach larger and more distant and divergent target groups more quickly and at lower cost. As "distributed learning" replaces the more traditional forms of distance education, ODL becomes less dependent on the availability and reliability of postal services and is less subjected to time constraints inherent in "snail mail" communication processes.

Easily the most obvious difference between distance education and campus-based education is the physical learning environment in which students and staff are situated. Traditional face-to-face teaching and learning takes place within the walls of an institution, with both teachers and students present in the same room, giving and attending a lecture or seminar or participating in exercises and lab experiments. In this setting, the educational environment is structured to a large extent by the school or university that provides the classrooms and equipment, library, and lab facilities, as well as opportunities on the campus for informal exchanges and communication between the students and between students and staff. To the extent that a university provides student housing, it also influences the students' personal learning environment.

A distance teaching university, by contrast, traditionally does not provide a teaching and learning environment for its students. Since there are very few or none of the usual attendance requirements, the DTU has no need for a campus in the classic sense or for university buildings as physical structures with classrooms, laboratories, lecture theatres, libraries, meeting places, or cafeterias where students habitually meet each other and their teachers face-to-face. Distance education materials are delivered to the students wherever they direct them to be sent. The students, relieved from the necessity of being present at a specific place at a specified time, are in turn responsible for setting up their own learning environments.

Both the campus-based and the home-study learning environments are defined, and distinguished, by the physical whereabouts of the students and the teachers. This is different for the new learning environment of the virtual university (VU) which, in principle, can supplement or replace either of the two existing teaching systems and, in fact, originates as often from "conventional" face-to-face institutions as it does from DTUs. Students can enter the "virtual" university regardless of their "real" learning environment, provided they have access to the necessary technology.

GENDER ISSUES IN THE VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY

Concerns about new learning environments have also spurred debate as to whether the new world of online teaching and virtual studying might be as closed to women as the traditional universities were until the turn of the twentieth century. The opposite viewpoint held that gender differences have all but disappeared with regard to the use of ICTs. In order to find answers to these questions, it is necessary to look at some recent research data on gender equality in e-learning and on issues concerning women students.

Looking at DTUs as forerunners to the electronic campus, we continually find empirical evidence of the ways in which different DE systems affect the participation of women and of gender differentiation in areas such as access, course choice, learning styles, and communication patterns (cf. especially the comparative research done by Gill Kirkup and Christine von Prümmer on the situation of women students at the British Open University and the German FernUniversität since 1985: Kirkup & von Prümmer, 1990, 1997; von Prümmer, 2000). There is no evidence to suggest that gender is less of an issue in the virtual university, although it is all too easy to "forget" that the new technologies are as gendered as their predecessors from which they developed and to assume that women automatically have equal opportunities to enter and succeed in the virtual university. Yet gender-specific and feminist research shows that women often have less access to the technologies, less control over the ICTs in their homes and places of work, and less confidence and competency in using the technology (Kirkup, 1996; von Prümmer & Rossié, 2001). When combined with the everyday institutional androcentrism and with the fact that students' private lives on the whole are still characterized by the gendered division of housework and child care, this could lead to systematic discrimination of women in the virtual campus unless special measures are taken to ensure gender equity.

ICTs have the potential to facilitate communication and interaction between the students and between students and staff in distance education settings. They are, therefore, especially attractive for women distance students who tend to prefer connected learning styles and opportunities for exchange and cooperation otherwise missing in their distance learning environment. At the same time, there is empirical evidence that communication processes in newsgroups and electronic discussions are often dominated by men and their styles of discourse—for instance, highly competitive and declamatory—that may be uninteresting or off-putting to women (cf. Balka & Smith, 2000). In order to ensure equity of access for both men and women, care must be taken to construct the virtual university as a women-friendly learning environment and to counteract dysfunctional developments.

In looking at gender and the use of ICTs, it is also helpful to distinguish more clearly between the "technology" and its "application": On the one hand, there is the basic technology and the know-how to operate the hardware and software—the engineering and informatics side of ICTs. On the other hand, there is the use of "the Web" as a means for communication and information gathering through electronic channels. It seems that the "technology" as such is still very much a man's thing (and men do their best to mystify it and keep women out), while communication and interaction is something women enjoy and excel at.

This distinction helps to explain why surveys continually show that it is mostly husbands/partners who decide which computer is purchased, why men have more sophisticated and better-equipped machines, and why women are less experienced and less enthusiastic about mastering the complex processes of setting up their own equipment, connecting up to the university server through an Internet services provider, and joining a discussion forum only after installing the appropriate conferencing software package. Once their systems are "hooked up" and functional, women are free to participate in online activities and—much like driving their car or using software packages for data analyses—can safely forget about the underlying hardware, the electronic fuel injection, and the computer programming that make it all possible. If the concept of "open" and distance learning is taken seriously, it cannot afford to neglect issues of equity and overt or latent discrimination. It is true that many women have discovered the Internet and its potentials. Research findings also confirm that gender differences still exist with respect to access and control over resources, social division of labor and time management, learning styles, and learning environments.

Surveys on computer access and use of ICTs for distance studies show that in Western, industrialized countries such as Germany, over 90 percent of DE students have access to a computer for study purposes, but there are still a significant number of distance students without high-speed Internet access.

While there are still differences between the students in different subject areas—people studying mathematical and technical subjects are more likely to have a computer, people studying education, social sciences, and the humanities are less well equipped—the *overall* results show hardly any gender differences. This result might be interpreted as showing, first, that gender has become irrelevant with regard to the new technologies and, second, that mandatory computer and Internet access would not be a problem for (prospective) students.

Looked at more closely, though, the survey data show the usual gender-differentiated patterns where women:

- mostly have access to only one machine, usually at home, while many men can access more than one computer and often have a suitable PC at their place of work;
- have less sophisticated equipment and software, especially as far as multimedia and ICT features are concerned;
- are more likely to leave the purchasing decision to their husband/partner;
- face more restrictions in using the technology and have less control over the computer, which is likely to be used by other family members;
- have less Internet access than men, especially at work, and must rely slightly more on the provision of the technology in study centers and other external sources; and
- often have less experience, less interest, and less confidence in using the multimedia and ICT features of a computer.

In order to ensure equal opportunities for women in e-learning, specific consideration must be given to these patterns of computer usage. On the basis of research and experience, it is clear that the virtual university must not be left alone to develop "naturally," following technological advances and software revolutions without regard to their social effects. In order to enable women to participate fully in the virtual university, factors that hinder this equal participation must be identified and measures taken to redress gender imbalances.

On the whole, ODL institutions seem to have embarked on a process toward becoming virtual universities. Most DTUs, and many universities set up in the traditional teaching mode, have introduced net-based courses and degree programs. Some existing DTUs are in the process of transformation; some new DTUs have been established outright as "virtual universities." In this situation, it is necessary to look at the students whom these universities serve and to assess their needs and wishes with regard to learning and communicating through electronic media as well as their access to the electronic campus as demonstrated by the availability of the necessary equipment and know-how. There is a tendency to assume that more and better equipment, more sophisticated computer programs, more powerful data transmission, and increased communication facilities equate to higher quality education. But is this true? There is evidence to the effect that "better servers" in the university do not automatically mean "better service" for the students, especially with regard to gender-specific patterns in access and study conditions.

In addition to issues of access and exclusion, the question on how to serve women students in a virtual learning environment, as in any other ODL context, touches on two spheres: First, the VU must be designed as a women-friendly, nondiscriminatory place; and, second, students' personal environments and life situations must be taken into account. In this context, it is interesting to note that the virtual learning environment tends to be seen as a closed system and that, consequently, there is little concern with the "outside" circumstances such as the conditions under which students study and their access to the computer and the Internet. Yet, these circumstances have profound effects on the way in which women and men are able to organize their lives around their studies and to pursue their academic interests successfully.

To the extent that ICTs replace the traditional media and access to advanced technologies becomes an essential prerequisite for studying in the virtual university, there is an increasing danger that women will be disproportionately disbarred from entering and enjoying the virtual learning environment—if gender issues are ignored and the definition and construction of the virtual university is left to the existing male-dominated, androcentric academic and political decision-making processes or to "market forces." To offset this, one area of support and services for (potential) women students might be measures promoting the necessary computer literacy and user confidence as well as supplying easy-to-use software with instructions that can be followed by people who are not familiar with computer jargon and do not aspire to become computer experts.

Another area in which gender sensitivity is essential is the field of content, presentation, and curriculum. Women's studies and gender studies have been shown to be effective in redressing some of the existing imbalances of an androcentric educational system by focusing on previously neglected issues and by looking at these from a different standpoint. The success of these programs suggests that one of the ways to promote women's participation in the virtual campus is the inclusion of women's/gender studies in the curriculum, dealing specifically with gender-related issues and developing women-friendly ways of using the new technologies for teaching and learning processes. Examples of this are courses offered for credit within various master's of distance education degree programs such as the Gender Issues in Distance Education course at the Canadian Athabasca University.

In order to ensure that the virtual campus will not be a place without women or a place in which women are passive participants who "consume" the education they cannot get any other way, women themselves must be prepared to embrace the new world of ICTs, to take a critical look at the dangers and also at the advantages inherent in virtual teaching and learning processes, and to be involved in shaping their own new learning environments.

This will not be an easy task as many projects in this area ignore the social and political implications, thereby adversely affecting the chances of women. For instance, the proponents of virtual universities tend to focus on the technologies at the expense of the human element. There are many cases where seemingly endless amounts of money are being spent on buying the hardware and little or no money is spent on hiring and training the staff who will have to work with this technology or on making sure all students and staff are computer literate. There is also a tendency for funding bodies and decision makers to focus on subject areas that have an obvious affinity to technology, such as the male-dominated fields of computer science and electrical engineering, and to be less open to developments in "unlikely" subject areas such as philosophy and literature that are more popular with women students.

Considering the limited resources and the high costs of developing high-quality teaching materials and maintaining effective and conducive structures for interaction, it is very important that women from different universities, and from different countries, are given the opportunity to set up networks for cooperating and for sharing not only their course materials but also their teaching and learning experiences and the results from their evaluation research. In this way, it is possible to avoid duplication, both of materials and of mistakes, and to build up a larger store of courses by and from women.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Balka, E., & Smith, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Women, work and computerization. Charting a course to the future.* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Faith, K. (Ed.). (1988). *Toward new horizons for women in distance education. International perspectives.* London & New York: Routledge.

Kirkup, G.E. (1996). The importance of gender. In R. Mills & A. Tait (Eds.), *Supporting the learner in open and distance learning* (pp. 146–165). London: Pitman.

Kirkup, G.E., & von Prümmer, C. (1990). Support and connectedness. The needs of women distance education students. *Journal of Distance Education, 5*(2), 9–31.

Kirkup, G.E., & von Prümmer, C. (1997). Distance education for European women. The threats and opportunities of new educational forms and media. *The European Journal of Women's Studies, 4* (1), 39–62.

Kramerae, C. (2001). *The third shift: Women learning online.* Washington, DC: The American Association of University Women. (Information on the report retrieved June 30, 2006, from http://www.aauw.org/research/3rdshift.cfm)

Spronk, B. (2002). *Globalisation, ODL and gender: Not everyone's world is getting smaller.* Retrieved June 30, 2006, from http://www.iec.ac.uk/resources/globalisation_paper_bs_2002.pdf

von Prümmer, C. (2000). *Women and distance education: Challenges and opportunities.* London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

von Prümmer, C., & Rossié, U. (2001). Gender-sensitive evaluation research. In E.J. Burge & M. Haughey (Eds.), *Using learning technologies: International perspectives on practice* (pp. 135–144). London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Christine von Prümmer

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Issues of racial equality have long received special attention at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). One consequence of this focus, however, is that issues of gender equality are sometimes swept under the rug—rarely discussed, except among a small group of feminists. This "sweeping" is quite evident in the research on HBCUs, where the focus is almost entirely on males. Discussion of women or the relationships between men and women within the Black college context is limited. In the words of Black feminist scholar Patricia Hill Collins, many Black college women have found themselves in the position of "outsider-within"—meaning that their gender puts them in a disadvantaged position within the racialized Black college community.

Most HBCUs were founded in the aftermath of the Civil War, with the exception of three in the North: Lincoln and Cheney Universities in Pennsylvania and Wilberforce University in Ohio. With the end of the Civil War, the daunting task of providing education to over 4 million formerly enslaved Blacks was shouldered by both the federal government, through the Freedmen's Bureau, and many northern church missionaries. As early as 1865, the Freedmen's Bureau began establishing Black colleges, resulting in staff and teachers with primarily military backgrounds. During this period, most Black colleges were colleges in name only; like many White colleges in their infancy, these institutions generally provided primary and secondary education. From their beginnings, most Black colleges, unlike their historically White counterparts, provided coeducational training. Black women, like Black men, were seen by the White missionaries and Whites in general as potential workers in need of training. Only Barber Scotia and Spelman Colleges, founded in 1867 and 1881, respectively, were solely dedicated to the education of women. Morehouse College, founded in 1867, was the only Black college for men.

The benevolence of the White missionaries was tinged with self-interest and sometimes racism. The missionaries' goal in establishing these colleges was to Christianize the freedmen (i.e., convert formerly enslaved people to their brand of Christianity). And, while some scholars see the missionaries' actions as largely well meaning, many others do not. According to a more radical group of scholars, the idea of a Black menace was at the forefront of the minds of these missionaries, who believed that education would curb the "savage" tendencies of the former slaves but should not lead to full-blown social equality. The education provided to Black college students was a mixture of liberal arts and industrial training: classical texts were taught side by side with manual labor skills for men and household duties for women (both for their own homes as well as for those White homes in which they might work). Many Black colleges also provided teacher training.

With the passage of the second Morrill Act in 1890, the federal government again took an interest in Black education, establishing public land-grant Black colleges and universities. This act stipulated that those states practicing segregation in their public colleges and universities would forfeit federal funding unless they established agricultural and mechanical institutions for the Black population. Despite the wording of the Morrill Act, which called for the equitable division of federal funds, these newly founded institutions received fewer monies than their White counterparts and, thus, had inferior facilities. Just as before the Act, women who attended these schools learned household duties, such as how to cook, clean, make brooms, and sew. On the other hand, men were trained in brickmaking and bricklaying, farming, blacksmithing, and other forms of manual labor.

It was not until the turn of the twentieth century that most Black colleges seriously began to provide college-level liberal arts education. Institutions such as Fisk in Tennessee, Dillard in Louisiana, and Howard in Washington, DC, exemplified this approach, schooling their male and female students in the classics. For the most part, these colleges prepared students for teaching positions in schools and colleges and for public service.

Today, according to the federal government, there are 103 HBCUs, both public and private. Three of these institutions are single sex: Spelman (female) and Morehouse (male) Colleges in Georgia and Bennett College (female) in North Carolina. At these institutions as well as the other 100, there have historically been gender disparities that continue today. These disparities and the discrimination that causes them are manifest within the ranks of students, faculty, and administration. Each of these groups provides a unique lens through which to view the problem. As such, each will furnish a frame for the discussion that follows.

STUDENTS AND GENDER ROLES

During the early years of Black colleges, female students were sheltered by the administration; their lives were shaped by institutional policies designed to control their behavior. In the eyes of the White missionaries, Black women had been stripped of their feminine virtue by the experiences of slavery and as such had to be purified before they could assume the responsibilities of the home. Typically, during the late 1880s, female Black college students were not allowed to leave the campus without a member of the administration escorting them. By contrast, men were free to come and go as they pleased. At most institutions, the dean of women lived on campus in order to watch over the "fragile" and "impressionable" young college girls. The dean of men, on the other hand, lived off campus as did the other upper-level administrators. During the mid-1920s, many female students at Black colleges and universities urged campus administrators to grant them greater autonomy, noting that it would help them learn self-reliance—a skill that they saw as essential to assuming leadership roles. These same women fought vehemently against the repressive religious customs used to rear their race and gender. These practices were generally imposed by White and Black male administrators, many of whom were also ordained Baptist ministers. In particular, the administrators often used the Biblical writings of Saint Paul as an excuse to relegate women to second-class status. Women were told that, according to the Bible, patient waiting was to be held above the development of one's talents.

In spite of the heavy hand of religion and resulting sexism, Black colleges during the late 1800s and early 1900s offered a surprising number of opportunities for Black female students to participate in traditionally male activities. For example, at Talladega College, women were able to join the rifle club. On the other hand, women participated in social service sororities such as Alpha Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta. While sometimes focused on the superficial aspects of appearance and socialization, these organizations were also active in suffrage and civil rights activities as well as other national causes.

During the 1950s and early 1960s, Black women on Black college and university campuses were instrumental in the civil rights movement. Women at both Bennett and Spelman Colleges participated in sit-ins and lunch counter demonstrations. The administrators of these women's colleges, now Black rather than White, were supportive of the student actions. However, this was not the case at all Black colleges and universities. At some public Black institutions, which were under the close supervision of state government authorities, administrators declined to help both male and female student protesters who had landed in jail.

Many of these young HBCU women were fearless, working diligently to make change within their communities and within the country as a whole. For example, Barbara Harris and Diane Nash, both Fisk University students, were jailed along with 63 other male and female students who protested Nashville's segregated lunch counters. Although they were offered an opportunity to make bond ($100), they chose to go to jail because, in their minds, paying the bond would be a capitulation to the South's Jim Crow government. Ironically, as these female students were fighting on behalf of civil rights, they were still being treated as fragile accessories to men by their college administrations. For example, at the same time that students at Bennett College were marching in the streets and attempting to desegregate lunch counters, they were required to take a course called the "The Art of Living," which focused on becoming a successful homemaker.

In the early 1970s, Patricia Gurin and Edgar Epps completed a research study that sought to understand the advantages and disadvantages gained by Black male and female students at HBCUs. Surveying 5,000 African American students, this study was comprehensive and its results compelling. The researchers found that undergraduate women at HBCUs were considerably disadvantaged. In particular, the educational and career goals of female students were significantly lower than those of their male peers. Not only were these Black women less likely to aspire to the PhD, but they were more likely to opt for low-prestige careers in the female sector of the nation's job market (e.g., teaching and the health professions). This seminal research also showed that the patriarchal environments at many HBCUs compounded the problem. Other researchers have found that social passivity and disengagement on the part of Black women, most likely caused by institutional environments, helped explain why these individuals did not have higher career aspirations. Scholars in the mid-1980s found that although women were actively engaged in the classroom and in extracurricular activities, they spent less time interacting with individual faculty members. This practice could result in fewer discussions about graduate school and less support for nonfemale career fields. More recently, researchers have shown more equal gains for men and women from the HBCU experience. It appears that women have overcome some of the barriers placed before them, breaking away from passivity. However, at many campuses, an atmosphere persists that encourages women to cede to male counterparts in class discussions and in student leadership positions.

Studies have shown that African American female students at HBCUs feel a higher level of anxiety than their male counterparts. In addition, when surveyed, they felt less competent and were often less assertive than males. Sadly, other studies have revealed that female students were more willing to take on positions and roles that made them seem less competent in order to avoid threatening their male peers. Despite these feelings of insecurity, women's academic performance at HBCUs outpaces that of Black males. A recent study showed that at most HBCUs, the percentage of Black women on the honor roll was larger than the percentage of women enrolled at the institutions. For example, at Clark Atlanta University in 2005, women accounted for 69 percent of the student body but made up 84 percent of the dean's list. Likewise, at Howard University, women made up 60 percent of the student body but accounted for 70 percent of the honor roll. On average, the percentage of women on dean's lists at HBCUs exceeded their enrollment by 10 percent.

Currently, the nation's HBCUs enroll approximately 250,000 African American students, with a large proportion attending private, four-year institutions. HBCUs grant roughly 28 percent of bachelor's degrees, 15 percent of master's degrees, 9 percent of doctoral degrees, and 15 percent of professional degrees awarded to African Americans. Black women outpace Black men at all educational levels. Despite generally favorable statistics for degree attainment for women, the majority of these degrees are in traditionally female-dominated programs. Over 70 percent of Black women's degrees earned at HBCUs are in the health professions or education. Black women, much like White women, hold positions in service areas and are less likely to hold jobs in the sciences. Here certain Black colleges are trying to make gains. For example, of the Black women who enter graduate programs in the sciences, 50 percent are from Spelman and Bennett Colleges—schools that have special programs preparing their students for scientific fields. Moreover, HBCUs represent the top 20 institutions overall in the placement of Black women in graduate programs in the sciences at all U.S. institutions of higher education. Xavier University in New Orleans, in particular, sends more Black women into U.S. medical schools than any other institution in the country. Some recent research has shown that Black college and university women are now selecting majors that were once exclusively male—including math, technology, engineering, and science. However, they are still aspiring to the lower level positions within these fields.

Although HBCUs were established to educate African Americans, and this population continues to make up the majority of these institutions' student bodies, they also educate a substantial number of White, Latino, and Asian students. In the student bodies of some HBCUs, such as Lincoln University in Missouri, White commuters, many of whom are part-time students, constitute the majority. African American students, however, continue to outnumber Whites among full-time, residential students at Lincoln. Other institutions, such as Bluefield State, Delaware State, and Kentucky State have between 18 and 26 percent non-Black students. Most of these students are women, adding to the large percentages of women at HBCUs overall.

GENDER IN THE FACULTY RANKS

During the early years at Black colleges, the faculty consisted mainly of White missionary men and women. Most, in fact, were White, unmarried women from the Northeast. As more African Americans gained college degrees that prepared them for teaching, they slowly trickled into the faculties of Black colleges. In addition, free Blacks from the

North, who had been trained as teachers prior to the end of the Civil War, came south to assist with teaching.

By the turn of the century, both the White and Black female faculty members (and for that matter, the Black male faculty) were kept under the tight control of White college presidents who, for the most part, were puppets of the newly wealthy White industrialist philanthropists. These philanthropists included men such as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Julius Rosenwald, who funded and sat on the boards of these institutions. Faculty members typically implemented the types of curricula supported by these philanthropists, who funded only those institutions that agreed with their educational philosophies.

Many HBCUs developed rigid puritanical and patriarchal codes of behavior for their female faculty. For example, in 1913, the board of Howard University decided to institute a policy stating that any female teachers who married would be required to resign their positions—married women were deemed incapable of handling both teaching and wifely duties. Unmarried female faculty members were seen as a separate class, and their actions were always subject to great scrutiny.

Although Blacks gradually supplanted Whites in the presidential offices, they sometimes continued the domineering leadership styles of their predecessors. This remained a problem through the 1960s and 1970s. Although there have not been any empirical studies in this area, individual testimonies abound of the difficult situation women were placed in under autocratic and male-dominated leadership. Unfortunately, the oppressive styles of some Black college presidents and their unfair treatment of faculty have been used by White outsiders to demonstrate the inferiority of Black colleges in general. This has made it difficult to raise questions about leadership at Black colleges without engendering charges of racist complicity with these institutions' outside detractors. However, as Black women who have actual experiences with these problems have come forward with more nuanced accounts, it has become easier to offer a balanced critique of Black male leadership. For example, in a painful report of the years she spent at Black colleges entitled "Black Women in Academia," Margaret Walker Alexander points, in particular, to her days at Livingstone College in North Carolina and Jackson State University in Mississippi (Alexander in Guy-Sheftall, 1995). According to Alexander, every time she succeeded in making a creative contribution within these institutions, she was replaced by a man. The institutions' presidents constantly questioned her intelligence and dedication.

Black women account for just over 6 percent of full-time faculty members in academia overall. Just over half of these women are employed at HBCUs. In the area of promotion and tenure, women continue to lag. According to data compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics in 2000, approximately 30 percent of men at HBCUs hold the rank of full professor and 26 percent hold the rank of associate professor. In contrast, only a little over 20 percent of female faculty members are full professors and 19 percent are associate professors.

Studies have shown that female faculty members at HBCUs are hesitant about discussing issues related to fairness in employment, workplace climate, and professional development. In a 2001 survey of 1,000 female faculty members at HBCUs, more than 45 percent said that they had been discriminated against because of their gender. When asked to give specific examples of the discrimination, these same women refused, noting that they were uncomfortable providing details due to fear of retribution. Research shows that women at HBCUs are promoted at a slower rate, receive the lowest salaries, and are more likely to teach part time. Some scholars attribute this situation to the fact that women have to juggle family, work, and community responsibilities. Moreover, Black female professors typically have more academic responsibilities than their male counterparts. They are looked to for advice by young women, are asked to serve on numerous committees, and are often required to be the voice of the college in the local community. It is interesting to note that male and female faculty members at HBCUs start out with approximately the same salary, but they do not progress at the same rate. By the time Black male and female faculty members reach the rank of full professor, Black women make only 89 percent of the salaries earned by men.

When asked their opinion in research studies, Black female faculty claimed that fewer opportunities exist for them to work collaboratively; they are rarely asked to do so by their male peers. As collaboration is a time for mentoring of junior faculty by senior faculty, this situation works to the disadvantage of females. In addition to less collaboration and mentoring, Black females sense a lack of support from the administration that manifests itself in less funding for research and teaching innovations.

ADMINISTRATORS: WHERE ARE THE WOMEN?

Traditionally at HBCUs, women have not played prominent roles in administration; in most instances, they were not given the opportunity. Early on, the leadership of these institutions was handpicked by the wealthy White philanthropists mentioned previously, and these individuals put their trust in the hands of mainly White men. By and large, it was not until the mid-twentieth century that even Black men would assume leadership roles at Black colleges and universities. There were a few exceptions, however. Mary McLeod Bethune started her own school for girls in 1904, which became coeducational Bethune-Cookman College in 1923. She served as a strong leader of the institution for 40 years, bringing the cause of African American higher education to the attention of the nation's political and business leaders. Although most people in Daytona Beach, where the college is located, including some of her close friends, thought she would not succeed and the school would fold, Ms. Bethune worked diligently and her efforts and charisma attracted the attention of James Gamble, cofounder of Proctor and Gamble. Gamble supported Bethune's college for years and also served as the chair of the institution's board of trustees. While Ms. Bethune was the first Black female president of a coed institution, Willa Player was the first Black female president of a Black women's college. In 1955, she took over the leadership of Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina, after having served as a faculty member and vice president at the institution. During her tenure at Bennett, President Player was continually asked to justify the existence of a Black women's college, as very few people saw the value in separate education for Black women.

Beginning in the 1920s, the dean of women position became a permanent fixture at coeducational institutions of higher education, and this provided a leadership opportunity for Black women. HBCUs chose women who were refined and cultured to act as role models and disciplinarians for their college women. As in the case of female faculty members, their behavior was scrutinized by the male administration. At most institutions, they were required to live on campus. In fact, it was not until 1929 that Juliette Derricotte, the Dean of Women at Fisk University, was allowed to live off campus. Other HBCU were slow to follow Fisk's example.

Lucy Diggs Slowe, the first Dean of Women at Howard University (1922–1937), was a powerful and groundbreaking leader within both the HBCU community and higher education in general. She challenged the exclusion and underrepresentation of women at Howard, especially within the institution's policy-making bodies. Moreover, she took public stands at the university, speaking out on gender-based salary discrimination and demanding equal living conditions for women. Her bold nature angered many of her male peers, who were used to being openly condescending to Black women. In one instance, when Ms. Slowe acted as a representative of several female students who had been sexually harassed by a Black male professor, she received a letter attacking both her credibility and that of the students. The accuser asserted, "You forget that you are merely the Dean of Women and not the custodian of morals of the male teachers of Howard University. It is my opinion if you had something to do and two classes to teach as the other Deans, you wouldn't hear so much" (Mills in Bell-Scott, 1979, p. 22).

Lucy Diggs Slowe's views on empowering women did not gain favor with then Howard University President Mordecai Johnson. A graduate of all-male Morehouse College, Johnson hired Black women for the faculty but still held paternalistic views. Ms. Slowe was in no way conventional and did not match Johnson's ideas of what a Black woman should be. From the time that Johnson arrived at Howard in 1926 until Slowe's death in 1937, they quarreled over issues of equality for Black women.

With these exceptions, there were very few female administrators at Black colleges or universities until the 1950s, and, even at this point, women mainly filled the role of dean of women. In fact, Spelman College, which many would consider the premiere Black women's institution in the United States, did not have a Black female president until Johnnetta B. Cole in 1987. Although women's colleges have historically been less resistant than coed institutions to employing women in the upper echelons of administration, only in the mid-1970s did Spelman and Bennett begin to fill these positions with women with any regularity.

The lack of Black female representation in the administration still plagues Black colleges and universities today. Only 15 out of the 103 presidents of HBCUs are women. With few exceptions, these women are the heads of the smallest, least well-known, Black colleges—those with fewer than 1,000 students. Men typically lead the larger and more prestigious HBCUs and are paid much higher salaries than their female counterparts. In a pattern that mirrors higher education overall, women in administration are typically found in the student and external affairs divisions (development, alumni relations, and public relations). They are particularly underrepresented in the chief academic officer position. On average, at HBCUs, this position is held by Black males in their early fifties who are married with children. Most are promoted from within the institution and hold doctoral degrees awarded in the academic disciplines. This is significant as more women receive degrees in more applied fields of study, especially in education and social work.

The women who are in chief academic officer positions tend to be older than their male counterparts, have been tenured longer, and are much more likely to be single. And, by and large, few of these women (who have been discouraged by male-dominated institutional policies) have any aspiration for the presidency. Of note is the fact that male chief academic officers are more frequently asked to serve as acting president when the president is on leave. An explanation for this may be that male administrators within Black colleges and universities take the professional background and socialization of their male colleagues more seriously than that of their female colleagues. Males tend to be integrated into the cultural milieu of the institution more quickly than females.

Much like their White female counterparts at predominantly White institutions, Black female administrators and faculty often face a chilly climate—sometimes experiencing incidents of sexual harassment. According to several Black feminist scholars, HBCUs lag behind their predominantly White institutional peers with regard to antisexual harassment education and policies. Some speculate that Black women have not fought as vehemently as Whites because they fear that feminism will demand that they give up their fight against racism. For example, with the exception of Spelman and Bennett, very few Black colleges and universities have women's studies programs. In more recent years, there have been gains in the area of gender relations at HBCUs. At Hampton University, for instance, President William Harvey has hosted forums on male and female relationships within the Black college community and beyond. More importantly, he has made a priority of the understanding of sexism and the incorporation of nonsexist values into the curriculum. And, Xavier University in New Orleans has targeted these types of programs specifically at Black men to ease on-campus gender relations.

In 2003, Johnnetta B. Cole and Beverly Guy-Sheftall authored *Gender Talk: The Struggle for Women's Equality in African American Communities.* Although this book covers areas beyond Black colleges, it is significant in that both Cole and Guy-Sheftall work at Black colleges. Johnnetta Cole was the president of Spelman (1987–1997) and is currently the president of Bennett College. Likewise, Beverly Guy-Sheftall is a full professor of Women's Studies at Spelman College and the founding director of the Women's Research and Resource Center. Both of these women struggled in a male-dominated Black college environment, pushing a feminist agenda, and often feeling the push back. More importantly, together they have spoken out publicly about the rift between Black men and women within the context of Black colleges but also within the larger Black community. This conversation, being facilitated from within Black colleges, is essential to making change in the area of gender relations and equity at these institutions.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Alexander, M.W. (1995). Black women in academia. In B. Guy-Sheftall (Ed.), *Words of fire. An anthology of African American feminist thought.* New York: New Press.

Bell-Scott, P. (1979). Schoolin' "respectable" ladies of color: Issues in the history of Black women's higher education. *Journal of National Association of Women's Deans and Advisors of Colored Schools,* pp. 22–28.

Bonner, F. (2001). Addressing gender issues in the historically Black college and university community: A challenge and call to action. *The Journal of Negro Education, 70*(3), 176–191.

Cole, J.B., & Guy-Sheftall, B. (2003). *Gender talk: The struggle for women's equality in African American communities.* New York: Random House.

Gurin, P., & Epps, E.G. (1975). *Black consciousness, identity and achievement: A study of students in historically Black colleges.* New York: Wiley.

Guy-Sheftall, B. (1982). Black women and higher education: Spelman and Bennett colleges revisited. *The Journal of Negro Education, 51*(3), 278–287.

Washington, E. (1993). *Uncivil war: The struggle between Black men and women.* New York: Noble Press.

Marybeth Gasman

Home Schooling

Over the past 30 years, home schooling has emerged as a viable alternative to public education. Its attractiveness to parents across the nation cannot be denied. Growing at a rate of approximately 11 percent every year, it is estimated that there are currently 1.6 million to 2.0 million home schooled students in grades K–12 in the United States. Since 1993, home schooling has been legal in all 50 states. State legislation, however, contains different restrictions that monitor the operation of home schools. Some state regulations are stringent and require parents to register their home school with the proper authority, seek approval for their curriculum, administer standardized tests yearly, and be certified as teachers. Other states offer home schools more flexibility and require parents to submit only annual test scores or evidence of the student's progress. The majority of states, however, do not mandate minimum academic standards for home schooled children and permit home schooling as an exemption to the state's compulsory attendance school act.

A substantial amount of research has demonstrated the demographic variation in the home school population. Home school families are typically White and middle class, although families are represented from all races and socioeconomic backgrounds. Intact nuclear families overwhelmingly make up the home school population (although other family types are minimally represented), and girls are as likely to be home schooled as are boys. Research has also examined the parental motivations involved in home schooling, as well as the social and cognitive development and academic achievement of children taught at home. Yet, very little research has focused on either the family dynamics or gender relationships embedded in home schooling activities. However, what research has been conducted consistently agrees that the labor involved in operating a home school—such as instructional planning, monitoring progress, and the emotional labor of nurturing as well as teaching children—requires the full time commitment of one parent. That parent is typically the mother.

MOTIVATIONS TO HOME SCHOOL

Research demonstrates that the home schooling population is not monolithic but marked by great variation (see Mayberry, Knowles, Ray, & Marlow, 1995). Although some people still prefer to think of home schooling as an educational choice made by parents who hold strong evangelical, Christian beliefs, studies have uncovered the multiple motivations parents have for being unwilling to relinquish control of their child's education to either public or private institutions. These motivations are commonly referred to as "ideological" and "pedagogical." Ideologically motivated home school parents are convinced that public schools do not transmit the values, beliefs, or world views they want their children to learn and embrace. A significant segment of these parents are committed to Judeo-Christian religious doctrine and believe that it is the parent's responsibility to cultivate orthodox Christian values in their children's upbringing. Both mothers and fathers commonly oppose the secular curriculum taught in public schools, particularly the teaching of evolutionary science, sex education, and moral relativism. In keeping with Judeo-Christian teachings, curriculum packages (e.g., A Beka Book Program) that emphasize biblical understandings of gender relationships are commonly used.

A smaller segment of families who operate home schools for ideological reasons are committed to a remarkably different orientation: New Age philosophy. The primary educational objective of these parents is to nurture in their children an appreciation for the interrelated aspects of the *human* experience (emotional, spiritual, intuitive, creative, aesthetic, and rational) and to provide them with a sense of the *internal* nature of authority. These parents, both mothers and fathers alike, appear more willing to exhibit nontraditional gender role behaviors in their own family life and are more likely to encourage their children to adopt nontraditional gender behaviors.

Other parents choose to home school for what is commonly defined as "pedagogical" motivations. Pedagogues prefer to home school their children because they feel it provides academic advantages. They are less concerned about *what* is being taught then they are with *how* it is being taught. Teaching their children at home offers them a way to individualize instruction and enforce high academic standards. Pedagogues also feel that public schools are both ill equipped to serve the unique learning styles of their children and to provide the type of learning environment that would facilitate their academic growth. Pedagogically oriented parents also commonly believe that the intimate familiarity they have of their children's learning styles and individual talents allow them to develop educational programs and instructional techniques that are not available in public schools. Research has not addressed the degree to which gender traditionalism is either supported or undermined in pedagogically oriented home school environments. However, in these families, mothers rather than fathers are most likely to first consider the academic benefits home schooling could provide to their children and to initiate family discussions about the possibility of establishing a home school.

ACHIEVEMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The academic achievement of home schooled children has received considerable research attention (see Ray, 2000). A variety of reports sponsored by public, private, and government institutions have examined the standardized test scores of children taught at home. The results are consistent across states and indicate that home educated children score at or above the national average on standardized achievement tests. The significant factors that appear to influence their academic achievement are parents' educational level and pedagogical variables such as individualized instruction and high academic expectations. The very few studies reporting specific effects of gender on academic achievement have found that father's educational attainment has a positive effect on overall student achievement, and mother's educational attainment is significantly associated with language and math scores. Student gender is not statistically associated with overall student achievement, although female home schooled students tend to have slightly higher language and math scores than their male counterparts. However, gender analyses of these findings are not presented.

A central issue in the debates regarding the appropriateness of home education is the potential of insulating children from other members of their community and thereby limiting their social and emotional development. Research conducted in this area suggests that parents who home school are aware of the problems associated with potential social isolation and make an effort to facilitate their children's social development by providing them with an appropriate degree of social contact. They commonly believe that appropriate socialization experiences can be found in parent-approved, age-integrated, and safe environments where their children can learn and grow as opposed to institutional environments (e.g., public schools) where they have little control over the social activities in which their children engage. Data on home schooled children's social activities reveal that the majority play with parent-approved children outside the family, take group field trips, and attend Sunday School. Attending classes outside the home, such as music and art classes, and participating in group sports are also common activities in which home educated students participate. Interestingly, the socialization data consistently refer to the home schooled *child* without identifying gender as a subject for analysis. However, socialization experiences reinforcing gender traditionalism are more likely to surface in households where home education is fueled by the desire of parents to protect their religious values and biblically based world views.

THE ROLE AND IDENTITIES OF MOTHER-TEACHERS

Most research rhetorically portrays the *parents* involved in home schooling and obscures the division of labor within home school households and the different ways in which mothers and fathers are involved in their children's educational process. Recently, a few studies have recognized that virtually all home school families have a nonworking *mother* in the household and that *mothers* are the most involved and active parent-teachers. These studies recognize the significant role women play (both as mothers and teachers) in their children's daily life. This recent research highlights the importance of examining the question of how gender is interwoven and understood in home school households (see Stevens, 2001).

Gender inequalities in home schools are evidenced by the emotional burnout experienced by a significant number of mother-teachers (see Lois, 2006). The reasons for burnout are not necessarily related to either a mother's lack of formal teacher training or limited range of instructional abilities. Rather, home school mothers often experience role strain as they move between their roles as mother, teacher, and homemaker. Home schooling mothers are typically the primary caregivers and educators in their homes. In addition, these mothers do most of the housework. The emotional management required to be successful caregivers and educators combined with the physical labor and time needed to maintain a household often leaves these women feeling anxiety and stress. Performing as a "mother" often conflicts with their "teacher" role, while their "homemaker" role often causes overload when housework obligations exceed the time available.

Some research suggests that in home school families where a traditional division of labor exists, mothers are more likely to experience burnout than in households where fathers provide parenting, teaching, and housework support. Supported home school mothers are more likely to successfully navigate competing role demands. While husbands who share the labor involved in operating a home school help to alleviate the stress and burnout experienced by mothers, research has demonstrated that most home school households maintain a traditional division of labor and that burnout is a common phenomenon.

Despite the fact that traditional household divisions of labor intensify the role conflict experienced by home schooling mothers, there is some evidence to suggest that these women devise creative strategies for dealing with the intensification of family responsibilities. Among the most mentioned strategies are those that involve minimizing standards for housework and reducing curriculum planning time. Such efforts help to alleviate stress by decreasing the labor involved in operating a home school. In addition, to ease feelings of overcommitment, some home schooling mothers ascribe religious meanings to their work, such as defining the decision to home school as necessary because it is part of God's plan. This latter strategy both obscures and legitimates the unequal division of labor found in many home school households.

Clearly, analyses of the primary role played by mothers in the operation of a home school have yielded important illustrations of how traditional gendered divisions of labor can undermine a woman's chance of becoming a successful mother-teacher as well as illustrations of how these women respond to the challenge of balancing multiple roles. Some observers suggest that the ideology of "intensive mothering" also provides a discourse that obscures the unequal division of labor and provides mothers with a socially acceptable way of making sense of home schooling, the sacrifices it involves, and the role conflicts that may be experienced (see Stambach & David, 2005; Stevens, 2001). The ideology of intensive mothering reaffirms that raising and educating children at home is "superior" mothering. By invoking this ideology, mothers' commitment to the home school supersedes any emotional conflict that might arise with their expanded workload. Some researchers have argued that the intensive mothering rhetoric also allows mothers to positively interpret their home school activities within the context of broader cultural messages about "ideal" womanhood. Survey and interview data suggest that many home school mothers resist the label of "homemaker" and prefer to think of themselves as a "home educator," refer to their continually busy and socially involved days, and define the activity of home schooling as intellectually challenging.

Some analyses have suggested that home schooling mothers, by taking control over their children's education, reflect the liberal feminist claim that contemporary women should be more than "just housewives." Critics of equating home schooling with liberal feminism, however, warn that the actual work of most home schooling mothers serves to reinscribe traditional family values.

While the ideology of intensive mothering and the use of "home educator" as an identity label may grant home schooling mothers more symbolic status than being a stay-at-home mom, their networking activities provide them with added pragmatic status. During the 1980s, home school networking organizations began to emerge and grow, removing mothers from the isolated home school setting. These organizations were established explicitly to provide academic and legal assistance to home school parents. In bringing parents who hold similar interests, values, and beliefs together, they also serve the function of making possible the connections between home school mothers and offering them the chance to engage in meaningful work outside the home. Home school networking organizations provide opportunities for women to organize conference and book fairs, serve publicly as home school advocates, and to develop and market curriculum plans, materials, and packages. In this sense, the meaning attached to home schooling moves into the public sphere and offers mothers an element of control in their own lives and a new level of social integration.

THE NEED FOR GENDERED ANALYSES

The common use of home school *parents* and home school *children* reflects the absence of gender analyses in both the popular discourse and most research on home schools. Also, it is interesting that voices within feminism are silent about this contemporary educational movement. It is important that research investigates home schooling as a gendered rather than genderless contemporary educational movement. What are the gendered systems of beliefs, values, and attitudes being taught by mothers who come to home schooling from different perspectives? How is motherhood and childhood redefined by women who home school, and what implications does this have for feminist theory? How has home schooling provided full-time mothers with a space for exhibiting their agency and power, and what are the implications for contemporary debates about feminism and motherhood? What is the relationship between home schooling and feminist activism regarding improving educational opportunities and experiences for girls? To what degree and in which ways do home schooling curricula reinforce or challenge normative ideas about traditional families? How does home schooling embody particular notions of families and gender relationships? We also need to investigate home schooling policies and reflect on their gendered assumptions and the degree to which they include and exclude certain segments of the population. Exploring these issues will serve to deepen our understanding of a rapidly growing educational movement that relies on the unpaid labor of women for its success.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Lois, J. (2006). Role strain, emotion management, and burnout: Home schooling mothers' adjustment to the teacher role. *Symbolic Interaction, 29*(4), 507–530.

Mayberry, M., Knowles, G., Ray, B., & Marlow, S. (1995). *Home schooling: Parents as educators.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press/Sage.

Ray, B. (2000). Home schooling: The ameliorator of negative influences on learning? *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*(1&2), 71–106.

Stevens, M. (2001). *Kingdom of children: Culture and controversy in the homeschooling movement.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Stambach, A., & David, M.E. (2005). Feminist theory and educational policy: How gender has been "involved" in family school choice debates. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30* (2), 1633–1658.

Maralee Mayberry

Joshua Miller

Men’s Colleges and Universities

College education was originally just for men, in particular, wealthy, White, Protestant men. But in the nineteenth century, especially after the end of the Civil War, women gained access to some men’s colleges; many women’s colleges were founded; and more colleges opened as coeducational institutions. Nonetheless, men’s colleges remained prestigious. They did not just exclude women; they celebrated a hegemonic or dominant form of masculinity, particularly at times when women’s ascendancy threatened male privilege. At the end of the 1960s, when demographic, economic, and cultural factors combined to favor coeducation, all but a handful of men’s colleges admitted women.

Today, men’s colleges are virtually an extinct form of higher education. Although women can now attend virtually all institutions of higher education in the United States, their experiences in formerly men’s colleges and universities, particularly at first, were not entirely positive. To transform formerly men’s institutions into coeducational colleges in the true sense of the word—where women are coequal with men—is not easy. Traditions, campus iconography, staffing, and “old-boy” connections all mean that women begin as marginalized outsiders. With the support of key leaders and a strong commitment to fight subtle as well as blatant inequities, colleges and universities have the potential to become as good places for women to study as they have been for men. Such transformations do not happen automatically, however; they take persistent efforts.

EARLY HISTORY

College education was for men only for about 200 years—between 1636 when Harvard opened and 1837 when Oberlin admitted its first women students. Nine colleges were founded during the colonial era. In addition to Harvard, they were William and Mary (1693), Yale (1701), Princeton (1746), University of Pennsylvania (1751), Columbia (1754), Brown (1764), Rutgers (1766), and Dartmouth (1769). All of these colleges were small, were associated with a particular Protestant denomination, had a curriculum focused on the study of classics, and stressed oratory rather than written work. Since professions of the time, such as law and medicine, did not require a college degree, many students attended for only a few years. At college, White, Anglo-Saxon gentlemen gained prestige and connections with others who might further their careers. The most common future occupation of male students was clergyman.

Student life in early all-male colleges was bleak. Students were subject to many petty rules administered by faculty, and their only extracurricular activities were literary or debating societies and sometimes dramatics or music. Student-faculty relations were so bad that, until the end of the Civil War, violent rebellions occurred quite frequently; in a few instances, professors or others involved in the fray were killed.

Colleges were founded at an increasingly rapid rate over the course of the nineteenth century. While in 1800 only 25 degree-granting institutions existed, this number more than doubled in 20 years, reaching 52 by 1820. Forty years later, this number had increased almost fivefold to 241. As they proliferated, colleges gradually became more like the institutions we know today. The curriculum became somewhat varied with the addition of a few practical courses and modern languages. Some colleges, notably Harvard, allowed students to choose courses among electives. Many more extracurricular activities, especially sports, developed after the Civil War and played a key role in eliminating students' violent rebellions. One aspect of college education remained about the same as it had before, however: Most colleges were for wealthy, White, Protestant men, and large segments of the public believed that this was appropriate since only men were expected to enter the public sphere.

Excluded groups used various methods to try to enter these male bastions. Women and their allies petitioned authorities at men's colleges, sometimes asking only for permission for women to take the colleges' exams so as to be able to verify that they were college graduates, but, in other cases, to take classes, too. When enrollments at men's colleges fell in response to war or to economic depression, they were more receptive to such petitions. A few, like Middlebury College in 1883, then accepted women on an experimental basis but stayed all-male in terms of college personnel and facilities much longer. Many people, including some women, believed that it was better for women to attend institutions designed specifically for them—academies and seminaries and then the new women's colleges, most of which opened up after the Civil War ended.

Beginning in the late eighteenth century, Catholics formed their own institutions, as did African Americans, or Whites acting on their behalf, about 60 years later. Various orders of priests, particularly the Jesuits, established Catholic men's colleges, beginning with Georgetown, which opened in 1789. About 100 years later, women religious (often called nuns) opened colleges for women. Black colleges, on the other hand, were almost all coeducational from the start; some even had women on their faculty. Notable exceptions to this coeducational pattern, however, were two Black colleges that exist today: Morehouse for men, which opened in 1867, and Spelman for women, which opened in 1881.

One way that men's colleges accommodated to women's pressure to be allowed entry was to establish annexes or coordinate colleges for them. Harvard was the first institution in the United States to try this compromise. Radcliffe opened as Harvard's unobtrusive annex in 1879. Others soon followed with probably the best known being Sophie Newcomb (1887), the coordinate of Tulane in New Orleans; Barnard (1889), the coordinate of Columbia in New York City; and Pembroke (1891), the coordinate of Brown in Providence. Coordinate colleges varied in terms of their independence from the men's institutions, which were always larger and richer. Barnard was one of the most independent with its own faculty, president, and board of trustees. Today it is unusual among coordinates to be an autonomous degree-granting institution.

While single-sex institutions were common in the Northeast and South, they were less common in the Midwest and West. Still, women's positions in coeducational colleges and universities were not always secure. Frequently, a separate curriculum was established for women students and, in certain periods, women were subject to quotas, as they were at Stanford, or even banned from an institution that had been coeducational. Such reactions to women were particularly common in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries during a period characterized by fears that the U.S. culture was being "feminized" or weakened by women and immigrants. Wesleyan, which had gone from being a men's college to becoming coeducational, changed its mind and excluded women in 1913; women were not readmitted until the coeducational wave of the 1970s. The University of Rochester had an even more complicated history. After opening as a men's institution in 1850, it finally succumbed to pressure (and money) from Susan B. Anthony and her allies and admitted women in 1900. But under another president, women's presence at the University was believed to stand in the way of its desired research reputation; so, the University became all-male again by establishing a coordinate college for women, which opened in 1914 and lasted until 1955 when, once again, Rochester became a coeducational university.

Men's colleges not only excluded women, they celebrated manliness. The stress on men students' physical activities and strength, stoicism, and endurance received particular attention at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. Theodore (Teddy) Roosevelt, later president of the United States, exemplified the type of student admired at Harvard in the 1880s: a good student but not a "grind," physically strong and very active, as well as involved in many clubs that fit the life of a gentleman. All team sports were believed to be character building and the best preparation for men's careers due to the discipline and rough give-and-take they required. But football, which became a dominant college sport beginning in the 1880s, played a particularly key role in the development of "manly men." More than any other sport, it enabled men to engage in controlled aggression and risk taking in front of audiences that often included admiring women.

Another part of the gradually developing collegiate culture that reinforced qualities judged to be masculine were the social or Greek fraternities. Begun in the 1820s at Union College but dominant after the end of the Civil War, fraternities used secret, hazing rituals to promote solidarity and reward such stereotypical manly characteristics as stoicism and fearlessness. Fraternities also permitted men to restrict their social circles further to people who shared social status or interests. Different fraternities got reputations for particular types of men—upper-class men or men good in a sport such as football, for example. At times fraternities at the top of the prestige hierarchy became influential in their institution and able to affect such college policies as admissions. Excluded groups, Jews and African Americans, formed their own fraternities in the early twentieth century.

MEN'S COLLEGES IN THE EARLY TO MIDDLE 20TH CENTURY

Although coeducation became the dominant form of higher education in the late nineteenth century and educated an increasing percentage of college students in the twentieth, being all male enhanced an institution's status. Of eight prestigious Eastern colleges (later known as the "Ivy League"), six were all men: Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. The other two, Cornell and University of Pennsylvania, were coeducational, although women within them were separate to some degree. The "Ivies," particularly the “Big Three” (Harvard, Yale, and Princeton), were viewed as the American counterpart to the all-men colleges of Cambridge and Oxford in Great Britain.

Prestige was maintained not only by longevity and being all male but also by a college or university’s class and ethnic homogeneity, particularly after World War I. By then, some rich Irish Catholics, but very few Catholics whose families originated in southern or Eastern Europe, were students at the Ivy League colleges. Because few African Americans applied to predominantly White institutions, elite colleges did not see them as a threat. Concern focused on the percentages of Jewish students that had risen during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Princeton, Yale, Harvard, Columbia, and other institutions instituted quotas to reduce the numbers of Jews as a way of increasing their status.

The two world wars inevitably had a negative impact on enrollments of men’s colleges as young men joined the military. Colleges survived with the help of the federal government, which paid them to help train members of the armed forces. During World War I, over 500 colleges and universities participated in the Students’ Army Training Corps, with a later benefit being large donations for building facilities, particularly football stadiums, named in honor of students who had died serving their country. Similar training programs existed during the World War II. The navy, for example, chose 131 campuses to provide 120,000 navy men with the kinds of courses they needed.

Between the wars, a greater percentage of the population attended college as higher education came to be viewed as essential to social mobility. Elite men’s and women’s colleges increased their tuition substantially for the first time, making them much more expensive to attend than state universities. Even during the Great Depression they found they could enroll a sufficient number of students, virtually all of whom had to be wealthy since very few scholarships existed. The vast majority of students attended coeducational institutions, including such newer college forms as the two-year junior college and teachers’ colleges, developed as part of a greater commitment to mass higher education. The Catholic colleges founded during this era remained exceptions to the coeducation trend, however, as did a few women’s colleges that opened on the east and west coasts.

At the end of World War II, college and university enrollments boomed, particularly among men, as many veterans took advantage of the “G.I. Bill” to further their education. Not only did this result in the proportion of women at colleges declining (although their absolute numbers rose), but it also resulted in colleges’ having more mature students who rebelled against the traditional restrictions of college life. Student bodies became more diverse as colleges, sensitized by the war against the Nazis, became more open to Jews and Blacks. Partly as a result of Cold War politics and the perceived need to keep up with the Soviet Union after their Sputnik success, the federal government of the United States poured money into higher education, enabling colleges and universities to expand and modernize their facilities. Thus, several factors converged to make the 1950s and 1960s a “golden age” for higher education.

THE MOVE TO COEDUCATION BEGINNING IN THE LATE 1960s

The situation changed dramatically by the end of the 1960s. Campuses were rocked by students protesting racism, the Vietnam War, campus policies that treated them as less than responsible adults, and curricula that seemed irrelevant to many social issues. Enrollments were no longer increasing at such a rapid rate, although women’s enrollments were rising faster than men’s. Commentators warned about the new depression of higher education, just as many administrators were worrying about how they would pay back loans or fill up dormitories and classroom spaces. For men's colleges, coeducation seemed like a good solution to these problems.

Students and the faculty who taught them increasingly took coeducation for granted as very few had experienced any other type of education. Men's (and women's) colleges seemed more and more out of step with a social order that claimed to value integration of races, ethnic groups, and the sexes. While people associated with women's colleges saw the value of women's-only spaces, especially as research spawned by the women's movement buttressed these claims, no corresponding justifications of men's colleges existed. Moreover, administrators at men's colleges knew that by opening their doors to women they would get excellent students who would raise their colleges' academic standards. Other benefits that college personnel believed would come from coeducation were civilizing men students, reducing their disruptive and antisocial behavior, and providing them with a normal, healthy social environment. Administrators and trustees were also responding to pressure from their students since a majority of them wanted their institutions to become coeducational. Among reasons advanced for making men's colleges coeducational, concerns about women's education and gender equity were almost entirely absent.

Opposition to admitting women existed as well. Many alumni, in particular, did not want their college to change in this fundamental way. The compromise popular in the late nineteenth century—not becoming fully coeducational but establishing coordinate colleges for women—once again surfaced and in a few cases was implemented. Hamilton, a small, conservative men's college in central New York State, developed a coordinate women's college in 1968 that was very different from itself—progressive, with a high percentage of Jewish students—but took over the coordinate college 10 years later. At the end of the 1960s, Yale began to negotiate with Vassar about establishing coordinate relations at virtually the same time that Princeton engaged in similar discussions with Sarah Lawrence. In the latter two cases, however, coordination was rejected, and all four institutions became coeducational before 1970. Princeton's rationale for preferring coeducation over coordination and its detailed plans to implement the change to coeducational status was written up as a committee report. This "Patterson Report" of 1968 became widely known and emulated.

Within a relatively short period of time, virtually all men's colleges, even Catholic ones, admitted women. In some cases, it took federal or court action to bring about this change. In the case of the University of Virginia, for example, courts mandated in 1969 that this public institution admit women and do so at a faster pace than the university had wanted. Congress required the five federal military academies to admit women in 1976. Considering the intimate association of the military with masculinity, the idea of women passing strenuous physical tests and enduring the ritual humiliations at a place like West Point helped to dismantle gender stereotypes.

One of the most sensitive issues involved men's colleges that were associated with women's colleges. A common solution was for the two institutions to merge although, in fact, that usually meant that the older, richer, larger, and more powerful men's institution subsumed the smaller women's college, as happened with Brown and Pembroke in 1971. In some cases, the women's coordinate was weakened so that it ultimately became little more than a residential unit. Such was the case with Sophie Newcomb at Tulane and Douglass at Rutgers, although protests in 2005 over the plan to merge all colleges at Rutgers demonstrate that even this degree of separation has been important to women. Barnard College was more successful in its negotiations with Columbia. Not only did

Columbia admit women later (1983) than all the other Ivies, but Barnard remained an independent women's college.

The coeducation movement in higher education was not confined to the United States. Men's colleges in "Oxbridge" (Cambridge and Oxford Universities) experienced similar pressures to admit women beginning in the early 1970s, and, in fact, all did so by the late 1980s. While women and men at these two "collegiate" universities had attended lectures together and shared many extracurricular activities (those sponsored by the university rather than the colleges), the colleges themselves had been sex segregated. Virtually all of the more than 20 colleges at each university were for men only, but both Oxford and Cambridge had a few historical women's colleges. Men's colleges gained in all ways by admitting women. Many highly qualified men wanted to be at coresidential colleges, and many gifted women began to apply to the most prestigious colleges from which they had previously been barred. The poorer women's colleges struggled since they lost their monopoly on women students and women academics. Some of them opened to men at a slightly later date than the men's colleges had become coresidential. By 2005 there were no men's colleges and only one women's college at Oxford and three at Cambridge (one of which is for mature women only).

EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN IN THE FORMERLY MEN'S COLLEGES

Most men's colleges did little to prepare for the entry of women beyond making some adjustments to the physical plant. They seldom considered how the preponderance of men among faculty and staff, the all-male iconography around campus, the traditions and college songs that celebrated manliness, the dominance of fraternities, and the attention paid to male sports would affect women students. Moreover, the first cohorts of women were often a small minority of all students and subject to the experiences of other minorities: treated as tokens who could speak for their group and marginalized, with their behavior carefully scrutinized. They received media attention as the first "coeds," particularly at the more famous men's colleges like Yale. Some of the new women students did not mind such attention, but others became bitter.

Unlike the "coeds" of the past, these women were entering male strongholds at a cultural moment when traditional gender roles were being questioned. The women's movement had made such concepts as "sexism" part of the lexicon and raised people's awareness of the myriad ways women were disadvantaged. Issues like date rape, sexual harassment, sexist language, and the "chilly climate" in coeducational classrooms were acknowledged and debated. Empowered by this movement, the new women students, sometimes assisted by key allies among administrators and faculty, protested the subordinate status they had been expected to assume. Typically, as at Johns Hopkins in the early 1970s, women formed campus liberation groups and organized conferences to which they invited famous women to speak. Not all women students were equally involved, however. Minority women, who experienced racism as well as sexism, often formed their own campus organizations.

Moreover, many institutions lacked basic support for the women students. Although Title IX was passed in 1972 at the beginning of the coeducation movement, it faced court challenges and was poorly enforced for years. As a result, sport facilities for women were vastly inferior to those for men. Generally, it took women themselves to organize and pressure their colleges for resources such as athletic coaches, decent locker rooms, and more women's teams. A famous incident occurred at Yale in 1976 when crew members went to a physical education director's office and bared their breasts, which had been inscribed with "Title IX," to protest inequality in athletic facilities. Outside of the sports arena, women had to fight for health services, including female contraceptives and abortion counseling. Women's resource centers became popular as places where women could maintain feminist libraries, run programs on issues important to them such as eating disorders, sponsor lesbian-bisexual support groups, and, in general, feel safe and acknowledged.

Men's colleges typically had a low percentage of women faculty, administrators, and trustees. Local as well as outside pressures, including law suits charging colleges with discrimination in hiring and pay, led colleges to try to improve their gender ratios. The emergence of academic fields in which women typically dominate, in particular, women's studies, also encouraged colleges and universities to hire more women. By 2005, about 38 percent of full-time faculties were women, but their representation is 10 percent less at research institutions, which are more prestigious.

In many men's colleges, pockets of sexism or even misogyny remained even after women students were admitted. Fraternities, secret societies at Yale, and eating clubs at Princeton continued to bar women and were places where women were sometimes harassed or raped. In many small colleges, and some larger ones, fraternities have been weakened or disbanded; Princeton's and Yale's exclusive clubs now admit women. Yet, incidents in which women are abused or used as sexual objects for football recruiting continue to occur. Today they are more likely to create protests and lead to sanctions than they were in the past, however.

Some formerly men's colleges responded more quickly and completely than others to the challenges of moving toward becoming gender equal institutions. Factors affecting responses include the wealth of the institution, how firmly entrenched a male dominant ethos was, and leadership, particularly of powerful women. A wealthy institution like Princeton, for example, was able to appoint more women faculty, top women administrators, including in 2001 a woman president, and to provide financial support for women students and needed facilities for them. Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Duke University are two well-known institutions that have embarked on major studies of gender relations on their campuses and instituted many reforms to try to assist women better.

MEN'S COLLEGES SINCE THE 1990s

In the 1990s, a decade after virtually all private men's colleges admitted women, controversy erupted over the admission of women to two southern state military institutions: Virginia Military Institute (VMI) and The Citadel in South Carolina. The case became well known as the media focused on a young woman, Shannon Faulkner, who had applied to The Citadel but eventually found the scrutiny and harassment too much and left. Nonetheless, the case went all the way to the Supreme Court, which ruled that even a parallel program for women at a women's college (what VMI was establishing) would not provide women with equal protection or the same access to privileges that graduates of these two institutions received. Women were admitted, but as of 2005, they remained a small minority of all cadets, less than 20 percent.

Today only a handful of private men's colleges remain: Wabash College in Indiana; Hampden-Sydney in Virginia; Morehouse in Atlanta, Georgia; and Catholic St. John's in St. Cloud, Minnesota. Additionally, there is a tiny exclusive, nontraditional, private two-year men's college, Deep Springs in California. Of the four-year men's colleges, two are closely associated with women's colleges: Morehouse with Spelman and St. John's with College of St. Benedict. They thus can offer their men students a partly coeducational experience. Even the more complete men's colleges, Wabash and Hampden-Sydney, have been somewhat affected by the women's movement. Unlike men's colleges of the past, their faculties are about 20 percent women; Wabash offers an area of concentration in gender studies. On the other hand, each of them has 10 fraternities (62 percent of Wabash men belong to one of them, and 34 percent of Hampden-Sydney men do). The ties to values of the past are clearly stated on a plaque on one of Hampden-Sydney's buildings: When you graduate, it promises, "You will be a changed person, an educated person. And you will be a man."

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Brubacher, J.S., & Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities* (4th ed.). Somerset, NJ: Transaction.

Horowitz, H.L. (1988). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller-Bernal, L., & Poulson, S.L. (Eds.). (2004). *Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950–2000.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Thelin, J.R. (2004). *A history of American higher education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Townsend, K. (1996). *Manhood at Harvard: William James and others.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Leslie Miller-Bernal

Military Colleges and Academies

Military colleges and academies are historically archetypal masculine institutions. The first women who entered these institutions as cadets generally encountered strong opposition to their presence. Hostility ran the gamut from malicious comments to outright sexual harassment. The women's motives for attending were questioned; their achievements were not acknowledged. Unsurprisingly, the single greatest obstacle to women's successful integration was the attitudes of male cadets.

The first female cadets fought an uphill battle to gain the acceptance of their male peers. It was often difficult for male cadets to accept that women had chosen to attend "their" school, not to make a point as feminists, to find husbands, or because they were lesbians, but simply because they wanted the challenges and benefits that came from a military college/academy education. As the percentage of female cadets increased, women became established at the institution, male cadets who chose to attend an all-male military college/academy were replaced by those who chose to attend a coeducational military college/academy, prejudicial attitudes generally began to abate, and female cadets gained acceptance.

At most U.S. military colleges and academies today, women are found throughout the ranks, from first-year cadets to upper-class leaders, from military trainers to professors, and female cadets feel welcomed and accepted. Today, women are viewed as valued members of the military college/academy community.

WHAT ARE MILITARY COLLEGES AND ACADEMIES?

Military colleges and academies are postsecondary institutions that provide a general education as well as training in military tactics and military strategy. These institutions educate and train future military officers by developing cadets in four critical areas: academically, physically, militarily, and morally/ethically.

Military colleges and academies maintain spartan military environments and regimens where incoming students receive indoctrination aimed at transforming them into cadets. As part of this process, entering cadets are typically given closely cropped haircuts, issued uniforms, and taught the proper way to march, salute, and address those with seniority. They rise early and their days are highly regimented, filled with military, athletic, and cadet activities, in addition to academic classes. A typical day might include marching, military drill, discipline, class, and extracurricular activities.

In the United States, there are two kinds of military colleges/academies: federal (government-run) and state/private-run. Graduates of the federal service academies are awarded Bachelor of Science degrees and are commissioned in their service-specific branch of the U.S. armed services for a minimum of five years. About 15 percent of the U.S. military officer corps are academy graduates. Unlike the federal academies, graduates of state and private military colleges and academies are not required to join the military after graduation. Nonetheless, some military colleges have high commissioning rates among their graduates.

Integral to military training and a prominent characteristic differentiating military from other institutions of higher education is the heavy emphasis placed on physical training and testing. In order to maintain this emphasis once women were admitted, almost all U.S. military colleges and academies developed a system of "equivalent training," or "gender norming," with separate physical fitness standards for male and female cadets based on established physiological differences between men and women. During the early years of coeducation, many male cadets found it difficult to accept gender norming and railed against what they perceived as lower standards for women. These men pointed to gender norming as confirmation that women had lesser abilities and an unfair advantage. Even today, gender norming remains a point of contention for male cadets who do not accept or understand that the standards set for women require the same expenditure of effort as those set for men. Unlike all other U.S. military colleges and academies, Virginia Military Institute (VMI) maintains a single physical fitness standard for its male and female cadets. While a single physical fitness standard may appear to be gender neutral, it is, in fact, based on a standard developed by and for men. For the sake of strict equality, VMI disregards actual physiological differences. However, since VMI's physical fitness standard is based on the male body, fewer women than men pass VMI's physical fitness test. Thus, VMI's "gender neutral" standard actually places VMI female cadets at a disadvantage because it is, in actuality, a male standard applied to both male and female cadets.

THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR COEDUCATION

Military colleges and academies have traditions as archetypal masculine domains from which women have historically been excluded. Several conditions propelled these institutions toward coeducation, including the dramatic influx of women into the workforce, the Equal Rights Amendment, and the changes in the military during and after the Vietnam War. Following that war, the United States shifted to an all-volunteer force. To maintain sufficient manpower, the military dramatically increased the number of women in the armed services and expanded the assignments available to women. Between 1972 and 1976, the number of women in the armed services rose from 45,000 (1.9 percent) to 110,000 (just over 5 percent) of military personnel. Prior to 1975, the U.S. Army had a separate corps for women, the Women's Army Corps (WAC). In June 1975, the secretary of the Army told Congress that the Women's Army Corps was no longer needed and that its removal would ensure full integration of women into the Army. Congress resolved that women could not be fully integrated unless it dissolved the separate corps status of the WAC, which it finally did in 1978.

Meanwhile, in 1972, the U.S. Naval Academy denied admission to two women nominated by Senator Jacob Javits of New York and Congressman Jack McDonald of Michigan. The legislators responded by introducing bills in both houses making it illegal for the services to deny admission to the academies on the basis of sex. In 1974, while these bills were still before Congress, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy amended its admission requirements, making it the first federal service academy in the United States to enroll women students. That same year, Norwich University (a private military college) began admitting women into its Corps of Cadets. Whereas both the Merchant Marine Academy and Norwich University voluntarily undertook coeducation, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard academies fought to remain all male. The fight over coeducation included divisive argument in Congress and resistance from the Department of Defense. Despite opposition, on October 8, 1975, the President of the United States signed into law a bill directing that women be admitted into America's service academies in 1976. Although the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard academies had no choice but to comply, they did so grudgingly.

In time, most state/private military colleges and academies voluntarily joined the federal service academies as coeducational institutions. Two notable exceptions were The Citadel and Virginia Military Institute, state-funded military colleges that undertook lengthy court battles to remain all-male institutions. Their court battles ended when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that, "Virginia Military Institute's all-male admissions policy violated women's constitutional right to equal protection." Although they could have relinquished state funding and become private institutions, both instead decided to admit women into their Corps of Cadets.

In the fall of 2006, the last U.S. all-male military college (Valley Forge Military College) became coeducational. Speaking on the advent of coeducation, the dean of Valley Forge Military College remarked, "This shift brings new diversity into the classroom and will strengthen our academic programs, while bringing us in line with the service academies and our military structure."

THE HISTORY OF COEDUCATION

The first female cadets at the military colleges and academies were tokens. They were highly visible, viewed as representatives of their social group, experienced performance pressure, were stereotyped, and found that the differences between them and the men were exaggerated. They stood out because of their identity as women, but their individuality was subsumed by their membership in the out-group. Those women who were unsuccessful were viewed as "representative of all women," and those who succeeded were considered "exceptions to the rule."

Not only were the first female cadets tokens, they were under extraordinary pressure to blend in and conform to masculine standards of behavior. To gain the acceptance of their male peers, they downplayed their femininity, tried to keep up with the men, did not make too much of women's solidarity, and avoided anything that would draw additional attention to themselves as women.

Keeping up with male cadets in the physical arena determined, in large measure, the women's acceptance by their male peers. They found that it was not enough to be outstanding women, they had to be as good as, or better than, the men. Women who could keep up with the men were judged, "not like other women," and therefore acceptable. At the same time, female cadets could not be too feminine or too masculine, or, for that matter, too successful, so that the men would not feel threatened by their achievements.

Female cadets who attained leadership positions were seen as threats to male authority, their successes frequently dismissed as acts of favoritism. Male cadets would complain that women who received leadership positions were selected as a result of political correctness, to fill a quota, or because the women were only judged relative to other women instead of relative to all cadets. Some male cadets also maintained that the women were usurping leadership positions that rightfully belonged to men. Female cadet leaders not only had to contend with male cadet opposition but also with the inherent difficulties of a leadership role and male cadets who found it difficult being led by a woman.

In addition to all the physical and emotional difficulties of cadet training, the first female cadets routinely encountered both subtle and overt harassment. Frequently it took the form of sexist remarks and condemnations. An alumna from one of West Point's first coed classes recalled one insidious form of gender harassment she experienced as a cadet. "[S]exist cadences (i.e., poems in marching rhythm such as, 'I don't know but I've been told, Eskimo p***** is mighty cold') were allowed all of the time. My innocence did not allow me to see the inappropriateness of these cadences back then. At the time, I just thought they were traditions that were passed down from class to class. I guess that I also assumed that we were talking about those 'other girls' and not me" (Interview with author, 1997).

Harassment, however, went beyond sexist cadences. Female cadets endured verbal affronts, rude jokes, sexual innuendo, and taunting from classmates as well as still more odious harassment including male cadets urinating or ejaculating on the women's belongings. Blatant forms of discrimination were, in fact, the norm in the early years of coeducation at the federal service academies with female cadets reluctant to report possible date rape, sexual assault, or sexual harassment to their cadet chain of command. Female cadets at nonfederal military colleges also experienced harassment. For example, in the third year of coeducation at VMI, the cadet chosen to be the next regimental commander (the highest-ranking cadet) was expelled after he was accused of seeking sexual favors from three freshmen women.

In their efforts to be seen as soldiers rather than women or sex objects, the first female cadets were afraid to wear makeup or skirts. Their male peers found it difficult to accept them as women and as cadets at the same time. Several years into coeducation, female cadets were still hesitant to be seen as feminine because, in the highly masculine environment of the military college/academy, femininity was equated with weakness. Today, female cadets are more confident about their femininity, no longer afraid to be women and cadets at the same time. Nevertheless, female cadets are still under some pressure to conform to the male ethos of the military college/academy. And, female cadets still must negotiate public perceptions of femininity and successful performance of their role as cadets. Gender was, and remains, the most significant issue structuring the women's experience as cadets.

The greatest obstacle to the acceptance of women at military colleges and academies was, and remains, the attitudes of men. Some male cadets held highly traditional views about women, believing that women had no place in a man's world, such as the military. Others were more concerned that standards would be made more lax to accommodate the women. Some men feared a loss of "esprit de corps," others that their institution, and they by affiliation, would suffer a loss of prestige following the admission of women. Some questioned why women wanted to be there, others thought women were attending only to prove a point. And, some male cadets would neither speak to nor voluntarily work with female cadets. A minority of men, however, saw coeducation as a change that would be beneficial to the institution, to cadets, and to the armed services overall.

A major step toward accepting coeducation occurred when male cadets realized that women were attending for the same reasons men do—the challenges, opportunities for rigorous military training, quality education, patriotism, institutional prestige, and institutional alumni network, to name a few. Some women come from military families; some come to prepare for a military career. Moreover, the federal service academies provide a free high-quality education, albeit with a five-year commitment.

By training alongside women, some male cadets began to develop cross-sex friendships and to see female cadets not as out-group members but as individuals with similar goals and aspirations. The presence of women sometimes even became a source of motivation. In time, the majority of male cadets came to accept the women, and some even came to acknowledge the benefits of coeducation.

THE BENEFITS OF COEDUCATION

Women, men, and the military colleges/academies all benefit from coeducation. Coeducation offers women access to specialized military training at schools to which they were previously denied admittance. Coeducation also pushes women to do their best and achieve more than they thought they could.

Male cadets also benefit from coeducation. By training alongside women, male cadets learn that female cadets are capable of doing what they (men) do. Coeducational military colleges and academies provide male (and female) cadets with models of women achievers and prepare them to be part of a diverse team. Women also serve as a unique form of motivation for men: If even one woman accomplishes a difficult task, men often feel compelled to do likewise so as not to be bettered by a woman.

Coeducation not only teaches male cadets how to work with women, it supplies "real world" training. Whereas an all-male education is good preparation for an all-male world in which women are relegated to peripheral roles, coeducation is good preparation for the real world in which women figure prominently, not only as mothers, teachers, and girlfriends, but also as subordinates, peers, and superiors.

Like their students, military colleges and academies also benefit from coeducation. Coeducation enables state/private military colleges and academies to mirror not only the federal service academies but also the armed services in general. Coeducation has helped military colleges and academies increase both the number and quality of their applicants. And, coeducation has helped schools with declining admissions raise their cadet numbers. On an organizational level, the admission of women has helped make military colleges/academies more professional. Whereas profanity and mistreatment were commonplace in many all-male military colleges and academies, once women became established, such behavior became less acceptable. Thus, coeducation helps transform military colleges and academies from boys' schools to schools of leadership.

The possibility also exists that coeducation in military colleges and academies may eventually benefit the armed services. While training at most military colleges and academies today, women are established members of the Corps of Cadets and can aspire to anything that men can. However, the same cannot be said of women in the armed services. Ironically, most military colleges and academies today are actually more progressive than the armed services for which they train their cadets. So, after four years of being equals, the rules change in the military and women are second-class citizens.

While this seems like ominous news, the progressive stance taken by many military colleges and academies may actually presage changes in the armed service themselves. Coeducational training may serve as the impetus for change, since graduates of these military colleges and academies will be the future military leaders, and military leaders who received their training in a coeducational environment will be more comfortable with the idea of men and women working together than military leaders trained in an all-male environment. Consequently, the future holds promise for a more fully integrated armed services, one that offers women greater opportunities for advancement.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR WOMEN

Although it takes only four years for a military college/academy to transition from all-male classes to all-coed classes, it takes far longer for coeducation to become naturalized. Coeducation begins with the admission of the first women but to succeed requires time and a long-term commitment on the part of the institution before those within its walls fully accept coeducation. Since women first entered military colleges and academies, several factors have helped to improve the experience of female cadets at most of these institutions. First, women are now found at all levels of the institutions from upper-class leaders, to professors, to military officers. Second, there has been an increase in the number of women who serve as cadets, faculty, and military trainers. Third, the chain of command is clearly supportive of women, sending the message that women are valued members of the community. These visible and consistent strong organizational supports for women demonstrate to both male and female cadets that the administration is serious about supporting women and is concerned about the safety and well-being of female cadets.

Because of these improvements, at most military colleges and academies today, female cadets no longer feel isolated from one another, are more comfortable associating with other women and expressing their femininity, and are better able to garner the support they need to succeed. These changes have helped make military colleges and academies more welcoming to female cadets.

Most military colleges and academies have also made concerted efforts to reduce sexism and prejudice based on gender. Some institutions have instituted "sensitivity training" related not only to gender issues but also to racial tolerance and sexual harassment, emphasizing that everyone is a soldier first, sexless, classless, colorless. By supporting their female cadets, enjoining male cadets to treat women appropriately, prosecuting improper behavior, and working to educate cadets about equity, harassment, and fair treatment, military colleges and academies have helped to reduce prejudice and gender bias.

At institutions that steadfastly support coeducation, in time, resistance to coeducation diminishes, women become established, and both the military college/academy and those within it become acclimated to coeducation. However, if the institution does not fully embrace coeducation, women will remain peripheral members. In 2003, the reports by women at the U.S. Air Force Academy of pervasive problems with sexual harassment demonstrated that time alone will not produce attitudinal change if the environment is not conducive to such change. Thus, whereas short-term transitional programs are necessary to initiate change, they are not in themselves sufficient to establish long-term institutional transformation. Such change requires a concerted long-term commitment of institutional leaders who actively support and enforce policies of change. By downplaying the seriousness of the sexual harassment and disparaging female cadets who came forward to report abuse, U.S. Air Force Academy administrators and officers created an atmosphere that condoned and perpetuated discriminatory behavior. The Air Force Academy has since undertaken a rigorous training program aimed at preventing sexual misconduct, and the Academy has shown improvement; the rigorous training has been credited for decreasing the number of reported cases of sexual misconduct.

THE CURRENT STATE OF GENDER INTEGRATION

Female cadets today are far better off than were the first female cadets. Today, the experience of female cadets is generally positive and gender relations quite good. Nevertheless, current female cadets generally have no difficulty offering up examples of gender bias ranging from sexist e-mails to a common misperception among male cadets that all female cadets are overweight. Gender bias even endures at military colleges and academies that have been coeducational for decades. For example, in a survey of graduating seniors at West Point conducted by the U.S. military academy office of policy planning and analysis in 2001, 99.2 percent of female cadets reported that they had heard members of the Corps of Cadets make disparaging remarks about women at West Point, with slightly more than half of them responding "frequently." Even if such remarks are spoken in jest, they create a subtly hostile environment that serves to remind women of their marginal status.

And, in a report issued in August 2005, a Pentagon task force faulted the military academies for harassment, hostile attitudes, and inappropriate treatment of women including jokes and offensive stories of sexual exploits, derogatory terms for women, offensive gestures, repeated and unwanted propositions for dates or sex, and offers to trade grades for academic favors. While this report credited West Point and the Naval Academy with progress in addressing sexual harassment and assault issues, it nonetheless called for placing more women in leadership roles at the academies and admitting more women as cadets and midshipmen. The task force study demonstrates that, although the federal service academies have made progress in incorporating women into their Corps of Cadets, gender integration is not yet a fait accompli.

In all the military colleges and academies, the transition to coeducation has not been easy. These institutions are tough under the best of circumstances with rigorous athletic, military, and academic requirements. With all of the added obstacles the first women encountered, it is impressive that some managed to graduate. The first female cadets showed that women were capable of handling the rigorous physical and military courses and could succeed in the traditionally masculine domain of the military college/academy. Contemporary female cadets continue to prove their competence as hardworking members of their Corps of Cadets, successfully mastering the rigors of military college/academy life. Although some military colleges, such as VMI and The Citadel, are still in the nascent stages of coeducation and all must continue their efforts to improve gender relations, at most military colleges and academies today, female cadets are welcomed, accepted, and valued members of their military college/academy community.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Barkalow, C. (1990). *In the men's house: An inside account of life in the Army by one of West Point's first female graduates.* New York: Poseidon.

Campbell, D., & D'Amico, F. (1999). Lessons on gender integration from the military academies. In F. D'Amico & L. Weinstein (Eds.), *Gender camouflage: Women and the U.S. military* (pp. 67–79). New York: New York University Press.

Diamond, D., & Kimmel, M.S. (2004). "Toxic virus" or lady virtue: Gender integration and assimilation at West Point and VMI. In L. Miller-Bernal & S.L. Poulson (Eds.), *Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities 1950–2000* (pp. 263–286). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Diamond, D., Kimmel, M.S., & Schroeder, K. (2000). What's this about a few good men? Negotiating gender in military education. In N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at school* (pp. 231–249). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Janda, L. (2001). *Stronger than custom: West Point and the admission of women.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Yoder, J.D. (1989). Women at West Point: Lessons for token women in male-dominated occupations. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (3rd ed., pp. 523–537). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Diane Diamond

National School Systems

International comparisons of national education systems reveal a variety of differences in the way girls are educated compared to boys. The history of national education systems is rife with gender inequality. In many of the nations that pioneered state-sponsored school systems, free and public education was not available or accessible to girls until the latter half of the twentieth century. In some nations, free state-sponsored schooling is still not wholly available to girls or, if so, it is provided in schools and classrooms that are completely separated from boys. While there have been many positive advances regarding girls' and women's education around the world, there are still significant gender differences that are ingrained in the policies and administrative structures of national education systems.

Institutionalized gender differences in national school systems primarily occur in one of two ways: (a) differing levels of access to state-sponsored schooling, and (b) differing opportunities to learn within state-sponsored educational systems. There are also generally two ways of interpreting gender differences in national school systems. One way looks at the relatively rapid closing of the gender gap in enrollment and curricular access among nations around the world. Another perspective looks at the persistence of gender differences and rightly critiques lackluster efforts to change the global situation as well as the institutionalized gender differences that exist in national school systems. This essay will balance these two approaches.

OPPORTUNITY AND ACCESS

With the fall of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan in 2003, the last of the nations whose formal, state-sponsored educational system entirely excluded girls from either basic opportunities to learn or access to public, state-sponsored schooling fell as well. This was a momentous occasion not just for women and girls worldwide, but for both men and women around the world because it signaled a major institutional change. In many ways, the global educational norm has shifted toward gender equality at both the ideological and national policy levels. Even in nations that retain their traditional culture and the gendered roles that are part of this culture, schooling norms and expectations for girls and women are changing. Increasingly, at the level of national education systems, there is an institutionalized culture of gender equality that is rapidly becoming an institutionalized norm (Baker & LeTendre, 2005). This means that gender equality is no longer a conscious decision or an overt goal that requires extra effort to achieve in many parts of the world. The concept of gender equality in schooling has gotten to the point where it is taken for granted in most national education systems—even when gender equality is not completely implemented in these systems.

Certainly, in most developed nations' educational systems gender parity is the legitimate norm, even if not always the normal practice. And, as developing nations garner the support and legitimacy of developed nations through economic or political associations (like official aid programs or political accords), gender equality becomes a taken-for-granted part of their national education systems and policies as well. Unfortunately, gender inequality of varying degrees is persistent within most national education systems in spite of the official policies and organization of schools that either assume or push gender parity. But, an educational culture of gender equality means that the formal, legitimate policy and organization of national education systems either encourage or require formal gender parity. However, the idea of gender parity in education did not spread around the world overnight through these economic and political connections. It was a slow (i.e., isomorphic) process that can be traced back at least as far as a post-World War II declaration by the United Nations.

In 1948, the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In particular, Article 26 of this declaration outlines a general plan for national education systems around the world. In brief, it says that education must be available to everyone because it is a human right. Article 26 also emphasizes the importance of primary education, in particular, noting that it should be free and compulsory. It also asserts that higher education (historically a bastion of male privilege) should be accessible to all based on merit. Article 26 finally says that education shall be directed to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. This declaration of education as a human right has shaped the development of national education systems in a profound way since its inception.

Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights became a foundation for the global expectation of gender equality in education upon which emerging and reforming national education systems modeled themselves. It has had a significant impact on the place of girls' education in national systems of education in particular (Chabbott, 2003). This declaration is still important because it emphasizes the point that education is an inalienable right rather than an important privilege. In essence, if education is a human right, it cannot and must not be denied to anyone, girls included. As such, this declaration paved the way for formally institutionalized gender parity in schools by declaring the global norm of equality in which national education systems have henceforth been either situated or steered.

Out of this global norm and belief in education as a human right came the World Conference on Education for All held in Jomtein, Thailand, in 1990. The Education for All (EFA) declaration that grew out of this conference served as a culmination of a century-long movement to transform existing national educational systems from elite or otherwise limited organizations into the most comprehensive mass system of schooling ever devised. A key component of the EFA push has been equal opportunity and access to free, public schooling for girls—at least at the primary level. Out of the EFA program came the Millennium Development Goals coordinated by the United Nations. Goal 2 of the Millennium Development Goals says that by the year 2015 all boys and girls will complete a full course of primary schooling. This is an ambitious goal but is indicative of the aggressive discussion among and global pressure on national education systems to establish systems where all girls are enrolled in school and complete primary education. It is the modern belief that education is a human right that drives this global initiative and that encourages national education systems to meet the goal of gender parity in opportunity and access to schooling.

As a result of these international level initiatives to bring education to everyone, including girls, enrollment gender ratios have improved in most nations since the late twentieth century. In fact, many nations around the world are nearing gender parity in enrollment in education, and those nations who lag behind in girls' enrollment are under tremendous international pressure to remedy the situation. Regions that lag significantly behind in girls' enrollment are South and West Asia and the Arab nations with only 46 percent of enrolled students being female (UNESCO, 2003; UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2005). North America and Europe are at the other end of the spectrum with approximately 48 percent of enrolled students being female. Girls' enrollment in individual nation's educational systems is much more varied, however, ranging from 29 percent in Afghanistan to 51 percent of enrolled students in countries as diverse as Iran and Rwanda. Since regional variation is not very great (46–48 percent enrolled girls), but variation between nations is quite large (29–51 percent enrolled girls), it is important to discover the reason for relative or near gender parity in enrollment between regions coupled with large gender disparity in enrollment between nations.

The reason for the relative gender parity in enrollment across regions is due in large part to the global expansion of modern mass schooling. In almost every nation, there now exists a public, state-sponsored school system. In many, if not most nations, this schooling is free. Those school systems that do still require a direct school fee or an indirect fee such as required uniforms are often the systems where fewer girls enroll in school. The reasons for girls' enrollment being affected by school-related fees more than boys has more to do with socioeconomic factors in the family, community, or culture than with the school fees themselves or with official policies excluding girls. These factors usually relate to opportunity costs. Many families will not send their girls to school because they believe the costs of their girls going to school are greater in terms of lost benefits than anything else (e.g., work at home, no economic return on their investment in the school fees, etc.). While this is certainly connected to the fact that some national school systems require direct or indirect school fees, families deciding to withhold schooling from their girls cannot be directly tied to national educational policies or structures—although these factors may contribute to families' decisions.

In response, however, to the tendency of families to withhold their girls from school for various reasons either affected by official education policy or traditional culture and norms, many nations are beginning to actively work to get girls in school instead of taking the passive route of simply providing public schooling opportunities and hoping girls come to school. This more active approach to gender parity within national education systems has included reducing or eliminating school fees, providing school uniforms at no cost to students' families, and providing nonacademic benefits to students (such as free lunches or health care) at school (UNESCO, 2004). Some national education systems are also working to actively recruit girls into schooling, especially at the primary level.

Although gender parity is not yet the global norm, the expectation of gender equality increasingly is—with one caveat. In all of the discussion about gender parity, the issue of gender segregation in schools seems to be forgotten. When UNESCO or other international development organizations talk about the "gender gap" in national education systems around the world, they largely refer to enrollment and achievement. In other words, when nations provide girls with relatively open access to state-sponsored schooling and girls enroll at levels relatively equal to boys, then these nations are praised for helping to reduce the gender gap. Or, when girls' achievement levels on national tests meet or exceed boys' achievement, these nations are credited with reducing the gender gap. In fact, nations whose national education systems are formally gender segregated (with different schools, teachers, and even governance structures in some cases) are proudly displaying enrollment and achievement statistics that show girls often matching or exceeding that of boys. For example, the Saudi Arabian Ministry of Education proudly reports that girls' achievement levels are equal to or beyond that of boys, and Saudi education officials assert that this is evidence of equal educational opportunity for girls in Saudi Arabia. The question then becomes whether or not "separate but equal" within national education systems can exist in an international context.

THE CLOAK OF EQUALITY

Critics of the current "separate but equal" trend in schooling for girls in nations around the world suggest that legitimizing gender-segregated national education systems (as long as girls participate in and perform at relatively similar levels to boys) allows these educational systems to operate under a "cloak of equality" (e.g., Benschop, 1996), but the question remains whether or not gender parity in education is really being achieved in gender-segregated systems.

In spite of the global availability of modern mass schooling and the active work of many national education systems to achieve gender parity in both educational access and opportunity, differentiation still exists. Differentiation between boys' and girls' education takes many forms at the national level. Broadly, national education systems mimic the structure and organization of the national political system. In terms of gender differences in education, two types of political systems have an especially strong impact on national education systems. These two types are religious and secular systems. Secular systems are those where religion and government are formally separated by law. The national education systems in nations with secular political governments are largely coeducational with boys and girls receiving roughly the same formal opportunity to learn, although informal differentiation (e.g., gender-based tracking and discrimination) frequently exists in spite of formal attitudes and educational policies to the contrary. Secular systems comprise the majority of national political governments.

Educational systems entwined with religion are usually those that are part of a larger state system that either is driven by or shares legal authority with religious principles, organizations, or leaders. The dominant form of political systems formally overlapping with organized religion in the twenty-first century is the Islamic nation-state. In most Islamic nation-states, the schooling process overtly points toward Islam and its prophets as the ultimate guides for social values and authority. And, although predominantly Islamic nations have been frequently characterized as authoritarian in both political and educational structures, many within the worldwide Islamic community believe that Islamic ideology stresses equality for all through the blending of religious and political ideology. In other words, according to some, Islamic educational principles suggest broad educational opportunities through closely guided schooling processes (Wiseman & Alromi, 2003). This ideology is intricately woven together with the social traditions of these predominantly Islamic nations, as well, and has been particularly emphasized by Islamization movements since the 1970s.

In spite of the tendency of religiously oriented political systems to claim commitment to the Education for All agenda, national education systems in religious nation-states frequently allow or require the formal separation of girls' and boys' education and attendant opportunities to learn. Girls and boys in these nations are not allowed to attend the same schools, share the same teachers, or otherwise be coeducated. National education systems that do literally segregate girls from boys in this way assert that although girls' and boys' schooling is separate, their education is equal in terms of curricular content and other opportunities to learn.

Most of the Arab Gulf States have separate schooling for boys and girls. These nations are Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Bahrain, Kuwait, and Yemen. Other nations whose educational systems either passively allow or actively support separation of boys and girls in state-sponsored schools are the Sudan, Libya, Egypt, Iran, Indonesia, and Malaysia. What is significant to remember, however, is that even in the systems that do formally segregate schools by gender, there is an overt effort to offer comparable curriculum to boys and girls. In this way, these systems attempt to establish their legitimacy within the international community of nations by showing that they are "separate but equal." It appears that this "cloak of equality" is working in many ways, but change is afoot.

NATIONAL SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS IMPACTING GENDER PARITY

Global trends in schooling related to gender result from a complicated mix of school factors and social factors. It is either difficult or inappropriate to separate school from society in most nations. There are, however, several characteristics of national school systems that play a larger role in either aiding or inhibiting gender parity than others.

The *national governance* of education can have a major effect on gender equality as can be seen in the changes that have occurred in the organization and administration of education in one traditionally gender-segregated education system. In Saudi Arabia, schooling for boys and girls is segregated and, until 2003, there were not only separate educational facilities for boys and girls but also different national administrative units that governed each. But, in 2003, the General Presidency for Girls' Education in Saudi Arabia was dissolved and responsibility for girls' education moved to the Saudi Ministry of Education. While this shift in governance authority has not immediately changed gender segregation in the Saudi school system, it is a move toward symbolic gender parity at least. And, these sorts of legitimacy-motivated changes have slowly led to real changes in some school systems in other countries in the past.

When governments require *compulsory enrollment* in school, education is usually coeducational. When it is noncompulsory, enrollment is more often differentiated by gender. For example, there are significant differences in enrollment both within and among nations between primary and secondary schooling. Primary education is often compulsory, which often means coeducation and gender parity. Secondary education is less often compulsory and when it is, it is compulsory to different levels. As a result, there is relative gender parity worldwide in primary school enrollment but less gender parity in secondary school enrollment (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2005). The interesting caveat to this shift in enrollment parity is that in many developed nations the shift in secondary school is toward more females enrolling than males. In other words, in developed nations, females are persisting in school longer than males, meaning that males are more likely to drop or stop out of school earlier than girls.

Unlike developed nations, poor countries have *attrition and drop-out* rates that are higher for girls than boys. This is not a function of the formal education system as much as the social and cultural environment, except that compulsory enrollment can sometimes stem the tide of dropouts. In countries without child labor laws, school-age children often work instead of going to school. Sometimes these children earn a salary that is vital to the survival of the family. For example, in many parts of India, only children from the wealthiest families attend public school because their families do not rely on the supplemental income that the children supply–but poorer families do.

A similar version of this scenario happens in developed countries among older, high school age children. For example, the drop-out rate for boys in the United States is much higher than for girls. This phenomenon is complex and has many reasons, but one of the reasons is that boys have work opportunities available outside of school which seem to be "worth more" to either the boy or the boy's family than going to school. In some situations, boys simply wait until they reach the age when schooling is no longer compulsory. Then they go to work. Some would say that these boys are on the right track because they traded a relatively unproductive life for one where they immediately became economically productive members of society. But, being cut off from outside-of-school opportunities does not necessarily mean that students who go to school are unproductive or losing productivity.

Choice-oriented curricula, which most national systems introduce in secondary school, leave the door open for gendered differentiation both formally and informally. At the secondary level in many nations, the curricular and course-taking arrangements of students shift from the sole control of schools to allow some parent and student preferences in course taking. In other words, course selection becomes more choice oriented in secondary school than before and especially the upper grades of secondary school. It is with this shift in curricular decision making control that a lot of community and cultural influences penetrate the schools that may increase gender differences in education even though schools as institutions support and formally encourage gender equality. Add to this other factors such as increased or changing after-school activities, the effects of adolescent peer influence, parental encouragement, along with other, similar factors and, as a result, the stability and equality of national educational systems shift somewhat. The culture of gender equality that modern mass schooling carries, however, can have a different effect in terms of gender parity.

One illustration of the potential influence of mass education on gender differences in education is the unexpected overrepresentation of females in advanced mathematics courses at the secondary level (Baker & LeTendre, 2005). It is not surprising that a consequence of greater gender equality through mass education is greater interest in advanced mathematics among female students. One cause for female overrepresentation is the creation of policies encouraging greater mathematics participation by females. In some school systems, female students are actually being pushed into more advanced levels of math and science by parents and teachers because of increasing expectations for gender equality at these levels.

With greater emphasis on female participation in certain math and science courses also comes the unintentional likelihood of less selective female cohorts relative to males and, hence, lower average academic performance than male students, who as a group may remain more selective. While it can be argued that this is a minor problem relative to the greater good of more female representation in advanced courses, the reporting of these sizable gender differences, for example, in advanced mathematics performance by public domestic and international agencies can further the image of female inequality in education. This was, in fact, the case in the wake of the initial release of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) data.

As noted earlier, *costs of education* have a strong effect on gender parity. In countries where public school is either noncompulsory or involves a direct fee of some sort (like tuition or uniforms), a family's decision to send their children to school may be a difficult one. This is especially true regarding the education of girls in many countries. School fees and uniforms prevent some families from sending their girls to school because the direct costs (combined with opportunity costs) do not outweigh the economic returns to schooling for either the girls individually or their families. For example, in less developed nations and more traditional cultures, the benefits of formal public schooling for girls may not be readily apparent to parents of girls.

In developing communities and more traditional societies, girls often do a lot of work in and around the home. Girls regularly help with or are primarily responsible for household chores such as cooking and cleaning. They also are caregivers for younger siblings in larger families. Sometimes girls are commodities themselves. This is a very foreign and, honestly, unethical idea in many Western industrialized nations, but young girls in some countries and cultures are wedded or betrothed at an early age. The future husband or his family pay a significant dowry for a girl's hand in marriage and in return expect the girl to be prepared to work in her new married home. In these situations, the value of formal public schooling is seriously questioned compared to the cost (both direct in terms of tuition and fees and indirect in terms of lost opportunities) of obtaining that education in the first place. The concern over costs and resources for education in general goes higher as well.

National level of development can affect gender equity because more developed nations can afford more schools and provide better school quality, which means equality is extended to girls as well as the general student population. The quality of schools is especially important if the school system in a particular nation is gender segregated because quality will often differ between the girls' and boys' schools with girls getting the lesser quality school facilities, materials, and personnel. More economically developed nations are also better incorporated into the international community that says national education systems must be gender equal in structure and policy even when the actual schooling processes themselves are segregated. Curriculum, in particular, matters in terms of legitimizing national education systems that formally segregate students and schools by gender.

In every nation, gender differences in education mirror gender differences in other social, political, and economic institutions. For example, if there is relative gender parity in society, government, or the labor market, then it is likely that gender parity will be more prevalent in that nation's schools. At the other extreme, if there are severe gender differences in society, government, or the labor market, then it is more likely that those gender differences will exist in schools as well. This link between schools and other social institutions is not always consistent, however. There are many ways that girls are disadvantaged relative to boys and even a few examples of the reverse.

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL?

The fact that there is as much equality or girls' advantage in academic achievement as there is in nations around the world suggests that some dramatic improvements have been made in the schooling of girls worldwide. And, these improvements seem to many people to be visible in average achievement scores by gender. For example, there are studies that have reported social, economic, and political inequality for women and girls—particularly in nation-states whose political and legal systems are based on religious law and whose school systems are formally gender segregated—yet data from recent international assessments of academic achievement like TIMSS show little or no difference between girls' and boys' academic performance. And, it is the achievement parity that is emphasized by national policy makers.

In several predominantly Muslim nations with either fully or partially gender-segregated schools—including Bahrain, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Malaysia, Palestinian National Authority, and Saudi Arabia—girls appear to be outperforming boys by a significant margin. For many, this finding will be a surprise, but it does suggest the power of universalism ingrained through mass schooling when, even in gender-segregated societies and systems, there is empirical evidence suggesting that teaching and learning are not so readily shaped by traditional male hegemony as is often asserted. In spite of this seeming gender parity within national systems of education around the world, there are still many glaring disparities—the greatest of which remains overt gender segregation.

Much has been written recently about the global progress made toward gender parity in enrollment and curriculum in nations around the world. And, there is much to tout in these areas. But, the question remains whether gender parity in education is really being achieved in gender-segregated systems or not. The persistent phenomenon of gender segregation in schooling in national education systems is the black spot on the record of progress toward gender parity that national school systems have made in the past several decades. But, removing the cloak of equality that "separate but equal" provides national educational systems that do segregate schools by gender is so intimately tied to social mores and traditional culture in the nations that practice gender segregation that coeducation is still a long way off. So, gendered educational differentiation at the national level still depends on the social and cultural context even though it has been integrated in many ways in a global culture of gender equality.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Baker, D.P., & LeTendre, G.K. (2005). *National differences, global similarities: Current and future world institutional trends in schooling.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Benschop, Y.W.M. (1996). *De mantel der gelijkheid, gender in organisaties.* Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum.

Chabbott, C. (2003). *Constructing education for development.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

UNESCO. (2003). *Gender and education for all: The leap to equality.* Paris: Author.

UNESCO. (2004). *EFA global monitoring report 2004: Education for all: The quality imperative.* Paris: Author.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2005). *Education trends in perspective: Analysis of the world education indicators.* Paris: UNESCO.

Wiseman, A.W., & Alromi, N.H. (2003). The intersection of traditional and modern institutions in Gulf States: A contextual analysis of educational opportunities and outcomes in Iran and Kuwait. *Compare, 33*(2), 207–234.

Alexander W. Wiseman

Private Single-Sex and Coeducational Schools

Of the nearly 115,000 schools in the United States, 27,700, or about 25 percent, are private. These schools enroll almost 6 million students, or nearly 12 percent of the school population. Most of these schools have some sort of religious affiliation. The largest group—the Roman Catholic schools—constitutes about 7,800 schools and enrolls about 2.5 million students.

Yet, when most people hear the term “private school,” what they picture is the elite independent school. There are only 1,500 independent schools in the United States, a small fraction of the private schools. Many of these also have a religious affiliation or tradition, but they are governed by independent boards of trustees and financed through tuition, endowments, and charitable contributions rather than being governed or supported by a church.

In the United States, single-sex education has been largely eradicated in the public schools, but it remains a viable alternative in American Catholic and independent schools. Studies comparing these schools with their coeducational counterparts in the United States and in other English-speaking countries where government-run single-sex schools still exist have yielded many interesting findings but no definitive conclusions about the relative benefits of these two educational contexts. In addition to comparisons with coeducation, single-sex private schools have been the venue for studies of girls’ psychological development and the relationships between upper-middle-class status and gender.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

In America, the line between public and private schools was not clearly demarcated until late in the nineteenth century. Many “academies” were governed by a private board of trustees and yet supported with public monies. The first of these was Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, founded in 1778, which now exists as an independent school. The early academies were for boys only; but in the 1820s and 1830s, female pioneers like Emma Willard, Catharine Beecher, and Mary Lyon founded their academies for girls. Though Beecher’s school closed in the late nineteenth century and Lyon’s school became

Mount Holyoke College, Willard's academy still exists as an independent high school for girls. During the 1680s, the Quakers were the first to establish coeducational academies, and many of the Friends' schools now exist as independent schools as well.

In the 1970s and 1980s, a wave of conversion from single sex to coeducation swept the independent schools with most of the elite boys' schools either accepting girls or subsuming or merging with nearby girls' schools. Some of the girls' schools also became coeducational. Whereas 64 percent of independent schools were single sex in the mid-1960s, by the mid-1970s only 34 percent were single sex. The National Association of Independent Schools, which represents approximately 1,200 of the 1,500 independent schools in the United States, currently has a membership that is 9 percent girls' schools, 8 percent boys' schools, and 83 percent coeducational schools.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Catholic schools for boys were established as early as 1677 by the Jesuits in Maryland. The Ursuline Academy, established in New Orleans with the support of the French Catholic Church in 1727, became the first girls' school in the colonies. Catholics in Philadelphia in 1782 opened St. Mary's School, considered the first parochial (which means supported by the parish) school in the United States. In 1784, the Catholic Church in the town of Dorchester, Massachusetts, established the first coeducational parochial school. The First Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852 urged every Catholic parish in the nation to establish a school; by the Third Plenary Council in 1884, the plea was a demand that all Catholic parishes open schools within two years.

In the mid-1960s, enrollment at Catholic schools reached an all-time high of 4.5 million elementary students and 1 million high school students, but since then enrollments have fallen. As of 2005, there are 6,574 elementary/middle schools and 1,225 high schools within the Catholic education system, enrolling 1.8 million elementary/middle school students and 640,000 high school students. Of these, 1 percent of the lower schools and 34 percent of the high schools are single sex; 32 lower schools and 171 high schools are for boys, while 31 lower schools and 249 high schools are for girls. The single-sex schools tend to be operated by religious orders, while the coeducational ones are parish or diocesan schools, making the single-sex high schools the "elites" among Catholic schools. Thus, there are proportionately more single-sex Catholic high schools than single-sex independent secondary schools and more girls' schools than boys' schools in both sectors.

COMPARISONS OF SINGLE-SEX AND COEDUCATIONAL SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

Gender bias in the schools began to receive considerable attention in the popular media in the late 1980s and early 1990s. After the publication of a series of reports by the American Association of University Women and several well-promoted books, some feminists began to look at single-sex schooling in a new light: If coeducation was simply reproducing the gender stratification of society as a whole, perhaps single-sex education was a better alternative. In a girls' school, female students would not have to compete with boys for the teacher's attention. They would see female administrators and girls occupying leadership posts in the school. Girls would be the focus of education, not the people on the sidelines. By then, there were almost no single-sex public schools left with the result that it was the Catholic school population that was most often studied by those interested in determining the benefits of single-sex schooling. A few researchers looked at independent schools in the United States, and comparisons were also made between coeducational and single-sex schools in the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia where single-sex education, as well as coeducation, still exists in government-run schools. Because of the focus on gender equity for female students, most studies looked at the effects of schools on girls, although a few examined effects on boys as well.

The Catholic school population in the United States has been well studied by Cornelius Riordan (1990) and Valerie Lee (1997; Lee, Marks, & Byrd, 1994). Lee and her associates, using data from the longitudinal study, *High School and Beyond,* sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics in 1980, compared students attending coeducational Catholic schools to those at single-sex Catholic schools. They found strong effects in favor of the single-sex situation for the girls but no significant differences for the boys. Girls at the all-girls schools were more positive about academics in general, expressed a greater interest in mathematics, showed greater achievement gains in science, and had higher educational aspirations than their peers at coeducational schools. Lee's studies also showed that these same girls held less stereotyped views about the role of women in the workplace, and she suggested that this might result in these girls' choosing nontraditional careers more frequently. Other researchers, however, have criticized Lee's studies for not controlling for preexisting differences, both in academic achievement and self-concept, in the students who attended these schools. They claim that the differences found by Lee and her colleagues could well be due to differences in the students who attend the schools rather than an effect produced by the schools themselves.

Riordan, also using *High School and Beyond* data, found that females in single-sex Catholic schools outperformed females in Catholic mixed-sex schools in vocabulary, reading, and mathematics. The single-sex school graduates did not, however, turn their high school advantage into higher educational attainment. Riordan likewise determined that, even after controlling for initial ability and home background, girls in single-sex schools scored higher than girls in coeducational schools on four curriculum-specific tests, most especially one in science. The girls from the girls' schools manifested significantly higher verbal and mathematical ability up to seven years after graduation. Nonetheless, there were no long-term differences in occupational achievement or attitudes regarding equal roles for men and women. Fourteen years after high school, no significant differences existed between female students from single-sex and coeducational high schools.

Riordan found that White males in single-sex Catholic schools did not perform as well academically as their counterparts in coeducational Catholic schools; the boys in the coeducational schools also had healthier attitudes and higher self-esteem. When he looked at Catholic schools with high minority enrollments, he found that minority females profit the most from single-sex schooling followed by minority males and then by White females. Only with regard to occupational attainment did males graduating from single-sex schools do better than those from mixed-sex schools. Riordan concluded that this result is due almost entirely to the higher socioeconomic status of the families of the male students who attend single-sex Catholic schools.

More recently, LePore and Warren (1997), using the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988, which followed a cohort of 25,000 eighth graders from 1988 through 1994, studied the effects of single-sex school enrollment on girls in Catholic schools. Controlling for initial student characteristics, they found no significant differences between girls in girls' schools and girls in coeducational schools in academic achievement, educational aspirations, or self-esteem. They attribute the difference between their results and

Lee's to either a recent change in the demographics of who attends Catholic schools or a lessening of sexist practices within the coeducational schools.

Although both Lee and Riordan found positive effects of Catholic girls' schools on the achievement and attitudes of their graduates, Lee did not look at whether the higher aspirations of the girls' school graduates were translated into higher career achievements. Riordan concluded that, in fact, they were not. More recently, Riordan has suggested that findings about single-sex schooling must take into account the social class background of students. He claims that data from U.S. Catholic schools support the conclusion that single-sex schools have more positive benefits for students of low socioeconomic status than coeducational schools, but the different effects of the two kinds of schools are virtually nonexistent among affluent students, regardless of race or gender.

In a 1982 study of independent schools across the United States, researchers examined differences in classroom environments and students' experiences in 15 girls' schools and 15 coeducational schools. This study showed that students at single-sex schools perceived their classes as having higher student involvement, higher academic orientation, more competition, and more order and organization than students have at the coeducational schools. Students in the two types of schools were equal in perceptions of teacher support and teacher innovation.

When Lee turned her attention to the independent school population, she examined the question of who chooses a single-sex independent school and who chooses a coeducational one. After collecting data from 60 independent schools (20 girls' schools, 20 boys' schools, and 20 coeducational schools), she concluded that girls' schools were chosen most often by families with a strong (Protestant) religious orientation or with a family tradition of attendance at single-sex schools. Coeducational schools were favored more by families who were "first-generation" in regard to attendance at independent schools and were more likely to be minority or non-Protestant. She also noted that the entrance examination scores in mathematics were significantly lower for the girls in girls' schools, but there were no differences in the verbal test scores.

In a later study, Lee and her colleagues visited 21 of these independent schools looking for incidents of sexism or gender equity within their classrooms. They found examples of sexism in all three types of schools although the forms of sexism were quite different. In boys' schools, sexism took the form of discussing women as sex objects, while at coeducational schools it was manifested by differential treatment of boys and girls, particularly in chemistry classes. At girls' schools, sexism was found in classes that encouraged girls to be dependent or that taught subjects in nonrigorous, "watered-down" ways. Gender equity incidents, on the other hand, were more likely to happen at the girls' schools and at coeducational schools with strong gender equity policies.

In contrast to her findings of better performance in Catholic schools that were single sex rather than mixed sex, Lee found that students in independent girls' schools did better than their coeducational counterparts on some outcome measures but worse on others. She concluded that, due to differences in clientele between the Catholic and the independent schools, her earlier findings showing the benefits of single-sex education in Catholic schools were not generalizable to the independent school population.

Lee suggested that the organizational features that enhance both school effectiveness and equity include small school size, a curriculum that emphasizes academics, expectations for high student involvement in their own learning, teachers' willingness to take responsibility for students' learning, and a feeling of community within the school. She concluded that single-sex schools for girls often look this way so it may be their organizational structure, not their gender composition, which produces their positive effects.

In 1992, Carole Shmurak compared the careers established by graduates of girls' independent schools to the careers of women graduates of similar schools that are coeducational. Nearly 13,000 alumnae records, from the classes of 1960 through 1985, from independent schools in the northeastern United States were examined, and the number of women in each of ten fields was counted. The fields were medicine, law, engineering, dentistry, veterinary medicine, finance, computers, scientific research, architecture, and psychology. Statistical analysis revealed that graduates of coeducational schools were more likely than girls' school graduates to have careers in four fields: law, computers, scientific research, and psychology. No significant differences between girls' school and coeducational alumnae were found for the other six fields. These results are consistent with the conclusion that the girls' schools conferred no advantage on their graduates in terms of establishing themselves in any of the nontraditional careers examined in the study.

Shmurak continued her study by conducting a five-year longitudinal study of 55 girls in four independent schools, two single sex and two coeducational. Although she found no initial differences between the girls who selected these two kinds of schools, there were some differences by the end of high school: a higher academic orientation (at least as measured by Advanced Placement test scores) and greater support for the arts at the girls' schools, and a stronger college acceptance record and greater emphasis on athletics and science at the coeducational schools. Also, like Lee, Shmurak found different types of sexist practices at the two types of schools: gender reinforcement at the girls' schools and gender discrimination at the coeducational schools. Shmurak concluded that both types are very effective learning environments; some girls may have been better served by one type of school, but almost all of the girls found their experience to be a positive one and felt that they had grown in confidence and academic skills. To some extent, self-selection may play a role in this. The feeling that the school gave prospective students when they visited was very important, and most girls tended to choose the school that fit them best.

The girls from the coeducational schools said that they enjoyed the competition and different perspective that the boys brought to their classes. Many said that being with males helped them to be more aggressive, a claim consistent with assertions by psychologists that already aggressive girls do not usually fare better in all-girls' than in coeducational schools. Girls from coed schools thought the social interactions made school more enjoyable and helped them learn that boys were people who could be friends. They thought it was good practice for college and the real world. The majority thought having boys in their class was an entirely positive experience, although two mentioned being self-conscious or holding back on asking a question for fear of looking stupid.

Over and over again, the girls from the girls' schools said that they were enabled, by the absence of boys, to speak out and to be themselves. The girls' school graduates in this study spoke of the lack of social distractions and the focus on learning. They also reported that their school helped them develop self-confidence, assertiveness, and a strong sense of identity. Some of the girls also said that they learned that being smart was a good thing. Most of them said that being without boys for four years had no negative effects, although a few mentioned that they missed the high school social scene, missed the male perspective in their classes, or found it difficult to have men as friends in college.

Does going to a single-sex high school have any effect on students' future academic achievement or their eventual careers? The results of Shmurak's study (and others) do not support any such effect. Despite this lack of systematic evidence, alumnae of girls' schools often attribute their successes in business and other fields to the years they spent in the single-sex atmosphere. There is much anecdotal support for alumnae feelings that the single-sex experience helped them develop self-confidence that has carried them through the challenges of adulthood. Nevertheless, results of research conducted in the United States are inconclusive as to whether one type of school is more effective than another in promoting higher academic achievement and psychosocial achievement.

RESEARCH IN GREAT BRITAIN, CANADA, AND AUSTRALIA

Studies (reviewed and referenced in Shmurak, 1998) comparing single-sex versus coeducational high schools in Great Britain, Australia, and Canada, where public girls' high schools still exist, have also produced highly equivocal results.

A few of these studies have demonstrated positive effects of girls' schools. Studies in England, Australia, and Northern Ireland found that girls at single-sex schools felt more positively about physics, received more encouragement to enter college from parents and teachers, were more likely to take science courses, had a higher academic self-concept, were more likely to attribute their successes and failures to internal factors, and were less rigidly attached to stereotyped views of English as feminine and science as masculine than their counterparts at similar coeducational schools.

On the other hand, a few researchers have found effects that favor coeducational schools. Studies in England have demonstrated that girls at coeducational schools performed better on tests of science achievement and were more positive about school in general than girls at single-sex schools. A study of a group of adolescents in Grades 7 through 11 in Australian high schools that were changing from a single-sex to a coeducational environment found an increase in positive self-concept after the transition with no change in academic achievement for either the girls or the boys. A follow-up study of these schools revealed the same findings with the additional finding that the teachers assumed that coeducation would be detrimental to girls' achievement, even though this was contradicted by the facts. A study of girls at two private schools in Australia found greater satisfaction with body type and fewer eating disorder patterns at the coeducational school and a greater drive for thinness at the all-girls school.

In Canadian high schools, researchers found that students at coeducational high schools rated their schools as having more pleasant environments with less emphasis on control and discipline, ranked their schools higher in intellectual orientation, had more positive academic self-concepts, and were more positive about their school environments than students in either all-girls or all-boys schools.

The greatest number of studies by far have found no significant differences between girls at girls' schools and those at coeducational schools. In the United Kingdom, researchers found no significant differences attributable to type of school in performance on science examinations. A study in Australian private schools found the sex composition of the school did not affect the amount of encouragement the girls received from parents and teachers to enter college or the number of science courses in which girls enrolled. A more recent Australian study found that, with regard to enrollment in biological and physical sciences, there were no significant differences between girls' schools and coeducational schools.

In Northern Ireland—where a strong partnership between church and state in the provision of separate-sex schooling has maintained a larger proportion of its secondary schools as single sex—researchers found no significant differences between girls at the single-sex schools and girls at the coeducational schools in their scores on state examinations in mathematics or English, their enrollment in science courses, or their achievement in science as measured by state examinations.

Following a group of Australian adolescents from 8th grade through 10th grade, researchers found no differences in attitudes toward school and toward teachers between girls attending coeducational high schools and girls attending girls' high schools. Ninth-grade girls at the girls' schools showed a significantly more positive orientation to mathematics than they had as 8th graders, but this difference disappeared by Grade 10.

Many of the studies done in Great Britain and Australia have been criticized because, in both countries, single-sex schools are often private or highly selective. Thus, many studies are confounding gender with other student characteristics such as ability and social class. Success in school, self-esteem, and levels of confidence are known to be influenced by socioeconomic factors and may not be caused by gender context of the school at all.

OTHER GENDER STUDIES AT INDEPENDENT AND CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

In addition to the studies that compare private single-sex schools to coeducational schools, there are a few noteworthy studies that use private schools as their setting to look at other gender issues. Carol Gilligan's (1982) now-classic study of female psychological development was conducted in an independent, single-sex school, as was her later research (Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990) concerned with girls' loss of self-confidence during the adolescent years. Although the results of this latter study might have been no different if the girls studied were in a coeducational school, it is noteworthy that, contrary to claims often made about the benefits of all-girl schools, the girls Gilligan studied showed a striking loss of confidence and loss of voice even in a single-sex environment. Also, more attention needs to be paid to the fact that major claims about female development, based on Gilligan's theories, are drawn largely from studies of students in single-sex and predominantly upper-middle-class schools.

Amira Proweller's (1998) work on constructing female identities is likewise set in an elite independent high school for girls, but her writing is explicit about its focus on upper-middle-class culture and privilege. She finds that in a single-sex culture, it is easy to take gender for granted; the students are not especially interested in looking at women's roles in history, for example. Just as being White and upper middle class can be unnoticeable dimensions in a school that is largely White and upper middle class, so can gender become invisible in an all-female school.

Still another study that examines explicitly the intersection of gender and upper-middle-class privilege was conducted by Brody, Gosetti, Moscato, Nagel, Pace, and Schmuck (2000) in three Catholic high schools in the northwestern United States. Two of the schools were single sex (a boys' school and a girls' school) but in the process of becoming coeducational, while the third school in the same district reaffirmed its commitment to remain a school for girls. All three drew from a largely upper-middle-class clientele. The researchers found that the boys' school had more power and privilege and was able to dictate the original terms of the transformation to coeducation. The two girls' schools had to press the diocese for a regional study that would allow them to respond to the boys' school plan. The researchers also found that, while both schools that became coeducational sought a gender-neutral environment, the boys' school did this by trying to make its curriculum and instruction free of gender-biased language and behavior. The girls' school tried to erase any remnants of its all-female past (including its name) that might offend or turn away male students.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Association of University Women. (1998). *Separated by sex: A critical look at single-sex education for girls.* Washington, DC: Author.

Brody, C.M., Gosetti, P.P., Moscato, S.R., Nagel, N.G., Pace, G., & Schmuck, P. (2000). *Gender consciousness and privilege.* London: Falmer Press.

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

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N.P., & Hanmer, T.J. (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of girls at Emma Willard School.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kane, P.R. (1992). *Independent schools, independent thinkers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, V.E. (1997). Gender equity and the organization of schools. In B.J. Bank & P.M. Hall (Eds.), *Gender, equity and schooling: Policy and practice* (pp. 135–158). New York: Garland.

Lee, V.E., Marks, H.M., & Byrd, T. (1994). Sexism in single-sex and coeducational secondary school classrooms. *Sociology of Education, 67*(2), 92–120.

LePore, P.C., & Warren, J.R. (1997). A comparison of single-sex and coeducational Catholic secondary schooling: Evidence from the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(3), 485–511.

Proweller, A. (1998). *Constructing female identities: Meaning making in an upper middle-class youth culture.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Riordan, C. (1990). *Girls and boys in school: Together or separate?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Shmurak, C.B. (1998). *Voices of hope: Adolescent girls at single sex and coeducational schools.* New York: Peter Lang.

Shmurak, C.B. (1994). Girls' high schools—How empowering have they been? *The High School Journal, 78*(1), 1–12.

Carole B. Shmurak

Public Single-Sex and Coeducational Schools

Single-sex schooling has increasingly become a controversial topic of public debate over the past decade. For the educational mainstream in the United States, separating boys and girls poses a direct threat to the canon of coeducation. That is not to suggest that educating girls and boys together originally rested on any grand educational philosophy or social theory. Early common school reformers of the nineteenth century embraced mixed-sex schools largely for reasons of efficiency. In fact, while separation was common nationwide in gender-specific vocational and technical classes (e.g., home economics for girls and drafting for boys), through the mid-twentieth century, totally separate schools were rare except in large eastern school districts like New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. According to the U.S. Commissioner of Education Report for 1900–1901, only 12 out of 628 cities reported that they operated any single-sex high schools.

Nevertheless, pragmatism turned to politics with the coming of the civil rights and women's movements in the 1960s when coeducation gained significance as a symbol of the equality ideal itself. As women fought for their place on an equal social and economic playing field with men, they pushed open the doors of prestigious academic institutions that traditionally had excluded them solely on the basis of their sex. At the same time, they rejected both the less academically challenging finishing school aura of elite girls' schools and the gendered curriculum of separate public schools, both vocational and academic, that trained girls for less lucrative careers than boys. As a result, single-sex education came to represent a system of male privilege and female subordination that would no longer be tolerated in an enlightened society.

As it has become increasingly apparent that coeducation is not a certain remedy for gender inequality in schooling, single-sex schooling in its contemporary incarnation is slowly gaining popular support, especially in urban communities, despite continued political resistance and legal ambiguities. While it will never replace coeducation as the norm, nor should it, it presents an alternative strategy for addressing educational gaps in interest, performance, and achievement that appear to fall along gender lines. It remains to be seen if the approach can achieve its promised results. Findings to date have been encouraging but nonetheless inconclusive. Yet, the growing number of programs nationwide is now creating the field necessary for gathering critical comparative data. The final proof rests with both the educational and research communities as they work together, through trial and error, to set aside ideological disagreements and objectively identify what works best for different populations of girls and boys at different stages in their schooling. Meanwhile, it rests with the U.S. Department of Education to vigilantly enforce newly revised standards and guide these programs as they navigate the turbulent waters of sameness and difference.

THE LEGAL CONTEXT FOR PUBLIC SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLING

The discussion of single-sex schooling in its modern incarnation becomes especially heated in the context of public schooling. This fact is not surprising since the federal government effectively banned single-sex programs in the 1970s following the enactment of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and the subsequent adoption of its implementing regulations. A series of significant legal events has intermittently fueled the debate since the mid-1990s. In 1996, the United Stated Supreme Court, using sweeping language with potentially broad implications, struck down the all-male admissions policy at the state-supported Virginia Military Institute, popularly known as VMI. That decision, addressing a unique institution with a unique mission, has yet to be tested on elementary and secondary programs. Nevertheless, it casts an uncertain cloud over current initiatives despite vast differences in their intent, practices, and effect as compared with VMI.

To complicate the matter even further, in January 2002, as part of the No Child Left Behind Act, Congress, with broad bipartisan support, authorized the use of federal funds for innovative educational programs, including single-sex schools and classes. In order to remove any conflicts between that authorization and Title IX, in October 2006, the U.S. Department of Education finally issued revised Title IX regulations. The revisions offer school districts considerable flexibility in establishing schools and classes that separate students on the basis of sex. The new rules are a striking turnaround from previous federal policy under which the Office for Civil Rights had aggressively threatened or initiated enforcement action against local efforts to establish single-sex schools or classes.

The four years of foot-dragging speaks volumes to the complexity and political sensitivity of the issues presented and the sharp disagreements over a possible resolution. Women's and civil rights groups have been the primary opponents of any changes in Title IX interpretation. Support, on the other hand, has come mainly from school districts and charter school organizers.

This is clearly one of those situations in which practice has outstripped both policy and the law. Despite continued political resistance and legal ambiguity, single-sex schooling has been experiencing a revival nationwide for over a decade, opening to question coeducation's long-standing veneer of gender neutrality. And, it is not confined to the public sector. In fact, interest in single-sex education, especially among private independent girls' schools, began to escalate in the early 1990s. Between 1998 and 1999 alone, enrollment in all-girls' schools increased by 4.4 percent. By the start of the new millennium, 32 new girls' schools had opened in the previous five years while applications nationwide had increased by 37 percent and enrollments by 29 percent over the course of a decade. By 2002, enrollments had risen by another 8 percent. Girls' schools were also outstripping boys' and coed schools in enrolling and retaining students of color (see NCGS, *Choosing a Girls' School,* 2001; NCGS, *Member Survey,* 2001).

The extent of this unexpected phenomenon, and the underlying reasons, vary somewhat by gender, race, and social class. First, even as the admission of women into prestigious all-male schools and colleges moved forward in the 1970s, it soon became apparent that coeducation itself could not remedy deeply institutionalized attitudes and practices. Discrimination in counseling, hostile classroom environments, and a curriculum devoid of women's experiences and accomplishments soon surfaced as serious obstacles to women's full participation in education and ultimately in society. The inequalities were pervasively evident from elementary school through higher education. Then there was the well-publicized research, dating from the 1980s and early 1990s, on how coeducation was more specifically shortchanging girls. Girls were lagging behind boys in math and science and were losing self-esteem as they approached adolescence. Add to that the more recent studies sounding an equally troubling alarm regarding boys and their academic alienation. And, finally and perhaps most critically, among school officials and policy makers there is the growing awareness of and frustration with the severe academic and social problems of African American and Latino students, especially males.

It is not surprising that urban educators and parents in particular are increasingly turning to single-sex programs. Between 2000 and 2003, 15 single-sex public schools opened their doors. Some were new upstarts including charter schools. Others were reconstituted from formerly coeducational schools. In all but three of them, 85 percent of the students were non-White (Project on Single Sex Schools, 2004). In the 2004 school year, an additional 11 schools opened, bringing the number to 34. By the 2006 school year, the number had grown to 51 with an additional 190 public schools offering some single-sex classes. Many of these schools are targeted toward underprivileged minority students. The landscape of single-sex schooling, therefore, is changing dramatically. And, it may change even more, depending on whether these new initiatives can demonstrate positive academic results and whether they can survive continued legal opposition.

DECONSTRUCTING THE DEBATE ABOUT SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLS

Although widely considered to reflect traditional values, single-sex schooling in its current form defies conventional political labels. On the question of public schooling in particular, it has generated an unusual alliance among an odd grouping of individuals and organizations: social conservatives touting "hard-wired" differences between boys and girls; political conservatives for its appeal to a free market of parental choice; feminists seeking to close the gender gap favoring boys, especially in math, science, and technology; and urban educators and activists concerned with the plight of minority students and especially African American males.

Supporters offer a number of rationales for separating girls and boys and particularly underprivileged minority students. They argue that single-sex programs remove the social distraction of the other sex, placing the intellectual above the social, which is above all important in communities where students do not necessarily identify with academic achievement. They provide minority boys with positive role models in socially secure settings and thereby enable them to establish a constructive sense of self and more academically oriented goals. Some maintain that single-sex programs serve as a counterweight to the negative influence of popular culture and the mass media. It is well known that today's preteens and teenagers are exposed to a hip-hop culture with a heavy sexual element. Given that reality, separate programs provide a "safe haven" from the social pressures to engage in early sexual activity along with the opportunity to channel energies into academic pursuits.

It is also believed that single-sex schooling more effectively accommodates the different maturational pace, learning styles, and emotional needs of many girls and boys. Girls as a group come to school with better verbal and fine-motor skills, longer attention spans, and greater impulse control, all of which puts young boys at a disadvantage in the lower grades. Most boys eventually do catch up, but many boys, and especially minority boys who lack basic prereading skills when they enter school, simply give up or are misidentified as learning disabled, a labeling that sets them on a path of low self-esteem and academic failure. Young boys in general have tremendous energy. Boys' schools pride themselves in channeling that energy into positive directions rather than trying to control it by making boys conform to the more sedentary learning style of most girls.

Meanwhile, proponents maintain that single-sex programs afford girls an emotional space in which they can develop leadership skills and intellectual abilities free from the social pressure of boys. More specifically, they believe that single-sex schooling can effectively increase math and science achievement, performance, and interest among girls and ultimately increase the numbers of women pursuing careers related to those subjects. And, finally, for a growing number of inner-city parents and school officials, single-sex education is an antidote to failing schools. It is widely known that four decades of compensatory programs and school reform have failed to stop the downward spiral that continues to capture many urban students.

Yet, despite these compelling arguments, single-sex schooling continues to evoke fear, vitriolic criticism, and threats of legal action from others. Opponents argue that these programs smack of benevolent sexism and deny young men and women the social skills and familiarity they need to relate to each other now and in the future. They maintain that separation does not breed the mutual understanding and respect that place women on an equal footing with men, that it diverts attention from the more pervasive gender inequities in coeducation especially for girls, that it reinforces archaic gender stereotypes, and that it inevitably results in lesser resources for female students. Finally, there are the legal claims, even despite the revised Title IX regulations, that publicly supported programs violate both the intent of the Title IX law and the U.S. Constitution. Separating students on the basis of any personal attribute induces outrage from civil liberties groups and others who invoke the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* and the principle that "separate is inherently unequal." It also raises the specter of the Court's 1996 decision striking down the all-male admissions policy at the Virginia Military Institute.

As stated, the most vocal and visible critics have been organized women's groups (although chapters of the American Civil Liberties Union have played a key role in bringing litigation and filing Title IX complaints challenging single-sex programs). The 5,800 letters and e-mails, many of them identically worded, that the Department of Education received opposing any revisions in the Title IX regulations were the result of efforts orchestrated by some of the most established feminist groups, including the National Organization for Women, the Feminist Majority Foundation, the American Association of University Women, and the National Women's Law Center. And so, at first glance, "feminism" appears to be the primary enemy.

That is the way many observers see it. Yet, that view is overly simplistic and misleading. It mistakenly implies that feminism is both monolithic and static. It also implies a negativity that many individuals, including women, now attach both to the feminist label and to the more radical oppositionist streams within feminism as a movement. Yet, many of those committed to advancing full political and social equality for women ardently endorse single-sex schools. In fact, numerous individuals, including dissenters within the same organizations that have voiced strong legal and political opposition to the concept, have supported it, mainly outside the public eye. A considerable number of these proponents themselves attended an academically rigorous girls' high school or elite women's college, which proved for them a positive and even a defining experience. For those who have lived single-sex schooling on the inside, opposing arguments simply defy reason especially when viewed against the modern-day backdrop of poverty and academic disengagement that characterize many urban minority students.

SAMENESS AND DIFFERENCE

Within the larger and looser network of gender equity advocates and within the formal ranks of "feminists" per se, the controversy turns primarily on fundamental disagreements over sameness and difference. For the most vocal critics of single-sex schooling, much of their view dates back to the 1960s and 1970s when women pushed to assimilate into a male world based on "sameness." For them, any concession to differences between the sexes signals a retreat to a world where women were foreclosed from a full range of life opportunities that men enjoyed. Proponents, on the other hand, pragmatically wind through a maze of sex differences and inequalities on race and social class.

We are now coming to understand that boys and girls are essentially the same at the core in abilities and performance but differ at the margins at various stages in their development. As already noted, girls enter school with more advanced fine-motor and verbal skills while boys tend to develop visual-spatial skills at a younger age, which gives them an advantage in math and science through much of schooling. But, the very fact that three decades of special programs for girls in these subjects has narrowed the gender gap demonstrates that performance is changeable and not carved in biological stone.

Meanwhile, the achievement gap favoring boys in math and science pales in comparison to the one favoring girls in reading and writing. Within public schooling, it progressively widens as students move up the grades. The average 11th- grade public school boy writes with the proficiency of the average eighth-grade girl. According to a 2004 Gallup poll (see Mason, 2004), although virtually the same proportions of adolescent girls and boys consider math or science their favorite subjects, only 5 percent of boys as compared with 22 percent of girls favor English. Boys moreover represent 73 percent of secondary school students identified with learning disabilities. It is, therefore, not surprising that the disproportionate number of female college students has become a matter of national concern. The female-male ratio has reached a stunning 60–40 at the University of North Carolina and 61.5–38.5 at American University. Even at Harvard, the incoming class for 2006 was 52 percent female.

In recent years, advanced technology and research techniques have afforded gender differences greater attention and credibility. Scientists can now view how females and males process information and how their brains develop from childhood to adolescence and into adulthood. As a result, researchers report a range of structural, chemical, and functional brain differences linked to gender. Some of these differences appear to arise from the moment of birth. Studies have documented the more rapid maturation of the female brain. Others have found sex differences in the specific regions of the brain activated for sound recognition (related to language and reading skills favoring girls) and spatial performance (related to mathematical skills favoring boys).

Nevertheless, these seemingly innate variations need to be looked at critically and cautiously. While they provide a compelling justification for single-sex schooling, at least at first glance, it must be kept in mind that findings from brain research are tentative and understandably lend themselves to potentially dangerous misuse and misleading implications. A significant link between these findings, on the one hand, and cognitive abilities, learning styles, and teaching strategies, on the other, has yet to be established. Moreover, these differences are not fixed over time nor do they exist in a cultural vacuum. There is general agreement that innate abilities respond to outside influences that either reinforce their strength or counteract their weakness. Where one sex may be biologically disposed to perform certain tasks, this difference in ability influences popular beliefs and expectations about the sexes. And so, children adapt to a normative view grounded in biological reality that home, school, and the media further underscore.

Proponents of single-sex programs maintain that separation permits the use of strategies and materials that appeal to different learning styles and interests. While that approach is not harmful in itself and may, in fact, prove effective for some students, educators must apply it with thought and careful attention when ascribing differences to sex. If not, it merely serves to reinforce and even imbed differences where they may not exist in the first instance. Constructing definitions of femininity and masculinity and assessing how those constructions reflect the values of the immediate community and the larger society are issues that go to the heart of all education and especially single-sex schooling.

Meanwhile, any discussion of educational programming for girls or boys would be incomplete without taking race and social class into account. As single-sex schooling migrates beyond the elite private schools and into the inner city, these differences are critical. The test-score gap between White and African American students has been widening since the mid-1980s in nearly every age group and in every subject, reversing gains made in the previous decade and a half. Nearly two-thirds of African American and non-White Latino fourth graders are functionally illiterate. Nearly two-thirds of eighth graders among them lack basic math skills. The deficits are especially striking at the top levels of achievement as Advanced Placement and SAT scores reveal. When compared with White students, the drop-out rate for African Americans is almost double while for Latinos it is quadruple. The problem is most acute among boys. The failure of disadvantaged minority boys, in particular, to identify with academic success has been well documented. Minority girls, in fact, fare almost universally better academically than minority boys but again far worse than majority girls.

THE SEARCH FOR EVIDENCE FAVORING SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLING

Threaded throughout the debate and the surrounding legal maneuverings, the obvious and perhaps most vexing question is whether single-sex schooling “works.” Is there any evidence that separating students on the basis of sex makes a positive difference in academic performance and achievement or social adjustment at least for some populations of students? That question is especially important for public schools, which are not only accountable to their constituents but also answerable to legal norms that remain open to wide interpretation. It is especially important for new schools as they try to articulate their mission and respond to demands that they produce research findings, initially to support their fundamental purposes and ultimately to prove that they have achieved what they originally set out to do.

Critics now invoke the federal No Child Left Behind Act and its provision calling for "scientifically based research" to guide educational practice. From that vantage point, qualitative studies as commonly carried out in educational circles do not provide hard evidence but at most hypotheses for further studies. As a remedy to those shortcomings, randomized trials have gained new currency in Washington policy circles. Such studies ideally assign subjects at random to either experimental or comparison groups. Commonly used in medicine and the biological sciences, they have been rare and somewhat controversial in education. The apparent disinclination to use the methodology has stemmed in part from the expense involved and in part from the impractical logistics of designing and monitoring identical learning environments that isolate the particular approach under study. Moreover, and perhaps most importantly, assigning students at random to yet unproven educational programs raises serious ethical concerns. It is, therefore, understandable why randomized studies on single-sex schooling cannot be found.

Critics also raise the Supreme Court's decision in the Virginia Military Institute case where the Court made clear that state actors must present an "exceedingly persuasive justification" when drawing distinctions on the basis of sex. Exactly what specific pedagogical and social rationales would prove constitutionally acceptable, and for what population of students, remain to be tested. The Court, nevertheless, did note that programs must develop the "talents and capacities" of the particular students that they serve. In other words, they must have academic merit and produce positive educational outcomes.

It should not be forgotten, however, that the facts surrounding VMI differed dramatically from public school programs now sweeping the country. In the case of VMI, the State of Virginia was offering a unique and highly valuable education to men while denying it to women. This was the only publicly supported military college in the state. And, it did not merely prepare students for military service. In fact, it was a primary entryway into high-level corporate and governmental careers. Although in the course of the lawsuit, the State opened a parallel program for women at a nearby private women's college, this was, as the Court said, a "pale shadow" of VMI in terms of "curricular choices, faculty stature, funding, prestige, alumni support and influence." In contrast, the new wave of initiatives attempts to level the playing field by sex, race, and social class. Their aim is to empower students and help them realize their full potential. Analogies drawn to racial segregation are similarly flawed for obvious differences in intent, practice, and effect. Unlike the forced segregation of students struck down by the Court in early race desegregation cases, publicly supported single-sex programs are voluntary as a matter of law. (The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, 20 U.S.C. §§1701–1721 [2003] prohibits the involuntary "assignment" of students to public schools on the basis of sex.) They also are enthusiastically embraced by the families that they serve.

That being said, federal research requirements and the VMI standard, taken together, have sent educators and policy makers in frantic search of evidence to justify programs that, critics argue, rest solely on anecdotal reports and scattered studies from other English-speaking countries and from private and, particularly, Catholic schools in the United States. Much of this research admittedly lacks the methodological rigor and the statistical controls of conventional scientific research. Nor can we deny the obvious organizational, cultural, and demographic differences between the programs studied and newly established public school programs in this country. These distinct features obviously limit the predictability of the findings. The limitations in themselves, however, should not derail the discussion as they so often do. To demand scientifically based evidence before moving forward would foreclose any innovation.

Rather than reject existing findings, therefore, policy makers should accept what they reveal in suggesting specific reasons for considering single-sex schooling. Some of this research unquestionably is now dated and begs for replication. Yet, several more recent large-scale and controlled studies (reviewed in Salomone, 2003) have generated especially promising results. Added to these findings is a growing body of case studies and anecdotal reports from public schools in the United States pointing to certain benefits to be gained from various forms of separate classes or schools. While the findings are not definitive, they are, nonetheless, instructive.

Researchers report that single-sex classes may develop greater self-confidence and broader interests, especially among adolescents. Girls note that single-sex math and science classes afford them a greater comfort level, allow them to interact more with their teachers, and enable them to develop more favorable attitudes toward these subjects. They state that they are less self-conscious about asking questions and participating in cooperative learning groups and that they have greater self-confidence when they advance to upper-level coed classes even in subjects unrelated to science or math. It is reasonable to speculate that these changed attitudes, examined over time, may lead to more advanced course taking and ultimately a broader range of career options. And, while conventional wisdom holds that boys prefer competition and independent work, there is some evidence that both girls and boys derive academic benefits from working collaboratively in same-sex groupings.

There is further evidence from other English-speaking countries (also reviewed in Salomone, 2003) that single-sex schools increase both interest and course taking in math, science, and technology among girls and likewise in language arts and foreign languages among boys, academic subjects that boys traditionally tend to disfavor. A study by James and Richards (2003) of boys' school graduates in the United States confirms these findings. They found that single-sex schooling promoted interest in the humanities (English, reading, and history), which further carried over into college majors and career choices. In contrast, male graduates of coed schools were more likely to major in business than their counterparts from boys' schools. Beyond these attitudinal and more long-range effects, findings further suggest that single-sex schooling more immediately improves academic performance and achievement. Several small experimental programs for disadvantaged minority boys, with male teachers as role models, have reported increased attendance and improved performance in reading and math. More recent large-scale studies from other English-speaking countries have yielded similarly positive academic results (see Salomone, 2003, for more details).

Educators report that single-sex schools afford students the possibility to engage in the full range of extracurricular activities beyond those conventionally identified with one sex or the other. Girls assume more leadership roles in political and debate clubs while boys are more likely to join the drama club, the choir, the literary magazine, and community service clubs—activities that girls often dominate in coed settings. It could be the case, however, that these findings are at least partially a function of social class. There may be a distinct difference in comparing elite private to public coeducational schools where male students are apt to be high achievers and drawn to traditionally male activities, and to the more general student population where, according to press reports, secondary school girls now dominate student government positions and receive the lion's share of academic awards.

Nevertheless, whether rich, poor, or middle-class, boys in coeducational schools do not appear to enjoy a full assortment of extracurricular activities. At the high socioeconomic end, socially determined interests reinforced by male role models in their lives lock boys into conventionally male-gendered activities while at the low end, equally powerful but different social pressures completely lock them out. If that is the case, then perhaps boys across the socioeconomic/academic spectrum, as well as girls at the high end, can benefit from the expanded leadership and extracurricular opportunities that single-sex schools seem to provide. Meanwhile, although girls at the low end of the spectrum theoretically enjoy these benefits by male default, they cannot realistically fill that void without the necessary academic identification and motivation that, for many low-income minority girls, give way to early pregnancy. In view of these troubling realities, the intense academic focus of single-sex schools has much to offer beyond the academic and social benefits found in earlier studies.

It cannot be denied, however, that the overall findings on single-sex education are inconclusive and merely suggestive. Yet, considered in the aggregate, along with other developmental and social evidence, they provide useful direction to educators as they initially consider justifications and define goals. This combined body of data and observations is at least equally informative for researchers to explore and selectively follow in charting a broad and varied research agenda specifically to measure outcomes. Following that route, a full assessment of single-sex schooling's benefits should cover a range of short- and long-term effects beyond the bottom line of school performance and achievement, including changed attitudes toward certain subjects as well as course selection patterns; immediate effects on disciplinary problems, pregnancy, suspension, and drop-out rates; and even long-range effects on college enrollment and career choices.

A further useful consideration would be the impact of single-sex education versus coeducation on socialization factors including attitudes toward the other sex. It is crucial to consider whether single-sex programs reinforce or dissipate gender stereotypes among students.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

James, A.N., & Richards, H.C. (2003). Escaping stereotypes: Educational attitudes of male alumni of single-sex and coed schools. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*(2), 136–148.

Mason, H. (2004). *Math=teens' favorite subject* (The Gallup Poll Tuesday Briefing, June 15, 2004). Available at http://www.gallup.com

National Association for Single-Sex Public Education. (2006). *Single-sex public schools in the United States.* Available at http://www.singlesexschools.org/schools-schools.htm

National Coalition of Girls' Schools. (2001). *Choosing a girls' school: Directory 2001.* Concord, MA: Author.

National Coalition of Girls' Schools. (2001). *NCGS member survey.* Concord, MA: Author.

Project on Single Sex Schools: Their Characteristics and Effects. (2004). *Single sex schools.* Portland, OR: RMC Corporation.

Salomone, R. (2003). *Same, different, equal: Rethinking single-sex schooling.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Salomone, R. (2004). Feminist voices in the debate over single-sex schooling: Finding common ground. *Michigan Journal of Gender and Law, 11*(1), 63–95.

Salomone, R. (2006). Single-sex programs: Resolving the research conundrum. *Teacher's College Record, 108*(4), 778–802.

Salomone, R. (2006). Putting single-sex schooling back on course. *Education Week, 26*(14), 32–33, 44.

Rosemary C. Salomone

Tribal Colleges and Universities

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the founders of the Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TCUs) movement undertook the challenge of entering and working to change a system of education for American Indian people in which they had been denied input and had seen a concentrated effort to eradicate all things American Indian. Today, the movement continues the efforts of educational exploration, initiative, and development that began in the summer of 1968 with the founding of Navajo Community College in Tsaile, Arizona. TCUs can best be described as small, tenacious institutions of higher education that serve the smallest and poorest minority group in the United States (American Indians) in difficult and challenging circumstances. TCUs are generally underfunded, with overworked administrators, faculties, and staffs, and are viewed by the rest of American higher education with some wonderment at their ability not only to survive but also to survive with panache.

It was among the founders of the TCUs that an important trend began in the TCUs' movement that is still prevalent today within the TCUs, namely, the leadership roles of women in all aspects of the TCU movement. Women make up nearly 50 percent of the founders of the TCUs over their 40-year history to date. Traditionally, American Indian women had been equal partners in all decisions made among the tribes of American Indians. This tradition nearly disappeared once American Indian people became a subjugated people. Indian societies began reflecting the norms of the majority society that had conquered them and, thus, relegating Indian women to near second-class status.

The founders advocated a philosophy that supports a dual mission, which is still adhered to by leaders of the TCUs, to protect and enhance their own cultures including values, traditional stories, and languages while at the same time embracing many of the tools of standard postsecondary education. TCU leaders recognize that they cannot just prepare tribal students to be proficient in their own cultures but must also prepare them to be proficient in the non-Indian world that surrounds the tribal communities. They have to prepare their students to live biculturally in two very different worlds.

Many in the American Indian world believe that TCUs are the best thing to have happened for American Indians in the past 120 years since the last free American Indian people were relegated to a reservation. Today TCUs constitute 0.01 percent of postsecondary education in the United States; yet, the American Indian College Fund (AICF) states that TCUs educate nearly 18 percent of the entire American Indian student population enrolled in higher education within the United States.

TCU HISTORY

Nowhere in Indian country during the 1960s were events moving more quickly concerning American Indian control of Indian education than in the Navajo Nation. Political and educational leaders formed Dine, Inc., a community-based and nongovernmental education organization, with the intention of taking control of the education of Navajo students. One area of Indian education that the founders of Dine, Inc., desired to impact immediately was that of higher education. The attrition rate of 90 percent or more experienced by Navajo students attending colleges off the reservation demanded innovative solutions. The participants in Dine, Inc., began exploring the possibility of a community college for the Navajo people. This was not a totally new topic of discussion but never before had it been approached with such seriousness.

After much preparation by Dine, Inc., the Navajo Nation founded and chartered Navajo Community College in July 1968 in Tsaile, Arizona. Though underfunded and forging a completely new path in higher education, Navajo Community College (now called Dine College) survived and succeeded, encouraging a number of other tribes to found and charter their own tribal colleges during the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and into the twenty-first century.

As early as 1972, however, leaders of the fledgling TCU movement recognized that unity among the small number of TCUs was essential to promoting the TCUs as a viable option for Indian people in higher education. Thus, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) was born of political necessity. Since its inception, AIHEC has provided a significant and vital support role to the TCUs as their national representative.

One of its most important activities has been that of advocate in Washington, DC, for the TCUs, charged with securing and maintaining the principal funding source of the colleges. The TCUs interact with the federal government much as state-supported institutions do with their state governments. AIHEC was able to convince Congress and President Carter in 1978 that funding the TCUs was part of the trust responsibility that the federal government had with American Indian peoples through its treaty agreements and obligations.

The Tribally Controlled Community College Act of 1978 has had a stabilizing influence on the tribal college movement. It can also be stated that the TCUs have never been fully funded through the Congressional appropriation process at the level ratified by the Act.

Title I of The Tribal College Act, in fiscal year 2000, authorized $6,000 per American Indian student FTE (full-time equivalent). Based on the Consumer Price Index since 1978, however, the authorization per student FTE should have been $8,450 by 2005 to have kept pace with inflation. Either figure is considerably higher than the actual amount of $4,447 per student FTE actually appropriated in the 2005 federal budget for funding Title I of the Tribal College Act. TCUs are still $3,000–$4,000 per student and a decade behind in funding when compared to their non-Indian state-supported mainstream counterpart institutions.

The tribal colleges do seek funding vigorously from a number of sources other than the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Tribally Controlled College Act. These include other federal agencies, philanthropic organizations such as the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the Bush Foundation, and corporations. These additional funds are targeted to specific high priority tasks by the individual TCUs as they are identified and funds are secured. Upon occasion, AIHEC, the national organization of the TCUs, will also seek grants from these sources to carry out membership-wide projects needed by all the TCUs or by the central office of AIHEC itself to improve its infrastructure. These additional funds can be instrumental in carrying forward much-needed educational programs within TCUs.

The important effort by the TCUs to build a diversified funding base was enhanced in 1989 with the founding of the American Indian College Fund (AICF). AICF has an independent board of directors yet is answerable to AIHEC as its chartering agent. It has raised significant amounts of funding, and AICF reports that between 1989 and 2005 it distributed more than $27 million in scholarships and an additional $18 million in grants to the TCUs. Several years ago, AICF was able to start a major capital fundraising effort, Sii Ha Sin/Campus Construction, and has used that initial investment to raise another $87.5 million from state, local, tribal, and federal sources. Currently there are 80 projects underway, totaling 730,000 square feet of classrooms, dormitories, libraries, administration buildings, and cultural centers. Fitting these additional funding sources into the tribal colleges' fiscal designs allows the colleges to begin examining new programs, new curricula, new forums, new buildings, and advanced degrees for their students and communities.

An important initiative of the TCUs and AIHEC has been the development and publication of the *Tribal College Journal* (TCJ). The TCJ has led the way in informing the world about the TCU movement, has played a vital role in spreading the news among the TCUs of innovative programs they can share, and has began an important research agenda on behalf of the TCUs. It has also become a major source of information to indigenous people around the world on "how to start their own community controlled institution of postsecondary education and keep it viable over time," and to non-Indians interested in the TCU movement.

The initiatives developed by the TCU presidents and the AIHEC have led to many innovative and productive outcomes. Three of the most important are the "Capture the Dream Project"; the passage of P.L. 103-32 by the U.S. Congress; and Executive Orders signed by Presidents Clinton and Bush. The recently completed "Capture the Dream Project" was the W. K. Kellogg Foundation's $25 million dollar American Indian Higher Education Initiative. It focused on strengthening the faculties and internal programs of TCUs; strengthening the cultural, languages, and sovereignty issues of tribal communities; and improving the relationships between TCUs and mainstream institutions of higher education.

P.L. 103-32 is the legislative number that identifies the Equity in Education Land Grant Status Act of 1994, by means of which the U.S. Congress gave land grant status to the TCUs. This important piece of legislation now helps to preserve and expand a solid agriculture, programmatic, and financial base for all TCUs.

The Executive Orders signed by Presidents Clinton and Bush serve as important reminders that the TCUs are constituents of the entire federal government and are part of a larger federal mandate to provide American Indian education. Executive Order No. 13021 signed by President Clinton on October 19, 1996, promoted TCUs' access to all federal programs and instructed relevant government agencies to explore ways in which they might assist TCUs to carry forward their mandate to serve American Indian communities. On July 3, 2002, President Bush signed Executive Order No. 13270, creating two potentially powerful new advocacy tools for TCUs: the President's Board of

Advisers on Tribal Colleges and Universities and the White House Initiative on Tribal Colleges and Universities.

MISSIONS AND CURRICULA OF TCUs

Though their functions are much more similar than different, there is a sharp distinction between non-Indian institutions of higher education and TCUs. Both strive to serve their communities as comprehensive institutions providing programs that respond to community and student needs. Their differences lie in funding sources, jurisdiction, and cultural factors, not educational goals. Today, the TCUs and non-Indian institutions generally remain separate in the political and fiscal arenas, but not in spirit. Generally, an atmosphere of educational exchange, mutual trust, and mutual appreciation exists between the two systems.

Today there are 36 TCUs, 35 in the United States and one in Canada, reaching from the state of Washington to the state of Michigan and from the province of Saskatchewan to the state of Arizona.

TCUs serve numerous American Indian tribes, but all adhere to several basic principles in their mission statements. Each has stated that the needs to preserve, enhance, and promote the language and culture of its tribe is central to its existence. The colleges serve their communities as resources to do research on economic development, human resource development, and community organization. Each provides quality academic programs for students seeking two-year degrees for transfer to senior institutions. Several TCUs have developed four-year and master's programs in areas where they felt the greatest need existed within their communities. Wherever possible, each college provides vocational and technical programs that help ensure that students can find decent jobs in their communities upon completion of their studies.

The top four associate's degrees awarded across the TCUs in 2002 were in the areas of liberal arts and sciences, education, business, and health. A typical academic and teaching curriculum offered today at a TCU would be two-year associate of applied science degrees, associate of arts degrees, and associate of science degrees, and one-year certification programs. Associate of applied science degrees combine practical coursework and general education designed to prepare students for immediate entry into the world of work the day after graduation. Typical disciplines for associate of applied science degrees would be human services, computer science and information systems, tribal language arts, office technology, and tribal administrative practices.

Associate of arts degrees and associate of science degrees are awarded for successful completion of academic programs designed to prepare students intending to transfer to four-year colleges or universities upon completion of their education at a tribal college. Typical areas of study leading to associate of arts degrees include general studies, business administration, tribal or Native American studies, and the social sciences. Typical courses of study leading to associate of science degrees are business administration, health sciences, and preengineering.

TCUs have also embraced the technical and trade curricula that are needed by their students to secure employment in the student's home community. One-year certificate programs are designed by the tribal colleges to respond to local community employment opportunities. Students are prepared within a sharply focused vocational program with much hands-on practical experience. Such programs are as wide-ranging and diverse as the communities and tribal colleges that create them.

Four tribal colleges, Sinte Gleska University, Oglala Lakota College, Haskell Indian Nations University, and Salish Kootenai College, have instituted four-year baccalaureate programs in human resources, social sciences, and education. A major stride by a TCU in curriculum development, considering the financial hardships and isolation it has endured, is Sinte Gleska University's success in developing and receiving accreditation for the first ever master's degree program in education at a TCU. This growth is illustrated by the fact that, in 1972, Sinte Gleska University, then Sinte Gleska College, offered only 22 courses in a scattering of disciplines from psychology to math with 13 administrators and faculty making up the entire college staff.

Each college has had to travel the accreditation path alone, but morale and expertise have been liberally shared among members to the benefit of all TCUs. This accreditation effort has so far resulted in 32 of the 36 TCUs gaining full accreditation as institutions of higher education. TCUs have spent the past 37 years doing their best to meet the requirements of outside agencies of higher education to serve their students and communities. That does not mean that they neglected their mission statements, which require they make a special effort to enhance, protect, and teach about their own cultures and languages. However, many in leadership roles at the TCUs believe that the time has come to reexamine the total curriculum of their institutions and focus on the development of a curriculum that is "indigenous" and less reflecting of mainstream higher education curricula yet still meets the needs of their students and communities in the twenty-first century.

THE PERSONNEL OF TCUs

The boards of trustees of TCUs are a reflection of their communities with a nearly 100 percent level of local American Indian community members serving on the boards. It is not uncommon, however, to find boards of trustees of the TCUs to be made up of nearly all women. Boards of trustees for TCUs play the important role of buffers between tribal politics and the colleges. They also often act as mediators among policy makers, as personnel selection committees, and as the local watchdogs of and for the TCUs. These important responsibilities make TCU boards of trustees unique in Indian country because of the autonomous nature of their authority as granted by the tribal charters founding the TCUs. However, board members do keep in mind how their decisions will impact their communities and their long-term relations with their chartering tribal governments.

Administrators and faculty of tribal colleges are a mixture of American Indians and non-Indians. About 80 percent of TCU administrators are American Indian and about 63 percent of TCU faculty members are non-Indian. Women make up 50 percent of administrators and faculty of the TCUs, but only 14 of the 36 current presidents of TCUs are women. Whatever the race or gender of a TCU administrator or faculty member, however, her or his strongest characteristic is dedication to the students and to the missions of the colleges as has been emphasized by numerous accreditation site visit teams. In almost every report made over the past 40 years, the accreditation associations evaluating the TCUs have written about the importance of the dedication of TCU administrators and faculty.

Faculty problems experienced by TCUs generally fall into three main areas. First is difficulty finding and keeping science and mathematics instructors. Second is the high turnover among faculty who find life on Indian reservations too isolated and culturally different. Third, and toughest to solve, is the fact that, as the colleges mature and their student populations grow, salaries generally remain low among TCU faculty. The issue of underfunding facing the TCUs is a serious one but nowhere is it more serious than in recruiting, hiring, and keeping good faculty, administrators, and support staff.

TCUs continue to focus on their students and the special abilities and needs these students bring to their colleges. Dine College and all subsequent TCUs recognized that mainstream institutions of higher education were not adequately serving American Indian students, especially those from geographically isolated reservations. The reasons were many. The social isolation of Indian students on off-reservation campuses, culture shock, and poverty were some of the main contributors to the 90 percent attrition rate experienced by Indian students in mainstream colleges and universities.

Students at TCUs are older, on average, than undergraduate students at other institutions of higher education. Sixty-six percent of them are female with females outnumbering males in every age category from under 18 to over 65. Women students are often single heads of households, and many students of both sexes speak English as their second language, are poor, and, prior to their tribal college experience, have found formal educational settings to be a hostile environment for them. One American Indian student told her teacher after attending class at a TCU that, for the first time in her life, she felt welcome when she entered the classroom. At no time before, including all of her elementary and secondary school years, had she ever felt welcome in her classes. She had always felt as if she were an unwanted visitor. Her experience at the TCU changed that for her, and she now looked forward to going to class with great anticipation each day.

In 1968, Dine College served 300 mostly Navajo students. In 2003, according to the AICF, TCUs serve more than 30,000 students representing 250 tribes from across the United States, Mexico, and Canada. TCU personnel work closely with each student to help that student design a program that will fit his or her individual needs and abilities. This concern for the individual student has played an important role in the high retention rates of first-generation American Indian students within the TCUs. Retention rates for the TCUs can be measured in two ways: (a) the conventional fashion that counts as a dropout any student who leaves college before completion of a degree program, in which case TCUs have a retention rate of approximately 45 percent; or (b) a more accurate method begun by the TCUs that labels as “stop-outs” those who leave and then return within a quarter to continue their studies. By measuring in this fashion, the colleges’ retention rate is approximately 75 to 80 percent. Students who stop-out generally do so because of financial difficulties or because they have been put on academic probation. A recent study by AICF found that after one year of completing their studies, 91 percent of TCU graduates are either working or pursuing advanced degrees. The significance of this 91 percent figure for students working or in advanced education becomes more apparent when it is compared to the finding that more than 50 percent of the adult population residing on an Indian reservation is usually out of school and unemployed.

PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES FACING TCUs

Sinte Gleska University, Oglala Lakota College, and Salish Kootenai College have demonstrated that advanced degrees are possible. Many of the TCUs are now researching advanced curriculum options for their students and are seriously studying the move to become four-year institutions. This latest focus of TCUs, expanding to become four-year colleges, is a strong indication of how optimistic these institutions are about their futures.

TCUs have become one of the strongest allies of the U.S. federal government in carrying out its unique trust responsibilities in education on behalf of American Indian people. The federal government’s support of TCUs has led to the best direct education being provided today to American Indians who live on reservations. AIHEC has also become a major source of administrative and educational technical assistance for the TCUs, especially the more recently founded TCUs.

Even with all the positives that have transpired over the past 40 years in the TCU movement, there are still major obstacles facing American Indian tribes who desire to develop and found a new TCU. The two major obstacles to such developments are funding for such efforts and maintaining the community will to persevere in the face of all the difficulties that appear when trying to start and/or maintain such institutions. Scattered across the Western half of the United States, there are only 35 TCUs serving their tribes on geographically isolated reservations, but there are approximately 300 tribal nations of American Indians in the United States. This means that only 10 percent of all reservations are being served by their own TCUs. Leaders of the TCU movement believe that there is much room for growth in the TCU movement when adequate resources are secured for that growth in partnership with the federal government.

At the 2002 World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education held on the Nakoda Reserve west of Calgary, Alberta, Canada, the World Indigenous Higher Education Consortium was founded among the indigenous peoples of the world to regain control of the postsecondary education of their peoples. Recently TCUs and AIHEC have embarked on a new outreach program and are now communicating regularly with their sister indigenous-controlled institutions from around the world. AIHEC is at the forefront of the development of this worldwide organization that will bring the international indigenous higher education institutions together as important and self-controlled research and program development entities.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Indian College Fund. (2003). *Facts: Educating the mind and spirit.* Denver, CO: Author.

American Indian Higher Education Consortium. (2002). *Tribal college map.* Alexandria, VA: Author. Available at http://www.aihec.org/tribal_college_map.cfml

Benham, M., & Stein, W.J. (Eds.). (2002). *Renaissance of American Indian higher education.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Boyer, P. (1997). *Native American colleges: Progress and prospects.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Stein, W.J. (1992). *Tribally controlled colleges: Making good medicine* (American Indian Studies, Vol. 3). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Wayne J. Stein

Women's Colleges and Universities

Women's colleges and universities are institutions with a mission to serve the educational needs of women. Most of these institutions enroll some men, either at the graduate level or in certain programs. Women's colleges and universities in the United States, which numbered approximately 214 institutions at their peak in 1960, today number fewer than 80 institutions. Although few in number, women's colleges and universities today, as in the past, are extremely diverse in size, location, selectivity, sponsorship, and other institutional characteristics. Despite their diversity, women's institutions of higher education, particularly women's undergraduate colleges, have been found to provide their students and graduates with more positive outcomes than coeducational colleges. By identifying the characteristics of women's colleges that account for these positive results, it is possible for women's colleges to serve as models for other institutional types and for those other types of institutions to learn the lessons that women's colleges can teach about how best to educate undergraduate students.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TODAY'S WOMEN'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Women's colleges and universities in the United States educate less than 1 percent of all women attending postsecondary institutions and award 1 percent of all degrees conferred—15,000 bachelor's degrees in 2000, with a total enrollment of 95,873 (93 percent of whom are women). Estimates are that fewer than 5 percent of college-going high school seniors will even apply to attend a women's college or university. These women's institutions tend to be small, ranging in size from 94 to 5,000 full-time students, and most of them are private institutions with more than half affiliated with a religious denomination, most often with the Roman Catholic Church (33 percent). According to *U.S. News and World Report,* women's undergraduate colleges are disproportionately more likely than coeducational liberal arts colleges to have class sizes under 20 students. In terms of geographic location, almost half of U.S. women's colleges and universities are located in the Northeast; 33 percent are located in the South; there are three women's institutions of higher education in California; and the rest are scattered around the country. Many women's colleges and universities have cooperative relationships with nearby coeducational institutions. For example, Scripps College in California is part of the Claremont Colleges Consortium; Smith and Mount Holyoke Colleges are aligned with Amherst, the University of Massachusetts, and Hampshire College; and Bryn Mawr has a cooperative relationship with Haverford and Swarthmore Colleges. These types of cooperative relationships allow individuals to take classes from any of the campuses, to participate in extracurricular activities, and even to share in cooperative living arrangements.

While the most selective women's colleges, those known as the "seven sisters," receive the lion's share of attention in the media and in the research literature, women's colleges and universities represent a diverse array of institutions. The "seven sisters" are the oldest, most selective, and most well endowed of the women's colleges. The "seven sisters" include Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley, although Vassar and Radcliffe are no longer women's colleges. There are also two historically Black four-year women's colleges (Spelman and Bennett) and approximately six two-year women's colleges. There are currently three public institutions of higher education for women—Douglass College of Rutgers University, Mississippi University for Women, and Texas Women's University. Seventeen women's institutions of higher education grant master's degrees, while 47 grant bachelor's degrees. Women's colleges range in selectivity from very selective to nonselective. Some of the institutions that grant master's degrees admit men to these programs, although their undergraduate population continues to be open only to women. From a resource perspective, the women's colleges and universities also vary greatly—from those with healthy endowments (including the "seven sisters") to those institutions that are entirely dependent on tuition revenue to cover operating expenses. Interestingly, in a review of the Top 10 colleges by *The Princeton Review,* 4 of the 10 listed with the nicest residence halls were women's colleges, as were 3 of the 10 with the most beautiful campus, and 3 of the top 20 with the best college food.

Though women's colleges and universities do not represent a single mold, they do share some common traits. For example, they serve women of color and nontraditional aged women in higher proportions than comparable coeducational institutions. The explanation for this is twofold. First, serving women, in all their diversity, is a major component of the mission of many of these institutions. Second, in order for the existing women's colleges and universities to survive with their original missions still intact, many had to be creative in attracting and retaining women students. As fewer than 5 percent of high school women will even consider applying to a women's college, this means that many women's colleges have had to focus their attention on attracting older women, part-time students, and transfer students. Women's colleges and universities are also more likely than their coeducational counterparts to grant undergraduate degrees to women in the more "male dominated" fields.

WOMEN'S COLLEGES OUTCOMES

Research, both quantitative and qualitative, demonstrates that women's undergraduate colleges are among the most empowering environments wherein women are taken seriously and ultimately experience success. Graduates of women's colleges tend to hold higher ranked positions and earn higher salaries than their coeducational counterparts. Despite the fact that women's college graduates account for less than 4 percent of all college-educated women, 20 percent of women in Congress and 30 percent of *Business Week's* list of "Rising Women Stars in Corporate America" are graduates of women's colleges. Further, 33 percent of the women board members for the 1992 Fortune 1000 Companies are women's college graduates, and they are overrepresented among the women who are the highest paid officers in Fortune 1000 companies. Approximately 14 percent of cabinet members in state government are women's college graduates, and 90 percent of women's college alumnae have participated in at least one civic or professional organization since graduation. Further, research shows that women's college graduates tend to be more involved in philanthropic activities after graduation than their coeducational counterparts. Famous women's college graduates include but are not limited to Jane Addams, Madeleine Albright, Pearl S. Buck, Barbara Bush, Rachel Carson, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Marian Wright Edelman, Nora Ephron, Geraldine Ferraro, Betty Friedan, Lillian Hellman, Katharine Hepburn, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Nancy Pelosi, Nancy Reagan, Cokie Roberts, Diane Sawyer, and Gloria Steinem.

Graduates of women's colleges are more than twice as likely as graduates of coeducational colleges to receive doctoral degrees, to enter medical school, and to receive doctorates in the natural sciences. Women's college graduates disproportionately pursue doctorates in math, science, economics, and engineering. Indeed, graduates of women's colleges are more likely to hold traditionally male-dominated jobs upon graduation, such as lawyer, physician, or manager. Nearly half the graduates of women's colleges have earned advanced degrees.

Compared to women at coeducational institutions, students at women's colleges are more satisfied with their overall college experience and express higher levels of self-esteem and leadership skills. Women at women's colleges are said to participate more fully in and out of class than women at coeducational institutions. Some suggest that this is because they observe women functioning in the top jobs of the college: 90 percent of women's college presidents are women and 55 percent of the faculty are women. Others suggest it is because there are more leadership opportunities available only to women at these colleges. Whatever the reason, students at women's colleges report greater satisfaction with their college experiences—academically, developmentally, and personally.

Some critics have questioned the results of individual studies on the efficacy of women's colleges, especially those that focus on the impact of attending a women's college on career and postgraduation outcomes. These critics focus on those studies that use institutions rather than individuals as the unit of analysis and the fact that the studies cannot adequately control for individual student background characteristics. In addition, some critics suggest that the relative success of graduates of women's colleges may be a dated phenomenon. In other words, when women students began to have access to prestigious men's colleges, did claims about women's colleges remain true? This question assumes that the success of women's colleges is due to the fact that the "best" women students could not attend the "best" schools in the country. It also assumes that studies of women's colleges focus on the most elite of these institutions. A third critique about the research on women's colleges is that it fails to account for the self-selection of students. In other words, some suggest that women who choose to attend women's colleges are somehow predestined to be successful, and that one cannot credit the institution at all for the outcomes produced.

The best way to address such critiques is to examine the literature on women's colleges in its totality rather than to look at one study at a time. Indeed, studies taken one at a time represent only pieces of a larger puzzle. Research is most powerful when conclusions are drawn from a wide variety of studies using different methods, sources of data, and time periods. In reviewing the literature, it is clear that the majority of studies on women's colleges, including those that control for both institutional and individual characteristics of students, come to the same conclusion. As such, although it is impossible to randomly assign students to attend either a women's college or a coeducational college, the self-selection argument appears specious. Further, it is not only dated studies that make claim to the outcomes associated with women's colleges as current studies using contemporary college attendees also come to the same conclusions. Given the totality of the research on women's colleges, one can safely conclude that, despite differences between methodologies and approach, the extent of overlap, the consistency, and the corroboration in the research findings are so great as to warrant the conclusion that a woman attending an all-women's college, compared with her coeducational counterpart, is more likely to achieve positive outcomes such as having higher educational aspirations, attaining a graduate degree, entering a sex-atypical career, and achieving prominence in her field.

HISTORICAL LEGACY

A brief history of women's education in general and of women's undergraduate colleges in particular helps to put today's women's colleges into the proper historical context. In the Colonial period, it was widely believed that women were intellectually inferior to men and that educating women might lead to health problems and eventually to a decreased ability to bear children. And, since education in the Colonial period was aimed at preparing men for the clergy, there was no real impetus to provide higher education for women. Formal higher education was not an option for women during this era.

In the early 1800s, several seminaries for women only were founded to provide girls with a liberal education, equivalent to a high school education. Graduates of these seminaries were prepared to be mothers, wives, and teachers. These seminaries were not immediately classified as colleges, although schools such as that founded in 1821 by Emma Willard modeled their curriculum, in large part, after that offered at the most prestigious men's colleges of the day. Other women-only institutions, such as those founded by Catherine Beecher in 1824 and 1832 and Mount Holyoke Seminary, founded by Mary Lyon in 1837, became prototypes for today's women's colleges and were seen by many as the best way to educate women.

There are several women-only institutions that claim to be the first "college." Georgia Female College was chartered by the state legislature in 1836; its curriculum, however, was more similar to a high school than a college. In 1853, Mary Sharp College in Tennessee was founded; its curriculum looked very similar to the four-year degree program offered at the men's colleges. Similarly, Elmira Female College in New York, chartered in 1855, offered a true collegiate course. In the early days of women's access to higher education, single-sex institutions were the norm. By 1860, there were approximately 100 women's colleges in existence, about half of which offered a collegiate level curriculum.

Also by 1860, several institutions, including Oberlin, began experimenting with coeducation. The passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act during the Civil War led to the creation of land grant institutions, all of which were coeducational. During this period, normal schools and public high schools also began to emerge as educational alternatives for women. These factors offered women a broader array of educational options, which affected the growth and popularity of women's colleges. By 1880, more than 20,000 women were enrolled in college, a figure that represented 33 percent of the college-going population. Approximately half of these students were enrolled in women-only institutions.

By 1880, there were 155 women's colleges that awarded college degrees. As is true today, these early women's colleges represented a diverse array of institutions. Among them were institutions that were religiously affiliated and independently controlled, including a large number of Catholic institutions. Some of these women's colleges were highly selective while others had open admission, some were urban, others were rural, and some offered a liberal arts curriculum while others offered vocational training programs. Many of these women's colleges were founded in the South and Northeast. In the Midwest and West, coeducation was the norm during this era. The women's colleges in the South were widely perceived as "finishing schools" and were not taken seriously by many in higher education.

After the Civil War, the women's colleges of the Northeast, especially the "seven sisters," wished to demonstrate that women were as capable of achieving advanced education as were men. These institutions replicated the classical curriculum of the most elite men's colleges. Indeed, compared to other educational options for women through normal schools and coeducational institutions, the curriculum at these women's colleges focused on liberal education rather than on preprofessional programs. These women's colleges not only replicated the curriculum of the men's colleges, they also required students to meet the admission standards of the men's schools. This created enrollment problems, as few women had the necessary background in Greek and Latin. Finding qualified faculty willing to teach at these women's colleges was also a significant problem in the early days. One solution to these dilemmas was the founding of coordinate colleges, institutions that shared the faculty and curriculum of men's colleges but that operated as separate institutions. These institutions, including Radcliffe, Pembroke, and Barnard, were considered women's colleges because the male and female students did not take classes together and because the institutions had different administrators. The "seven sisters" served as an enduring model of high quality education for women.

Between 1890 and 1910, undergraduate enrollment at women's colleges increased by 348 percent, while the gain of female students at coeducational colleges was 438 percent. Over a similar period, male student attendance in college increased by only 214 percent. By the turn of the century, coeducation had become the norm for women. Among the arguments in favor of coeducation were that separate education was economically wasteful, that women were equal to men and they should therefore be educated together, that single-sex institutions were unnatural, and that coeducation would be helpful in taming the spirits of young men. By 1920, women students represented 47 percent of the student body in colleges and universities. Indeed, the 1920s were a high point in women's education, and in many cases women outnumbered men in undergraduate colleges. During this era, 74 percent of the colleges and universities were coeducational and the vast majority of women attended these institutions. Women's colleges, however, continued to attract sufficient enough numbers of students to remain viable.

The 1930s through 1950s are marked by a return to more traditional views about the role of women in society, a view that emphasized women in the home and family. By 1950, the percentage of women in higher education dropped to a low of 30 percent, and enrollment at many women's colleges began to decline precariously. The 1960s and 1970s saw a more pronounced shift away from single-sex institutions toward coeducation. During this period, the most prestigious exclusively male colleges and universities began to admit women to their undergraduate programs, and many women's colleges also became coeducational. Many of the women's colleges that decided not to admit men closed due to financial exigency during this period. Indeed, many small private liberal arts colleges, both coeducational and single sex, closed during this era. To many, the replacement of single-sex education with coeducation was seen as part of women's attainment of parity with men. In fact, many believe that the shift away from single-sex institutions to coeducational ones served both sexes better. Some argued that if one believed that women should attend women's colleges, it somehow implied that women are different or inferior to men. Others argued that women who attend single-sex institutions do not learn to deal with men and, therefore, are less ready to compete and function in the "real world." As a result, the number of women's colleges today has declined to fewer than 80 institutions.

Most of the women's colleges that survived the decline in the 1970s transformed themselves from women's colleges to "colleges for women." These institutions purposefully rededicated themselves and their institutional missions to serve women students. The Women's College Coalition, founded in 1972, was created to support these institutions and to increase the visibility and acceptability of women's colleges. Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 barred institutions from discriminating in admissions by gender. While private women's colleges have been relatively free to continue admitting predominantly women, this act had a significant effect on public women's colleges. The Supreme Court ruled in 1982 that Mississippi University for Women, one of the three remaining public women's colleges, admit men seeking admission to all of their programs. They did so, but continue to maintain an explicit mission to serve women. In 2005, the Rutgers Board of Governors proposed ending Douglass's tenure as a standalone, single-sex institution, thereby placing its status as a public women's college in jeopardy. Despite their many successes, women's colleges are struggling to remain a viable option on the higher education landscape. Their future tenuous, they nonetheless can serve as models for ways to successfully educate women.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM WOMEN'S COLLEGES

The positive outcomes associated with attending a women's college has led some researchers to explore the characteristics of these institutions to see how they can serve as models for coeducational institutions. Seven institutional traits stand out as being descriptive of how women's colleges facilitate the success of their women students. These traits can serve as lessons that other institutions might wish to follow to create environments that facilitate the success of women students. These lessons include: (a) clarify and communicate a mission that puts women at the center; (b) believe women can achieve and hold them to high expectations; (c) make students feel as if they matter; (d) provide strong, positive role models; (e) provide ample opportunities for women to engage in leadership activities; (f) include women in the curriculum; and (g) create safe spaces where women can form a critical mass.

With regard to the first lesson, women's colleges typically have focused missions that permeate their culture, values, decisions, physical environment, rituals, and history. The education of women is central to this mission and is intentionally reflected in curriculum decisions, in publications, and at numerous decision-making points day to day and over the long term. While coeducational institutions do not have the luxury of being able to focus exclusively on women, by purposefully considering the needs of women, such institutions may be better able to serve this group of students.

Just as women's colleges were initially established to refute the notion that women could not succeed in serious academic pursuits, today's women's colleges continue to demonstrate the importance of holding women students to high academic standards and believing in the capacity of women students' success. Having high expectations and encouraging students to achieve is one of the main characteristics of women's colleges that is worthy of emulation. At women's colleges, the most common approach to getting students to "aim high" involves faculty telling students that they have potential, telling them that they are capable, and telling them what is expected of them. Faculty members at women's colleges suggest the importance of not giving up too early on students who are having academic difficulties, especially in male-dominated fields. This is a trait that should be emulated across all institutional types.

Women's colleges are known for the level of support and caring that students receive from faculty and administrators. Support from constituents at women's colleges includes not only guidance related to academic issues but also support and advice on personal matters. Research demonstrates that some degree of personal support on a campus is pivotal for student success in that students need to feel that they are noticed, that what they say or do is important, and that they are appreciated. Institutions that are able to create an environment where students feel cared for are more likely to have students who are motivated to learn and who have a strong sense of institutional loyalty.

By the composition of their employees, women's colleges clearly communicate that the options for women are varied and the doors of possibility are open wide. Without the presence of women at all levels on a college campus, a significant statement is made about whether women should be in those positions, whether they can succeed in such positions, and whether women students should aspire to such positions. That is, the presence of women in leadership roles and within the faculty communicates a great deal about women's options and choices.

Women's colleges provide a large variety of opportunities for women to be involved in the life of the campus, both in and outside of class. These opportunities help students develop strong leadership skills, keep them active in their institutions, and facilitate their overall success. At women's colleges, women were not only expected, but also obligated, to hold all of the available leadership positions. Institutions that expect women students to be involved and active members of the community are more likely to graduate successful students.

Women's colleges often infuse women into the general curriculum via classroom examples, lectures, and assigned readings. Or, topics pertaining to women can be found as a major part of extracurriculum—presented through planned, often required lectures, speaker series, and discussion groups. Providing opportunities for students to learn about themselves and about others who have been historically marginalized is important. Including the voices of women is not something one does merely to enhance the self-esteem of underrepresented students. Instead, the infusion of diversity into the curriculum helps all students understand how to succeed and how to fight societal discrimination and injustice.

Women at women's colleges believe that one of the factors that make these institutions successful is that women are not only in the majority but also that the institution offers a supportive peer culture that creates a feeling of safety among students. Research suggests that the proportion of different types of individuals within an institution impacts both how they are viewed by the organization as well as how they fit in. Having a critical mass means more than just "adding more" students from a particular group, it also means consciously paying attention to the needs of women and providing a supportive climate. It means fostering an effective community which entails, among other things, incorporating diversity, creating a shared culture, and promoting caring, trust, and teamwork. The strength of a women's college is that being around peers who share certain characteristics makes one feel comfortable, safe, supported, and included. Moreover, having this critical mass expands how one perceives limitations, assets, and possibilities. In contrast, the absence of this supportive peer culture makes one feel isolated and limited.

Many of the characteristics inherent at women's colleges parallel traits associated with successful academic institutions for men and women students. What sets women's colleges apart from most coeducational institutions, however, is the purposefulness with which the former responds to the needs of their women students. The success of women is central to the values held by campus constituents. This belief undergirds most of the actions of both the institutions and the individual campus constituents. These are environments in which the situation for women is not only favorable but also empowering—colleges where there is a critical mass of women faculty, colleges where women are nurtured and challenged, and colleges where woman-related issues dominate campus discussions. These colleges act intentionally to take women seriously.

Women's colleges carry out these traits in different ways, exemplifying the idea that "successful" colleges are not all alike. While separate examinations of the characteristics of each institution are illuminating, it is important to understand that the whole of these institutions is greater than the sum of their parts—one cannot look at a single element in isolation. Instead, it is the combination of characteristics, the ethos of these institutions, which makes them unique and able to facilitate the success of their students. What women's colleges do that set them apart from other campuses is that they are purposeful in their adoption of structures, policies, practices, and curriculum that are sensitive to the needs of women.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Harwarth, I., Maline, M., & DeBra, E. (1997). *Women's colleges in the United States: History, issues, and challenges.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Lasser, C. (Ed.). (1987). *Educating men and women together: Coeducation in a changing world.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Purcell, F.B., Helms, R.M., & Rumbley, L. (2005). *Women's universities and colleges: An international handbook.* Rotterdam, Holland: Sense Publishers.

Riordan, C. (1994). The value of attending a women's college: Education, occupation and income benefits. *Journal of Higher Education*, *65*(4)*,* 486-510.

Solomon, B.M. (1985). *In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tidball, E., Smith, D., Tidball, C., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (1999). *Taking women seriously: Lessons and legacies for higher education from women's colleges.* Phoenix: AZ: ACE/Oryx Press.

Wolf-Wendel, L. (1998). Models of excellence: The baccalaureate origins of successful African American, European American and Hispanic women. *Journal of Higher Education, 69*(2), 144–172.

Women's College Coalition Web site. www.womenscolleges.org

Lisa Wolf-Wendel

Becky Eason

Part IV

Gender Constructions in the Official Curriculum

Overview

The term *official curriculum* refers to the accredited courses offered by one or more educational institutions. Usually the curriculum is listed in the printed or electronic materials educational institutions use to describe themselves, such as their institutional Web sites, course schedules and catalogs, or faculty and student handbooks. These listings are often accompanied by short descriptions of the goals and content of each course, but a full understanding of the curriculum requires additional information about each course, such as all the topics that will be covered, the content of the course readings, the various assignments and tests students will have to complete, and what the teacher will say about the course materials. This information can be gleaned by examining course outlines, handouts, and tests; reading the textbooks and other course-related materials, including students' tests and papers; attending class meetings and listening to the course-related comments of teachers and students; and watching and listening to audio visual materials and student reports presented in class. As indicated, the curriculum is not just a list of accredited courses, or even a statement of goals and intentions relevant to those courses, but also a set of practices.

Two conditions are necessary for a curriculum to be official. First, it must be accepted and approved by recognized and legitimated educational authorities. Nowadays, most curricula are also designed and implemented by such authorities, but there are cases in which courses offered in a nonofficial curriculum, such as by home schoolers, may be accepted and approved by established educational authorities after review or examination. Second, an official curriculum consists of only those courses that are accredited for purposes of earning a diploma or degree. It is not unusual for schools, especially at the secondary and higher education levels, to offer some courses for "no credit." These are regularly and officially scheduled meetings of students and faculty for purposes of student learning, but they do not count toward graduation. Such unofficial courses are particularly common in the United States where they often include remedial courses, homeroom and study hall, highly specialized seminars, choir and band rehearsals, and sports practices. In schools where students who participate in such courses are *not* awarded credits that count toward graduation, such courses are considered to be part of the *extracurriculum* even though they are officially sponsored and may take place during the regular school day. Sometimes, however, these activities do make it into the official curriculum, as when students are given music credits toward graduation for participating in the school choir, band, or orchestra, and are given physical education credits toward graduation for being members of a school athletic team. And, sometimes courses in the official curriculum are offered on a no credit, extracurricular basis to special constituencies, such as retired professors or other adults in the community in which a university or secondary school is located.

As these examples indicate, there is variation across U.S. schools concerning the type of courses that may or may not be included in the official curriculum. There is also considerable variation across countries with educational institutions in some countries adhering to the kinds of standardized and fairly narrow set of courses described in "National Curricula" while other educational institutions, especially larger ones in the United States, offer so many courses and choices in their curricula that they have come to be metaphorically labeled as shopping malls or cafeterias.

In all countries, it is also possible to trace changes in official school curricula over time. Of the essays included in this section of the encyclopedia, at least four—"Black Studies," "Men's Studies," "Multicultural Education," and "Women's and Gender Studies"—describe components of official curricula that did not exist as such prior to the 1960s. In contrast, vocational education and home economics, the forerunner of what Virginia Vincenti calls "Family and Consumer Sciences," have roots that go way back in the history of education, but they did not enter the official curricula of schools and colleges in North America until the nineteenth century. Even the sciences that many people regard as part of the "traditional core curriculum" had either no place or a very limited place (as part of natural philosophy) in the classical curricula that characterized higher education prior to the mid-nineteenth century. And, because of this emphasis on the classical curriculum, Yale University, founded in 1701, did not make arithmetic an entrance requirement or offer mathematics courses in its own sophomore and junior year curricula until 1745.

Regardless of the years in which they entered the curricula of elementary, secondary, or higher education, most of the components of the official curriculum were likely to bring with them gendered assumptions and biases. As the authors of the essays included in this section of the encyclopedia indicate, some of these assumptions consisted of notions about what kinds of teachers and students were likely to be interested in a particular subject. Biological and physical sciences, mathematics, and technological and computer science, for example, were and are still seen by many people as "masculine" fields of study, whereas family and consumer sciences, like the home economics curricula they are replacing, are still regarded by many as "women's subjects." Such assumptions about the gender appropriateness of portions of the curriculum have been and sometimes continue to be reflected in the curricular materials and teaching styles characteristic of particular subjects, and they affect the ways in which women and men are treated in different curricular areas. Thus, for example, women might be channeled into becoming art or history or music or drama teachers at the elementary, middle, or secondary school levels, while men with similar interests and talents are encouraged to develop their talents to the fullest as designers, musicians, composers, performers, and university professors. Fostering this kind of tracking will be course materials and lessons that ignore or belittle the contributions of women to a particular curriculum, suggesting instead that all the great work in a particular field has been done by White men.

The authors whose essays appear in this section of the encyclopedia were asked to discuss the ways in which their particular section of the official curriculum has been gender/culturally stereotyped or exclusionary as well as the efforts that have been made to make their curricular area more gender/culturally inclusive and equitable. Most of the authors date these latter efforts to the late 1960s and early 1970s when women's studies and Black studies emerged as formidable challengers to the traditional undergraduate curriculum. Not only did that traditional curriculum ignore or distort the experiences and contributions of men of color and all women, it also failed to engage critical issues of justice, equality, power, and community service. These issues were regarded as crucial components of a quality education by the many founders of Black and women's studies in the United States who brought to their academic work the experience of political activism in the Black Freedom Movement and Women's Liberation Movement. Over time, their criticisms of the exclusionary nature of the official curriculum and, to a lesser extent, their liberatory view of education led to many of the changes in the official curricula at all levels of education that are described by the authors who wrote essays for this section.

In addition, these criticisms and the struggle to create curricula that were no longer White male centered led to the successful establishment of many programs or departments of Black studies and of women's studies in the United States and, in the case of women's studies, in countries outside of the United States as well. The successes of these new curricula and the research and scholarship that they fostered have also given rise to courses or entire curricula in gender studies and men's studies. In addition, queer studies have greatly expanded the challenge to the official curriculum by encouraging students and educators to "queer" it in ways that transform their own and others' understandings of social control and of the ways in which knowledge is produced and disseminated.

The impact of these challenges and criticisms has not been uniform across subjects. As a result, users of the encyclopedia who are particularly interested in only one or a few components of the official curriculum should be careful not to generalize to the entire curriculum what an author writes about only one or a few subjects. In support of this point, Sue Rosser begins the opening essay in this section by suggesting that there has been more acceptance of women and their contributions in the humanities and social sciences than in the biological and physical sciences on which her own essay is focused. Nevertheless, Rosser echoes many of the other authors in this section by suggesting that the area of the curriculum about which she is writing has become less male oriented, more female friendly, and generally more inclusive than ever before. Although this optimism is widespread, most of the authors also agree with Rosser's less sanguine point that additional efforts are needed to rid the official curriculum of remaining gender biases. In some curricular areas, such as computer science, teacher education for elementary and preschools, and graduate education in mathematics, large and traditional gender (and racial-ethnic) gaps continue to exist.

For those who are troubled by such gaps and would like to see them closed, the authors provide several examples of successful curricular transformations and offer many suggestions about additional ways in which the official curriculum can root out its heavy and continuing emphasis on the accomplishments and traditions of affluent White males by putting cultural pluralism at its core.

Additional discussion of the ways in which the official curriculum is gendered may be found in the essays contained in Part V. See also "The 'Boy Problem'" in Part X.

Biological and Physical Sciences

The impact of women's studies and scholarship focused on gender has emerged more slowly and made fewer inroads in the natural and physical sciences than it has in the humanities and social sciences. Although women's health concerns became one of the forces motivating the women's movement in the 1960s, women scientists and engineers tended not to be heavily represented in the leadership of women's studies on most campuses. Nationally, directors of women's studies and much of the scholarship on women emerged initially from the humanities, followed by the social sciences, and only more recently from the sciences.

Gender construction in the official curriculum of the biological and physical sciences has not been mainstreamed as widely or penetrated as deeply as it has in the humanities and social sciences. This may result from the relatively small number of women in science and engineering and even smaller number of women scientists involved with women's studies. Not until a substantial number of women populated the ranks of the faculty in humanities and social sciences did gender construction transform the mainstream curriculum.

Now, the research and its reflection in curricular content demonstrate an increase in the critiques of androcentric bias, topics studied, diversity of approaches used, and disciplinary and interdisciplinary background of the scholars and teachers. The pedagogical techniques exemplify increased attention to how gender construction in society as a whole can be reinforced or resisted in reaching students in the classroom.

WOMEN IN SCIENCE

This dearth of scientists in women's studies resulted partially from the very small number of tenure-track women faculty in senior positions in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Although 57.5 percent of BS degrees, 58 percent of MS degrees, and 43.8 percent of all PhD degrees went to women in 2000, women comprise a smaller percentage of the degrees in the physical sciences, computer science, and engineering. For example, women received 40.3 percent of the BS degrees, 35.5 percent of the MS degrees, and 23.2 percent of the PhD degrees in the physical sciences and only 20.4 percent of the BS degrees, 20.7 percent of the MS degrees, and 15.7 percent of the PhD degrees in engineering in 2000 (Commission of Professionals in Science and Technology, 2002). Although women received 28 percent of the BS degrees, 33.3 percent of the MS degrees, and 16.5 percent of the PhD degrees in computer science in 2000, a recent report reveals that only 0.3 percent of women first-year college students express an interest in majoring in computer science. This represents an 80 percent decline in interest between 1998 and 2004 (Foster, 2005).

The small number of women receiving degrees in the sciences and engineering results in an even smaller percentage of women faculty in these fields. Only 26.5 percent of science (including social and life sciences) and engineering faculty at four-year colleges and universities are women.

The percentage of women in a particular discipline varies from relatively high percentages in psychology to much lower percentages in the physical sciences and engineering. Elite or research institutions (Carnegie category—doctoral/research-extensive) have the smallest percentage of women faculty in the physical sciences and engineering.

OBJECTIVITY, ANDROCENTRIC BIAS, AND GENDERED RESEARCH IN SCIENCE

In addition to the small number of women scientists and engineers, strong cultural traditions of masculinity and objectivity in science threatened to keep women's studies separate from the theories of cultural and social construction of knowledge production acceptable in humanities and social sciences. Most researchers in the behavioral, biomedical, and physical sciences are trained in the scientific method and believe in its power. Few, however, are aware of its historical and philosophical roots in logical positivism and objectivity. Positivism is premised on the assumption that human beings are highly individualistic and obtain knowledge in a rational manner from immediate sensory experiences that may be separated from their social conditions. This leads to the belief in the possibilities of obtaining knowledge that is both objective and value-free, the cornerstone of the scientific method.

Longino (1990) has explored the extent to which methods employed by scientists can be objective and lead to repeatable, verifiable results while contributing to hypotheses or theories that are congruent with nonobjective institutions and ideologies of the society. According to Longino, background assumptions are the means by which contextual values and ideology are incorporated into scientific inquiry. The institutions and beliefs of our society reflect the fact that the society is patriarchal. Even female scientists have only recently become aware of the influence of patriarchal bias in the paradigms of science.

A first step for feminist scientists was recognizing the possibility that androcentric bias would result from having virtually all theoretical and decision-making positions in science held by men. Not until a substantial number of women had entered the profession could this androcentrism be exposed. As long as only a few women were scientists, they had to demonstrate or conform to the male view of the world in order to be successful and have their research meet the criteria for "objectivity."

In the past two decades, feminist historians and philosophers of science, anthropologists, and feminist scientists have pointed out the bias and absence of value neutrality in science, particularly biology. By excluding females as experimental subjects, focusing on problems of primary interest to males, utilizing faulty experimental designs, and interpreting data based in language or ideas constricted by patriarchal parameters, scientists have introduced bias or flaws into their experimental results in several areas. These flaws and biases were permitted to become part of the mainstream of scientific thought and were perpetuated in the scientific literature for decades. Because most scientists were men, values held by them as males were not distinguished as biasing; rather they were congruent with the values of all scientists and, thus, became synonymous with the "objective" view of the world and the aspects of it studied.

The demonstration that contextual values, including gender, bias not only the scientific research of individuals but also what is accepted as valid science by the entire scientific community represents one of the major contributions that feminism has made to science. In her 1999 book *Has Feminism Changed Science?* Londa Schiebinger examined how the presence of women in traditionally male disciplines has altered scientific thinking and awareness, concluding that feminist perspectives have had little effect on mathematics and the physical sciences but more impact on biology, including medicine, archaeology, reproductive and evolutionary biology, and primatology.

A small number of women have worked in both women's studies and science to include gender in the science curriculum and science in the women's and gender studies curriculum. Now, most campuses boast women in science and engineering programs for students; each year numerous conferences, journals, and anthologies focus on women and science, and the National Science Foundation and other federal agencies award multimillion dollar grants to facilitate institutional transformation to advance and retain women in science and engineering.

Within the sciences, substantial differences exist between the biological sciences and the physical sciences in the extent to which gender construction has permeated the official curriculum. Some of these differences reflect differences between the number of women in biology compared to the number of women in the physical sciences.

An overarching theme emerging from studies underlines that the social usefulness of science and technology, especially to help human beings, attracts and retains women in science. One can see this appeal in the number of women in the biological sciences who undertake research centered on animals and, in many cases, human health. On a more abstract level, the connection between gender and biology and the impact of gender on biological research becomes evident. Given the high costs of sophisticated equipment, maintenance of laboratory animals and facilities, and salaries for qualified technicians and researchers, virtually no experimental research is undertaken today without governmental or foundation support. The choice of problems for study in research is substantially determined by a national agenda that defines what is worthy of study, that is, worth funding. The lack of diversity among Congressional and scientific leaders may allow unintentional, undetected flaws to bias the research in terms of what we study and how we study it. Feminist critiques revealed the impact of distinct gender bias in choice and definition of health research problems.

Cardiovascular research became the poster child demonstrating the extent to which the data for the studies done only with male subjects could not be extrapolated to women. Cardiovascular diseases and AIDS stand as classic examples of diseases studied using a male-as-norm approach. Aspects of this approach included research designs that failed to assess gender differences in cardiovascular disease, case definitions that failed to include gynecologic conditions and other symptoms of AIDS in women until 1993, and exclusive use of males as research subjects in clinical trials.

Exclusion of women from clinical drug trials was so pervasive that a survey of clinical trials of medications used to treat acute myocardial infarction found that women were included in less than 20 percent and the elderly in less than 40 percent of those studies (Gurwitz, Nananda, & Avorn, 1992). Thus, individuals most likely to benefit from the medications were excluded in most trials. The Women's Health Initiative, established in 1990, seeks to fill these gender gaps in research and practice by collecting baseline data and determining interventions to prevent cardiovascular disease, breast and colorectal cancer, and osteoporosis.

Similarly, it was clear in the early primatology work that particular primate species, such as the baboon and chimpanzee, were chosen for study primarily because their social organization was seen by the observers as closely resembling that of human primates, where the male was dominant. Subsequent researchers forgot the "obvious" limitations imposed by such selection of species and proceeded to generalize the data to universal behavior patterns for all primates. It was not until a significant number of women entered primatology that the concepts of the universality and male leadership of dominance hierarchies among primates were questioned and shown to be inaccurate for many primate species such as the bonobos.

The influence of gender in research in the physical sciences becomes less evident where the materials and bodies studied lack the sex and gender evident in animals. In *Gender and Boyle's Law of Gases,* published in 2001, Elizabeth Potter demonstrates that gender and other social conditions such as his conservative political and religious beliefs, influenced Boyles' choice of the mechanistic, rather than animistic, model to explain his law of gases.

The choice of particular technologies to develop from basic research may also reflect male priorities. Male dominance in engineering and the creative decision-making sectors of the workforce may result in similar bias, particularly design and user bias. Shirley Malcom, Director of Education and Human Resources for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, suggested that the air bag fiasco suffered by the U.S. auto industry serves as an excellent example of gender bias reflected in design; this fiasco would have been much less likely had a woman engineer been on the design team. Since, on the average, women tend to be smaller than men, women on the design team might have recognized that a bag that implicitly used the larger male body as a norm would be flawed when applied to smaller individuals, killing, rather than protecting, children and small women.

INFLUENCES OF WOMEN'S STUDIES RESEARCH AND THEORIES ON THE SCIENCES CURRICULUM

In many ways, the gender construction in the official curriculum of biological and physical sciences mirrors the categories of scholarship in women's studies as a whole and the emerging development of the field. Recovery of lost texts and missing women characterize some of the earliest scholarship in the late 1960s and early 1970s as women's studies emerged as the academic arm of the women's movement with the establishment of the first programs in 1969 to 1970. The search for where and why women were missing from all fields was a necessary first step in beginning to understand how their absence led to flaws, distortions, and biases in each discipline. History of women in science and their impact upon the different disciplines and subfields continues to be an active research area today. Work in the history of science has blossomed to include roles of institutions in general, particular types of institutions such as women's colleges, the national laboratories, outstanding women such as Nobel Laureates, the lives of ordinary women scientists, as well as the reflection of gender in men's scientific theories.

Recognition that basic data on the number of women relative to men receiving degrees in science, mathematics, and engineering and their employment status, rank, salary, and professional progress and attainments were crucial to women and science came early. After a successful lobbying of Congress, the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act of 1980 was passed. The National Science Foundation was required to collect data each year on the status of women and other underrepresented groups; in the 1990s the data collection included the rates of participation in science of persons with disabilities. Building on these foundational data, current scholars provide statistical documentation and analyses of more subtle factors and obstacles that now deter women.

The revelations from the data on number of women coupled with documentation of differential socialization, environmental, and educational environments for women and men scientists led to questions about the impacts that these differences might make. Would women's differing interests, life experiences, and perspectives lead them to ask new questions, take different approaches, and find alternative interpretations leading to new theories and conclusions?

Just as women's studies scholars revealed that the assumption that male experience coincided with human experience constituted a form of androcentric bias that rendered women invisible and distorted many research results, these same scholars mistakenly assumed that the experience of all women was the same. Women of color, working-class women, and lesbians pointed out that their experiences as women and as scientists did not fit the depictions that emanated from a White, middle-class, heterosexual perspective. This revelation led to the recognition that gender did not represent a homogeneous category of analysis and that gender needed to be studied in relationship to other oppressions of race, class, nationalism, and sexual orientation.

Age or developmental stage becomes another aspect of diversity that can modify the experience of even the same woman throughout her life course. The comments of senior women scientists and engineers reveal the new, subtle forms of gender discrimination and discounting they encounter, after successfully overcoming barriers to establishing their career and balancing it with family responsibilities.

The past 15 years underline the influence of globalization and the significance of understanding international perspectives and movements. Much in the same way that, early on, in its eagerness to discover the influence of gender, women's studies suffered from the failure to recognize diversity among women, scholars now acknowledge the constraints of not understanding the experiences of women in different countries and cultural contexts.

Although enrollment of foreign graduate students in science and engineering increased by 35 percent from 1994 to 2001, it peaked in 2001 when 41 percent of doctorates awarded in the United States went to non-U.S. citizens. Although nearly 30 percent of the actively employed science and engineering doctorate holders in the United States are foreign born, as are many postdocs (National Science Board, 2004), very little research has focused on immigrant women scientists. One study (Xie & Shauman, 2003) found that immigrant women are only 32 percent as likely as immigrant men scientists and engineers to be promoted, partly because the women tend to immigrate for their husband's career.

Some of the junior women scientists and engineers interviewed as part of another study (Rosser, 2004) comment explicitly on their experience of becoming established in the United States after immigration and compare the status of scientists in their country of origin with that of U.S. scientists. Only a few of these women provide insights that shed light on how the experiences of immigrant women scientists differ from those of their U.S.-born colleagues.

As women's studies entered a stage that focused on the analysis of gender as a social category, critics began to question the ways in which gender determines the structure of social organizations, systems of cultural production, and the roles and definitions of masculinity and femininity. One of the greatest contributions of women's studies in all fields has been to broaden the definitions, language, and categories of knowledge. Scholars explored how the scientific hierarchy, including the language and metaphors of scientific theories and descriptions used, both reflected and reinforced gender roles. They uncovered the historical roots of modern science in a mechanistic model in which objectivity became synonymous with masculinity and that encouraged the domination of male scientists over women, nature, and organic models of the world.

Similarly, for many years, women's health was synonymous with obstetrics/gynecology. Not only did this define women in terms of reproduction, leaving out huge chunks of the life span, it also reinforced the male as norm approach to the rest of disease. Looking at all of health and disease and all of the body as part of women's health stands as a critical contribution to the women's health movement. When viewed from women's perspective, new issues enter the definition of "health" issues. For example, domestic violence is now considered a major health issue.

Women's studies, science, and medicine all suffer when theories and research become too disconnected from the daily lives of people, particularly women. Women's studies is currently in a phase of recognizing the significance of rejoining theory and practice; it places emphasis upon refocusing on the personal experiences and daily lives of women.

Many women scientists and engineers, while appreciating the issues raised about objectivity, questioned the translation of "high theory" into the practice of science and the relevance of such theories in their own lives as scientists, where they still encounter substantial discrimination. The science wars that developed from postmodern theories and increasing globalization drew attention to the necessity for the refusion of theory and practice. For many women teaching and practicing science, this dichotomy between theory and practice appeared to be a false separation. Grounded in laboratory practice, the fusion of theory and practice in science classrooms and laboratories has a long tradition.

Further evidence of the fusion of theory with practice comes from a current focus of feminist science studies on the personal experiences and daily lives of women scientists. These studies also reflect interdisciplinary approaches in their use of postcolonial theories, oral histories, and ethnographies as theoretical and methodological approaches to science studies.

Rosser (1997) suggests 20 pedagogical techniques developed by feminists and women's studies faculty that could be more widely employed in science classrooms:

1. Expand the kinds of observations beyond those traditionally carried out in scientific research. Women students may see new data that could make a valuable contribution to scientific experiments.
2. Increase the number of observations and remain longer in the observational stage of the scientific method. This would provide more hands-on experience with various types of equipment in the laboratory.
3. Incorporate and validate personal experiences women are likely to have had as part of the class discussion or the laboratory exercise.
4. Undertake fewer experiments likely to have applications of direct benefit to the military.
5. Propose more experiments to explore problems of social concern.

6. Consider problems that have not been considered worthy of scientific investigation because of the field with which the problems traditionally have been associated.
7. Formulate hypotheses focusing on gender as a crucial part of the question asked.
8. Undertake the investigation of problems of a more holistic, global scope rather than the more reduced and limited-scale problems traditionally considered.
9. Use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in data gathering.
10. Use methods from a variety of fields or interdisciplinary approaches to problem solving.
11. Include females as experimental subjects in experimental designs.
12. Use more interactive methods thereby shortening the distance between the observer and the object studied.
13. Decrease laboratory exercises in introductory courses in which students kill animals or render treatment that may be perceived as particularly harsh.
14. Use precise, gender-neutral language in describing data and presenting theories.
15. Be open to critiques of conclusions and theories drawn from observations differing from those drawn by the traditional male scientist from the same observations.
16. Encourage the uncovering of other biases such as those of race, class, sexual orientation, and religious affiliation that may permeate theories and conclusions drawn from experimental observation.
17. Use less competitive models to practice science.
18. Discuss the role of scientist as only one facet that must be smoothly integrated with other aspects of students' lives.
19. Put increased effort into strategies such as teaching and communicating with nonscientists to break down barriers between science and the layperson.
20. Discuss the practical uses to which scientific discoveries are put to help students see science in its social context.

Like specific pedagogical techniques, the broader models for phases of curricular transformation developed by women's studies scholars for other disciplines have been modified for the sciences (Rosser, 1997):

Stage 1. The absence of women is not noted. This is the traditional approach of the curriculum, in which the perspective of the White, Eurocentric, middle- to upper-class male is considered the norm and the absence of others is not noted.

Stage 2. Women are added onto existing science curriculum, structures, and design, without changing or attempting to accommodate them to fit women's interests and needs.

Stage 3. Women's concerns and approaches are seen as a problem, anomaly, or deviant from the norms of science, as barriers that prevent women from entering science are identified.

Stage 4. The focus is on women as workers, users, and scientists and on developing curricula that will attract them to the field.

Stage 5. Science is redefined and reconstructed to include all.

Although few would argue that Stage 5 has been fully achieved, there is little doubt that the curriculum in the biological and physical sciences is less androcentric, more female friendly, and generally more inclusive than ever before.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Commission of Professionals in Science and Technology. (2002). *Professional women & minorities* (14th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Foster, A. (2005). Student interest in computer science plummets. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* LI, 38, p. A-31.

Gurwitz, J.H., Nananda, F.C., & Avorn, J. (1992). The exclusion of the elderly and women from clinical trials in acute myocardial infarction. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 268* (2), 1417–1422.

Longino, H. (1990). *Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

National Science Board. (2004). *Science and engineering indicators—2004.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Rosser, S.V. (1997). *Re-engineering female friendly science.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Rosser, S. V. (2004). *The science glass ceiling: Academic women scientists and the struggle to succeed.* New York: Routledge.

Schiebinger, L. (1999). *Has feminism changed science?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. (2003). *Women in science.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Sue V. Rosser

Black Studies

The intellectual roots and data sources of Black studies, in a general sense, reach back in history to societies like ancient Egypt, Mali, and Songhay, which had institutions of higher learning, established an intellectual tradition of study of themselves and the surrounding world, and left a rich and varied body of documents for critical examination. However, Black studies, as a self-defined and organized discipline in the modern university, has its origin in the social and academic struggles of the 1960s. Indeed, the defining process for the emergence of Black studies is the Black Freedom Movement in both its civil rights and Black power phases. The critical issues of freedom, justice, equality, power, political and cultural self-determination, educational relevance, community service, and social engagement are all found in the fundamental and formative concerns that shape the early and continuing self-conception of Black studies.

These focal concerns are, of necessity, framed by overarching and pervasive concepts of race, class, and gender and the disciplinary imperative to engage these constraints on human freedom and human flourishing both intellectually and socially. Thus, Black studies develops a self-understanding as both a site of critical intellectual study, production, and transmission and an agency and instrument of social change in the interest of African and human good. It self-consciously builds on an activist-intellectual tradition evident in African culture as early as ancient Egypt and continuing through nineteenth and twentieth centuries as expressed in the work and activities of activist-intellectuals such as Anna Julia Cooper, W.E.B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, Ida B. Wells, Mary McLeod Bethune, Ella Baker, Malcolm X, and Martin Luther King, Jr. The paradigm that evolves here is one of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills to address critical social issues in the interest and service of community, society, and the world. That Black studies was conceived and constructed in the midst and interest of the Black Freedom Movement clearly influenced its reaffirmation of this activist-intellectual tradition and drew it inevitably not only toward confronting the race, class, and gender issues in society and the academy but also eventually toward a critical self-questioning and confrontation with these issues within the Black community and within the discipline itself, especially issues of gender.

Pan-African in scope, the discipline began with the fundamental assumptions that the Black initiative and experience in the world represented a special cultural truth worth studying and knowing and that it offered a rich source of paradigms of human excellence and achievement and, thus, for understanding humanity in its varied and various ways. Moreover, Black studies understood itself, along with other ethnic studies, as a necessary corrective for the existing monocultural curriculum and focus in the academy and argued that quality education, by definition, was a culturally pluralistic or multicultural education.

Finally, Black studies also understood itself as an emancipatory project in an intellectual and social sense. It thus linked intellectual emancipation with social liberation and knowledge acquisition with the obligation of service and social action. And, it embraced the concept and imperative of mutually beneficial relations between campus and community as put forth by Nathan Hare, architect of the first Black studies program.

In the course of its development, Black studies has demonstrated its capacity to broaden its core of original concerns and includes in its core curriculum areas vital to its self-understanding and continued development in the face of new demands and challenges in the academy and society. In the midst of its critical and persistent search for truth and meaning in history and society from an African vantage point, it poses the African initiative and experience as a rich resource for critical intellectual study. Moreover, it offers a rigorous intellectual challenge and alternative to established-order ways of understanding and engaging social human reality. And, as an emancipatory educational and social project, it self-consciously offers an African contribution to understanding and approaching the world and to multicultural efforts to initiate polices and practices that constantly expand the realm of human freedom and human flourishing. Within this overarching framework, Black studies conceived and structured its mission around three disciplinary pillars—cultural grounding, academic excellence, and social responsibility.

CULTURAL GROUNDING

From its inception, Black studies saw African culture—continental and diasporan, ancient and modern—-as the foundation and framework for its intellectual, pedagogical, and social practice. Discussion of the centrality of culture evolved in the discipline first around the early call for a Black frame of reference advanced in Kawaida philosophy, a theory of social and cultural change, developed in the 1960s by Maulana Karenga. Afterwards, it appears in discourse around the theory of Afrocentricity developed by its founding theorist Molefi Asante in the late 1970s and early 1980s. For Kawaida and Asante, Afrocentricity or African centeredness is a methodology and orientation, which places Africans at the center of their own culture, treats them as active subjects rather than passive objects of history, and engages African ideals and ways of being human in the world as the fundamental point of departure for intellectual production in the discipline. Contrasted to this is the Eurocentric approach in which European culture is the fundamental source for ideas and research agendas. The African-centered vision critically defined requires that Black studies root itself in African culture as a dynamic, varied, and living practice and constantly dialog with it, asking it questions and seeking from it answers to the fundamental concerns of humankind, and from this ongoing process continuously bring forth the best of what it means to be African and human in the world.

ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

The emphasis on academic excellence develops in the context of establishing both the value and durability of the discipline and Black studies scholars' own commitment to the highest level of teaching and intellectual production. Concern was also directed toward a similar deep intellectual grounding for Black studies students who had initiated the struggle for Black studies and had put forth as one of their priorities the demand for a relevant education. A relevant education for Black studies scholars and advocates meant one that was meaningful, useful, and reflective of the social realities of society and the world. Thus, an early stress of the discipline was on social service, service learning, and political involvement as component parts of the Black studies project.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The emphasis on social responsibility evolves out of both the ancient and ongoing African activist-intellectual tradition and the origin of Black studies in the midst of the Black Freedom Movement and the social and academic struggles that defined this process. The emancipatory role assigned to education, as key to intellectual and social liberation within this tradition of activist scholarship, calls into being a process of critique and corrective of domination in its various forms. This critique and corrective are parallel and complementary processes in Black studies and rooted in the ancient African understanding that poses knowledge, not simply as a personal possession or pursuit, but a social good to be shared and used to improve the human present and enhance the human prospect.

THE EMERGENCE OF BLACK WOMEN'S STUDIES

As Black studies continued to develop, it underwent the ongoing critical self-questioning associated with growth and expansion. It thus began to expand its curriculum to continuously include additional areas of studies deemed essential to its mission. The additions included Black women's studies, classical African studies (especially of ancient Egypt), Afrocentric theoretical and philosophical studies, popular cultural studies, expanded offerings of ethics, and various forms and kinds of diaspora studies. Among these additional fields of focus, Black women's studies stands out as one of the most invigorating and expansive. This was so, not only because of the generative discourse and debates that occurred around its essentiality and even indispensability to the discipline, but also because of the valuable scholarship that evolved within this vital area and from its exchange with other fields of focus.

The history of the emergence of Black women's studies as a vital component part of Black studies is informed and shaped by several factors. The first factor, as mentioned above, is the ongoing self-questioning of the discipline itself as it develops and seeks to constantly expand and meet the internal and external challenges related to its mission. Within this general developmental self-questioning was the specific concern about the core conception of the discipline itself as an emancipatory project and how its structure and functioning expressed this commitment. Black studies had come into being denouncing all inequalities, injustices, and constraints on human freedom and flourishing. It now discovered it had to confront the contradiction of having a male-privileging curriculum and often a similar faculty hiring practice, although it understood itself as an emancipatory educational and social project.

The contradiction, however, is brought to the forefront in a strong and sustained way by the intellectual and practical struggles waged by Black women within the discipline itself, and these struggles form the second factor shaping the emergence of Black women's studies. These Black studies scholars and advocates struggled to create and sustain space for teaching and research in Black women's studies and to establish it as an indispensable component part of Black studies. Not only did they challenge male-centered interpretations of African and human reality and the relationships that such interpretations created, they also produced and posed alternative visions. Among some of the early works in the 1970s that raised important Black women's studies issues are Toni Cade's *The Black Woman,* Joyce Ladner's *Tomorrow's Tomorrow,* Inez Smith-Reid's *"Together" Black Women,* Mary Helen Washington's *Black-Eyed Susans,* Sharon Hurley's and Rosalyn Terborg-Penn's *The Afro-American Woman: Struggles and Images,* and Roseann P. Bell's, Bettye J. Parker's, and Beverly Guy-Sheftall's study *Black Bridges: Visions of Black Women in Literature.* These works raised critical issues of race, gender, and class and called for correctives.

In the 1980s and 1990s, early Black women's studies literature was built on and expanded in various fields, especially in literature. Among the most notable are LaFrances Rodgers-Rose's *The Black Woman;* Gloria Hull's, Patricia Bell-Scott's, and Barbara Smith's *All the Women are White, All Blacks are Men, But Some of Us are Brave;* Paula Giddings's *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America;* Vivian Gordon's *Black Women, Feminism and Black Liberation;* Delores Aldridge's *Black Male-Female Relationships;* bell hooks' many books including *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black;* Darlene Clark Hine's multivolume *Black Women in American History;* Patricia Hill Collins's *Black Feminist Thought;* Clenora Hudson-Weems's *Africana Womanism: Reclaiming Ourselves;* Niara Sudarkasa's *The Strength of Our Mothers: African and African American Women and Families;* and Rosalyn Terborg-Penn's and Andrea Benton Rushing's *Women in Africa and the African Diaspora.* These early writings laid the basis for a continuously expansive literature and discourse.

A third factor shaping the emergence of Black women's studies was the key role Black women played in building and developing the two major professional organizations of the discipline, the African Heritage Studies Association (AHSA) and the National Council for Black Studies (NCBS). Black women scholars were in the vanguard of the move for self-determination and self-definition in the discipline and collaborated in both the intellectual and practical founding of AHSA in 1968. Since then, they have played a fundamental role in its maintenance, development, and leadership. Some of the important pioneers in this process are Shelby Lewis, Barbara Wheeler, Barbara Sizemore, Charshee McIntyre, Nancy Cortez, and Inez Smith-Reid.

Likewise, the founding of NCBS was due in great part to the conceptual and organizational initiative of Bertha Maxwell Roddy who issued the call for the founding of NCBS. Black scholars around the country joined her at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte, in 1975 to engage in dialog on critical issues in Black studies. From this initiative, she created interest in building NCBS and, along with other women, played a central role in its conception, formation, and development and served as its first chair. These women not only played leadership roles in the founding and development of NCBS and AHSA, but also in the definition and development of the discipline itself. Among the most noted, in addition to Maxwell Roddy, are Delores Aldridge and Carlene Young who, along with women leaders in AHSA, have continuously advanced women's intellectual and social issues in both Black studies discourse and organizational practice. Through this process, they have not only enriched Black studies discourse but also expanded the discipline itself.

Another factor operative in the shaping of the emergence of Black women's studies is the development of creative tension between Black womanists and feminists and White feminists and between Black studies and women's studies. Black studies had always understood the discipline as composed of studies of Black men and women, male and female, family and community. Thus, it resisted efforts to place Black women's studies in women's studies programs for several reasons. First, it was seen as compromising the integrity of the discipline, dividing and separating its component parts and locating them in different areas of study and administration. Second, it was argued that this violated departmental and discipline autonomy and self-determination and represented White racial disregard for these academic and political principles. It was also seen as a contradiction to White women's claim of the importance of women's self-determination and then denying this to Black women and other women of color. Third, it was contended that Black women are a central subject in Black studies and only a topic in White women's studies, for there the central theories, concepts, figures, and focus are rooted in White culture. Finally, it was argued that, although there were commonalities among various kinds of women, there were also basic differences that required, as a matter of self-determination, that each group of women speak with their own voice in the context of their own community.

Tensions also revolved around issues of differing emphases on race and gender and calls by Black womanists and feminists for White feminists to recognize the race and class nature of their own feminism and the privileged position of White women in the White patriarchy, which worked to Black women's and Black people's disadvantage.

A fifth factor that aided in shaping the development of Black women's studies is the critical revisiting of the unequal male/female relations in the Black Freedom Movement and the resultant critique of sexism in its philosophy and practice. This criticism became a central and expanded discourse with a persistent demand for inclusion and the end of inequality in participation, power, and representation in the discipline and social relations. In this continuing process, there are also genuine efforts of many male scholars to be self-critical and self-corrective, developing literature on ethical and mutually beneficial bases for improving the quality of male/female relations and representation in the discipline and society.

WOMANISM

Within the ongoing growth and expansion of the discipline of Black studies, Black women's studies has continued to develop and define itself through its intellectual and professional initiatives and the discourse created around these. Especially significant is the development of an expanding literature and discourse of womanism. Womanism, like feminism, has many forms, reflecting both the sociohistorical and cultural contexts in which it evolves and the various thinkers and groups who constructed and advanced it as an intellectual and political project. Moreover, the major forms evidence within them variations by different thinkers. This reflects the fact that there is an open-textured and unfinished character to the project, involving not only constant internal self-interrogation but also ongoing critique of and correctives for the established order of things.

The history of womanism is also a much-discussed issue. It is placed in its ancient origins in the sociohistorical and cultural context of ancient Africa and in its modern origins in the early struggles of African women and people against external domination (i.e., imperialism, colonialism, and the Holocaust of enslavement). Thus, although the term "womanism" was coined in the early 1980s, some of its fundamental concepts, especially in Africana, African feminist, Afrocentric, and Kawaida womanism, are rooted in ancient African values such as the shared dignity of human beings, male and female; complementarity of the sexes with the Cooperian stress on equality and mutual respect; male/female partnership in healing, repairing, and reconstructing the world; cultural grounding; community commitment; and moral and social agency.

Womanism as a modern intellectual and political initiative evolved in the midst of social struggle and attendant discourse and discussion within the Black Freedom Movement (1955–1975), the Black Studies Movement, and between Black and White women over common and differing issues and concerns and the need to have a voice and vision authentically African. In this regard, it reflects both conflict and confluence with Black and White feminist thought and practice. Thus, African American feminism or Continental African feminism, while staking out space for an authentic and independent Black voice, nevertheless uses feminism and/or feminists to define their project. Africana womanists like Clenora Hudson-Weems and Kawaida womanists like Tiamoyo Karenga and Chimbuko Tembo argue, however, that authenticity of voice and vision requires cultural grounding, that feminism and feminists are culturally and historically specific to White women's experience, and that Africana womanism is the correct and most useful term for Black women's emancipatory project. African feminist womanists, like Oyeronke Oyewumi, also reject the use of feminism as a historically and culturally specific global political project growing out of White women's experience and as possibly imperialist. However, Oyewumi sees the category feminist as transhistorical and indicative of female agency and self-determination, both deeply rooted in traditional African culture. Beverly Guy-Sheftall embraces both womanism and feminism as categories to define her stance, using them interchangeably.

Given these considerations, forms of womanist and feminist discourse, while distinct, often overlap and interrelate. Thus, even in articles or books designated Black or African feminist, the issues addressed and the methodology used to engage them will often reflect a womanist approach and understanding, a self-consciously and distinct Africana women's voice and vision.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Aldridge, D., & Young, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Out of the revolution of Africana studies.* New York: Lexington Books.

Asante, M. (1998). *The Afrocentric idea* (Rev. ed.). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Asante, M., & Karenga, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of Black studies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DuBois, W.E.B. (1973). The field and function of the Negro college (1933). Reprinted in H. Aptheker (Ed.), *W. E. B. DuBois: The education of Black people: Ten critiques, 1906–1960* (pp. 83–102). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Hare, N. (1969). What should be the role of Afro-American education in the undergraduate curriculum? *Liberal Education, 55*(March), 42–50.

Hudson-Weems, C. (1993). *Africana womanism: Reclaiming ourselves.* Troy, MI: Bedford.

Karenga, M. (2002). *Introduction to Black studies* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: University of Sankore Press.

Marable, M. (2000). *Dispatches from the ebony tower: Intellectuals confront the African American experience.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Mazama, A. (2002). *The Afrocentric paradigm.* Trenton, NJ, & Asmara, Eritrea: African World Press.

Stewart, J. (2004). *Flight: In search of vision.* Trenton, NJ, & Asmara, Eritrea: Africa World Press.

Maulana Karenga

Early Childhood Education

Gender matters in the lives of children in the years between birth and eight years of age. It helps children to decide what to like or not to like in an early childhood educational setting, but also it influences what they think other children would like, whom they think should be their friends, and how they act toward each other. While some boys and girls do play and learn together in early childhood settings and spaces, many boys and girls, when left to their own choices, divide their educational world into separate spaces for boys and girls. Many studies have highlighted how preschool children can talk in detail about gender marking what clothes you wear, the colors you like, your hairstyle, your voice, your play choices, your likes, your dislikes, and your relationships with each other. For these reasons, gender influences how children experience early childhood education, and it creates educational worlds in which gender matters to what happens—positively and negatively—for young children as learners.

There is a strong research base to support these contentions and competing theories about why gender matters and how teachers can and should engage with gendering in early childhood education.

GENDER AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION RESEARCH

The impact of gender in young children's lives in Western countries has been researched extensively for over 50 years. This research has produced indisputable evidence that young children know about gender and acquire gendered ways of being and thinking from an early age. More specifically, we know that children's gender awareness and identity development is well established by three years of age. Most classic research indicates that it is extremely difficult to identify boys from girls on behavioral grounds when children are under two years of age unless there are some external cultural indicators of gender—for example, clothing—but that after two years of age some differences between boys and girls do emerge. By three years of age, most children understand and practice gender differences that are culturally produced in the adult world.

By the mid-1980s, a formidable array of information had been generated about how young children can and do play, think, and react in traditionally gender-stereotyped ways in Western early years of education. During the 1990s, a new wave of research further reinforced the idea that young children were highly gendered and often traditionally so. Furthermore, preschool children often actively maintain gender stereotypes in their own behaviors and that of their peers. Specifically, children who agree with a gender stereotype will often change their behavior to be consistent with it; and by five years of age, biases against the gender group to which the children do not belong have been firmly established.

From the 1970s, extensive research has demonstrated the gender-stereotyped nature of young children's play, play patterns, play styles, and use of play materials in early learning environments. The 1970s saw a strong focus in research about the toy preferences of boys and girls that highlighted strong gender stereotypes at play. This research has continued and, most recently, researchers identified gender-stereotyped choices in preschool children's choice and knowledge of musical instruments. However, in more recent research, there has been a focus on how boys and girls play with the toys that they choose. For instance, the differential use of Barbie products by girls and boys has shown that traditionally gendered boys and girls use her very differently. Traditionally gendered boys often sexualize her and/or turn her into a weapon. Traditionally, gendered girls are more likely to use her as intended by the producer, adapting and interpreting the story lines contained in Barbie's packaging. What has also emerged in recent research is that less traditionally gendered boys and girls do desire to play with what would generally be considered the "other" gender's toys. However, they tend to keep this desire secret and play with them covertly if they have peers who are traditionally gendered.

This more recent research on children's toy and play preferences has clear educational implications. It affects the learning materials that children believe are relevant to them and how they engage with what they consider to be the "other" genders' materials. For instance, a small piece of research from the late 1990s showed that when four- and five-year-old children were left to choose their own books for reading the color of the cover of the book affected their decision to choose the book or not. Traditionally gendered boys chose books with blues and dark colors, irrespective of the content of the book. Traditionally gendered girls chose books with pinks and pastel colors, irrespective of the content of the book.

It is not just the children who determine what happens in early childhood education. There is also sound evidence from several Western countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia, that early childhood teachers can and do respond differently to boys and girls and that these differences are often based on traditional gender stereotypes. In the 1980s and early 1990s, researchers primarily from the United Kingdom studied the impact of specific equal opportunities strategies (e.g., teacher modeling, nongendered room arrangement, and the use of nonsexist stories) in early childhood curriculum on children's gendered behaviors. The results were less than decisive. Some researchers found a short-term reduction in children's stereotyped play. Longer-term studies indicate that work to shift gender stereotyping in early childhood programs may take several months of intensive work with active and deliberate intervention by teachers.

More recent research from the late 1990s and 2000s has highlighted the complexities and possibilities in working with children's resistances and in supporting children to transgress gender stereotypes. One of the key complexities this research has highlighted is how the gender dynamics of specific groups of children vary. When there is a large group of traditionally gendered boys in a specific classroom, this will produce different challenges for the teacher than when there is a small group of less traditionally gendered boys. While this appears obvious, many gender equity strategies recommended for use in early childhood classrooms have tended to be globally directed at all children, rather than being nuanced and targeted toward the specific dynamics of a specific classroom.

Another complexity that more recent research has highlighted is the shifting ways in which specific children understand and practice gender. The educational context, in part, constructs how children construct gender and vice versa. For instance, some groups of children have been found to make nonsexist statements for their teachers but then in unpoliced peer encounters produce very traditionally gendered and sexist ways of being and talking. This work is helping to build a more fine-grained picture of the need to identify how specific groups of children understand and practice gender and then work explicitly with them to counter those understandings and practices that limit the possibilities they see for themselves and for others.

Not all children are traditionally gender stereotyped in their preschool years, and those children who are often traditionally gender stereotyped are not consistently so. However, those children who move outside traditionally gendered stereotypes can be challenged and/or rejected by their peers in the preschool years. This is linked to the fact that many preschool children find gender violations (crossing the gender boundaries, e.g., girls doing boys' things or wearing boys' things) to be as serious as violating moral rules such as lying or taking a toy. These violations are more serious for boys than they are for girls when they involve wearing girls' clothes or acting like a girl. Girls were evaluated most negatively when they played more loudly and roughly than boys.

There is some indication to suggest that very young children are more likely to break out of these moral codes if they are in the same gender groups. However, further research is needed to explore if this and other strategies can support children who challenge gender stereotypes and their negative effects. It may be that different strategies are required for boys and for girls, but we lack classroom research on this issue. Understanding this is critical to developing policies and implementing programs that support children in their efforts to do gender differently. It may also help us to understand how to work with children who resist gender equity policies and programs in early childhood education. Specifically, young children's views and perspectives on what makes it possible for them to resist traditionally gendered ways of being and how best to support them when they do is beginning to provide helpful guidance for gender policy development on these issues in preschool classrooms.

GENDER THEORIES AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

Two broad theories of gender have dominated most educational literature on gender in the early years: sex-role socialization theory and relational (or feminist poststructuralist) theory, and each has different educational implications.

Sex-role socialization theories see gender as divided into two distinct and opposite (binary) categories: the masculine and the feminine. While it is possible for children to learn to be nonsexist, all children must learn the category associated with their sex (male or female). Their task in the early years is to learn the social roles appropriate to this category.

Sex-role socialization theories try to link the internal processes of individual learning about gender category with wider social and cultural factors to explain gender development. They argue that children learn gender categories from the key agents in the socialization process—their family, peer group, media, and school. Children learn sex roles through observation, imitation, and modeling how to behave in category appropriate ways. There is no explanation in sex-role theory about how power operates as a relation in transactions.

Gender inequalities in education arise from children learning traditional and stereotyped roles that limit what they consider appropriate for gender. Children are considered to be either sexist or nonsexist in their thinking and behaviors because of the gender roles that they have learned. For instance, children's participation or lack of participation in a specific early childhood learning area, such as block play or home corner, is explained by the gender roles learned to date. If girls have learned traditional sex roles, then clearly they will gravitate to "homemaking" activities such as playing with dolls or cooking. The same is so for boys. Traditional gender roles expectations are what limit young children's early childhood experiences and outcomes. Hence, it is these roles that need to be challenged and changed to achieve gender equity in early childhood education.

As gender inequity results from learning traditional and stereotyped roles, gender equity can be achieved through reteaching (or resocializing) children to be nonsexist. Educational policies and practices that draw on these theories emphasize teacher modeling and child observation of, and participation in, nonsexist curricula to reverse the effects of sex-role stereotypes on children as learners. Although these theories gained prominence in the 1970s, they are still evident in early childhood curriculum texts, despite heavy critique of their simplistic understandings of gender effects in young children's lives as learners.

More recent thinking driven by feminist poststructuralist theories of identity sees gender as relational and interdependent rather than two separate and distinct categories. It is relational because being a girl is related to and defined by how girls should act toward boys and vice versa. A girl is recognizable because she acts differently from boys and vice versa. Ways to "do" gender for boys and for girls are interrelated and complicated or problematic because the construction of gender involves power. Masculinity is seen as the measure that is the one, to femininity as the other. Shifting the boundaries of what is acceptable for one gender to do disrupts ideas about each gender. Gender is interdependent in that all forms of being gendered are on a continuum. There are more or less traditional ways to be masculine or feminine and some ways of being masculine overlap with some ways of being feminine.

Feminist poststructuralists argue that educational work should target gender *relations* not gender *roles* because educational gender issues arise from how girls and boys interact with each other and how they socially construct their interactions. They also contend that children actively *construct* their gender. It is not simply absorbed from agents of socialization. Their research has demonstrated that not all children absorb nonsexist messages in an early childhood classroom and many children may resist them. Hence, feminist poststructuralists see social learning theories as simplistic and flawed. Instead of seeing gender as a role children play, they emphasize that gender is a way of being that is inherently emotional and linked to discourse (social frameworks in language for making sense of the world) and power. Children invest emotionally in gender, and to shift from being sexist to nonsexist is more than a cognitive exercise of learning a new role. It is an intensely emotional occurrence in which children are asked to "give up" what they find pleasurable. For instance, asking a four-year-old girl who loves playing with dolls to see them as sexist and limiting asks her to reject what she finds deeply pleasurable. To ask her to see playing with trucks as pleasurable, in the same ways that playing with dolls is, proves just as puzzling.

Young children's gender choices are constructed and, at times, constrained by their perception of what is pleasurable, but what they find pleasurable as boys or as girls is no accident. It links to power and gender discourses. The gender discourses that have the most power will be those that have strong institutional support and presence in a society. The most powerful gender discourses in young children's lives are those that are persistently presented as the normal ways to girls and boys, women and men. Using these discourses, young children find the pleasures of "getting it right" and "being normal" in their specific culture. Often, these discourses express the more traditional and stereotyped ways of being gendered, and so young Western children often actively choose to be traditionally gendered. They also eschew others who violate their sense of what is the right and normal way to be gendered. There is nothing "natural" in these choices. Children socially construct them from their world. Their constructions express specific gender politics in which particular ways to be masculine and feminine are not only more valued but they accrue the advantages of being considered right, normal, and proper.

Feminist poststructuralist theories of gender identity formation also emphasize that children's identities are complex and that they can shift according to context and experience (as noted above). Gender is a shifting set of ideas, actions, and feelings about what it means to be a boy or a girl in a specific place, culture, and time. Gender identity is made complex by how it intersects with identities of race, class, and culture, and so universal explanations of gendering in the early years are shunned in preference for situated explanations that recognize gender is constructed socially by its time, place, space, and culture.

The complex, interdependent, and relational nature of gender links inequalities to gender relations and their politics. Educational inequalities are the effects of how specific ways of constructing masculinity and femininity impact on the children in early childhood education. These effects can look different according to the shifting gender identities of boys and girls and how their culture privileges specific ways of being masculine and feminine. In early childhood, children work hard to make sense of "gender politics" (i.e., the social position and status of different ways to be masculine and feminine) and these gender politics need to be dealt with as we tackle gender inequalities in education.

Feminist poststructuralists argue for pedagogies that acknowledge power relations, including children's capacity to resist what adults want for them and that lead to more contextually aware and specifically targeted strategies. These involve proactive pedagogies that critically explore the effects—negative and positive—of gender in their own and their peers' lives. Related educational policies should focus on how specific groups of children experience gender, the pleasures that children associate with how they do and use gender, and the ways to help children to find pleasure in being gendered that produce equitable educational outcomes for all children. Research about how best to do this is still very scant as is research on the effects of using feminist poststructuralist theories to drive gender pedagogies in early childhood classrooms.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Connelly, P. (1988). *Racism, gender identities and young children.* London: Routledge.

Davies, B. (1989). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Gallas, K. (1998). *Sometimes I can be anything: Power, gender and identity in a primary classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

MacNaughton, G. (2000). *Rethinking gender in early childhood education.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Glenda MacNaughton

Family and Consumer Sciences (Historically, Home Economics)

Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS), the name adopted in 1994, represents a new and broader vision of the field previously called home economics (HE). From its beginning, the field has been involved with education at multiple levels. Child development programs in higher education have early childhood education programs as do some FCS high school programs. Some programs also have high school students working with elementary students as "teachers" and mentors. Professionals in different capacities, including Cooperative Extension Service, offer noncredit adult education programs. From the early twentieth century to the present, HE—and now FCS—has provided professional positions for educated women (and men) in government, social services, the cooperative extension service, business, and industry, most of which involve some teaching.

Although some community colleges have FCS programs, the largest enrollments are in secondary and higher education. Today's college and university programs offer associate's, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees in FCS and its specializations (merchandizing, textile science, family science and child development, gerontology, marriage and family therapy, hospitality management, dietetics/nutrition, housing/interior design, and family economics), graduating thousands annually.

FROM HE TO FCS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Although there are references in eighteenth century U.S. historical documents regarding the need for educating women for their culturally defined roles, HE did not emerge as a field of study until the second half of the nineteenth century. Catharine Beecher's 1841 publication, *A Treatise on Domestic Economy,* became the first comprehensive text for girls and a popular manual for women. It detailed fulfillment of their role defined by Victorian ideology. Blocked by culturally defined gender roles from entering the clergy like her father and several brothers, Beecher shifted her attention to educating girls in her seminaries and women through her publications. She prepared females to be society's moral leaders through their roles as mothers, as homemakers, and, most recently, as teachers, previously limited to men. Her seminaries for young girls offered more intellectually challenging education than generally available to them during Beecher's lifetime (1800–1878).

After the 1862 Morrill Act established land-grant colleges, campus and informal community-based programs developed to provide practical education for women like those in the agricultural and mechanical arts that prepared men for their presumed roles in the agrarian, working-class American society. Except for the private women's colleges in the East, established for the middle and upper class, women's entrance into public land-grant colleges was primarily in HE. Iowa State Agricultural College (now Iowa State University) established the first HE program in 1871.

Near the end of Beecher's life, Ellen H. (Swallow) Richards—a two-time Vassar College graduate, the first woman to attend Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and later an MIT chemistry instructor—emerged as a leader of the HE movement in its transition to a profession. Despite degrees from land-grant institutions or private colleges, women continued to have limited professional opportunities. Male-dominated professional societies either denied entry to them or marginalized them; professional employment was difficult to find, almost impossible for married women.

This marginalization led Richards and other educated women and several men to create the new profession called home economics. When Melvil Dewey invited Richards to the Lake Placid Club in upstate New York to discuss development of a HE Regents' exam, Richards encouraged expansion of this meeting into a conference for those interested in improving home and family life to discuss unification of their independent efforts in educational programs in schools, communities, and higher education. The resulting Lake Placid Conferences on Home Economics (1899–1908) led the conferees to establish the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) and its *Journal of Home Economics* in 1909.

The conferees were concerned about the impact of immigration, industrialization, and lack of common understanding of applications of science to improve daily life in homes and families. They wanted their new profession to address poor housing and overcrowdedness, food adulteration, unhealthful and unsafe living and working condition, pollution from the uncontrolled factories, growing poverty, and communicable diseases—then the leading cause of death. They developed practically oriented interdisciplinary curricula for different educational levels that included the natural sciences, arts, humanities, and the emerging social sciences.

Although American society and the AHEA founders—primarily White, educated, middle-class women and men—were not particularly sensitive to ethnic differences by today's standards, their turn-of-the-century ideas and ideals were truly progressive. Typical of the Progressive Era (1890–1920), they rejected capitalism's *laissez faire* approach to the plight of the poor and the Social Darwinian notion of eugenics. Instead, they embraced the notion of euthenics, a science dealing with development of human well-being by improving living conditions.

Minorities, however, had a particularly difficult time obtaining education, particularly higher education. There were only three higher education institutions that enrolled African American students before the Civil War, and land-grant higher education institutions in the South excluded them until the 1890 Morrill Act established separate land-grant institutions for minorities.

This racism affected many aspects of society, including AHEA. Not until the 1940s could minorities join AHEA but only as members-at-large, not state affiliate members. This precluded their rise through state leadership to national offices. In the late 1950s when the civil rights movement raised the nation's consciousness, HE honor societies initiated efforts to address racial inequality within the profession. In 1958 to 1959, Kansas State's chapter of Omicron Nu, the oldest national honor society in HE, initiated its first African American student. In 1963, Kappa Omicron Phi, the second oldest honor society in HE, and Omicron Nu founded chapters in historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Beginning in the early 1960s, the National Council of Administrators in Home Economics (now Council of Administrators of Family and Consumer Sciences) elected officers from HBCUs and included sessions in its conferences on diversity and minority recruitment. In 1963, AHEA reduced racial tension within the organization with a bylaws change to eliminate discrimination at the state and national levels. Since 1975, four African American women and two White men have been elected Association president and numerous minorities have held other offices. Unhappy with slow progress, in 1980 a group of mostly African American professionals created the Coalition for Black Development in Home Economics (now the National Coalition for Black Development in Home Economics). Despite minority recruitment projects, minority FCS graduates entering the profession are still lower than needed.

Because of dramatic societal change after World War II (WWII), FCS educational institutions also changed significantly; AHEA published "New Directions" to affirm changes in professional practice needed to assist contemporary families in this new era. During the 1960s, the discipline developed specializations and the profession grew dramatically. HE professionals made their rhetoric more gender neutral, focused more on paid careers, increased their research productivity, and recruited males into the field. However, as other professional options opened, the proportion of women enrolled in HE in higher education declined.

Since the 1960s, HE professional associations have struggled to reestablish a clear identity and vision for the profession. Like other professional associations, the AHEA revised its mission and made efforts to educate its funding providers, policy makers, and the general public about its value to society and to both men and women. Several HE professional organizations incorporated discussions of such matters into regularly scheduled conferences and numerous special meetings. AHEA commissioned studies of the public's perception of the profession and launched public relations campaigns to improve the profession's image and address contradictory perceptions of itself among business, government, and academic employers. In 1975, it published "New Directions II," which recommended changing the focus from improvement within the home to strengthening families as ecosystems interdependent within rapidly changing political, economic, and social environments.

Still searching for identity clarification, AHEA commissioned professors Marjorie Brown and Beatrice Paolucci to write *Home Economics: A Definition* in 1979. This in-depth philosophical essay was discussed at national and regional forums, at state conventions, and in college and university courses and seminars. Their new theoretical conceptualization, called "critical science," was based primarily on the philosophy of German philosopher, Jürgen Habermas. His theory critiques positivism while simultaneously integrating empiricism, hermeneutics, and critical theory to determine how society *ought to be* rather than adapting to *what is.* The AHEA Future Development Committee developed discussion outlines and leader guides for state affiliates on important issues such as the profession's mission, ethics, specialization, and core curriculum. For about a decade Brown and Paolucci's dramatically new vision and mission for the profession prompted proponents, especially teacher educators, to make numerous national presentations and develop publications on its application to professional practice.

By the mid-1980s, increasing specialization within the field was weakening the interdisciplinary approach. Extension administrators, teacher educators, and some specialized faculty were concerned about this fragmentation, but many others were indifferent or unsupportive. Mirroring this debate, higher education units adopted more than 30 names for themselves, either to emphasize their program's integrative nature (e.g., Family and Consumer Sciences) or to accommodate the particular combination of specializations included in their individual units (e.g., Design, Family, and Consumer Sciences). New professional organizations emerged focusing on specific work settings and/or specializations. Nationally, this proliferation of names and organizations further exacerbated identity confusion. Specialized professionals identified with their root disciplines.

In 1984, for its 75th anniversary, AHEA initiated an annual competitive commemorative lectureship to stimulate critical thinking and improve articulation of the profession and its relationship to society. Marjorie Brown, honored for her professional and intellectual contributions, was the first selected. She shocked her audience by chiding the profession for conforming to existing society, dominated by individualism and strongly influenced by business and industry. She claimed the profession still subscribed inappropriately to economic materialism, a nineteenth-century view that physical and economic conditions in society and the home naturally precede political-moral, social-psychological, and cultural improvement. This emphasis on the physical aspects of daily life in homes and unreflective acceptance of empirical science and technology has led to internal inconsistencies between the profession's philosophy and its members' professional practice. Brown urged the profession to be more self-critical and to stop compromising its commitment to families simply to gain and/or keep positions in business and industry.

Brown's lecture was a prelude to her three forthcoming volumes on the intellectual foundation and reconceptualization of the profession. Brown's first two volumes, published in 1985, clarified how the profession's history had led it to where it was in the early 1980s, and the third critically examined the basic ideas by which home economists understood their profession (Brown, 1993).

By 1992 the identity problem of the profession had become so problematic that five major professional HE organizations sponsored a national meeting entitled, "Positioning the Profession for the 21st Century," in Scottsdale, Arizona, in 1993. After much deliberation, the attendees selected "family and consumer sciences" as the new name for the profession, and developed a new conceptual framework reaffirming its unifying focus as an integrative approach to the relationships among individuals, families, communities, and the environments in which they function. This new name was intended to escape the stereotypic connotations of the term "home economics" that had plagued the profession and to broaden the focus to include improvement of individual, family, and community well-being; impact on the development, delivery, and evaluation of consumer goods and services; influence on the development of public policy; and the shaping of societal change. Some who attended the conference felt it had created a new profession that transcended HE.

At their respective 1994 annual meetings, all five national associations voted to adopt the conceptual framework and four changed their organizations' names. The fifth, the Association of Administrators of Home Economics, became the Association of Administrators of Human Sciences because "human sciences" parallels "agricultural sciences" with which HE programs in land-grant institutions have had to interact since the 1862 Morrill Act. For some higher education programs, the new name has dramatically increased enrollments and attracted more male students. Although many units changed their names to FCS after 1994, there are still multiple names used in higher education both in the United States and elsewhere.

Internationally, the field is referred to primarily as home economics, but other names such as human ecology and home science are also used. Since 1994, Japanese scholars in home economics have been studying the impact of the name change of the profession in the United States, wondering whether the profession in Japan should do the same.

FROM HE TO FCS IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

By 1900, compulsory schooling had increased student educational diversity. To produce workers for the industrial economy, secondary education broadened from college preparation to include preparation for community and work life through specialized, technical vocational education. Early home economists sought HE's acceptance as an academic version of manual training for younger children and for college entrance credit as a science. Some home economists wanted secondary school programs to be part of liberal education for all students, but Congressional, trade, and vocational representatives strongly supported a narrower gender-stereotypic view of vocational training for homemaking (Apple, 1997). Although child development, family relations, and consumer economics gradually were added to the HE curricula, the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act and its amendments funded vocational programs that would largely serve nonacademically oriented students.

From 1917 through 1945, philosophical discussion decreased while the country and the profession were preoccupied with WWI, the Great Depression, and WWII. Although some HE secondary school programs lost funding during the Depression, WWII prompted curricular changes to meet defense needs and postwar legislation restored funding for secondary programs. Overall, it was a time of rapid growth in the profession: membership in AHEA soared; student chapters increased; demand for home economists in retail stores, banks, food manufacturing, magazine publishing, public utilities, research firms, and government increased dramatically. However, the profession had expanded so much that its objectives became unclear and consensus illusive.

Technological developments and industrial efficiency's influence on society increased concern about their impact on family relationships. After WWII, Americans wanted to rebuild their personal lives, but they had been changed by their war experience and their war effort experiences at home. With such challenging readjustment facing families, HE again became philosophically reflective during the late 1940s and 1950s.

In 1961, the U.S. Office of Education, the Federal Extension Service, and HE land-grant university units sponsored a conference in French Lick, Indiana, to redesign HE curricula at the secondary, college, and adult levels. Subsequent workshops developed outlines of concepts and generalized principles to be taught within HE.

This approach supported the use of behavioral objectives and the common educational practice of lecture followed by group laboratory experiences to apply factual knowledge. Quality assessment of products produced in labs using criteria and score sheets were stressed. Interactive techniques such as group projects and preschool laboratory programs also were used frequently. Even though some course objectives related to nonphysical skill development such as managing time and energy and developing interpersonal relationships, production of home and family oriented products dominated junior high school programs and attracted students to elective senior high HE courses. However, such products perpetuated the stereotype of HE providing commonsense knowledge lacking academic rigor. This perception and the hands-on approach to teaching daily life skills encouraged administrators to assign special needs students to HE courses. Since 1963, when the federal vocational education legislation insisted on job skill training, industry has had an increased influence on public education curriculum, classroom equipment used, and teacher education. Again, this perpetuated the long-standing stereotypes and further diminished the general education orientation of HE courses for all students. The Federal Vocational Education Act of 1976 addressed sex discrimination, which for HE meant developing gender-neutral courses and recruiting male students.

In 1979, after the introduction of Brown and Paolucci's reconceptualization, FCS secondary school programs in some states developed curricula focused on students' development of reasoning abilities, including ethics, to identify and address underlying family problems distinct from their symptoms. Such programs have used discussion, role-playing, and self-reflection, and deemphasized production (e.g., cooking and sewing). However, because of the federal direction toward vocational education, elimination of many teacher education programs from higher education, and establishment of vocationally oriented national standards for secondary programs, the critical science thrust has yet to be widely adopted.

The name change of the profession in 1994 was adapted by many secondary school teachers as FACS (pronounced "facts") to market their courses as providing "the FACS of Life." The recent federal legislation, No Child Left Behind, emphasizes traditional "academic" subjects at the expense of applied curricula such as FACS, physical education, art, and music.

Although Brown and Paolucci have inspired some in secondary and higher education to change curricula, the greatest impact has been on teacher education that welcomed a more integrative, problem-posing approach. Secondary school educators, however, necessarily have followed the guidelines of the federal vocational funding that requires FCS programs to provide technical preparation for specific entry-level jobs rather than careers. FCS still has few male teachers but would welcome more because it believes strengthening families is not the responsibility of women alone. Just as previously male-dominated professions are becoming gender neutral, previously female-dominated professions are seeking to be gender neutral as well.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Apple, R. (1997). Liberal arts or vocational training? Home economics education for girls. In S. Stage & V.B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 79–95). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Brown, M.M. (1985). *Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States: Our practical intellectual heritage.* (Vols. I & II). East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Human Ecology.

Brown, M.M. (1993). *Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States: Basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves.* East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Human Ecology.

Brown, M.M., & Paolucci, B. (1979). *Home economics: A definition.* Alexandria, VA: American Home Economics Association.

Virginia B. Vincenti

Health and Sex Education

Educators must be cognizant of gender when planning and implementing sexuality curricula. Expectations regarding appropriate gender role characteristics have changed considerably over past decades, especially for girls and women. The appropriate incorporation of gender differences in sexuality curricula should provide students with the climate for questioning the nature, validity, or origin of gender stereotypes.

Historically, challenges to gender stereotypes played little role in sex education curricula, which were primarily concerned with matters of public health and family life. Even at the present time, curricula based on the abstinence model of sex education are tied to conservative views of masculinity and femininity that support, rather than undermine, stereotypes about women and men. In contrast, the comprehensive sexuality model of sex education aims to undermine the limits of these stereotypes by empowering students not only by giving them information about sexuality and related matters but also by helping them to improve their decision-making and communication skills, clarify their values, and increase their understanding of themselves and their relationships.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF SEXUALITY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The demand for sexuality education in the United States began in 1912 when the National Education Association (NEA) issued a request for teacher preparation programs focusing on sexual health. In 1940, the U.S. Public Health Service specified sexuality education as an “urgent need” in public schools and promoted the concept throughout the nation. A conservative approach to the controversial topic was initiated in 1953 by the American School Health Association with the implementation of the “family life education curriculum.” The American Medical Association and the NEA followed the trend in 1955 with the development and distribution of five informational brochures referred to as the “Sex Education Series for Schools” (Pardini, 2002).

Arguments against even this conservative, family oriented curriculum surfaced in the 1960s when the Christian Crusade movement and the John Birch Society characterized all sexuality education as “smut, raw sex,” and a “filthy Communist plot.” Opponents of sexuality education viewed course content as a precursor to sex that would ultimately lead to an increase in sexual activity among students (Pardini, 2002).

Public attitudes regarding sexuality education dramatically changed in the early 1980s with the diagnosis of Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) among newborns, heterosexual females, and gay/homosexual males. U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop launched a proactive approach against AIDS and called for an immediate response to the threat of the disease through comprehensive AIDS and sexuality education beginning in the third grade.

Sexuality course content in typical U.S. schools evolved from teachers making references to animal sexual behavior patterns in the 1950s to displaying reproductive organs of animals to students during the sexual revolution of the 1960s. Human sexual behaviors emerged as a central topic in most health classes in the 1970s with diagrams of the male and female reproductive anatomy being used by educators. Reproduction, contraception, and decision-making skills, threaded with emphasis on individual responsibility, became the normative content of sexuality classes during the early 1980s. Koop's call for the inclusion of AIDS awareness in health classes led to the progression of comprehensive sexuality education with sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), risky sexual behaviors, and the use of condoms being integrated into course content during the mid-1980s. Because of the growing incidence of AIDS in the United States and worldwide, conservative opponents of sexuality education found it difficult to ban the curriculum. In response, traditionalists initiated a new trend to control the content of sexuality education courses by launching the abstinence-only education movement (Pardini, 2002).

CONTEMPORARY MODELS OF SEXUALITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Two opposing philosophies prevail in the current content and delivery of sexuality education in the public and private K-12 curriculum and in college courses. *Abstinence-only education* enforces abstinence as the only option of sexual expression among the unmarried and censors information about contraception for the prevention of unintended pregnancies and STDs. In partial contrast, *comprehensive sexuality education* emphasizes abstinence as the most effective means to prevent STDs and pregnancy, but also incorporates human development, sexual behavior, sexual health, and contraception into the curriculum.

One in three U.S. schools incorporates the principles of abstinence-only sexuality education into the content of health classes (Cordi, 2002). Often referred to as "abstinence-only-until-marriage" programs, the foundation of the curriculum is based on fundamentalist Christian beliefs that support self-discipline as the primary means to avoid risky sexual behaviors among students. The abstinence-only movement gained momentum with the enactment of the Adolescent Family Life Act of 1981 that funded educational programs that sanctioned prudent approaches to adolescent sex. In 1996, Congress inserted an abstinence-only provision to the Welfare Reform Bill for school and community-based sexuality education programs. Programs wishing to receive government funding for abstinence-only initiatives must comply with the following mandates specified by the Federal government: (a) teach the social, psychological, and health gains to be realized by abstaining from sexual activity; (b) teach abstinence from sexual activity outside marriage as the expected standard for all school-age children; (c) teach that abstinence from sexual activity is the only certain way to avoid out-of-wedlock pregnancy, STDs, and other associated health problems; (d) teach that a mutually faithful monogamous relationship in the context of marriage is the expected standard of human sexual activity; (e) teach that sexual activity outside of marriage is likely to have harmful psychological and physical effects; (f) teach that bearing children out of wedlock is likely to have harmful consequences for the child, the child's parents, and society; (g) teach young people how to reject sexual advances and how alcohol and drugs increase vulnerability to sexual advances; and (h) teach the importance of attaining self-sufficiency before engaging in sexual activity (Perrin & DeJoy, 2003).

Prevention-based sexuality education is the underlying principle of the comprehensive sexuality education framework. The philosophy guiding the model is based on the theory that students will be empowered to make prudent decisions regarding risky sexual behaviors and choose abstinence when they participate in an age and developmentally appropriate sexuality curriculum (Pardini, 2002). Supporters for comprehensive sexuality education understand that marriage does not magically enable a couple to understand the constructs of contraceptives, pregnancy, monogamy, and STD awareness; but rather an inclusive educational approach promoting abstinence plus education is required. The content base for the majority of comprehensive programs includes: families and family life, relationships, decision-making skills, abstinence, sexual maturity, values clarification, reproductive health, communication skills, contraception methods, and recognition and prevention of STDs and AIDS. Additional issues discussed in more liberal environments include abortion, masturbation, sexual fantasies, sexual orientation, sexual dysfunctions, and sexual art and culture. Although the comprehensive model has been found to be more effective in delaying sexual activity than the abstinence-only model, utilization of a specific model is dependent upon the milieu of the educational and community environment in which the course is being delivered.

NEW TRENDS IN FACILITATING SEXUALITY EDUCATION

The sensitive nature of the content of sexuality courses can create a barrier to learning and behavior change for participants. Program delivery can be facilitated through the selection of educational strategies that are age and developmentally appropriate without reference or inference to gender bias. The utilization of the multiple intervention approach, combined with a variety of teaching methodologies, can enhance a student's cognitive awareness of and positive attitudes toward the course content. Strategies that have been identified in the current literature as innovative techniques to incorporate prevention-based information into sexuality education programs include: web-based sexuality education; the use of media interventions, including TV, newspapers, and magazines; peer education programs including youth-developed newsletters and one-tier discussion groups.

The Internet provides an opportunity for students to inquire about sex-related information while protecting their identity from classmates, parents, and program facilitators. Since birth, many members of the Millennial Generation have been indoctrinated to computer and Internet use and have become confident users of the World Wide Web format. By using these skills, students maintain a sense of privacy and anonymity while they seek information regarding sensitive sexual issues. As with any Web site, program facilitators must ensure that these sites are secured and sponsored by a governmental or voluntary health organization such as Planned Parenthood's site for teens (www.teenwire.com) and ETR's Resource Center for Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention (www.ReCAPP.org).

Protected sites also attempt to control gendered sexual scripts that can influence normative behavior among both sexes. In contrast, many Web sites utilize and even foster gender stereotypes. In a comparative study of 52 teen-oriented sexuality education Web sites, Bay-Cheng (2001) determined that females were targeted more often than males regarding sexual values, males were portrayed to be the sexual initiator, and females were pursued as objects of sexual desire searching for protection without being allowed to discuss their own sexuality. These findings suggest the importance of using Web sites as part of a broader program of sexuality education in which gender stereotypes can be challenged.

Mass media campaigns provide an ideal opportunity to communicate sexual health information to students. Patterned after public information campaigns, sexual health campaigns target audiences who rely on the media as a primary source of entertainment and a resource for acquiring information. Findings from an American School Health Association study completed in 1996 indicate that 25 percent of adults in the United States rely on media sources to obtain information pertaining to STDs. These sources include public service announcements (PSA), billboards, commercials, documentaries, celebrity spokespersons, brochures, and press releases. Subtle health information, referred to as embedded messages, are often infused into existing television programs targeting a specific viewing audience. The information portrayed in the episode is often highlighted at the end of the show with a PSA from the cast and then mentioned as a feature story on the news. Program facilitators can use sexual health media campaigns to reinforce and complement the content of their curricula and course activities. Research in this area suggests that mass media campaigns positively influence sexual health decisions when messages are shown on a long-term basis, are repeated extensively, and are linked to a hot line or Web site for immediate use (Keller & Brown, 2002).

Feature articles highlighting sexual health issues in local, state, and national newspapers offer program facilitators an inexpensive and accessible resource for the classroom. Topics such as abortion, AIDS, dysfunctional relationships, contraception techniques, and STDs are common headlines that appeal to the student readers’ emotions regarding functional sexual relationships. Integrating news articles into the curriculum enhances student readership, improves their scope of problems facing society, and helps them relate to the experiences and consequences of others. Subject matter can be used as a lead-in to other sexual topics and can also reinforce course content previously discussed in the classroom. Teachers can use news articles to improve their students’ critical thinking skills by developing reflective summaries, creating an issue and trend file on a sexual health topic, brainstorming alternatives to issues discussed in the article, or submitting a “letter to the editor” in response to the article.

Youths and young adults rely on magazines as an important resource to acquire information about sexual issues such as reproduction, sexual skills and techniques, sexual health, and alternative lifestyles. The ease and accessibility of magazines and articles on the Internet provides an unlimited source of sex-related information. Independent reading has a significant effect on a student’s cognitive knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors regarding sexual health. According to Cultivation Theory, the reader’s beliefs evolve as a result of constant exposure to a consistent set of messages (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002). Magazines targeted for male and female readers offer sexuality educators a means for students to utilize their critical thinking skills in the analysis of the article content and compare it to sexual health issues discussed in class. Cultivation Theory can be utilized in the course with the instructor generating readings from various texts that relate to the content of the articles found in popular youth magazines. Sexual gender roles portrayed in articles can be discussed in a debate or panel discussion format, compared to previous generational roles, and analyzed for behavioral modifications.

The peer education movement can provide a safe learning environment that promotes confidence and comfort for teens and young adults to discuss sensitive topics that relate to sexual health issues. Peer-led programs have shown significant success in both the abstinence-only and comprehensive sexuality education models. Adolescents and young adults cite peers or friends as their primary source of sex-related information and rely on them for reinforcement of course content they receive in the classroom (Hoff, Greene, & Davis, 2003). The underlying principle of the "friends teaching friends" initiative is that peers have the ability to exert greater influence than teachers on young people's behavior. Participation is the key to effective programs with peers taking an active role in the planning, promotion, implementation, and evaluation components of the curriculum. Program facilitators typically serve as mentors to peer educators with their role focusing on training and communication with the peer leaders.

Sex, etc., a newsletter on sexuality for teens, written by teens, and published by the Network for Family Life Education, reaches 400,000 teens in 49 states each year. Articles include information on abstinence, contraception, teen parenthood, sexual harassment, violence, abortion, and adult and child sexual abuse. Teens are recruited across the state to conduct phone interviews, focus groups, and brainstorming sessions to generate stories for the newsletter. Members of the Associated Press coordinate production of the newsletter that is published three times per year. *Sex, etc.* has been recognized by the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy and is used in community-based organizations serving youth. The newsletter concept can be replicated at the local level and tailored to meet the specific sexual health issues that face youths in high schools and universities.

Small-group discussions personalize and reinforce course materials presented in the larger lecture format. These groups are of particular importance in sexual health classes because they provide a safe environment for students to investigate their attitudes and understand the diversity of others in the class. Course instructors divide the class into diverse groups representing gender, race, age, sexual orientation, and teaching experience. Students participate in an instructor-led lecture twice per week and then lead discussions in a small-group session once a week. Each student rotates as a discussion leader during the semester and prepares activities, lesson plans, and an evaluation under the guidance of the course instructor. Many students enjoy this format and the availability it offers for group ownership and creativity in the classroom.

EFFECTIVE COMPONENTS OF SEXUALITY COURSES

Sexuality educators are faced with the challenge of delivering sensitive information to student populations from diverse cultural and religious backgrounds while attempting to remain objective in their personal views regarding course content. Ultimately, the primary focus of sexual health education is to develop self-empowerment in youths and young adults to enable them to cope with social norms and pressures associated with sexual maturity. The foundation is the provision of sexual knowledge based on scientific facts within the cognitive dimension of learning. Attitudinal exploration and discussion is the next level of the curriculum, followed by a behavioral component that will empower participants to make realistic goals and healthy sexual decisions affecting their lives.

The utilization of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors can be integrated into the sexual health curriculum through the combination of learning experiences and teaching methodology that includes the following: (a) utilizes upbeat interactive activities and teaching styles; (b) focuses on a student-centered approach; (c) requires a clear and sensitive insight into behavior; (d) uses participatory and experiential learning techniques;

(e) ensures that program content is facilitated through a cohort of instructors; (f) supports peer education and leadership of youth; (g) creates opportunities for open and frank discussions about sensitive issues; (h) provides prevention efforts that are developmentally, age, and culturally appropriate; (i) focuses on reducing one or more risky sexual behaviors; (j) employs theoretical approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing risk-taking behavior; (k) incorporates research findings that identify determinants of selected sexual behaviors; (l) gives clear and consistent messages about sexual activity, condom use, and contraceptive methods; (m) provides accurate information about risks of sexual activity, about methods of avoiding intercourse, and about using protection against pregnancy and STDs; (n) includes activities that address social pressures that can influence sexual behaviors; (o) teaches assertive communication, negotiation, and refusal skills; (p) utilizes a variety of teaching methods designed to involve participants and have them personalize course information; (q) conveys behavioral goals, teaching methods, and materials that are appropriate to the age, sexual experience, and culture of students; (r) lasts a sufficient length of time to deliver the entire curriculum, activities, and interventions; and (s) solicits instructors and peers who are committed to the program and provide them with appropriate training.

Sexuality educators must be cognizant of their own feelings regarding sexuality. Their own inhibitions, attitudes, or misconceptions might obstruct honest, open communication with their students. Facilitators can further enhance learning by creating a sense of safety and comfort for students by respecting the diversity of their students regarding sexuality, promoting objectivity in the delivery of curricula, empowering students to increase personal responsibility, building collegiality and trust between students and facilitators, and serving as positive role models in the classroom (Valerio, 2001).

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bay-Cheng, L.Y. (2001). SexEd.com: Values and norms in web-based sexuality education. *Journal of Sex Research, 38*(3), 2.

Cordi, S. (2002). Fight for your right...to sex ed. *Girls' Life, 9*(2), 88.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 43–68). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hoff, T., Greene, L., & Davis, J. (2003). *National survey of adolescents and young adults: Sexual health knowledge, attitudes, and experiences.* Menlo Park, CA: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.

Keller, S.N., & Brown, J.D. (2002). Media interventions to promote responsible sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research, 39*(1), 67–72.

Pardini, P. (2002). Part 5—Sexuality education. In *Classroom crusades: Responding to the religious right's agenda for public schools* (pp. 58–67). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools. Available at http://www.rethinkingschools.org/publication/class_crusade/crusade.shtml

Perrin, K., & DeJoy, S. (2003). Abstinence-only education: How we got here and where we're going. *Journal of Public Health Policy, 24*(3), 445–459.

Valerio, N.L. (2001). Creating safety to address controversial issues: Strategies for the classroom. *Multicultural Education, 8*(3), 24–28.

Rosanne S. Keathley

Martha A. Bass

Alice M. Fisher

History Lessons about Gender

At the beginning of each new academic year, you can almost hear the wheels turning as thousands of college professors and high school teachers put into order a broad array of lecture notes, primary documents, photographs, and films and gear up for another term of teaching the history of the United States survey course. Still the mainstay of U.S. culture requirements at most American colleges and universities, and certainly the backbone of the advanced placement curriculum completed by college-bound students across the nation, foundation courses in American history come as close to a disciplinary canon as anything else. In this post-9/11 world, many teachers and professors scramble to make these courses as relevant as possible by adding new materials—particularly on U.S. foreign policy in relation to the Middle East, revising older lectures on Latin American migration, and updating their references on U.S. relations with post–Soviet Russia and the New China. As historians, they strive to prepare students for the twenty-first century by encouraging them to scrutinize the past more carefully and systematically than ever before in order to understand the daunting complexities facing the United States as it wages an ongoing “war on terror,” participates in an unyieldingly competitive transnational economy, attempts to tackle unprecedented global health crises, and deals with the effects of relentless poverty—both within and outside of its national boundaries. The economic, social, and political challenges facing the United States have never been greater or the need for first-rate leadership rarely more acute. In a climate permeated by despair and pessimism, solutions to the problems that plague the country appear elusive, at best.

Given the national and international challenges that the United States faces, why is it germane at this juncture to reexamine historical lessons about gender and the American past? The fact is, it has never been more important to analyze the social and historical construction of gender. Gender forms one of the primary building blocks of every society. National cultures reinforce gender-linked behavior, and gendered symbols permeate the cultural formation of nation states. The various ways people in the United States have used (and not used) gender to tell their national story reveals a great deal about them as a people. For academics, the challenge is to teach students how to untangle the twisted skeins of the American past and reevaluate American history on their own terms. As students undertake these tasks, they must ask some fundamental questions about gender and history in America: What roles have men and women played in the development of the United

States? What economic positions have men and women occupied over time and why? How has power been distributed in American society from the founding of the Republic up to the present? In what ways have women and men contributed to the development of American culture? How does one move beyond a male/female binary when discussing the role of gender in American society, past and present? A gendered study of American history, like analyses that carefully consider race, ethnicity, and class, provides a richer and more nuanced understanding of the past, one that reflects more accurately the multiple experiences of a majority of the American people. Moreover, the contemporary world cries out for analyses that take into consideration changing constructions of masculinity and femininity, both in the United States and in other nations and cultures. At this historical moment, more sophisticated ways of understanding how gender has worked in the past are needed in order to make sense of contemporary global politics and to comprehend the roles of the major cultural players on the world stage.

One can make a plausible argument that the way educators and historians teach and write about U.S. history has changed dramatically over the past three decades. The work of feminist historians and the "new" social history, from the 1970s through the 1990s, resulted in the production of college-level textbooks that no longer focus solely on political and military history, moving from one presidential administration to the next, analyzing U.S. history war by war, and offering detailed biographies of a short list of White male captains of industry. Students in the early twenty-first century are introduced to a more diverse set of historical characters than earlier generations of Americans came to know, and most become familiar with a range of political and social movements set in motion by Americans representing both majority and minority viewpoints. Women and men from a complex array of ethnic and racial backgrounds have shaped American culture and, from the beginning of U.S. history, have struggled to be included as part of the body politic, to be recognized as citizens. Many of these struggles have been gendered as evidenced, for example, by the fact that American women worked for over 150 years to obtain suffrage and property rights within the nation recognized as the world's greatest democracy.

The long fight for women's suffrage clearly exemplifies the connections (and disconnections) between the "enterprise of women's history" and the "story of the American past." In this regard, changes in U.S. survey courses have been remarkable in many respects. Classes once narrowly defined have given way to courses that openly address the American past in terms of politics, foreign affairs, economic change, and cultural and social transformation over 500 years. On the other hand, while major revisions in the U.S. foundation courses are real, one must ask whether or not the ways in which gender figures into most survey courses has actually gone beyond the "add women and stir" recipe for curricular reform. Women make more appearances in most survey courses now, but one could argue that most of the time representations of women in these courses remain marginal. Despite the progress that has been made, the difficult challenges of transforming the U.S. curriculum regarding gender lie not behind us, but ahead. Historians are at a point where they must work hard to protect the gains that have been made, even as they move ahead to promote more significant change. After 30 years of good work, they still have a long way to go before they can proclaim victory in terms of successfully gendering public understanding of the American past. This statement is applicable across the gender spectrum. An argument can easily be made that, at this point in time, more is known about women's history, in terms of the construction of female roles, than about male roles and the development of masculinity. Historians still know precious little about what happens when they forego heterosexuality as normative and open themselves to understanding the realities of homosocial and homosexual relationships, networks, and life experiences. And, Americans with transgendered identities have barely begun to, in Kathi Kern's words, "feel as part of history."

So where do things stand and what needs to be done? A close examination of the way U.S. history is taught reveals that historians from across the country have put enormous energy into revising the curriculum. This has been crucial work, for these courses are the seed corn of their profession: At any one time in the United States, in four-year colleges, community colleges, and high schools (public and private) approximately 3 million students are enrolled in introductory U.S. history courses. Educators have devised ingenious new ways of teaching the survey, but the American history narrative that forms the basis of most U.S. survey courses are still, despite all of the changes and the enormous amount of work that has been done, courses inherited from the past in which, as historian Linda Kerber (1997) put it, the lessons seem to march in a well laid-out sequence from Columbus to as close to the present as the instructor can get before the semester or school year ends. She argues that, because of the need for efficiency and coverage (although she would agree that this is probably not the only reason), historians adopt a structure in which matters related to women are less important than those related to men.

A close analysis of U.S. history survey syllabi confirms this argument and suggests that, while significant changes have been made, the version of American history most frequently available to students remains dominated by male-centered stories and gender-differentiated versions of the past. A close reading shows that, without question, the broad range of U.S. history books available for college and high school students, like the survey courses they support, have changed dramatically. A simple measure of index entries referring to women can track the evolution of women's inclusion in survey texts. In 1963, the first edition of John Blum's *The National Experience* included six topical entries under the heading "women" in its index. The eighth edition of that work published in 1993 included 14 topical references to women. Tracing women's inclusion across the four editions of *The American People* by Nash and Jeffrey et al. reveals a similar pattern: the first edition (1986) included 54 topical references to women; the fifth edition (2001) 120 references. And so it goes with every text. So far not one textbook, even among those written by authors adverse to women's history, has reduced the number of references to women in later editions.

What is striking about U.S. history survey texts is that, once one moves beyond the indexes with their ever-increasing numbers of references to women, women become significantly less visible. Tables of contents are particularly bad. If women appear at all, and usually they do not, they surface in 1830–1860 in subchapter headings such as "Women, Families, and the Domestic Ideal" and make rare appearances in subheadings such as "Rebirth of Feminism" and "Feminism, Anti-feminism, and Women's Lives." That is all. Let me emphasize this: As a rule, women do not appear in any form in chapter titles in U.S. history textbooks. If they appear in tables of contents at all, they emerge in chapter subheadings and then only rarely. The exceptional textbook in this regard has one to three references to women in subheadings (out of an average of 500 subheadings per text).

If one looks at charts in these texts, women disappear almost completely. An occasional chart illustrates, for example, the "Occupational Distribution of Working Women, 1900–1998" or "Marriages and Divorces, 1890–1997," but many texts do not have a single chart that incorporates data about women's lives. You may well be asking, "Are men mentioned in chapter titles or subheadings in these texts?" That is a good question for the words "man" or "men" are not used as often as are references to specific men. For example, in many recently published textbooks, male political leaders are regularly referred to by name in chapter headings and subheadings (e.g., “Progressivism and the Republican Roosevelt” or “Senator Douglas and the Kansas-Nebraska Act, 1854”).

Textbook maps tell the same story. In our mapping of the American past, women fare badly. Although maps appear at first glance to be gender neutral, when one looks at list after list of the maps included in survey texts, it is striking how gendered they actually are: War campaigns are mapped by the movement of soldiers, not the involvement of civilian populations. Farm tenancy is mapped according to the number of male tenants. Elections results are mapped with a presumption of universal suffrage, even in the many decades when the suffrage was anything but universal. The standard map including women shows pro- and anti-suffrage states. A powerful message is given to students in terms of what is important enough to appear on a map: Land acquisitions (most in the years when in most states women could not, by law, hold property in their own name) are very important (many maps). Conversely, the average number of maternal deaths in childbirth do not appear on maps or charts in any contemporary U.S. survey textbook. Paintings and photographs, on the other hand, often seem to be the vehicles by which women are most frequently brought into the survey text.

Over the past three decades, there is no question that scholars and teachers have worked diligently to transform the U.S. history survey course in order to make the past more relevant and accessible to a broader range of American students. In many ways, they have been extremely successful in reshaping foundation courses in U.S. history, especially as far as gender is concerned. But, when considered as a whole, has the story of the past told to U.S. students actually become more complex and inclusive over the past quarter century? What do students take with them when the course ends? What kind of foundation are history surveys providing? What will the long-term effects of 9/11 be on the narratives historians and their students write about the American past? Most importantly, what should the future be?

Clearly, the time has come to change the paradigms used to teach American history. In many ways, past efforts to introduce gender as a category of analysis should embolden educators to try some additional new strategies. Let me suggest two avenues that I see as promising in terms of further transforming the ways American history is taught, particularly regarding gender and the construction of masculinity and femininity, as well as forms of sexuality that transcend the male/female binary. First, digital technology and the World Wide Web offer a way to supersede the linear chronological track that has usually been followed in teaching about American history. Second, historians and educators need to begin to seriously analyze gender and women’s history in the United States from a global perspective.

Digital technology and the Web have transformed multiple aspects of people’s experience and consciously and unconsciously changed their world view. The future is now because students already have crossed into this new world. A revolution many believe to be as profound as the Gutenberg invention of movable type is well underway, and this new technology is in the process of changing the ways people teach, write, and think. A Web-based approach to the history survey can help facilitate the much needed paradigm shift many have been seeking and make it easier to integrate women and gender into the American historical narrative. If used to disrupt the rigid linearity and unswerving chronological schema of the history survey, the Web and the Internet will alter existing paradigms and teach in ways that expand discussions of gender and multiculturalism beyond male/female, beyond Black/White/Brown.

This change will not be that difficult to make. In fact, the shift is already well underway. Thousands of U.S. survey courses in colleges and high schools across the country use

Web-based materials: photographs, maps, and primary documents; the rich archive stored by the History Cooperative; virtual tours at sites ranging from Ellis Island to the Holocaust Museum to the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center; specific Web sites accessible to students and faculty include Ed Ayers's "Valley of the Shadow," Jacquelyn Hall's *Like a Family,* and the "Documenting the American South" Project at UNC–Chapel Hill, to name a few. Dozens of Web sites now publish documentary projects for teachers and students of U.S. history. For example, Katharine Sklar and Tom Dublin's "Women in Social Movements in the U.S." now attracts 10,000 visitors a month from 90 countries and has moved into partnership with an online publisher that markets the Web site to libraries throughout the United States and beyond. Kriste Lindenmeyer's article in the March 2003, *Journal of American History* provides excellent online resources for weaving women's history into the U.S. survey. The AP Central Web site has been enormously successful in terms of making online sources on women's history available to thousands of high school teachers across the country and also as a model for cooperative projects with both the Smithsonian Institution and Columbia University.

Access to the Web is also making a more transnational approach to U.S. history a reality. The tens of thousands of overseas visitors to the "Women in Social Movements" Web site make visible the global community of researchers and students committed to researching aspects of the American past. Scholars from China to Norway to the United States are responding to increasing global interdependence and interaction by rethinking the geographical and chronological boundaries that delineate the history, geography, and culture of America. Those committed to expanding our knowledge of gender and women's history are particularly well equipped to participate in the project of internationalizing American history. Existing academic programs in comparative women's history provide important models for new efforts to internationalize American history. Students engaged in courses of study that emphasize a comparative approach will be better equipped to connect America to other parts of the world and to address the multitude of global challenges and opportunities that face the United States.

History teaches people about themselves, and nothing is as integral to the construction of a self as gender. Individually, as Americans with unique personal histories and, collectively, as a people sharing in the experience of national identity and citizenship, Americans need to understand the ways in which gender has shaped their lives in earlier periods as well as in the contemporary world. Americans who honestly open themselves to studying the American past in all of its complexity, in terms of gender—and class, race, and ethnicity—may actually be able to understand where they came from and how they reached the place where their nation finds itself now. History lessons about gender are integral to this process for they provide clear ways to transform understandings of the American past as well as the means to achieving a future that is sustainable in a world of transformation.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Blom, I. (2004). Global gender history—a new research area? In North South. Gendered Views from Norway [Special issue of *Kvinneforskning, Journal of Gender Research in Norway*].

Downs, L.L. (2004). *Writing gender history.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Frederickson, M. (2004). Surveying gender: Another look at the way we teach United States history. *The History Teacher, 37*(4), 476–483.

Kerber, L. (1997). The challenge of opinionative assurance. *National Forum: The Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 77,*9–13.

Kern, K.L. (1996). To feel as part of history: Rethinking the U.S. history survey. *Perspectives: American Historical Association Newsletter, 34*(5), 7–8.

Lindenmeyer, K. (2003). Using online resources to re-center the U.S. history survey: Women's history as a case study. *Journal of American History, 89*(4), 1483–1494.

Yang, M.M. (Ed.). (1999). *Spaces of their own: Women's public sphere in transnational China.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press.

Mary E. Frederickson

Mathematics

As we survey the landscape of gender and mathematics relationships in various countries of the world, it is clear that we have reached an interesting and important time. In many countries, differences in girls' and boys' mathematics achievement that used to prevail have been eradicated. This is a significant achievement reflecting, in part, increased sensitivity to issues of gender and to the ways girls and women can be supported in mathematics classrooms. Even though the performance of women and girls in mathematics has steadily increased over the past 25 years and girls now perform at equal or higher levels than boys in school mathematics and science, the participation of women and girls in such fields remains critically low. In the United States, this is an important issue since it is predicted that over half of all jobs in the near future will involve mathematics, and analysts are forecasting critical shortages of people in mathematical and scientific fields. There are a number of reasons for women's relatively low participation in mathematics and in mathematical careers: (a) The teaching of mathematics favors the learning preferences of boys by neglecting openness and collaboration in its mastery; (b) Mathematics departments in higher education discourage women through explicit and implicit forms of discrimination; (c) The rendering of math as gender neutral masks its history as a gendered subject; and (d) Assumptions about gender in educational research and the media often reinforce stereotypes that limit the vision of what is possible for girls and women in mathematics.

TEACHING APPROACHES AND CURRICULUM MATERIALS

The traditional model of mathematics teaching that prevails in U.S. classrooms presents mathematics as an abstract, procedural subject: a series of methods that need to be practiced and memorized. In such classrooms, there is little room for discussion, interpretation, or original thinking; students learn that their role is relatively passive and it predominantly comprises paying careful attention and reproducing standard methods. This model of teaching has been shown in several research studies to be one that favors boys over girls, often producing higher achievement and higher rates of participation for boys (Boaler, 1997; Fennema & Leder, 1990). When mathematics is taught in more open ways and students are invited to consider and discuss different methods and to draw links between different areas of mathematics and between mathematics and the world, girls' and women's performance and participation increases. In our recent study of 700 students in three U.S. high schools that taught mathematics in very different ways, we found that the more open methods resulted in higher participation of young women at advanced levels and higher levels of interest among them. In all three schools a questionnaire was given to students that required them to respond to different pedagogical approaches and indicate their enjoyment of the different teaching approaches. We found that significantly more girls than boys enjoyed approaches that were more open and discursive. This was true for girls who did and who did not experience such approaches as part of their regular mathematics teaching.

Developmental theorists, such as Gilligan (1982) and Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule (1986), have related the underachievement (where it occurs) and nonparticipation of girls and women to their learning styles and ways of thinking and knowing. Both sets of authors used Gilligan's notions of "separate" and "connected" thinkers to conceptualize different kinds of learners. Gilligan describes "separate thinkers" as those who prefer to work with subjects characterized by logic, rigor, absolute truth, and rationality and "connected thinkers" as those who prefer to use intuition, creativity, personal processes, and experience. She claimed, controversially perhaps, that many more women than men are connected thinkers and more men than women are separate thinkers. Gilligan's work has remained controversial, but it has also received a lot of support from women who have identified with the thinking styles she describes. The lack of opportunity girls and women experience to work in the ways Gilligan describes as "connected" may be part of the reason that girls often develop higher levels of anxiety and fear of success, along with lower levels of confidence and motivation in mathematics. Indeed, the findings of attitudinal research studies of girls suggest that girls experience and engage in mathematics classes differently than boys.

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) developed the educational implications of Gilligan's work by proposing "stages" of knowing from a longitudinal interview study of women across multiple sites of formal education. When Becker (1995) and Boaler (1997) explored these notions and the idea that girls differentially experience and engage in mathematics, both found that girls preferred more connected mathematics approaches. Becker describes the types of mathematics classes that would reinforce connected knowing as ones in which the process of solving problems and different ways to solve problems, not just the finished products of proof, are shared with students.

In a study in England, Boaler monitored a cohort of students in two schools over a three-year period—from when they were 13 to when they were 16 years old. The two schools taught mathematics in completely different ways. At 13 years of age, before the students embarked on their different mathematical pathways, there were no significant differences in mathematical attainment of the two cohorts, and there were no recorded gender differences at either school. Three years later, girls who attended the school following a traditional, procedural approach attained significantly lower mathematics grades on the national examination than the boys at their school. In the other school where an open-ended, project-based approach was employed, there were no gender differences between girls and boys at any level. The students attained significantly higher grades than the students at the more procedural school. On questionnaires given to the students each year that asked them about their confidence and enjoyment of math, the boys at the two schools did not respond significantly differently. In contrast, the girls at the project-based school were always significantly more positive and confident than the girls following a procedural approach (Boaler, 1997).

The past 20 years have witnessed various reforms in countries around the world aimed at moving school mathematics closer to an experiential, open, and discursive discipline, offering more opportunities for connected thinking. Despite these reforms, traditional pedagogies continue to dominate. The growing body of evidence showing that knowledge presented in this traditional, abstract, decontextualized way is more alienating for girls than boys (Becker, 1995; Belenky et al., 1986; Boaler, 1997) and for non-Western than Western students (Banks, 1993) suggests that inequality in the participation of different sexes and cultural groups in mathematics—particularly at the highest levels—will be maintained at least as long as traditional pedagogies prevail in classrooms.

THE CLIMATE OF UNIVERSITY MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENTS

Not only must the discipline of mathematics be opened through curricula and instruction to address the needs of a broader range of students, so too must mathematics departments at institutions of higher learning. The assumption that mathematics is objective and impersonal is contradicted by the fact that personal issues—such as isolation, sexism, lack of role models, and stereotyped understandings of their interactions—are serious obstacles that prevent women from developing a feeling that they belong in mathematics. This is especially apparent at the graduate level. By and large, math departments in the United States remain male preserves in which the underrepresentation of women among students is eclipsed only by the underrepresentation of women among the faculty. In order for students to persist in math, they must be engaged in it meaningfully, and part of that engagement involves direct access to teachers and professors like themselves.

In her study of graduate students' relationships with faculty, Herzig (2004) found that female students of mathematics feel awkward and isolated until and unless they reach a critical mass within the student population. By virtue of their small numbers, women graduate students in mathematics may feel less confident to ask questions in class and, therefore, feel less ownership and belonging within the domain. To compensate for these tacit forms of discouragement, the women in her study suggested that access to women faculty goes far in keeping them in the discipline. For these female students, the lack of women faculty translated to a lack of mentors and, in turn, a higher rate of attrition. Although high quality mentoring and advising at the graduate level in mathematics can positively affect all students, Herzig suggests that more women than men express this as an explicit need for their educational experience. Just as the benefits of formal interaction between female faculty and students are important to consider (e.g., increased retention), so too must we consider the benefits of their informal interactions.

Women who study mathematics at the graduate level suggest that a consequence of having fewer interactions with same-sex faculty is that they lose out on "tacit knowledge" about the department and discipline—such as what classes to take or avoid, how their professors think about math or solve problems, and what the department's expectations are of them (Herzig, 2004). In this way, women without access to female faculty members are at a disadvantage because they are often left out of the network of information that is shared among men in the interstices of formal conversation that provides them valuable insight and guidance in how to succeed. In cross-sex mentoring (typically male professors and female students), women suggest that they are less often treated as a junior colleague than their male counterparts and that such treatment can make the difference in their choice to remain in the male-dominated field of mathematics. In addition, women expressed concern that their male professors were more quickly and likely to suggest they drop challenging math courses rather than encourage them to continue further in them.

Mathematics classrooms in schools are considerably less gender stereotyped than they were 20 years ago, when sexist images prevailed in textbooks and mathematics teachers were found to give boys more attention, reinforcement, and positive feedback (Becker, 1981). But girls in schools, and especially women in higher education, still experience stereotyped attitudes and behaviors, contributing to their low interest and participation in math. Graduate women in mathematics report incidents of unwanted sexual advances and sexist comments as well as interactions with peers and faculty that have disparaged their intelligence and right to be a part of the program. Women are stereotyped within the domain to be less capable, uncompetitive, and not to be taken seriously. With regard to this latter concern, women in graduate programs of mathematics describe a kind of "invisibility" as compared to their male counterparts (Herzig, 2004) that remains until they have proven themselves institutionally by meeting departmental milestones, like qualifying exams. Moreover, these experiences of alienation, discrimination, and neglect are compounded in the case of minority women and women who are mothers.

Ultimately, as Herzig (2004) suggests, the web of factors that cause the disproportionately low participation of women in mathematics is very complex, and the task of identifying those causes is not a simple one. Yet, at a minimum, it is clear that the promotion of women in mathematics will take more than simply recruiting greater *numbers* of women into the field. It will require a sincere commitment on the part of institutions to retain and support female students and faculty as well. Moreover, it may even require an acknowledgment that the very discipline of mathematics is itself gendered.

CONCEPTIONS OF MATHEMATICS

An interesting perspective on gender and mathematics research considers the nature of the discipline and the ways that mathematics, the subject, may be gendered. Such research takes up Johnston's (1995) proposition that when pupils say that mathematics does not make sense or has no point, they are speaking the truth. The reasons for their claim lies in secondary-school mathematics, not in the people who learn and teach mathematics. This body of work begins with a basic premise: Mathematics is a system of knowledge, a product of human thought, discovery, and practice. Although understanding as an informal, subjective exploration of the natural world is honest to its history, mathematics in schools belies this truth and is presented as a formalized "objective," and discrete system of skills and rules that is largely void of the context that gave rise to it. Feminist scholars suggest that a transformation of mathematics from its organic roots to a more synthetic rendering has detrimental implications because it purposely obscures power, privilege, and the gendered nature of the discipline to its teachers and learners alike.

Scholars in this field of research generally advocate for a feminist conception of the discipline. Leone Burton (1995), for example, proposes that if we recognize that what we call mathematics is a European-based body of knowledge that excludes the knowledge of non-Europeans, then surely we should also recognize that mathematics reflects the maleness of its producers. As an alternative, positioning mathematics within a feminist epistemology enriches the discipline while also enabling historically marginalized communities, such as women, to feel they too have the power to author and own it. Although Burton perceives little support for challenging the notion of "objectivity" in mathematics, the work of feminist science writers adds support to the idea that we can offer richer accounts of the world by employing critical feminist stances. One of the outcomes of such work would be to reveal what Burton (1995) calls the "humane, responsive, negotiable, and creative" aspects of mathematics taught to students in schools at all levels of the discipline. One female graduate student interviewed by Herzig (2004) recalled sitting in a seminar in which her professor was "slaughtering" the mathematics that she had previously considered to be a "beautiful" subject, worthy of a lifetime of study. Thus, by using pedagogical approaches and taking epistemological stances that belie the history and aesthetics of math, along with its connection to living and being, we risk not only women's participation but the essence of the discipline itself.

THE CONSTRUCT OF GENDER

In the 1970s and 1980s a great deal of interest was given to the issue of women's and girls' underachievement in mathematics. This prompted numerous research projects that investigated the extent and nature of the differences between girls' and boys' achievement and offered reasons why such disparities occurred. But many of the analyses that were produced positioned girls in essentialist ways, attributing anxiety and underachievement as stable characteristics. Thus, researchers searched for the origins of girls' underachievement. Even when these were linked to pedagogies or environments, they were generally presented as characteristics of girls rather than coproductions of people, society, and environment. This led educators to propose interventions aimed at changing the girls so that they became less anxious and more confident and reasoned and behaved in ways deemed more masculine. The 1980s spawned numerous programs of this type for girls that were intended to make them more confident, challenging, and competitive. In such programs the responsibility for change was laid firmly at the feet of the girls, while problems with mathematical pedagogy and practice or issues of gender and learning within the broader social system were not considered. Our own preference for a situated, relational conception of gender derives in part from the implications that such conceptions carry for action and change and for the responsibility they endow upon educational organizations for making change. The long history of equity research has drawn conclusions about groups of people and publicized these at some cost. For example, in interviews with high school students we have frequently encountered stereotypes about the potential of students from different sexes and cultural groups to succeed in mathematics. It is particularly disturbing to know that the prevailing idea that girls are mathematically inferior often derives, ironically, from the findings of equity researchers that are picked up by the media and sensationalized. In a recent interview with a group of high school students in California, Boaler asked "Katrina" and "Betsy" about gender differences:

> *JB:* Do you think math is different for boys and girls or the same?
>
> *K:* Well, it's proved that boys are better in math than girls, but in this class, I don't know.
>
> *JB:* Mmm, where do you hear that boys are better than girls?
>
> *K:* That's everywhere—that guys are better in math and girls are like better in English.
>
> *JB:* Really?
>
> *B:* Yeah, I watched it on *20/20* [a television current affairs program] saying girls are no good, and I thought—well if we're not good at it, then why are you making me learn it?

The girls refer to a television program that presented the results of research on the differences between the mathematical performance of girls and boys. This extract speaks clearly to the ways categories of students are essentialized by the media who generally draw upon research findings and present them in sensational ways. Headlines that have appeared in the media in recent years include the *New York Times* headline: "Numbers

Don't Lie: Men Do Better than Women" with the subheading "SAT Scores accurately reflect male superiority in math." But this article, like many others, was based upon research results and analyses that constructed performance difference as a characteristic of women rather than a response to particular teaching and learning environments and other societal biases.

The girls' reflections above also speak clearly to the ways that such reporting may impact the motivation and confidence of students in schools. "If we're not good at it, then why are you making me learn it?" is a view that is shared by students of different sexes and cultures when they are subject to deficit stereotypes. The prevalent discourse that constructs girls and other categories of students as "not good" at mathematics is a particular language that must surely have played a part in the underrepresentation of girls and women in mathematical competitions, courses, and professions. We can only speculate as to the ways the world would be different if researchers had focused on learning environments when they attempted to identify sources of inequalities.

CHALLENGES AND GOALS

There is no single source of explanation for the underrepresentation of women in mathematical careers. Despite their achievement and successes, women and girls face a series of challenges in their pursuit of mathematics that begin as early as grade school and extend as far as graduate school. Whether these challenges come in the guise of traditional pedagogies or sexist teaching materials, an unkind atmosphere of graduate work, or the pressures of a disbelieving society, women and girls who persist in the field are a testament to their own strength and resilience. Promoting women in the field of mathematics and, in turn, science is a concern that seems to enter popular consciousness only when the media sensationalize it. Yet, this is a concern, or rather a crisis, worthy of sincere national attention because it threatens the strength of our society and the commitment we make to work for equity and fairness in promoting the limitless potential of young people.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Banks, J.A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher, 22*(5), 4–14.

Becker, J. (1981). Differential treatment of females and males in mathematics class. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 12*(1), 40–53.

Becker, J. (1995). Women's ways of knowing in mathematics. In P. Rogers & G. Kaiser (Eds.), *Equity in mathematics education: Influences of feminism and culture* (pp. 163–174). London: Falmer.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing.* New York: Basic Books.

Boaler, J. (1997). *Experiencing school mathematics: Teaching styles, sex and setting.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Burton, L. (1995). Moving towards a feminist epistemology of mathematics. In P. Rogers & G. Kaiser (Eds.), *Equity in mathematics education: Influences of feminism and culture* (pp. 209–226). London: Falmer.

Fennema, E., & Leder, G.C. (Eds.). (1990). *Mathematics and gender.* New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Herzig, A. (2004). "Slaughtering this beautiful math": Graduate women choosing and leaving mathematics. *Gender and Education, 16*(3), 379–395.

Johnston, B. (1995). Mathematics: An abstracted discourse. In P. Rogers & G. Kaiser (Eds.), *Equity in mathematics education: Influences of feminism and culture* (pp. 226–234). London: Falmer.

Jo Boaler

Tesha Sengupta Irving

Men’s Studies

Men’s studies is the study of gender as it applies to the experience of boys and men. Scholars of men’s studies develop theory and carry out research that explores what it means to have a biological designation of being male in the context of culture, society, and human interaction. They critically examine how maleness is interpreted and how it is experienced within societal institutions such as family, religion, workplace, politics, and education. In the field of education, men’s studies research may relate to such perplexing questions as whether boys really do learn differently than girls, why males are pursuing college education at lower levels than females, as well as ways to reduce male bullying and create school environments that support many ways of being masculine.

Men’s studies, which is sometimes located within or associated with women’s studies or gender studies, can best be understood as a broad interdisciplinary field of study that provides, in whatever discipline it surfaces, a critical examination of how our concepts of masculinity are influenced by and influence society. Beginning in the mid-1970s and into the 1980s, a variety of academic departments at colleges and universities began to offer courses focused on men and masculinities. The term “masculinity” itself came to be pluralized, acknowledging the broad range of ways males are and can be “masculine.”

Like women’s studies, men’s studies has its roots in a broader social movement that began as a series of small men’s groups in the 1960s and 1970s that were concerned with increasing their understanding of their relationships with women and with one another. Although many of the early participants in the men’s movement considered themselves feminists and supporters of women’s rights, other branches of the men’s movement also emerged that were indifferent to feminism or were antifeminist. Some of the academics active in men’s studies as either faculty or students are also active in the men’s movement, usually in the more progressive and profeminist branch of that movement. Men’s studies scholars have also conducted research into the men’s movement and have presented the results of their investigations to students in classes and to colleagues at professional conferences.

The major contributions of men’s studies, however, has been to help students, educators, and other practitioners to think more analytically about gender and, specifically, about the needs of boys. The traditional view of males is that they are different from females and share a common predisposition to separate themselves from anything considered feminine. This assumption has led, in the past, to the expectation that all males will want to be or should be athletic or competitive. Schools thus emphasized programs and activities that accentuated those "masculine" qualities instead of providing equal levels of support for boys pursuing noncompetitive and nonathletic activities. Boys who do not fit into the desired ways of being male are marginalized.

Such practices, say men's studies scholars, not only fail to acknowledge the many differences within male experiences of gender but also contribute to maintenance of a gender hierarchy, wherein certain types of masculine expression are valued over others. That negative effects—including bullying, higher drop-out rates, poorer educational outcomes, and school violence—may result from such socialization of males goes unexamined. Recent scholarship indicates that boys in the United States and elsewhere are increasingly rejecting education (especially in the humanities) in part because of its association with femininity. Thus, men's studies scholars find that when social institutions such as schools over-reinforce traditional male gender expectations, society struggles to keep boys actively engaged in intellectual pursuits.

BEGINNINGS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEN'S MOVEMENT

The men's movement, including men's studies, is rooted in Western culture by three historical developments: the psychoanalytical movement started by Sigmund Freud in the late nineteenth century, the suffrage movement, and the second wave of the feminist movement beginning in the 1960s.

Freud and later psychoanalysts, such as Karen Horney, questioned the assumption of biological "givens" related to males and females. They raised questions about the influence of parents on children's gender-related behavior, arguing that factors such as a boy's rivalry with his father and fear of castration (becoming too close to his mother) were the basis of psychological trauma. While psychoanalytic theories have been challenged and criticized, these theorists importantly asserted that neither masculinity nor femininity was fixed. Rather, they saw that how boys and girls expressed themselves as male and female occurred within a social context. In the case of boys, attention was paid to the relationship between mother and son and the importance of the son separating from the mother, leading to the belief that boys would become like girls if they did not detach from the feminine.

Such perceptions of gender had implication for education. Boys were encouraged to participate in "male" educational and social opportunities that devalued the association of boys with anything perceived to be feminine. As a result, organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America were founded in the early 1900s. The mission of the Boy Scouts was to instill in each boy the "manly qualities" that he would not find in areas where women were influential, including family and education. In this context, the relationship of a boy to education came to be valued less than his relationship to adventure and activities that took place outside of the home and school.

On social and political levels, the suffrage movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries raised serious questions about gender, far beyond women's right to vote. The suffrage movement called into question women's overall relationship to and dependence on men, raising uncomfortable questions about men and the meaning of masculinity. After all, if women could have access to the voting booth and be able to advocate for social and political causes, then what would come next—access to men's colleges and high-status careers, even economic independence? This meant that institutions created for males—for the socialization and education of boys—could be called into question. What, after all, did it mean (and did it take) to be a man?

Answers to these questions during the early part of the twentieth century were often premised on the assumption that males had qualities that were special, if not superior, to qualities of women, with significant educational implications. Intellectuals and political leaders maintained that boys should be seen as *essentially* different from girls. School curricula reflected this; each sex was encouraged to study topics appropriate for their sex—woodshop for boys, home economics for girls. Until the rise of second wave feminism in the 1960s, most colleges and universities gave preference to male applicants and guided males into careers traditionally assumed appropriate for men (and females into traditionally women's careers). Emphasis within the curriculum represented particular ways of being gendered. Literature and history focused on male heroes whose behaviors accentuated male desire and need for adventure, war, and independence, while females were portrayed as dependent and homemakers. Females were represented as one-dimensional, based on the assumption that the ideal woman (and thus all women—or at least all White women) would desire to be limited to these roles.

What men's studies scholars would later point out is that the focus on these particular ways of being male also severely limited how males are perceived and how boys are socialized. The emphasis on separate curricula, on separate spheres in terms of exposure to ideas and ways of thinking, while limiting girls' and women's access to opportunity, also limited males' perception of the desirability of anything identified as feminine. Effects continue; recent studies of educational choices of males and females show male students devaluing the study of literature and the "soft" sciences like psychology or sociology, since these are seen as less worthy of male attention, while engineering and chemistry are pursued in part for their value as "hard" sciences. Not surprisingly, careers in these latter areas are more highly rewarded.

Prior to the development of women's studies and, more recently, men's studies, such institutional assumptions and curricular decisions regarding men went without question. But after second-wave feminists began advocating for inclusion of women in educational institutions and programs where only males had been allowed and for including the study of women's lives in all academic arenas, education experienced significant changes throughout the latter half of the twentieth century.

What was also occurring, though less visibly, was a new emphasis on examining the implications of gender on males. By the early 1970s, both mass-market publications and scholarly writing emerged that challenged assumptions society held regarding males. These writers joined feminists in questioning the perception that males had innate and superior qualities compared to females or that males were even distinctively different from females at the levels previously assumed. The second wave of feminism's message to males was that they should question what effect gender had on their lives and they should question the gendered arrangements in institutions such as family and schools that contributed to problems experienced by both females and males.

Those who began to focus on the study of men raised questions about whether masculinity, and expectations and assumptions made in its name, was really just a set of social assumptions that was now being threatened by social change. As they started to document, in men's lives, like women's, gender can be expressed in a range of ways. The differences between males and females were found to be less dramatic than previously thought, and they found more variation than previously assumed in the way males "are"—both across and within cultures.

Three quite different and sometimes oppositional approaches to understandings of men's lives evolved in the 1970s and 1980s that continue to frame debates about men and masculinity in the men's movement and, to a lesser extent, within men's studies. These have come to be called men's rights/father's rights, mythopoetic, and profeminist.

Men's rights advocates see males as experiencing societal oppression from being used as "machines," as workers and providers in an increasingly materialistic culture, while not receiving support equal to that of women for being engaged as parents (e.g., being less likely than mothers to gain custody of children in divorce cases). They have responded sometimes angrily to feminists arguing that women's issues are not more important than men's are nor should women's rights receive priority over the rights of men. In the 1990s, a related movement, the Christian-based "Promise Keepers" drew very large audiences calling on men to return to traditional roles of husbands and providers.

The *mythopoetic* men's movement got its name from the reliance of movement leaders on analyses of men's lives that are based on ancient myths and archetypes (deep unconscious themes). Mythopoetic writers and self-help workshop leaders, including Robert Bly and Sam Keen, suggest that maleness is, in its essence, different from women and femininity. While not taking political stances like the men's rights movement, they often see men as being victims of feminism and father loss/single motherhood. They emphasize ritual, mutual support, the importance of "unleashing the wild man within," as well as the importance of mentoring boys as they become men.

A third branch of the men's movement that evolved during the same period takes a profeminist approach and, thus, provides a critique of the men's rights perspectives. Men and women taking this perspective assert that, while gender relationships in a patriarchal culture are based on an imbalance of power between men and women, men are also negatively affected because social institutions privilege and benefit certain types of masculinity over others and in the process devalue not only women, but all that is perceived as feminine. Beginning as a set of informal, antisexist men's groups in the 1970s, the organization that is now known as the National Organization of Men Against Sexism began holding annual conferences on men and masculinity in 1975 that were and still are attended by men and women exploring these perspectives on a personal and intellectual level.

While these three approaches to understanding men's lives offer differing perspectives, they each have contributed to the growing discussion about men and gender. They have led to the formation of a range of national organizations of activists, academics, and practitioners focused on programs as divergent as interventions to stop men's violence, advocacy for fathers' access to children following divorce, support for men who are trying to overcome addictions to pornography, informational campaigns about men's health problems, and various efforts designed to end the devaluation of the feminine and of homosexuality among males.

MEN'S STUDIES AS A SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL FIELD

Like the men's movement, men's studies is a response to the feminist movement and to the women's studies programs of academic research and theory that grew from that movement. Beginning in the 1960s, feminists began to advocate strongly for the academic study of gender in addition to calling for a range of social and political changes needed to reduce inequality between men and women. Feminists called attention to "gender" as a core human identity around which much of the social world is organized and which deserves multidisciplinary study.

Similarly, men's studies has made conceptualizations of the male gender role visible as a focus of study in a range of disciplines. Men, and particular expressions of masculinity that are predominant at a given point in time, have historically gone unexamined. For instance, school shootings are often associated with "kids" or "students" acting out, rather than reported and investigated as a gender—specifically male—problem composed of a set of patterned behaviors associated with masculinity—such as boys' access to and likelihood of using guns, greater exposure to bullying and violence, lower emotional self-awareness, and lower likelihood than females of seeking help.

Men's studies advanced as courses began to be offered in universities and colleges, served by a growing body of literature of scholarly books and journal articles. Important early scholarly works that stressed the ways in which patriarchy and sexism disadvantage men, as well as women, included *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role* by Deborah S. David and Robert Brannon (1976) and *The Myth of Masculinity* by Joseph Pleck (1981). The American Psychological Association formed a men's studies division in the 1980s. As indicated above, regional and national conferences on men and masculinities were organized during this period, drawing together those working in the emerging fields of domestic violence/battering intervention, profeminist activism and scholarship, and those pursuing personal changes in their lives that called for a new vision of what it meant to be a man.

Philosopher Harry Brod (1987) in *The Making of Masculinities* laid a foundation for theorizing masculinity as a product of social norms and values that change and adapt to societal dictates over time. Gender, for males, came increasingly to be viewed as a social construction that is a product of social forces with specific forms of masculinity being idealized to the extent that they serve to support social order. In a culture that devalues homosexuality, males are socialized to devalue homosexuals in exchange for being perceived as appropriately "masculine." At the same time, males are given encouragement and rewards for overtly sexualizing women as a means of demonstrating a particular type of heterosexuality (one that is dominant over females). Similarly, in alignment with a culture that values competition, schools place an emphasis on competitive sports, and males are rewarded if they compete for athletic, economic, or personal gain. Boys who are not competitive—or not athletic—are devalued.

By the 1990s a more developed literature began to surface among scholars presenting theory and research on men overall and in specific arenas of men's lives such as education, sports, sexual orientation, religion, literature, and media. The American Men's Studies Association, founded in 1991, sponsors annual conferences featuring papers by professors, students, researchers, and practitioners. Some indication of the rapid growth of the literature in men's studies can be had from the fact that *Men's Lives* (Kimmel & Messner, 1997), an edited reader often assigned as required reading in college courses concerned with sex and gender, appeared in seven editions between 1997 and 2006, each of which contained a substantial amount of new material. Additionally, a number of books and journal articles addressing masculinities in the context of race and ethnicity, social class, and age have contributed to an understanding that the field of men's studies has become an important area of study providing rich insight into the diversity of men's lives and critical analysis of the notion of masculinity and its effects. As well, men's studies courses often interrogate feminist and queer theories concerned with the effects of gender on sexuality and sexual identities.

In *Masculinities,* Robert Connell (1995) made a major contribution to the field, identifying as hegemonic, the form of masculinity against which all other ways of being male are measured, one which requires women to perform "emphasized femininity." He argues that hegemonic masculinity (the dominant perceptions and enactments of what it means to be male) prevents alternative forms of masculinity from gaining legitimacy and keeps problems associated with traditional masculinity from being acknowledged. This reconceptualization challenges the linear conception of masculinity, in which some males are seen as being more or less "masculine" than others, based on some normative definition. By challenging this conception and the dichotomous conception in which males are seen as either masculine or not, scholars have begun to understand the wide ranging variations of male behavior. For instance, in the school context, males who prefer to participate in activities and interactions predominantly involving female students might be considered "less masculine" than those participating in male-only sports and be labeled as "sissy," "queer," or "fag" by other males. Different sports are seen as more or less masculine, for example, football as compared to gymnastics, resulting in boys shying away from pursuing "nonmasculine" activities as well as devaluing those males who do participate. Often school administrators, teachers, and parents attribute greater value to sports considered the most masculine, even if without intention. By examining the meaning of such behaviors, men's studies scholars introduce ways of understanding their influence.

Recent research on boys and men, accompanied by further theorizing, continues to accentuate the importance of viewing masculinity as a socially negotiated experience while acknowledging physiological differences between males and females, as well as among males. Men's studies scholars in the social and behavioral sciences explore topics such as male violence, sexuality, boys and men's emotional self-awareness, and boy's school failure and drop-out rates. At the same time, scholars in religious studies, history, literature, and the arts and popular culture seek to critically examine the representation of masculinities and the voices of men in their respective fields of study.

The field of men's studies continues as a broad range of ongoing courses taught in a variety of disciplines—many located within the social sciences, but increasingly incorporating the humanities. These courses are supplemented by projects such as dissertations examining the representation of masculinity in literature or film and college-based conferences or programs addressing men's studies and/or men's issues on campus. Several colleges and universities have developed overarching programs related to men's studies, notably Saint John's University in Minnesota, which has created a men's center for leadership and service that has organized three major conferences addressing issues related to the college male. Hobart and William Smith College in New York State offers an interdisciplinary minor in men's studies, while other colleges are considering similar programs. The American Men's Studies Association has initiated a project to collect syllabi and related course material and make them available on their Web site to encourage the development of more courses about men and masculinities on more campuses.

The scholarship of men's studies, although still relatively new, serves to advance a greater depth of understanding of the influence of both biological and social factors on men's lives and our concepts of masculinity, thus creating new understandings of boys' and men's realities and the influence of gender on males. The results of their studies produce knowledge that will continue to be of value to educators in their goal of effectively teaching all students, of all genders.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Brod, H. (Ed.). (1987). *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies.* St. Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

David, D.S., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role.* Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Kimmel, M.S., & Messner, M.A. (Eds.). (1997). *Men's lives.* New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Pleck, J. (1981). *The myth of masculinity.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Robert Heasley

Multicultural Education

Throughout the past 40 years a variety of definitions of multicultural education have emerged. There is evidence to suggest that much of the literature and (by extension) the resulting pedagogy concerned with multicultural education ignores gender and has a tendency to focus upon issues of race and ethnicity. An analysis of social class is also usually ignored, as are the complex ways in which social class, race, and gender intersect. Of the five prevailing approaches to multicultural education, the one known as Multicultural Social Reconstructionist Education makes this intersectionality central. It attempts to create an understanding of how race, social class, and gender coalesce to create systemic patterns of institutionalized oppression.

FIVE APPROACHES TO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

In the 1980s, Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant developed a taxonomy identifying five prevailing approaches to multicultural education. While the first four approaches are grounded in theories advocating transmission of the dominant culture, the fifth approach, Multicultural Social Reconstructionism, is grounded in critical and liberatory theory and advocates transforming schools and social institutions. Social justice advocates and liberatory pedagogues believe, therefore, that it can be an effective pedagogical approach to redressing issues of gender inequity as well as other forms of social injustice.

The first approach chronicled by Sleeter and Grant (1994), known as *Teaching to the Exceptional or Culturally Different,* advocates that teachers assist students in acquiring knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will enable them to participate successfully in the culture of the dominant group. This approach is used to teach children a sense of their own distinct cultural ethnicity or heritage or to teach about a particular historically marginalized group and is primarily used when members of a historically marginalized group are represented in a school or class. Students are encouraged to acknowledge their racial and ethnic identities but are asked to assimilate those identities into the cultural mainstream. Critics contend that the approach centers on a deficiency orientation wherein all groups are measured against and expected to conform to a dominant, White Western cultural norm. A further criticism of the approach is that it ignores social class and gender.

Of the approaches discussed by Sleeter and Grant, one that remains popular is the *Human Relations Approach.* Advocates of this approach employ it to foster positive, individual relationships among students of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds but ignore gendered issues. The overarching goal is to replace tension and hostility with tolerance and to do so with personal interaction. It can be argued that although women and men have had thousands of years of personal interaction, interaction has not ameliorated gender-based inequality. In fact, it has been asserted that personal, especially sexual relationships, among women and men sometimes exacerbate gender inequities. Sexual relationships often bind women and men together in traditional and sometimes inequitable social relationships that make it difficult to remediate or even call attention to inequities.

Teachers using this approach fail to educate students to think critically about how categories of difference originate or why various groups have been marginalized and oppressed. Issues of race and ethnicity are of primary importance and issues of gender and social class are subsumed. Tension between girls and boys is sublimated and depicted as a natural part of the maturation process. Consequently, the harassment of girls that has been widely reported by researchers during the past two decades is overlooked. Girls receive the message that harassment is natural, and boys develop a sense of entitlement to girls and to the school environment.

Additionally, students who are taught from a human relations approach are not asked to wrestle with the moral or ethical implications of gender inequities or to investigate the ways in which women are victimized when men are advantaged. This approach also suggests that people should tolerate rather than accept and value individual and group differences.

The *Single-Group Studies or Ethnic Additive Approach* educates students about a historically marginalized group. This is done primarily by teaching about members of the group at certain points in the curriculum or at particular junctures during the year as in the designation of February as Black History Month or March as Women's History Month. The approach is aimed at dispelling the myth that schooling is a neutral process by attempting to be more inclusive and helping students understand how schools have supported the status quo through the perpetuation of stereotypes. Further, it addresses some of the systemic issues of inequality such as in the exclusion of women's accomplishments from the curriculum. One version of this approach peripherally infuses women into the curriculum. Women may appear in certain parts of the curriculum as, for example, in a chapter titled "Women in Science" in a science textbook. The peripheral infusion (either in a text or at certain times of the year) suggests that women have not been an integral part of a discipline; indeed their accomplishments are limited to a chapter often located at the end of the text, which is further complicated by the fact that many teachers never reach the end of a textbook. The ethnic additive approach relegates women, their lives, and accomplishments to the margins of the canon and sends a message that women are not as highly valued for their contributions as their male counterparts.

The approach known as *Multicultural Education* is an effort to strengthen the knowledge base by transforming the curriculum so that, on the surface, it presents diverse perspectives. The approach attempts to free curricular materials of gender stereotypes but is limited in that it fails to acknowledge multiple forms of diversity as complex and inextricably linked. With this approach, there is scant attention to social class and its effects on women's lives. This approach may acknowledge the accomplishments of women in some superficial ways. For example, schools have become more adept at supporting women's athletics and displaying their trophies, but girls are often relegated to the use of lesser facilities, less popular schedules, and lesser celebrations of their victories. When women's lives and accomplishments are included, they are often co-opted by a perceived need for fairness, usually under the guise of sameness for boys and men.

An illustration of this occurred when the National Organization for Women advocated a Take Your Daughters to Work Day. Schools could have been at the forefront of a discussion acknowledging that many occupations remain closed or difficult for women to enter. They might have countered the bogus claim that boys are also discriminated against by educating children and using data about occupational segregation and wage disparities. Instead, there was virtually no outcry as conservative groups balked and insisted that boys be allowed to accompany parents to work. While many schools would assert that they have initiated a Multicultural Education approach as described by Sleeter and Grant, it is clear that the approach does little to probe the depths of gender equity issues.

Further, the Multicultural Approach presents a dominant cultural perspective but avoids delving into causal factors that undergird issues of oppression. Topics such as homophobia are considered taboo in most schools and are, therefore, virtually absent from the curriculum. Homophobic epithets are commonplace in school hallways and on playgrounds where many students report that playing games such as “Smear the Queer” are still part of playground culture. Homophobia does not exist in isolation. It is inextricably linked to the privileging of that which is masculine over that which is feminine, and it plays an important role in fostering school violence.

While critical educators recognize that some approaches to multicultural education actually impede students from adequately addressing gender equity, the approach advocating education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist or *Multicultural Social Reconstructionism* (MCSR) is widely considered to be the most efficacious. A derivative of liberatory, critical, and feminist theories, MCSR is characterized by eight objectives. MCSR: (a) views culture as a product of power relationships; (b) helps students investigate issues of inequality in their own environments and encourages them to take action regarding those conditions; (c) conceptualizes culture and identity as complex and dynamic; (d) organizes a curriculum that incorporates students’ backgrounds, learning styles, and experiences; (e) uses schools as laboratories to prepare students to participate actively in a democratic society; (f) builds a curriculum that enables students to become agents of change; (g) creates an environment that celebrates diversity; and (h) teaches students to build coalitions and develop cooperative learning strategies.

The MCSR approach advocates that students question the status quo and challenge existing inequalities, implying a shared responsibility to work actively toward redressing systemic inequities. It recognizes that knowledge is political and not neutral and that schools are arenas of struggle, resistance, and transformation. It is predicated on the belief that intellectual tension opens up new possibilities of interaction between teachers and students and affords them an opportunity to challenge dominant social forces. Most importantly, this approach views culture as a product of power relations and encourages students to recognize and confront the power structure. It also calls for a restructuring of the social institutions that transmit the dominant culture to entities that challenge and, therefore, destabilize the current societal paradigm.

Multicultural social reconstructionists insist upon a recognition of the complex ways that racial, gender, and class oppressions intersect. An MCSR approach has the potential to unite students across oppressions so that various forms of oppression are not viewed as competing with each other. For example, students of color may perceive that the history of racism, including the enslavement of African Americans, is so horrific that no other form of oppression can compare to it. Rather than pursuing the idea that racism and sexism are competing oppressions, critical pedagogues seek unification to achieve a common goal, in essence, the eradication of all forms of oppression. By encouraging students to unite for the common good across oppressive conditions, strength and commonality of purpose can be realized.

An MCSR educational approach prompts students to interrogate oppressive social relationships in order to help shape a society that is more equitable, democratic, and just. It calls upon students to rethink cultural norms and value structures that reify the status quo. Further, it establishes classrooms as democratic sites of empowerment and underscores the need for critical dialogue and the enactment of counterhegemonic principles thereby enhancing the potential to transform traditional relationships of power and domination while simultaneously calling attention to the representative voices of historically marginalized groups.

Critical multicultural pedagogy does not merely seek to transform the society but rather functions as a means of investigation. It promotes rigorous thinking and the development of students' intellects, thereby asking them to interrogate complex, synergistic social relationships. It encourages students to search for new perspectives as well as alternative lenses and to transgress social boundaries.

POSITIONALITY AS A LIBERATORY TOOL

Positionality refers to the race, class, and gendered identities that people occupy in society, the ways in which the culture situates those identities, as well as the power that they are able to accrue as a result of those positionalities. Positionality acknowledges that people are all raced, classed, and gendered and that those identities are relational, complex, and fluid positions rather than essential qualities. Because all positions are partial, they represent stances and points of view that are problematic and that must be problematized. Students who understand the construct of positionality are able to question the legitimacy of their worlds, the construction of their personal identities, systems of rewards, relationships of power, moral positions and ethical tenets that function to uphold or deny power, and access to institutions and resources to which they have become accustomed.

Understanding the construct of positionality is essential to the effective implementation of an MCSR approach that requires that educators and their students interrogate their positionalities as raced, classed, and gendered individuals. Positionality does not define people in terms of fixed identities but by their location within shifting relational networks. It questions what happens when positionalities are depicted as mutually exclusive and what occurs when multiple positions exist. Further, it questions what tensions arise as a result of the interplay among various positions.

For example, many young women are discouraged from pursuing so-called masculine activities, occupations, or sports. What occurs for girls who are talented athletes who also find themselves on the brink of adult femininity as it has been constructed by the dominant culture? Even if they have the strength, stamina, and talent, few possess the psychological acumen that is needed to endure the stigma associated with girls who play football, wrestle, box, or play ice hockey. A salient factor in the battle to overcome gender oppression is a cultural preoccupation with normative masculinity and femininity. Walkerdine (1990) noted that American society is overflowing with social fictions of what it means to be feminine or masculine. She contends that these fictions are so deeply embedded in society that they can take on the status of fact, especially when they are incorporated into and regulated by powerful social institutions such as schools or media.

Gender oppression in the form of homophobia is used as a powerful deterrent to advocating for equity. The quest for equity is viewed as a direct threat to the status quo and the perpetuation of a world in which men are accorded disproportionate power, access to resources, and the ability to govern those resources. In order to deter women from interrogating issues of gender inequality, some men have devised heinous epithets such as labeling feminists "femi-Nazis," thereby equating women's quest for liberation with one of the most horrific genocidal events in the history of the world. Antifeminist propaganda routinely depicts women who attempt to engage in nontraditional activities or occupations as masculine, man haters, and lesbians. Similarly, men in American society are apprehensive about violating the culture's prevailing masculine code of behavior. Goals to overcome sexism have been historically ascribed to women. Some men, fearing that they will be labeled homosexuals, have expressed disdain for any affiliation with "women's issues." There is pressure for men to adopt what Jackson Katz has called a "tough guise," a hypermasculine persona that projects an image of men as physically powerful, muscled, and polar opposite to anything in the culture that might be viewed as female or feminine. The "guise" of masculinity exists as an unwritten code of behavior that restricts men and encourages them to use physical prowess and power over others to project manhood.

Positionality also encourages us to ask what occurs when multiple positions exist. It asks us to consider what tensions arise as a result of the complex interplay among various positions. Racism, sexism, and elitism have interdependent effects on patterns of discrimination based on the positionalities of race, gender, and class. The discrimination is rationalized through a network of prejudices founded largely on cultural biases in the form of myths and stereotypes that Vega noted are unconsciously passed from one generation to the next. The ways in which positionalities are situated determine our access to power, our ability to control our lives, and our ability to effectuate our goals. Gender is always situated within racial and social class positionalities. Being a woman does not mean definitively that one will be treated a particular way. It is one thing to be a wealthy, heterosexual, African American woman in the United States, and it is quite another to be an African American lesbian who lives in poverty.

Positional knowing prompts us to interrogate the links between race and gender. For example, what positionalities collide for a person of color who is female in American society? Women of color, for example, African American women, have written extensively about the tensions that arise between the obligation they feel to defend and support African American men as well as to defend themselves against racism while simultaneously grappling with the sexism and issues of gender that are also present in their lives. MCSR affords people an opportunity to investigate the tensions, resonances, and complicities that hold possibilities for understanding the complexities of their positionalities.

Among the questions for those who embrace an MCSR approach is how to best invoke its principles in order to effectively teach students about issues of gender equity and social justice. Doing so can be a fairly daunting task. Various authors have discussed the fact that a culture and its institutions have colonized students' minds. Students arrive in classrooms with a wealth of knowledge about what it means to be feminine or masculine and predicate their identities on the importance attached to traditional depictions of those roles in society. The task for critical educators is to find ways to tap into the tacit knowledge that students bring to schools and to excavate the landscape of their intellectual terrain in ways that do not alienate them from that knowledge but that cause them to unearth its nuances.

Critical multicultural pedagogy has the potential to enable students to identify contradictions and initiate alternatives to the status quo. It encourages them to pose questions such as: What characterizes the cultural contexts in which women live, work, and learn? What are the cultural paradigms for female success? What multiple and often contradictory positionalities intervene when we attempt to create alternatives to inequitable practice? And, what kinds of pedagogical and institutional practices are possible when we admit that we are doubtful, that the world contains ambiguities, and that we are vulnerable?

There are risks and problems associated with advocating an MCSR approach. Some arise because schools are not designed to interrogate the status quo; rather they tend to perpetuate it. Standardized testing and the invocation of national initiatives such as No Child Left Behind have exacerbated the attempts of those whose goal it has been to reform education. Most colleges of teacher education have failed to substantively integrate issues of social justice across their teacher education curricula. Isolated courses, which often completely ignore issues of gender and social class in favor of superficial attention to race, tend to prevail. Consequently, many teachers enter classrooms ill equipped to adequately address issues of social justice and, specifically, of gender justice. For many of the reasons cited earlier in this essay, gender has not been regarded as a substantive issue. A cursory glance at teacher education programs aimed at addressing school violence underscores the fact that few, if any, consider the gendered nature of school bullying, harassment, and shooting. Additionally, the scholastic underachievement of girls is rarely highlighted, while numerous recent texts have focused on whether or not boys are being left behind. Finally, the culture at large permits and encourages stereotypes and gender injustices in virtually all of its institutions. There is little incentive for teachers to invoke curricular approaches that oppose those injustices, and this is evidenced in the research that indicates that employing an MCSR approach is not yet a reality in most schools. While using an MCSR approach to educating about issues of gender equity constitutes high-risk pedagogy, it must be noted that its use affords educators opportunities to display how women and men might live authentic lives to their fullest potential. Consequently, there can be no doubt that the risk is outweighed by the potential benefits of this approach to multicultural education.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Alcoff, L. (1988). Cultural feminism versus poststructuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 13*(3), 405–436.

Bartlett, K. (1990). Feminist legal methods. *Harvard Law Review, 103*(4), 829–888.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(3), 575–599.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking Black.* Boston: South End Press.

Kincheloe, J. (2004). *Critical pedagogy.* New York: Peter Lang.

Maher, F.A., & Tetreault, M.K.T. (1993). *The feminist classroom.* New York: Basic Books.

Sleeter, C.E., & Grant, C.A. (1994). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Macmillan.

Vega, F. (1978). *The effect of human inter-group relations education on the race/sex attitudes of education majors.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Walkerdine, V. (1990). *Schoolgirl fictions.* London: Verso.

Renée J. Martin

Music

Although many gender themes and divisions are embedded in musical performance and music teaching, the belief that music transcends politics and culture has undermined the impact of feminism on music education. As a result, music lags behind other fields in education when it comes to integrating feminist and gender theories and approaches to teaching, learning, and educational research.

Recently, an organization devoted to Gender Research in Music Education has identified several broad areas requiring additional research including gender equity, the history of women in different aspects of music education, and gender identity related to music. Examples of such research may be found in recent publications and, especially, in the dissertations that appeared after the synthesis of gender research in music education published by Lamb, Dolloff, and Howe in 2002. These recent studies indicate that interest in and sophistication of gender and feminist research is growing in music education.

GENDER THEMES IN MUSIC AND MUSIC EDUCATION

No matter what their experience, people tend to wrap any discussion of music and gender in memories and emotions. Because most everyone feels emotional involvement with some kind of music, the relationship of music education with gender is difficult to analyze.

Generally, educators struggle with the idea that music itself is gendered. Classroom teachers who include music as part of their general education program may identify and understand common gender issues that affect all educational settings (e.g., offensive sexist words, stereotypical assignments—girls play flute, boys play drum kit) and procedural practices where the boys move the piano but girls hand out the song sheets. However, classroom teachers seldom attribute these practices to music as a subject. Simultaneously, music is culturally perceived as a “feminine” or “soft” subject in Western society, especially when compared to “masculine” or “hard” subjects, such as math and science.

On the other hand, music specialists (who are musicians and teachers by vocation) tend to forget some of the basic gender issues because these issues are so embedded in the musical process that they can go unremarked. Many of the gender divisions in music would be frowned upon in other settings. For example, the chord progression that ends a phrase or piece of music may still be referred to as masculine cadence or feminine cadence, with the masculine being stronger, assertive, and more final, while the feminine is weaker, uncertain, and indefinite. Sex-stereotyped choice of instruments in school music programs remains strong, with only slight indications that they have weakened since the first studies on this topic in the 1970s. Music does bear similarity to sports in the organization of "teams" or choirs by gender. The girls' choir will often include young women through high school age, while the young men's choir is limited to adolescents, and the boys' choir includes only those boys whose voices have not yet changed. The parts in a choir are identified according to female and male genders, although they could be named in a pitch range from the highest to the lowest. Simultaneously, the commodification of music as an industry for popular culture entrenches sexism and sexual violence in its products: the music video, the CD, film, and TV.

A related problem is that North American musicians and music educators tend to be an apolitical group. After all, Western art music is a conserving tradition, based in patronage throughout centuries. The patron changed from church to royalty and aristocrats to the state to educational institutions, but musicians and music teachers have acquiesced to the relationship. A deeply held belief among musicians in Western culture is that music transcends politics and culture. This belief affects pedagogical practice and philosophy, even as the foundations of that belief are challenged by sociology, critical theory, feminism, and popular culture in academia, and by equal opportunity, gender-inclusive, multicultural, and antiracist policies and laws in schools and society.

In part because of this belief in transcendence, music education lags behind other fields in education when it comes to integrating feminist and gender theories and approaches to teaching, learning, and educational research that have been adopted in other areas. While early education feminism anthologies indicate that education researchers were concerned with women's issues found in the feminist movement itself, there exists no such parallel in music education. "Women and Music" courses were added to many university music departments and women's studies departments/programs, but very little feminist/gender content has been included in teacher education courses or precollege education focused on music.

In fact, music education did not demonstrate concern with issues addressed by educational feminism in the 1980s. Such topics would have included uncovering sexism in historical perspectives of music education, justifying equal opportunities and affirmative educational programs, and creating nonsexist curricula in music. The issue that interested music education researchers was identifying how boys' and girls' experiences in musical achievements differ; however, that exploration was limited to identifying sex stereotyping of musical instruments. Interest in other early feminist/gender issues (e.g., identifying women leaders in music education and studying the status of women in education as a profession) is a recent phenomenon.

AREAS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

In 2000, the organization called Gender Research in Music Education (GRIME) identified several broad areas requiring additional research. These include appropriate pedagogical materials, equity, the history of women in different aspects of music education, gender identity related to music, and philosophical or theoretical research. Each of these broad areas continues to need more research in order to establish a strong foundation for understanding gender in music and music education.

Pedagogical materials and models of practice are required to promote gender equity and awareness in music education at all levels and in all contexts. In the K–12 schools, we need music education materials focused on critical thinking about gender and remedying gender inequities. These should include general music materials for teaching about women in music to elementary and middle school children. At the secondary school level, performance materials by women composers for a variety of ensembles including, but not limited to, the traditional band, choral, and orchestral repertoire are required. In the university, we need music teacher education materials to encourage a fuller understanding of feminism, gender, and equity as well as to encourage graduate student feminist and gender research in music education.

Equity issues remain relevant to the current state of gender in music education. Many of these relate to pedagogical materials and pedagogical models or to institutional equity policies. GRIME members listed the following topics that demonstrate a strong emphasis on uncovering hidden and evaded curricula: appropriate role models and mentors, preparation of students for careers in music and music education, equal opportunities in all areas of music education, equity in classroom and ensemble practices, equitable repertoire in classrooms and ensembles, gender expectations in music technology and jazz, drop-out rates (particularly of females from composition, jazz, and instrumental music and males from choirs), continued monitoring of sex stereotyping of instruments, hierarchical gender systems in educational institutions, chilly climate and glass ceiling issues in music institutions, and professional development in equity in music education.

Historical research about gender in music education begins with the history of women in music education from biographies of well-known women music education leaders to composers, conductors, and performers, all within a music education context. New approaches to historical research need to be adopted in future gender/feminist analysis of the development of the music education profession and professional organizations, as well as gender constructions within music education across “race,” ethnicity, class, and nationality in the past. This kind of historical research would have a close connection to research into contemporary identity issues, such as the construction of gender expectations within the music education profession; what it means to be female in a discipline that greatly favors males, or to be male in a discipline that greatly privileges them, or to be male in a “feminine” discipline; and further, to examine how race, ethnicity, sexuality, sexual orientation, age, social class, and culture inflect gender in music.

Scholars are addressing the philosophical or theoretical issues relevant to gender and feminist research although, to date, more of this work has been presented at conferences than has been published. As these papers work their way through the publication process, more articles will become available that are underpinned with critical theories of gender in music education, poststructural and postmodern theories of gender, feminist criticism, queer theory in music education, continued scholarly inquiry into the musical experience of all marginalized groups in society, how music education’s gender ideology and resulting gender-related behaviors affect its musical thought and/or practice, and how music functions in education to reflect or affect intergender relations.

RECENT PUBLISHED RESEARCH

An important contribution to the psychology of music in relation to gender and feminism is a special issue of *Feminism & Psychology* (2002) that features several articles presenting research from feminist perspectives about music cognition, music preferences, music technology, performance and memory, constructions of femininity through music, social psychology, and mixed methods across disciplines. The journal *Music Education Research (MER)* has published some individual gender and/or feminist articles in various issues since 2000. Usually these include analysis of “race” as embedded with gender. Sometimes sexualities and social class are discussed, too. Along with standard research articles, philosophical perspectives and case studies are included in *MER.* The philosophical papers criticize the assumptions that restrain music education from wholeheartedly engaging feminist discourse. The case study examples are easier to comprehend and provide insight into specific viewpoints from different locations and genders. Gender research about boys and men in music and music education is growing. Some of this research moves toward analysis of the gay male experience in music education. The *British Journal of Music Education (BJME)* has published several articles addressing gender in classroom practices, particularly music composition. Historical studies that include aspects of gender issues can be found in *BJME. Gender Education Music Society (GEMS)* is the online journal of GRIME International and features innovative gender research. British, Australian, and Canadian scholars write most of these gender and/or feminist articles no matter where they are published.

The first and most comprehensive review of contemporary feminist and gender research in music was authored by Lamb, Dolloff, and Howe (2002). This chapter provides a summary review of feminist and gender research in education, music, and music education, which was necessary because feminism and gender were so poorly understood in music education. The chapter includes definitions of terms and feminist theories in music and education and provides guidelines and models for those who wish to engage in such research. Research models are identified as those with an unacknowledged feminist influence, models of compensatory research, and models that challenge disciplinary structures of music education. They are not discrete categories because some research has aspects of more than one model. They are not progressive and linear. All three models exist in contemporary music education research about gender. The influence of this chapter can be seen in the increased number of music education dissertations with gender and/or feminist topics completed after its publication. During the 15 years from 1990 to 2005, 56 such dissertations were completed while only 4 were completed in the decade before 1990. Twenty-eight of the 56 dissertations were completed after the 2002 chapter publication.

DISSERTATIONS SINCE 2002

The doubled number of dissertations in four years is impressive. It is also interesting that more men are beginning to do research in gender and feminist topics in music education (6 of 28 dissertations since 2002). Yet, the topics these dissertations present do not venture far from earlier areas: history of women in music education, gender issues in vocal study and choirs (particularly the lack of participation by boys), gender effects in instrument selection, music course drop-out rates, gender in applied pedagogy, and gender in elementary music classes. Therefore, we have yet to see music education research move into some of the same topics that other education subject areas have, such as exploring gender identity and sexuality or socioeconomic class in connection with music.

The “history of women” dissertations (five total) include valuable explorations of the lives and pedagogical practices of music education leader Marguerite V. Hood (1903–1992) and of composer, conductor, and teacher of famous composers Nadia Boulanger (1887–1979). The others concern women oboists, clarinetists, and pianists who contributed to teaching and pedagogy in their studios and their compositions for their students. Three other studies included studio lessons as a major component: one on piano teachers (primarily women older than 45), another on musical discrimination skill (which determined that gender had an impact), and on structure of instrumental lessons (gender differences found between teachers and between students). However, these three studies were not historical but about current instrumental teaching practices.

Four quantitative studies of elementary school music classes found that gender did not have a significant effect in music instruction. One study found significant gender differences between Taiwanese parents concerning their involvement in singing with their children outside of music classes. Another dissertation, focusing on the experiences shared among traditional musicians, students, and teachers in a community project, utilized a feminist theory framework that allowed teachers to implement mutual, interactive, and egalitarian instruction.

The remaining dissertations dealt with gender bias in instrumental music instruction (five), particularly bands and jazz, or with gender norms in vocal instruction and choirs (five). Gender differences were noted in all of the instrumental contexts, although these differences were not discussed analytically or meaningfully in three of the five dissertations. They were merely descriptive. The concert band study that found gender differences looked at the experiences of students who cross over gender stereotypes. The researcher discovered that gender played a part in the instrument selection whether it was chosen by the student, teacher, or parent. Students still perceive the flute as the most "feminine" instrument. Girls could adapt better to playing a "masculine" instrument than boys could to playing a "feminine" instrument. Boys who played the flute were harassed. The jazz study found a great gender imbalance in participation by music students in jazz programs at high schools and universities: Forty-six percent of females compared to 15 percent of males indicated they did not play instrumental jazz. While both women and men indicated that lack of time was the primary reason for withdrawing from jazz, the women rated needing to focus on classical playing, feeling more comfortable in traditional ensembles than in jazz, and being unable to envision jazz career goals higher in their decision to quit playing jazz than did the men.

All five of the dissertations that focused on vocal classes or choirs found gender differences. One suggests that low participation by boys in choirs is a symptom of gender discrimination. The others suggest more nuanced social reasons for boys' lack of participation in choral music. One study suggests the development of gender-appropriate materials and single-gender choirs to provide a better learning environment. Another compared multiple intelligence profiles of singers and nonsingers and found that male singers scored significantly higher on mathematical/logical and intrapersonal intelligences, while females' spatial intelligence scores are higher with age and males' spatial intelligence scores are lower with age. The remaining two dissertations in this group examine gender differences each in a particular type of singing and singing instruction and provide suggestions for addressing them.

Four innovative dissertations were found. One, using a hybrid quantitative and qualitative research design with a thorough grounding in feminist theory, critical sociology, and postmodern theories of sexuality and power, examined the representations of women in *The Instrumentalist* journal. The other three were based on qualitative research models. One examined musical content and pedagogy as tools of gender-role formation in relation to power and sexuality and included a CD. The second is discursive research into the transformation of identity from musician to schoolteacher. And, the last dissertation takes a decidedly liberatory approach to teaching singing, noting that singing is a cultural phenomenon that can reinforce social norms by race, class, gender, and sexuality. However, when music educators critically reflect upon their teaching they can transform that experience socially into one that empowers and liberates.

Additional innovative research, such as these concluding four examples, that use hybrid quantitative/qualitative research designs, critical reflection, and discursive research, and look at music and music education as cultural phenomena would be most welcome for the field. Philosophical and theoretical discussions of gender as foundational to music and music education and the importance of practical applications of equity within music education need to be made available to current music educators through professional development and to future music educators through preservice education programs. Research that considers music and gender roles in conjunction with subject identity, power, sexuality, socioeconomic class, and the effects of racism would help place music education on a par with other disciplines within education. The recent dissertations reviewed here give encouraging evidence that research is beginning to move in this direction and that more young scholars will delve into this rich vein of research possibilities in the future. In the twenty-first century, interest in and sophistication of gender and feminist research is growing in music education.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Feminism & Psychology. (2002). Special feature: Crossing the gender divide: Feminist perspectives on gender and music education, *12*(2).

Gender Education Music Society. Online refereed journal. Available at http://www.queensu.ca/music/links/gems/index.htm

Gender Research in Music Education (GRIME). Available at http://post.queensu.ca/~grime/ (Particularly archived issues of newsletter since 1995).

Lamb, R., Dolloff, L., & Howe, S.W. (2002). Feminism, feminist research and gender research in music education: A selective review. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 648–674). New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberta Lamb

National Curricula

A national curriculum is a curriculum mandated by the government of a country to be followed by all or most public schools in that country. In some countries (such as Canada and Australia), there are state curricula that have similar impact and effect. In others (such as Germany), there is formal federal coordination of such curricula at the national level. Some countries (such as the United Kingdom and Belgium) have different curricula for the different regions or language groups making up that country.

National curricula vary in a number of ways. There are considerable variations in the detail with which the curriculum is controlled from the center, and this can affect teachers' flexibility regarding teaching methods as well as content. Some countries (such as New Zealand and Sweden) simply specify the areas of knowledge to be covered, leaving schools and teachers to determine methods and, in some cases, the proportion of curriculum time devoted to each. Others (for example, Greece and Cyprus) specify the number of teaching hours for each subject per week. Many countries require what is taught to be based on textbooks specifically approved by the government; in some (such as Iceland), they are centrally produced. National curricula also vary in the age groups covered, though most focus on the education of children between the ages of 5 and 6 and 15 and 16. There is also considerable variation in the extent to which these curricula are subject to public examination. Overall, however, the general effect of national curricula is to reduce autonomy for teachers, students, and schools in respect of their work. This can mean, where gender is not a significant issue for government and national agendas, that it is difficult to implement gender equality initiatives (such as those focused on girls and science education in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand in the 1980s) at grassroots levels. There are, however, a number of benefits arising from the loss of autonomy in curriculum choice for students, as will be examined below.

There is a considerable amount of international agreement about the broad content of national curricula. Most countries mandate teaching in the national language (and local languages where appropriate) and in mathematics, science, modern foreign languages (usually, though not always, for older students), humanities and/or social sciences, technology, physical education, and the arts. Within this overall commonality, however, there are considerable variations in emphasis. A number of countries give high priority to vocational education; some (for example, the United Kingdom) make religious education compulsory; others (such as Japan and France, respectively) have a strong emphasis on moral or civic education. In a few cases, this latter emphasis includes provision for the study, discussion, or promotion of gender equality.

WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF NATIONAL CURRICULA FOR GENDER EQUALITY?

To assess the effects of national curricula on gender equality, it is useful to distinguish between those national curricula that explicitly address gender equality and those that do not.

National Curricula That Explicitly Address Gender Equality

The proportion of national curricula that explicitly address gender equality is small. Nevertheless, it is important to consider what such curricula contain and whether such provision is likely to be successful. Addressing gender equality in curriculum documentation generally reflects government intentions regarding the promotion of gender equality more widely, although there is evidence from some countries that a focus on gender equality in education is more specific to that area and results from activists in the education field.

Sweden, for example, has an explicitly feminist government commitment to the eradication of gender inequality with a requirement that "all proposals and decisions must be analysed from a gender perspective in order to map all possible consequences for women and men" (Statistics Sweden, 2004). The Swedish national curriculum is no exception to this. The curriculum documentation makes it clear that fostering social equality in Swedish society is a central aim of education. Consequently, gender is referred to in the curriculum documentation for several subjects. Gender equality is explicitly taught through the subject of home and consumer studies in which children are expected to examine the relationship between gender equality and household activities (National Agency for Education, 2001).

There have been similar moves in South Africa where there is an explicit policy of "gender mainstreaming," that is, making gender a central aspect of education rather than a supplementary issue. Government documentation in post-apartheid South Africa states explicitly that, in the past, the curriculum, considered the heart of the education process, supported inequality. It did so, notes the government, by perpetuating race, class, gender, and ethnic divisions and by emphasizing separateness rather than common citizenship and nationhood. As a result, the government considers it imperative the curriculum be restructured to reflect the values and principles of the new, post-apartheid, more democratic society (Government of South Africa, 1997).

There is also a strong focus on combating sex- and gender-based violence, rates of which are high in the South African education system. Initiatives include specific materials for teaching about sexual violence and harassment, provided by the national education department. Ireland also has a strong emphasis on the promotion of gender equality in its curriculum documentation, with legislation specifically requiring schools to promote gender equality.

Evidence suggests, however, that such requirements do not always make much difference in practice in the content or outcomes of the curriculum. It is important to understand that most national curricula are based, at least up to the lower secondary level, on what was originally education provision for elite males in the West. The high-status subjects, apart from the study of the national language, are those that have traditionally been associated with males and with the brain rather than the body, such as mathematics and science. There is a tendency to give emphasis to curriculum areas based on reason and rationality, both traditionally associated with masculinity and favored by males when choosing noncompulsory subjects. Thus, national curricula have a tendency to mandate a masculine form of and approach to schooling. Nevertheless, in part because of their association with the masculine, the subjects that are compulsory in most countries are those that are most important for success in employment and for civic life. One measure of the success of a national curriculum in combating gender inequalities is, thus, the degree to which equal access to, and performance in, high-status, masculine subject areas is achieved.

Despite its long-standing policy initiatives regarding gender equality, the Swedish government has made little headway in terms of affecting who studies what in the final years of secondary education, a central aspect of gender inequality both in the education system and in wider society. Traditional gendered choices remain predominant, particularly in vocationally related subjects. Mainly young women take health care and childcare courses, while mainly young men take technology, construction, and engineering courses (Statistics Sweden, 2004). With regard to curriculum content, Valiulis and her colleagues (2004) similarly note that Irish junior history examination syllabi and textbooks have failed to reflect national policies relating to gender equality within the curriculum. Instead, they retain a focus on males and their achievements, with relatively few images of women in texts. Thus, while government commitment to gender equality is important, it appears insufficient to make a significant difference to gendered patterns of curriculum provision and uptake.

National Curricula That Do Not Explicitly Address Gender Equality

Because the dominant curriculum is masculine-based, and because most societies have traditionally been male-dominated, the absence of a gender perspective within national curricula can be highly problematic. Without attention to gender, texts may contain sex-biased imagery (for example, males taking active and females taking passive roles in explanations, exercises, or illustrations). There may be perpetuation of traditional stereotypes through curriculum content or form, or there may be an overwhelming focus on male achievement. Where textbooks have to be approved or are government produced and prescribed, such bias may not be amenable to remediation by local initiatives and thus difficult to challenge without central government initiatives. Systematic curriculum bias makes it less likely that students will make counterstereotypical choices about their education or their later lives.

Despite these problems, even gender-blind national curricula can have beneficial effects in terms of gender equality. A major problem in many education systems where national curricula do not exist is the gendered take-up of school subjects, particularly toward the end of compulsory schooling. There is considerable evidence to suggest that when given choices about what they can study, male and female students make these on traditional lines, and subjects studied by girls tend to lead to fewer life chances than those studied by boys. Thus, an important issue in the consideration of national curricula is the question of whether they act to ameliorate or exacerbate this phenomenon. The implications of the presence of national curricula for such issues will be investigated here through an examination of changes in the English and Welsh national curriculum since its introduction in 1989.

Before the advent of the national curriculum, England and Wales had an education system that was in many ways divided on social class lines. This resulted in a high degree of gender segregation and gendered separation of provision for some groups of students, particularly after age 14. Students considered more able—and who were predominantly middle class—had more or less equal access to the high-status, academically elite, masculine curriculum. Other—predominantly working-class—students could end up spending a considerable proportion of their time in vocational, homemaking, and craft subjects largely selected along traditional gender lines that might, despite antidiscrimination legislation, be offered to only one gender. Consequently, there was considerable scope for gender segregation and gender-based provision, especially in the final years of schooling. This was also the case, though to a lesser extent, for students following the elite curriculum: Many girls gave up physical sciences and many boys gave up modern foreign languages after age 14.

The English and Welsh national curriculum was brought into law by the 1988 Education Reform Act and introduced gradually, starting with English, mathematics, and science for 5 and 11 year olds. By the time the curriculum had spread throughout the system, all children educated in public schooling were required to study English, mathematics, science, humanities, design and technology, information technology, physical education, art, and music from ages 5 to 16 and modern foreign languages from age 11. Children in Wales also had to study the Welsh language. The curriculum for each subject was strongly prescribed, and children were tested on its content at ages 7, 11, 13, and 16. Until the introduction of the national curriculum, schools and teachers were left to decide for themselves what to teach; therefore, this was the first time children in English and Welsh schools could be said to be following a common curriculum.

The introduction of a national curriculum was, in many ways, enormously beneficial in terms of curriculum equality. For the first time, all students were required to study all subjects throughout compulsory schooling. Furthermore, although it was possible to follow a reduced science course from ages 14 to 16, most schools adopted a policy of a full science curriculum (taking up twice as much time as any other subject) for all. As a result, more girls studied more science, particularly physical science, for longer than before. There were corresponding benefits for boys, who now had to complete five years of modern foreign language education. All students now had access to a much broader version of design and technology, encompassing both craft and domestic subjects and conceptualized as gender neutral and focused around design rather than the home or manual crafts. While curriculum gender segregation persisted in some of the few curriculum areas that remained noncompulsory (such as a second modern foreign language or physical education as an examination subject), it was markedly less, particularly for "less able" and working-class students.

In consequence, there was a period in England and Wales during the 1990s in which the curriculum offered to the vast majority of children was the most equitable it had ever been in terms of who was permitted or enabled to study what. Students could no longer be excluded from aspects of the curriculum because of their perceived ability or their own gendered choices. The compulsory curriculum might be elitist, dominated by reason and rationality, and generally masculine in outlook, but it was, nevertheless, applied to all students in mainstream public schooling. It was no longer possible for 14 year olds to reduce their future opportunities through gendered curriculum choices that restricted the breadth of their studies.

This situation was, however, short-lived. No sooner had the new curriculum begun to become established than it was reduced in scope. This was partly because it had been specified with too much content for the time available. The reductions, however, went beyond what was strictly necessary to remedy these problems and have continued, with the main force of the reforms being on the curriculum for 14 to 16 year olds, the compulsory aspects of which have been reduced considerably. The first seriously gendered effect came with the reduction of content in design and technology to a core of work in resistant materials that could be supplemented by further study in a number of options. Take-up of these options has been overwhelmingly gendered, with 93 percent of electronics students being male and 97 percent of those taking textiles technology female in 2005. By 2004, modern foreign languages, humanities, the arts, and design and technology, all previously compulsory, remained so no longer. They have to be offered by schools, but no one is required to study them. If take-up of these subjects follows the trends seen in design and technology, it is likely that there will be a rapid return to gender bias in subject choice toward the upper end of secondary schooling, with concomitant inequality of employment and further educational opportunities for both boys and girls.

THE BEST WAY FORWARD

It is clear from the above discussion that national curricula can be restrictive or emancipatory, depending, at least in part, on local conditions. A closely prescribed, textbook-based curriculum can tie teachers closely to gender-biased texts and syllabi, making any attempts at working for greater gender equality in education problematic. On the other hand, a national curriculum can act to ensure that all children follow a broad core curriculum throughout compulsory schooling. Given the overwhelming evidence that when they can choose what they study, boys and girls choose along stereotypical gender lines, enforcement of a common curriculum is likely to mean that children and young people will retain wider options for their future lives for longer than they would otherwise.

If we prescribe such curricula, however, we need to bear a number of things in mind. First, most common curricula derive from a masculine model dating, in many cases, from late eighteenth century Europe. While this is, internationally, a powerful curriculum, it may alienate some groups, including girls. Second, provision of a common curriculum will not eliminate bias in textbooks and other learning materials. These need to be scrutinized and any problems addressed at both national and local levels. Allowing teachers the freedom to teach the common curriculum as they wish may allow local gender activists to provide a more equal curriculum but, at the same time, it will make it possible for traditional gender stereotypes to be perpetuated in some areas. Ideally, a national common core curriculum, underpinned by an understanding of gender and in which gender equality is a major concern throughout, is likely to be the best way forward in promoting a more equal school curriculum.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Government of South Africa. (1997). *Curriculum 2005: Lifelong learning for the 21st century.* Retrieved December 1, 2006, from http://www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/misc/curr2005.html?rebookmark=1

National Agency for Education. (2001). *Sweden curriculum: Compulsory school syllabuses.* Stockholm: Author.

Paechter, C. (2001). *Changing school subjects: Power, gender and curriculum.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Statistics Sweden. (2004). *SCB, women and men in Sweden, facts and figures 2004.* Stockholm: Author.

Valiulis, M., Redmond, J., Cregan, C., Raftery, D., & Harford, J. (2004). *Gender perspectives in the delivery and assessment of junior cycle history: Final report.* Dublin, Ireland: University College.

Carrie Paechter

Physical Education

Gender has long been acknowledged as "an issue" in and for physical education and, more specifically, for physical educators committed to striving for equity and social justice in education. The school subject and the physical education profession have an openly gendered history, characterized by sex-differentiated curricula and pedagogical practices in schools and in teacher education institutions. Academic and professional communities remain united in stressing the ongoing need for gender to be considered in decisions and developments relating to policy, curriculum, and pedagogy in physical education.

Because of its gendered history, physical education plays a crucial role in the development of children's gendered and embodied identities. The dominant format and focus of physical education curricula, conceptualized and organized *as a collection of activities or sports,* is a key factor contributing to those identities being framed in relation to stereotypical images of masculinity and femininity. This curriculum form and the extent to which sport is a key reference point for both teachers and students in physical education contributes to physical education being an arena in which there may be few opportunities for "alternative" femininities, masculinities, sexualities, and embodied identities to be expressed by either students or staff. The tendency for both staff and students to regard *ability* and *achievement* in physical education in terms of performance in sport can be seen to actively inhibit such opportunities. *Grouping* arrangements also have powerful influences upon the experiences of girls and boys in physical education. There is a need for greater acknowledgement that both single-sex and mixed-sex grouping have potential merits and inherent limitations in relation to gender equity.

Contemporary commentaries stress the need for physical educators to move beyond dualistic approaches to gender and/or a sole focus on gender and to explore gender as complex and relational—that is, as *always in dynamic relation with age, class, ethnicity, sexuality, cultural, and national identity.* Finally, gender relations and inequities are matters that teachers, students, and teacher educators are actively implicated in either reaffirming, reproducing, and legitimating, or, in contrast, challenging and changing. Gender discourses are embedded and embodied in the actions and lives of physical education teachers and teacher educators, and in the behaviors of children in physical education lessons. Physical educators (as all educators) are, therefore, prompted to accept social responsibility and, more specifically, responsibility for gender equity, as an integral and inescapable aspect of their positions and work.

A HISTORICALLY GENDERED SUBJECT AND PROFESSION

Internationally, the history of the development of physical education as a school subject is a history of the separate development of a curriculum for girls and a curriculum for boys and of the parallel development of distinct training for female and male staff. Many children's experiences of physical education still reflect the legacy of conceptions that different activities and pedagogical approaches are appropriate for girls and boys in physical education and that girls and boys represent two quite distinct and essentially homogeneous groups of children, each with particular needs in relation to their physical and social development (see, for example, Kirk, 1992). Internationally, one can find many examples of the curricula for girls and boys featuring different, stereotypically gendered activities and/or gendered patterns of staffing in physical education. The latter may involve *either* female and male staff being respectively assigned to groups of girls and boys *or* female and male staff being seen to "naturally" have expertise in particular activities that themselves carry stereotypically gendered identity "labels" as the respective domain of either men or women. This is the historical and, for many children, contemporary reality of physical education.

DEVELOPING EMBODIED AND GENDERED IDENTITIES

Identity is an important concept for studies focusing on gender in physical education. Physical education is fundamentally concerned with children developing physical abilities and embodied identities. In many countries, developing an identity as a physically active and healthy child is a key contemporary agenda for physical education. Yet, in physical education, arguably more than in any other school subject, gender remains an immediate and invariably defining reference point in the development of those identities. In physical education, interactions and relations among students, between teachers and students, and among teachers are never merely that. Pedagogical relations are always also gendered relations. One's identity as a girl or a boy, a male or a female teacher, is inescapably at the fore of daily interactions in and "around" physical education and will shape the relations that can be developed. Gender is unavoidably central to the professional identities of physical education teachers, distinguishing how they are seen by children, colleagues, and parents; what they are presumed to have expertise in; and *what, who,* and *how* they ought to be teaching in physical education.

Meanwhile, children come to physical education with experiences, attitudes, and expectations that mean that emerging and desired physical identities are also invariably framed in stereotypically gender differentiated terms. Experiences in physical education will serve to either reaffirm or challenge boundaries in terms of the physical and simultaneously gender identities (*masculinities* and *femininities*) that are recognized as attainable, legitimate, and desirable for girls or boys. Physical education is an arena in which, whether intentionally or not, the curriculum and teachers' professional practices enable or constrain students' exploration of gender identities—and, particularly, of identities that may be regarded as deviating from stereotypical, social, and cultural norms.

Research continues to identify physical education curricula and pedagogies as invariably privileging dominant Western discourses of masculinity and reaffirming stereotypical understandings of masculinity and femininity. A curriculum conceptualized as a collection of activities or sports is arguably a root cause of this situation. Particularly when it features "traditional" and inherently gendered activities, the dominant "multiactivity" curriculum model (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000) is far from neutral in terms of the gender identities that are destined to be reaffirmed, celebrated, or effectively deemed to be illegitimate and/or inferior. The curriculum model can be seen to openly privilege masculine discourses of strength, power, speed, and physical dominance over others and, furthermore, to promote gendered presentations and understandings of those discourses. In many instances, the physical education curriculum continues to give prominence to activities that, beyond schools, are perceived to be "ultimately" the domain of *either* men *or* women and/or as demanding skills and abilities that are themselves seen to be far from equally attainable by men and women (or desirable for them to seek to attain). Simplistic and stereotypical understandings of the relationship between gender and physical abilities are reinforced in and by the very nature of the physical education curriculum. The curriculum structure is such that assumptions that girls or boys will "naturally" be better at, more suited to, and/or more interested in particular activities and, furthermore, *should be,* can very readily be reaffirmed in contemporary physical education classes. The dominant curriculum model effectively orients both teachers and students toward stereotypically gendered understandings of ability/ies and embodied physical identities. At issue, therefore, are the abilities and identities that teachers regard as legitimate in physical education settings for girls and for boys and that, both overtly and subtly, they promote and celebrate or subordinate and/or dismiss in teaching. From a student perspective, the concern is with the abilities and identities that either girls or boys participating in physical education envisage as attainable and desirable, as well as likely to bring them recognition or rejection within and beyond their physical education lessons.

In addition to curricula, pedagogical practices in physical education will serve to portray, promote, and also marginalize or subordinate particular gender identities. Research has revealed the constraints that both students and teachers (male or female) may experience in terms of opportunities to express particular gender identities in physical education. Variously, studies of girls in physical education, of lesbian physical education teachers, of boys, and of beginning male physical educators have reaffirmed the need to continue to explore the identities that are variously recognized and legitimated or, instead, deemed illegitimate—and more particularly, *how, by what, and by whom*—in physical education (see Penney, 2002). Physical education and educational research continue to illustrate the ways in which teachers and students are implicated in the creation of limits to the identities that can legitimately be expressed in and through physical education by girls and boys and men and women and that are celebrated or condemned. Both single-sex and mixed-sex grouping arrangements have the potential to either advance or suppress opportunities for both girls and boys to express *femininities* and *masculinities* and to feel comfortable doing so. Neither mode of grouping can, in and of itself, be regarded as inherently more progressive from a gender equity perspective. Research has clearly demonstrated that no simple relationship exists between single- or mixed-sex grouping and the quality of the learning experience and learning opportunities that a spectrum of students (girls and boys) will enjoy. The particular grouping arrangement that in any instance is likely to be the most productive and inclusive of girls and boys of varied abilities will depend on many factors. It will not be consistent across different student groups (within or between schools) or different activity settings and, furthermore, is likely to depend upon the particular learning priorities being pursued.

Better understanding of the opportunities and constraints in relation to the expression and development of gender identities in physical education also demands recognition that the dominant gender discourses in and of physical education are inherently classed and racialized. Retaining a gender division, or gender as either the prime or sole reference point for identities, in physical education is often not helpful and certainly has notable inadequacies. It subordinates the cultural, classed, ethnic, national, sexual, and religious identities that are interwoven with gender identities, that all find expression in and through the physical, and that, undoubtedly, are worthy of more attention in development of physical education curriculum and pedagogy. Rather than posing questions of whether physical education curricula and pedagogies are connecting with and meaningful to girls and boys, the focus arguably needs to shift to *which* girls and *which* boys and *whose lives and cultures* are meaningfully represented in curriculum, in pedagogy, and, particularly, in what is perceived to constitute "ability" in physical education.

ABILITIES AND BODIES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

In many respects, the legitimation, reproduction, or subordination of gender identities in and through physical education are matters that are inseparable from concerns with ability. Historically and contemporaneously, physical education can be regarded as concerned with a narrow and openly gendered set of abilities that have their origins in a sport-dominated and performance-oriented curriculum and that connect with *some* boys and *some* girls but that are destined to disillusion and alienate many more. Internationally, there have been a number of curriculum and pedagogical initiatives designed to address these issues and, in particular, promote discourses of achievement that will be inclusive of more girls and that enable and celebrate the expression of a range of femininities and masculinities. "Sport Education" (Siedentop, 1994) and "Sport for Peace" (Ennis, 1999) are examples of such endeavors that aim to encourage students to critically engage with gender issues in physical education and sport and promote recognition of more (and more diverse) abilities in physical education. Introducing a more diverse range of activities into physical education curricula and, particularly, activities that may serve to challenge gendered (and simultaneously also often racialized) assumptions around participation and performance, remains an important strategy for teachers.

Providing opportunities that are designed to extend the roles that students can take up and use to demonstrate their individual abilities is similarly important. Coaching, officiating, commentating, administration, and management are all integral to participation and performance in sport and physical activity beyond schools. Physical educators internationally have responded with curriculum models that encourage diversification in teaching and learning to reflect this reality. They have presented important opportunities to challenge gendered understandings of ability and, more specifically, perceptions about who is likely to be effective in a role and who can develop the skills required for a role. Yet, research focusing on these developments also reveals an ongoing tendency for "other abilities" to be regarded by students and/or teachers as precisely that—"*other*"—and, by definition, subordinate and inferior to the dominant understanding of ability in performance-orientated terms that reflects, reaffirms, and celebrates traditional dominant masculinities in physical education. Thus, curriculum and pedagogical innovation in physical education has highlighted that challenging and changing gendered understandings that are normalized within and beyond schools is by no means easy.

The normalization extends to issues that are at the core of physical education, including the movement capabilities that one can and should look to develop as either a boy or a girl and as a boy or a girl with particular ethnic and/or cultural and/or class identities. With movement as its core, physical education is an arena in which girls and boys can be encouraged and enabled to explore and enhance personal freedom as embodied self-expression of individual and diverse gender identities. Yet, more often, it is identified as an arena promoting compliance to particular gendered, classed, and culturally specific ways of moving and engaging in physical activity or sport and to physical identities that do not connect well with the lives and life experiences of many students. Whether we are concerned with the notion of a "healthy body," a "fit body," the sort of body that is "suited to" participation in physical activity and/or particular sports, or the body that is destined to be deemed as unsuited to such participation, we can expect that the images generated by children will be gendered. Physical education teachers and teacher educators are positioned to either disrupt or reaffirm established understandings of health, fitness, physical activity, and physical abilities that typically overlook issues of gender, ethnicity, class, and culture. They face the challenge of revealing the lack of neutrality in discourses of physical activity and health and, most of all, prompting students to recognize their own tendency to accept and seek to conform to dominant and inherently gendered images without question.

POWER RELATIONS, GENDER, AND PEDAGOGY

Power relations are very much a part of pedagogical experiences and professional lives in physical education. Gender and, more specifically, gender identities are inherent and remain influential in those relations and the power dynamics that are integral to them. Gender remains central to considerations of "who is positioned how" in physical education; the authority that either students or teachers are able to assume and are accorded in the subject and wider school community and environment; the capacity that they, therefore, have to reaffirm or move to challenge gender inequities.

Research points to "defining authority" over curriculum and pedagogy in physical education being actively maintained by those with interests in (and who will continue to benefit from) the ongoing dominance discourses of masculinity that are notably narrow. The subject and profession still face the challenge of finding ways in which physical education can reconstruct itself so as to transcend gender inequities that are so ingrained in curriculum, pedagogical relations, and meanings and, furthermore, remain dominant in the external arenas, practices, and discourses (of sport and physical activity) upon which the subject draws and to which it relates. Physical education teachers will always be presented with problematic dilemmas in seeking connections with sport and physical activity beyond schools and with the skills and knowledge that students develop from and can apply in those settings, yet simultaneously striving to challenge some of the gender inequities that remain prominent, accepted, and even celebrated in physical activity and sport beyond schools. Talk of "empowerment" in and through movement features in contemporary discourses of physical education, physical activity, and health and has understandable appeal within and beyond the profession. Research with young adolescents continues to reaffirm, however, that physical educators (and particularly those concerned with gender equity) need to critically reflect upon exactly who is being empowered to "do what, where, how, and with whom" in and through their experiences in physical education.

Amid advances in awareness and understandings of the ways in which practices within physical education can serve to reproduce long-standing gender inequities, there has also been notable recognition that physical education teacher education (PETE) remains central in largely perpetuating gendered practices and celebrating gendered identities of a certain type. Yet, PETE professionals and institutions seem trapped amidst pressures to direct their training toward meeting the needs and expectations of the "status quo," of openly gendered school physical education programs and pedagogies. Breaking complex cycles of reproduction of gender inequity in physical education remains a challenge for all in the profession to continue to engage with.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Ennis, C. (1999). Creating a culturally relevant curriculum for disengaged girls. *Sport, Education and Society, 4*(1), 31–49.

Evans, J., Davies, B., & Wright, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Body, knowledge and control.* London: Routledge.

Fernandez-Balboa, J.M. (Ed.). (1997). *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education and sport.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Kirk, D. (1992). *Defining physical education: The social construction of a school subject in postwar Britain.* London: Falmer Press.

Penney, D. (Ed.). (2002). *Gender and physical education. Contemporary issues and future directions.* London: Routledge.

Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport education: Quality PE through positive sport experiences.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Siedentop, D., & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing teaching skill in physical education* (4th ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Dawn Penney

Queer[ing] Curriculum

In popular culture these days, the presence of *queer* is ubiquitous. And, even in relation to education and schooling, queer theory and an attention to queer issues is becoming increasingly prevalent. There are various ways that the notion of *queer* is understood and mobilized. Once these are understood, it is possible to interrogate what, to some, might seem an unlikely combination—queer[ing] curriculum.

QUEER AS IDENTITY AND IDENTIFICATION

The concept *queer* is understood and used in a myriad of ways, some closer to the theoretical origins of the term and some further afield. In much popular usage, unfortunately, the term "queer" has come to represent a shorthand way of signaling a collective of sexual minorities, possibly including lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgender people, intersex people, and even sexual "nonconformists." Though this meaning has a good deal of cultural cachet, it is in opposition to what is intended by, in, and through queer theory. This meaning of "queer" focuses on identities and identity politics and, however unintentional, suffers from the same assimilationist politics that arose in parts of the lesbian and gay studies movement. But, what this *queer* configuration does usefully do is move away from the exclusionist practices of specific labels, such as lesbian or transgender, to something much more nonspecific and inclusive of the range of nonnormative sex, gender, and sexuality embodiments and practices.

Instead of representing identities, *queer* subverts normative, naturalized coherences between configurations of sex, gender, and sexuality. Moving beyond an acknowledgment that these three concepts are all socially constructed, though this is an important first step, *queer* upends the seemingly sedimented relations that portray some configurations as "normal" and many others as "abnormal." Queer eschews notions of "core identities" and must work hard in the face of strident advocacy of such notions from the normalizing discourses that often predominate in education.

Queer troubles the norms of sex, gender, and sexuality by challenging the seemingly tidy interrelationships between the three concepts—and allows us to see the disjunctures, as well as the coherences, among them. Thus, *queer* works to disrupt the ease with which people and texts slide effortlessly from the knowledge that someone is female, for example, to the assumption that she would then enact a narrow range of acceptable femininities and profess a particular, benign heterosexuality. Queer enables us to both recognize and refuse such assumptions, drawing our attention to the vast range of hybrids that exist across these identity axes, rather than the stable few we may have previously been taught about.

This is not to deny that there are people who self-identify as queer but to shift the focus from one of identity, to one of identification. Queer identification—potentially felt and chosen by anyone who feels marginalized by hegemonic configurations of sex, gender, and sexuality—moves us away from the construct of identity, because it is an identity without an essence, for there is nothing in particular to which it refers. Rather than being of an essence, a queer essence, the shift to identification focuses on the interdependent spheres of theory and activism that constitute, if not fully or precisely define, "queer." This emphasizes the relational nature of identification that is in concert with or in conflict with "the normative." Thus, for some, queer becomes an identity at the same time it challenges the very notion of "identity." It is concerned not with identities in and of themselves but by what gets represented through certain identities and what do those same identities veil, obscure, or ignore? Thus, the shift from identity to identification is a shift from an assimilationist politics to a politics of difference.

QUEER AS PROCESS AND PRACTICE

Queer is also understood and deployed not as a state, but as a process that reinscribes relationships between readers, texts, and the world. Queer, then, can be understood as a verb —to queer—shifting the focus from people to actions. That is, "to queer" is to excavate the assumptions that underpin and shape reading practices, discourses, and texts and that manage to render these practices and works as self-evident, coherent, and unified. Queer disrupts fixed, stable relations of identity by understanding sex, gender, and sexuality as contingent, fashioned, and constructed. It explicitly refuses the easy slippage that presupposes dichotomous notions of sex (male/female), gender (masculinity/femininity), and sexuality (straight/gay), and then juxtaposes them in specific, proper, and discrete arrangements, foreclosing other possibilities.

Thus, the *queering* in "queering the curriculum" might be understood as an "outing" of the curriculum to help disrupt the seemingly self-evident nature of identities and acts of identification. Thus, *queering* of curriculum can refer to the acts of making it queer, reading it as queer, and teaching queerly. One might conceptualize this "project of unsettling" in at least two ways. The first involves including or foregrounding curricular materials that might be seen as *queer,* both from curricular and pedagogical vantage points. This unpacking is best left to authors concerned with specific curricular subjects who can indicate the ways in which binary identities, such as masculinity and femininity or male and female, have been challenged and disrupted in their own areas of the curriculum. The second involves a pedagogical consideration of how to foster *queer* reading practices in students and in educators.

Queering rests at the intersection of several domains—power, pedagogy, disciplinarity, and knowledge—as much as it is contingent upon the specific curricular areas themselves. Thus, this type of queering of the curriculum is largely accomplished though pedagogy and policy, as subjects are brought to life in classrooms or other educational settings. This "version" of queering moves beyond a consideration of queer curriculum materials to consider how teachers can mobilize the curriculum through policy and pedagogy in queer ways. For instance, this might happen through the deliberate selection of children's picture books to challenge hegemonic portrayals of the nuclear family; through an exploration of the heteronormative nature of evolutionary theory in the high school or university biology classroom; or via a social policy analysis in the social studies or sociology classroom that reveals how members of sexual minority groups are largely invisible in and absent from government social and economic policies. Students might use the lens of heterogender—gender constructions inflected by patriarchal heterosexuality—to examine works of fiction, policy documents, portrayals of patients or clients in the research or clinical literature, or constructions of categories such as “woman,” “family,” or “healthy” across a range of disciplines. All of these possibilities illustrate pedagogical deployments of *queering* that aim to render the curriculum in new and different ways. Thus, a queering of the curriculum must move beyond a focus on identities and collectivities (curriculum materials *about* people who are sexual minorities) to engage with issues of knowledge construction and validation as lucrative and powerful acts worthy of our close attention.

But, *queering* is also about a practice of reception—done in the viewing, hearing, reading, and interpreting in the classroom and other educational sites, and this constitutes the second way we might understand the queering of curriculum. Because learning involves more than just the passive receiving of information, we need to attend to the ways that active learners make sense of the world in the coproduction of meaning and identifications. It is in this active coproduction of knowledge that there are further possibilities and opportunities for a queering of the curriculum. So, heteronormative curricular materials might contain queer aspects that can be uncovered, analyzed, and discussed, or at least aspects that are able to be read queerly by the learner. This ability to “read queerly” can be encouraged and developed in students by focusing on critical textual engagement that works to destabilize understandings rather than cementing them. This position of refusing assumed, received understandings instantiates a queer theoretical perspective by explicitly examining how discourses and texts (understood broadly to include utterances, behaviors, visual and spoken images, printed words, and identities) are taken up and refused. Reading queerly denaturalizes the constructs of sex, gender, and sexuality and enables readers to refuse the project of “really knowing” themselves and others based on a simplistic reliance on the narrow logic of binaries. Rather, reading both with and against the grain can invoke a queering of any topic as it focuses upon the cultural, economic, political, and textual manifestations of sexes, genders, and sexualities.

Queer, in this sense, is not a label applied to certain curricula or pedagogies but rather is manifested in the ways discourses and texts are both delivered and received, or read. And, the curricula and pedagogies of some disciplines—the arts, social science, and education perhaps—might accept queered perspectives as more commonplace in the ways they engage students than in other subject areas. But, there are ample opportunities for the future development of a queer[ed] curriculum practice across the full range of disciplines. This work should continue to unearth and deconstruct the alluring binaries that frame and define fields—male/female, reason/emotion, neutral/biased, nature/culture, knowledgeable/ ignorant, etc.—in order to examine how such oppositional configurations actually delimit our knowledge. Critical engagements with discourses and texts identify, resist, and reconfigure heteronormativity and the narrowly conceived arrangements of sexes, genders, and sexualities that mark hegemonic configurations of these constructs.

Ongoing work in all fields could [continue to] investigate the ways that certain whole subject areas or specific concepts within subjects offer resources and/or barriers to the constructing, refining, resisting, and altering of identities in/through schooling. After all, schooling, at any level, is a prime site for the production, experimentation, exploration, and maintenance of identities and particular identifications. Instead of focusing on particular identity groups, such as bisexuals or intersex people, such a stance interrogates what resources and opportunities are made available or foreclosed through the teaching and learning of specific subjects. This might lead educational researchers, educators, and their students to ask questions like, "What sort of a girl is good in science?" or "Can I see myself in the accounting curriculum?" or "How is my drama major constructing me and how am I constructing it?" Questions such as these get to the heart of the epistemological issues that frame and define disciplines and excavate the ways that people do or do not connect to particular subject areas. And, no matter what subject area these practices were adopted in, it would certainly make for a very queer curriculum indeed.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Britzman, D.P. (1995). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. *Educational Theory, 45* (2), 151–165.

Bryson, M. (1993). Queer pedagogy: Praxis makes im/perfect. *Canadian Journal of Education, 18* (3), 285–305.

De Castell, S., & Bryson, M. (1998). Don't ask, don't tell: "Sniffing out queers" in education. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum: Toward new identities* (pp. 233–252). New York: Garland.

Foster, T., Siegel, C., & Berry, E.E. (Eds.). (1997). *The gay '90s: Disciplinary and interdisciplinary formations in queer studies.* New York: New York University Press.

Letts, W.J., & Sears, J.T. (Eds.). (1999). *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Pinar, W.F. (Ed.). (1998). *Queer theory in education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Will Letts

Social Studies

Social studies is a vast and ambitious subject area in the K–12 curriculum that is charged with preparing young citizens for social, economic, and political roles. According to the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), powerful social studies teaching helps students develop social understanding and political efficacy. Encompassing history, economics, geography, political science, anthropology, and sociology, along with curricular structures such as units, concepts, and instructional strategies, social studies typically consists of integrated topics such as family and community in the early grades and subject-specific courses in the later grades. The scope of knowledge and grade-level sequences are designated and recommended in subject-specific curricular frameworks published by professional organizations and in social studies frameworks provided by school districts and governmental offices of education at county, state, and national levels. Textbooks, which are a key determinant of what gets taught, are published by for-profit companies and are adopted by states and/or local communities. Publishers are influenced in their choice of content and sequence by the curricular frameworks of large populous states such as California, New York, and Texas.

Notions of what is important to teach and learn in social studies instruction across the United States have been influenced by both progressive and conservative ideas depending on historical context and cycles of reform. The past 20 years have witnessed a generally conservative period in social studies marked by concerns about historical and geographical illiteracy and pressure to eliminate special interest topics such as women's history. Compounding this conservative trend, No Child Left Behind implementation, with its emphasis on mathematical and verbal skills, has eclipsed much of the social studies instruction in public elementary schools, according to research and news reports.

While gender, as both a topic of study and a lens for understanding learning differences and achievement in social studies subjects, has not occupied a prominent place in social studies curriculum and instruction or in textbooks during the past 20 years, the cumulative record of advocacy, research, published scholarship, curricular materials, and teacher development constitutes a considerable body of work. This work, along with teacher narratives and organization history, has become a permanent—if not popular—domain in the field of social studies.

Major questions in this domain are: What is the history of gender and social studies? What has been the significance of gender to the goals of social studies, as a field generally, to different levels of the K–12 curricula and to specific subjects that are outlined in K–12 social studies frameworks?

THE HISTORY OF GENDER AND SOCIAL STUDIES

NCSS provides valuable information about the history of gender and social studies because it was the site of advocacy and action lobbying for gender equity. In January 1971, the newly elected president of NCSS suggested to the Board of Directors that a committee on social justice for women might serve the interests of the membership and of social justice. This suggestion resulted in the creation of the Advisory Committee on Social Justice for Women and the establishment of an agenda for gender and social studies.

That same year Janice Law Trecker's groundbreaking article titled "Women in U.S. History Textbooks" was published in *Social Education,* the NCSS trade journal. Trecker asked, "Where are the women?" and went on to argue that women, notable or not, separately or in relation to their brothers, fathers, and leaders were virtually absent from textbooks and from social studies curricula while men, particularly White men, dominated the pages and definitions of significant knowledge. Trecker's article was the launching pad for the movement that was organized to lobby for changes in the story line of social studies curricula.

The initial goals were access, equity, and social justice in publications, in local and state social studies council programs, and in social studies textbooks and curriculum materials. For example, the California Council for the Social Studies devoted the fall issue of their 1972 publication to "Women in the Social Studies." A significant addition to the publication was the voice of contributor Molly Murphy Macgregor, future founder and director of the National Women's History Project.

In 1977, the Advisory Committee on Sexism and Social Justice revised their original position statement to broaden the scope of responsibilities. The revised position statement that was adopted by the NCSS Board stipulated equity of influence and representation for women in the organization, dissemination of information about Title IX, revision of curricula guidelines to substantively represent women's experiences and perspectives, inclusion of programs and materials on social justice for women and workshops on sexism awareness, and monitoring of publications to ensure the elimination of sex bias. While the agenda for the group of advocates who populated the Advisory Committee and its sister organization, the Special Interest Group on Gender Equity, was focused on organizational issues, they were, in fact, hoping to change the knowledge base of social studies in general.

Between 1975 and 1985, substantial progress was made toward achieving advisory committee goals and establishing an agenda for gender equity in social studies. Women were recruited for NCSS governance positions, the number of programs related to gender and women's history increased modestly, manuscripts proposed for publication were reviewed for sex bias, and the accumulative record on sex equity in social studies was gathered into a chapter for the *Handbook on Sex Equity in Education* (Hahn & Bernard-Powers, 1985). Yet, in terms of Trecker's concerns—the absence of women and topics related to women's lives, work, and political behavior—little had changed in the scope of social studies knowledge as evidenced in social studies frameworks and textbooks.

The years between 1975 and 1985 were also significant in establishing a network of supporters for the agenda for gender equity. NCSS was represented at the United Nation's NGO Forum on Women in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1985, and related programs were presented at the national meeting, including "The United Nation's Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women." Curriculum projects such as The National Women's History Project, the Midwest Center for Women's History, and Women in World History became a regular feature of the national and state meetings, providing support, resources, and in-service education for teachers and curriculum planners. This flowering of materials and ideas energized the movement and contributed to an evolving and broadened understanding of the meaning of gender in social studies.

The five years that followed the Women's Forum in Kenya were marked by two contradictory developments: the rise of a conservative era in social studies and a broadening of the scope of gender in social studies. The conservative agenda appeared in the form of national reports that advertised the developing cultural and historical illiteracy among America's schoolchildren. Special interests such as multiculturalism and gender equity were identified as the source of the problem, and the social studies curricula frameworks were the battle sites. Gender issues and women's history were minimized in The NCSS Report and the California and New York State Social Studies frameworks published in the 1980s. In the late 1980s, the NCSS eliminated the Advisory Committee on Gender Equity and essentially disarmed the network of professionals who had rallied around gender issues.

At the same time, drawing on scholarship and research in the academy at large, teachers, scholars, and researchers in gender and social studies continued to explore the dynamics of gender in differing contexts. Terms such as gender equity, gender sensitivity, gender issues, and engendering curriculum replaced the monolithic and limited term *sex equity* in social studies. This change in language signaled the growing complexity and tensions of the field. Gender, which is socially constructed, could not function as a single category because race, ethnicity, class, language, and other relevant aspects of identity almost always mediate it. Political rights were significant for many women across the globe but for many others basic economic issues were critical. The developing understanding of the complexity of gender issues in social studies has been a significant aspect of gender in social studies over the past 25 years.

GENDER ISSUES ACROSS ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE, AND SECONDARY GRADE LEVELS

Social studies teaching in K–8 classrooms is likely to include integrated topics and hands-on projects. When male and female students are working together on projects, research has indicated that some boys are likely to dominate in material handling (art materials, for example) or on the keyboard in computer research. Thus, the careful structuring and monitoring of mixed gender groups in social studies projects is critical for equal access to both knowledge and materials.

A second aspect of classroom life that requires careful structuring is the question and answer period that often follows individual or pair/share reading of text. When question answering is an unstructured phenomenon, young males will tend to dominate. Teachers can mitigate the effects of gender-based student dominance by adopting strategies that support equal participation such as monitoring who is called with a class list or popsicle sticks, calling on specific students as a normative process, and keeping track of who is called on. Well-defined processes and structures can make the social studies discussions a comfortable learning opportunity for boys and girls.

Classroom books and visual materials, such as graphics, photographs, and artwork for the walls of classrooms, are sources of either gender bias or gender equity. Studies of award-winning trade books in the social studies suggest that in both graphic illustrations and content, males outnumber females, and the disparity worsens when specific ethnic populations are considered. Gender sensitivity in trade books is especially important in K–5 classrooms where social studies units are based on key books. There are plentiful bibliographies of trade books that have been evaluated for gender sensitivity, many of which can be found at the National Women's History Project Web site.

Teacher preparation and teacher development are critical to providing gender equitable social studies; yet, research indicates that many candidates in preservice programs have not studied multicultural women's history and cannot identify significant women in U.S. or world history. Teachers at all levels need to be introduced to concepts, curriculum, and materials that facilitate gender equity in the classroom. Classrooms that are selected as preservice practicum sites should be exemplars of gender equity—both generally and with respect to social studies. Video evaluations of preservice and in-service teaching can and should include commentary on teacher's response to male and female students.

In secondary classrooms, Grades 9–12, and for high schools, some issues mentioned in the previous paragraphs are also relevant. These include teacher preparation, carefully orchestrated discussions where young men cannot dominate discussions, and gender-sensitive grade-level appropriate visuals. Web sites used for research should be identified and discussed in terms of gender, race, class, sexual identity, and ethnicity. In short, gender should be a topic of discussion in secondary classrooms as well as a lens of analysis.

Standardized tests that measure knowledge of social studies subjects have the potential to provide significant information about gender differences. Two reliable sources of data on student achievement are the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and Advanced Placement Exams. The NAEP tested students' knowledge of civics, history, and geography at Grades 4, 8, and 12 in 1994 and 2001. NAEP data indicate some gender differences between years and across subjects. Of the three subject areas tested, geography yielded the most consistent gender finding, a 4-to-5-point difference favoring males that was sustained across time.

Some insight into the possible reasons for consistent differences of this type can be had from a recent analysis of the 1993 results of the American History Advanced Placement exams. Although the overall results indicated that males outperformed females, an item analysis of these results published in 2002 by the College Board, indicated that males outperformed females on multiple choice items and on items with content determined to be of masculine interest. In contrast, females tended to perform as well as or better than males on free response items and on items that had content determined to be of interest to females (Buck, Kostin, & Morgan, 2002).

These findings indicate that even seemingly consistent gender differences in overall test scores may mask the nuanced differences caused by the kinds of test items used. Also hidden within overall gender differences or similarities may be differences across subsets of the student population when they are disaggregated by race-ethnicity and social class, as well as by gender and age.

GENDER ISSUES IN SPECIFIC SUBJECTS: HISTORY, GEOGRAPHY, AND CIVICS

The three subject areas that receive the dominant emphases in K–12 social studies curricula are history, geography, and civics/government. Each has a different way of dealing with gender issues.

History rivals geography for dominance in the K–12 curriculum, and the two are frequently partnered in grade-level content frameworks. In the California social studies framework, as in many other states, history enters the curriculum in Grade 2 with the study of people who make a difference, including historical figures, and the curriculum in subsequent grade levels combines the history and geography of particular places, such as the state, the United States, or other countries and regions.

As noted above, women's studies and gender studies were labeled special interests, and they were minimized or not included in frameworks published after 1985. Nevertheless, the fields of women's history, social history, and ethnic histories took root in the academy in the 1980s and, in limited ways, influenced textbooks and teaching at the lower levels.

History was the first subject in the academy to receive serious scrutiny from feminist scholars such as Gerda Lerner, and it was the field from which Trecker (1971) launched the conversation about gender in the social studies. Women's history workshops of the 1970s provided secondary teachers with both content and teaching strategies that expedited the curriculum reform process. Using teacher designed units along with commercially available materials, teachers were able to achieve rapid reform at a superficial level by introducing the stories of women, such as Sojourner Truth, Mary McLeod Bethune, Dolores Huerta, Maria Tall Chief, March Fong Eu, and Abigail Adams, and some concepts of gender bias into the historical narrative.

More substantial reform would require changing the content of history to ensure women's place in the traditional framework. "Add women and stir" is how it has been characterized. This means that traditional frameworks for U.S. history would be changed to accommodate stories of individual women, women's movements such as suffrage, and women's issues such as birth control, and/or the history of economic discrimination. This second layer of reform in history teaching and learning represents the "paper ceiling" or the limit of that reform for history frameworks and textbooks during the past two decades.

Geography is a subject that has gained prominence over the past two decades, and it is currently emphasized in K–12 curricula guides. Geography as a K–12 emphasis began to flower in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Coincidentally, scholars acknowledged the realization that women were hidden from geography, and teachers in both the United Kingdom and the United States asked the foundational question, namely, "Where are the women and the women's issues?" Pioneers in this movement endeavored to change the field by developing new courses, establishing a journal called *Gender, Place and Culture,* and ensuring a place on conference programs for gender and women's issues.

Nevertheless, the recent spotlight on Geography Bees has shown that boys are located on the stage and in the winner's box of the National Geographic Bee in Washington, DC, and girls are not. In 2005, there were 50 contestants competing for a $25,000 scholarship, only four of whom were female.

The knowledge base of geography was broadened in the early 1980s by research that focused on special topics such as time-space continua, which are records that compare the movements of men and women across time and spaces, such as urban neighborhoods. Research using time-space continua that charted gendered movements were later broadened to incorporate discussions of class, race, and ethnicity. Thus, the field of human geography, compared to physical geography, created avenues for the consideration of gender implications in geography.

Geographers have been assertive in their efforts to document and understand the implications of gender for geography teaching and learning. Under the auspices of the National Council for Geographic Education (NCGE), curriculum projects, research projects, and evaluation projects have been formulated and implemented to enhance achievement for women and underrepresented groups in geography. An Advanced Placement Exam in human geography was developed (54 percent of the test takers in 2004 were female), a doctoral program that includes a significant focus on gender was developed at Texas State University, and a teacher accessible curriculum was designed and disseminated through the NCGE.

Like curricular frameworks for history, however, geography frameworks are weak on gender. An analysis of *Geography for Life, National Geographic Standards* for 1994 found only one reference to gender as a category or a topic and revealed that gender was not taken seriously as a category or lens. Nevertheless, of the initiatives to reform social studies curricula and ensure more gender-equitable education, efforts in geography education stand out. Steps were taken in the late 1980s and early 1990s to address inequities in geography learning, alter the content of human geography, and make the subject more interesting to the student population generally (see LeVasseur, 1993). The work involved: (a) collaboration among researchers to build a knowledge base; (b) research and scholarship focused on understanding gender differences and instructional strategies; and (c) an orchestrated and comprehensive plan to address the needs of girls and women and other underrepresented groups in geography classes.

Citizenship education is identified by the NCSS as a fundamental goal of social studies education, and civics, also known as government, is the subject area with primary responsibility for achieving that goal. Through text, discussion, participation in school organizations, and service learning, girls and boys, young women and men are provided with knowledge and experience to be good citizens, in both attitude and behavior. The language of civics suggests that under the law all Americans are equal and the rights and responsibilities of all citizens are fundamentally the same, but gender bias and gender phenomena, working in concert with race-ethnicity, social class, and other social descriptors, are silent partners in the process that can limit or shape access to political office and the formal corridors of power.

As in history and geography, reforms in citizenship education originated outside K–12 education. In departments of political science and women's studies, scholars and researchers wrote and theorized about gender and justice, gender and power, and the significance of public and private spheres. Focusing on the activities and behaviors of women outside formal institutions, which were civic in function, created a narrative of citizenship that challenged—at least theoretically—the definitional boundaries of politics. At the same time, theorizing about the processes that exclude women and underrepresented groups of men from the corridors of formal public power provided the basis for a challenge to civics as usual.

Even so, gender as a topic and as a lens has not been a prominent aspect of civic education or government courses. The National Standards for Civics and Government published by the Center for Civic Education in 1994 mentions gender twice. Gender topics have been absent from civic textbooks since scholars started keeping track of the phenomena. Recently, Avery and Simmons (2000–2001) found that there were few women pictured or mentioned in seventh-, eighth-, and ninth-grade textbooks, compared to men, and that the subject of gender discrimination was basically not addressed.

Despite the absence of information about gender phenomena, data on civic knowledge from large studies, such as the National Assessment of Education Progress of 1988, indicate that the difference in scores between males and females is minimal, and females excel in some areas of knowledge. Moreover, large-scale studies have found that females are more likely than males to support gender equity and more likely to anticipate being active members of the community as adults. These findings suggest that the presence of adult women in the community, supporting educational and community welfare agencies and activities, might be a powerful influence on young women.

If the traditional story of what is important to know about government and politics were to include justice and injustice, inclusion and exclusion, along with the multiple stories of civic behavior and effectiveness that happens in the small spaces and hallways, it would be transformative. The curriculum of family, community relations, and social contract is critical to a gender-sensitive civic education as is an understanding of the political nature of school classrooms, cafeterias, and hallways.

The gender biases and issues that emerge in cafeterias, hallways, and classrooms, laced with other aspects of identity, are part of the informal curriculum that needs to be moved from the margins into a more central place and mediated. Attitudes about sexual identity that are expressed in defamatory language such as “fag” and “lesbo” have a chilling effect on all students, and they deny both students who are targeted and those who are observers their basic right to a safe school experience. An effective citizenship curriculum should include the gendered experiences of all students and the significant realities of community life. What is most important is that social studies teachers and faculty in general take the leadership in this area.

It is evident that sensitizing teachers and their students to the concept of gender and the multiple ways that gender implicates the social studies is an uneven work in progress. The knowledge generated by scholars and researchers about the social sciences should be more consistently represented in social studies curricula, especially textbooks. Teachers need to be introduced to current scholarship and controversies in the field in their undergraduate educations and teacher preparation. Research on the significance of gender in all subjects among varied populations needs to be the focus of the social studies research community. The social studies community of scholars and teachers needs more oversight in the development of both frameworks and textbooks. Consistent attention to these instructional structures and tools, the *grammar of gender and social studies,* holds the promise of a strong and just social studies education that may benefit all future citizens.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Avery, P.G., & Simmons, A.M. (2000/2001). Civic life as conveyed in U.S. civics and history textbooks. *International Journal of Social Education, 15*(2), 105–130.

Bernard-Powers, J. (1995). Out of the cameos and into the conversation: Gender, social studies and curriculum transformation. In J. Gaskell & J. Willinsky (Eds.), *Gender in/forms curriculum* (pp. 185–199). New York: Teachers College Press.

Buck, G., Kostin, I., & Morgan, R. (2002). *Examining the relationship of content to gender-based performance differences in advanced placement exams* (College Board Research Report No. 2002-12). New York: College Board.

Hahn, C.L., & Bernard-Powers, J. (1985). Sex equity in social studies. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving sex equity through education* (pp. 280–297). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

LeVasseur, M. (1993). *Finding a way, encouraging under-represented groups in geography: An annotated bibliography.* Indiana, PA: National Council for Geographic Education.

Mayer, T. (1989). Consensus and invisibility: The representation of women in human geography textbooks. *The Professional Geographer, 41*(4), 397–409.

National Women's History Project. Available at http://www.nwhp.org

Trecker, J.L. (1971). Women in U.S. history textbooks. *Social Education, 35*(2), 249–261.

Jane Bernard-Powers

Teacher Education

Gender has been a central construct in teacher education since the inception of formal programs in the United States and other countries. In many nations, the majority of students in teacher education, especially in primary or elementary education, are women. However, the most recent *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (Sikula, Buttery, & Guyton, 1996) does not include a chapter devoted to gender, only scattered discussions of gender as an aspect of other topics.

Within teacher education, gender has been and can be viewed as a structural principle, a social problem, or an identity. As a structural principle, gender has differentiated and stratified teacher education curricula and programs. As a social problem, gender in teacher education has periodically captured policy attention, albeit for different, and sometimes contradictory, reasons. As a facet of identity, gender is regarded as a social construction that can best be understood and analyzed within recent critical, feminist, postmodern treatments of teacher education. How gender is understood has important implications for educational policies, and it seems also likely that current policy debates about educational achievement will have implications for teacher education programs, including the ways in which gender is treated in teaching and research.

GENDER AS STRUCTURAL PRINCIPLE

From a functionalist perspective, places called schools need people called teachers. Before the establishment of public school systems in the United States, men far outnumbered women as schoolteachers. Women taught children, of course, but in the home context. Women in early New England established "dame schools" in their homes that provided beginning reading instruction and a form of day care. An educated young woman might become a tutor or governess for children of an affluent family. But, teaching in a school as usually depicted was either a temporary occupation for men studying to enter more respected professions such as the clergy, law, or medicine or an esteemed position in a private, college preparatory institution for boys. Teachers were schoolmasters.

Through the nineteenth century, several trends converged to change this pattern in teaching and, thus, in teacher education. Early in the century, advocates of Republican Motherhood (the idea that mothers, as the first teachers of future male citizens, were important to the welfare of the new republic) supported the creation of secondary and postsecondary institutions for women. Even some who believed in the intrinsic value of women's education adopted the discourse of Republican Motherhood to gain sponsorship for women's schools. Therefore, a growing number of middle-class women pursued advanced formal education.

In the period before the Civil War, northern states passed laws establishing state-supported elementary schools for the masses, creating a surge in demand for teachers. New states admitted during westward expansion usually established public schools as a matter of course. Advocates and providers of women's education, as well as state education leaders, presented a variety of arguments for recruiting educated, unmarried women into teaching. Women teachers, like ideal mothers, would be pure, gentle, moral guardians for young children. They would be more likely to stay on the job than men because their other economic opportunities were severely limited. Finally, and some think most importantly, self-sacrificing women would make few complaints about low salaries and exploitative working conditions; therefore, they would provide a cheap and compliant workforce for the burgeoning public schools (Clifford, 1989; Spring, 2005).

At women's schools, such as the Troy Female Seminary and Mount Holyoke College, as well as state normal schools, young women enrolled in classes specifically designed for teacher preparation. Schoolmasters were increasingly replaced by schoolmarms; by 1860, women outnumbered men in teaching. A teacher might travel west to find a teaching position in a new frontier community or in a federal or church-affiliated school designed to "civilize" Native American children. After the Civil War, southern state constitutions were rewritten to create segregated public school systems, and federal funds supported freedmen's schools. Northern teachers, both White and Black, went south. At the turn of the century, women taught thousands of immigrant children in urban schools to speak English and become loyal American citizens. Women who embarked on these challenging ventures often saw themselves not only as independent risk takers but also as missionaries—religious, political, and/or social (Hoffman, 1981).

However, the supply of formally prepared women teachers did not meet the demand. Local control of hiring meant that local school boards might prefer men or applicants with little formal preparation. The pay and working conditions in many schools, as well as the common restriction that women could not continue to teach after marriage, did not resolve the problem of teacher turnover. These conditions still made teaching a short-term occupation that hardly seemed to warrant extensive preparation. Nevertheless, formal teacher education grew, provided by a variety of private and public institutions. Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) had a mission of meeting the demand for Black teachers in segregated schools after the Civil War. HBCUs were somewhat more likely to encourage both men and women to pursue teaching because employment opportunities for educated African American men were meager. In some states, teachers could work in elementary schools if they had graduated from a high school teacher preparation program; these programs enrolled almost exclusively women. Finally, many teachers were hired to teach without formal preparation and later attended summer teacher institutes, often held at regional teachers colleges, to learn about pedagogy. Eventually, all states adopted regulations requiring formal teacher education, at the college level, for certification to teach in public schools (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988).

Another structural pattern that affected teacher education was gender stratification between elementary and secondary teachers, as well as between teachers and administrators. Early public schools were often ungraded one-room elementary schools with lone female teachers. Public secondary schools did not really multiply until the late nineteenth century. Men with bachelor's degrees in the disciplines predominated in high schools and earned higher salaries than elementary teachers. The "principal teacher" in a graded elementary school up until the 1920s was often a female teacher with part-time administrative duties. Colleges of education began offering new graduate degree programs in school administration. As the principal's role professionalized and became separated from teaching, men displaced women at this level. Men in teacher education programs often planned to teach for only the minimum number of years required by state or local policies before leaving to pursue the principalship.

These gender patterns continue to influence teacher education today. The vast majority of college students in U.S. teacher education programs are White females. After desegregation, most positions for African American teachers, who had been restricted to Black schools, were eliminated. HBCUs today produce far more African American teachers than predominantly White institutions, but the numbers are still small. Most preservice teachers in early childhood and elementary education are White women, while White men compose about half of the students in secondary programs. Women have made inroads in traditionally male-dominated secondary disciplines such as math, science, and social studies, and to a more limited extent in vocational fields, such as agricultural education. In addition, White women are now a majority of teacher education faculty in the United States, although in many countries men still predominate in the faculty ranks.

Critics of teacher education today continue to question whether teachers need special preparation in how to teach, if they have adequate knowledge of curriculum content. For decades, these critics have assailed the quality of teacher education, including the academic abilities of education students and their instructors. In these critiques, authors usually do not explicitly mention gender, but it is interesting that equal derision is rarely leveled at historically male-dominated professional schools such as engineering and law. Some critics recommend cutting back or even disbanding formal teacher education to provide more open entry into teaching through an unregulated labor market. They propose that open entry might diversify the teacher population in terms of gender and ethnicity.

Although the specific historical causes differed, in European and South American countries, there was a similar shift from male to female teachers in the past century, especially at the primary levels. A common factor is the spread of universal primary education, with a resulting demand for large numbers of low-salaried teachers. There is evidence of the importance of gender in the politics of teacher education in countries as dissimilar as Germany, Mexico, Australia, Sri Lanka, and Argentina (Ginsburg & Lindsay, 1995).

GENDER AS SOCIAL PROBLEM

Current studies and commentaries on education in the United States often begin by noting, or even bemoaning, that the majority of teachers are White, middle-class females while the student population is becoming more ethnically diverse. Moreover, low-income students of color are more likely to have low scores on standardized achievement tests that, in today's political context, are considered to be a key indicator of school and teacher ineffectiveness. While gender equity advocates argue that schools disadvantage girls, others worry about how boys, especially African American boys, fare in schools where most teachers are White women. According to this demographic argument, the proportion of White, middle-class women in teacher education programs is a problem because they may not be capable of effectively teaching their low-income students of color, thus contributing to the "achievement gap." Their misunderstandings of African American male students, in particular, may be a factor in the incidence of school disciplinary infractions, which have increasingly severe consequences under zero-tolerance laws.

From a conflict theory perspective, an important question has been: Do schools systematically advantage or disadvantage certain groups of students? Tyack and Hansot (1992) point out that for the past two centuries, U.S. education critics have alternated between identifying schools as having a "boy problem" or a "girl problem." According to the boy problem, female teachers do not understand boys and try to feminize them by limiting their physical activities and pursuits of "masculine" interests. According to an outmoded version of the girl problem, schools might push girls too hard academically, making them physically and intellectually unfit for wife- and motherhood. The more recent version of the girl problem, presented most notably in a report from the American Association of University Women (AAUW), published in 1992, is that schools disadvantage girls through low academic expectations, less teacher attention, and gender stereotyping in the curriculum.

These gender conflicts have had several effects on teacher education. The approach to the girl problem since the 1970s, and especially since the AAUW report, has been for teacher educators to integrate gender equity content into the curriculum to a limited extent, often as one topic under the broad headings of "multicultural education" or "diversity." Preservice teachers today are more aware of potential gender biases in textbooks and language, for example. However, for future teachers to examine their sexist assumptions and unconsciously biased interactions with male and female students—as gender equity advocates propose—would require much more extensive curriculum revision.

The boy problem in the early twentieth century brought about implementation of curriculum reforms such as manual training, physical education, and extracurricular sports intended to retain more boys in school. Recently, boy problem discourse has been revived in support of a call for more men in teaching. Some teacher education programs are actively recruiting men, especially minority men, and especially in elementary education. Alternative teacher education programs for people who are changing careers (e.g., retiring from the military or from a math/science related occupation) may attract men who want a faster route into teaching than attending a two- to four-year program with a cohort of young women. Once an occupation is identified as "female," it is stigmatized, and men entering it may feel that their masculinity, career ambition, or even sexual orientation are suspect.

Teacher educators in other countries, if the available literature is any indication, pay some attention to gender equity in the curriculum but do not seem to claim that women teachers disadvantage their male students. The United States has experienced a backlash against the feminist movement and gender equity policies, which may contribute to the revival of the boy problem in education policy arguments in this country. Other countries also do not have the same racialized histories as the United States, where the teacher education literature repeatedly identifies the predominance of *White* female teachers as the problem.

GENDER AS IDENTITY

From critical, feminist, and postmodern perspectives, gender is one aspect of a teacher education student's identity, intersecting in complex ways with other aspects such as race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, age, and religion. Recommendations for teacher education reform in the 1990s called for more teacher reflection, not only on teaching practices but also on identities and beliefs. Critical and postmodern theorists called into question the liberal assumptions of the equity and multicultural movements. According to their analyses, White preservice teachers may express positive intentions about treating all students equally and may even acquire knowledge of cultural differences among their students, but until they critically examine the social construction of their "whiteness," they will have only surface understandings of the complexity of their work in a racialized society.

Because identity is multifaceted, examination of racial identity, which has received by far the most attention in teacher education, is intertwined with gender (class, sexual orientation, etc.) identities. However, many researchers report that convincing preservice teachers that they should critically interrogate the construction of their multiple identities and cultural assumptions can be challenging. Educators of the "missionary" teachers of earlier times did not ask their students to question their identities and intentions, or to abandon their naive notions of assimilation, racism, and reproduction. Young, heterosexual, middle-class, White female students often appear in teacher education case studies as people who resist self-examination and social critique (although there are exceptions).

Critical and feminist teacher educators have made an impact in teacher education research, probably more than in practice. In this area, there is more international literature and more evidence of the influence of non-U.S. scholars (see, e.g., Britzman, 2003; Evans, 2002; Fischman, 2000). These writers ask teacher educators to help their students, both men and women, break down essentializing discourses portraying women as self-sacrificing caregivers and men as controlling disciplinarians or technicians. They would expand limited notions of gender equity to include deeper understandings of femininities/masculinities, sexuality, and sexual orientation. They envision the transformation of teacher education through frank interrogations of the self and society. Within the generally conservative cultures of colleges of education, however, this transformation of teacher education curricula seems unlikely.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Teacher education is currently facing political pressures on several fronts, and there may be gender implications of these pressures for the preservice teacher population and the teacher education curriculum. The first major source of pressure is the contradiction between simultaneous demands for higher standards for teacher education candidates and programs and for less time- and resource-intensive alternatives to teacher education or even open entry without formal teacher preparation. In the United States, this demand is supported by a perennial argument that colleges of education are self-aggrandizing institutions that promote ineffective quackery. More difficult entry and requirements are supposed to professionalize teaching. Easier entry, in contrast, might deprofessionalize teaching in comparison with other fields and diminish the size and mission of colleges of education. Easier entry, however, might also attract men who perceive teacher education as a college program for women. Some programs are recruiting African American men into teaching through alternative routes, even providing salary incentives that may prove controversial.

Another important policy trend is for teacher education programs to be evaluated based on the achievement scores of their graduates' students, according to production function models of education. In the context of market competition, low-quality teacher education programs would presumably be forced out of business if they cannot show that their graduates are academically competitive. This policy trend is likely to have the effect of focusing teacher education curricula more narrowly on content knowledge and technical practices shown through experimental research to produce higher student test scores.

Multicultural, feminist, and other critical approaches to teacher education would be even less likely if teacher education programs make such curricular changes. In addition, teacher education faculty may find it more difficult to find external, particularly federal, support for research on gender, unless they can argue that such studies will contribute to higher achievement outcomes.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Britzman, D.P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Clifford, G. J. (1989). Man/woman/teacher: Gender, family and career in American educational history. In D. Warren (Ed.), *American teachers: Histories of a profession at work* (pp. 293–343). New York: Macmillan.

Clifford, G.J., & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). *Ed school: A brief for professional education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Evans, K. (2002). *Negotiating the self: Identity, sexuality, and emotion in learning to teach.* New York: Routledge Falmer.

Fischman, G.E. (2000). *Imagining teachers: Rethinking gender dynamics in teacher education.* Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ginsburg, M.B., & Lindsay, B. (Eds.). (1995). *The political dimension in teacher education: Comparative perspectives on policy formation, socialization and society.* London: Falmer Press.

Hoffman, N. (1981). *Woman's "true" profession: Voices from the history of teaching.* Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press.

Sikula, J., Buttery, T.J., & Guyton, E. (1996). *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Spring, J. (2005). *The American school, 1642–2004.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1992). *Learning together: A history of coeducation in American public schools.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Peggy Placier

Technology and Computer Science

The complex character of the interaction between gender and technology derives largely from the sprawling, rapidly evolving nature of technology itself. In the United States, "technology" has become synonymous with information technology (IT) and information and communication technology (ICT). Computers are only a subset of this, albeit the most central part. Ironically, the world outside of the United States uses the word "technology" in a much narrower way, and many Americans do not know what ICT stands for. In this essay, "technology" is used in the broad, U.S.-centric sense.

People have been writing and talking about technology-based gender gaps for about 35 years, but almost nobody listened. Then about 10 years ago, someone dreamed up the term "digital divide," and soon lots of attention was given to gaps based upon income, age, and race. While some tried to focus the digital divide movement on gender, journalists and others chose to concentrate on economic divisions within society.

Some believe that the gender gap has disappeared, having heard that men and women are equally likely to be using the Internet. In 2005, the official Web site of the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Technology stated, "The gender divide in computer use has been essentially eliminated, as there is no overall difference between boys and girls in overall use of computers."

Such conclusions are misguided because they fail to recognize that there are many different ways that people relate to technology. Not only do access and mere use matter but so do amount, quality, and appropriateness of use. Not only does opportunity to learn matter but so do acquisition of technology-related skills and understandings. Not only do motivation and preference for different kinds of technology applications matter but so do recruitment and retention into computer science curricula and technology-related jobs. Each of these dimensions is discussed here using those gender-related data that are currently available.

GENDERED ACCESS AND USE

For the first 35 years of computers (1940 to 1975), the principal force underlying computer use was occupation. During that period, men dominated engineering occupations, and computers were the purview of electrical engineers. However, as business and government installed large data processing operations, they needed data entry, and women were relegated to those routine jobs. Eventually they needed lots of computer programmers, and men primarily sought those jobs.

During this early period, computers took up a huge amount of space and cost more than most people could afford; but the microcomputers, later to be called PCs, of the late 1970s changed all that. In the early 1980s, many people took home their first computer, schools acquired them for staff and students, and companies installed them for individual workers. Using computers became not just a matter of occupation but of education, income, and personal preference.

In 1984, the U.S. Census found that among 3 to 17 year olds, 14 percent of American boys used a computer at home but only 9 percent of girls did so. This gender gap grew even larger over the next 10 years as parents sought to steer their boys into "good computer jobs." Parents were more likely to buy their sons a computer than their daughters, and that propensity has continued for at least two decades.

Not only did boys access computers more but they used them for much longer periods of time than girls. Boys took to programming and playing computer games in a big way, but girls tended to use them for practical things like learning and writing. In 1992, The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) conducted the Computers in Education study in about 12 different countries including Austria, Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, India, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Slovenia, and the United States. Students in three different grade levels answered questions about gender equality. Specifically, they were asked if boys or girls (or equally boys and girls) were more likely to play computer games, do computer programming, and use computers for practical work. The students in all countries tended to say boys were more likely to play computer games and do programming but that girls were about equal with boys in using computers for computer jobs.

Interestingly, this gendered pattern still persisted 10 years later in the way people adapted to the Internet. Boys and men continue to be more likely to use the Internet for fun and technical matters like downloading software with girls and women more likely to use it for practical things like searching for health and medical information.

Researchers Chen and Wellman (2003) analyzed Internet usage statistics for the period of the 1990s and the early 2000s for eight countries and made the following conclusions. During this period, the gender gap continued to be "declining yet persistent" in the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan, and China. It was declining in Mexico and persistent or flat in Korea. But most interesting was that the gender gap for Internet use was increasing in Germany and Italy. It is quite likely that the rising gap in these two countries relates to beliefs about gender roles, but it is also possible that it is partly explainable by the slow rise in the use of handheld Internet devices in these two countries.

Statistical trend studies in the United States show that in terms of mere access, the gender gap narrowed across time until it dissipated. But for measures of total time used (e.g., online hours), the gap started very small and progressively got larger. As of 2004 that gap in time spent online had not started to narrow.

As of the summer of 2005, a Pew Internet and American Life survey of adults in the United States concluded that 72 percent used computers and 68 percent used the Internet.

Men were much more likely than women to go online for no particular purpose or to go to a pornographic site, while women were more likely to go online to send e-mail or search for religious or medical information. This suggests that women tend to be more goal oriented and serious, or even more mature, in their utilization of the Internet.

Interestingly, adolescents in the age range of 12 to 17 went online (used the Internet) by 15 percent more than adults in general in 2005. Pew also found that 68 percent of adolescents used the Internet in school. Like their adult counterparts, girls were more likely than boys to engage in practical online activity like searching for college information or talking with classmates about schoolwork. Also, girls were slightly more likely than boys to use home computers for e-mail, word processing, and completing school assignments than playing games.

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) is a UCLA-based survey taken each year by a half million college freshmen across the United States. In 2003, 71 percent of the freshmen women, compared with 60 percent of the men, said they had communicated via e-mail during the past year. Likewise, 86 percent of the women, compared with 80 percent of the men, said they had used the Internet for research or homework during the past year. Thus, education not only helps to close the gender gap but to reverse it, such that women in some facets are using technology more than men.

LEARNING TECHNOLOGY-RELATED SKILLS

Studies in the 1980s found that in the United States boys outnumbered girls by about 2 to 1 in taking elective computer programming courses in middle and high school. The question remains as to whether or not a gender gap could be found in general computer education. The IEA international study mentioned above pioneered a general computer fitness test called the FITT. High school boys scored higher on this test in Austria, Germany, Greece, Japan, Latvia, and the Netherlands, but they were about equal with girls in Bulgaria, India, and the United States. Clearly, the gendering of learning computer skills differs by culture and curriculum.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development conducted an international study called PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) in 2003. In each of about 35 countries, they tested a random sample of 15-year-old students for general problem solving. One part of this test assessed “system analysis and design,” which requires skills and logic very similar to algorithmic thinking and programming. They found that the gender differences in problem solving were generally not large enough to be statistically significant. However, girls outperformed boys in more countries than the other way around. And in some countries—Iceland, Sweden, Norway, and Indonesia—the differences were very large and significant. It is noteworthy that the girls did particularly well in countries with educational systems that have implemented special programs specifically designed to reach gender parity.

The PISA finding that overall girls solved problems better than boys agrees with the findings of a study of Minnesota high school students in the early 1980s. That study found that when computer logic problems were stated in words, girls excelled, but when they were stated in numbers, boys did better. Since that time computer and information systems work has become more and more about logic and text and less about numbers and mathematics. Yet many still hold onto old stereotypes of computer work as mathematical and computer workers as male nerds and geeks.

The PISA study also discovered some other things related to technology and learning. The study found that the 15 year olds in the United States who got higher problem solving scores were more likely to have learned how to use the Internet on their own. Those who had learned it at school or from family tended to perform lower in problem solving. Those who never use the Internet in school did very poorly in problem solving. This suggests that the schools in the United States were not doing as well in teaching students the skills of using the Internet, in large part because many students did not receive any instruction in it. These findings were not found in most other countries where the curriculum tends to include instruction for all students in how to use the Internet.

THE COMPUTER SCIENCE PIPELINE

The flow of students along the routes from high school to college degrees is often called a pipeline, although it would more aptly be labeled a funnel because fewer and fewer students pass through each more advanced educational milestone. When we examine this flow of students by contrasting computer science degrees for men and women, it is appropriate to call it a gendered pipeline because a gender gap persists throughout.

Researchers pointed out 25 years ago that not only did men get advanced degrees in computer science at much higher rates than women, but enrollments in elective computer programming and computer science courses in high school were far from equally gendered. More general, less specialized computer courses tend to have less of a gender gap, in large part because they include instruction in applications like writing and databases, which are topics that are more of interest to the pragmatic minds of high school girls.

The CIRP program mentioned above asked all college freshmen about their probable careers. In 2003, 5.5 percent of the men and 0.5 percent of the women checked “computer programmer or analyst,” and 3.6 percent of men versus 0.4 percent of women checked “computer science” for their “probable career.” This constitutes a gender gap for computer science that is among the highest of projected career paths for freshmen. According to U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, women occupied 20 percent of the IT workforce in 2002. The CIRP findings suggest that the technology labor force gender gap may be even higher in future years.

The principal professional association of computer scientists, the Association for Computing Machinery, started college programming contests in the 1980s, and they were still popular among male students 20 years later. However, women students rarely participate in these contests. While some people infer that men are better at programming than women, a more plausible interpretation is that women are less attracted to cutthroat competition and to the honor that comes from winning such contests.

In the United States, enrollments and degrees earned in BA/BS programs rose in the 1990s but skyrocketed in the late 1990s, coinciding with the so-called “dot.com boom.” In contrast, MA and PhD degrees declined during the 1990s. The gender ratios of those graduating from these various degree programs did not shift dramatically during that time, although during the mid-1990s the percent of women getting bachelor’s degrees did drop. It is especially remarkable that the gender ratios did not shift much because, during that time, not only were the gender gaps very large but many teachers and administrators initiated programs to attract more women.

At the turn of the century, women comprised 16 percent of PhD recipients, 27 percent of MAs, and 19 percent of BA degrees in computer science. In the five years prior and after 2000, those percentages were essentially the same; no major trends up or down were evident. Women may be big users of the Internet, but there are some very strong forces blocking their entrance into either high-level technology jobs or into computer science as a profession.

GENDERING PROCESSES

In an attempt to identify and map the social psychological forces behind the gendering processes related to computers, psychologists have run experiments by getting students to play a game like the Zork adventure game on a computer. When playing the game in private, females did a lot better than males; but when another person was stationed in the room, males performed far better than females. The mere presence of another person degraded female performance even though the other person was on the other side of the room working on something completely different.

Psychologists use the concepts of anxiety and self-confidence to explain this impact of the presence of another person upon computer game performance. They argue that females experienced "great anxiety" because they believed the stereotype that females tended to fail at computer tasks. What they fail to consider is that there are other explanations at least equally valid: Females might have been bored with the game and the person seemed more interesting than the computer; the women were distracted by the mere presence of another person, wondering why the person was in the room; or the women figured out what the experimenter was hoping to find and were trying to please him or her by changing their behavior.

Computer games are not necessarily the best vehicle for understanding how people of different genders respond to computer work. Furthermore, other factors like social class or race may work together with gender to produce major effects. For example, Bird and Jorgenson (2003) found that among working-class families, men were more resistant than women to both recreational and work-related uses of the Internet.

WORKPLACE IMPLICATIONS OF GENDERED TECHNOLOGY

While some technology-based gender gaps have disappeared, many gender-based digital gaps remain. Some would attribute these gaps to female temerity and anxiety, but a careful review of the data reveals that structural conditions like occupation and school curricula shape the gendering process. In addition, cultural forces, such as simplistic stereotypes, make it very difficult for girls and women to participate equally in technology opportunities.

In general, in the U.S., boys continue to be more likely than girls to have and to use computers at home. While students may get equal exposure to technology coursework in the early grades, by the time they reach the middle school years, the character of the technology activities they pursue at school has already begun to divide along gender lines.

By the time these students graduate from college, four times as many men receive computer science degrees as do women. Since the choice jobs in the computer and Internet industries require college degrees, the character of the workplace remains as gendered as it did before.

Aside from the moral and political implications of the gendered technology pipeline from kindergarten to the workplace, there are serious labor force inadequacies that derive from underutilization of women. United States policy has encouraged both overseas outsourcing and the immigration of computer workers from other countries to deal with national shortages of computer workers. These policies arguably have not worked well.

A more well-rounded, and perhaps more sensible, approach would be to invest in ways to ungender the computer pipeline.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Association of University Women. (2000). *Tech-savvy: Educating girls in the new computer age.* Retrieved from http://www.aauw.org/research/girls_education/techsavvy.cfm

Anderson, R.E. (1987). Females surpass males in computer problem solving. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 3*(1), 39–51.

Anderson, R.E., Lundmark, V., Harris, L., & Magnan, S. (1994). Inequity in computing. In C. Huff & T. Finholt, *Social issues in computing* (pp. 352–385). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bird, S.E., & Jorgenson, J. (2003). Extending the school day: Gender, class, and the incorporation of technology in everyday life. In M. Consolvo & S. Paasonen (Eds.), *Women and everyday uses of the Internet* (pp. 255–274). New York: Peter Lang.

Chen, W., & Wellman, B. (2003). *Digital divides and digital dividends.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto, Centre for Urban and Community Studies.

Consaluo, M., & Paasonen, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Women and everyday uses of the Internet: Agency and identity.* New York: Peter Lang.

Margolis, J., & Fisher, A. (2002). *Unlocking the clubhouse, women in computing.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Morris, H.H., & Lee, P. (2004). The incredibly shrinking pipeline is not just for women anymore. *Computing Research News, 16*(3): 20–22.

Ray, S.G. (2003). *Gender inclusive game design.* Herdon, VA: Charles River Media.

Ronald E. Anderson

Theatre and Drama

The field of theatre and drama in education has been largely associated with and dominated by women. While the field is, in the West, traditionally periodized as a twentieth-century phenomenon, an impressive list of female playwrights, educators, and practitioners preceded this periodization including Hroswitha von Gandersheim in twelfth-century Germany, Stéphanie Félicité Ducrest, Comptesse de Genlis in eighteenth-century France, Maria Edgeworth in early nineteenth-century England, and the educated women who were running the settlement houses in late nineteenth-century America.

Clearly not all pioneers in the field were women. By and large, however, the ratio of women working in the field has outweighed that of men, with the historiographically interesting and critical observation that a comparatively large number of historians and scholars writing *about* these women and their activities, particularly in the latter half of the twentieth century, have been men. This in and of itself suggests at least two underlying assumptions related to gender and bias in the field: one, that women are better, or even naturally, suited to *work* with and for children and youth; and two, that *scholarship* in the field is a male prerogative or, alternatively, that men are in a better position to disseminate history and scholarship. Although the latter is changing, the field of theater and drama education operates under a number of deeply ingrained, gendered assumptions and perceptions that, on one level, assume an ontological relationship among women, children, and education and, on another level, presuppose it as an alternative refuge for those (male) students who are "not into sports."

While the practice of teaching children and youth on the primary and secondary levels remains a female prerogative, the theorizing and teaching of theatre and drama methods in theatre education programs has become more diversified. The training programs of prospective theatre and drama teachers, indeed teachers in general, at most accredited institutions aim to foster sensitivity to inclusion and diversity. The current attention in these programs to feminist practices, gender diversification, and sexual orientation—along with discussions on race, class, and ability—filter down to the primary and secondary education students. Gender sensitive teachers no longer perceive students a priori as heterosexual future husbands and wives in traditionally prescribed role patterns but teach for a multiplicity of gender identities and relationships. While the traditional dramatization of fairy tales and folk stories often reinforce a gendered perception of the world, a number of materials have become available that counter that perception and foster notions of inclusion and possibilities in young people. Devised performances by students in high schools, whether in class or produced in public, demonstrate a critical pedagogy approach. They also stand in sharp contrast to the annual plays and musicals that are the public face of the high school theatre program.

Before examining gender-conscious teaching practices in more detail, it is useful to discuss the separate meaning and educational goals of drama and theatre and explicate the ways in which gender and diversity play out in school curricula.

DRAMA, THEATRE, AND THE PERFORMANCE OF GENDER

The terms *theatre* and *drama* are often linked, especially in higher education, but they do not necessarily refer to the same concepts on the primary and secondary levels, or in teacher education. Winifred Ward (1884–1975), one of the first women in the field with a university appointment (at Northwestern University), articulated in the late 1920s a difference between theatre and what she termed creative drama, or creative dramatics. Albeit modified, this separation has been maintained over the years, with *theatre* referring to formal productions, scripted or devised by the performers with an outside audience in mind, and *drama* (creative drama, improvisation with youth, process drama, holistic drama, drama in education, educational drama) referring to informal drama activities that may or may not be shared within the group. In drama, the performance is not the ultimate goal. Instead, goals can vary from enhancing understanding of curricular material—for example, through the use of dramatization and role play in history or social studies—to fostering behavioral understanding by offering acting perspectives—for example, the use of a variety of drama techniques in prevention programs—to more discipline-specific objectives such as creating characters or structuring scenes.

Although both drama and theatre can be taught at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels, there is an upward scale from informal drama to formal theatre across the (age) levels. Few primary schools have a certified drama teacher, and annual concerts are often put together by the music teachers. An increasing number of elementary school teachers, however, are using drama methods to enhance their curriculum. Many teacher education programs offer drama as an elective or, in a few cases, mandatory methods course in their elementary education training programs. At the middle school level, one can find both drama and theatre courses, although this is hardly a consistent phenomenon and very school dependent. At the high school level, drama classes are dramatic literature classes, while theatre classes are generally taught by certified theatre teachers who are often more performance directed. The epitome of high school theatre is, in most cases, the school play or musical that has, in some instances, expanded to an extraordinarily big business involving tens of thousands of dollars.

Drama, as well as theatre, is a performative discipline. Because of its performative nature, drama can teach for multiple representations and understandings of important questions, topics, and themes. Several feminist writers, both academic and populist, have pointed out how boys and girls are taught to perform their gender according to societal norms and expectations. Whether it is because of the punitive consequences of performing one's gender wrong (Butler, 1990) or because of the desire to please that turns girls into "female impersonators" (Pipher, 1994) or because of the whole range of media images and societal expectations that reinforce the "Boy Code" (Pollack, 1998), boys and girls perform their expected roles often to the exclusion of alternative choices.

Drama is often advocated as "a rehearsal for living," a safe place where young people can experiment with, rather than conform to, societal roles and expectations. As such, it can offer a space where situations, actions, and consequences can be played out in numerous variations. It does not make claims to "universal truths," but it can function as a metaphorical site for students to make connections within themselves and build relationships with the world around them. "Drama creates forms symbolic of human feelings," wrote Susan Langer in the mid-1950s. While she may not have had drama in education in mind, human feelings and experiences are the tools of drama.

Nevertheless, some words of caution are necessary. Throughout the ages, educational theatre and drama has been posited as an instrument of moral and ethical education. Less frequently, if at all, have theatre and drama teachers been asked to consider whose morals and ethics they are addressing and where their own biases and assumptions shine through. In addition, little attention was given to gender or the notion that gender constructions are neither fixed nor stable and that they transform over time and under different material conditions. The sociocultural and ideological (drama) contexts in which gender relations are enacted generate different interpretations. It is imperative that this diversity in gendered experience is recognized in drama and theatre curricula and teaching practices.

GENDER AND DIVERSITY IN SCHOOL CURRICULA

Recently, research from other disciplines, most notably psychology, sociology, and the neurosciences, started to corroborate what drama practitioners have been purporting for decades. Based on this research, various new learning theories have been developed or revisited, ranging from Glasser control theory, to problem-based learning, to constructivism (see van de Water, 2001). One of the more interesting and fascinating aspects for drama and theatre teachers regarding these theories of learning is that they, albeit rather inexplicitly, legitimize drama as an enhancing teaching strategy. For teachers concerned with gender equity the use of drama strategies, such as role play, image work (tableaux), spotlight, hot-seating, and parallel play (see van de Water, 2001), is a valuable consciousness-raising technique, which is child centered and rooted in life-like experiences. It is one thing to talk to students about assumed gender behaviors but quite a different thing to allow them to perform a multiplicity of gender roles and relationships (the "gender flip" is a popular exercise in this context) and take that as a jumping-off point for further exploration on gender roles in society. A gender inclusive praxis of drama education will incorporate the idea that there are multiple sites of power and knowledge. Gender sensitive drama/theatre teachers can use drama techniques, brain-based learning, and feminist praxis to foster gender equity in their classrooms and contest the dominant gender paradigms that are perpetually reinforced by social, cultural, ideological, economic, and political forces.

The way issues of gender and diversity play out in school curricula is very uneven and bound to the specific material circumstances (ideological, social, economic, cultural, political) and community expectations under which the various curricula are interpreted and implemented. Thus, one can find primary school teachers in liberal progressive Midwestern towns who dramatize *Heather Has Two Mommies* in their classrooms while the local high school play features stereotypical gendered impersonations by adolescent actors either in one of the three musicals that are most popular in U.S. high schools—*Bye Bye Birdie, Cinderella,* and *Guys and Dolls*—or in the two most frequently performed plays at U.S. high schools in the twentieth century, *You Can't Take It with You* and *Our Town.*

The limited research available on gender and theatre and drama education suggests that the issue of inclusion and exclusion is most visibly played out at the high school level and most hidden at the primary school level. In contrast to other Western countries where high school drama/theatre is either a mandatory subject or an elective and where the school play, if any, is often scripted by students for students, in the United States the school play is often one of the most important events in the high school theatre curriculum, legitimating the discipline. Jennifer Chapman (2005) in her dissertation "The Theatre Kids: Heteronormativity in High School Theatre" interrogates the pervasiveness of heteronormativity in high school theatre study and play production. She points to the discrepancy between the adolescent experience and the plays and musicals they are to perform. Chapman notes that the field of theatre/drama education lacks significant research about the roles that gender and sexuality play in teaching, learning, and play production. This is the more remarkable since high school theatre, whether as a curricular subject or as the extracurricular drama club, is often seen as, what Chapman calls, an "unmasculine" space, an alternative to sports and a welcome environment for those who do not perform their gender "well."

Students who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered or who otherwise contest stereotypical gender roles and behaviors are asked to put all activism aside and embody and embrace the (hetero)sexualized roles and behaviors the plays demand. Students who do identify with traditional gender roles are simply confirmed in their stances and are not asked to either challenge or expand their thinking. Few drama specialists specifically ask for teachers to be sensitive to the representation of gender and sexuality in the plays and dramas they chose. One problem is that in performance, as in life, issues of diversity and inclusion (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ability) often arise simultaneously. Is a scene in which a bunch of White guys invite some Black girls to tag along racist, sexist, classist, or none of these? Changes in context will render different answers but will not erase other possibilities and points of view. The drama teacher needs to be sensitive to the endless array of interpretations and address these rather than ignore them.

GENDER-CONSCIOUS TEACHING PRACTICES

The high school is, in most cases, the first place on the educational ladder where issues of gender and diversity as well as sexual orientation can be openly addressed, although this is very site specific. At the elementary school level, the issue is most frequently ignored. Despite the official antidiscrimination policy, gender is mostly addressed in terms of "typical" boy and girl behaviors. Sharon Grady in her groundbreaking work, *Drama and Diversity: A Pluralistic Perspective for Educational Drama* (2000), geared toward elementary and middle school teachers, points out how teachers, parents, and caregivers inadvertently contribute to gender role stereotyping and how drama can intervene and contest gendered assumptions and expectations. Grady warns that teachers need to stay alert and continuously educate themselves about gender equity issues to create environments where young people can build their own awareness of gender and identity. Grady's work is the only work to date that specifically deals with drama and gender construction at the primary school level.

At the secondary level several sources have become available in the past few years. Paula Ressler (2002) gives a number of lesson plans and practical strategies for incorporating drama across the curriculum—from English, social studies, art, music, and dance to physical education, health, and guidance group. Her approach is heavily influenced by the British drama/theatre in education movement, which is child centered and primarily concerned with teaching life skills using theatre and drama techniques rather than teaching theatre and drama skills per se. One of the early and most influential proponents of the British Drama in Education Movement, Dorothy Heathcote, has been criticized for her exclusive terminology such as "brotherhoods," "life is a man in a mess," and, in particular, the "restrictively essentialist and phallocentric" notion that drama gives access to universal truths (Nicholson, 1995; see also Fletcher, 1995). The feminist drama critics of the mid-1990s met with fierce opposition from the establishment in the drama field. According to Helen Nicholson, leading feminist drama scholar in the United Kingdom, drama was thought immune from matters of gender because of the interest in child-centered education, leading to a homogenization of the "child," undifferentiated in terms of gender (and race, for that matter). Nicholson and Fletcher were among the first drama teachers and scholars to openly recognize gender bias in educational drama and theatre praxis based on British paradigms.

In the past decade, a number of teacher/researchers have published books and articles on their own gender-conscious teaching practices and the impact on their students. Jeanne Klein, editor of *Youth Theatre Journal*—the annual journal of the American Alliance for Theatre and Education—designated the 1998 issue a "Gender Issue," recognizing the limited scholarship published in the field. Kathleen Gallagher (2000) wrote a book based on two years of extensive observation of her tenth-grade drama class at a Canadian single-sex Catholic secondary school for girls. Jo-Beth Gonzalez (2006) writes extensively about her experimentations with gender roles in what she terms the "Critically Conscious Production-Oriented Classroom." Seminal publications like these continue to sensitize theatre and drama teachers to gender inclusive teaching practices, but it may also be clear that notions of gender construction and the accompanying biases and assumptions are formed long before secondary education. It is therefore crucial that more research is done on creating gender inclusive classrooms at the primary school level and on how drama as a performative activity can contest early bias and exclusion. Educating gender sensitive drama teachers at the college level is but the first step. Contesting societal discourse that reinforces exclusionary teaching practices is another step. The goal of drama teaching will then focus less on perceived universalities and changing personal values and more on offering insights into different cultural practices (Nicholson, 1995).

In 2001 at the International Drama/Theatre in Education conference in Bergen, the feminist Special Interest Group reflected current debates by putting an emphasis on gendered identities rather than exclusively female experiences. The group contended that in many educational and community contexts, participants' experiences of drama and theatre is influenced by their gender. Through intercultural dialogue, drama educators formulated the following questions:

- How might we recognize the range of feminisms currently informing thinking and dramatic practices?
- How do political issues associated with gender vary in different social, cultural, and artistic contexts?
- How might the relationship between the processes of working in drama and theatre forms take account of gender and sexuality? (Bundy & Nicholson, 2003)

Attention to these questions in theatre and drama curricula at all levels of education will lead to fairer and more inclusive teaching practices not only with respect to gender but also with respect to race, class, sexual orientations, and national and cultural identities.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bundy, P., & Nicholson, H. (2003). New images and old lies: Gender and drama education. In H. Heikkinen (Ed.), *Special interest fields of drama, theatre and education* (pp. 68–84). Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylä University Press.

Butler, J. (1990). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. In S.E. Case (Ed.), *Performing feminisms: Feminist critical theory and theatre* (pp. 270–282). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Chapman, J. (2005). *The theatre kids: Heteronormativity in high school theatre.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Fletcher, H. (1995). Retrieving the mother/other from the myths and margins of the seal wife drama. *NADIE Journal, 19*(2), 25–38.

Gallagher, K. (2000). *Drama education and the lives of girls.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Gonzalez, J.B. (2006). *Temporary stages: Departing from tradition in high school theatre education.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Grady, S. (2003). Accidental Marxists?: The challenge of critical and feminist pedagogies for the practice of applied drama. *Youth Theatre Journal, 17,* 65–81.

Grady, S. (2000). *Drama and diversity: A pluralistic perspective for educational drama.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Klein, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Youth Theatre Journal, 12*.

Langer, S. (1953). *Feeling and form: A theory of art.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Nicholson, H. (1995). Performative acts: Drama education and gender. *The NADIE Journal Australia, 19*(1), 27–37.

Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Pollack, W.S. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood.* New York: Henry Holt.

Ressler, P. (2002). *Dramatic changes: Talking about sexual orientation and gender identity with high school students.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

van de Water, M. (2001). *Drama in education reader.* Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Manon van de Water

Visual Arts

As in many fields, the women's movement of the 1970s has had an enormous impact on the visual arts. The movement raised consciousness about many gender-related issues, particularly issues of gender equity. Among art educators, these gender issues included the status or professional equity of women, student equity, the ways in which women are represented in art, and the curricular equity of art as a subject. In the ensuing years, this raised consciousness led to actions that achieved some improvements in professional equity, student equity, and women's representation in art, although the curricular equity of art as a subject seems to be declining under the impact of recent governmental policies.

Beyond earlier efforts to increase consciousness about the need for the four kinds of equity mentioned above and discussed below, feminist theories, vision, and practices have continued to energize ongoing efforts to foster personal and social change. A broad array of feminist concerns are now having an impact on the ways in which gender is constructed in the visual arts. These concerns include identity, sexuality, the body, agency, and the intersection of gender issues with other identities and politics that include race, sexuality, economic status, and environment. Recognition of these issues has profoundly affected the way in which art and visual culture are understood and studied and the kinds of leadership for social change that are being exerted by feminist artists and educators.

PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF WOMEN ART EDUCATORS

In U.S. higher education, art faculty are found in departments or programs of art education, art history, and studio art. The total number of male art faculty in these three areas is greater than the total number of female art faculty, although the gap has narrowed since the late 1970s. When these areas are considered separately, however, women art educators and art historians are found to outnumber their male colleagues, but males still dominate studio teaching despite the fact that more women than men graduate with terminal (MFA) degrees in studio art and three-quarters of PhDs in the arts are awarded to women. White non-Hispanic men and women continue to disproportionately outnumber their Hispanic and non-White colleagues when compared to population data and to graduates with terminal degrees in the area of specialization. Faculty salaries, another indicator of status equity, are slightly lower for females than males at all ranks.

STUDENTS IN THE VISUAL ARTS

In eighth-grade assessments of the arts, females' scores are higher than those of males in all art-related subjects, and Asian students score higher than other ethnic groups. Among high school students, female students' participation in the arts outweighs that of males, with females earning more high school credits in the arts and taking more extracurricular art classes. White, non-Hispanic women are participating in the arts at higher rates than Hispanic and non-White women. Fewer students now take arts classes than they did in 1980.

Some studies indicate that boys and girls exhibit different preferences in color, subjects depicted, detail orientation, and willingness to experiment. Other studies indicate that when working in mixed gender groups, boys frequently assume leadership positions while girls feel they should cooperate. High school girls are more likely than boys to know, understand, and value the qualities a teacher is looking for in their work; to value discussing their art with their teachers; and to value group critiques. Most researchers emphasize that interests and skills are learned, not inherent. Students' ideas and responses are influenced by gender assumptions found in visual culture. As well, the "hidden curriculum" reinforces the socialization of students into gender roles, and teachers often unintentionally show preferences for certain gender-related skills or learning styles.

Lessons that stereotype continue through tertiary art education. Although the sexist practices in university art classes described in 1975 by Judy Chicago are less blatant, they continue in insidious ways. Expectations for "important" studio art favor large, expensive to make, nonfunctional artwork, qualities valued as male. Women art students struggle with thinking of themselves as artists.

Gender scholars recommend teachers pay careful attention to nonsexist language, to gender-value messages conveyed to girls and boys, to types and amounts of attention given boys and girls, and to learning and behavior expectations communicated to boys and girls. They also suggest that teachers carefully review teaching content and resources to include a variety of roles for women, including leadership and artist roles. Many art educators have developed methods of teaching that address multiple identities and learning styles such as teacher knowledge about students' different cultural backgrounds and the use of autobiography focused on a positive relationship with life experiences and strategies to nurture relationships among dissimilar life experiences.

GENDER REPRESENTATION IN VISUAL ARTS

One way of assessing equity, and a foundational area of feminist art and film theory, is through studying the representation of women in art and film. Male gaze theory has offered a theoretical foundation for how women are viewed and objectified in the arts. Informal surveys indicate that in 1989, 85 percent of the nudes in the modern and contemporary sections of New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art were women; in 2004, 83 percent were female. Children Now, a children's advocacy group, found that women are represented in a broad cross-section of media as preoccupied with romance and personal appearance rather than with school or jobs. These findings are notable in that the media play a significant role in the way that society, and in particular youth, views and constructs notions of women as well as people of non-European cultures and ethnicities. Similar research in education and cultural studies links girls' perceptions of self and body image to ideals presented through advertising and other venues of popular culture.

Additionally, the interests targeted in films, television, and music videos are most often those of teenaged boys.

Examination of the representation of the female body in art and visual culture remains an important content issue in the arts and visual culture. Many feminist artists turned to performance art in the 1970s, in which the female body was the primary art medium. The use of the female body, however, became suspect when, following Laura Mulvey's analysis of the male gaze, feminist artists and theoreticians felt that any representation of the female body could play into fetishism. Moreover, the influence of postmodern theory on feminism led to a distancing of the body as material for making art. In the late 1980s and 1990s, some feminist artists explored the body through abjection and flow in order to disrupt the male gaze and fetishism. For example, photographer Cindy Sherman depicted the female body as ugly, gross, or mechanically sexualized. Representation of the body as enactment of particular embodied subjects and as a means by which gender is visualized through social codes and is connected to mind in expressing gender is replacing ideas of the male gaze and fetishism. At the same time, newer feminist artists are playing with intersections of "feminist" and "femininity."

CURRICULAR EQUITY OF THE VISUAL ARTS

With the passage of the nationally legislated *Goals 2000: Educate America Act,* the arts were acknowledged as a core subject. Still, school subjects associated with men, masculine virtues, rationality, and intellectual achievements (mathematics and sciences) are valued more in schools and in funding initiatives than subjects associated with women (arts and humanities). Girls (and boys) are typically encouraged to take courses in the sciences, mathematics, and technology rather than art. High school graduation and college entrance policies give more weight to "core" subjects such as math and science than to the arts. In some cases, the arts are not included in calculating high school grade-point averages, and advanced placement arts courses do not weigh equally with those in other subjects. Many states do not require the arts for high school graduation. Because the No Child Left Behind legislation, enacted by the U.S. Congress and signed by President Bush in 2001, assesses whether students are making "adequate yearly progress" by testing them only in reading, mathematics, and science, other subject areas, such as arts, are vulnerable to cuts not just in budget but in curricular time and in their status as subjects within the curriculum.

FEMINIST VISIONS AND PRACTICES

The impact of feminism on the visual arts goes well beyond concerns with gender representation and gender equity for art educators, art students, and curricular areas. As feminist theory has developed, it has supplemented the question of whether males and females are treated equally with a more complex and nuanced understanding of the meaning of gender. Feminism has also affected the ways in which the visual arts have come to be defined and taught and the kinds of leadership now exerted by feminist educators. A new vision of the role of feminists in the visual arts has emerged that stresses their potential as leaders for innovative social change and social justice.

Since the 1970s, the feminist art movement has argued that the way that "important art" was defined privileged men's styles, subjects, and genres over women's historical art production, which was limited by how women's roles in society were defined. In art education, "visual culture/visual culture education" and "material culture/material culture education" take into consideration a much broader spectrum of objects and practices.

"Visual culture" takes into its definition art, popular culture, performing arts, film, architecture, and material culture. The approach to visual culture education is critical pedagogy, focused on developing students' critical consciousness and active involvement in challenging beliefs and practices that dominate, including those that affect gender. While the definition of visual culture includes material culture, material culture studies are oriented slightly differently, privileging many senses, not just the visual, emphasizing commonplace objects and expressions found in our daily lives (whereas visual culture in practice emphasizes popular mainstream culture), and takes an anthropological approach to study. Both "visual" and "material culture" are welcomed by feminist art educators because they broaden the objects of study and include a deeper understanding of gender in their study.

Feminism and gender in art education today exist in an ecology of research and practices undergirded by similar values that revolve around social justice and social reconstruction. For feminism, this means pluralistic and diverse identities, identities that are fragmented and ambiguous. The binaries that defined gender in early feminism (for example, male/female) would be naive in this expanded context. Further, feminism informs many art educators but may not be explicit or singled out in their research and practice. Art educators continue to document and make visible the lives and artistic expressions of women from diverse backgrounds and perspectives: lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender identities; ethnic, racial, and national identities; differing abilities; rural and urban identities; and age. Although sexuality and the erotic are explored in feminist art, they are not developed within art education. All identities are understood as intersectional and impermanent as well as sociohistoric constructions that intersect with their time and place. Further, identity intersects individual and social life issues and the environment.

Feminist administration in art education—not unlike feminist leadership in other disciplines—balances power, authority, and vision with communication, collaboration, sharing power with and empowering others, acting responsibly, and ethics of care and love. The personal and the professional are both invested in this process. Not limited to administrators, feminist leadership in teachers involves teachers finding their own voices, developing a sense of agency, taking initiative, determining how and what they will teach, as well as using reflective practice. Leadership also develops from networking in teacher communities, peer coaching, and collaborative projects.

Important to teaching youth today is reaching them and helping them look more closely at gender issues as well as being open to the changing understanding and practice of contemporary feminism. The status quo of schools, as well as the demands of testing and accountability and parent and student expectations, means that there has been little systematic implementation of feminist art and pedagogy in elementary and secondary school education.

Feminist art and visual culture pedagogy is an interdisciplinary location that is multiple and in continual motion, moving around practices of feminist social change. It encompasses emotional and personal dimensions, self-knowledge, learning in great depth, critical reflection, and developing a sense of social justice and a view of the world as a community. Art and visual culture are studied in relation to social and cultural contexts as well as to lived experiences. Images studied come from a variety of locations and makers, multiple interpretations are possible, contextual inquiry is stressed, and the possibilities of social justice through art are continually raised.

Teaching about women artists and their accomplishments is a common way to incorporate gender into the art classroom but should not be the only strategy used. Strategies to build a context of understanding gender in relation to art and visual culture include studying women artists from a variety of backgrounds, considering how women are represented in art and visual culture, considering physical attributes of artworks such as media and size, analyzing language in writings about the work as well as the extent to which a work or genre is written about and where such writing appears, the values represented in the work and in writing about it, and what is not presented. Rather than emphasizing "talented" students' work, feminist teachers show women artists at work, include different roles that artists play in societies across the globe, teach that fame is not necessarily a marker of a good artist, guide students to question art historical "truths" that are often based on tradition and opinion rather than fact, and engage all students in serious dialogue about art. The embeddedness of gender stereotypes as signs in visual culture and discourse about art can lead students to explore how they brought their own gender stereotypes to art interpretations. Using a variety of strategies, feminist teachers serve as facilitators in involving students in planning their art experiences. Outside of the classroom, art teachers are encouraged to talk together about their teaching experiences and each other's art.

The number of resources about women artists for educational use has increased in the past 20 years, although the means is generally to add women artists and artists of color without changing or questioning the contexts of high art that are focused on artist as genius and sole creator. Internet resources provide the potential to overcome publishers' image choices, and these can include local and hidden stream art as well as feminist pedagogical approaches to learning.

Gender study in art and visual culture education engages community and collaboration, seeks social justice, and values differences between people as well as challenges hegemony, stereotyping, and oppression. Education plays an important role in achieving a just society. To be relevant to learners today and in the future, feminist art and visual culture pedagogy must be flexible and multiple in its definition and strategies, recognizing gender as multiply located and that gender intersects with other political, social, cultural, and identity issues.

Knowledge of gender and feminist issues in art and visual culture continues to be an important foundation for social change. Feminist practices grow out of real issues relevant to the lives of students, teachers, artists, and administrators committed to social change. Thus, a vision for feminist change in art and visual culture includes classroom strategies that help learners question their own assumptions, reflect on their art making practices, and formulate their own visions for social change. To guide this process, teachers must be prepared to expect and value different behaviors in their students and to value their gendered differences.

We need to hold on to the activism for social justice change that was the real strength of feminism a generation ago, not in a reactive way, but in inventive, creative ways. In the classroom, a disruptive approach that engages multiple ways of learning and media that fall outside the traditional purview of arts education—for example, zines, blogs, culture jamming, hacktivism, public service announcements, public art, humor—can help free students' and teachers' approaches to art expression and critical response.

Feminists in the visual arts must develop leadership capabilities as teachers, artists/visual culture makers, writers, community members, and administrators. The leadership styles they cultivate must emphasize a connective, relational style in which those with whom they work and teach find their own voices and visions as well as a sense of agency. Feminist art leadership involves developing innovative, reflective, caring strategies that establish gender equity for a collaborative community of learners, especially our future citizens in PK–12 schools.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Broude, N., & Garrard, M. (Eds.). (1994). *The power of feminist art: The American movement of the 1970s, history and impact.* New York: Abrams.

Collins, G., & Sandell, R. (Eds.). (1996). *Gender issues in art education: Content, contexts, and strategies.* Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Dalton, P. (2001). *The gendering of art education: Modernism, identity and critical feminism.* Buckingham, England, & Philadelphia: Open University.

Garber, E., Sandell, R., Stankiewicz, M. A., & Risner, D. (2007). Gender equity in visual art and dance education. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving gender equity through education.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grauer, K., Irwin, R., & Zimmerman, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Women art educators V: Remembering, revisioning, reconsidering.* Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Isaak, J. A. (1996). *Feminism and contemporary art: The revolutionary power of women's laughter.* New York: Routledge.

Jones, A. (Ed.). (2002). *The feminism and visual culture reader.* New York: Routledge.

Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. *Screen, 16*(3), 6–18.

Saccá, E. J., & Zimmerman, E. (Eds.). (1998). *Women art educators IV: Herstories, ourstories, future stories.* Boucherville, Québec: Canadian Society for Education through Art.

Elizabeth Garber

Renee Sandell

Vocational Education

The ways schools prepare students for work matter a great deal for women. The occupational segregation, lower pay, and lack of status that most women experience at work have been fundamental to their lack of power in both the public and private spheres. Too often, schools simply reflect and reproduce the divisions of the workplace, disadvantaging women, as well as minority students, the poor, and other marginal groups. The disadvantage is recreated each generation by providing different groups of students with different amounts of education and with different kinds of education that set them on their way into different kinds of jobs. In poor countries, women are more likely than men to be illiterate and poorly educated. In wealthier countries, women often receive as much education as men, but the kind of education they receive sets them apart, on a trajectory into "pink collar work," overwhelmingly female employment ghettos.

Schools prepare everyone for jobs, directly or indirectly. What is usually labeled "vocational education" prepares students for working-class, less-privileged, lower-paying jobs, not professional jobs that require university education. In vocational classrooms, students are explicitly prepared for the workplace. The curriculum deals explicitly with what employers expect, what workers need to know, and how students come to understand the social and technical issues they will face at work. Vocational education takes place in secondary schools, in some community colleges or technical institutes, and with private providers.

Vocational courses remain a bastion of single-sex education because they reflect divisions in the labor market. Courses in auto mechanics, metalwork, and carpentry, as well as apprenticeships and technical training, are filled with young men. Young women study hairdressing, child care, foods, sales, and, overwhelmingly, clerical work. The reasons for the gendered enrollments are clear. Young women tend to want jobs in the female sector of the job market, the courses are available, and the admission standards recognize and reward their backgrounds and abilities. Young women are encouraged by parents, employers, friends, and teachers to choose these jobs; and the young women themselves most often tell researchers they see more potential for employment, flexibility for domestic responsibilities, and satisfaction in traditionally female workplaces. Young men gravitate to male fields for similar reasons, because of the access and the social relations of those workplaces, as well as the pay and status.

One way to promote gender equity in vocational education is to work toward diminishing the sexual segregation that is so prevalent. Encouraging young women in a wider variety of job areas, opening up opportunities for employment for women in nontraditional areas, providing nontraditional role models, emphasizing the rewards of nontraditional employment, and developing a more gender-sensitive curriculum are important initiatives that will increase the options for some young women, and ultimately men. Some strides have been made in this domain as young men enroll in food preparation courses and young women try carpentry or learn to operate large machinery. The success of these initiatives requires change in such concrete organizational issues as timetables, admissions policies, and curriculum, as well as requiring change in the beliefs and assumptions of teachers, students, and employers. Although some change has occurred, there has not been nearly as much decrease in the sexual segregation of working-class jobs, such as carpenter, secretary, and construction worker, as there has been in the sexual segregation of professional jobs, such as doctor, lawyer, and principal.

Another approach to gender equity requires an even more thoroughgoing reevaluation of vocational curricula. Instead of encouraging women to move to male areas of work in order to achieve equal rewards, it encourages increased recognition and rewards for female areas of work. Vocational education can make visible the skills that are necessary for the jobs women do, equipping women with the sensibility and competencies to fight for their rights and insist on the value of their work. This approach means revisiting the nature of the workplace from the point of view of the women who work there, changing the curriculum from a series of tasks and skills to be mastered to a recognition of the social, intellectual, and technical skills that allow women to accomplish their work. It challenges the nature of "vocational" curriculum instead of challenging the gendered composition of the students who go through it.

The distinction between liberal and vocational education arose in the class system of the Greeks. Aristotle prescribed a liberal education for the citizens and a vocational education for the slaves, the foreigners, and the women. Women's education was considered vocational because women, like slaves and craftsmen, were one of the instruments necessary for the production and reproduction of a free or rational life (for men). As women's role was to serve men, their education was to remain practical in its orientation, firmly separated from men's and lower in status. Both liberal and vocational education suffer from this classical distinction. It deprives the liberally educated person of an education for action, while it deprives the vocationally educated person of an education for thought. It reflects the strict hierarchies of the Greeks, not the interdependent, democratic, and industrially developed world of today.

There is a long tradition of female education being vocational, related to women's future work as wives, mothers, teachers, nurses, and secretaries. All women have been expected to learn about cooking, sewing, and child care. As women were not considered long-term employees and did not have the economic power to insist that employers provide on-the-job training, employers did not invest in on-the-job training of women. Public education filled the gap. The result is a pattern of public provision of vocational courses for work traditionally done by women, while little on-the-job training is available or required in the female sector of the labor market.

The expansion of vocational education took place in the context of technological change and industrialization in the early twentieth century. Its justification drew on the technical and industrial skills that workers needed to cope with these changes, and a large part of the education that was introduced was clerical. Today, the rhetoric of vocational education still emphasizes the specification of technical skills, skills that can be defined clearly, graded “objectively,” and traded profitably in the labor market. The vocational education of women is forced into this mold, although it applies much better, if still very imperfectly, to men’s work.

Much of the discussion about what should be taught in vocational courses is about trying to construct accurately what jobs require. Course catalogs describe secretarial and clerical courses in clearly job-related ways. Courses will cover “as many types of written language projects as are relevant to office work”; students who graduate “should be capable of handling books in a small business firm”; and the course “qualifies a student for a standard secretarial position.”

Although students’ “employability” dominates curriculum discourse, its meaning is not obvious. What kinds of knowledge and skills and beliefs and attitudes does it entail? An instructor’s assessment of the nature of office work, of the capacities and interests of her students. and of employers’ responsibilities all inform her account of what this entails. What is “needed” by the employer to get the work done faster is different from what is “needed” by the worker herself to feel in control of the work process. What a woman needs in order to cope with sexual harassment and take advantage of promotion opportunities is different from what a man in her office needs to preserve his privileged access to power. Each of these accounts of what is needed might be different again from what is needed by the consumer of the services that are produced by the company. Whose needs count?

Clerical and secretarial work involves a wide variety of types of jobs and activities, and attempts to define the work have been fraught with tension. Typing, basic accounting, formatting documents, and filing are commonly part of what the work involves. These specific technical skills are inextricably entwined with intellectual and interpersonal competencies that go well beyond these technical skills. Thus, the work women have actually done as secretaries, clerical workers, and service workers is not best described as routine and technical. The tasks are varied, requiring complex intellectual and social competencies that are learned over time, in context. When vocational education amounts to a focus on technique and the requirements of the employer, it reifies working activities, takes them out of their context, and makes them an end in themselves. It separates the execution of tasks from thinking about them and the social relations of work from its accomplishment.

The specification of skills is always and everywhere an evaluative process that involves reducing a varied set of activities to a few definable and hierarchically valued capacities. Some workers have more power to insist on the skilled nature of their jobs than do other workers. Skill designations give status and importance to work. They are also used to justify and specify the length and type of educational requirements. Any official version of skill requirements is partial and interested. Pay equity schemes have been one mechanism for putting the discussion of skill back on the table and trying to revalue the things women do.

There are many structural pressures encouraging instructors of vocational education courses to take the point of view of employers in assessing what should be in the curriculum. They need to ensure that their students are hired. They need the support of the business community. Many instructors have been supervisors or employers, and they identify with the problems of management. On the other hand, instructors are educators, helping students to learn and ultimately to lead more satisfying lives. Most women instructors have worked in clerical jobs. They are in close contact with students and can empathize with their problems and frustrations. They also have an interest in upgrading the status of the occupation, a status they come to share as instructors.

To educate for work as a feminist means encouraging young women to think about the conditions and organization of their work, not just to practice specific skills, whether formatting a letter or welding a metal box or answering the telephone politely. It entails expanding working knowledge so that contextual decisions can be made about when to use appropriate techniques, in the absence of constant supervision. Our commonsense notions of skill arise in the context of male crafts, for these were the workers who had the power to regulate and define their work. "Skilled workers" were craft workers who had gone through an apprenticeship. The census defined skilled workers as those who learned to work with machinery. The realm of the social is invisible and undervalued in these discussions of skill. The interpersonal work of women tends not to be recognized as skill or rewarded in salary or status. It is treated as an aspect of femininity or a personality trait rather than as part of an official skill profile and, therefore, of vocational education.

Many analyses of secretaries and clerical workers emphasize their role as office "wives," as helpmates in whatever task needs to be done, as the smiling, cooperative, and decorative women answering the phone, receiving the public, making the coffee, anticipating the needs of the boss, calming clients or customers, remembering birthdays, and listening to personal stories. While these interpersonal demands are particularly obvious in the work and the image of the secretary, they are present in many of the jobs women do. In a work world that continues to be sexually segregated, there is a tendency for female jobs to require more social and verbal tasks.

Interviews with the instructors of clerical courses emphasize that what is usually referred to as appropriate "attitudes" are necessary for getting and keeping a clerical job. "If you have a girl who has been drilled and trained and whose attitudes are extremely poor, then she will always do worse than someone whose attitudes are good and who is slower." But, "The policy is to base grading on technical competence only." "We aren't allowed to evaluate students on their attitude."

Many important strands of feminist theory have tried to reclaim the interpersonal, the reproductive, the nurturant, the caring, not just for the sake of increasing the recognition due to women, but also because of its importance for society. The workplace depends on emotional well-being, communication, and good interpersonal relationships. This is not something women do "naturally." It is learned, stressful, and difficult.

The association of women with interpersonal, relational work has been used to limit their access to positions of power and to reinforce their association with the domestic realm. It is not surprising that unions of clerical workers fought for clear technical job descriptions and hiring policies that make "personality" and "attitude" illegitimate bases to judge the work or the worker. However, instead of trying to turn clerical and secretarial work into a conglomerate of technical tasks with specified typing speeds, computer competencies, and bookkeeping knowledge, what is in order is including, rethinking, and revaluing the interpersonal tasks involved. These tasks can be specified, not as personal and idiosyncratic characteristics, but as a set of behaviors to talk about, teach, and learn, and upon which a good deal of work depends.

Vocational educators, themselves low in status in the school hierarchy, have been reluctant to take on board the interpersonal, the female, and the low status. Vocational discourse is already devalued in the school setting, and the language of social relations threatens to further devalue it. Vocational education has been valued for its technical tasks, its machines, its scarce skills, and criticized for its lack of "serious" content, its emphasis on the "hidden" curriculum (i.e., social expectations). Increasing the number of specific technical skills required has been a way of demonstrating the status and importance of the work and of the instruction. Social relations are treated as private matters, and the public has been valued over the domestic.

Paid work has taken its status from not being private, not being woman's sphere, not being the everyday. But, vocational education has much to gain by expanding its understanding of what can be taught and how. Social skills can be reclaimed as "real" skills, ones that involve moral judgment and sophisticated emotional and intellectual work. They can be taught and learned, recognized, and evaluated.

There are, of course, dangers and contradictions in the project. Teaching social skills, like teaching most curriculum content, can be used to oppress, discriminate, and invade the legitimately private. But, debate about what kinds of interpersonal competencies are required can be carried on only when the social is not smuggled into the curriculum illegitimately. In any vocational program, one can find disagreement about what kinds of "attitudes" should be fostered. There is a lot of emphasis on being "helpful" and "cooperative." The good student is "dependable, well groomed, and professional." But, there is also emphasis on independence, speaking out, and self-confidence. "Students are not independent enough. They are afraid to ask why." These discussions about what kind of social skills should be taught should take place in curriculum committees and program approvals. Individual decisions by instructors fail to give public recognition to those areas of competence where women make major contributions to the economy.

Constructions of gender are closely linked to the social and interpersonal curriculum. For example, an instructor says, "Last week someone phoned me up and said, 'I need somebody and she's going to have to be good looking,'" and I went, "Oh!" "I mean they say these things to me that they would not say to a lot of other people because it is against all human rights and the rest of it." But, because of these kinds of comments from employers, she emphasizes the importance of dress in her classes. "I tell them basically what to wear...isn't that awful? But I do." She describes the students who will not get a job. "She had a disgusting attitude." "She dressed poorly and her attitude was obnoxious." "She has dress problems." "Her hair sticks out like this, she looks like the Wild Woman of the West." "She is not going to get a job, it's as easy as that." "Forget it." "She isn't even going to be looked at for 20 seconds."

Vocational instructors with a feminist bent would avoid "telling them what to wear." They would encourage students to talk about complex social and economic issues in the workplace, raising questions about modes of dress, standards of conduct, safety, ergonomics, and appropriate compensation. Rather than providing strict rules about how to dress and act, they would give the rules an historical and social context and discuss them in class in ways that reveal their understanding that such rules will and should be continually negotiated between employer and worker.

Vocational education has tended to buy into technical skills talk, while women's work demands social skills, interpersonal sensitivity, and judgment. Vocational education needs to find ways to incorporate the social into the curriculum and to contextualize knowledge, equipping young people with the ability to analyze work critically. For the problem women have had in the workplace is not a lack of skills and knowledge but a lack of recognition of their skills and knowledge. Women's jobs pay less than men's jobs for the same level of education. The education women have received has not equipped them to increase their status at work.

Vocational education will not create equality for women all by itself, but it need not reflect uncritically the gender inequality that is built into the relations of work. A feminist vocational curriculum would form part of a strategy to recognize the contributions women make to the work of the society and to have them more adequately rewarded for it. While taking onboard “women’s issues” may seem a risky strategy for instructors who are already low in status, revaluing women’s work can draw on the tradition of a progressive vocational education articulated at the turn of the past century and make a difference to many.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Cohen, M.G. (Ed.). (2003). *Training the excluded for work: Access and equity for women, immigrants, first nations, youth and people with low incomes.* Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.

Gaskell, J. (1995). Making it work. In J. Gaskell & J. Willinsky (Eds.), *Gender in/forms curriculum* (pp. 59–76). New York: Teachers College Press.

Harland, S., & Steinberg, R. (Eds.). (1989). *Job training for women: The promise and limits of public policies.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Reskin, B., & Roos, P. (1990). *Job queues, gender queues: Explaining women’s inroads into male occupations.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jane Gaskell

Women’s and Gender Studies

Women’s studies have now been in existence for close to 40 years and, like any organism, have gone through several generational changes. The most recent of these is the metamorphosis of some women’s studies programs into academic units with a new name—gender studies—and with a more heightened focus both on the making and meaning of gender and on the various forms of sexuality that are part of human experiences.

The first women’s studies program was established at San Diego State University (then San Diego State College) in 1970. Only one full-time women’s studies instructor was hired by the campus at that time, and most of the other instructors of women’s studies courses were drawn from faculty teaching in other departments. Cornell University established a women’s studies program in 1972, generally considered to be the second in the United States. Women’s studies spread rapidly as an academic interdisciplinary program; it now exists at more than 600 colleges and universities nationwide. In 2006, there were an additional 250 women’s studies programs, centers, and departments internationally.

That women’s studies as an academic pursuit grew out of the women’s movements of the 1960s has been well documented. The first campus programs were the academic response to the American feminist movement off-campus. They began both when women started asking questions about women’s history and no one knew the answers and when feminists inside the academy, both students and faculty, began to ask why the study of women was almost nonexistent. Because the history of women’s lives had generally been ignored or subsumed within the history of men and society, there was little accumulated knowledge, fewer books, and even fewer courses that focused on a critical understanding of the ways in which women’s and men’s roles, histories, and opportunities were shaped by gender, class, race, and power.

The first women’s studies courses at most campuses examined histories of women in the United States, studies of women’s literature, and courses typically titled “Women and _____,” where everything from religion to art history to political philosophy filled in the blank. These courses were embedded in programs shaped by the contemporary feminist practices. They promoted a transformation in the construction and dissemination of social knowledge by establishing nonhierarchical and, thus, revolutionary forms of scholarly organization on campuses. The first task, as many early texts and articles in women’s studies suggested, was to discover women’s experiences and to uncover the ways in which social orders shaped and oppressed women. Women's studies facilitated a more systematic accumulation of the then-marginalized information about women's lives by promoting the collection of materials on women and gender in libraries. They facilitated research on women and gender by providing spaces and funding for that research. They disseminated research by establishing academic journals, encouraging university and commercial presses to publish books and journals on women's studies topics, and, most thoroughly, by establishing a wide-ranging curriculum that focused on this research and newly gained knowledge through interdisciplinary academic programs. Since no professors or instructors had been trained specifically to do research and teaching in women's studies, the first women's studies courses were ineluctably additive. They sought to corral information and to add information and research on women's lives, creations, and roles to core disciplines.

Just as the idea of focusing solely on women was a rebellious addition to the substantive literature that constituted core knowledge so, too, the administrative structures created and embraced by women's studies programs seemed to establish a new paradigm for how academic programs and departments should be run. Rather than having senior scholars make all decisions, as in most mainstream departments in the 1960s and 1970s, many women's studies programs were founded on the concept of feminist solidarity and nonhierarchical management. Instead of chairs and directors who were responsible for managing the programs, the curriculum, and the lecture circuit, there were (and often still are) coordinators and steering committees. In the early years, staff from secretaries to librarians took their places alongside research and teaching faculty to make curricular, hiring, and funding decisions. Students were invited to participate as voting members of coordinating committees and to share a leading role alongside faculty in making decisions about what an education in women's studies would and should entail.

The earnestness and passion of the early women's studies programs bore fruit in the development of large numbers of courses throughout the humanities and social sciences. Students and faculty were energized by the excitement of learning new things and of thinking about old ideas and imparted wisdom in new ways. But, there were also troubles along the way.

Much of the work of running and maintaining the core curricula depended on volunteer labor. Faculty taught overloads, and lecturers were paid a pittance to teach ever-growing courses while developing the new content as they went along. Students would provide free child care so that working mothers could attend sponsored events. Few programs were given permission to hire their own faculty, so coordinators and directors had to beg departments to loan faculty for a course or two. Budgets were tiny. Faculty, staff, and students would have brown bag lectures where the speaker was free and the announcements for the events were copied, folded, and distributed by the coordinating committee. Faculty and staff "borrowed" paper from their home departments in order to eke out the meager supplies given women's studies programs. It was a communal effort, at a time when community was highly valued in radical politics but carried low status in the academic world.

In addition to the hard work, low status, and lack of money, other challenges emerged. One was related to the very nature of feminist organization. One was related to the debates over how women's studies—and professors who taught and researched in women's studies—would gain legitimacy in the academy. The third was related to the demographics of the core of second-wave feminism.

The feminist organizing that was the forerunner to women's studies was based on the dual principles of democracy and nonhierarchy. Although the nonhierarchical organizing structure of the many women's groups could not be completely replicated in the academy, many women's studies programs sought to avoid formal structures of power. This ultimately created tensions because, as feminist theorist Joreen (Jo Freeman) suggested, the consequence of a lack of formal rules of hierarchy and democratic governance was a failure to recognize the hidden power of the supposedly equal participants. The "tyranny of structurelessness" sometimes meant that an inordinate amount of time was spent on process and not enough on securing outcomes or that someone or some group of people imposed order in the vacuum left by a lack of structure. Structurelessness and a reluctance to appoint singular leaders made it difficult to act decisively in academic environments that typically were formally structured and based on unitary authoritative leadership. Some women's studies foundered because they refused to adjust to the prevailing norms of chairs and deans. Other programs fought internally over how to have a functioning leadership that was still responsive to the feminist community and operated in a transparent mode.

Many, if not most, of the faculty involved in the early women's studies programs were young untenured women. Most had been trained in disciplinary studies and were either self-educated in women's studies or applied interdisciplinary training in other areas to women's studies research and teaching. The vast majority were employed in mainstream disciplinary departments. Yet, in order to survive, women's studies programs needed to have their own secure group of dedicated faculty who had the expertise to teach and research in women's studies. Because women's studies programs usually were not allowed to hire their own faculty, this meant that most faculty members still had to satisfy the demands of their home departments.

Women's studies teaching and research often had to be fit into the margins of one's work life. If young professors tried to make it the center, they might have to defend the legitimacy of research on women to their colleagues. Especially in the social sciences, but also in many humanities-oriented departments, the challenge was to find a way to publish work on women that was judged acceptable by non–women's studies colleagues. As often as not, these women's studies research efforts did not count for much in the home disciplinary department. Many assistant professors, thus, had to meet two different disciplinary and interdisciplinary sets of expectations. Too often, the women's studies line of research and teaching was dropped in order to secure tenure for the faculty member.

Simultaneously, women's studies directors and coordinators had to develop other mechanisms to ensure that professors would be released to teach courses and could obtain the credit for their work in women's studies research that it deserved. Often the resolution to the search for the legitimacy that faculty and directors faced was to move toward establishing faculty lines in women's studies. At some universities, this could be done within the framework of the existing interdisciplinary program. At other institutions, it was done through establishing women's studies lines in disciplinary departments. At still others, women's studies moved to become a freestanding department. Sometimes a combination of these three options was attempted. In almost all instances, though, the conversion meant that women's studies moved out of the volunteer-based communal structure into one that more closely resembled the tenure-line formal hierarchy of typical academic departments.

The third challenge of the women's studies programs was how to expand beyond the core demographics of the second-wave women's movement. As noted earlier, the midwife of women's studies was politics, and that politics was American second-wave feminism. This was the feminism that understood that liberation was about sex as much as it was about equality but that found talking about sex and critiquing heterosexuality risky and intimidating. This was also the feminism that was mostly focused on issues relevant to White middle-class women. This was the feminism of Betty Friedan and the 1970s women's movement that split over the "L" word. Although women's studies programs certainly embraced the opportunity to examine sexuality in its many forms and to analyze gender as a sexualized construction, nevertheless, the sexual focus was often diffuse. And, although women's studies programs, faculty, and students certainly embraced the opportunity to examine race, ethnicity, class, and privilege in its many manifestations, nevertheless the class, racial, and ethnic focus remained predominantly White middle-class American.

The challenge for women's studies programs was to ensure that classes, curriculum, research, and programming were inclusive, exhaustive, welcoming, and self-critical. Conversations around these issues often became fraught with anger and guilt. In the early to mid-1980s, the National Women's Studies Association almost disbanded because of the tensions within the organization surrounding these fundamental issues. Eventually, through extensive debates, through establishing venues for the regular consideration of race, sexuality, class, ethnic, religious, accessibility, and other issues, women's studies developed mechanisms and processes to monitor so that the focus of teaching and research was not only or primarily for and about White middle-class women.

Generally, the period of new establishment of women's studies programs started in the 1970s and extended through the mid-1980s. The transitions discussed above were neither easy to resolve nor the same at every institution. But, for most women's studies programs at American colleges and universities, the mid-1980s through the mid-1990s was a period of consolidation during which answers to the dilemmas of structure, legitimacy, and constituency were found. Some of the resolutions were quite idiosyncratic, shaped both by the personalities and politics of the faculty members and students involved and by the politics and structures of the academic institutions in which they were embedded.

By the mid-1990s, though, new issues were emerging. The first formally trained generation of women's studies scholars were now being hired by women's studies programs and departments. These were women, and some men, who had learned women's studies as undergraduates and had focused on women's studies in their graduate training in interdisciplinary and disciplinary departments. And, inevitably, a clash emerged between the first generation of self-taught now-tenured women's studies founding "mothers" and the new generation. There was talk about professionalizing the field, making programs into departments, hiring and legitimating only those who had the proper women's studies credentials, and, perhaps most controversially, rejecting feminist politics for academic feminism. With good reasons, the young scholars sought to establish legitimacy for the rigorous and interdisciplinary approaches and paradigms they had mastered, and they saw little reason to continue the traditions and practices of that first voluntary wave of feminists in the academy.

In the late 1990s, as some women's studies programs transformed themselves into gender studies or women and gender studies departments, the midwife was again politics. The politics this time, though, was a new version of feminism—a feminism that partnered with the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender movement in the United States and that, unlike the earlier women's movement, was not afraid to identify with sexual issues. Indeed, gender studies has been criticized by some women's studies proponents as forgetting about women and ignoring the continuing need for feminist activism in favor of sexuality and transgendered studies. Others, however, point out that gender is about both men and women; that it is about our constructed notions of what constitutes masculinity and femininity; and that sexual practices as well as the political construction of acceptable sexuality create many of the constraints that women and men experience.

In 2006, within the United States there existed over 600 academic interdisciplinary programs that were organized around the study of women and gender. Of these, slightly over 100 called themselves gender studies, or women's and gender studies, or, to a much less extent, feminist, gender, and sexuality studies. Are these all the same kind of studies with just idiosyncrasies in the naming? At Cornell, for instance, where a shift in name and focus took place in 2002, the feminist, gender, and sexuality studies program describes a unit that is intended to bring attention to the intertwining of gender and sexuality with power and inequality. Cornell first added a lesbian, bisexual, and gay studies minor in the early 1990s to the women's studies program. The original women's studies program, so named to highlight the ways in which the traditional curriculum marginalized women as the "Other," no longer seemed sufficient either politically or theoretically. Similarly, at Indiana University, the shift from women's studies to gender studies, which took place in the mid-1990s, was intended to reflect the ways in which theorizing and knowledge about women and gender have evolved and become more complex.

Organizationally, women's studies and gender studies departments and programs still must resolve the generational problem. The newest trend in this decade has been to secure faculty lines within programs and departments where these core faculty have primary responsibility for the curriculum, for hiring and policy decisions, and for establishing new degree programs. These faculty are more likely to have earned doctorates in interdisciplinary programs; to have written dissertations on gender themes; and to have experience teaching about sexuality, intersectionality, and transnationalism. Adjunct or affiliate faculty, often including the first generation of self-taught women's studies professors, sometimes feel excluded from the new project of women's/gender studies, but notably few of them have tenure in the programs or departments. They have less at stake currently since their academic home is likely elsewhere; nevertheless, they do understandably want to protect their stake in "owning" women's studies. The generational tension over ownership has lessened at some institutions when efforts to expand specifically address the inclusion of this first generation. At other colleges and universities, hostility to change (or to the old guard) and anger at being excluded has led to rehashing old debates and to creating roadblocks in moving forward.

In other parts of the world, many gender studies programs have been institutionalized while avoiding the birth pangs so commonly found in the transition from women's studies to gender studies. Because women's and gender studies tended to come later to academic institutions, especially outside North America and Western Europe, they were more likely to be informed by scholars who had experience and knowledge gleaned from observing and interacting with specific North American or European universities. Nevertheless, institutionalizing gender studies has faced additional challenges in many places, especially in those societies where feminism is even less accepted than it is in North America or Europe. The challenges include convincing other scholars that women and gender are even worthy of study. In Canada, Australia, and many parts of Western and Central Europe, however, gender and women's studies is thriving, as scholars and programs have often benefited from support from state feminist agencies in national and supranational governments.

The discourse has certainly shifted. While in the heyday of women's studies, the rhetoric was often about patriarchy and oppression. Now the rhetoric is about the intersection of gender with other substantive categories of analysis and identity. Revolution takes different forms in different times, and, if at first glance gender studies no longer seem to be the site for overt feminist activity, this is deceiving. From its inception, an underlying goal of women's studies and gender studies has been to spotlight women as producers and consumers of knowledge and to focus on gender constructs as a substantive and legitimate theme within the realm of the university. Gender studies, feminist studies, sexuality studies—no matter what they are called—remain revolutionary efforts that seek to reframe knowledge and power.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Chen, P. (2004). *Acting "otherwise": The institutionalization of women's/gender studies in Taiwan's universities.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Freeman, J. Feminist articles by Joreen: The tyranny of structurelessness. Available at http://www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/jofreeman/joreen/joreen.htm

Griffin, G. (2005). *Doing women's studies: Employment opportunities, personal impacts and social consequences.* London & New York: Zed.

Kennedy, E. (2005). *Women's studies for the future: Foundations, interrogations, politics.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

National Women's Studies Association. Available at http://www.nwsa.org

Wiegman, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Women's studies on its own: A next wave reader in institutional change.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Jean C. Robinson

Part V

Gendered Achievements in the Official Curriculum

Overview

Although children experience the pain of failure and joy of success in their homes and playgrounds at very early ages and throughout their lives, their achievements or lack of achievements rarely become official until they enter school. From then on, they are subjected to frequent evaluations by teachers and various testing regimens, and a public record of these evaluations gradually accumulates. Not surprisingly, these evaluations have also attracted the interest of educational researchers who use school records, national and international test results, and research data collected in their own and others' studies of achievements to determine what kinds of students have more successes or more failures in school.

The researchers who wrote the essays contained in this section were asked to focus on the educational successes and failures of boys versus girls and men versus women. While consistent with the gender-oriented goals of this encyclopedia, this request is not without peril. In particular, there is the danger that relatively small gender differences will be given more attention than they deserve. As noted in the "Overview" for Part II, the average differences between a group of boys and a group of girls in a test score or other educational outcome is often much smaller than the differences within the group of boys or within the group of girls. Fortunately, the expert group of authors who wrote the essays for this section are well aware of this danger. They comment often on the small differences between boys and girls in some of the test scores or outcome measures that they have examined, calling those differences too small to be of statistical significance or clinical importance or practical significance.

Some of the authors also call attention to international variations in the direction and size of differences in the educational achievements of boys versus girls, often using those variations to challenge claims about gender differences based only on data collected in the United States and to discredit explanations for U.S. gender differences based on assumptions about biological differences between males and females that transcend national boundaries. Several of the authors also highlight the importance of race-ethnicity, social class, and individual differences within gender groupings. In fact, for most of the topics discussed in this section, these differences within the grouping of boys and within the grouping of girls are substantially larger than the average differences between all the boys and all the girls. And, as Catherine Riegle-Crumb suggests in "Science Achievement," contexts that have not yet received much research attention, such as variations across schools and communities within countries, may also produce larger differences in student achievements than gender.

If differences in the educational performance of boys and girls are relatively small and often unreliable across contexts, why pay attention to them? There are at least four answers to this question. For convenience, I call them the *identity* answer, the *stereotype avoidance* answer, the *equity* answer, and the *human capital* answer. The first of these answers flows from the general proposition that the same characteristics of people that are emphasized and elaborated in the broader society will also be important in that society's schools. Thus, as long as gender is an important part of the identities of students, parents, and school personnel, they will continue to define themselves and one another in gender terms, and gender will affect their interactions and their expectations for themselves and one another. These expectations will include ideas about what kinds of school-related behaviors and achievements are appropriate for boys versus girls, and these ideas will help to shape the motivations and performances of the students. As several of the essays in this section point out, students' attitudes and motivations are powerful determinants of what courses they take, how well they do, and whether they stay in school. So, even though gender is not the only determinant of whether a student thinks that he should not be interested in poetry or another student thinks that she will not do well in physics, gender will continue to have an effect on student's interests and performance as long as it is regarded as an important way to classify and differentiate among people.

The nature of this effect can change, however, and it is these changes in gender differences over time that emerge as a major theme in the essays in this section. Despite these changes, one still encounters people, even educators, whose notions of gender differences are little more than outdated stereotypes. Girls outperform boys in elementary school, but boys catch up in high school and outperform girls in college and graduate school is one of these stereotypes. Girls lag way behind boys in mathematics and science is another. *Stereotype avoidance* is an important reason to pay attention to the research evidence concerning the academic achievements of boys and girls. As the essays in this section reveal, some differences between boys and girls that used to be found no longer exist or have been reversed. Thirty years ago, it was true in the United States that boys were more likely to graduate from college than girls, but now girls are more likely to graduate from college than boys. Some gender differences, such as those in mathematics and sciences, have become less "either-or" and more nuanced. Yes, girls do lag behind boys in physics, but not in biological sciences. Also, as noted in many of the essays, the size and nature of gender differences often depend on the social background of the students studied, on the contexts in which they are studied, and on the measures of achievement used to study them. Even when stereotypes are not completely wrong, they often are simplistic distortions of the complex and changing ways in which educational performance is affected by gender.

Much of the attention to gender achievements in schools is driven by the desire to make certain that public education provides all students with *equity*. One way to determine whether schools are treating all students in an equitable manner is to assess the extent to which students of different backgrounds are equally distributed across courses and curricula in the school and are enjoying equivalent levels of success. Thus, the large amount of attention paid to gender differences is usually driven by worries about whether schooling is fair and whether all students are achieving at the highest level of which they are capable. Male-female differences in enrollments or achievements are seen as "red flags" that may possibly signal gender biases and inequities. As the essays in this section document, three red flags have received a great deal of attention in recent years: the STEM curricula; literacy issues, including reading and writing; and attrition. STEM stands for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and the big worry about these subjects since the 1960s has been the underrepresentation of girls and women in courses, college majors, graduate work, and careers in STEM-related areas. As a result of these worries, a great deal of money and effort has been devoted to increasing the interest and improving the performance of girls and women in STEM, and as the essays in this section reveal, these efforts have been successful although some STEM-related deficiencies on the part of girls remain.

As far as literacy is concerned, the big worry in North America has been the underperformance of boys in reading and writing, and the big worry internationally has been that women's literacy rates in several countries continue to lag behind those of men. And, when it comes to attrition, there has been a long-standing worry about the tendency in several developed countries for boys to drop out of high school at much higher rates than girls and a more recent worry in the United States about the tendency for young men to drop out of college more frequently than young women. In developing countries in recent years, there has been a tendency to bundle together under the label of "the Boy Problem" the higher drop-out rates of boys and young men with their poorer verbal skills, their higher probability of being labeled as slow or problem learners, their higher rates of misbehavior in school, and their greater disaffection from formal education. All of these issues are discussed in more detail in the essays that follow.

Despite some acrimony concerning the question of whether boys have been neglected in favor of girls, both those educators who worry about girls' performance in STEM and most of those who focus on various aspects of "the Boy Problem" are united in their concern for gender equity and their advocacy for fairness. In contrast, there are people who argue against equity as a major goal for the educational system in their own and other countries. To them, studies comparing the relative performance of boys and girls are important not for what they tell us about equity but rather for what they tell us about *human capital.* From a societal perspective, human capital has to do with how much education and job training are characteristic of various segments of the population. The assumption is usually made that the more human capital a nation has the greater will be its economic development and national wealth. For those who put these concerns ahead of equity, good, accurate information (stereotype avoidance) about how well different groups within the population are doing in school is valuable and important for economic planning and improvement. Thus, literacy programs for women are often advocated in third world countries on the grounds that women's literacy in itself and in its influence on children in the family will further economic development. Even within developed countries, one often hears the argument that the nation cannot afford to waste the talents of its women or its minorities and expect to stay competitive internationally. And by aiming educational programs at underperforming groups, it is assumed that the national pool of qualified workers with the appropriate amounts and types of human capital can be increased.

The reasons for being concerned with gender differences in educational achievements are unlikely to diminish in the near future. What is to be hoped is that the concern will move away from the simple question of whether boys do better than girls on various measures of educational outcomes to the kinds of more complex questions raised in the following essays. Some of these are questions about existing gender differences in particular countries that are already the focus of good educational research: Why are so many boys disaffected from school? (see "Attrition From Schools"). What can be done to get boys as interested as girls in reading? (see "Reading"). Why have the biological sciences seen a growth in gender equity that is not paralleled by the physical sciences? (see “Science Achievement”). Others are broader questions that underlie all of the essays in this section and will continue to be raised in many different countries far into the future no matter what kinds of gender differences future research may reveal: Do schools serve some students better than others? What characteristics of the official curriculum work for and against what kinds of students? And, under what conditions do boys and girls perform equally well?

See also “National School Systems” in Part III; “Biological and Physical Sciences,” “Mathematics,” “National Curricula,” “Technology and Computer Science,” and “Vocational Education” in Part IV; and “The ‘Boy Problem’” in Part X.

Academic Majors

Young women's striking advances within higher education represent a significant example of social change since the 1970s. Historically, young men were more likely to enroll in and graduate from college as well as achieve postgraduate and professional degrees. However, since the mid-1980s, young women's educational attainment in the United States has kept pace with men's. Among contemporary cohorts, young women's educational achievements surpass those of men in terms of earned bachelor's and master's degrees. Furthermore, in 2001, young women's attainment of professional degrees such as law, medicine, and dental degrees reached near parity with men.

Women have made remarkable strides in higher education, yet gender inequality in the workplace, measured by both occupational sex segregation and the pay gap between men and women, remains persistent. Young women's seeming lack of progress in the workplace, despite substantially higher educational attainment, represents a puzzle for scholars. What explains patterns of persistent gender inequality at work, despite women's increasing educational achievements? Part of the answer lies in the sex segregation of academic majors. Many studies of occupational sex segregation and gender inequality in earnings treat educational achievements similarly, regardless of the credentials, course of study, or academic major. Yet, many elite and lucrative occupations require specific educational credentials as prerequisites for entry into these careers. For this reason, gender and education scholars need to focus not just on women's overall level of educational attainment but also on the extent to which women are able to enter and persist within certain academic majors in college.

Historical overviews of gendered pathways in American higher education since the 1970s show that young women's successes in some traditionally male-dominated majors have been substantial. For example, whereas women's share of earned degrees in communications and biology lagged far behind men's share 30 years earlier, by 2001 women were more likely than men to earn biology and communications degrees. Similarly, the gender gap in business and social science degrees has also shrunk considerably from the 1970s to the twenty-first century. In contrast, extensive gender inequality lingers in some academic majors, notably science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) majors. For example, in mathematics and computer science, the gender gap in bachelor's degrees actually increased from 1985 to 2001, and, during this same period, the percentage of women earning physical science and engineering degrees fell, contributing to resilient gender inequality in these majors. Potential explanations for women's inroads into some male-dominated academic majors such as business and social science include a gender convergence in young adults' career expectations and evaluation of work rewards. Scholarly research on women's continued underrepresentation in STEM majors suggests the importance of resilient gender differences in adolescents' valuation of family, self-efficacy, and work preferences for understanding stubborn gender inequality in science.

TRENDS IN GENDER SEGREGATION OF ACADEMIC MAJORS

In 1970, young women earned approximately 43 percent of all bachelor's degrees awarded in the United States. By 1985, young women's share of bachelor's degrees earned in the United States was just over half, and young women earned 57 percent of U.S. undergraduate degrees awarded in 2002. Just as young women's educational achievements have risen in the past 30 years, women also have carved new inroads into academic majors traditionally dominated by men. Since the early 1970s, considerable shifts have occurred in the distribution of young women and men across academic majors. However, like women and men in the U.S. workplace who experience considerable occupational sex segregation, contemporary American youth continue to pursue gender-differentiated educational paths.

Table V.1 presents the percentages of young women and men achieving bachelor's degrees in major fields of study in the early 1970s, the mid-1980s, and the early twenty-first century. In the early 1970s, close to one-quarter of male college graduates earned their degree in business, approximately 22 percent earned social science degrees, and 11 percent earned degrees in engineering. In total, these three college majors accounted for over half of the college degrees earned by men in 1970 to 1971. By contrast, just 3 percent of women earned a business degree and far fewer than 1 percent earned an engineering degree. For female college graduates of the early 1970s, education, social science, and English were the top three academic majors. Majors in education accounted for nearly 40 percent of the bachelor's degrees earned by women in 1970 to 1971.

While other fields of study may not have been as prevalent in the 1970s, they also tended to be highly segregated by gender. For example, men were 5.7 times more likely to earn architecture degrees, 16.9 times more likely to earn agriculture degrees, and 4.8 times more likely to earn a degree in physical science than women. Men were nearly twice as likely to earn a degree in biology as women in 1970 to 1971. Women, on the other hand, were 4.4 times more likely to earn a degree in health occupations, almost 3 times more likely to earn a bachelor's in public administration, and almost twice as likely to earn performing arts degrees as were men. Few academic majors were gender integrated during the early 1970s, with psychology and math most closely approximating similar proportions of women and men. Consequently, academic majors were very sex segregated during the 1970s. The sex segregation index score of .47, shown in Table V.1, means that almost 47 percent of women and men would have had to change majors in order for American women and men to be similarly distributed across majors of earned degrees in 1971. An index score of .00 would indicate that women and men are equivalently distributed across academic majors (no sex segregation), and a score of 1.00 would indicate that women and men are completely sex segregated across academic majors.

By the mid-1980s, young women had made considerable progress into previously male-dominated academic majors. For example, women and men were almost equally likely to earn biology degrees in 1985, and the gender gap in business degrees declined from 20

Table V.1 Percentages of U.S. Men and Women Receiving Bachelor's Degrees in 17 Academic Major Fields in 1970–1971, 1984–1985, and 2001–2002

	1970–1971		1984–1985		2001–2002	
Major field	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**
Agriculture	.0270	.0016	.0282	.0125	.0261	.0166
Architecture	.0109	.0019	.0136	.0074	.0108	.0056
Biology	.0563	.0304	.0453	.0410	.0488	.0569
Business	.2316	.0305	.2882	.2340	.2906	.2184
Communications	.0155	.0111	.0388	.0553	.0488	.0625
Computer science	.0046	.0009	.0555	.0319	.0708	.0203
Education	.0997	.3839	.0480	.1489	.0497	.1278
Engineering	.1103	.0012	.1879	.0281	.1240	.0217
English	.0492	.1232	.0256	.0488	.0345	.0566
Foreign language	.0105	.0418	.0057	.0159	.0075	.0149
Health occupations	.0129	.0568	.0220	.1219	.0212	.0935
Math	.0344	.0276	.0193	.0163	.0137	.0090
Performing arts	.0272	.0530	.0327	.0528	.0561	.0615
Physical science	.0410	.0086	.0385	.0148	.0213	.0117
Psychology	.0471	.0495	.0287	.0606	.0357	.0922
Public administration	.0038	.0109	.0064	.0199	.0077	.0243
Social science	.2180	.1669	.1157	.0899	.1326	.1066
Sex segregation index	**.4687**		**.3164**		**.2801**	

percentage points in 1970, to 5.4 percentage points in 1985. Moreover, some fields of study such as psychology and communications, which were relatively gender integrated in the 1970s, had feminized by the mid-1980s such that women were significantly more likely to earn degrees in these majors than men. Two important changes in women's educational participation facilitated their growing representation in previously male-dominated majors. First, women's college commitment increased between the early 1970s and 1985, as evidenced by their increased likelihood of achieving a college degree. Second, between the 1970s and the 1980s, a considerable proportion of women shifted away from education majors, as only 15 percent of women earned education degrees in 1985 compared to 38 percent in 1971.

While considerably more women earned degrees in engineering, physical science, and computer science in the mid-1980s, women's achievements in these majors continued to be far outpaced by men. In fact, in 1985, engineering degrees constituted the second largest field of study among men college graduates; nearly 1 in 5 men graduating from college in 1985 earned an engineering degree. By contrast, women remained far more likely to earn college degrees in education and health occupations than men. Between 1970 and 1985, the sex segregation index for academic majors declined to .32 meaning that just under one-third of men and women college graduates would have had to change majors to have an equal dispersion of women and men across fields of study in 1985.

The twenty-first century brought increased educational opportunity for young women in terms of earned bachelor's degrees, yet continued to be characterized by resilient gender inequality in higher education in terms of women's access to some male-dominated academic majors. As Table V.1 shows, the most prevalent majors for women in 2001 were business, social science, education, and health occupations, in that order. Business and social sciences were also the two most popular majors for men in 2001, but they were followed by engineering and computer science, majors that lead to higher paying jobs than those associated with a bachelor's degree in education and the health occupations. In a few male-dominated majors, such as engineering and physical sciences, the gender gap in earned degrees narrowed somewhat between 1985 and 2001, but increased gender integration in these fields stemmed more from men's lower likelihood of achieving degrees in these majors rather than women's enhanced degree attainment in science and engineering. Similarly, health occupations, which was a heavily feminized major in the mid-1980s, became somewhat more gender integrated in the early twenty-first century due to women's movement out of health majors. The gender gap in some academic fields, such as business, computer science, and mathematics, actually grew larger between 1985 and 2001, primarily due to a slight reduction in the percentage of women in these fields. Psychology, which feminized in the mid-1980s, grew increasingly gender segregated in the late 1990s. Women's attainment of biology degrees outpaced men's by the twenty-first century, a noticeable change from the mid-1980s when similar proportions of men and women earned degrees in biological science. Finally, the gender composition of architecture, social science, and public administration remained fairly stable between the 1980s and 2001. Because declines in the sex segregation of some academic majors were offset by increases in the segregation of other majors, the overall level of sex segregation declined only slightly to .28 between 1985 and 2001. By 2001, to have an equal distribution of women and men across fields of study, 28 percent of college graduates would have had to change their academic major. Moreover, while sex segregation declined slightly between 1985 and 2001, some evidence suggests a stalling in young women's progress into majors necessary for some elite occupations, such as science, math, and engineering.

EXPLANATIONS FOR TRENDS IN GENDER SEGREGATION OF ACADEMIC MAJORS

Young women's rising educational attainment, coupled with resilient gender inequality in the workplace, represents an anomaly to scholars. A primary cause of the seeming mismatch between women's striking progress in the educational arena and stalled advancement in the workplace is that many scholars treat and measure educational achievements similarly, regardless of major field of study. Yet, as shown by closer examination of trends in the distribution of women and men college graduates across academic majors since the 1970s, sex segregation within higher education continues to be a dominant feature of the American educational system. Research shows that career advancement and earnings depend not only on the amount of education but also upon the academic major of educational credentials. Furthermore, entrance into many elite occupations in the fields of science, math, and engineering requires advanced credentials that young adults obtain in postsecondary and graduate education. For these reasons, understanding the reasons underlying young women's lack of progress into academic majors that can lead to such elite occupations represents a critical step in understanding persistent gender inequality in careers.

Explaining Declines in Gender Segregation in Previously Male-Dominated Majors

As shown by trends of women's degree patterns over time, since the mid-1980s, young women have made considerable strides into several previously male-dominated majors such as business, communications, social science, and biology. What may account for women's progress in these fields? Cohort change in young women's and men's occupational expectations and work values provides some clues. Research on early occupational goals of youth during the 1960s and 1970s revealed pronounced gender differences in occupational expectations that reflect sex-stereotypic roles within paid work. Among high school seniors in the 1970s, girls expected to work in service-oriented occupations such as teaching, nursing, and other social service occupations, whereas boys expected to work in more competitively oriented environments that involved entrepreneurial activity, small partnership, and corporate activity. However, recent work on the transition to adulthood suggests that gender differences in adolescent career goals have all but disappeared among contemporary cohorts. These shifts in young women's career goals, away from traditionally female-dominated occupations such as teaching, may have facilitated women's increased interest in academic majors such as business, social science, and biology.

Historically, young men have valued paid employment more than young women. Yet, since the 1980s, there has been significant convergence between young women and men in their prioritization of careers. Recent studies indicate that young women and men are now equally likely to view paid work as centrally important in their lives, and in some studies, girls are even more likely than boys to value their careers as a central goal. In addition, past research found that young men tended to value the extrinsic rewards of work (e.g., income, power, and opportunities for advancement) more than young women. Among contemporary young adults, however, women and men tend to evaluate the importance of extrinsic work rewards similarly. Furthermore, young women's valuation of extrinsic work rewards has increased more rapidly than young men's, which has contributed to the erosion of the gender gap in extrinsic work values. Young women's growing commitment to paid employment and interest in the pecuniary rewards associated with work may also explain their increasing propensity to pursue previously male-dominated academic majors such as business, social science, and communications.

While women have made considerable strides into business and social science majors, men have not similarly moved into traditionally female areas of study such as education, health, and humanities. To date, scholarship on the gender segregation of academic majors has focused almost exclusively on women's progress (or lack thereof) into various college majors. Therefore, missing from this literature is an explication of men's (relative) lack of involvement in traditionally female academic majors that tend to lead to service-oriented careers such as teaching and nursing. Though there is only a paucity of research on this topic, resilient differences in women's and men's work values may provide some clues. For example, though gender differences in extrinsic work rewards are subsiding among contemporary youth, men continue to be less likely to value other nonpecuniary aspects of work such as the opportunity to be of service that has often attracted women to teaching and nursing careers.

Explaining Continuing Gender Segregation in Physical and Computer Science, Math, and Engineering

While sex segregation of academic majors has declined considerably since the 1970s, with young women having substantial success in some previously male-dominated majors, women's continued underrepresentation in physical and computer science, math, and engineering remain examples of persistent gender inequality in higher education remaining in the early twenty-first century. Women's lower access to these college majors has garnered substantial scholarly, media, and political attention recently for two primary reasons. First, women's underrepresentation in math and science represents a significant loss of talent for science and engineering endeavors that fuel economic productivity. Second, women's lower achievements in math and science majors have sizable implications for gender inequality in the workplace since many lucrative occupations require advanced math and science credentials. Scholars offer a variety of explanations for women's lower interest and achievements in math and science majors, including women's *lack of academic preparation, lower math self-efficacy, greater valuation of intrinsic work rewards,* and continued *valuation of family.*

Past research on women's underrepresentation in math and science college majors focused on gender differences in *academic preparation,* since advanced coursework in math and science during secondary school fosters success in science at the college level. Gender differences in math and science participation and achievement are few while students are in primary or junior high school. Among high school students, earlier cohorts of young women tended to be less likely to take advanced coursework in math and science, but studies of contemporary high school students suggest that gender differences in the number and level of math and science courses taken during secondary school have eroded. However, the course-taking gender gap has shrunk more in math than in science. Therefore, young women's lower achievements in math, science, and engineering majors may stem—in part—from a lack of earlier educational preparation, especially in STEM fields, during secondary school.

Self-efficacy in math and science means that a person has feelings of capability and competence in those subjects. Students' self-efficacy in math and science promotes interest in future mathematical and scientific endeavors as well as persistence within those fields. Some evidence indicates that broad cultural beliefs about gender negatively affect young women's self-efficacy in math and science (Correll, 2001). Specifically, those cultural beliefs about gender that privilege men's competency in math and science over women's infuse young women's self-perceptions of their (in)ability to perform math and science tasks. Consequently, in order for young women to feel equally competent in math and science, their actual performance in these subjects may have to *exceed* men's performance. To the extent that contemporary young women continue to receive gendered messages about men's greater competency in math and science, women's lower self-efficacy in math and science may explain their lower achievements in math and science majors in college.

While gender differences in the valuation of extrinsic work rewards such as salaries and prestige may be subsiding, young women's and men's *valuation of the intrinsic rewards from work* remain notably different. Although young women's valuation of extrinsic rewards has increased, women continue to value intrinsic work rewards such as helping others and self-fulfillment. Young women's and men's different valuations of intrinsic work rewards may explain women's lower achievements in science, math, and engineering majors. In contemporary studies of early life orientations, girls tend to value compassion and purpose in life more than boys, whereas boys tend to value materialistic goals more. Young women may also have less interest in science majors because they have greater interest in helping others, working with "people" rather than things, and seeking intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards from work, which are aspects of gendered behavior shaped by cultural norms. In fact, the gender gap within subfields of science tends to be smaller in science majors that are directly linked to helping others, such as premedicine and biology, which are common majors in the United States for those intending to pursue medicine or veterinary science at the postbaccalaureate level.

Women's advancement in certain academic majors may also be limited by their continued *valuation of family,* despite their rising educational achievements and career ambitions (Jacobs, 1995). Women's responsibility for family may continue to channel them into academic majors that lead to careers perceived to be better fits for balancing work and family. While young women's career goals have risen, women continue to value family more than men. Furthermore, contemporary young women expect more work and family conflict than do young men, and both young women and men anticipate resolving work/family conflict through women's career sacrifices. Therefore, young women may avoid academic majors leading toward careers that they perceive to be incompatible with balancing work and family demands.

Several ethnographic studies suggest that one reason women do not pursue or persist within math and science majors during college is due to their perception that scientific careers do not lend themselves to work and family balance (Seymour & Hewitt, 1997). However, other studies indicate that valuing family negatively affects women's science achievements, but gender differences in adolescents' valuation of family are not large enough to fully explain the gender gap in collegiate science achievements (Xie & Shauman, 2003). Perhaps other causes, such as those mentioned above, combine with family valuation, as well as some gender-biased conditions of scientific training and work, to explain this persistent gender gap.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Correll, S. (2001). Gender and the career choice process: The role of biased self-assessments. *American Journal of Sociology, 106*(6), 1691–1730.

Jacobs, J.A. (1995). Gender and academic specialties: Trends among recipients of college degrees in the 1980s. *Sociology of Education, 68*(2), 81–98.

Johnson, M.K., Oesterle, S., & Mortimer, J.T. (2001). Adolescents' anticipations of work-family conflict in a changing societal context. In S. Hofferth & T. J. Owens (Eds.), *Children at the millennium: Where have we come from, where are we going?* (pp. 233–261). London: Elsevier Science.

Marini, M.M., Fan, P.L., Finley, E., & Beutel, A.M. (1996). Gender and job values. *Sociology of Education, 69*(1), 49–65.

Seymour, E., & Hewitt, N. (1997). *Talking about leaving: Why undergraduates leave the sciences.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. (2003). *Women in science: Career processes and outcomes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stephanie Woodham Burge

Attrition from Schools

The major problem with conventional discussions about students "dropping out" of school is that such discussions individualize blame by placing certain groups of young people in pathological "at risk" categories that require them to be fixed up, remedied, or treated. Such approaches psychologize the problem in ways that locate it within young people themselves, thus allowing the focus to be moved away from the broader social, economic, and political forces at work that may be the real "cause" of attrition.

These broader forces include the processes of identity formation within which students work out issues of class, race, and gender that have implications for school success and attrition. Often these processes come into conflict with the narrow identity demands of the school, causing interactive trouble for students that results in disaffection from schooling. Research on disaffection and dropping out usually takes account of gender as an individual or group attribute, ignoring the ways in which it is constructed by educational practices. A better understanding of the ways in which gender and attrition are interrelated can be had within a theoretical framework that focuses attention on school culture, coercion and harassment, school credentialing, and transitions to the labor market.

IDENTITY FORMATION

An expansive view of what is going on when young people make the active choice to leave school necessitates looking through the lens of identity formation (Smyth, 2006). From this perspective, high school students are seen as engaging in a struggle to "become somebody" by developing a self that is verified in the eyes of those friends they come to school to meet. According to Wexler (1992), "becoming somebody" can be seen as a process of production that uses cultural resources that are deeply embedded in the societal structures of inequality and differences. These resources are used selectively, however, with young people bringing to school different repertoires of social and cultural resources that they could use to create a valued product in the form of self or identity. As we might expect in such circumstances, there are dissonances and mismatches here because some personal resources are ignored, denigrated, or disparaged while others are seized upon, used, and affirmed as collectively valuable. Thus, schools act as crucial image makers in a process of amplifying, distorting, condensing, representing, and diffusing partial signs that denote full identities.

When applied to student attrition, Wexler's notion of "becoming somebody" suggests not only that young people come to school with biographies and gendered histories deeply embedded in previous life experiences, but also that schools are crucial sites within which issues of class, race, and gender are actively worked out as part of the wider attrition issue. Weis (1995) captured this view of schools by arguing that race, social class, and gender are structured into schools and that students respond to the manifestations of these structuring factors. Young people will differ in how well they are able to use schools to make sense of the various resources they bring with them. They will also differ in how they interpret whatever disfiguring attributes schools have embedded within them. These differences will in large measure reflect the extent to which young people are prepared to consider schooling to be relevant to their lives and, as a consequence, to treat schools as places worthwhile "hanging in" with or as places to be rejected and to leave.

The notion of "interactive trouble" (Freebody, 2003) is useful in explaining the meaning of early school leaving as experienced from the vantage point of young people. Interactive trouble can be interpreted as referring to the wider misunderstandings, communicative breakdowns, and mismatches that are constructed between students and schools as young people engage in their project of identity formation or "becoming somebody" (Smyth et al., 2000). In many instances, the "trouble" occurs around the excessively narrow identity demanded and imposed by schools, on the one hand, and the lack of congruence this creates with young people's lives as they struggle to understand, discover, and appreciate who they are within similarities and diversity, on the other. Adult participants in schools often fail to recognize how narrow identity demands cause "trouble" for young people in school. As a result, as Freebody (2003) argues, when adults attempt to repair the "trouble" of those young people, they end up prolonging or exacerbating it.

An area of considerable contestation is around issues of class/race/gender and how these are played out in schools. Identity—whether it be raced, classed, or gendered—is not something that is brought to school as fixed, final, stable, static, or factual, but rather it exists in the process of being socially constructed by young people as they actively negotiate the complex intersections around race, class, ethnicity, and gender within and outside their experience of school. Class, race, and gender are literally sutured together in institutions like schools to produce a social identity. Gender is, therefore, not simply another additive to race and class in a theory of school attrition, but it is itself an active part of how these mutually reinforcing hierarchies are played out in young people's lives in schools.

GENDERED SCHOOL LEAVING

Gender has become an important signifying category that is used by governments, the media, and policy makers as a way of both explaining and then attending to the issue of attrition from schools. For example, allowing the debate to be constructed around the so-called "gender wars" and then explaining significant educational underperformance of a sizable group of young people as a "problem of boys" avoids the more complex and intractable political issues of social justice, inequality, class, social, and economic disadvantage and poverty, and allows them to go largely unattended by governments and policy makers.

There are cogent reasons why some students succeed at school while others do not, and these explanations go considerably beyond explanations that reside in individual or group differences. One factor that plays a significant part is patriarchy, which can best be understood as comprising the subordinated normalization of women within a binary hierarchy of male/female. Patriarchy contributes quite profoundly to female experiences of schooling including decisions to leave school early. Although girls regularly perform better than boys in school, there remains a heavy residue of educational practices and ideologies that inhibit female success. What is created is a climate that contributes to girls' lack of confidence that can lead to their early school leaving. This can take multiple forms:

- curriculum, books, and learning materials/activities that fail to adequately portray the range of contributions of women and that, by implication, provide subtle stereotypical messages to girls about limited career prospects and horizons;
- a curriculum hierarchy that often operates to undermine girls' postschool options by, for example, reinforcing higher expectations for girls in nonscientific subjects;
- pedagogical practices that ignore girls in classrooms because they are less demanding and, hence, are made more invisible than boys and different teacher responses to boys and girls, for example, by giving boys more air space in class;
- the perpetuation of male images as somehow being more important, which has the effect of diminishing the spaces and places in which girls can flourish and experience success in schooling;
- the construction of girls as having to engage in behaviors pleasing to male teachers, which promulgates an image of what is required of girls for academic success that can impede their pathways to successful schooling.

Gender also plays a major part in propelling some boys out of school, and certain kinds of male relationships to schooling help to explain why it is that boys leave school prematurely in such large numbers worldwide. The way this works in many instances is through legitimating "macho" attitudes toward school by certain boys, effectively giving unwarranted credence to underperformance and aggressive behavior. In contrast, the schools have a narrow notion of what a good male student should be that creates the kinds of interactive trouble already discussed for many boys, especially for those who come to consider schooling irrelevant to being macho and becoming somebody. A process is set into motion that culminates in certain boys prematurely leaving school with diminished pathways and life chances.

The processes leading up to the attrition from school of both boys and girls are illustrations of the social and historical construction of gender and, as such, they are not biologically determined nor are they immutable. However, they can and should be the basis for changes that result in more positive and egalitarian outcomes from schooling. In addition, full understanding of what is going on within gendered school leaving requires that we acknowledge something of the historical patterns and relations of power between men and women. When it comes to school completion, gender cannot be meaningfully dealt with apart from the interactive effects of wider aspects of educational disadvantage. The real question is not whether girls or boys as a group are necessarily more disadvantaged than one another but, as Teese et al. (1997) put it, which girls and which boys? The problem is more complex than simply delineating and leaving it at the level of specific groups. The issues are fundamentally structural and cultural.

Gendered explanations as to why some students succeed while others reject school (which may not be the same as "dropping out" of school) need to go considerably beyond labeling some groups as being "at risk." To put school attrition simply in those terms is to end up blaming the victim. The widespread belief that anyone can rise socioeconomically through educational effort without regard to the interacting and historical effects of class, gender, ethnicity, and race fails demonstrably to adequately explain the interacting mix of structural, historical, and socially constructed contributions to premature exit from school.

Extensive sociological research and literature on "dropping out" of school makes it clear that exclusion and disaffection are central elements in gendered explanations of attrition from school. Such explanations are deeply entwined with aspects of: (a) school culture, (b) coercion and harassment, (c) the policy rhetoric around school credentialing, and (d) transitions to the labor market (see Smyth et al., 2000, and Smyth & Hattam, 2004, for elaboration).

School culture, including the way schools convey explicit as well as coded messages about who and what kind of cultural capital is welcome, is unquestionably one of the most significant elements influencing whether young people complete school or reject what schools have on offer. The stakes are incredibly high. Schools that present themselves as inhospitable and fearful places in which students' lives, experiences, aspirations, and emotions are ridden over can appear to provide no other course than propelling out of school any young people courageous enough to speak back. But even here, the situation is far from straightforward with individual relationships with particular teachers often assuming far more importance than wider school cultures. Given that schools have historically been constructed as middle class institutions, it is not altogether surprising that students from working class, disadvantaged, and minority backgrounds find schools to be disempowering and alienating places. It is only when schools are prepared to work against their own institutional histories by challenging societal norms about the way schools are supposed to be and, in the process, reinventing themselves that culturally relevant and respectful practices are possible that acknowledge students and their backgrounds as providing rich resources to be worked with—a major element in enabling young people to make the kind of investment necessary to stay at school.

Schools, especially high schools, operate in powerful ways both formally and informally to normalize and discipline young identities, especially around *coercion and harassment* perpetrated by young people themselves, and often legitimated through adult neglect. Relentless forms of physical and verbal disciplining can often become so unbearable as to present leaving school as the only viable option for some young people. For these young people, school feels like prison or a "living hell." Harassment can be class based and directed at students who do not have the cultural capital or financial resources to enable them to conform. Equally, it can be based on appearance, skin color, or body shape. Peer discipline operates powerfully to control young people who display conformity to the positive academic identity being promoted by the school. Sexual taunts, homophobia, rumors, and innuendo can also serve to further discipline deviant identities. In far too many cases, schools shrug off or refuse to seriously confront these matters (even though many have policies to supposedly deal with them), preferring instead to label forms of harassment as a harmless part of growing up. Whatever the source, the effect is the same—a generalized feeling by those affected that school is not a safe place, that the social institution of schooling is not to be trusted, that the expenditure of emotional labor necessary to protect themselves is not worth the effort, and that leaving school is the only feasible option. This is not to overlook the significant identity work many young people do in schools with and against oppressive forms of coercion, disciplining, and normalizing discourses from other students.

How young people negotiate an identity for themselves within a *school credentialing system* that is heavily committed to using the credential as a way of sifting, sorting, and selecting them to fit into a globally created hierarchical labor market is another aspect to the gendered story of school leaving. In this regard, gender is one of a range of resources young people use as they exercise autonomy and agency in contesting the linear propulsion pathway of school-to-university-to-work being constructed for them by policy makers and others. In this regard, young people see the credentialing process not as operating deterministically but as something to be negotiated and contested as they make difficult decisions embedded in much more gender sensitive pathways of the school-to-work transition. The lack of value attached by certain groups of young people to pursuing and completing a school credential appears to be heavily influenced by the intersection of gender and socioeconomic class, and this is despite demonstrable evidence of the collapse and disappearance of the youth labor market. Early school leaving in countries like Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States remains remarkably high given the extensive disappearance of jobs requiring little formal education. Anywhere up to a third or more of young people internationally, mostly boys and those from disadvantaged and low socioeconomic backgrounds, leave school before completing 12 years of education. This compares with figures closer to 10 percent for students from wealthy backgrounds. The fact that such levels of attrition persist, despite knowledge about diminished lifetime earnings and attempts at diversified school curriculum offerings, leads to the conclusion that, for some young people, having a school credential is still not worth the psychological and emotional investment. Having a precarious toehold in the labor market is seen as being preferable to investing more in the uncertain benefits of school. The fragile relationship between many young people and the value they attach to completing a school credential is glaringly apparent when gender and socioeconomic status are taken into account. The situation is most pronounced for boys, with up to 25 percent of them leaving school before graduation. The likelihood reduces by half for girls. The highest rates of early school leaving for both boys and girls are disproportionately concentrated in urban, rural, and remote areas that suffer most from the ravages of socioeconomic disadvantage.

The *wage labor identity and postschool options* of young people are profoundly shaped by gender and, in turn, deflected back into what happens in schools. How young people frame their hopes and aspirations for the future has a major impact on how they go about transiting the labor market. As Weis (1990) points out, young people's school identities are not formed in a linear fashion nor are they unrelated to economic context. Indeed, patriarchal societies appear to sediment gender domination and subordination in the ways they sustain and maintain sex-segregated labor markets that perpetuate expectations about what is regarded as acceptable. This in turn has an inevitable follow-through into school-related actions. For example, what gets to be constructed as common sense about the restricted place of women in the public versus the private sphere can play out powerfully in the way some girls think and act out stereotypical plans around working futures, pregnancy, and motherhood. These issues can loom significantly in the ways girls make decisions about the place of a wage labor identity. But even here the situation is far from straightforward, with many girls placing primacy on obtaining wage labor over other gender roles. This can translate, for example, into girls' desires to complete an education as a way of escaping oppressive male control characteristic of previous generations of women.

Research evidence suggests that even when girls contest the stereotyping of gender hierarchies by undertaking studies that would carry them into such nontraditional areas as, for example, metal fabrication, perhaps in order to sustain a family tradition (across gender lines), they may be unsuccessful. In the end, these aspirations can be thwarted by an inhospitable labor market unprepared to accept girls stepping out of typically narrow roles. In this regard, gender and class location operate in powerful ways to reinforce and shape aspirations. In the case of working class young people, this can mean adopting aspirations and actions that work against staying at school (Smyth & Hattam, 2004). On other occasions, feminist perspectives can embolden some young women in their preparedness to confront entrenched stereotypes by opportunistically interpreting changes in the labor market to their advantage.

In whatever ways school attrition works its way out in the end, what is undeniable is the complex intersection of gender, class, and race in providing a rich tapestry of challenging conceptual resources by means of which young people can construct a life for themselves with or without school.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Freebody, P. (2003). *Qualitative research in education: Interaction and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smyth, J. (2005). An argument for new understandings and explanations of early school leaving that go beyond the conventional. *London Review of Education, 3*(2), 117–130.

Smyth, J. (2006). Researching teachers working with young adolescents: Implications for ethnographic research. *Ethnography and Education, 1*(1), 31-51.

Smyth, J., & Hattam, R. (with Cannon, J., Edwards, J., Wilson, N., & Wurst, S.). (2004). *"Dropping out," drifting off, being excluded: Becoming somebody without school.* New York: Peter Lang.

Smyth, J., Hattam, R., Cannon, J., Edwards, J., Wilson, N., & Wurst, S. (2000). *Listen to me, I'm leaving: Early school leaving in South Australian secondary schools.* Adelaide: Flinders Institute for the Study of Teaching; Department of Employment, Education and Training; and Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia.

Teese, R., Davies, B., Charlton, M., & Polesel, J. (1997). Who wins at school; which boys, which girls? In J. Kenway (Ed.), *Will boys be boys? Boys' education in the context of gender reform* (pp. 8–12). Deakin West: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.

Weis, L. (1990). *Working class without work: High school students in a de-industrializing society.* New York: Routledge.

Weis, L. (1995). Qualitative research in sociology of education: reflections on the 1970s and beyond. In W. Pink & G. Noblit (Eds.), *Continuity and contradiction: The futures of the sociology of education* (pp. 157–173). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Wexler, P. (1992). *Becoming somebody: Toward a social psychology of school.* London: Falmer.

John Smyth

College Student Attrition and Retention

Attrition and retention have been of interest to scholars, policy makers, administrators, parents, and students for a long time. From an institutional standpoint, this interest is rooted in the fact that student retention is directly related to resources. The first kind of resources associated with retention are economic: The larger the number of students enrolled in a public institution, the greater the claim on public resources by that institution. For both private and public institutions, enrollment is also associated with tuition income. In either case, retaining students can be seen as retaining financial resources, while student attrition is associated with the loss of resources upon which the institution depends.

The second kind of resources associated with retention is human capital resources. These are the social, aesthetic, intellectual, and other skills, abilities, and knowledge obtained by individual students during their period of enrollment. The goal of teaching students requires that students remain enrolled. An institution fails in its mission to educate students when they are missing, and students' best chance to develop their human capital resources occurs only when they remain in college.

When looking at attrition and retention in the context of a student's gender, two main issues arise. The first is a policy question: Do men and women leave schools at the same rates? If they do leave at different rates, how is the institution failing the group that leaves more often? If they leave at the same rate, how can the institution reduce attrition? The second question related to gender is an analytical one. The purpose of this kind of analysis is to try to understand whether women and men leave the institution for the same reasons. This knowledge can inform the development of programs intended to reduce retention. If men leave an institution because they do not feel the coursework prepares them for a career, early career guidance might help. If women feel the social relationships they develop at school are the most important reason to stay, then career guidance might not work for them in terms of increasing retention. Of course, the reverse might be true. What is important is to understand the factors affecting retention for each group so that sensible policies can be developed. To promote this understanding, increasingly complex theories and models of attrition and retention have been developed.

THE SCOPE OF ATTRITION AND RETENTION

The overall rate of college completion in the United States for bachelor's degrees is about 50 percent in four years. The usual pattern of attrition is a 25 percent freshman-to-sophomore year dropout, 12 percent sophomore-to-junior, 8 percent junior-to-senior, and 4 percent of seniors fail to graduate. Such a pattern can vary astronomically. The most elite schools graduate about 95 percent of their freshmen, while the least prestigious community colleges may grant degrees to fewer than 15 percent of their students. Men and women leave college at about the same rates but often for different reasons. Here, the stereotype pertains: Women report more home and personal conflicts and unsatisfying relationships at school, while men report that they needed to work or could not get the courses they wanted. Both report financial reasons for leaving.

While a 50 percent completion rate is a good estimate, research has indicated that about 45 percent of students graduate in four years and about 55 percent graduate in five years, rates that have remained relatively constant over the past 100 years despite a radical shift in who attends college. A century ago, the vast majority of students attending college were full time and male, whereas now 40 percent of students attend college part time, and more women attend college than men. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, between 1971 and 2003, enrollments for men increased 43 percent to 7.2 million, while enrollments for women increased 166 percent to 9.4 million. In 2003, 57 percent of students in higher education were women and 43 percent were men.

A simple calculation indicates that if 50 percent of the 16.6 million students enrolled drop out of college for a single year, institutions would lose about 8.3 million students. Average tuition, room, and board costs at all colleges in 2003 were $12,111. The loss of income from students who dropped out would approach $100 billion. Since a freshman who leaves does not pay for three years of college, actual costs would likely be higher.

DEFINING ATTRITION AND RETENTION

In order to discuss student retention, it is important to put some boundaries around its meaning. Attrition and retention are names for the same behavior but with opposite meanings. Three perspectives are relevant: the personal, the institutional, and the state or national. From the student perspective, attrition, or dropping out, can be viewed as failing to meet personal goals. A personal goal could be the completion of a single class, however, and a student who meets his or her goals but does not obtain a degree is not a dropout. From the institutional point of view, the student who enrolls for any reason and does not complete a degree is a dropout. From this perspective, a student who meets his or her goals and leaves school before graduation is a dropout, as is a student who transfers to another school where he or she completes a degree. From the state or national perspective, students who complete certification or degree programs from any institution are not dropouts because they are an asset to labor force development. Those who fail to complete their degrees are dropouts.

There are many relevant institutional perspectives related to attrition and retention. For administrators, low retention rates mean declining income. For the faculty, low retention rates mean fewer students learn what they are trying to teach. In this case, the institution is less well able to accomplish its mission if students leave before their education is complete. In contrast, a reduction in the number of students in overcrowded classrooms or residence halls is often welcomed by the staff and faculty. While the consensus for most people at most institutions is that having more students is preferable to having fewer students, it is not universally true. If academic incivility is a problem, then selecting out students causing this problem can be an asset to the educational process.

It is important to keep in mind that overall retention rates might be of interest to some administrators and policy makers, but they are of little use for reducing attrition. What is important to know is the retention rate for meaningful groups of students—the comparative rates for women and men, for demographic groups such as African Americans, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and European Americans, for full- and part-time students, and for older and younger students. When an institution understands the differences in these retention rates, it is ready to act to reduce attrition.

THEORIES OF ATTRITION AND RETENTION

Modern retention research began with William Spady's publication in 1970 and 1971 of two articles that changed the way scholars and others considered retention. First, he wrote that dropping out of college was analogous to committing suicide—both are withdrawals from a social system. Emile Durkheim, eminent sociologist from the late nineteenth century, described egoistic suicide as resulting from a lack of normative congruence, meaning that an individual did not share the values of the group, and a lack of friendship support. Spady argued that students left college because they lacked normative congruence, which for students meant a lack of academic interest, effort, and integration, and they lacked meaningful friendships at college.

Spady's model indicates that retention is longitudinal with factors affecting students over time. It is complex, containing many factors. Retention decisions are rooted in a student's family background. Family background influences both the academic and social integration of the student. Poor grade performance can lead directly to dropping out. Social integration, which contains both social support and academic success, increases student satisfaction, which, in turn, increases institutional commitment and reduces the likelihood of leaving school. These relationships continue to inform current thinking about retention.

Spady not only developed the model but tested it as well. For freshman-to-sophomore-year retention, the time dropout is most likely to take place, he found that for women the most important reasons to leave were having a lack of institutional commitment, being a science major, having a high intellectual development, earning low grades, and having unsatisfactory faculty contacts. Pressures against women succeeding in the sciences have a long history. Men, on the other hand, were most likely to leave if they had poor grade performance and low levels of institutional commitment, social integration, and friendship support.

Five years later, Vincent Tinto (1975, 1993) developed a model of student retention based on Spady's earlier research. Tinto's model was longitudinal, complex, and centered on academic integration—which Spady had called normative congruence—and social integration—which Spady had called friendship support. Tinto's contribution was to add to the model student's *initial* and *later* goal commitment and institutional commitment with the transition for initial to later commitments depending on the student's integration into the academic and social system of the college.

Tinto's article in 1975 and the two editions of his book that followed in 1987 and 1993 have had the greatest influence on the study of student retention. Thirty years ago, Tinto found men were more likely to finish college than women and, when women did leave, they were less likely than men to leave because of academic dismissals. The explanation given for this gender difference was that women would attend college while waiting to marry and, after finding a spouse, would drop out of school. While these findings were true for some women, they were untrue for others. In today's environment of single parents and dual careers, women are more likely to finish college than men.

Tinto and Spady brought the perspective of sociology to retention studies, and John Bean added insights to the study of retention from the perspective of organizational theory and psychology. His original work, published in 1980, was based in organizational theory and paralleled studies of turnover in work organizations. In a test of his model, he found that women were more likely to leave school if they were dissatisfied, whereas satisfaction has no effects on retention for men. For men, motivations such as *usefulness of education for getting a job* and *self-development through education* had important effects on retention. The stereotypical view that women are more in touch with their emotions and men are more concerned with their careers seemed to pertain at the Midwestern university where the study was completed.

Bean (see his chapters in Braxton, 2000; Seidman, 2005) later focused on the psychological aspects of retention and organized his variables around several psychological theories. From Kurt Lewin's classic formula, *behavior is a function of the person and the environment,* the model incorporated the premise that students' background characteristics influence how they interact in an academic environment. Next, Bean used Fishbein and Ajzen's theory that past norms and behavior lead to attitudes, then intentions, and then future behavior. Applied to student retention, this theory led to a model in which educational experiences lead to attitudes about one's school leading to intent to leave or stay followed by actual attrition or retention. He also described with Shevawn Eaton how three psychological processes—approach/avoidance, self-efficacy, and locus of control—lead to social and academic integration.

Bean's conceptual model of student retention indicates that rates of retention depend on who is let into the system, and one way to change the rate of retention is to admit a different kind of student. The enrolled student interacts with the bureaucratic aspects of the college, the academic and social cultures of the institution, and confronts forces from outside the school, such as a family crisis, that might take the student away from school. On the basis of these interactions, the student develops certain general attitudes. The cumulative effect of these forces lead to an academic outcome indicated by grade point average, a social outcome indicated by a sense of fitting in with others at the institution, and a psychological outcome in the form of a sense of loyalty or commitment to the school. The attitudes and outcomes can affect retention directly or can operate through intent to leave. While some components of the model may have stronger or weaker effects on women than men, the general processes that lead to staying at or leaving a college are presumed to be the same for men and women.

Within these general processes, Bean's conceptual model identifies nine major determinants of student retention:

1. *Intentions: Intent to leave* indicates who is likely to leave, but contains in itself no reasons why the student intends to leave. Asking students currently enrolled if they intend to return next semester or next year is an excellent way of identifying students likely to drop out or transfer.
2. *Institutional fit and institutional commitment* are a social and a psychological outcome from attending a college. Institutional fit depends on the attitudes a student has developed toward a college and his or her social experiences in school. Institutional commitment has similar origins, but commitment is a more psychological orientation and fit a more social one. Both affect intentions and both are important reasons why a student would stay or leave college.

3. *Attitudes and psychological processes.* Developing positive attitudes toward a school is a key to retaining students. When faculty, staff, and administrators with whom a student has contact not only deliver their services but do it in a way so that the student develops positive attitudes toward the school, they have done their job well and the student is less likely to drop out. Satisfaction with being a student, a sense of self-efficacy, self-confidence, and self-development help students remain enrolled. For many students, understanding how their current academic work is directly or indirectly associated with future employment is another key to retention. Helping students approach rather than avoid schoolwork and developing the student's internal locus of control—the sense that they are responsible for their academic success and not some outside force—also improves retention.
4. *Academics.* When students do well in courses they want to take that they believe will lead to later employment, they are likely to remain enrolled. For students to achieve at high levels, they must have academic skills and abilities when they arrive or these must be developed on campus. When a student lacks the ability to achieve a passing grade, departure from college can be involuntary (academic dismissal). Voluntary attrition, choosing to leave school before graduation, is a common occurrence. While certain levels of academic abilities are necessary to remain enrolled and graduate, they are not a sufficient reason to remain enrolled.
5. *Social factors.* Since Spady's work in the early 1970s, it has been recognized that social factors are important in retention decisions. Three groups have important social impacts on students: peers, faculty, and significant others outside of campus. Feeling friendship support on campus and a sense of fitting in with other students is probably the most important social factor in retention. Where students expect contact with faculty outside the classroom, this factor too can affect both fitting in and retention. When a student has significant others away from campus who require attention (a close friend, ill relative, boss), this social force can pull a student away from campus.
6. *Bureaucratic factors.* All colleges and universities have bureaucratic structures such as the financial aid office, bursar's office, admissions office, residence hall directors, administrative assistants, departmental secretaries, advisors, and so on. When a student has a good experience interacting with those responsible for the administration of the institution and the staffing of its programs, she or he is more likely to remain enrolled than if her or his experiences are unfortunate. A single incident of harsh or thoughtless treatment can create negative attitudes toward the school and result in the student leaving.
7. *External environment.* Students can leave school because of factors over which the school has little or no control. A crisis in the family, change in financial situation, homesickness, wanting to be with a boyfriend or girlfriend, a boss who withdraws support for taking classes, a spouse who gets a job in another city—any number of external factors can lead a student to leave school.
8. *The student's background.* Retention is a dance between the student and the institution. Either can misstep and cause the dance to fail. Retention is heavily influenced by selectivity and fit. Students who have academic, economic, and cultural advantages are likely to remain enrolled compared to those who do not. But, to select the best students only and offer them mediocre courses will lead to a lack of fit, and such students are likely to transfer away from that school.
9. *Money and financial aid.* Recent research has suggested that finances should have a more prominent role in retention modeling. Finances can have direct effects on retention independent of academic ability, and finances can have indirect effects on retention by influencing the extent to which a student feels that she or he fits in at a school. Lack of funding is the best excuse for leaving school, and when asked why they left, many students claim it was for financial reasons when it was for other, less acceptable reasons. Few students will say, "I left school because I was lazy and didn't have any friends," when it is more acceptable to say, "I ran out of money." On the other hand, students can have real financial reasons for leaving school, and when institutions can reduce the direct costs for those students, this action is likely to increase retention.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO ATTRITION AND RETENTION

Because retention is valuable, institutions have tried many strategies to increase the completion rates for their students. Where exemplary programs have been identified, some effort has been made to differentiate the factors that affect majority as opposed to minority retention. The authors were not able to find exemplary programs that differentiate between male and female students.

There is no programmatic formula for increasing retention. An institution needs to capitalize on its competencies when offering a retention program with the aim not only of providing the service but also of helping the students develop a belief that the institution is caring and helpful so that the student can develop positive attitudes toward the school. Each program can be successful, but demonstrating the success is problematic due to the multiple influences on retention. Examples of programs directed toward increasing retention include outreach to high schools, summer bridge programs, orientation, freshman interest groups, advising, diversity awareness, career counseling, intrusive advising and monitoring, involvement in social and volunteer groups, exit interviews, and reentry made easy.

Undoubtedly, these programmatic efforts would also be helped by additional research, especially research focused on minority student retention. At many predominantly White institutions, retention rates for African American, Hispanic, and Native American students are substantially lower than for majority students. While the reasons for this might vary, they often revolve around a comparatively poor academic preparation and cultural differences that result in a lack of fit with others at the institution, particularly other students and faculty. Attrition rates also vary by gender across different ethnic and racial groups, although these differences have not been adequately researched and are not yet clearly understood.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bean, J. (1980). Dropouts and turnover: The synthesis and test of a causal model of student attrition. *Research in Higher Education, 12*(2), 155–187.

Braxton, J.M. (Ed.). (2000). *Rethinking the departure puzzle: New theory and research on college student retention.* Memphis, TN: University of Vanderbilt Press.

Seidman, A. (Ed.). (2005). *College student retention: Formula for student success.* Westport, CT: ACE/Praeger Series on Higher Education.

Spady. W. (1970). Dropouts from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. *Interchange, 1*(1), 64–85.

Spady, W. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. *Interchange, 2*(3), 38–52.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*(1), 89–125.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

John P. Bean

Beth W. Bean

Curricular Tracking

The organizational structure of American public schools contributes to the presence or absence of gender equity in educational processes and outcomes. The practice of curricular differentiation—ability grouping both within elementary school classrooms and within subject-area tracking among secondary school courses—continues to be one of the most common organizational features of U.S. public education.

Although they are not intended as such, tracks and ability groups are major sources of inequality in opportunities to learn. This is true because ability group and track placements are strongly correlated with students' social class, race, and, to a lesser extent, gender. At the same time, it is difficult to make generalizations about the relationships among gender, or race, or social class and curricular tracking without also taking the other two factors into account because of multiple ways that these social forces intersect and interact.

Curricular tracking is a source of educational inequality because, depending upon the track in which a student learns, her or his education will be vastly different from that of students in other tracks. These differences revolve around the scope and depth of the curriculum taught, classroom peers' academic orientation, and the rigor of the instructional practices teachers employ. The higher the track, the more curricular coverage, the more academically oriented peers, and the more rigorous the instructional practices are likely to be.

The effects of ability grouping and tracking are cumulative: Young students who possess similar social backgrounds and cognitive abilities but who learn in different tracks become more and more academically dissimilar each year they spend in school. Numerous studies indicates that students in higher tracks—even less academically able ones—learn more because they are exposed to broader curricula, higher peer academic norms, and better teaching.

There is surprisingly little empirical research on the specific topic of gender and tracking. The vast literature on race, social class, and tracking indirectly shines light on the relationship between gender and tracking. It indicates that a student's gender alone rarely has a large effect on ability group or track placement. There are, however, important gender-by-race-by-social class interactive effects on placement that begin in elementary schools. Elementary school placements in special education and gifted programs reflect this intersection of students' gender, social class, and racial background. Middle-class and White students are more likely to be identified as academically gifted, while ethnic minority and working-class students are more likely to be identified for special education. Disadvantaged minority males (especially African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans) are more likely than other students to be placed in special education while White, middle-class females are more likely to be identified for gifted education programs.

TRACKING THEORY AND PRACTICE

In theory, tracking is a meritocratic process that allocates educational resources and opportunities commensurate with students' prior academic achievement, ability, and interest, and with course availability. In practice, tracking rarely operates in this manner. Nonmeritocratic factors informally influence track placement. These include the recommendations of educational gatekeepers such as teachers and counselors, parents' pressure on school decision makers, students' ascriptive characteristics, students' prior exposure to racially isolated minority schooling, students' desire to be with their friends or to be in a class with a welcoming social climate. Specific organizational features of schools—such as types and number of course offerings, seat availability in a given course, and the racial mix and socioeconomic level of the student population—also contribute to placement decisions.

Students of color and those from lower-income families are disproportionately placed in lower tracks. The origins of the social class-race-track correlation can be traced, in part, to historical efforts to separate recent immigrants, Blacks, and Hispanics from native-born Whites and to provide education commensurate with perceived ethnic, racial, and social class differences.

While the formal goals of tracking no longer include reinforcing and reproducing race, social class, and gender hierarchies, the practice of tracking often has these same effects. In many instances, the racially correlated track placements occur among comparably able students of different socioeconomic backgrounds. For these reasons, despite the many changes in the practice and scope of tracking during the past several decades, tracking still presents serious challenges to educators, parents, and policy makers who strive to meet the legal, educational, and moral imperatives to provide an equitable and high-quality education to all students.

TRACKING AND THE GENDERED CURRICULUM

Tracking is intimately connected to the formal curriculum. Today there are few official systematic gender differences in curricular offerings for public school students. That was not always the case. During the early years of U.S. public education, most students were White males. Entry of girls into the common schools gradually increased during the nineteenth century, so that by the middle of the nineteenth century as many White girls attended common schools as White boys. For African American students, the post–Civil War period was especially critical. Tyack and Hansot (1990) point out that as of 1870, 70 percent of African Americans were illiterate because they were denied formal education during slavery. From Reconstruction until the era of Jim Crow, coed African American common schools flourished. White elites tended to send their sons and daughters to gender-segregated private schools.

Beliefs about similarities and differences between males and females shaped gender policies and practices in public schools. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, female students were unlikely to enroll in certain courses because of pervasive gender stereotypes about the proper kinds of knowledge for males and females. These normative assumptions rested on notions of gender-differentiated public (workforce) and private (family) roles.

When coeducation became the norm in secondary schools, males and females were often taught specific curricula designed to prepare them for these roles. Curricula in coed schools varied but always reflected the local community's social construction of gender, especially the gendered nature of men's and women's public and private roles.

Coed common schools usually offered manual training and vocational skills from the upper elementary grades through secondary schools. Importantly, at the turn of the twentieth century, most students did not attend secondary schools. But, for those who did, vocational classes were generally segregated by gender with manual training for male students and "domestic" sciences for females. Females enrolled in commercial courses of study and males enrolled in skilled trades. Union resistance to women in the skilled trades and conservative attitudes about race and women in the workforce resulted in changes in the range of curricular choices available to Black students and White females. As a result, the range of vocational curricular choices for White males far exceeded those for White females and Black students.

During the Progressive Era, educators argued that the "logic" of gender differences suggested the necessity for gender-segregated academic courses, physical education, and, of course, sex education. In addition, educators expected gender-segregated academic courses would improve the lagging achievement of male students. The failure of this approach to improve the academic performance of males, as well as its costs, led to the replacement of gender-segregated academic courses with gendered academic electives. Some science electives offered gendered curricula. For example, in a physics course for girls, students learned about the mechanics of vacuum cleaners and sewing machines. Observable gender differences in math and science enrollments soon arose, with females taking far fewer advanced math and science courses than males. Tyack and Hansot (1990) note that this kind of gendered science curricula did not prepare females for college science or engineering courses.

TRACK PLACEMENTS AND ACADEMIC TRAJECTORIES

Tracking and ability grouping begin very early in children's school careers and have consequences that follow students throughout the course of their education. Curricular differentiation begins when students enter elementary schools where typically they are separated into groups for reading and arithmetic instruction. At this age, there is little evidence of gender inequality in ability group assignments (although race and class correlates are clear even at this stage of students' school careers). An important early source of gender-correlated tracking is the process of identification of students for gifted education or special education. Males, especially from disadvantaged minority backgrounds, are the most likely to be identified for special education and for disciplinary sanctions that remove them from school. White middle-class females are more likely to be identified for gifted programs. Once children are identified and labeled, they rarely change their status. An exception to this generalization is the greater likelihood of White female high school students dropping out of the gifted tracks compared to other students.

One reason for the relative permanency of a student's track placement status once he or she is identified for these programs is that students in different programs receive very different educations. Participation in these programs creates the reality that students in special education know less and those in gifted programs know more than those who remained in the regular classes.

Elementary gifted or special education placements influence middle school placements. Middle school track placements, in turn, launch students onto academic trajectories that most of them follow throughout high school. Enrolling in an academic course at a particular track level frequently leads to enrollments in the other courses at similar levels, especially in middle schools. At the middle and high school levels, within subject-area differentiation of mathematics, social studies, English, foreign languages, and science results in courses that vary widely in the rigor of the instruction, in the depth and breadth of the curricular coverage, and by the social relations of the classrooms (for example, discussion groups verses individual seatwork).

Overall, research suggests that race, class, and gender differences in track placements are shaped by characteristics of specific schools intersecting with the characteristics of students. For example, the racial and socioeconomic composition of a school influences the academic track structure, number of offerings at each level, and the rigor of the standards for entry into the top academic tracks. The decision-making processes that underlie secondary track placements for male and female students are similar but not identical. The processes tend to differ by the gender and race of the students. Kubitschek and Hallinan (1996) found that in order for female and Black male students to maintain their middle school advanced mathematics track placement when they transition to high school, they had to demonstrate their suitability for top tracks through high test scores and grades. Less of a demonstration was necessary for non-Black males.

Other researchers report that among those African American students who reach high school (considering the staggeringly high drop-out rate among African American males), those who attend racially imbalanced minority schools have greater chances of entering college preparatory tracks. But, even in those schools, Black females have a more difficult time getting into the top tracks than Black males with similar background characteristics and comparable records of prior achievement.

Gender equity in public education requires an equitable distribution of high levels of achievement and engagement among males and females across all ethnic groups and social classes. Currently, there remain troubling differences in educational outcomes that may be rooted in gender inequities in early access to the gifted programs and enrollment in special education. Any measurable differences in secondary track placements are likely a consequence of the differential educational trajectories on which students were launched during elementary school and the cumulative effects of that trajectory once students entered middle school.

INEQUALITIES IN HIGH SCHOOL TRACK PLACEMENTS

Gender differences in educational achievement and attainment are much smaller than the gaps associated with race or social class. In general, female students' achievement exceeds that of males beginning in elementary school. More females graduate from high school and go on to earn college degrees than males. Still, female high school students are less likely to take the highest track levels of physical science courses. But, when females do enroll in such classes, their achievement is comparable to male achievement.

Female students' lower enrollment rates in high school top track physical science courses are mirrored in the disparate choices of college majors among males and females. These gendered patterns of secondary school physical science course taking are likely sources of gender differences in higher education outcomes. Males are more likely than females to major in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

African American female students are more likely than their male counterparts to enroll in college preparatory level academic courses. White and Asian female students today enroll in top level secondary school academic courses (including in math and science) at rates comparable to the rates of White or Asian males. Currently, there are no gender differences in the likelihood of students' placements in higher-level math and science secondary school tracks once prior achievement and previous track placements are taken into account (research identifies persistent race and social class effects, though). Yet, the fact that so many disadvantaged minority males were placed in special education during elementary school means that by high school, disproportionate numbers of disadvantaged minority males will enroll in lower level math and science courses while very few of them will enroll in top level academic courses.

Importantly, even if the processes of high school track placement were equitable, there still would be unequal distribution of students by race, social class, and gender in the top and bottom levels of tracked academic courses because of differences in students' prior achievement, peer group norms, and prior track placements during middle school. Early gifted or special education placements begin long processes that socially construct the differences in cognitive ability, stocks of knowledge, attitudes of engagement, and academic self-concepts that unfold over the course of a student's educational career and underlie disparate track placements and, ultimately, inequitable educational outcomes.

Some research suggests that curricular tracking's equity problems are rooted in poor implementation of the practice, and that if tracking were implemented correctly, there would be no inequities. Other research points to inherent flaws in the practice itself. Consequently, there are a number of efforts to eliminate ability grouping and tracking altogether. Efforts to do so have encountered resistance from educators who are unfamiliar with teaching techniques for heterogeneously grouped classes and from parents who fear detracking will undercut the quality of their high-track children's education. Other parents fear that their lower-track children will be ignored in a class with a diverse population of students. One approach to detracking is AVID (Advancement through Individual Determination), a program designed to upgrade skills among academically able but underperforming students so they will successfully enroll in top level tracks (Mehan, Villanueva, Hubbard, & Lintz, 1996).

The early race-by-class-by-gender differences in special education, disciplinary, and gifted education placement rates have notable consequences for students throughout their educations. These differences raise important questions about the tracking process, the track mobility, and the equity of opportunities to learn that future researchers will need to address.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Kubitschek, W.N., & Hallinan, M.T. (1996). Race, gender, and inequality in track assignment. In A. Pallas (Ed.), *Research in sociology of education and socialization* (Vol. 11, pp. 121–146). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lucas, S.R. (1999). *Tracking inequality.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Mehan, H., Villanueva, I., Hubbard, L., & Lintz, A. (1996). *Constructing school success: The consequences of untracking low achieving students.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track* (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1990). *Learning together. A history of coeducation in American public schools.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Roslyn Arlin Mickelson

LaTasha Jones

Educational Achievements in International Context

Over the course of the twentieth century, the global expansion of modern mass schooling has created a world culture of gender equality in education. This world culture of gender equality is most often manifested in national school systems' structures and official policies but has penetrated actual school and classroom processes as well. Recent and ongoing international assessments such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) show that, while there are persistent differences in educational achievement by gender between nations, these differences are slowly decreasing. Even now, in some countries, girls outperform boys on these international achievement tests. These international assessments have been going on long enough to also indicate that, over time, gender differences in achievement continue to decrease overall around the world. This evidence suggests that common cultural ideas about gender equality have penetrated national educational systems enough to impact teaching and learning, but that the gendered social and cultural contexts in which schooling occurs still operate outside of the direct influence of schooling.

TOWARD A WORLD CULTURE OF GENDER EQUALITY

Discussions about gender and education at the national and international levels often focus on gendered inequality of educational opportunity and access for girls. According to many arguments, gendered educational inequality is the result of female oppression in a world dominated by global male hegemony within and across institutions like schools—even when formal equality for girls and women is incorporated into these national school systems' official policies and organizational structures. There is much international evidence to support this critique of national educational trends and educational processes. For example, some of the most damning evidence of gendered inequality in schooling is the fact that in many developing countries there are large proportions of school-age children who are not in school—many, if not most, of whom are girls.

Yet some of the most interesting recent scholarship on gender inequality in schools focuses on how gender intersects with race, ethnicity, and class. Indeed, national and international level discussions about girls' education have gone beyond a "gender wars" dichotomy to encompass something broader and more complex. The reality of girls' education is in every way contextualized by the environment of both local schools and national educational systems. This environment is permeated by common cultural ideas that increasingly suggest a person's gender is neither a limiting quality nor a legitimate reason to socially exclude a person. These ideas about gender are shared not only by small groups of acquaintances but also by large communities of people who all participate in the worldwide phenomenon of modern mass schooling.

Within this global educational community, there is some evidence that a world culture which celebrates equality in education has arisen, particularly in respect to girls. This culture of equality can perhaps ironically explain why inequality persists and may appear to deepen even when measurable progress toward equality is demonstrated. Indeed, egalitarian standards are official components of most national educational systems. And, partly due to the substantial worldwide expansion of mass schooling and acceptance of the institutional ideas behind it, these shared egalitarian standards are, therefore, well established in world society.

The institutionalization of gender equity standards, as well as informal practices such as coeducational classrooms and school-based activities, in schools around the world has had an unusual effect. It is indeed ironic that as the common culture increasingly reinforces the notion of gender equity, it also increases the likelihood that modest and even small gendered inequalities will be identified and publicly defined as a problem. This heightened awareness of both educational equality and inequality spurs on additional attempts at full gender equality and equity. And, there has been notable success in overcoming a long history of gender inequality in education up to the modern period.

But the trend toward greater gender equality has not come easily. It has been a hard-fought battle. Given this shift toward more gender equality in education, it is interesting to note that parallel feminist critiques of gender in modern society have ignored or downplayed significant evidence of progress toward greater gender equality in school and society. This persistent focus on gender equity problems to the exclusion of positive outcomes is surprising given the increasing evidence that females in many nations are actually outperforming males.

This makes it even more important to analyze trends in gender differences in schooling and academic performance to find out which education-related efforts may be contributing to these success stories. Of course, just when empirical evidence seems to be showing the rewards of this hard work, there are still the persistent stereotypes of girls and schooling (especially math and science education) that arise. In spite of the prejudice and stereotyping that still exists, national and international evidence has shown for some time that girls tend to get better grades in school, and newer evidence is showing that girls around the world are attaining higher levels of education than boys. This positive evidence is, unfortunately, not the focus of much of the discussion about gender and education.

EXPLANATIONS FOR GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ACHIEVEMENT

While there has been an overall world trend toward greater gender parity in performance, still some nations show that girls lag behind boys in basic mathematics achievement. There have been differing explanations for this variation and eventual increase in gender inequality of achievement at different ages and school grades. In an oft-cited study of gender differences in academic achievement using cross-national data from the Second International Mathematics Study conducted in the 1980s, David P. Baker and Deborah

Jones (1993) outlined three general explanations for these gender differences in achievement: biological, psychological, and sociological.

The classic biological argument asserts that differences in achievement are biological functions of a student's sex. In other words, the simple fact of physically being a female or male would lead to different cognitive abilities through perhaps hormonal, neurostructural, and other physical differences between the sexes. Such a line of reasoning has been popular mostly because of the obvious phenotypic differences between males and females. Yet this popular argument flounders in obvious ways when it is applied to academic achievement. If the biological argument were true, then there should be no cross-national variation in gender differences in achievement because, of course, biological sex differences do not vary by nation, society, or culture. Likewise, from a biological perspective, gender differences in achievement should not change over time because biological sex differences do not respond to temporal conditions. Previous work by David P. Baker and his colleagues has shown that, on both counts, the biological argument for sex differences in achievement is unsupported because gender differences in academic achievement do, indeed, vary cross-nationally and over time.

From a more psychological point of view, others have argued that the social and cultural construction of gender more than biological sex influences differences in academic achievement. This psychological perspective suggests that gendered inequality of achievement is due to the impact of face-to-face relationships that students have. The argument is that these interactions promote gender stereotypes that could lead to learned differences in cognitive functioning. If the psychological approach is true, then there could be, as is the case, some variation in the size and direction of gender differences between nations due to differences in cultural ideas about gender in families and society in general. A psychological perspective on gender differences in academic achievement also does not suggest that stratification of out-of-school opportunities should influence gender differences in achievement as much as the immediate schooling context, including parental, peer, and teacher expectations for students.

Another answer is to look at the institutional qualities of mass education for elements that allow or encourage penetration of informal and formal schooling influences on students. Modern mass schooling increasingly provides equality of access and opportunity to girls and boys alike—at least officially if not always in practice. Consequently, when girls and boys around the world go to school, especially in the elementary and early secondary grades, they go to the same schools, sit in the same classrooms, learn from the same teachers, and are taught the same curriculum and content. This shared schooling, by virtue of the students' formally equalized opportunity to learn, potentially reduces gender differences in achievement.

The longer that girls and boys have the same opportunity to learn, resulting from mass schooling and shared-curricula situations, the more equal their achievement becomes, according to this sociological perspective. But, there is often an unintended consequence of equity initiatives. In fact, in recent international studies of academic expectations of parents and teachers for students and of students themselves, females are expected and encouraged to do well in school subjects, including mathematics, and attend universities more often than males are. Boys, on the other hand, are more frequently expected to become economically productive, which means they often drop or stop out of schooling earlier in their academic careers than girls do.

As more and more females are being encouraged, as a result of favorable shifts in societal norms and improving adult opportunity structures, to do well in and continue their studies of math and science in particular, an interesting phenomenon has occurred. These favorable attitudes toward females and education have created a single-minded effort at recruiting females into traditionally male-dominated educational arenas, which inadvertently pushes a significant proportion of underprepared, lower-aptitude girls into specialized and advanced courses. When this more inclusive group of females is compared to a more selected group of males, there are large male-dominated differences in end-of-secondary school achievement in mathematics and science. Therefore, while the institutional qualities of modern mass schooling may have a positive effect on the academic achievement of girls relative to boys, the effect in the short term often appears as increased gender disparity. Educational researchers and policy makers concerned with gender differences in achievement should take heart, however, because through "false" setbacks such as this, the larger goal of gender equity becomes further institutionalized in the formal structure of schooling.

MASS SCHOOLING AND GENDER EQUALITY

Recent comparative, cross-national evidence shows a decline in gender differences in school access and achievement since the late 1960s. In particular, there is increased gender equality in the early and middle school years. The institutional qualities of mass schooling are such that when gendered cultural ideas shift toward the expansion of gender equality through adult opportunities for women in the social, political, and economic arenas, gender parity in school achievement often increases. And, through improved adult opportunities and achievement both within and across nations, the shift of societal norms toward gender equality becomes more rapid.

Nowhere is this increased effort to formally produce gender equity in schools more apparent than the widespread "girls' education" movement that is central to most global education policies and multilateral agencies participating in or directing the development of nations around the world. The World Bank along with many United Nations-related agencies (e.g., UNICEF and UNESCO) and other international organizations have been instrumental in creating the girls' education movement that is now a part of the larger women's rights movement and most nations' formal educational policies. The far-reaching efforts of UNESCO's Education for All program and related initiatives have as a key component the access to and improvement of education for girls and women. This has led to increased attention to and emphasis on the improvement of girls' education even in nations that, for social and cultural reasons, have maintained separate educational facilities for girls and boys.

Indeed, improving girls' education is now on the women's rights agenda for all nations who are a part of or aspire to be a part of the global social, political, and economic community. This agenda, however, is a relatively recent global phenomenon. This line of reasoning suggests that, as countries or socioethnic groups become "nation-states," the importance of individual citizenship, notions of nationalism as the basis of social cohesion, as well as educated females' potential contributions to the nation's human capital replace previous sociocultural divisions such as gender.

Of course, gender parity in access to schooling is a significant concern for parents, educators, and policy makers worldwide. In a recent Education for All report from UNESCO, gender parity in access to education was identified as one of the key indicators of achieving education for all. In fact, this report listed 40 middle- and lower-income countries that had achieved gender parity in primary and secondary education enrollment and 34 that were likely to achieve gender parity in the next few years. While complete gender parity in educational access has certainly not been achieved in every nation around the world, significant strides have been made and many resources are focused on this effort. Yet, in spite of these advances in gender parity in access to schooling, the persistent question of gender inequality in education continues to focus most intensely on academic achievement, especially in math and science.

One of the most recent cross-national studies of math and science achievement is the 2003 Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS 2003) administered by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). The results of this study of 46 nations suggested that, on average, eighth-grade boys do not perform better than girls in mathematics in most nations nor in many nations in science. In fact, in 28 of the 46 countries (61 percent), there was no gender difference in math achievement. And interestingly, among the 18 countries (39 percent) with a gender difference in math achievement, girls—not boys—had significantly higher achievement in half of these countries. The nine countries posting higher average math scores for girls were Serbia, Macedonia, Armenia, Moldova, Singapore, the Philippines, Cyprus, Jordan, and Bahrain. So, in 37 of the 46 nations (80 percent) that participated in TIMSS 2003, there was either no difference in math achievement by gender or on average girls had an advantage over boys in math achievement. These numbers do not suggest widespread male dominance in math achievement—at least not at the eighth-grade level in these countries.

The TIMSS 2003 results for eighth-grade science achievement tell a slightly different story. In fact, in 28 of the 46 countries (61 percent) participating in TIMSS 2003, boys scored higher than girls on the eighth-grade science assessment. Yet, there were still 11 countries where there was no gender difference in eighth-grade science achievement (Egypt, Iran, Chinese Taipei, Botswana, South Africa, Lebanon, Singapore, Estonia, Cyprus, the Philippines, and New Zealand) and even seven countries where girls scored higher than boys in eighth-grade science (Macedonia, Moldova, Armenia, the Palestinian National Authority, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Bahrain). All told, more than one-third (39 percent) of the nations showed either no gender difference or showed a girls' advantage in science achievement compared to boys.

Even though the cross-nationally comparative data on gender differences in science achievement do not suggest gender parity or girls' advantage as much as the math achievement data do, the fact that there is as much equality or girls' advantage in math and science achievement as there is suggests that some improvements have been made in the schooling of girls worldwide. For example, in both math and science, girls outperformed boys in countries where, according to some studies, they should not have. In particular, there have been studies and reports that have demonstrated the subordination of women and girls in traditionally Muslim nations. Yet, the TIMSS 2003 results either show no significant difference in girls' and boys' performance or show girls outperforming boys by a significant margin in several predominantly Muslim nations including Bahrain, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Malaysia, Palestinian National Authority, and Saudi Arabia. Interestingly, in some of these nations there are separate schools for boys and girls. Although this finding will be a surprise to many, it clearly demonstrates the power of universalism ingrained through mass schooling such that, even in these gendered societies, teaching and learning are not so readily shaped by traditionally male-dominated cultures.

Almost 10 years prior to TIMSS 2003, the IEA and participating countries administered an earlier incarnation of the TIMSS in 1995. TIMSS 1995 assessed math achievement for students at three levels of schooling rather than two as TIMSS 2003 did. The third level included in TIMSS 1995 comprised students in their final year of secondary school (U.S. 12th-grade equivalent).

The TIMSS 1995 sample of students in the final year of secondary school posed a special situation and deserves unique explanation. Several characteristics of this sample population make it idiosyncratic. For instance, this "final year" sample is small. Only 22 countries participated in this sample in 1995 versus 26 and 41 in the other two age/grades sampled. The final year of secondary school sample is also idiosyncratic in that some of the highest scoring countries in the other grade levels, such as Singapore, Korea, and Japan, did not participate in the final year of secondary school assessment. The most interesting idiosyncrasy, however, is that this sample represents less influence by a common mass institutional structure than either of the other sample populations because of the nature of secondary schooling in general and the differences in the final or terminal year of secondary school among nations in particular.

It is noteworthy that the final year of secondary school may not be the same age-grade level for all students in all countries. Thus, the opportunity for variation in age, grade, and opportunity to learn is greater in the "final year" sample. In addition, the final year sample was divided into a "literacy" and an "advanced" group in mathematics. The literacy final year mathematics group consisted of all students in the final year sample, and the content of the test was considered grade and age appropriate for what students were expected to typically know during their final year of secondary school. The advanced final year mathematics group was tested on advanced math content, such as calculus, which was not used when testing the literacy group.

Evidence from TIMSS 1995 shows that the size of mathematics achievement differences by sex varies more in the "final year" sample than in either fourth or eighth grades; in fact, the final year gender differences are two or three times as large as either of the other age/grade samples. Overall, the final year gender differences in achievement fall into two categories: nations showing male advantage and nations showing no significant difference between boys' and girls' achievement scores. In other words, there is no girls' advantage group in the final year sample. Also, the boys' advantage group is large in the final year sample (91 percent in literacy and 88 percent in advanced), whereas the no difference group is small (9 percent and 12 percent, respectively). For those concerned with gender equality, this is not a positive story at all, and the obvious question is, therefore, why is there such a dramatic shift in the positive trends in gender differences in achievement when students in the final year of secondary school are sampled? There are a few possibilities including the more feminist-based explanations related to male hegemony and active female subordination. But, other sociological and organizational explanations exist as well.

In the final year of secondary school and for several years before in many situations, the curricular and course-taking arrangements of students shift away from the sole control of schools toward allowing some parent and student preferences in course taking. In other words, course selection becomes more choice oriented in secondary school, and especially the upper grades of secondary school, than before. With this shift in the institutional structure or, rather, control, an influx of social and cultural influences may penetrate the schools and increase gender differences in achievement even though schools as institutions support and formally encourage academic gender equality. Add other factors such as increased or changing after-school activities, the effects of adolescent peer influence, and parental encouragement along with other, similar factors and, as a result, the stability and equality of the mass schooling institution shift somewhat.

One of the more frequently discussed factors influencing girls' persistence and attainment in education in general and in math and science in particular is related to role models and perceived future opportunities—often referred to as the "pipeline." While previous studies rest their argument on the assumption that the perceived access to and anticipation of future opportunities for women shape female students' current academic achievement and goals, there are other factors at play. The work of comparative sociologist Francisco O. Ramirez and his colleagues suggests that the influence of women's citizenship and increased access to and participation in schooling impact not only the larger gendered opportunity structure but also each other so that these factors, which are two of the most important influences on gender differences in achievement, are combined. Indeed, the social, political, and economic incorporation of women as "citizens" is intricately connected to the global expansion of mass schooling and opportunities for women in the labor market.

Obviously, the results reported above do not contradict the fact that gender inequality persists in schools both within and across national systems of education. These results, however, do confirm that progress toward gender equality is taking place—slowly but surely. Schools, in fact, are the locus for much of the progress that is being made, although there is still much more to be done in order for gender equality to be a consistent characteristic of educational systems around the world. Indeed, mass schooling has helped gender equality become part of a pervasive world culture. This same world culture is also impacting schools through the common structure and shared norms that mass schooling both incorporates and disseminates.

For example, the official policies and formal structures of modern mass schooling now largely avoid formal differentiation in schooling by gender. The global norm is no longer for girls to learn home economics and for boys to learn the industrial arts or for boys to be assigned to more math and science classes and girls to more history and language courses. These distinctions still do exist, but they exist apart from the formal structure and form of modern mass schooling. Instead, quite the opposite has become an institutionalized component of schooling. When home economics (now often called by some other more appropriate name) is offered in schools, boys are encouraged and even pushed to enroll in it at the same or greater rates than girls. Likewise, girls are being encouraged and pushed into advanced math and science courses—sometimes beyond what is needed or wanted.

For an overwhelming number of nations, formal differentiation in schools by gender has largely shifted to formal differentiation in schools by academic achievement in modern mass schooling systems. For example, the official criterion for access to advanced math and science courses is not a student's gender anymore in most schools around the world. Instead, in most cases, the official criterion for advanced math or science course enrollment is demonstrated academic ability. This shift from the more traditional stratification indicator of gender to a more performance-based criterion is typical in most school systems. Mass schooling has played a large part in making this happen. Once the entire school-age population was both given the opportunity to enroll and, in most nations, compelled to attend school, traditional gender differentiation was no longer appropriate or effective.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Baker, D.P., & Jones, D.P. (1993). Creating gender equality: Cross-national gender stratification and mathematical performance. *Sociology of Education, 66*(2), 91–103.

Baker, D.P., & LeTendre, G.K. (2005). *National differences, global similarities: Current and future world institutional trends in schooling.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ramirez, F.O., & Wotipka, C.M. (2001). Slowly but surely? The global expansion of women's participation in science and engineering fields of study, 1972–92. *Sociology of Education, 74* (3), 231–251.

Stromquist, N.P. (1998). The institutionalization of gender and its impact on educational policy. *Comparative Education, 34*(1), 85–100.

UNESCO. (2003). *Gender and education for all: The leap to equality.* Paris: Author.

Wiseman, A.W. (2006). A world culture of equality? The institutional structure of schools and cross-national gender differences in academic achievement. In M.A. Maslak (Ed.), *The agency and structure of women's education* (pp. 36–51). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Alexander W. Wiseman

David P. Baker

Graduate and Professional Education

Graduate and professional education involves the continuation of academic study beyond the baccalaureate degree. Although the clear separation of graduate from professional education did not fully evolve until the twentieth century, there now are sharp distinctions between the programs offered and the degrees granted by graduate versus professional schools and colleges both in the United States and in most other countries. Graduate education has typically been distinguished from professional education in its breadth and, at the present time, the broader scope of knowledge gained in graduate programs makes those programs suitable training for a broad range of professional positions not including, however, the positions requiring education in professional degree programs. In contrast to graduate programs, professional programs are much more specialized and prepare students for work in a specific area such as law or medicine. Although both graduate and professional education have been well established in the United States for many years, it was only in the latter part of the twentieth century that the faces of graduate and professional students began to change and become more diversified. Diversification included the proliferation of women students.

MASTER'S, DOCTORAL, AND PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

Contemporary graduate education is divided into two main areas: the master's degree and the doctoral study. Obtaining a master's degree in the United States typically requires a minimum of 30 credit hours past the baccalaureate degree, or about two years of graduate-level coursework, although some programs may require more or less depending on the university and discipline. At the completion of class work, a comprehensive exam is administered or a written thesis is submitted, or both are required, and either of these may be followed by an oral defense in which the student is asked questions by the department faculty. There are hundreds of different types of master's degrees offered in the United States, however, and many programs have unique characteristics and requirements.

The traditional master's degrees grounded in the arts and sciences curricula are the master's of arts (MA) and the master's of science (MS). Examples of other master's degrees that have a more practical or profession-specific approach are the master's of business administration (MBA), the master's of education (MEd), and the master's of engineering (MEng). Although there are a significant number of students who attend graduate school immediately following their undergraduate experience, more students choose to return for a master's degree several years later. For these older students, the general reason for pursuing a master's degree is that it provides a stepping-stone for career advancement, and more businesses now make it possible for their employees to attend graduate school by offering tuition reimbursement and/or time off from work. At the same time, universities are offering more options for students who choose to remain employed while pursuing their master's degree. Examples include offering evening or weekend classes, conducting classes in the work environment rather than on the college campus, and offering distance learning online classes. With the increased availability and visibility of master's education, the number of master's degrees awarded in the United States has grown from 311,000 in 1988–1989 to 513,000 in 2002–2003 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005).

Differences in postbaccalaureate education can be found in countries outside the United States. For instance, in addition to MA or MS degrees (or their non-U.S. equivalents), the United Kingdom offers several postgraduate degrees including a postgraduate diploma (PG Dip) or a postgraduate certificate (PG Cert), and, for those interested in teaching, a postgraduate certificate in education (PGCE). In the United Kingdom, postgraduate degrees are not as academically focused as traditional master's degrees and are often vocational. The time frame to receive a postgraduate diploma is also shorter, lasting about nine months.

A doctoral program is now considered to be a necessary prerequisite for a position as a tenured faculty member in most academic departments at most colleges and universities in the United States. Exceptions include some of the fine arts departments (art, theatre, music) in which the master's of fine arts (MFA) degree is accepted as an alternative terminal degree to the PhD and some small four-year colleges and community colleges in which it is still possible, albeit increasingly difficult, to achieve tenure with only a master's degree. While there are differences in course and examination requirements, the doctoral program generally begins with one to two years of coursework beyond the master's degree or beyond the credit hour criterion for the master's degree (for those admitted to doctoral programs without a master's degree) and ends with the oral defense of the dissertation. The dissertation, which is reviewed by a panel of faculty members, shows a thorough knowledge of the topic on which it is focused along with the presentation of original scholarship that adds to the body of knowledge in the PhD candidate's discipline. Many doctoral students in the United States hold research or teaching assistantships in addition to taking classes and conducting original research.

The PhD (doctor of philosophy) is the typical doctoral degree received at universities although areas of study range from the humanities to the biological, physical, and social sciences to applied areas such as business, nursing, and education. Those receiving PhDs have traditionally gone on to faculty positions at colleges or universities, but it is not uncommon today for PhD recipients to go immediately into careers outside of academe. Not only do many choose to forego teaching or research opportunities but also some are forced to look elsewhere for work due to the lack of available faculty positions. With the proliferation of doctoral recipients, it is natural to assume that not all PhDs will find the ideal job at a college or university.

Other doctorates are available for those selecting a less traditional, more practical course of study. Some examples are the educational doctorate (EdD or DEd) and the doctor of engineering (DEng). It is normal for these graduate students to focus their studies and dissertations on more applied areas. For instance, some EdD programs require a capstone project in place of a traditional dissertation. An example of a capstone experience is a year-long involvement in independent research and analytic activity embedded in a larger group project with a written capstone project report submitted at the year's end.

While a PhD obtained in the United States is accepted in other countries as a terminal degree, there are some countries such as the United Kingdom and Australia that make a distinction between doctorates and higher doctorates. The higher doctorate is awarded after a significant period (7 to 10 years) of exceptional research along with a thorough peer review of research and publications. The higher doctorate, which has now become quite rare, was devised in response to the fact that U.S. doctoral programs generally require a great deal of coursework, whereas doctoral programs outside the United States are more heavily focused on independent research leading to the dissertation.

Among professional schools and colleges, two of the oldest and more prestigious are medicine and law. The requirements for obtaining a doctor of medicine (MD) or a law degree are rigid and do not vary greatly across different universities. Generally, students enter as a cohort, proceed through the program at the same pace, and graduate within the recommended time period unless serious circumstances delay their progress. The process may be less rigid in other professional areas like engineering or divinity programs, but those curricula also focus on more applied areas of study. Unlike those who obtain PhD degrees for which a successful dissertation defense in front of a faculty committee is the culmination of study, graduates in medicine and law are required to take state-regulated examinations in order to practice their profession.

The number of doctor's degrees awarded in the United States has grown from 36,000 in 1988–1989 to 46,000 in 2002–2003. The number of first professional degrees awarded in the United States has grown from 71,000 in 1988–1989 to 81,000 in 2002–2003 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005).

American universities did not assume world leadership in graduate education until the twentieth century. The earlier leaders in graduate education were European, especially German, universities. In the United States, Harvard, Yale, and Johns Hopkins are credited as the founders of postbaccalaureate education. Although Harvard took the lead when it was established in 1636, Yale developed a model in 1847 that made a clear distinction between undergraduate and graduate education. Johns Hopkins University, founded in 1876, was the first institution to be founded primarily as a graduate education institution.

WOMEN IN GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Before American graduate programs proliferated and achieved prestige, both men and women pursued graduate education in Europe. Women did have limited access to graduate programs in the United States in the late 1800s but found it easier to be admitted to programs in European countries. Early graduate programs open to women in the United States included the program at Bryn Mawr College (1885), an all-women's institution, and coeducational programs at University of Pennsylvania (1885), Columbia (1890), Yale (1891), Brown (1892), University of Chicago (1892), and Johns Hopkins (1907). Although some of these universities, like Chicago, were founded as coeducational institutions, others, such as Yale, admitted women to graduate programs many years before their all-male undergraduate colleges became coeducational.

Women have had limited inclusion in graduate and professional education almost as long as these courses of study have been offered, but the number of women completing graduate and professional degrees was always far below the number of men. That pattern changed in the 1990s when the number of master's degrees awarded to women surpassed the number awarded to men. However, gender disparities remained in the 1990s with more men than women earning doctorates each year, even though women made steady gains in admission to doctoral programs and completion of those degrees. There was one exception to this disparity: Women outnumbered men in doctorates earned in educational fields since at least 1995. By 2005, the most recent year for which such statistics are available from the National Opinion Research Center, women were earning 45.2 percent of *all* PhDs conferred in the United States, a large increase from 30 years ago when women earned only 16 percent of U.S. PhDs. When international students are excluded from the figures for this century, U.S. women earned more PhD degrees than U.S. men in 2005, and they have been doing so since 2002.

There are demographic differences between men and women doctoral students, the greatest being that women tend to be older than men, and they are more likely to be single. Women also take longer than men to complete their doctoral studies. Research shows that motivating factors for older women pursuing graduate degrees are job and financial security. Traditionally, men are seen as the wage earners in the family, but the United States has seen a dramatic rise in single-parent families and in dual-earner families. In order not only to provide for their families but also to compete for the needed higher salaries and career advancement, increasing numbers of women are pursuing not only undergraduate but also graduate and professional degrees. While a more mature woman may have greater complexities in her personal and professional life (i.e., children, aging parents), these challenges often are motivators in that graduate school enrollment helps achieve personal and professional growth.

The path to higher education for American women has been long and has contained many obstacles. Formal higher education for White American men has been available in North America since the founding of Harvard University in 1636. Women were not admitted into any coeducational institution of higher education until 1833 at Oberlin College. Even though the admittance of women into colleges and universities was a long-fought triumph, the road to a high level of education was more difficult for women of color (Blacks, Asians, Hispanics, North American Natives, Pacific Islanders). Even today, the disparity in the numbers of women of color receiving doctorates compared to other populations is vast. In 2004, the Survey of Earned Doctorates listed 3,590 women of color receiving doctorate degrees compared to 10,631 White women and 13,734 men receiving doctorates. The numbers of women of color in graduate higher education are growing; however, women of color still face challenges such as finding a favorable campus climate, eliminating gender gaps within their own ethnicity, and increasing retention.

The implementation of affirmative action provides women of color with greater access to continued education although an undesired outcome is that many of these women are taken out of their comfort zones as they try to acclimate to predominately White universities. As an example, many older buildings on campuses display works of famed artists that are historically and monetarily valuable but the nonverbal and social messages are often not supportive of minority women on campus. For instance, murals displaying slavery can still be found on college campuses today. Further, many campus artworks often portray women in passive positions and roles, whereas the men are portrayed in more dominant roles.

Within the campus environment, undergraduate and graduate students of color, particularly women, often look in vain for faces similar to theirs. Even though more U.S. women than men are now earning doctorates, more than 70 percent of professors at the nation's top research institutions are male. This lack of women among faculty sends nonverbal messages to female students that may be contrary to the message the university is trying to convey. For women of color, the problem is even deeper. Often times, a woman of color may be the only person of color in the classroom, especially in science and engineering classes where they comprise only 9 percent of the undergraduate degree recipients. With so few undergraduates, it follows that the percentage of women of color in sciences is considerably less at the graduate level. The fallout from the shortage of minorities in graduate education is that women of color are often singled out to be the primary spokespersons for minority and women issues. This can lead to marginalization and feelings of incompetence on the part of the student. One way to combat this problem is for institutions of higher education to provide mentoring as a way to assist women through graduate and professional education. With so few women of color holding tenured faculty or top administrative positions, women of color are at a disadvantage when seeking out a mentor, an advisor, or some form of administrator to help guide them throughout their college career.

There is a positive trend in the proportion of all women, but particularly women of color, who are matriculating at college, completing bachelor's degrees, and now completing graduate and professional degrees. It is interesting to note that in her 1969 book, *The Woman Doctorate in America,* Helen Astin wrote that, despite the increase in educated women, they were still underrepresented in the professional and scientific fields. Years later, the increase in educated women is greater than ever, but Astin's statement about their underrepresentation in professional and scientific fields continues to be true. The National Center for Education Statistics has predicted that from 2000–2001 to 2012–2013 there will be continued increases in the number of degrees awarded to women at all levels. The question is whether that period will also see an increase in the number of educated women who can convert their increased educational credentials into academic and professional employment.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Astin, H.S. (1969). *The woman doctorate in America: Origins, career and family.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Harvey, W.B., & Anderson, E.L. (2005). *Minorities in higher education 2003–2004: Twenty-first annual status report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). Earned degrees by level of degree and sex of recipient. Available at http://nces.ed.gov/programs/projections/ch_4.asp#2

National Opinion Research Center. (2005). *Doctorate recipients from United States universities: Summary report 2005.* Available at http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/issues/sed-2005/pdf

National Science Foundation. (2005). *S&E doctorate awards.* Available at http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/doctorates/

Welch, L.B. (1992). *Perspectives on minority women in higher education.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Patricia A. Helland

Intelligence Tests

Differences between the cognitive skills of males and females have been pondered since prior to the development of modern intelligence tests in the early twentieth century. The research on the topic of gender differences in intellectual ability has examined differences in specific individual skills as well as general intellectual ability, often referred to as *g*. The findings of research studies comparing males and females on standardized intelligence tests have produced results that are consistent in some cases but controversial and debatable in other cases. For example, gender differences in specific skill areas have been repeatedly shown across diverse test batteries. Males have a well-documented advantage in visual-spatial ability and often outperform females on tests of mathematical reasoning. Females typically score better than males on tasks of clerical speed, verbal memory, and verbal fluency. In contrast to these results on specific cognitive skills, there is a general trend for males to score slightly higher than females on global IQ scales, but this difference is of little practical importance and has limited generalizability regarding a theoretical understanding of male versus female intellectual functioning.

The equivocal nature of the results concerning male-female differences in global IQ is related to the fact that such studies are contaminated because test developers have consistently tried to avoid gender bias during the test development phase, both in the selection of subtests for the batteries and in the choice of items for each subtest. Great care has been taken by test publishers to counterbalance or eliminate any items or subtests from their final scale that were found to result in a higher score for one sex over the other, a tradition that began when Wechsler developed the Wechsler-Bellevue test in the 1930s. In addition, with large sample sizes, like those found in the standardization samples of major intelligence tests, even differences of two points are likely to be statistically significant. However, such small differences between groups on a measure of global IQ are not of practical significance.

GENDER DIFFERENCES ON GLOBAL IQ SCALES

There are numerous tests of adult intellectual ability, but one of the most widely used is the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale—Third Edition (WAIS-III). Gender differences on the WAIS-III for individuals ages 20–89 years have been examined by computing age-corrected and education-corrected z scores for each WAIS-III IQ, index, and scaled score from the test's standardization sample. Males earned IQs and indexes that were slightly higher than those earned by females. Males scored higher by about 5 points on Verbal IQ (a measure of verbal comprehension, verbal reasoning, and short-term verbal memory), 0.5 points on Performance IQ (a measure primarily of visual spatial skills, nonverbal reasoning, and processing speed), and 3 points on Full Scale IQ (global intellectual ability). On the indexes, men outscored the women by about 3.5 points on both the Verbal Comprehension Index and Working Memory Index and about 2.5 points on the Perceptual Organization Index; in contrast, women surpassed men by about 5.5 points on the Processing Speed Index. All of these differences are relatively small effect sizes, all less than two-fifths of a standard deviation; the largest difference observed was the female superiority of 0.37 of a standard deviation on the Processing Speed Index.

The small differences in favor of males on the WAIS-III IQs resemble data from studies using data from earlier editions of the same test, including the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–Revised (WAIS-R) and Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS). For example, WAIS-R data from 1987 showed that males scored higher than females by 2.2 points on Verbal IQ and Full Scale IQ and 1.4 points on Performance IQ. In the 1955 WAIS standardization sample, males scored higher by about one IQ point on the Verbal and Full Scales, with no IQ difference evident on the Performance Scale.

Non-Wechsler tests have likewise yielded very small gender differences on their global scales for adult samples. For example, on the Kaufman Adult and Adolescent Intelligence Test (KAIT), for individuals ages 17–94 years less than one IQ point separated the education-adjusted IQs earned by 716 men and 784 women on the Fluid (novel problem solving) and Crystallized (acquired knowledge) Scales. Also, at ages 12–23 years on the Stanford-Binet IV, the standard-score differences between 800 males and 926 females was one point or less for the Composite and for three of the four area scores (females scored 2.2 points higher on Short-term Memory).

The similarity in the results of gender-difference studies for adults from instrument to instrument extends to studies of gender differences for children. For example, on Wechsler's children's scales, boys outscored girls with slightly higher IQs on three versions of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children: WISC, WISC-R, and WISC-III. On the Stanford-Binet IV, and the first and second editions of the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (K-ABC and KABC-II), girls scored a bit higher at the preschool ages, but boys and girls performed equally at the school-age level. This finding from tests normed in the United States has also been reported in France. On the 1993 French version of the KABC (i.e., *Kaufman Batterie pour l'examen psychologique de l'enfant),* girls did better than boys on most cognitive scales at the preschool level, but at school-age levels, there were virtually no global score differences between genders.

GENDER DIFFERENCES ON SEPARATE IQ SUBTESTS

It is likely that the mean gender differences in global IQs are an artifact of the specific subtests included in the comprehensive IQ test battery. In fact, gender differences in subtest scores may be an artifact of the specific items chosen for each subtest. However, it is possible to reach some hypotheses about "true" male-female differences on some of the subtests. Although test developers have worked diligently to remove any gender-biased items from intelligence tests, it is hard to imagine how items on subtests requiring examinees to build abstract block designs or rapidly copy symbols could have been eliminated from an IQ test due to gender bias (or any other kind of bias) because of the abstract, nonmeaningful nature of the stimuli. Similarly, arithmetic items on an IQ test are far more dependent on the computational process than on the verbal content and, therefore, are not reasonably subject to the potential impact of bias. If one accepts these assumptions, it is reasonable to conclude that adult males are superior to adult females in the skills assessed by subtests demanding visual-spatial skills, and that adult females clearly outshine adult males in the ability measured by subtests demanding clerical speed and fine motor skill. However, even the subtests on major IQ batteries that yielded the largest gender differences produced differences of about two-fifths to one-half of a standard deviation, which reflect small (or, at best, moderate) effect sizes. Consequently, even the tried-and-true gender differences produce discrepancies on adult intelligence tests that are too small to be of very much clinical value.

Gender differences have been identified on separate subtests of adult intelligence tests developed by Wechsler and by Kaufman. Specifically, among WAIS-III subtests that produced a gender difference greater than one-tenth of a standard deviation, males outperformed females on Information, Arithmetic, Comprehension, Block Design, and Picture Arrangement, while females were superior on Digit Symbol Coding and Symbol Search. On the KAIT, males scored higher on five of the eight subtests, with the largest differences observed on Memory for Block Designs, Famous Faces, and Logical Steps. Overall, the strongest gender differences favored males on WAIS-III Information by 0.51 of a standard deviation (0.51 *SD*), WAIS-III Arithmetic (0.47 *SD*), and KAIT Memory for Block Designs (0.40 *SD*), and favored females on WAIS-III Digit Symbol Coding (0.50 *SD*). Males also scored higher on tasks requiring broad visualization (0.45 *SD*), measured by Gestalt Closure from the Kaufman Short Neuropsychological Procedure (K-SNAP), and quantitative thinking (0.24 *SD*), measured by Arithmetic from the Kaufman Functional Academic Skills Test (K-FAST).

Quantitative Reasoning

Males have consistently outperformed females in quantitative ability, although the advantage does not emerge until early adolescence, about age 12 or 13. That research finding may account for the notable gender difference on Arithmetic on the WAIS-III and WAIS-R but not on Wechsler's children's scales. Interestingly, the math superiority for males is evident on standardized tests but not in classroom grades; research on math performance in school has generally reported no differences, or differences favoring females, even in high-level mathematics courses. The reasons for the gender differences observed in math are subtle and sometimes controversial. Whereas some investigators have implicated biological factors as causing the gender differences in mathematics, others have cited the lack of evidence for biological causation, focusing instead on a series of investigations indicating that math anxiety, gender-stereotyped beliefs of parents, and the perceived value of math to the student account for the major portion of sex differences in mathematical achievement. More recent models take less extreme positions about causality, recognizing that societal and biological factors interact systematically to create gender differences in cognitive abilities such as mathematics.

Clerical Speed

When examining closely the female superiority on Wechsler's Processing Speed Index, the subtests composing this index reveal further information about this gender difference in clerical speed. The females earned a substantially better score on Digit Symbol Coding and a mildly higher score on the second processing speed subtest, Symbol Search (which places less demands on fine-motor coordination than does Digit Symbol Coding). Female superiority on Coding, Digit Symbol, and symbol-digit substitution tasks (rapidly copying the digit rather than the symbol) is well documented in the literature, although the reason for this female advantage is less apparent. Numerous experimental psychologists have systematically explored explanations for this persistent gender difference. One hypothesis is that females outperform males on these psychomotor tasks because of a greater ability to verbally encode the abstract symbols. However, this hypothesis has received support from subsequent studies that were devised to include three forms of the symbol-digit substitution task, each with symbols that have greater spatial and orientational complexity (ones not readily encoded verbally). Females outperformed males significantly on the WAIS symbols, as expected, but males significantly outscored females on the most complex symbol set. Additional support for the verbal encoding hypothesis comes from an experiment indicating female superiority on matching and symbol-digit tasks that utilize verbal material, contrasted with male superiority on symbol-digit substitution tasks employing spatial stimuli. Yet, other studies have concluded that the female advantage seems due to a perceptual speed superiority rather than a verbal encoding strength.

Although the female advantage in Wechsler's Digit Symbol and other tests of clerical speed has emerged in numerous investigations, including cross-culturally, some researchers have noted that the size of the discrepancy had fallen substantially from the mid-1940s to mid-1980s. Other researchers have provided contrary observations, indicating that the WAIS-III versus WAIS-R data do *not* support a decrease in the female superiority in clerical speed through the mid-1990s, when the WAIS-III was normed. If anything, the discrepancy increased during the almost two decades that separated the standardizations. On the WAIS-R, published in 1974, females earned scaled scores that averaged 0.92 points higher than males, across four age groups between 16–19 and 55–74 years, a discrepancy of 0.31 *SD*—not nearly as large as the discrepancy of 1.5 points observed on WAIS-III Digit Symbol Coding (0.50 *SD*).

Spatial Visualization

The higher scores by males than females on specific subtests such as WAIS-III Block Design, KAIT Memory for Block Designs, K-ABC Triangles (U.S. and French versions), KAIT Logical Steps, and Gestalt Closure (from the K-SNAP, as well as the French and U.S. versions of the K-ABC) undoubtedly reflect the well-documented male advantage in visual-spatial ability, or Gv from Horn's theory, a skill that is measured by all of these subtests. Researchers have noted that the largest and most consistently found gender difference is spatial visualization ability. This gender discrepancy is especially evident on spatial tests that require analysis, such as mentally breaking up a configuration into smaller units in ways that facilitate spatial problem solving (e.g., the Block Designs test). Interestingly, the male-female difference in spatial ability is not established consistently until puberty but it persists thereafter. Research studies on spatial visualization find that, generally, only about one-fourth of adolescent and adult females exceed the male median on various tests of spatial visualization.

Researchers studying the impact of gender on specific cognitive abilities have calculated that about 4 percent of the variation in visual-spatial abilities is attributed to gender differences, versus only about 1 percent each for verbal ability and quantitative ability. In comparison, similar small effect sizes for the variable of gender have been identified for noncognitive factors, such as aggression and social influence. These researchers have concluded that, although additional evidence remains to be gathered, the gender of an individual may account for up to a maximum of 5 percent of the main effects in specific social and cognitive behaviors.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. *American Psychologist, 39*(2), 105–116.

Gallagher, A.M., & Kaufman, J.C. (Eds.). (2005). *Gender differences in mathematics.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Gur, R.C., Turetsky, B.I., Matsiu, M., Yan, M., Bilker, W., Hughett, P., & Gur, R.E. (1999). Sex differences in brain gray and white matter in healthy young adults: Correlations with cognitive performance. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 19*(10), 4065–4072.

Haier, R.J., Jung, R.E., Yeo, R.A., Head, K., & Alkire, M.T. (2005). The neuroanatomy of general intelligence: Sex matters. *NeuroImage, 25*(1), 320–327.

Hyde, J.S. (1981). How large are cognitive gender differences? A meta-analysis using w2 and *d*. *American Psychologist, 36*(8), 892–901.

Kaufman, A.S., & Lichtenberger, E.O. (2006). *Assessing adolescent and adult intelligence* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Kaufman, J.C., Chen, T., & Kaufman, A.S. (1995). Race, education, and gender differences on six Horn abilities for adolescents and adults. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 13,* 49–65.

Kaufman, A.S., & Kaufman, N.L. (1993). *Kaufman Batterie pour l'examen psychologique de l'enfant (K-ABC) manuel d'interpretation.* Paris: Les Editions du Centre de Psychologie Appliqué (ECPA).

Kittler, P., Krinsky-McHale, S.J., & Devenny, D.A. (2004). Sex differences in performance over 7 years on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children—Revised among adults with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 48*(2), 114–122.

Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Buchard, T.J., Boykin, A.W., Brody, N., Ceci, S.J., et al. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns. *American Psychologist, 51*(2), 77–101.

Elizabeth O. Lichtenberger

Alan S. Kaufman

Literacy

What do we mean by "literacy"? In the United States, the United Kingdom, and other first world countries (which I prefer to call "the North"), literacy has been identified as an area of the school curriculum where achievement is highly gendered. This has led to a focus on boys' underachievement in literacy, and strategies have been developed to make reading and writing more "boy friendly." Conversely, in the third world countries (which I prefer to call "the South"), the fact that female literacy rates are often much lower than male has led policy makers and planners to promote adult women's literacy as the key to development. Whereas literacy within the school context has been defined in terms of reading, writing, and (sometimes) speaking skills, in adult programs, "literacy" is often used interchangeably with adult "education." In particular, women's "literacy" can encompass a range of activities from skills for running savings and credit groups to awareness raising and training on legal rights.

In both the schools of the North and adult programs in the South, researchers have analyzed the ways in which literacy curricula can contribute to supporting and reinforcing gendered stereotypes or can help to challenge and transform gendered roles, identities, and relations. The "New Literacy Studies" (Street, 1993) have drawn attention to the gendering of literacy practices within school and adult literacy classes, as well as in everyday life. The prevailing assumption by policy makers that the purpose of adult literacy education is to enhance women's reproductive role as wives and mothers has meant that women participants' views are rarely taken into account in the development of literacy programs. As with the situation in schools, the first step is for curriculum planners to investigate and build on learners' existing literacy practices in order to understand the ways in which literacy can help to transform unequal gender relations.

WOMEN, LITERACY, AND DEVELOPMENT

The question of how women's literacy is linked to development has dominated policy and research in countries of the South (see Introduction to Robinson-Pant, 2004). Debates around gender and literacy have been influenced by an instrumental discourse based on the assumption of a relationship between improved women's literacy and development outcomes. For several decades, literacy research was exclusively concerned with statistical correlations between women's literacy rates and health indicators, such as child mortality. Increased women's literacy, for instance, was shown to have an inverse relationship with female fertility rates and child mortality rates, suggesting that literate women would raise healthier and smaller families. Although there is now recognition that adult literacy rates do not allow us to make a distinction between those who became literate at school as compared to those who learn to read as adults, this evidence of correlation between literacy rates and other indicators of development has been used to promote adult literacy initiatives.

Adult literacy policy in the South has adopted what has been termed an "efficiency" approach (see Moser, 1993)—aiming to make women more efficient in their roles as wives and mothers through greater participation in development programs. The Women in Development approach of the 1970s was based on the belief that economic progress would be possible only if women became equal partners in development with men. This implied that they needed to catch up with men in areas like literacy but did not involve challenging traditional gendered roles and relations. Programs tended to adopt a functional literacy approach—linking basic literacy learning to practical skills for improving the lives of poor families (for instance, reading about the benefits of latrines, then learning to build one). The concern with ways of increasing women's access to literacy and educational programs was reflected in the focus on overcoming "barriers" as opposed to critically examining curricula and teaching approaches. Women's lack of participation in literacy could be seen as due to both structural barriers (such as lack of time and childcare facilities) and social factors (such as opposition from family members and limited mobility outside the household). Programs attempted to address these constraints by holding classes in the early morning or late evening when women were free from domestic work and running awareness-raising campaigns to encourage community support for women's literacy classes in their area.

In the 1980s, the Gender and Development approach turned attention to women's relations with men. Rather than considering literacy only in relation to women's traditional reproductive roles, policy makers looked at how literacy programs could help to tackle gender oppression within the home and wider community. Freire's critical literacy approach—where literacy becomes a tool for challenging class inequality—was used to reflect on women's traditional gendered roles as the starting point for collective action. The notion of women as a homogeneous target group for literacy programs was challenged by the work of feminists in the 1980s and 1990s who stressed women's multiple identities according to ethnic, class, caste, economic, and age differences. More recently, policy has promoted a "rights" approach to literacy (see UNESCO, 2005)—based on the belief that literacy (and education) are a basic human right, rather than the earlier instrumental approaches that emphasized how literacy could enhance women's contributions to the economy. The more politicized "rights" approach to women's literacy has shaped curricula, too—for instance, through legal literacy initiatives that enable women to challenge their unequal rights to land or to take legal action against child marriage.

Women's literacy has been regarded in many countries as an "entry" point to other development activities—the assumption being that, unless a woman learns to read and write, she cannot gain other knowledge such as family planning or how to run a kitchen garden. However, high drop-out rates from women's literacy programs have led to concerns about how far they meet women's needs and own motivations for becoming literate. Though most literacy programs are designed and intended primarily for women, planners have often failed to take a gendered perspective on issues related to structure, curriculum, and teaching approaches (Stromquist, 1997).

Women's literacy classes have been welcomed as one of the few social spaces where it is acceptable for women to get together and talk about their lives (see Rockhill chapter in Street, 1993). The advantages of a women-only class are seen to lie in this opportunity to gain confidence or to catch up on male skills in a "safe" noncompetitive environment. The downside of a women-only class has been that women's programs are invariably underfunded and poorly resourced. It can be difficult to develop nontraditional skill areas, since local women facilitators are unlikely to have "male" skills to offer. By contrast, a mixed gender class can enable women to enter traditionally male domains and provide the opportunity for both men and women to discuss gender issues together—such as the gender division of labor or domestic violence. The REFLECT (Regenerated Freirean Literacy though Empowering Community Techniques) programs have developed literacy circles for women and men to sit together and discuss gender inequalities—in the recognition of the fact that women-only classes cannot easily help to raise male awareness around gender relations (see Attwood et al.'s and Fiedrich's chapters in Robinson-Pant, 2004).

Women's literacy classes have also been viewed as a way of creating a group that can then begin to function in other ways, such as campaigning or providing services—an example being women who trained together as health workers after participating in a basic literacy class. Recognizing the constraints on women's mobility and time, some programs have been based on residential camps where women are freed from the burden of domestic work and can have a more intensive experience of learning literacy. The "each one teach one" individualized approach to literacy learning (where a literate person will teach a neighbor or relation) has also helped to address some of these practical barriers, since women can learn at a time and location convenient to them rather than being limited to times when a whole group is free.

Women's reasons for coming to literacy programs can differ from the purposes intended by planners and policy makers. In particular, though the aim of the program may be to impart "functional" literacy linked to new health or agricultural knowledge, women themselves may attend in order to feel educated, to read religious texts, or simply to learn to sign their name. "Literacy for women's empowerment" has been a common theme in literacy programs, yet literacy approaches and curricula are frequently developed in a top-down way and are shaped by planners' perceptions about women's traditional roles. The dilemma is how to develop materials that reflect women's existing lives yet also challenge gender stereotypes. Many literacy courses rely on textbooks that promote images of women as dependent on men and engaged only in domestic work (whereas many poor rural women are active in subsistence agriculture). Programs based on Freirean critical literacy approaches have attempted to encourage critique of such materials by providing a space for women to reflect on their own experiences of oppression. Postliteracy programs have also provided practical materials, such as guides to legal rights or credit facilities, to support women in addressing gender inequalities.

Language policy and choice has also been analyzed from a gendered perspective. Although teaching literacy in a participant's mother tongue has been seen as educationally effective, some women come to a literacy class in order to learn what they regard as a language of power (either English or the official language in that community). In many countries of the world, there is gendered access to languages: Whereas men and boys have often had the opportunity to learn a language of power at school, women may only know how to speak their mother tongue and feel that this is a constraint in participating in committee meetings or accessing formal education. Learning literacy only in the mother tongue can be viewed as perpetuating women's lower status, whereas bilingual literacy approaches can facilitate women's empowerment.

Focusing on women's literacy learning in isolation will not enable women to improve their health or gain an enhanced income. Increasingly, there has been recognition of the need for supporting policies outside the education sector to ensure that women can use new skills or knowledge. This may consist of legislation to remove some of the barriers to formal employment or perhaps enhanced access to credit to help women to set up their own businesses. Similarly, unless there are adequate health services, women with knowledge about family planning or improved nutrition gained through literacy programs can do little to improve their lives. The question of "women's literacy plus what else?" has drawn attention to the complex relationship between gender, education, and development: Increasing women's access to literacy is integrally linked to wider issues around their subordinate position in society.

In many countries of the South, adult literacy has been seen as education for women, not men. Most literacy classes have a majority of female students and are facilitated by part-time women on volunteer conditions. Literacy teachers suffer from a lack of long-term career opportunities due to their limited mobility and the tendency for literacy programs to be run on a "campaign" basis—moving to a new area after a year's course when all class participants are assumed to be literate. The danger is that under these conditions, literacy is not only seen as women's domain but as a second-class education suitable for women because of its lower status in terms of funding, duration, and lack of experienced teachers.

THE FAILING BOYS: GENDER AND LITERACY IN SCHOOLS

The starting point for discussion about gender and literacy in schools of the North has also been the gender gap in attainment. The policy concern in the 1970s and 1980s with why girls did not do as well as boys in math and science has been followed more recently by discussion about why boys have failed to score as highly as girls in literacy and language tests. Attention has also been drawn to the intersections with class and ethnic inequality: Should our real concern be with the poor literacy attainment of White working-class boys?

The reasons for girls' relative success in literacy consist both in factors within the school and outside. The literacy curriculum has been identified as "girl friendly" in privileging the kind of reading and writing practices that girls prefer, such as reading fiction. Conversely, research has shown, for instance, that boys like reading comics, which few teachers regarded as "legitimate" reading material in school (Maynard, 2002). Girls' success in literacy has also been attributed to their being amenable to the requirements of the literacy curriculum and assessment criteria such as writing neatly and giving attention to correct spelling and grammar. The overall bias in the literacy curriculum, toward assessing reading and writing more than speaking, could also be seen to help girls. Analysis of classroom talk has shown that boys dominate in many classrooms, interrupting girls, shouting out answers, and having a longer response time than girls (Guzzetti et al., 2002). Although being marginalized in class discussion can mean girls have less opportunity to develop confidence in speaking and debating, this does not always have an impact on their performance in assessment tests since greater weight is given to reading and writing.

The home environment also influences girls' and boys' attitudes toward literacy. As well as having largely female role models in the school (due to the feminization of the teaching profession in the early years), children have been found to identify literacy primarily as a "female" activity at home. Mothers were seen to be reading magazines and novels themselves, and they were more likely to help with spelling homework and to listen to their children reading. By contrast, men in the family spent little time reading or writing; when they did, they tended to read newspapers and play computer games. Probably as a result of these gendered literacy practices in the home, boys read for utilitarian purposes, preferring factual material in order to gain information, whereas girls read for fun and enjoyed fiction (Millard, 1997). Social attitudes toward boys and girls were also found to influence the time spent on literacy activities at home: Parents felt that boys should be more active than girls so not having time to read at home was regarded as a positive sign.

Understanding children's gendered preferences for literature and their gendered attitudes toward reading has been seen as the starting point for developing strategies to address the gender gap in literacy attainment. Girls' and boys' preferences for fiction and factual books, respectively, have been related to the ways in which they read. Girls liked to read privately as well as for pleasure at home but often preferred undemanding texts such as magazines for girls (Millard, 1997). At school, they selected books about children, which they saw as helping them with real-life problems through empathizing with the main characters and the dilemmas they faced. They read to explore their emotions and liked to discuss the relationships between characters. By contrast, researchers have found that boys chose to read books with adult characters and that they read for the action, following the plot and identifying with the hero. Whereas girls preferred fiction, boys identified humor, adventure, and football as important characteristics of the books they liked to read. These findings have suggested ways in which the literacy curriculum could be revised to appeal more to boys—through introducing reading lists of "boys' literature," such as books with male heroes or books that cover male areas of interest and draw on popular culture. Using computers to promote reading has also been seen as a way of building on "male" literacy practices at home.

Although mainstream literacy curricula have been seen to reflect the interests of girls more than boys (through the greater emphasis on fiction and poetry, for instance), questions have been raised about how far such literature reinforces traditional gendered roles. Research into reading materials available in classrooms has revealed considerable gender bias: more male than female authors, more heroes than heroines, prevalence of sexist language, and gender-stereotyped roles in illustrations and stories (Minns, 1991). Tools for discourse analysis of texts have been introduced to children as a resource for analyzing such materials for gender and cultural bias. Creating a pedagogy to encourage children to read texts critically could be a more effective strategy to deal with gender bias than the censoring of sexist material through removing books from classrooms (as many U.K. schools did in the 1980s). This could be seen as the difference between an antisexist, as compared to a feminist, approach to teaching literacy (see Moss, 1995).

Children's writing has been analyzed in relation to their reading practices, particularly in terms of girls' preference for fiction and boys' for factual writing. Girls tended to write stories with happy endings, fairy tales involving dialogue and bringing emotions and relationships into the plot (Maynard, 2002). They preferred not to write in the first person and often pictured themselves as dependent characters in the plot. By contrast, boys' writing was aggressive, influenced by film and television, and reflected comic book language. They wrote in the first person, had fast-moving and action-packed plots, and avoided using descriptive language as this was seen as more appropriate to girls. The differing characteristics of girls' and boys' writing can be seen as influenced by traditional gender roles: girls seeing themselves as dependent on others and less likely to put themselves in the center of the action.

Researchers have also analyzed children's writing in terms of their intended audience, asking, "Who do you write for?" (see Guzzetti et al., 2002). Girls often wrote primarily for the teacher, writing what they thought their teacher expected, and to the assessment criteria. Boys were more likely to write first for themselves but acknowledged that they had to compromise to some degree through including elements that the teacher considered important. Unlike boys, girls also engaged in writing practices with their friends outside the classroom—such as exchanging notes and letters. These private writing practices have been used as a starting point for challenging girls' normal writing through encouraging girls to write collaboratively for each other (rather than for the teacher) in small single-sex groups. Feminist writing groups have helped girls and boys to look more critically at their gendered identities, thus supporting their speaking as well as writing development.

Literacy practices around electronic texts are gendered in similar ways to conventional texts. At home, men have been found to engage in a wider range of computer practices than women, including record keeping, Internet access, and computer games. They primarily used computers to search and share factual information. Girls and women engaged almost exclusively in e-mail and instant messaging, seeing computers as a way of building and consolidating social relationships. Computer games and even the hardware have become gendered through marketing, promoting gender stereotypes in a similar way to conventional texts (for instance, car racing games for boys and dressing dolls for girls).

Within the classroom, information and communication technology (ICT) has been identified as an important means of supporting boys' literacy because of the assumption that boys' strengths lie in subjects such as science and technology. Recent literature (Guzzetti et al., 2002) has, however, pointed to the potential for ICT to challenge gender stereotypes in that new forms of electronic communication are not yet gender enculturated (for instance, Web design). As with conventional text, teachers need to be aware of the gendered nature of many electronic literacy practices and how this influences girls' and boys' participation and achievement in the literacy classroom that integrates ICT (Rowan et al., 2002).

GENDER AND LITERACY: A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH?

The emphasis on boys' underachievement and the polarization of male and female in debates about literacy in schools have recently been identified as more problematic than helpful in dealing with literacy issues (Rowan et al., 2002). The issue is not just how to raise achievement in reading and writing tests but also how far the literacy curriculum in schools supports or challenges traditional gendered roles. Rowan and her coauthors (2002) suggest that boys' gender identity is more limited and rigid than girls: Girls' preference for a greater variety of literacy genres at home can be related to social acceptance of their multiple identities. A key strategy in improving boys' literacy could be to allow boys this space, to reflect on what it means to be male and to challenge limited notions of masculinity. In the early years of schooling, this could be encouraged through play—such as having a male cook in the home corner.

Literacy education can become a way of challenging and transforming gender identities—rather than an attempt to respond to fixed and polarized notions of what kinds of literature boys and girls prefer or an effort to determine how schools can promote the purposes of reading or writing in ways that will appeal to boys, as opposed to girls. Developing a transformative approach to literacy is central not only to promoting gender equality in schools but also as part of the wider responsibility of schools to encourage and respond to other kinds of diversity. In the context of adult literacy programs, the tendency to develop a "one size fits all" approach to teaching adult literacy based on gender stereotypes must also be replaced by teaching materials and approaches that respect diversity and help to transform unequal gender relations.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Guzzetti, B., Young, J., Gritsavage, M., Fyfe, L., & Hardenbrook, M. (2002). *Reading, writing and talking gender in literacy learning.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Maynard, T. (2002). *Boys and literacy: Exploring the issues.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Millard, E. (1997). *Differently literate: Boys, girls and the schooling of literacy.* London: Falmer.

Minns, H. (1991). *Language, literacy and gender: Equal opportunities in primary English.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Moser, C. (1993). *Gender planning and development: Theory, practice and training.* London: Routledge.

Moss, G. (1995). Rewriting reading. In J. Holland & M. Blair (Eds.), *Debates and issues in feminist research and pedagogy* (pp. 157–168). Clevedon: Open University.

Robinson-Pant, A. (2004). *Women, literacy and development: Alternative perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Rowan, L., Knobel, M., Bigum, C., & Lankshear, C. (2002). *Boys, literacies and schooling: The dangerous territories of gender-based literacy reform.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Street, B.V. (1993). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Stromquist, N.P. (1997). *Increasing girls' and women's participation in basic education* (Fundamentals of Educational Planning No. 56). Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2005). *Literacy for life* (EFA Global Monitoring Report 2006). Paris: Author.

Anna Robinson-Pant

Mathematics Performance

Mathematics has traditionally been regarded as White, middle-class, male territory, and, in many countries, the lower status of females has been attributed to their lesser involvement and poorer performance in mathematics. To counter this situation, diverse programs and legislation have been introduced in recent decades to increase females' participation rates and levels of achievement in mathematics. Not surprisingly, these programs and the gender differences in mathematics learning they are designed to remedy have attracted much attention not only from researchers but also from practitioners and policy makers.

Early research interest focused particularly on patterns of performance and participation in mathematics by females and males, factors likely to contribute to such differences, and the apparent consequences of any differences observed. Recognition of the gatekeeping or critical filter role played by mathematics (i.e., of the longer-term impact on subsequent educational and occupational pathways and opportunities of failure to study mathematics) fueled a range of further work. Though difficult to quantify precisely, an indication of the volume of this activity can be gleaned from an analysis of some 3,000 mathematics education research articles spanning most of the 1980s and 1990s. Close to 10 percent of these, it was reported, included gender as a factor of interest. How best to achieve gender equity in mathematics has featured strongly on the research agenda of both highly technological countries and developing nations. This approach has not been without its critics, however, and explanations for gender differences in mathematics performance have evolved and become more complex over time.

Nevertheless, reports of mathematics performance across countries and across genders tend to rely heavily on results from a few large-scale, comprehensive international studies. These reports often give limited attention to the relative unimportance of small between-group differences or to the complex conditions that help to produce those differences. Among the latter are the tests themselves, and recent research has shown that the direction and size of male-female differences in mathematics performance depends on the ways in which such performance is assessed.

EXPLANATIONS FOR GENDER DIFFERENCES IN MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE

A careful reading of the many studies concerned with mathematics achievement published in the 1970s and 1980s reveals that there was much overlap in the performance of females and males. Consistent between-gender differences were invariably dwarfed by much larger within-group differences. In other words, the differences between males and females who took the test were much smaller than the large differences among the women or the even larger differences among the men.

Differences in mathematics performance between males and females were rarely reported before students entered elementary school or during the early years of elementary school. However, from the beginning of secondary schooling and beyond, males often, but not unfailingly, outperformed females on tests in mathematics. Whether differences were found seemed to depend on the format and content of the tests, whether high or low cognitive level items predominated, and whether standardized test or classroom-based data were compared. The composition and context of the group also seemed to be important, with gender differences, again in favor of males, more likely to be found in certain countries or when the sample consisted of high achievers. Attempts to explain these subtle but persistent differences have been driven by a variety of research agendas, personal values, and philosophical perspectives.

The 1970s was a period in which concern with gender differences in mathematics learning increased dramatically. Reports, internationally, of substantial differences in the number of females and males who persevered with the study of mathematics once it was no longer compulsory created widespread debate and calls for action. The much higher rate of participation of males, compared with females, in the most demanding mathematics subjects was seen as a further barrier preventing females from participating in male-dominated scientific and prestigious careers for which such courses served as a prerequisite. Significantly, in those studies in which comparisons between male and female students were restricted to groups with equivalent backgrounds in mathematics, gender differences in mathematics achievement were rarely reported. Attitudinal differences, on the other hand, remained.

Assumptions that gender differences in mathematics learning were produced or exaggerated by the more limited educational opportunities available to females, by social barriers, or by biased instructional materials or methods framed much of the research conducted in this period, and, to a lesser extent, that kind of research continues to the present. Gender equity could be achieved, it was frequently assumed, by resocializing females and removing school and curriculum barriers. Male (White and Western) standards of performance and participation levels were generally accepted as ones to be attained by all students. Females were considered deficient if they failed to reach these norms, or to use a theme from Kaiser and Rogers (1995), were perceived as *a problem in mathematics.* A host of interventions was introduced with varying degrees of success to help females *assimilate.* These ranged from comprehensive legislation to small individually driven initiatives (e.g., focusing on students' spatial abilities, on supplementing background knowledge perceived to be inadequate, on increasing exposure to leisure activities considered to facilitate mathematics achievement, on providing educational settings, on countering stereotyped media reports, on improving participants' confidence in their ability to do mathematics and/or reducing their anxiety about mathematics, on highlighting the usefulness of mathematics)—in short on a host of environmental and affective factors perceived as inhibiting females' mathematical development. Following the publication of the seminal and much-cited article by Fennema and Sherman (1977), research on affective factors and gender differences in mathematics learning proliferated, seemingly unabated to the present day. Helping females attain male norms (i.e., achievements equal to those of males) was consistent with the tenets of *liberal feminism.* It must be mentioned, however, that, contrary to the liberal feminist emphasis on the socialization of girls and women, some researchers throughout and beyond this period pointed to inherent biological factors, alone or in interaction with cognitive or social variables, as particularly important contributors to gender differences in mathematics performance.

The approaches promoted by the *assimilationist* and *deficit* model continued to shape many of the programs aimed at achieving gender equity in mathematics learning throughout the 1980s and beyond. Reporting of patterns of males' and females' participation and performance in mathematics persisted, but without the accepting tone of earlier work. Instead, such data were likely to be critiqued and analyzed for their structural, systemic, and political biases. This change was consonant with developments in the broader research community. Traditional Western conceptions of knowledge and of the sciences were increasingly challenged. How could and should feminist perspectives be incorporated into the design of research? What other factors might be contributing to gender differences in mathematics education? No longer, it was argued, should we accept, uncritically, the way in which mathematics was being taught and valued. Why should young women strive to become like young men? The goals, ambitions, and values of females should be celebrated, not denigrated. The advantages and disadvantages of single-sex and coeducational groupings and schooling were hotly debated, a debate that continues to the present in some countries. In which setting might mathematics be taught and learned more effectively by males and females? Why should preference be given to educational settings and instructional approaches favored by males? Questions such as these influenced the design and contents of many educational intervention programs aimed to increase females' short- and long-term engagement in learning mathematics. Females were to be perceived as *central to mathematics* and *mathematics* as being *reconstructed* (Kaiser & Rogers, 1995).

The assumptions of the "women as central to mathematics" phase proved naive, however. The focus on highly successful females with rare and exceptional mathematical talents, a popular approach in this phase of research, repelled rather than attracted many of the participants of such programs. Some of the portrayals merely seemed to confirm that the path for females to excel at mathematics was strewn with obstacles and hardships and ultimately unattainable. Programs that promoted values and interests presumed to be exclusively female often reinforced gender stereotypes and alienated females who did not conform to this mold. Over time, the recognition that previously unchallenged assumptions and traditions about the teaching and learning of mathematics needed to be reexamined and perhaps redefined was balanced by a clearer appreciation that essentialism needed to be avoided, that both individual and group characteristics and needs be heeded in the planning and delivery of special programs. It became increasingly accepted that personal values and beliefs influenced which explanations were highlighted to account for the gender differences in mathematics learning that continued to be documented, the consequent framing of interventions designed to address these inequities, and the ways in which these interventions were interpreted.

Thus, attempts to make females more *central to mathematics* and to achieve the *reconstruction of mathematics* soon accelerated and diversified. The assumptions of liberal feminism that discrimination and inequalities faced by females were the result of social practices and outdated laws were no longer deemed sufficient explanations. Instead, emphasis began to be placed on the pervasive power structures imposed by males for males. The acceptance of (White, Western) male norms, the assumption that females inevitably aspired to these standards and modes of behaviors, and the presentation of a deficit model of womanhood were also challenged. Some insisted that equity could be achieved only by making fundamental changes to society. Advocates of this approach, often classed as *radical feminists,* argued that traditional power relations between men and women, in mathematics and more broadly, could be redressed only through such means.

Since the 1980s, the recognition that many interacting factors contribute to gender differences in mathematics learning has been reflected frequently, but not consistently, in the design of research aimed at increasing our understanding of these differences and ways to address them. The concerns of *socialist feminists,* that females from working-class backgrounds are likely to experience educational disadvantage as well as hardship in the home, in the labor force, and in access to leisure pursuits, have undoubtedly influenced research in mathematics education. Females are less frequently considered as a homogeneous group. Measures of socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and cultural affiliations are often included in explorations of mathematics and gender. Some researchers still emphatically reject the argument that gender differences in mathematics achievement are largely socially constructed. Incisive evaluations of intervention programs have become more prevalent. Few, if any, now argue that biological factors per se account for any gender differences found. However, the inclusion in some contemporary research designs of measures such as sex hormones, other hormonal effects—both prenatal and postnatal—variations linked to the menstrual cycle, brain organization, or genetic abnormalities illustrates that in some quarters these factors, alone or in combination with other variables, continue to be regarded as important contributors to gender differences. Planning, executing, reporting, and interpretating of research are no longer assumed to be value free but are accepted as influenced by the values and theoretical orientations of researchers.

Gender differences in mathematics achievement continue to be reported, though in more recent years, evidence of gender differences in performance has become more equivocal with females at times reported as outperforming males. Indeed, in some quarters it is now argued that intervention programs aimed at improving mathematics learning for females have been so successful that males, as a group, should now be perceived as disadvantaged: in terms of educational participation, adjustment to schooling, and achievement in most subjects—including mathematics. Although few writers attribute boys' educational disadvantage simplistically to a single cause, some have pointed to the changing emphasis in assessment methods away from traditional facts and skills tasks toward ones that rely more heavily on language skills as a particularly powerful contributor.

RECENT RESULTS FROM LARGE-SCALE MATHEMATICS TESTS

Despite the growing sophistication among many researchers and mathematics educators in their understandings of the nature, meaning, determinants, and implications of gender differences in mathematics performance, most reports concerning gender and mathematics achievement that are presented in the media, and even in some research publications, continue to consist of simple statements concerning male-female differences on standardized tests. In recent years, two large-scale, comprehensive, international tests—*Trends in International Mathematics and Science* (TIMSS) and the *Program for International Student Assessment* (PISA)—have been particularly likely to be the source of these reports.

In 2003, 46 countries participated in TIMSS and 41 in PISA. Some countries, including Australia, Hong Kong, Hungary, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Tunesia, and the United States participated in both tests and at each of the levels tested that year: fourth and eighth grade for TIMSS; 15-year-old students for PISA. Others limited their involvement to only one of the two tests or chose to participate at only some of the targeted grade levels. Canada and Brazil, for example, participated only in PISA; a number of countries in Africa limited their involvement to the eight-grade test in TIMSS.

As for earlier versions of this instrument, detailed collaborative planning went into the development of the items in TIMSS 2003 to ensure that its contents were consistent with the curricula of the participating countries, authentically translated and culturally appropriate. The test contained many newly developed items as well as questions included in tests administered in earlier years to allow trends over time to be determined. Items were categorized in terms of five content and four cognitive domains. The former comprised number, algebra (termed patterns and relationships for the fourth-grade test), measurement, geometry, and data—the latter knowing facts and procedures, using concepts, solving routine problems, and reasoning. At least one-third of the items at both grade levels required students to generate and record their own answers. The remainder was in multiple-choice format.

In many countries no statistically significant gender differences in mathematics performance were found in the TIMSS 2003 testing, and when such differences were found they varied by country. The United States was among those in which males performed statistically significantly better than females at both the eighth- and fourth-grade levels; Australia and Japan were among those in which males performed somewhat but not significantly better than females at both these levels; and Singapore was among those in which females performed significantly better than males at both the grade four and grade eight levels.

Gender differences by content area also showed considerable between-country variations. At the grade eight level, the most striking gender differences were found on the algebra items, with females significantly outperforming males in 22 of the participating countries, but not in the United States. Fewer differences were found for the number, measurement, and geometry items with males outperforming females in 12, 13, and 11 countries, respectively, including in each case the United States. At the grade four level, males outperformed females on the measurement items in well over half the participating countries. Although, overall, there were few other consistent gender differences in performance, for the American sample males outperformed females in each of the content areas, with only the difference on the geometry items failing to reach significance. Still focusing on the American sample, longitudinal comparisons indicated that at the grade eight level both males and females performed significantly better in 2003 than in 1995. For the grade four sample, there were no appreciable differences in performance over that period.

The PISA program, initially launched by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, aims to measure how well 15-year-old students (i.e., students approaching the end of compulsory schooling in many countries) are prepared for their lives beyond school. Assessment thus focused particularly on students' ability to apply their knowledge to real-life settings. Mathematical literacy was a key domain assessed. As in TIMSS, the items included in PISA are the result of careful planning and multiple trials.

In the 2003 testing, gender differences in performance on the PISA mathematics scale favored boys in almost all countries, with Iceland and Thailand being the only exception. Furthermore, despite variations in the size of the performance difference observed, most reached a statistically significant level. At the same time, it should be noted that, on average, the gender differences, in favor of males, found on the mathematics scale were less than those reported, in favor of females, on the literacy scale, an important focus of PISA in 2000.

To get beyond simple male-female differences in mathematics performance, both TIMSS and PISA attempted to assess students' attitudes to mathematics. In PISA, for example, students' interest and enjoyment in mathematics and their instrumental motivation in mathematics were assessed, using, respectively, items such as: "I enjoy reading about mathematics," "I do mathematics because I enjoy it," "I learn many things in mathematics that will help me get a job," and "Mathematics is an important subject for me because I need it for what I want to study later on." In the majority of countries, including the United States, gender differences were found on both scales, with males having more positive attitudes. These differences have practical implications with students with positive attitudes more likely to continue with the study of mathematics and opt for mathematically related careers.

These large-scale testings reveal complex patterns of gender differences in mathematics performance. Whether and by how much one group outperforms another seems to depend on attitudes, the ages of the students, the type of mathematical items on which students are tested, and the country in which testing takes place. Overview reports of gender differences in mathematics performance, with their emphasis on between-group differences instead of the much greater within-group differences, tend to ignore these complexities and are likely to reinforce gender stereotypes about students and within the wider society. More research is needed to determine the conditions that increase and decrease male-female differences, as well as other group differences, in mathematics achievement. One such line of research was recently undertaken to examine the effects of different kinds of mathematics tests on gendered outcomes.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ASSESSMENT METHODS

During the 1990s, in common with many other countries, innovative mathematics reform curriculum and diversified assessment methods were introduced in Australia. In particular, changes were introduced to the examinations used to measure achievement in the three mathematics subjects that were part of the high stake grade 12 end of secondary schooling examination in one of the most populous states. The traditional strictly timed, externally assessed tests comprising multiple choice/short answer questions and problems requiring extended written answers continued to be part of the examination process. In addition, under the new system, students were required to complete an investigative project or challenging problem to be solved over several weeks during school time and at home and submitted as a substantial written report. The traditional components were externally assessed and the extended task, which had a strong verbal component, internally (i.e., at school level). During the year, students also completed a general achievement test that covered three major areas: written communication, mathematics/science/technology, and arts/humanities/social science.

Data from these various mathematics achievement tasks completed, it should be emphasized, by the same cohort of students within one school year, illustrated unambiguously that (apparent) gender differences in mathematics performance are linked to test format. Females outperformed males on the novel, extended assessment tasks in all of the three mathematics subjects. Whether males or females performed better on the tests comprising the traditional items varied by mathematics subject and in different years. No gender differences in achievement were reported on the overall score of the general achievement test, but moderate gender differences—in the traditional, stereotyped direction—were found on the different components: females scored higher on the written communication component; males on the mathematics/science/technology. (For the arts/humanities/social science component, males and females generally performed equally.)

Selective findings from this total set of results, which are described in greater detail in Cox, Leder, and Forgasz (2004), provide support for those who consider males to be educationally disadvantaged, for those who argue that females are still disadvantaged in mathematics, and for those who claim that gender equity has been achieved. Collectively, they undoubtedly have a significance well beyond the sample and geographic setting in which they were gathered. They convincingly demonstrated that the scope and demands of assessment tasks can influence a student's performance in mathematics, often equated with mathematical ability. As a group, males and females performed differently on inherently different assessment tasks, all high stake and given in the same academic year. The traditional assessment tasks appeared to favor males. More innovative but still demanding assessment tasks with a strong focus on the solution process and not merely the answer, tasks which required sustained and independent efforts over a longer period of time and which had a stronger verbal component, seemed to favor females.

There are clear and practical implications from these findings for those determined to achieve equity in assessment, in encouraging females who are well able to do so to continue with the study of mathematics, and in ensuring more equitable educational and occupational pathways for all students.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Cox, P.J., Leder, G.C., & Forgasz, H.J. (2004). Victorian certificate of education: Mathematics, science and gender. *Australian Journal of Education, 48*(1), 27–46.

Fennema, E., & Sherman, J. (1977). Sex-related differences in mathematics achievement, spatial visualization and affective factors. *American Educational Research Journal, 14*(1), 51–71.

Kaiser, G., & Rogers, P. (1995). Introduction: Equity in mathematics education. In P. Rogers & G. Kaiser (Eds.), *Equity in mathematics education. Influences of feminism and culture* (pp. 1–10). London: Falmer.

Leder, G.C. (2002). Sex differences in achievement scores: Can we design assessments that are fair, meaningful, and valid for girls and boys? A commentary. *Issues in Education, 8*(1), 55–63.

Nation's Report Card. Available at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard

Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). Available at http://www.pisa.oecd.org (international) and http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa (USA).

Trends in International Mathematics and Science. Available at http://isc.bc.edu (international) and http://nces.ed.gov/timss (USA).

Gilah C. Leder

Reading

The increased attention to the lagging reading scores for boys has spurred renewed investigation into gender-based differences in reading outcomes. Reading is a cornerstone of school achievement, and the lag in reading interest and ability is no doubt one of the factors in boys' increased risk for special education placement, retention, and dropout. There are a number of hypothesized reasons for these reading differences, invoking various aspects of biology and environment. A review of documented differences and research investigating these patterns of literacy achievement helps to put current concerns into perspective.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES

According to UNESCO, about one in four adults worldwide are illiterate and women comprise about two-thirds of those adults. These gendered illiteracy patterns are strongest in developing countries and virtually nonexistent in Western industrialized countries. Efforts to increase women's literacy have been advanced as strategies for women's social and economic empowerment. In addition, because child outcomes are strongly connected to maternal education, efforts to improve women's literacy have been undertaken specifically as a means to improve children's health and well-being. However, in countries without these extreme discrepancies in adult literacy, a different set of concerns exists. School achievement data collected internationally for the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study, 2001, showed patterns of fourth-grade girls scoring significantly higher than boys in all 35 participating countries as well as reading more fiction than boys and having more positive attitudes about reading.

In the United States, data on student reading scores have been collected at regular intervals for over 30 years in order to determine progress for 9-, 13-, and 17-year-old students. Results from the Nation's Report Card, disseminated by the National Center for Education Statistics, have consistently shown boys to score significantly lower than girls at each testing and across the three age groups. Most recent testing shows that the gap in scores from students in the youngest age group is diminishing somewhat as boys' scores are increasing on average; however, a significant difference remains. Further, if we take socioeconomic status into account, the differences are strongest for low-income boys and are much weaker for more affluent boys. Gains for reading across all students overall have generally remained stagnant, pointing to significant problems in reading achievement of which gender differences are just one aspect and which is moderated by socioeconomic status.

READING DISABILITY AND GENDER

An accepted marker of reading disability is scoring 1.5 to 2 standard errors below expected scores on standardized reading tests as expected by age and intelligence. Until recently, prevalence studies of reading disability using this criterion tended to show mixed results of gender disparities, with some finding greater odds of boys having disabilities and others supporting parity because of nonstatistical differences. Researchers have argued that one reason for finding disparity is the fact that boys are overreferred because of behavioral problems, whereas girls in need of services are more likely to be underreferred because they function well in the classroom. Additionally, boys are more likely to be diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) compared to girls, and ADHD has a high correlation with reading disability. However, more recent studies using large national samples do provide evidence of a genuine difference suggesting that boys have twice the odds of girls of having reading disabilities. The greater the severity of the disability, the greater the odds that boys will be identified compared to girls. Using a large prospective national sample, Flannery, Liederman, Daly, and Schultz (2000) found a gender disparity in reading disabilities even when they controlled for the fact that boys have more attentional disturbance than girls, a difference that has been hypothesized as the reason boys are more often identified as having reading disabilities. Contrary to this hypothesis, however, Flannery and colleagues were able to show that boys had more reading disabilities than girls whether or not they had attentional disturbance.

Coinciding with stronger evidence for the gender differences in disabilities are advances in brain research including the use of brain imaging to test for biological sex differences. Using fMRI imaging, Shaywitz and colleagues (1995) were able to display previously theorized differences in brain activation patterns for language processing in phonological awareness for males (lateralized to Broca’s area) and females (bilateralized to both sides of the brain). These patterns of male lateralization versus female bilateralization may be a link to gender differences in diagnoses of dyslexia. However, this does not prove a causal relationship between brain functioning and gendered reading outcomes, nor does it prove that these patterns of brain functioning are biologically based. Much work still needs to be done to evaluate neurological processes across various domains of reading skill and how those may be differentiated by gender and related to disability.

In contrast to the differences present in outcome measures across domains, there is great support for models of gender similarities in cognitive ability, such as verbal and nonverbal communication, and in psychological measures. As a corollary to gender differences in reading, an extensive review of investigations into biologically based cognitive capacity for math and science revealed that, from infancy and early childhood, boys and girls are equally matched in cognitive ability, but with adolescence and adulthood they diverge in developed skills, interests, and careers, which is more likely due to socialization (Spelke, 2005). Thus, it is important to examine the messages being sent and received by boys and girls about reading practices.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN READING INTERESTS, MOTIVATION, AND MATERIALS

A national survey of elementary school students' attitudes toward reading (McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, 1995) found that interest in academic and recreational reading diminishes for both boys and girls as they get older and that readers with lower ability levels have poorer attitudes toward recreational reading. However, even controlling for these factors, girls maintain more positive attitudes toward reading compared to boys, and, further, the gender gap in attitudes toward recreational reading increases as students reach the end of elementary school. The researchers speculate that, because reading is seen as an activity with gender-specific expectations, girls receive more encouragement. Thus, they engage in more literacy activities, become more skillful, and maintain more positive attitudes. In McKenna's model of reading attitude acquisition, beliefs about external (including gendered) expectations regarding reading and internal beliefs about reading outcomes (e.g., degree of pleasure gained in reading, degree of difficulty of activity) influence decisions to read, and this all occurs within a social context of family, peers, and media that can promote a negative influence on reading.

Many have made the argument that language arts classes and libraries tend to cater to girls' tastes and offer limited choices for the types of reading that boys prefer. Students tend to show gender-specific reading interests, with boys more interested in nonfiction and girls more interested in narrative texts, though some researchers have found that when high quality nonfiction informational texts are available to elementary school students, both boys and girls will choose those over fictional narratives. Indeed, the scarcity of such texts has been documented and shown to be especially problematic in low-income schools (Duke, 2000). Nonfiction informational texts offer benefits for the general reading achievement of all students, providing opportunities for expanded vocabulary and comprehension skills, which may be essential in order to avoid the "fourth-grade slump." In addition, exposure to informational texts provides a foundation for success in science learning, specifically, and skill building in the sorts of practical day-to-day literacy that students will need outside of school. Increasing the variety of literature available to children not only helps to foster boys' motivation for reading but is the best practice in reading instruction for all students.

Much of the popular rhetoric surrounding differences in reading outcomes for boys compared to girls has been premised on the argument that school is an overwhelmingly feminine institution where boys are made to sit still and expected to conform in ways antithetical to their natural inclinations. This ignores much of the historical context of development of our public educational system as well as the racial and socioeconomic dimensions that interact with gender and lead to inequities in achievement. Focusing on arguments about fundamental and immutable differences— "boys will be boys"—obscures the effects of gender socialization that can be the target of interventions.

One of the biggest challenges to gaining parity in reading outcomes among boys and girls is the construction of literacy as a gendered activity. Many students, both boys and girls, are quick to state that reading is boring, especially if they are not skilled readers or if the materials they are asked to read in school are of little personal interest. However, too often, we hear derisive comments about reading being something for girls, a "sissy" activity that should not be undertaken in lieu of play or sports or something more appropriately masculine. An exception to the negative connotations boys may ascribe to reading is the expertise gained in masculine topics (e.g., sports) through exposure to books and magazines. A boy who can demonstrate this kind of knowledge through the reading process can maintain a high-status position among male peers.

Even as girls have been outscoring boys on standardized reading tests, research over the past three decades has shown clear differentiation in the sex roles portrayed in children's literature that favor boys and men. In 1972, Lenore Weitzman and her colleagues published a groundbreaking study of books that had won the coveted Caldecott Medal for the most distinguished picture book of the year. Their study revealed that images of women and girls were underrepresented in this selection of "the best" children's literature and that, when women and girls were included, they were shown as passive and in stereotyped roles that typically reflected well-dressed homemakers or mythical underwater maidens. In contrast, boys and men were shown as active and in an array of high-status positions such as astronauts, doctors, or presidents. Researchers who have recently revisited these sorts of analyses have found improvement in the number of representations of girls compared to boys but not as much change in the stereotyping of gender roles presented (Jackson & Gee, 2005). These trends continue to exist even in the face of guidelines established by children's book publishers to foster equity.

Despite a prevalence of positive gendered representation of boys in books, classroom reading may still be experienced as a restrictive activity. Dutro (2001) documented the peer pressure boys face in choosing books deemed appropriately masculine for classroom reading activities. In spite of content analyses described above that suggest boys are portrayed more favorably in classroom materials in general, the repertoire that boys allow each other to read without ridicule is quite limited. A book that includes male characters, even protagonists who are active and heroic, is not enough to constitute a publicly safe reading choice. A boy who picks up a book about Prince Charming is likely to be teased and taunted, no matter how heroic the prince. In regards to gender, books are most certainly judged by their covers, and any indication of femininity depicted by images of female characters or of feminine colors in the artwork invites the scorn of the more dominant boys in the classroom. In contrast, girls can and do choose to read from a wider array of topics including both "girl books" and "boy books." Practitioners working in the classroom can help expand boys' responses to reading beyond stereotypical expectations (e.g., books about sports heroes or tales of suspense) by engaging in conversations that explicitly critique gendered notions of genre. Unfortunately, this "gender boundary" in book choice is just one facet of the masculine and feminine divide that is so entrenched by early childhood.

Smith and Wilhelm's (2002) study of literacy beliefs and practices of boys in middle school and high school offers a window into the complexity of the place of reading in boys' lives and how a better understanding of this complexity is essential for teachers who want to foster boys' reading interests and achievement. Disengaging from the gender wars and biological determinism provides opportunities for intervening in areas of possible change related to areas of social construction of masculinity. Drawing on the work of Millard (1997) who describes a gender regime that limits opportunities for learning, Smith and Wilhelm elucidate how teachers can work with boys to both expand these boundaries and recognize strengths that might be missed in established literacy assessments. Boys tend to view schooling and the literacy activities taking place in school as instrumental. They value education as important for future employment opportunities, but often school lacks the sort of reading they enjoy, especially the kind that has immediate purpose and connection to the here and now in their lives. Inclusion of the particular reading interests of boys, while providing opportunities for competence, control, and challenge, is necessary for successful reading instruction for boys. While girls are stereotypically believed to be more invested in relationships, boys actually made it clear how important relationships were to their motivation for reading. They reported being more engaged when teachers made an effort to get to know them and their interests more personally.

Jon Scieszka, an author of children's books that are extremely popular with boys, has called for a greater expansion of classroom and library materials to include those favored by boys in order to promote and support motivation for reading. Rather than writing specifically for boys, he suggests simply letting them know what books "other guys" have enjoyed reading, and that motivation can be increased if boys see more male role models reading and providing reading instruction. The clear disparity in male and female teachers (12 percent vs. 88 percent) providing initial literacy instruction to students in the elementary grades is unlikely to change anytime soon due to the low status and salary of early elementary positions along with problematic perceptions of men having physical contact with young children. Thus, efforts to challenge gender stereotypes of literacy are themselves hamstrung by the same limiting expectations. Alternatively, family literacy interventions are promoting greater involvement of fathers in order to encourage their sons to read.

A number of strategies exist to boost children's reading ability, and some of these are particularly useful for boys. For instance, fluency—the ability to read with automaticity, to decode words accurately and quickly, and to read with understanding—is a skill that can enable a poor reader to become a strong reader. Practice at oral reading is one method used to enhance fluency but is often ignored because of the predominance of silent reading, which can mask difficulties. On the other hand, if oral reading is used poorly, it can exacerbate resistance to reading by highlighting a student's low level of skill. Used well, interactive strategies can be especially appealing to boys, as they allow freedom for energetic performance while also providing plenty of practice for oral reading that can facilitate both reading improvement and interest. For example, reader's theater provides opportunities for students to perform in the classroom as they read through plays or famous speeches or tell jokes or recite poetry. With choral reading or singing, students can practice along with peers in the classroom. Students whose reading experiences include interesting texts, social collaboration, and self-expression are more likely to increase intrinsic motivation for literacy.

Evidence suggests that we should continue to investigate the influence of both nature and nurture on gender-related reading outcomes, although we have much more information about socialization patterns than genetic patterns. While we continue to gather information about specific biological factors and subsequent interventions that might be based on those findings, we can work right now on behavioral interventions designed to counteract gender-based socialization of reading. The problem of boys not wanting to read is a more pressing concern than boys lacking the ability to read because it is arguably a precursor to reading difficulty.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Duke, N. K. (2000). 3.6 minutes per day: The scarcity of informational texts in first grade. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(2), 202–224.

Dutro, E. (2001). "But that's a girls' book!" Exploring gender boundaries in children's reading practices. *Reading Teacher, 55*(4), 376–384.

Flannery, K. A., Liederman, J., Daly, L., & Schultz, J. (2000). Male prevalence for reading disability is found in a large sample of Black and White children free from ascertainment bias. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society, 6*(4), 433–442.

Jackson, S., & Gee, S. (2005). “Look Janet,” ”No you look John”: Constructions of gender in early school reader illustrations across 50 years. *Gender and Education, 17*(2), 115–128.

McKenna, M. C., Kear, D. J., & Ellsworth, R. A. (1995). Children’s attitudes toward reading: A national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(4), 934–956.

Millard, E. (1997). Differently literate: Gender identity and the construction of the developing reader. *Gender and Education, 9*(1), 31–48.

Shaywitz, B. A., Shaywitz, S. E., Pugh, K. R., Constable, R. T., Skudlarski, P., Fulbright, R. K., et al. (1995). Sex differences in the functional organization of the brain for language. *Nature, 373* (6515), 607–609.

Smith, M. W., & Wilhelm, J. D. (2002). *“Reading don’t fix no Chevys”: Literacy in the lives of young men.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Spelke, E. S. (2005). Sex differences in intrinsic aptitude for mathematics and science: A critical review. *American Psychologist, 60*(9), 950–958.

Weitzman, L.J., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture-books for preschool children. *American Journal of Sociology, 77*(6), 1125–1150.

Michelle V. Porche

Science Achievement

The gender gap in science achievement is a topic that has garnered much attention from academic researchers, educational policy makers, and the popular media. This achievement gap encompasses females' relatively lower test scores on tests compared to males, first appearing in middle school and continuing in high school, as well as high school girls' lower rates of advanced science course taking. Gender differences in science attainment continue in college and graduate school, where young women have a lower representation than their male peers in most science-related undergraduate majors and in graduate school programs. These gendered trends are apparent in the United States as well as many other industrialized countries. There is some evidence from the United States that the gender gap in science has been shrinking in the past few decades, although disparities between males and females in this field appear more entrenched than in other historically male disciplines, such as mathematics and business. Differences between male and female achievement patterns in science also remain the strongest in the physical sciences, in contrast to the biological sciences.

Explanations for the causes of the gender gap in science achievement center largely on social influences. This suggests that stereotypes about the appropriateness of women in science or their lower innate abilities continue to function and that parents, teachers, and even peers have the potential to either maintain the status quo of inequality through their actions and encouragement or, alternatively, actively support girls and young women to pursue science. More research is needed to uncover the complexity of factors that operate to result in this gender gap, including more attention to race/ethnic patterns of science achievement, as well as whether and why the gap may be more pronounced in some schools and communities than in others. Yet overall, studies suggest that the gender gap in science achievement can be closed, at least in part by addressing obstacles to female achievement such as stereotypes, discouragement from others, and the lack of mentors and peers.

GAPS IN PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The gender gap in science achievement includes differences in test scores, attitudes, course taking, and college and graduate programs of study. In investigations of when observable gender differences in science achievement first appear, studies find that such disparities are small or even nonexistent during elementary and middle school. For example, in 1996, there were no gender differences in science achievement test scores administered to fourth-grade students nationwide, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). In middle school, small gender differences in test scores are sometimes apparent. NAEP data from 1996 indicate that the average difference between males and females on the science achievement test was approximately seven points on a scale of 300.

In high school, gendered achievement patterns in science tend to become more pronounced. Differences in test scores favoring males continue and, according to some studies, become markedly larger. Also at this time, course-taking disparities emerge. While girls are as likely as boys to take courses in biology as well as chemistry, they are less likely to take physics, with approximately 25 percent of female high school students nationwide taking this course compared to approximately 30 percent of male students. This gap is important because physics is often considered the most advanced high school science course and the one viewed as providing a competitive advantage for college matriculation, particularly at more selective colleges and universities. Girls are more likely than boys to take Biology II, an advanced science course that is not always offered in high schools nationwide.

It is important to note that throughout primary and secondary schools, girls tend to receive higher grades in science than boys. This is part of a general pattern of a female advantage in grades from elementary through high school, which is often attributed to girls being raised to focus more than boys on following rules, meeting expectations, and generally fulfilling the role of a “good student.” Although achievement tests are often pointed to as a more objective standard of ability than grades, some studies have questioned this fact, pointing to a bias in test items that favors boys through the use of questions that focus on topics more familiar to them, such as sports.

Throughout the primary and secondary school years, girls generally express less favorable attitudes toward and lower interest in science. Specifically, studies reveal that, compared to boys, girls generally find science less interesting and perceive it as less relevant or useful to them. Furthermore, these gendered differences in attitudes tend to be apparent early, in middle school for example, when differences in achievement are small. Even during the high school years, girls at high ability levels in science as measured by test scores tend to think of themselves as less capable in the subject and express less interest in having a future career in science, compared to boys with similar characteristics. Studies suggest that such attitudes are important obstacles to girls’ achievement in science and in large part reflect the influence of gender stereotypes and other sources of discouragement.

By college, the science gap in gender has widened, such that undergraduate majors reveal relatively strong patterns of sex segregation. Women comprise well over half of certain majors, including education and humanities, while males tend to dominate science and related fields such as engineering and technology. For example, in the 1990s women earned approximately 65 percent of all bachelor’s degrees awarded in the humanities, while men earned well over half of the degrees in science and engineering fields. It should be noted that more women than men major in the social sciences, including psychology and sociology. However, social science is not typically considered to be a specialty within science, but rather its own field.

Women who do declare science, technology, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) majors have a high probability of switching to a non-STEM major. However, recent studies have found that women’s attrition rates from STEM majors are very close to those of men, as these majors tend to have very high loss rates overall. Finally, the representation of women in graduate programs in science-related fields also indicates sex segregation, as women made up 55 percent of all graduate students nationwide in 1997, but substantially less than one-half of those in graduate programs in STEM fields.

The path through science education beginning in elementary school and continuing onto college and beyond is often referred to as the science pipeline, and a wealth of research has been directed at trying to determine why females tend to exit this pipeline at greater rates than men, particularly at later points along the way. A recent study by Xie and Shauman (2003) finds that the single biggest point of loss of females from this path is during the transition from high school to college, where young women who have been successful in advanced science classes in high school are still less likely than similar young men to declare a STEM major in college. Additionally, their study also questions the applicability of the pipeline metaphor, which suggests that there is a single linear path leading to a science career. Instead, Xie and Shauman (2003) show that there are alternative paths to reaching the same end point. For example, many girls who did not originally intend to declare a STEM major at the end of high school decide at the time of or shortly after college entry to pursue a STEM major in college.

PUTTING THE GAP IN PERSPECTIVE: DIFFERENCES ACROSS SPECIALTY, TIME, AND PLACE

It is important to note that within the discipline of science, there are areas or specialties where gender differences in achievement are much more pronounced than in others. Specifically, girls' and women's achievement is notably higher in the biological sciences than in the physical sciences and engineering fields. Studies examining trends in national data find that gender differences in sections of tests containing biological science questions in middle school are nonexistent, and, while differences are apparent in high school, they are smaller than differences on physical science test sections (Burkam, Lee, & Smerdon, 1997). Similarly, as mentioned above, girls are more likely than boys to take Biology II or advanced placement biology courses in high school. This gender distinctive pattern within science is also evident in college. In 1996, women comprised approximately 53 percent of bachelor's degree recipients in the biological sciences, compared to 37 percent in the physical sciences and 18 percent in engineering. This trend is also reflected in women's representation in graduate school topics of study, where gender equity is apparent in the percentage of women and men enrolled in full-time graduate study in the biological sciences. In contrast, approximately 20 percent of those enrolled in graduate programs in engineering are female.

Gender differences in science achievement extend beyond the borders of the United States. Data from the Third International Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS) find that male students outperform female students on achievement tests in the majority of countries participating in the survey and that gender differences were generally apparent in middle school and increased further in high school. However, there were a substantial number of countries characterized by gender equity in science test scores and, among those countries with a male advantage, the extent of this advantage varied considerably. Gender differences in tertiary education are also evident in countries other than the United States. In their study of 12 industrialized countries, Charles and Bradley (2002) found that men outnumber women in science fields in all but two countries and that there is a male advantage in engineering in all of the countries considered. Again, however, there is substantial international variability in the degree of gender differences in postsecondary fields, with countries such as Japan exhibiting a strong male advantage, in contrast to Sweden, where the male advantage was slight.

While gender disparities in science achievement remain, there has, in fact, been considerable improvement in the closing of the gender gap. With regard to course taking in the United States, in the 1980s boys outnumbered girls in high school chemistry classes as well as physics. In the 1990s, girls closed the gap in chemistry and have narrowed the gap in physics to a difference of approximately 5 percent. However, this gap in physics remains in contrast to the historically male-dominated subject of math, where gender equity is now apparent in all advanced high school math classes including trigonometry, precalculus, and calculus. Changes in achievement test scores are also apparent. Among both male and female high school graduates, national scores on science achievement tests have been generally increasing since the early 1980s. During that time, gender differences on these tests have decreased approximately 35 percent.

Finally, with regard to postsecondary education, the percentage of bachelor's degrees awarded to women in the biological sciences as well as the physical sciences and engineering has increased by approximately 10 percent since the early 1980s. This time period saw the emergence of gender parity in previously male-dominated majors such as business and mathematics, but the increase of women in science majors has resulted in gender parity only within the biological sciences.

EXPLAINING THE GENDER GAP IN SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT

Many explanations have been offered to explain the gender gap in science educational achievement. Explanations based on theories of females lower' innate genetic abilities are not supported by evidence that differences in science test scores have declined over the past several decades and that gender gaps in course taking and college majors exist even among students of similarly high ability levels. Instead, most research examining the reasons behind the gender gap in science achievement implicates the role of social or cultural forces. This includes how children are raised to accept certain gender roles.

Social definitions of appropriate gender attributes may influence achievement in science in somewhat subtle ways. Studies find that little girls are encouraged to focus on interpersonal relations and on cooperation rather than competition, and to recognize the subjective nature of things. In contrast, boys are raised to recognize and accept objective definitions of knowledge and truth, to focus on status and competition, and to be comfortable with abstract concepts. Thus, by the time that adolescents start taking science courses in middle and high school, it is likely that boys feel more comfortable with science as an abstract subject centered upon ideas of objective knowledge and also feel more comfortable with the competitive environment of the science classroom. In contrast, girls are raised to value certain priorities and ways of looking at the world that may seem out of place in the science classroom in high school and even more so in science classrooms in college.

Additionally, specific gender stereotypes still prevalent in society that define science as a male domain can have a psychological influence on girls' achievement by affecting how they perceive their own abilities. Psychological studies suggest that as most girls are aware of such stereotypes, they often interpret their achievement in science accordingly. Therefore, a low grade on a test could be perceived as evidence of a lack of talent, and subsequently viewed as evidence that the stereotypes are true. Thus, girls may come to believe in the truth of such stereotypes, discount their own abilities,and judge their achievement more critically than is necessary. Additionally, studies find that parents, peers, and teachers may play an active role in encouraging girls toward nonscience related subjects. To the extent that other individuals in their lives accept gender stereotypes of science in particular, or accept ideas about girls and boys being predisposed to different kinds of things in general, they may discourage girls from actively pursuing science.

However, studies find that even when parents or teachers do not personally believe in the validity of gender stereotypes, they may still be reluctant to encourage girls' science achievement because they are aware of the obstacles that girls are likely to encounter from others. Likewise, research indicates that girls themselves do not necessarily have to internalize or accept stereotypes of science as more appropriate or suited to males in order for it to influence their achievement. Rather, the recognition that others do and the subsequent obstacles that they are likely to face may deter many girls from choosing to pursue science. Thus, they may decide to concentrate their efforts more on other subjects such as English, where they are unlikely to encounter discouragement, discrimination, or harassment from other individuals who believe that "girls cannot do science."

Additionally, the curriculum of science classes and the manner in which they are taught may present more structural obstacles to girls' achievement in science. Studies show that textbooks in science typically offer few examples of women doing science and instead tend to reiterate stereotypes of science as a male domain. Examples given to demonstrate scientific concepts may use analogies that draw more on male experiences. Lecture formats that discourage discussion or alternative viewpoints or interpretations have also been found to negatively influence girls' achievement. In contrast, research finds that more hands-on work, such as laboratory work, may stimulate girls' interest.

During the college years, females' persistence in science majors can be deterred by the lack of presence of other women, including fellow classmates as well as instructors and professors. A number of studies have reported that a key factor discouraging women away from STEM fields of study is their perception of a "chilly climate" comprised mostly of men. When a young woman is one of the few or the only one of her gender in a science classroom, study group, or program, this creates an atmosphere where feelings of isolation and lack of fit are likely to be prevalent and, likewise, gender stereotypes may thrive and a more individualist and male-centered culture may dominate.

Yet, the opposite side of the story is the potential for parents, teachers, and friends to positively promote girls' and women's science achievement. Studies find that girls who have mentors such as science teachers or professors are more likely to persist in a science educational trajectory. Similarly, girls' science achievement can be increased by the presence of female friends who themselves do well in science and, therefore, provide both a social and academic resource. Research on science courses in same-sex schools and classrooms also indicates that in such an environment, gender stereotypes lose salience, cooperation and encouragement prevail, and girls' perceptions of their abilities in science increase. Therefore, when surrounded by tangible evidence that females can "do" science, girls' science attainment increases, often to the point that is comparable to that of boys. Such studies suggest that the gender gap in science is clearly capable of being closed.

With regard to why the biological sciences have seen a growth in gender equity that is not paralleled by the physical sciences and engineering, several explanations have been proposed. Some studies suggest that this pattern is due to the fact that girls are raised to prioritize issues tied to human life and topics that are more tangible than abstract. Others have suggested that the physical sciences are generally considered to be the most competitive and difficult areas of science, which discourages females from pursuing them. This explanation is inconsistent with women's high rates of entry into other competitive fields such as business. Still others have suggested that the general climate of the physical sciences is more hostile to women. Arguably, more studies are needed to better understand all of the reasons that contribute to females' lower levels of achievement in the specific areas of the physical sciences and engineering.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

While there have been many studies specifically examining gender differences in science achievement, by contrast there have been few studies that explicitly consider both gender and race/ethnic patterns of achievement in science. This includes a relative lack of studies on whether gender gaps are equally apparent within different race/ethnic groups, as well as studies comparing race/ethnic differences in science achievement within each gender. With regard to the former, while stereotypes may suggest a constant and prevailing male advantage, there is some recent evidence that in some instances African American and Latino girls may have comparable or even higher levels of science achievement, such as test scores, compared to their male peers. With regard to the latter, some studies find that minority female students have more favorable attitudes toward and interest in science than White females. In general, more studies are needed to examine whether and how gendered patterns of achievement in science vary by race and ethnicity.

Furthermore, there are few studies that consider whether the gender gap in science achievement varies across schools or communities. International research finds considerable variation across countries in the extent to which there is a male advantage on science test scores. Likewise, it is possible that within the United States some schools or communities may be characterized by more gender equity in science achievement and others characterized strongly by inequality. Future research could examine this possibility and the factors that might explain differences across schools, such as the role of educational programs designed to encourage girls in science that may be implemented in some schools.

Although gender differences in science achievement—including test scores, attitudes, course taking, and college and graduate degrees—currently remain, prior studies suggest that the gender gap is capable of being closed. Until that occurs, both academic research and popular attention will likely continue to focus on the patterns and explanations behind gender inequality in science achievement.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Burkam, D., Lee, V.E., & Smerdon, B. (1997). Gender and science learning early in high school: Subject matter and laboratory experiences. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(2), 297–332.

Charles, M., & Bradley, K. (2002). Equal but separate? A cross-national study of sex segregation in higher education. *American Sociological Review, 67*(4), 573–599.

Correll, S. (2001). Gender and the career choice process: The role of biased self-assessments. *American Journal of Sociology, 106*(6), 1691–1730.

Hanson, S. (1996). *Lost talent: Women in the sciences.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Leslie, L., McClure, G., & Oaxaca, R. (1998). Women and minorities in science and engineering: A life sequence analysis. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(3), 239–276.

Seymour, E., & Hewitt, N. (1997). *Talking about leaving: Why undergraduates leave the sciences.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Stake, J., & Nickens, S. (2005). Adolescent girls' and boys' science peer relationships and perceptions of the possible self as scientist. *Sex Roles, 52*(1–2), 1–11.

Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. (2003). *Women in science: Career processes and outcomes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Catherine Riegle-Crumb

Writing

Writing is one of the ways in which children and adults explore and construct their gender identities. Writers' perceptions of what it means to be female and male influence what and how they write. In classrooms, writers gain a sense of what is recognizable and acceptable as feminine and masculine in their social worlds through peer and teacher feedback on their writing, through reading their peers' and teachers' writing, and through observing what their peers write.

Gender plays a role in students' composing processes, their motivation and self-confidence as writers, and the content and style of their writing. Although the findings are mixed in terms of postsecondary students' writing, gender patterns are apparent in the topics, characters, language, tone, and plot structures of elementary and middle school students' writing. Writing characteristics attributed to boys and girls are always described with the caveat that they are gender patterns that cannot be generalized to all male and female writers.

In many cases, gender patterns appear as contrasting characteristics of female and male students' writing and writing processes that fall in with gender stereotypes. For example, boys' narrative writing tends to be more action oriented and centered on topics beyond their immediate home and school experience, whereas girls' narrative writing tends to be more relationship oriented and focused on topics connected to their families and friends. Boys' narrative topics and plots tend to be more highly valued in elementary and middle school classrooms, following historically established gender hierarchies that are part of the wider society. Because it is desirable to take up writing styles that are considered more powerful and valuable, girls are more likely than boys to cross gender lines (adopting the style of the other sex) in terms of the topics, plots, and characters of their writing.

Also evident are gender trends in elementary through high school students' attention to spelling, punctuation, and grammar, their perceptions of the value of writing, and their consequent writing achievement, with girls tending to demonstrate greater competence in all these areas. Results of large-scale writing examinations at the elementary, intermediate, and senior levels reveal gender disparities in writing achievement that have persisted across time and geographic borders. Greater percentages of girls score at the expected grade level or higher than do boys. There is a concomitant expectation, on the part of students and teachers, that girls are better writers than boys, particularly in terms of their willingness and ability to conform to conventions of spelling, grammar, punctuation, and form.

The ways in which gender enters into student writing and teachers' writing assessment can be analyzed in terms of gender differences in writing performance and assessment and patterns in male and female students' writing. Two approaches for supporting female and male students' writing are indicated by research in the field of gender and writing. One of these advocates the acceptance of gender differences; the other advocates intervention to produce change.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN WRITING PERFORMANCE AND ASSESSMENT

An examination of the results of large-scale assessments of elementary and middle school students' writing reveals an ongoing and unbroken trend: Girls have historically outperformed boys, and they continue to do so. Gender disparities persist not only across the decades, but also across provincial, state, and international borders. Gender disparities appear as early as primary school, as research studies show that girls perform consistently better than their male counterparts on the number of words and clauses produced in narrative and informational writing.

Students, themselves, perceive girls to be better writers than boys. In a study by Peterson (2000), for example, eighth-grade students who correctly identified the writer of one story about an archaeological dig as a girl assessed the writing as "imaginative with descriptive words." In contrast, students who identified the writing as a boy described the story as having poor grammar, short sentences, lack of detail, and "no big words." One boy elaborated after identifying spelling errors, "Usually girls would go back and correct them." One girl explained, "There's no main character, plot, and setting," and another girl asserted that the story did not have a good ending. A boy observed that male writers "write stuff short and simple." Male and female students speak with one voice in assessing girls as being more competent than boys in their use of description, detail, plot structure, and writing conventions. They find boys to be more creative and able to appeal to an audience, however.

Girls use writing processes that teachers recognize as effective (e.g., they carry out planning activities, revise and edit their writing, and use dictionaries) to a greater degree than boys. Students, themselves, describe girls as being more likely to correct spelling errors before writing final drafts, to use more sophisticated vocabulary, and include more detail and description than boys. Boys tend to be more "reactive," showing erratic problem-solving strategies, using overt language to accompany composing, and rarely reviewing their writing and revising at the word level. Girls tend to be reflective writers who use little overt language to accompany their writing and frequently reread their writing to revise at the word or phrase level.

Generally, postsecondary teachers hold the more typically masculine rhetorical tradition of stating the thesis up front and supporting it as the ideal standard for a persuasive essay. This type of writing receives higher scores than the contextual and committed style of writing typically attributed to women's persuasive writing. Elementary and middle grade teachers, in contrast, value the well-organized, descriptive, detailed writing with careful attention to mechanics that is typically associated with girls' writing styles. They characterize boys' writing as being short, lacking in detail and description, and action oriented. Teachers also perceive that boys do not attend to conventions to the same degree that girls do.

Gender has been implicated in teachers' feedback to students on their writing, as well. When writing comments to students about their writing, female teachers tend to highlight issues of language, mechanics, and form more often than male teachers do. Male teachers tend to be less tolerant of the typically feminine style of emotional writing than female teachers. Elementary teachers have a greater tendency to make more corrections on boys' writing and to critique and command boys to revise or edit their writing. Also consistent with a perception that boys are not likely to use conventions as well as girls is teachers' tendency to provide lessons, explanations, and suggestions in their written feedback to boys more frequently than in their feedback to girls.

In summary, elementary teachers and students in Canada and the United States have been found to privilege girls' writing styles and processes. They expect girls to be more willing and more likely than boys to conform to standards of length, organization, description, and use of writing conventions in their narrative writing. At the postsecondary level, teachers privilege the masculine model of the essay as the standard of high achievement. This model is characterized as unemotional, succinct, and with a readily identifiable thesis that is clearly supported with relevant evidence.

PATTERNS IN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS' WRITING

Gender patterns have been found in the length and complexity of sentences and in word choice, syntax, and topic choice of writing. In many cases, adult men's and women's writing has been deemed to be more similar than dissimilar. However, postsecondary instructors perceive that male writers are more likely to write persuasive essays characterized as strong, assertive, active, competitive, and independent. They characterize female students' writing to be contrastingly pleasant, socially interconnected, focused on others, and emotional.

Theme and characterization are the strongest indicators of gender in students' narrative writing. Elementary-aged writers tend to create main characters of their own sex. Often, the characters act in stereotypical ways: Male characters are brave, assertive, competent, and independent; and female characters are nurturing, collaborative, passive, and emotionally expressive. Boys generally position themselves as actors, using first-person singular pronouns in their writing more often than girls do. Girls generally use third-person references to position themselves as observers in their narratives. Girls in elementary grades generally write about themes related to home and school experiences (primary territory) and to focus on inner experience. Often, girls use diary, poetry, and narrative writing to express their thoughts and emotions privately when they are not in school. In contrast, boys tend to write on themes that extend beyond their homes and schools (secondary territories) including expanded territory such as current events, history, and geography. Boys' writing tends to focus on outer scenes and includes more violence and parody as a way to resist authority within parameters acceptable to their teachers. Boys' writing often uses graphic and visual details, whereas girls' writing generally uses other sensory images.

These gender patterns reflect students' tendencies to act in ways that are readily recognizable as appropriate for their sex. Because of the more widely respected position of boys' topics, themes, and characters, boys feel that they need to write in ways that clearly identify them as masculine to their classmates. In elementary and middle grade classrooms, students show greater enjoyment of stories that follow a more typically masculine conflict-resolution model than they do of the more typically feminine descriptive stories that resolve problems in a collaborative manner.

Girls' adoption of more masculine writing styles is viewed as taking up powerful ways of writing. Girls may write about sports or action heroes from popular culture, and they may include violence as part of the conflict resolution. Their peers still view them as feminine if they cross gender lines, from time to time, by taking up topics, themes, and characters that are considered masculine. However, boys run the risk of being ridiculed by peers if their writing takes on feminine qualities; so, they are less likely than girls to cross gender lines and write using typically feminine styles and topics. It is extremely rare for boys to write the romance stories that many adolescent girls enjoy writing, for example. This provides the girls with a wider range of topics that are considered acceptable by peers in their classrooms. Girls write with the knowledge that the topics, themes, and characters associated with their sex are not valued as much as the masculine ones when they decided to cross gender lines, however.

Gender expectations interact with other sociocultural factors, such as classroom social status. In the writing of a class play, for example, a girl who was a competent writer and held high social status in her combined grades 3–4 class, enjoyed agency in crossing gender boundaries and in working out social relationships in her play writing. Girls and boys with less status did not enjoy this wide sense of agency in their writing nor in taking up roles in peers' plays (Anderson, 2002).

In surveys, Canadian and American adolescent girls express greater confidence as writers than do their male counterparts. Boys find significantly less satisfaction with writing and are less positive about the perceived value of writing. At the high school level, however, boys are more likely to balance their own communicative intentions with teachers' expectations for high grades, whereas girls tend to subordinate their purposes to their teachers' expectations in order to earn high grades.

Generally, male *and* female students derive greater satisfaction from their writing and feel a greater sense of self-determination and autonomy when provided opportunities to balance their own social purposes with teachers' expectations for high grades. Writing is particularly appealing when boys and girls can use it to enhance their social relationships with peers and their status within the classroom social network. For example, boys have written letters to National Hockey League players asking for an autographed picture and received great admiration from their peers. Socially popular middle school girls have used note and graffiti writing to create boundaries around their groups of friends. Other girls have used the support of their social group to write a magazine questioning gender stereotypes and advocating for social justice.

In summary, gender differences appear with much greater consistency in elementary and adolescent students' narrative writing than in postsecondary informational writing. Characterization and theme in narrative writing are the strongest indicators of gender. Young writers tend to write about characters of their own sex. Girls tend to write about nurturing, relationship-oriented female characters on themes relating to primary territory; and boys tend to write about heroic, independent male characters on often-violent themes within secondary territory. Individual students who write stories that are atypical for their sex are usually girls. By writing adventure stories within secondary territory using heroic male and female characters, girls take up more powerful writing themes and characters than boys would if they were to cross gender lines and write stories with feminine themes and female characters in powerful roles.

SUPPORTING FEMALE AND MALE STUDENTS' WRITING

Researchers in the field of gender and writing take two approaches when recommending how teachers can support female and male students' writing. One approach is to accept boys' and girls' writing topics, styles, genres, and other preferences, providing space for boys and girls to write as they desire. A second approach advocates teacher intervention to bend students' writing away from recreating gender stereotypes. It is hoped that students will create gender hybrids that incorporate feminine and masculine characteristics in new ways. These two approaches are discussed in turn.

Nurturing girls' writing may take the form of creating out-of-school writing groups for girls to explore issues of personal relevance that they might not feel comfortable writing about in their classrooms. Girls' writing could become more publicly powerful, as well, through opportunities to read their writing to audiences outside the classroom. For example, in Luce-Kapler's (1999) Canadian study, high school girls read their poetry at a local café.

Teachers are advised to enhance the relevance of writing to boys' lives by providing opportunities to use multimedia and digital technology in writing assignments and to collaborate with peers, perhaps by using writing as a basis for drama activities. Also recommended are opportunities to become acquainted with male role models who use writing to further their work and other interests in their every day lives.

Teachers are also advised to set wide boundaries for acceptable topics for writing, so that the more violent writing or the slapstick humor that boys tend to enjoy writing has a place in classrooms. This might take the form of determining with students when violence is appropriate in a story and to what degree graphic descriptions of the violence enhance the story. In addition, the criteria for assessing writing might be expanded to include features that recognize boys' writing strengths, such as presenting a new twist on a familiar topic or idea or entertaining a classroom audience. Such additions to the assessment criteria might encourage girls to show less of a concern for conforming to teachers' expectations, as well.

Taking another approach, others advocate teacher intervention to move boys' and girls' writing beyond the parameters of stereotypically feminine and masculine writing. As outlined below, these interventions take many forms, ranging from deconstructing gender roles in literature to creating greater awareness of the other sex's interests. Elementary-aged students crossed gender lines when writing stories for younger students of the other sex, for example. Girls who wrote for younger boys cast an overlay of domesticity and morality to science fiction and adventure stories. Boys who wrote for younger girls cast female characters in humorous and dangerous positions as tomboys in their adventurous fantasy stories. Girls' stories written for boys introduced emotional responses that were not observed in the boys' stories for other boys. Unlike the girls' stories written for other girls, boys' stories for girls cast heroines as self-sufficient and independent.

Students' performances of their narratives in author's theater and teacher-led discussions about gender stereotypes in children's literature have also fostered many examples of cross-gendered writing. Boys in a primary classroom who read aloud and asked for feedback on their writing from girls and boys in their classroom wrote stories about characters that possessed helpful, prosocial qualities that are typically attributed to females. Their characters resolved conflicts through collaborative efforts.

Groups of early adolescent and adolescent girls meeting regularly with a facilitator to write and talk about their writing opened up opportunities for girls to write about issues that were significant to them. The girls took up powerful public voices that are not usually associated with feminine writing, as they published the findings of ethnographic research on issues important to them in an edited volume. Young women from minority working and nonworking poor families found that personal writing, such as opinion logs, essays connecting personal experiences to literature, and research projects on topics of their choice helped them to shape lives after high school that moved beyond traditional gender roles.

These two approaches to supporting students' writing are presented with the caveat that a particular set of teaching recommendations can never be appropriate for all female students or for all male students. Teachers do need to recognize that gender is undeniably an integral part of students' identities. As such, teachers need to be aware that the need for female and male students to present themselves to their peers and their teachers as feminine and masculine will always influence students' writing processes, their views of themselves as writers, and the content and style of their writing. Students are also individuals, however, and the gender trends identified in the studies reviewed here will not describe the writing choices of all students every time they write. As such, supporting male and female students as writers requires sensitivity to students' interests and needs as boys and girls and also to their preferences and needs as individuals.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Anderson, D.D. (2002). Casting and recasting gender: Children constituting social identities through literacy practices. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36*(3), 391–428.

Luce-Kapler, R.L. (1999). As if women writing. *Journal of Literacy Research, 31*(3), 267–291.

Peterson, S. (2000). Grades four and eight students' and teachers' perceptions of girls' and boys' writing competencies. *Reading Horizons, 40*(4), 253–271.

Shelley Stagg Peterson

About the Editors and Contributors

Barbara J. Bank is Professor Emerita of Sociology and of Women Studies at the University of Missouri–Columbia. She has been honored with a Fulbright Senior Scholar Award, visiting fellowships at the Australian National University, and three awards for outstanding teaching. Her scholarly presentations and publications, including *Contradictions in Women's Education: Traditionalism, Careerism, and Community at a Single-Sex College* (2003), reflect her interests in the areas of social psychology, gender studies, and the sociology of youth and education.

Sara Delamont is Reader in Sociology at Cardiff University, Wales, U.K. She was elected an Academician of the U.K. Academy of Social Sciences in 2000. In 1984, she was the first woman President of the British Educational Research Association, and she was also the first woman Dean of Social Sciences at Cardiff University. She is currently editing two journals, *Teaching and Teacher Education* and *Qualitative Research,* and her most recent single-authored book is *Feminist Sociology* (2003). Her ongoing research interests include an ethnography of how the Brazilian martial art capoeira is taught in the United Kingdom.

Catherine Marshall is Professor of Educational Administration and Policy at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Her gender studies focus on leadership and policy in education. She has also studied gender policy internationally. Her *Feminist Critical Policy Analysis* (1997) demands policy attention to a range of gender issues. Marshall also conducts research on state education politics and gender issues in education careers. She initiated the formation of Leadership for Social Justice, an international network for equity advocacy. Her books, *Reframing Educational Politics for Social Justice* (2005) and *Leadership for Social Justice* (2006), are used to shift the educational administration field away from managerial assumptions to equity advocacy leadership.

Ronald E. Anderson is Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota where he taught in Sociology for 35 years. His legacy includes 7 books, over 100 articles, 150 presentations at professional meetings, 15 large research grants, and over 50 smaller research projects. He began studying gender and technology in 1979.

Lucy E. Bailey is Assistant Professor in Social Foundations and Qualitative Research and Affiliated Faculty in Women's Studies at Oklahoma State University. Her research interests include qualitative research methodologies, the social construction of race, and the history of women in education.

David P. Baker is The Harry and Marion Eberly Faculty Fellow Professor of Comparative Education and Sociology at the Pennsylvania State University. He has authored or coauthored over 60 journal articles and reports on comparative education and achievement, including analyses of gender differences in achievement, national governance and curricular implementation, effects of national policies on school outcomes, educational and national economic development, the expansion of higher education, and the use and misuse of international data in educational policy making.

Martha A. Bass is Assistant Professor of Health Education at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. Her focus areas involve women's health issues centering on nutrition, relationships, alcohol, osteoporosis, and well-being.

Beth W. Bean is a doctoral candidate in Higher Education at the University of Denver and is writing her thesis on college student retention.

John P. Bean is Associate Professor of Higher Education at Indiana University–Bloomington. His career has been focused on studying, understanding, and modeling college student retention, and he is coauthor of *The Strategic Management of College Enrollments* (1990).

Jane Bernard-Powers is Professor of Education at San Francisco State University in San Francisco, California. She has written on women's educational history, including *The Girl Question in Education* (1992), and on gender and social studies for the past 25 years. Her most recent work is a coauthored chapter on gender equity and social studies in the *Handbook for Achieving Gender Equity Through Education* (2007).

Jo Boaler is Associate Professor of Mathematics Education at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California. She has researched and written extensively about the impact of different mathematics teaching approaches upon student understanding and achievement, with a special focus on gender. She is the author of four books, including *Experiencing School Mathematics: Teaching Styles, Sex and Setting* (1997), which won the Outstanding Book of the Year award for education in Britain given by the Standing Conference for Studies in Education.

Stephanie Woodham Burge is a Visiting Lecturer at the University of Oklahoma in Norman. Her research interests include gender and education, work and family, and aging and the life course.

Dana L. Comstock is Professor of Counseling at St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas, and is Editor of *Diversity and Development: Critical Contexts That Shape Our Lives and Relationships* (2005).

Diane Diamond received a doctorate in Sociology in 2005 from Stony Brook University in New York and is currently teaching at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts. She has written on gender integration and assimilation at the United States Military Academy at West Point and Virginia Military Institute. Her research interests include women in male-dominated professions, tokenism, and the debate over gender equity and gender equality.

Jo-Anne Dillabough is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia, and a Spencer Research Fellow. Her scholarly work has been concentrated in three interrelated areas: the "sociology of education" and social theory, particularly in relation to critiques of democracy and the study of marginalized communities; the sociocultural analysis of youth, economic disadvantage, and social exclusion in Canada and cross-nationally; and, most recently, the relationship between youth exclusion, international human rights' issues, and critical analyses of the law. She is coeditor of *Challenging Democracy: International Perspectives on Gender, Education and Citizenship* (2000) and *Globalisation, Education and Social Change* (2006).

Becky Eason earned her doctorate in Higher Education from the University of Kansas in 2002. She is currently the Assistant Director of the Institute for Educational Research and Public Service at the University of Kansas.

Alice M. Fisher is Chair of the Department of Health and Kinesiology and Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. Her research interests include ethics, mentoring, and gender equity.

Becky Francis is Professor of Education at Roehampton University, U.K. Her expertise and extensive publications center on the production of subjectivities in educational contexts, social identity and educational achievement, and feminist theory. Her recently coauthored books include *Reassessing Gender and Achievement* (2005) and *Understanding Minority Ethnic Achievement: Race, Gender, Class and "Success"* (2006). She has also coedited several readers on theory and practice in gender and education, including the *Sage Handbook of Gender and Education* (2006).

Mary E. Frederickson is Associate Professor in the Department of History and an affiliated faculty member in American Studies and Women's Studies at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. The author of numerous articles in labor and women's history, she served as chair of the AP U.S. History Test Development Committee during 2004 and 2005 and was named the Miami University Distinguished Educator for 2005–2006. She is coeditor of *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Worker's Education for Women* (1984) and is currently editing an anthology on *Gendered Resistance: Women Opposing Sexual and Economic Subjugation in Global, Historical and Contemporary Contexts.*

Elizabeth Garber is Professor of Art at the University of Arizona in Tucson. Her many published works on social justice art and visual culture education, including feminist art criticism and pedagogy, have been recognized by numerous awards and honors, and she has held frequent leadership positions in art education. A self-supporting ceramicist for many years, she also works on issues of craft in relationship to culture.

Jane Gaskell is Dean and Professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, Canada. She has written books and articles on educational policy, gender equity, secondary schooling and "exemplary schools." Her current work is on the way educational policy has approached the problem of poverty.

Marybeth Gasman is Assistant Professor of Higher Education at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. She has written extensively on historically Black colleges and is the author of *Envisioning Black Colleges: A History of the United Negro College Fund* (2007).

Tuula Gordon is Professor of Sociology at the University of Helsinki, Finland. She works in the context of sociology, education, and women's studies. She has conducted research on feminist mothers and single women, but most of her work has focused on schools where she has collaborated in ethnographic research and has followed young people's transitions into adulthood. She is coeditor of *Democratic Education: Ethnographic Challenges* (2003) and is a contributor to several edited volumes including *The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education* (2006).

Martyn Hammersley is Professor of Educational and Social Research, The Open University, Milton Keynes, U.K. His early research was in the sociology of education, but much of his recent work has been concerned with social science methodology. His books include *Taking Sides in Social Research* (2000) and *Educational Research, Policymaking and Practice* (2002).

Robert Heasley is Associate Professor of Sociology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. From 1986 to 1991, he was a member of the board of directors of the National Organization for Changing Men (now the National Organization for Men Against Sexism) and now serves as Vice-President of the American Men's Studies Association. His current work focuses on "queer masculinities of straight men"—expanding the discourse on the intersection between masculinities and sexualities in men's studies. He has worked with schools and community programs toward ending men's violence, school-based bullying, and homophobia.

Patricia A. Helland is Director of Special Initiatives and Assessment and Lecturer for the Department of Human and Organizational Development at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee.

Erin McNamara Horvat is Associate Professor of Urban Education at Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Her research has focused on issues of access and equity in education. She is a coeditor of *Beyond Acting White: Reframing the Debate on Black Student Achievement* (2006).

Tesha Sengupta Irving is a doctoral candidate of Mathematics Education at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California. Her research interests include how student collaboration in diverse school settings can create a more equitable and open conception of math so as to promote engagement in the discipline of historically marginalized student communities.

LaTasha Jones is a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction (urban education emphasis) at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her scholarly interests include how the intersection of gender, race, and social class impacts educational equity. Currently she is investigating the effects of White male teachers using critical pedagogy on the academic achievement of students in urban classrooms.

Maulana Karenga is Professor of Black Studies at California State University, Long Beach. He is a senior/founding scholar of Black Studies and author of the standard introductory text, *Introduction to Black Studies* (3rd ed., 2002). He is the creator of Kwanzaa and author of *Kwanzaa: A Celebration of Family, Community and Culture* (1998). An authority in classical African ethics, he is also author of *Odu Ifa: The Ethical Teachings* (1999) and *Maat, The Moral Ideal in Ancient Egypt: A Study in Classical African Ethics* (2003).

Alan S. Kaufman is Clinical Professor of Psychology at the Yale University School of Medicine. He has published many comprehensive and brief tests of intelligence and related abilities and has written and edited numerous books and journal articles on the topic of intelligence. His most recent intelligence tests include the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children—Second Edition and the Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test—Second Edition.

Rosanne S. Keathley is Associate Professor of Health Education at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. Her research areas include HIV/AIDS, human sexuality, STDs, relationships, alcohol, pregnancy, and women's health issues.

Roberta Lamb is Associate Professor, School of Music, with cross-appointments to Women's Studies and the Faculty of Education, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. She is a founding member of Gender Research in Music Education. Her dissertation, *Including Women Composers in Music Curricula: Development of Creative Strategies for the General Music Classes, Gr. 5–8* (Teachers College, Columbia University, May 1987), was the first feminist dissertation in music education. Topics of recent research include Ruth Crawford Seeger and community partnerships.

Gilah C. Leder is Professor at La Trobe University in Bundoora, Australia, and Director of its Institute for Advanced Study. Her teaching, research, and publications embrace gender issues, affect, and the interaction between teaching, learning, and assessment of mathematics. She is a Fellow of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia and a life member of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia.

Will Letts is Senior Lecturer in the Cultural Studies of Science and Technology Education in the School of Teacher Education at Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia, where he is Sub-Dean for Learning and Teaching in the Faculty of Education. His research interests lie in the cultural studies of science and science education, especially with respect to sexuality, gender, and indigenous knowledges. He is also interested in rural [teacher] education and issues related to space and place in education. Electronic address: wletts@csu.edu.au

Elizabeth O. Lichtenberger is an adjunct faculty member at Alliant International University in San Diego, California. She has written extensively on the topic of intelligence testing. Her writing on this topic has included several books in the *Essentials of Psychological Assessment Series* published by John Wiley & Sons.

Lisa W. Loutzenheiser is Assistant Professor of Curriculum Studies at the University of British Columbia. Her research interests touch on a number of fields, all of which intersect with the teaching and learning of marginalized students and anti-oppressive education. Current projects include a study of cohorts in teacher education, the use of autobiography in anti-oppressive education, and the educational experiences of youth in foster care.

Glenda MacNaughton is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Melbourne, Australia, where she established and now directs the Centre for Equity and Innovation in Early Childhood. She has published widely on gender and diversity issues in early childhood.

Renée J. Martin is Professor in the Judith Herb College of Education at The University of Toledo in Toledo, Ohio. She is the recipient of two National Women Educator awards for the development of social justice curriculum, is a recipient of the University's Outstanding Teacher Award, and has received Two Outstanding Woman awards. She is the editor of *Practicing What We Teach: Confronting Diversity in Teacher Education* (1995) and *Transforming the Academy: Struggles and Strategies of Women in Higher Education* (Vol. 1, 1996; Vol. 2, in press).

Maralee Mayberry is Professor of Sociology at the University of South Florida. She has written extensively on effective educational environments, the home school movement, and feminist science studies.

Amy Scott Metcalfe is Assistant Professor of Higher Education in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia. Her research examines the organizational space between higher education institutions, the state, and markets, and she has developed a theory of "intermediating organizations" to describe these relationships.

Roslyn Arlin Mickelson is Professor of Sociology and Adjunct Professor of Public Policy, Urban Education, and Women's Studies at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her scholarly interests include the ways that gender, social class, and race shape educational processes and outcomes. Currently she is investigating the effects of school and classroom composition on academic achievement and educational equity.

Joshua Miller is a graduate student in Sociology at the University of South Florida. His current research explores the identities and self-perceptions of fathers of disabled children. He was educated at home.

Leslie Miller-Bernal is Professor of Sociology at Wells College in Aurora, New York. She has written about the comparative experiences of women in single-sex and coeducational colleges and is the author of *Separate by Degree: Women Students' Experiences in Single-Sex and Coeducational Colleges* (2000) and the coeditor of *Going Coed: Women's Experiences in Formerly Men's Colleges and Universities, 1950–2000* (2004) and *Challenged by Coeducation: Women's Colleges Since the 1960s* (2007).

Carrie Paechter is Professor of Education at Goldsmiths College, London, U.K. Her research centers on the intersection of gender, power, and knowledge, the construction of gendered, spatialized, and embodied identities, and the processes of curriculum negotiation. Her most recent books are *Educating the Other: Gender, Power and Schooling* (1998) and *Changing School Subjects: Power, Gender and Curriculum* (2000).

Kevin J. Payne is Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator of Sociology at Park University in Parkville, Missouri. He was an AERA Dissertation Fellow and is currently researching the joint effects of school, family, peer, and neighborhood contexts on student achievement.

Dawn Penney is Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Education at the University of Tasmania in Lauceston, Australia. Equity has been central to her research addressing policy and curriculum developments in health and physical education in Australia and the United Kingdom. She edited *Gender and Physical Education: Contemporary Issues and Future Directions* (2002).

Shelley Stagg Peterson is Associate Professor in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. She teaches and conducts research in elementary literacy, particularly in sociocultural issues in writing and writing assessment.

Peggy Placier is Associate Professor of Education Policy Studies at the University of Missouri–Columbia, where she has been practicing and conducting research in teacher education for 16 years. She is particularly interested in critical discourse analysis of school policies both past and present.

Michelle V. Porche is a Research Scientist at Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College, where she studies achievement and literacy development for low-income students. Her coauthored publications include the book *Is Literacy Enough? Pathways to Academic Success for Adolescents* (2007) and the Albert J. Harris Award-winning article *Project EASE: The Effect of a Family Literacy Project on Kindergarten Students' Early Literacy Skills* (2000).

Diane Reay is Professor of Education in the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, U.K., with particular interests in social justice issues in education, Pierre Bourdieu's social theory, and cultural analyses of social class. Her most recent book *Degrees of Choice: Social Class, Race and Gender in Higher Education* (2005) utilizes Bourdieu's conceptual framework to examine inequalities in access to higher education.

Catherine Riegle-Crumb is Research Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Faculty Research Associate at the Population Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin. Her research has included work on gender differences in science achievement both internationally as well as within the United States. She was recently awarded a grant from the National Science Foundation to investigate issues of gender equality in science and math during high school, with a specific focus on the experiences of diverse student groups such as racial and ethnic minorities.

Jean C. Robinson is Professor of Political Science and Affiliate Professor of Gender Studies at Indiana University in Bloomington where she served as Coordinator/Director of the Women's Studies Program during 1977 to 1982 and 1991 to 1992. She has written extensively on gender and social policies in China, Eastern Europe, and France, including *Living Gender After Communism* (2007). She also contributed a chapter on cultural change in women's studies to *Women's Studies on Its Own* (2002).

Anna Robinson-Pant is Senior Lecturer at the Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia, U.K. As a development planner, trainer, and researcher with various aid agencies, she has spent much of her working life in South Asia. She won the 1998 UNESCO International Award for Literacy Research for her study of women's literacy in Nepal, *Why Eat Green Cucumber at the Time of Dying?*

Sue V. Rosser is Dean of Ivan Allen College, the liberal arts college at Georgia Institute of Technology, where she is also Professor of History, Technology, and Society. From 1995–1999, she was Director of the Center for Women's Studies and Gender Research and Professor of Anthropology at the University of Florida–Gainesville. In 1995, she was Senior Program Officer for Women's Programs at the National Science Foundation. She has edited collections and authored 10 books and more than 120 journal articles on the theoretical and applied problems of women and science and of women's health. Her most recent single-authored book is *The Science Glass Ceiling: Academic Women Scientists and Their Struggle to Succeed* (2004); she coedited *Women, Gender, and Technology* (2006). She has held several grants from the National Science Foundation to improve teaching and curricula in science and mathematics.

Rosemary C. Salomone is the Kenneth Wang Professor of Law at St. John's University School of Law. She has written and lectured extensively on gender and single-sex education and is the author of *Same, Different, Equal: Rethinking Single-Sex Schooling* (2003), which was selected as an Outstanding Academic Title for 2005 by *Choice Magazine.*

Renee Sandell is Professor and Director of Art Education at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia. Recipient of numerous honors and awards, she is Past-Director of the Higher Education Division of the National Art Education Association and is currently a member of the College Art Association's Education Committee. Her active professional record of publications and presentations also includes consulting for various school systems, museums, and educational publishers.

Carole B. Shmurak is Professor Emerita of Teacher Education at Central Connecticut State University. She has written extensively on gender equity and single-sex education. Her book, *Voices of Hope* (1998), was named a Critics' Choice by the American Educational Studies Association; her novel, *Deadmistress* (2004), set at a single-sex independent school in Connecticut, was named a Notable Book by *Writers Notes Magazine.*

Sheila Slaughter is the first occupant of the Louise McBee Professorship of Higher Education at the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. A distinguished scholar of higher education, her most recent book is *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education* (2004). Her scholarship concentrates on the relationship between knowledge and power as it plays out in higher education policy at the state, federal, and global levels.

John Smyth is Research Professor in Education at the University of Ballarat and Emeritus Professor, Flinders University, Australia. In 2004–2005 he held the Roy F. & Joann Cole Mitte Endowed Chair in School Improvement, Texas State University–San Marcos. He is a former Senior Fulbright Research Scholar at the University of Pittsburgh and in 1993 was awarded the Palmer O. Johnson Award from the American Educational Research Association for the most outstanding published article in 1992. He has written extensively on early school leaving and was the coauthor of *"Dropping Out," Drifting Off, Being Excluded: Becoming Somebody Without School* (2004). His latest book is entitled *Teachers in the Middle: Reclaiming the Wasteland of the Adolescent Years of Schooling* (2007).

Wayne J. Stein is Professor of Native American Studies and Higher Education Studies at Montana State University in Bozeman, Montana. He works closely with the seven tribal colleges (TCUs) of Montana and several others around the country. He has also consulted with several tribes interested in starting their own TCU. His scholarship has focused primarily on TCUs, but he has done some research and writing in the areas of Indian gaming and faculty of color in higher education. He is author or coauthor of three books, including *The Renaissance of American Indian Higher Education: Capturing the Dream* (2002). He formerly served as President of Sitting Bull College and Vice-President of Academic Affairs at Ft. Berthold Community College. Dr. Stein's tribal affiliation is Turtle Mountain Chippewa.

Jean Stockard is Professor in the Department of Planning, Public Policy, and Management at the University of Oregon. She has published extensively in areas related to gender, education, and the changing experiences and well-being of youth.

Susan Talburt is Director of the Women's Studies Institute at Georgia State University in Atlanta. She is the author of *Subject to Identity: Knowledge, Sexuality, and Academic Practices in Higher Education* (2000) and coeditor of *Youth and Sexualities: Pleasure, Subversion, and Insubordination In and Out of Schools* (2004).

Rosemarie Tong is Distinguished Professor of Health Care Ethics in the Department of Philosophy and Director of the Center for Professional and Applied Ethics at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. She has published over 100 articles on topics related to reproductive and genetic technology, biomedical research, feminist bioethics, and global bioethics; and she has authored or coedited 13 books, including *Feminist Thought* (1989, 1998) and *Linking Visions: Feminist Bioethics, Human Rights, and the Developing World* (2004). She is the chair of the American Philosophical Association's Committee on the Status of Women; a frequent panelist and speaker at national and international conferences, universities, and medical schools; a judge for the National Institutes of Health; and a winner of the 1986 CASE National Professor of the Year Award.

Barbara K. Townsend is Professor of Higher and Continuing Education at the University of Missouri–Columbia. She is a former community college faculty member and administrator whose current research interests include community college faculty, community college missions, and transfer and articulation policies. In 2000, she received the Council for the Study of Community Colleges' Senior Scholar Award.

Manon van de Water is Associate Professor in the Departments of Theatre and Drama and of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin–Madison and Director of the Theatre for Youth Program. She has published numerous articles on theatre and drama education, edited a special issue of *Youth Theatre Journal* (Volume 17, 2003) on ideology in theatre/drama for children and youth, and is the author of *Moscow Theatres for Young People: A Cultural History of Ideological Coercion and Artistic Innovation, 1917–2000* (2006). For the past six years, she served as chair of the American Society for Theatre Research ad hoc committee on Liaison with K–12 Educators.

Virginia Vincenti is Professor of Family and Consumer Sciences in the University of Wyoming's Department of Family and Consumer Sciences in Laramie. She has published extensively on the history, philosophy, and contemporary issues of home economics/ family and consumer sciences. She has coedited *Rethinking Home Economics: Women and the History of a Profession* (1997), presented her research at international conferences in Thailand and Finland, and keynoted international conferences in Japan and Korea.

Christine von Prümmer is Senior Researcher and Head of the Evaluation Unit at the German FernUniversität, a single-mode distance teaching university. Since the early 1980s, her research and writing have focused on gender in distance education and gender issues in virtual, open, and distance learning environments. She is coauthor of the seminal paper "Support and Connectedness. The Needs of Women Distance Education Students" (1990) and the author of *Women and Distance Education: Challenges and Opportunities* (2000). See also her home page at http://www.vonpruemmer.de/christine/

Chris Weedon is Professor of Critical and Cultural Theory at Cardiff University, Wales, U.K. Her books include *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (1987), *Cultural Politics: Class, Gender, Race and the Postmodern World* (1994), *Feminism, Theory and the Politics of Difference* (1999), *Identity and Culture* (2004), and *Gender, Feminism and Fiction in Germany 1840–1914* (2007).

Evangeline A. Wheeler is Associate Professor of Psychology at Towson University in Maryland. She writes on issues of concern to African Americans and is currently at work on an edited volume of essays in emancipatory psychology.

Alexander W. Wiseman is Associate Professor in the School of Education at The University of Tulsa, Oklahoma. He has written extensively on national school systems in international contexts and is the author of several books on this topic, including *Principals Under Pressure: The Growing Crisis* (2005) and *The Employability Imperative: Schooling for Work as a National Project* (2006).

Lisa Wolf-Wendel is Professor of Higher Education in the Department of Educational Policy at the University of Kansas where she coordinates the master's program in higher education administration. Her expertise centers on college students and equity issues in higher education, and her research typically explores the characteristics of programs, policies, or institutions deemed exemplary in responding to diversity issues. She is coauthor of *Taking Women Seriously: Lessons and Legacies for Educating the Majority* (1999).

Part VI

Gender Constructions and Achievements in the Extracurriculum

Overview

The extracurriculum consists of school-sponsored and school-recognized organizations and activities that are not considered to be part of the official curriculum. As the titles of the essays in this section indicate, in contemporary educational institutions, particularly in the United States, these organizations and activities include academic, arts, and service clubs, sports, cheerleading, fraternities, sororities, service learning programs, student government, and women's centers. Some of these activities and organizations, such as academic clubs, student government, and interschool or intercollegiate athletics, are officially sponsored by schools or by institutions of higher education. Some of these officially sponsored organizations, like women's centers, were initiated primarily by students, but others, like honors societies, were initiated by faculty or administrators. Other activities and organizations are officially recognized and regulated, but not sponsored, by the schools, colleges, and universities in which they exist. Included among these would be fraternities and sororities as well as newer, student-initiated organizations for which gaining official recognition usually means that they can meet in a school or campus building and sometimes also that they receive funding from the student activity fees paid to that educational institution. Organizations of this latter type are often political or religious in nature, and, because they are controversial, educational institutions go to great effort to indicate that they are not "sponsoring" such activities, merely allowing them to exist, meet, and publicize themselves in school or on campus.

There also are activities and organizations that seek official recognition, but have not yet achieved it. Groups advocating on behalf of equal treatment for gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgendered people sometimes fall into this category, although in some schools and in many colleges and universities such groups are officially recognized. And, on some campuses and in many secondary schools, either they do not exist at all or they are treated as peer groups and denied any official support.

Outside of the United States, educational institutions are far less likely to sponsor or even give official recognition to a plethora of extracurricular activities and student clubs. At the university level, these activities and clubs are likely to be sponsored by student unions or associations that often own their own buildings in which extracurricular activities and club meetings take place. These student unions or associations generally have their own budgets and considerably more autonomy than student governments in the

United States. Neither universities nor secondary schools have the elaborate, expensive school-sponsored athletic programs common in the United States. Indeed, many of the extracurricular activities common to U.S. schools are either unknown in other countries or are considered leisure-time activities unrelated to schooling. The reasons for many of these international differences can be found in the history of how and why the extracurriculum developed in the United States.

Historically, many of the activities and organizations that are now considered to be part of the official extracurriculum of U.S. universities were initiated by students, often in rebellion against the academic emphases of the faculty. These activities and organizations included athletic programs and contests, “school” newspapers, debating clubs, fraternities, sororities, and other social clubs. They evolved on college campuses, especially at the male-only institutions, throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as ways for students to gain some control over their own status systems, independent of the faculty. Whereas the faculty considered the status of students to parallel their academic performances, the students judged each other on the basis of other skills, such as the writing and speaking talents, athletic prowess, and social skills they exhibited in the extracurriculum. To many students, the activities and organizations of the extracurriculum were more important than the classes in which they were enrolled, many of which were seen as irrelevant not only to future careers but also to life more generally. Not surprisingly, their differences in emphasis led to many conflicts between students and faculty, some of which resulted in quite violent rebellions of male students against faculty rules and regulations.

In the United States, these rebellions date back to the colonial period and occurred on almost all campuses in the first half of the nineteenth century. Although the reasons for them were often campus specific, underlying all of them was a struggle for power. Many campus riots resulted from an unwillingness of faculty to entertain grievances from students, a refusal the students interpreted as an unjust and unreasonable and authoritarian exercise of power. Faculty efforts to retain their authority and power took different forms. Until the latter part of the nineteenth century, college heads and the faculty they represented were generally determined to keep students in their place, viewing their rebellions largely as results of immaturity and bad judgment.

Some colleges, especially those founded in the early decades of the twentieth century, tried to prevent the extracurriculum from developing on their campuses, stressing the importance of hard work in the academic curriculum and telling potential students not to attend unless they planned to be serious about their studies. Other colleges had been unable to stop the extracurriculum from developing in the nineteenth century, but instead of continuing to fight with the students, they began in the twentieth century to bring the extracurriculum under their own control. This was accomplished, in part, by creating and working with student governments and, in part, by creating new college officials, such as deans of students, whose job it was to help plan and coordinate student activities that were compatible with the goals of the campus administration.

The outcome of these efforts can be seen on contemporary university campuses in the United States where there is likely to be a large office of student affairs or department of student services responsible for supervising student housing, including fraternity and sorority houses, and for working with student government to recognize and regulate a vast array of student clubs and organizations. In addition, there is likely to be a department of athletics. Unlike the departments of physical education that award credits or degrees to students whom they have successfully educated and trained as teachers, coaches, and physical trainers, departments of athletics are the part of the official extracurriculum that is in charge of intercollegiate athletics. So large and dominant have these departments become both on campus and in the nation that they often have budgets in excess of those of even the largest of the academic departments, and it is not unusual for the head football coach at a major university to be paid more than that university's chief academic officer, usually titled the president or chancellor.

The importance of intercollegiate athletics at major U.S. universities is reflected in the importance assigned to school sports beginning in middle schools and junior high schools where interschool sports are often the only or the major extracurricular activity that receives official school sponsorship and funding. The official status and high visibility of interschool sports in these schools create a major competition among students, particularly males. Although participation and interest in sports are requirements for being thought masculine, they are no longer enough for prestige as they were in elementary school. Instead, well-regarded boys become those who are members of school teams that compete with teams from other schools. For many years, athletic success has been the major source of prestige for young men in secondary schools, a finding that has been reported by researchers in Australia as well as in many high schools in the United States.

In *The Adolescent Society,* published in 1961, James Coleman explained the high prestige assigned to athletic success on the grounds that extracurricular activities, such as athletics, are seen by adolescents to be activities in which they can carry out positive actions on their own, in contrast to schoolwork, where they carry out assignments from teachers. Coleman's explanation masks the extent to which interschool sports are—and were at the time he wrote—part of the official school extracurriculum in which the athletes are not only recruited by official school personnel, but are also coached by them and expected to comply with their instructions. It may very well be true, as Coleman and many other researchers since his time have concluded, that the extracurriculum, especially interschool athletics, tends to undermine the academic goals of the school. But, this no longer means, as it did in nineteenth century colleges, that the official school culture, in the form of intellectual endeavors, is at war with the student culture, in the form of sports. Instead, the official school curriculum is often at war with the official school extracurriculum.

It is not only the peer group, but often the schools themselves, that give a highly visible priority to school sports over academe. In the United States, schools that have only one convocation per year to present awards for academic excellence, artistic talent, and student leadership may have a football rally before every varsity game plus additional sports rallies during basketball and baseball seasons. School-sponsored squads of cheerleaders and pompon girls, along with special pep or spirit clubs, are often created to lead the rallies and to ensure an enthusiastic audience for sporting events. This heavy emphasis on athletics has implications for the ways in which students come to be viewed, not only by other students but also by teachers and school administrators who are not above giving favors to star athletes whom they perceive to be valuable assets in their efforts to enhance the reputation of the school in the eyes of parents and the local community.

Within the student culture, male athletes often form peer cultures of their own, sometimes in combination with cheerleaders or, more rarely, with female athletes. For at least three reasons, these peer cultures are usually accorded elite status in the school. The first reason, alluded to above, is the high *visibility* of athletic teams even to students who never attend a game. Not only is school time devoted to sports rallies, but considerable space in the school paper and yearbook are devoted to athletic contests. Rare is the American high school, or junior high school, that does not have a glass-fronted cabinet in the hallway displaying athletic trophies. Also common are banners, posters, and other forms of decoration that publicize forthcoming games and announce support for the school team. Nor is this visibility limited to the school. In small and moderate-sized towns, local papers often cover high school athletics in considerable detail, and high school sporting contests attract sizable numbers of parents and other adults from the community. Even in major metropolitan areas, mass media coverage of citywide high school athletic tournaments is commonplace, especially for football and basketball, and the media are also likely to take a keen interest in regional and statewide tournaments, especially if a local team is participating.

Two other, interrelated reasons why students and school administrators accord elite status to athletes are the high *value* assigned to athletic talent and the *competition* that exists for positions on varsity teams. Undoubtedly, the high value assigned to athletics reflects the emphasis on them not only in the school, but also nationally and internationally. Undoubtedly, also, the value of team membership increases if there is a great deal of competition for positions. And both the value of and competition for positions are likely to increase if the team is winning. Even sports teams that are not usually very visible in schools, such as men's tennis and swimming or most of the women's sports, can become increasingly prestigious and attract increasing numbers of students to "tryouts" if they have recently won a championship. As these comments indicate, the athletic programs of schools, far more than their academic programs, provide ample, public opportunities for male students—and increasingly for female students—to compete for success and to convert their successes into prestigious social standing in their school.

As is true of athletics and cheerleading, the social status accorded to other extracurricular activities and organizations will depend on their visibility, perceived value, and the amount of competition for positions. Although student government tends to be highly visible in most schools and is selected on the basis of competitive elections, it may not be as valued as, for example, a band or chorus that can win competitions and create a positive image for the school. Throughout the world, schools honor certain kinds of student activities and achievements and try to ignore or punish other kinds of activities. The emphasis found in U.S. schools on getting involved in the extracurriculum, having school spirit, and being a winner will not be found in all countries, but most schools will develop a dominant image of what a good student is and does. In some schools this image will be organized around academic achievement. In other schools, particularly in the United Kingdom, the dominant image will be closely tied to social class background, with students from middle-class or elite backgrounds assumed to be "naturally" better students than those from the lower orders. In schools that honor athletics and other types of extracurricular behaviors, students can often gain major status rewards from those activities without having to be interested or committed to the official curriculum of the school. Such students may make some effort to obtain the average or passing grades in their courses necessary for eligibility to continue their participation in the extracurriculum. They will be handicapped, however, if they do not acquire the skills, knowledge, and orientation necessary for educational and occupational success beyond the secondary level. The heavy emphasis on the extracurriculum in many schools, especially in the United States, contributes little to the intellectual mission that is central to the official curriculum, and may even undermine it.

See also "Title IX and School Sports" in Part X.

Academic, Arts, and Service Clubs

Adolescents in the United States spend more than half of their waking hours in leisure activities. These activities may be unstructured, such as playing computer games, talking on the telephone, or hanging out with friends. Alternatively, teens may spend time in more formally structured activities such as academic, arts, or service clubs. Organized extracurricular activities are an integral part of high school for many students. Approximately 60 percent of high school sophomores and 70 percent of high school seniors participate in at least one extracurricular activity. According to a national study of U.S. high school sophomores in 2002 (see Ingels et al., 2005), sports were the most popular activities, with 54.8 percent of sophomores reporting sports involvement. Academic, arts, and service activities also represented an important part of many students' lives. Twenty-one percent of sophomores reported being in a musical group, while 11.2 percent of them were in a service club, and 8.4 percent of them were in an academic club. These participation rates vary considerably by gender and socioeconomic status, with girls and more affluent children more likely to participate in academic, arts, and service clubs.

Aside from the importance indicated by their prevalence, extracurricular activities influence teens' development in a variety of ways. Involvement in extracurricular activities, such as academic, arts, and service clubs, has been associated with academic achievement and other positive outcomes. Those who participate in extracurricular activities are more likely to be satisfied with school than those who do not. They have higher levels of personal empowerment, a greater sense of commitment to the school, and a stronger belief that the school organization is valid. Those who participate in extracurricular activities are less likely to engage in risky behavior, such as using drugs, or to drop out of school than students who do not participate.

Children are not equally likely to succeed in school. Girls are more likely than boys are to complete high school and attend college, while a growing number of adolescent boys say that they do not like school. Meanwhile, boys are more likely than girls are to engage in risky behavior, such as alcohol and drug use, and drop out of school. If academic, arts, and service clubs can help students succeed, such findings suggest the importance of understanding why students choose to participate in clubs and what mechanisms link club membership to other positive outcomes.

WHO PARTICIPATES IN THESE CLUBS?

Girls perform at higher levels than boys do not only in the formal curriculum but also in the extracurriculum. In the national study of sophomores mentioned above, girls were more likely than boys were to participate in arts, academic, and service clubs. Another study of 1,259 sophomores in the small industrial areas surrounding Detroit, Michigan (Eccles & Barber, 1999) also found that more females than males participated in these clubs.

In an analysis of performing arts, the national study of sophomores reported that 27 percent of girls, but only 16 percent of boys, were in a music club such as band, orchestra, or choir. The Michigan study, which examined many types of perform ing arts activities, found that some activities had more gender parity than did others. Gender differences ranged from less than 1 percent for art clubs (8.6 percent of girls belonged versus 7.7 percent of boys) to almost 10 percent for dance clubs (14.4 percent of girls belonged versus 5.2 percent of boys). The most popular performing arts activity for both sexes was band/orchestra with 19.1 percent of girls and 14.3 percent of boys participating.

Overall, academic clubs are less popular than are performing arts clubs, but gender gaps in participation persisted. Ten percent of girls participated in academic clubs, compared to 7 percent of boys. The Michigan study reported that in a few types of academic clubs, the proportion of boys actually outnumbered the proportion of girls. The debate club had 1.2 percent of girls compared to 1.4 percent of boys, and the math and chess clubs did not have any girls, but 0.5 percent of boys were in math and 0.7 percent of boys were in chess clubs. Foreign language clubs are the most popular academic activity for both boys and girls, but more girls (12.5 percent) than boys (4.5 percent) participate.

For service clubs considered alone, the Michigan study found that about 3.2 percent of girls and 2.4 percent of boys were members. Church clubs were more popular than were secular service clubs, and the gender gap in participation was greater for the church-related activities with 18.2 percent of girls involved compared to 10.8 percent of boys.

In addition to gender, other factors influence student participation decisions. Socioeconomically advantaged students are more likely to participate in extracurricular activities than are their peers. Ingels et al. (2005) report that 13.3 percent of U.S. high school sophomores in the highest quartile of socioeconomic status were in academic clubs and 27.1 percent of them were in music clubs. In contrast, among those in the lowest quartile, only 5.6 percent were in academic clubs and 15.6 percent were in music clubs. Some of this difference across social class reflects the relative affluence of different schools. Those with more affluent students probably have more resources to support extracurricular activities, and more impoverished schools do not provide the same number or range of clubs as their wealthier counterparts. Regardless of the affluence of the school, however, students from more affluent families were more likely to participate in performing arts, academic clubs, honor societies, publications, student government, and service clubs than were students from poor families. Costs for transportation and items such as equipment or uniforms may prevent some students from joining.

WHY DO STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN CLUBS?

Understanding these participation gaps across gender and socioeconomic status is important because arts, academic, and service clubs help students succeed in high school. In addition, students who participate in these activities have been found to be less likely to engage in risky behaviors such as drug use and more likely to enroll in postsecondary education. Boys and poorer children are more likely than girls and affluent children to be suspended from school, to fail courses or proficiency exams, and to drop out of school. Given that boys and poorer children are less likely to participate in clubs, it may be useful, or even crucial, to discover ways to involve them in more high school clubs.

Investigating why some students decide to participate in clubs may give some insight into why those who might benefit most from joining tend to shy away from these clubs. Some students decide to participate because they believe they have talent and want to challenge themselves and improve their skills. Some join clubs to be with friends in the club or to please others, such as their parents or teachers. Others think that these activities will help them later in life, such as when applying to college. Perhaps boys are more likely than girls to find other ways to improve their talents, spend time with friends, impress adults, and enhance their resumes, or perhaps they do not see the connection between these activities and those outcomes as clearly as girls do.

Students may join clubs to become more popular. In *The Adolescent Society,* Coleman (1961) found that, in some schools, girls from higher-class backgrounds joined and led clubs in order to enhance their social status. For boys, playing sports was a way to gain prestige, but for girls, arts and academic clubs were more important than sports clubs. Forty years after this landmark study, academic and arts clubs, and probably service clubs, continue to be relatively more important avenues for prestige for girls than they are for boys. These different paths to prestige may help explain why boys are less likely than girls to participate in academic, arts, and service clubs. If this explanation is correct, it suggests that teachers and administrators who want to increase the participation of boys in clubs will have to find ways to increase the social status associated with club memberships and activities, especially among boys.

WHY DOES CLUB PARTICIPATION PRODUCE POSITIVE OUTCOMES?

To encourage administrators to recruit underrepresented students into academic, arts, and service clubs, researchers need to do a better job of identifying the mechanisms through which club participation helps boys and girls become better students. Recently enacted federal and state education policies have emphasized school and student accountability measured by performance on standardized tests. As a result of these policies, schools are tending to place more emphasis on core subjects and give less attention to creating learning opportunities in other areas. The combination of accountability policies and state budget shortfalls may mean that schools are less able or willing to sponsor as many arts, academic, and service clubs. Thus, demonstrating the links between such club participation and academic outcomes may give policy makers incentives to promote these activities.

Even without the recent emphases at the national and state levels on high-stakes testing, administrators may feel that their major responsibility is to improve the academic performance of students and reduce the drop-out rate. Thus, to give more support to arts, academic, and service clubs, they need to understand how these activities enhance academic outcomes. Some research suggests that these clubs might help students improve their academic performance and stay in school through the following mechanisms: changes in students' attitudes toward self and school, interaction of students with more prosocial peers, and increased contact of students with teachers and other authority figures.

Participation in clubs may lead to changed attitudes toward self including gains in self-knowledge, enhanced emotional, cognitive, and physical skills, and knowledge about how to take initiative. Additionally, participation may lead to improved attitudes toward school. Existing research suggests that academic, arts, and service clubs have different influences on these forms of personal development. Academic clubs are not associated with self-knowledge or interpersonal development, but performing arts activities have been found to produce higher rates of self-knowledge among those who participate than among those who do not. Compared with academic and arts clubs, service clubs provide the most benefits for personal development. Those in service activities report that these activities give them opportunities for identity reflection and emotional regulation. They are likely to refer to these activities as a "positive turning point." They are also more likely to report having interpersonal development experiences, such as "learning to be supportive of others," and they experience higher self-esteem. These patterns persist whether the service activities in question are faith-based or secular. It is not clear, however, whether psychological or emotional benefits of these service activities are the same for boys and girls. However, students who participate in service clubs are more likely to say they like school than students who do not participate, and this benefit is greater for boys than for girls.

Participation in academic, arts, and service clubs gives students the opportunity to interact with other students during club meetings. These activities may expand a student's peer group, allowing him or her to meet and befriend others from different social classes, neighborhoods, and ethnic groups. Unlike sports, which are typically sex-segregated, arts, academic, and service clubs provide opportunities for boys and girls to explore common interests, working together to achieve a shared goal. Joining clubs based on common interests and shared goals may help teens make friends beyond cliques in their school.

Organized activities such as arts, service, and academic clubs also help adolescents by giving some structure to their discretionary time. Teens spending time in structured activities have less unsupervised time to engage in deviant behavior and more time to interact with motivated and similarly interested peers. Teens who participate in arts, service, and academic clubs have a higher proportion of academically oriented friends than would be expected by chance, and this outcome is true for both boys and girls. If joining clubs gives a student positive peers, then opportunities for such activities may be more important for at-risk students.

Extracurricular activities have different influences on student behavior. Participation in sports has been found to be associated with risky behaviors, particularly alcohol abuse; however, participation in academic, arts, and service clubs is associated with reduced rates of risky behaviors in high school. Perhaps the peer groups formed in these clubs tend to be more prosocial and less rebellious against school authority.

Some research has examined the long-term effects of participation on risky behavior. Those who had joined service clubs in high school were less likely than nonparticipants to engage in risky behaviors such as drinking alcohol or using marijuana both in high school and when they were young adults. In contrast, performing arts clubs produced different effects over time. Like other club members, as high school students, performers were less likely to drink alcohol, less likely to skip school, more likely to like school, and more likely to attend college than those who did not belong. However, later in life, performing arts club membership has a positive association with risky behavior, especially for men. Male performers had a dramatic increase in drinking alcohol from ages 18 to 21. This rate of increase for male performers was greater than for female performers, male nonperformers, and female nonperformers. Similar patterns persist for marijuana use. It would be important to know how peers influence drinking among male performers and whether these drinking rates decline as male performers move into more adult roles.

In addition to opportunities to interact with positive peers, academic, arts, and service clubs facilitate getting to know adults within a nonclassroom, nonfamilial setting. Adolescents interact with the club advisors more informally than they might in class and then potentially have more adults to talk to if they have a problem. In fact, teachers have higher academic expectations of students who participate in academic, arts, and service clubs than they do of students who have jobs or who do not participate in any structured afterschool activities. In addition, teachers' beliefs about students' academic potential can influence the students' academic gains during the year. In other words, a teacher directly or indirectly communicates her expectations of the student's potential to the student, and then the student lives up to those positive or negative expectations. If teachers' expectations influence student academic outcomes and teachers have lower expectations of boys in general but higher expectations of club participants, then boys may benefit even more from participating in these types of activities.

Regardless of the mechanism through which participation in academic, arts, and service clubs helps students, it is clear that such clubs do enhance school engagement. Currently, it is difficult to know whether personal growth and changes in attitudes toward school, peer interactions, or contact with adults are equally important mechanisms by which participation in arts, academic, and service clubs affect academic performance. Nor is it clear whether these mechanisms have equally strong effects on boys and girls and on poor and richer students as one moves across different school contexts. And, because almost all research showing the effects of clubs has been done on students who volunteer to participate, little is known about whether the effects of clubs would be the same if school officials required or pressured students to join. More research in these areas could give policy makers incentives to provide more of these activities and make them appealing to greater numbers of students.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Coleman, J.S. (1961). *The adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Eccles, J.S., & Barber, B.L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band? What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14*(1), 10–43.

Hansen, D.M., Reed, W.L., & Dworkin, J.B. (2003). What adolescents learn in organized youth activities: A survey of self-reported developmental experiences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*(1), 25–55.

Ingels, S.J., Burns, L.J., Charleston, S., Chen, X., Cataldi, E.F., & Owings, J. (2005). *A profile of the American high school sophomore in 2002: Initial results from the base year of the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Mahoney, J.L. (2000). School extracurricular activity participation as a moderator in the development of antisocial patterns. *Child Development, 71*(2), 502–506.

Schreiber, J.R., & Chambers, E.A. (2002). After-school pursuits, ethnicity, and achievement for 8th- and 10th-grade students. *The Journal of Education Research, 96*(2), 90–100.

Suiter, J.J., & Reavis, R. (1995). Football, fast cars, and cheerleading: Adolescent gender norms, 1978–1989. *Adolescence, 30*(118), 265–273.

Elizabeth Glennie

Elizabeth Stearns

Femininity, Cheerleading, and Sports

Extracurricular activities are a central component of most middle schools and high schools in the United States. Two of the most visible activities in these schools are sports and cheerleading. Girls are participating in sports in record numbers, and cheerleading continues to be a high status activity for girls. Sports and cheerleading are also two of the most gendered extracurricular activities.

This essay examines the social and historical construction of gender in cheerleading and girls' sports in middle schools and high schools. While the essay focuses on the construction of femininity, it is important to consider the construction of masculinity, as well. Historically, both cheerleading and sports were considered masculine activities in the United States. Today, both activities are surrounded by a complex and often contradictory set of cultural meanings concerning gender. The need for adjectives in the phrases "female athlete" and "athletic cheerleader" symbolizes this complexity. Scholars have analyzed several gendered meanings in cheerleading and girls' sports including appearance, sexuality, physicality, and athleticism. This essay provides a historical overview of each activity, examines the gendered meanings in cheerleading and sports over time, and concludes with a discussion of the "athletic cheerleader" and "female athlete."

CHEERLEADING

Many popular articles and manuals have been written about cheerleading since its emergence in late nineteenth-century collegiate sporting events. Most high schools and the majority of middle schools have cheerleading squads. Yet, cheerleading has received relatively little attention by scholars. One book provides an overview of the historical development of cheerleading and its cultural significance (Hanson, 1995); while another book examines the multifaceted nature of cheerleading using historical sources, popular materials, interviews, and observations (Adams & Bettis, 2003a). There are few empirical articles based on studies of contemporary cheerleading.

Cheerleading emerged as an exclusively male activity in the late 1800s and represented ideal or normative masculinity. Cheerleaders were extroverted, athletic, college students.

Males who cheered and performed athletic stunts were considered manly. Women started participating in cheerleading in small numbers at the collegiate level during the 1920s. However, cheerleading was still considered to be a male activity until the 1930s, and some educators felt that girls would become “mannish” if they performed athletic stunts. Dance became an appropriate activity for female cheerleaders, and girls were encouraged to use their appearance to lead crowds to cheer.

Girls’ participation in collegiate and high school cheerleading squads intensified during the 1940s due, in part, to World War II. During the 1950s, cheerleading spread to junior high and elementary schools, and the activity gradually became feminized. By the 1960s, cheerleading was transformed from a male activity to a female activity and represented ideal or normative femininity. Cheerleaders were wholesome and attractive girls who supported male athletes and were popular with their peers. They cheered, chanted, danced, and performed simple stunts such as cartwheels. Cheerleaders were assumed to be heterosexual, and they were expected to adhere to higher moral standards than their peers.

During the 1970s, professional cheerleading squads were introduced, and cheerleading became sexualized. Professional cheerleaders became sexual objects to be displayed for the pleasure of men. Males returned to cheerleading at the collegiate level in the 1970s. However, Davis (1990) found that male cheerleaders avoided activities associated with femininity (e.g., dancing) and embraced activities associated with masculinity (e.g., tumbling and stunts). Thus, a sexual division of labor was constructed within coed squads. The display of physical strength defined male cheerleaders as athletes and men.

The feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s, the passage of Title IX in 1972 (discussed in the next section), and the introduction of regional, state, and national cheerleading competitions contributed to another transformation in cheerleading. Athleticism was reintroduced and cheerleaders became serious athletes. Contemporary cheerleading includes difficult jumps, pyramid building, tumbling, and complicated cheers and dances. Competitive cheerleading squads were formed in the 1990s. These squads were not affiliated with teams; they only competed against other squads. The reintroduction of athleticism into cheerleading has made it easier for males to participate at the high school level. However, males who participate in cheerleading may have their masculinity and sexual identity questioned.

Two qualitative studies illustrate how gendered meanings are constructed and reproduced in schools. Eder and Parker (1987) examined the effect of extracurricular activities on the peer group culture of early adolescents. Since male athletic events were the main social events of the school, male athletes and female cheerleaders had considerable visibility and status among their peers. Therefore, the activity of cheerleading had the most influence on female peer culture. The values promoted by cheerleading were appearance (neatness), attractiveness (cuteness and thinness), and a bubbly personality expressed through smiling. These values, particularly the focus on appearance and attractiveness, were interpreted and modified in informal peer groups. As girls discussed clothing, hairstyles, weight, and makeup during lunchtime conversations, they developed different behavioral norms across groups. Nevertheless, cheerleaders symbolized the importance of appearance for adolescent girls.

In another study of middle school adolescents, Adams and Bettis (2003b) examined how cheerleaders actively constructed their gendered identity. Cheerleading offered a safe space for girls to take pleasure in the physicality of their bodies. Cheerleaders were expected to discipline their bodies (master movements, techniques, and tumbling, and adopt a stance of invulnerability to pain), control their emotions, and develop an ability to smile at all times. Cheerleading also provided a school-sanctioned space for girls to play with a sexualized identity. Girls experienced a form of power and pleasure that they did not experience in other extracurricular activities, including sports. They enjoyed being the center of attention and the object of others' gazes. Girls thought they had the power to control how the players and crowd responded to sporting events. At the same time, girls took their leadership role in the school seriously. Thus, cheerleading provided an opportunity for a girl to be an athlete, a nice girl, and a "girlie girl."

While cheerleading is primarily a gendered activity, race also interacts with gender (see Adams & Bettis, 2003a; Hanson, 1995). Prior to the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954, Black students participated in cheerleading at segregated colleges and public schools. The style of cheering that developed on Southern African American squads was influenced by popular music and church hymns. Innovative rhythms and fluid improvisation were important elements of cheers and routines. Representation on squads became an issue in schools during desegregation. African American students were expected to adopt a style of cheering that was associated with White squads. Black students as well as Chicano students were not well represented on squads in the late 1960s and 1970s. Protests erupted at schools across the country. Today, schools have implemented selection processes to promote racial and ethnic representation on squads. Moreover, squads are challenging the perception that cheerleading is for White girls by constructing a different look and a different style of cheering. Nevertheless, cheerleading squads are still disproportionately White in some parts of the United States.

Bettis and Adams (2003) examined how and why a cheerleading equity policy in a middle school failed to achieve more racially, ethnically, and economically diverse squads. The researchers found there were problems with implementing the policy (cost of participating in cheerleading and limited opportunities for girls to learn tumbling skills). Moreover, the board did not consider the peer status system in the school when they created the policy. Cheerleading was associated with membership in the "Preps," the dominant peer group in the school. Prep girls embodied the cheerleader look in the school (pretty, petite, and smiling all the time). Girls defined themselves in relation to this peer group. Some girls simply could not be Preps and other girls had no desire to be Preps. Thus, the cheerleading squad remained predominantly White and middle class, despite the school board's effort to implement an equity policy.

SPORTS

Girls' sport participation in schools has increased considerably since the 1972 enactment of Title IX, the legislation that required all schools receiving federal aid to provide equal opportunity for participation in sports. Data from the National Federation of State High School Associations (2005) indicates that participation increased from 294,015 in 1971 to 1972 to 2,908,390 in 2004 to 2005. However, female sport participation did not begin in 1972. Women have participated in physical activity and struggled for acceptance into the sports world for over a century.

Competitive sports have always been associated with masculinity and physical strength. Biological differences between the sexes have been celebrated in sports and interpreted as evidence for the natural superiority of men. Sociohistorical accounts of women's sport participation have examined the connections between sport, femininity, and sexuality (for example, see Cahn, 1994). As women's access to and participation in sports increased in the early twentieth century, cultural tension between athleticism and femininity and concerns about female sexuality emerged. Female athleticism was associated with "mannishness" between 1890 and World War I. Vigorous physical activity was viewed as harmful to women's health (potential damage to reproductive organs) and morality (uncontrolled heterosexual desire). Consequently, educators promoted a philosophy of athletic moderation for women.

The 1940s were a period of advancement for women due largely to the social and economic impact of World War II. Women's participation in sports became more acceptable. However, as women became more physical, their appearance was emphasized. In subsequent decades, the "mannish" female athlete was depicted as undesirable, and she became explicitly linked with lesbianism. Female athletes felt pressured to prove their heterosexuality and femininity. Consequently, many developed an apologetic stance about their athletic skills. However, some research suggests that Black women did not adopt this stance. They adhered to a more active ideal of femininity than White women.

The feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s and the fitness boom of the 1970s and 1980s revitalized the national interest in women's sports. Despite the increased acceptance of female athletes, concerns about lesbianism persisted. Femininity and heterosexuality were viewed as incompatible with athletic excellence. Moreover, some sports were viewed as less appropriate for women. The success and coverage of women in the 1996 Olympics games and the 1999 Women's World Cup Victory marked a cultural celebration of female athleticism. Today, women's athletic skills and achievements are emphasized more in the media, and the image of the athletic, muscular woman is more acceptable. However, sexualized images of female athletes have also surfaced, and women have been marketed according to their appearance rather than their athletic performance.

One of the most persistent themes in the literature on girls' sport participation is the connection between athleticism and femininity. Historically, researchers have used two frameworks to analyze this relationship. The role conflict perspective asserts that female athletes perceive and experience a conflict between their role as female and their role as athlete. Yet, research conducted over several decades suggests that female athletes perceive and experience low levels of role conflict.

The second framework, the apologetic defense strategy, argues that girls experience tension between being an athlete and being a female. The apologetic defense is a strategy that allows girls to compensate for the perceived masculinization of sport participation by exaggerating feminine behaviors. In other words, a girl downplays her athleticism and overemphasizes her femininity. Research indicates that girls have used this strategy within the athletic context. Moreover, some research suggests that the strategy has changed over time. In contrast to earlier times, girls today embrace their athleticism. Nevertheless, they still must be appropriately feminine. Thus, they continue to overemphasize feminine behaviors. Other researchers suggest that female athletes may use the apologetic defense strategy to avoid being labeled a lesbian.

Two qualitative studies illustrate the complexity of female athleticism in high schools. One study examined female athleticism within the peer culture of a team, while the second analyzed female athleticism in relation to male athleticism. Enke (2005) analyzed how White girls interpreted and negotiated cultural meanings of athleticism and femininity within the peer culture of a high school varsity basketball team. While there were multiple meanings of athleticism on the team (competitiveness, teamwork, and toughness), physical appearance was the only meaning of femininity. Players grappled with the meanings collectively through the cultural routines of gossip, funny stories, and teasing. In the process, they indirectly discussed their concerns, conveyed information about appropriate behavior, and expressed underlying emotions. Sexuality was not a concern for the members of this team because they were attractive by heterosexual standards of femininity, and they had a losing record. The players' athleticism may have been interpreted differently if the team had produced a winning record. In sum, the girls' produced an understanding of female athleticism that included displays of athleticism and femininity. They did not experience a role conflict or employ the apologetic defense strategy. However, they reproduced the cultural concern with women's appearance within the athletic context.

Shakib and Dunbar (2002) examined the meanings of athleticism among a diverse sample of male and female basketball players from three different schools. Both sexes viewed female athleticism as different and subordinate to male athleticism. By emphasizing perceived differences in style of play, girls' performance was viewed as less competitive, weaker, and less socially valuable than boys' performance of the game. In two of the schools, the girls' teams were ranked higher than the boys' teams, but this fact did not challenge the perception of boys' superior athletic performance. Ironically, girls' basketball was viewed as less entertaining because girls' games were less stylized, slower paced, and more inclusive. Yet, girls were teased for winning or beating boys and labeled "dykes." Nevertheless, girls negotiated meanings they found empowering. For example, beating a boy at basketball affirmed female equality.

A recent theme in the literature is the relationship between gender, sport, and physicality. Research conducted in Canada analyzed girls' experiences in ice hockey, a contact sport in which opponents physically confront one another (Theberge, 2003).

The rules of play are the same for men and women except for one. Body checking, the intentional effort to hit another player, is prohibited in women's ice hockey. As a result, the style of play is different. Women's hockey emphasizes speed, finesse, and playmaking; men's hockey emphasizes force, power, and intimidation. The girls in Theberge's study described games as aggressive and physical. Playing hockey meant taking control, being powerful, and sometimes acting fearless in the use of their body, even though body checking was prohibited. Consequently, girls' understanding of hockey and athleticism was grounded in the physicality of the sport. While the players endorsed the women's version of the game, they recognized that "real hockey" involved body checking. In other words, they knew that the men's version of hockey was valued more than the alternative version of the sport.

GIRLS' ATHLETICISM IN CHEERLEADING AND SPORTS

As scholars have noted, the social construction of gender is a product of discourses, social practices, and social relations that vary over time and across social locations. Normative or ideal femininity in the twenty-first century includes displays of behavior that are considered masculine, such as athleticism. Sports and cheerleading provide an opportunity for girls to experience empowerment (confidence that develops from using one's body skillfully) and pleasure through physical activity. However, the cultural meanings of athleticism differ in the two activities.

The phrase "athletic cheerleader" highlights the recent transformation in the activity. The athleticism required in cheerleading takes hours of practice, training, and physical conditioning. But, the activity is still regarded as a feminine one. The basic function of a cheerleading program in schools is to support athletic teams and the achievement of others. Moreover, the femininity of cheerleaders is highlighted through uniforms, demeanor, and appearance. Hence, contemporary cheerleading affirms heterosexualized femininity.

Girls' sport participation in schools has become widely accepted in contemporary society. Yet, the framing of an athlete as female and the sexualization of women's sports suggest that competitive sport is perceived as a male domain, which girls and women have entered. Consequently, the rules of play may be modified, girls' athleticism may be subordinated to boys' athleticism, and girls who play sports may have their sexuality or femininity questioned. Thus, girls' display of strength, competency, and skill in sports continues to pose a challenge to the social order. In this post-Title IX era, gender still counts.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Adams, N.G., & Bettis, P.J. (2003a). *Cheerleader! Cheerleader! An American icon.* New York: Palgrave.

Adams, N.G., & Bettis, P.J. (2003b). Commanding the room in short skirts: Cheering as the embodiment of ideal girlhood. *Gender & Society, 17*(1), 73–91.

Bettis, P.J., & Adams, N.G. (2003). The power of the preps and a cheerleading equity policy. *Sociology of Education, 76*(2), 128–142.

Cahn, S.K. (1994). *Coming on strong: Gender and sexuality in twentieth-century women's sport.* New York: Free Press.

Davis, L.R. (1990). Male cheerleaders and the naturalization of gender. In M.A. Messner & D.F. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives* (pp. 153–161). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.

Eder, D., & Parker, S. (1987). The cultural production and reproduction of gender: The effect of extracurricular activities on peer-group culture. *Sociology of Education, 60*(3), 200–213.

Enke, J. (2005). Athleticism and femininity on a high school basketball team: An interpretive approach. In D. A. Kinney & K. B. Rosier (Eds.), *Sociological studies of children and youth* (Vol. 11, pp. 115–152). New York: Elsevier.

Hanson, M.E. (1995). *Go! Fight! Win! Cheerleading in American culture.* Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.

National Federation of State High School Associations. (2005). *2004–05 NFHS high school athletics participation survey.* Retrieved November 19, 2005 from www.nfhs.org

Shakib, S., & Dunbar, M.D. (2002). The social construction of female and male high school basketball participation: Reproducing the gender order through a two-tiered sporting institution. *Sociological Perspectives, 45*(4), 353–378.

Theberge, N. (2003). "No fear comes": Adolescent girls, ice hockey, and the embodiment of gender. *Youth & Society, 34*(4), 497–516.

Janet Enke

Fraternities

Fraternities, in North American colleges and universities, are organizations of men who share common ideals and values, enjoy a sense of communal brotherhood and social orientation, and have pledged allegiance to each other and to their particular organization. These groups are often named with Greek letters, frequently express ideals of scholarship, service, and leadership, and have become largely social in nature and purpose. As social organizations, fraternities can be distinguished from other groups that are known by Greek letters. Such groups—literary societies, honorary organizations, and professional organizations—may share similarities with fraternities in basic structure, origin, or purpose, but today's fraternities have become unique as outlets for male students to feel a sense of social belonging and community.

Sharing the values of brotherhood—the quality of support and friendship rooted in kindred minds and spirits—has been an original aim of fraternal life and has been enhanced and passed down through generations of members. Because many fraternities were founded as academic and literary societies, striving toward scholarly achievement in academic life also has been a goal, building on the spirit of mutual challenge and support in bettering oneself academically. In addition, a vast commitment to others—a "love of humankind"—is often demonstrated through philanthropic activities of community service and the benevolent support of charity and those less fortunate.

Along with this rich and positive heritage of brotherhood, academic achievement, and philanthropy, social fraternities also have a tradition of peer rebellion against faculty and administrative authority that began with open and violent student revolts in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Although these outbreaks were forcibly and successfully suppressed by leaders of the colleges in which they took place, acts of student rebellion against institutional control—often in the forms of pranks, rowdiness, ritualized violence, insubordination, academic cheating, and what is now called substance abuse—continued to characterize many college and university campuses. Such acts were and are not unique to fraternity members, but fraternities have provided an organizational context and brotherly support for all sorts of activities, legal or not, that have come to be regarded collectively as fun, good fellowship, and bases for social prestige.

In response to the problems created by fraternal crimes and misbehaviors and the other challenges facing fraternal life today, student affairs professionals and some faculty have begun to assess the need for greater attention to undergraduate chapters and intensified training for fraternity leaders. With particular focus on liability issues, the need for leadership, diversity, raising academic and ethical standards, and other strategies for positive membership development, there is a renewed commitment to support fraternities in "returning to their roots" and redefining the fraternal experience in light of each group's founding values. The ability of college men to join together with common interests and shared concerns, to pledge to uphold all that is good in an organization's heritage and subscribe to the positive beliefs handed down through the generations, to wear a member's badge and celebrate an age-old ritual, and to exemplify the best characteristics of educated gentlemen are the renewed goals of fraternal life today. Overcoming the negative stereotypes and destructive behaviors remains a challenge to truly reaching these goals.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

America's first institutions of higher education were small colleges founded to educate preachers, teachers, and statesmen. Because of the frequent lack of intellectual excitement and social freedom in the formal curriculum, students began to create their own extracurricular activities. They formed debating societies and literary clubs; some colleges witnessed the founding of "secret" societies comprising students who were "pledged" and "initiated" into the traditions of the societies as defined by each group's founders. Often reflecting the aims of the philosophical-scholarly schools of ancient Greece, these groups would take on distinct characteristics—whether as literary societies, debating groups, or other academically focused bodies—that would later distinguish them entirely from each other. Sometimes the groups' motto or guiding values would be named in Greek, and the organizations came to be known by the initial letters of those Greek words. These initials served through the decades as the distinct "nicknames" (and later, the formal names) of the organizations. These groups eventually developed a much more social focus, primarily because they began to offer housing to students. This created the modern prototype of the fraternities of today.

The Phi Beta Kappa honorary fraternity was founded in 1776 at the College of William and Mary and is the forerunner of today's Greek-letter organizations. Phi Beta Kappa established precedents that today's groups still follow, including a name composed of Greek letters; secret rituals and symbols that affirm shared values and beliefs; and a badge that, in general, only initiated members wear. Despite these similarities, it can be argued emphatically that today's Greek organizations lack the scholarly emphasis of Phi Beta Kappa, which now admits its members, including women, solely on the basis of their grades and other academic achievements.

In the past two centuries, student life at American colleges and universities expanded broadly beyond the walls of the classroom. Early leadership in this expansion was often exercised by groups of male students who shared common interests and banded together to discuss not only academic matters but also the affairs of campus and society. These groups developed into friendship networks and became brotherhoods defined by shared values, beliefs, and perspectives. These distinct brotherhoods—these *fraternities*—were a mainstay on the landscape of U.S. higher education for much of its history.

Throughout their rich histories, fraternities have often been the birthplace of leaders who have taken their place on the national and international scene in government, athletics, entertainment, and other public venues. All but two U.S. presidents have been fraternity members, and 16 vice presidents have been members of fraternities. Approximately two-thirds of all who have served in Cabinet-level posts in any administration since 1900 have been fraternity men, and over three-fourths of U.S. Senators and Representatives have been members. Over 85 percent of U.S. Supreme Court Justices have been fraternity members, as have 43 chief executive officers of the nation's 50 largest corporations. Fraternity membership runs wide and deep and is often the birthplace of leadership for many who choose it.

Fraternities have a long history of relationships with sororities, or women's fraternities. These women's organizations were founded almost a century after Phi Beta Kappa first appeared primarily as a way for women to gain male acceptance and to ally themselves with male power on coeducational campuses. Although modeled after the men's fraternities, sororities developed their own character on the landscape of campus life. Both historically and in contemporary times, they have been less likely than fraternities to engage in rebellion against college authority, and they are generally less likely to attract attention because of antisocial or illegal behaviors. Nevertheless, they remain closely associated with fraternities as "siblings" or "partners" in campus Greek communities.

CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATION, CHARACTERISTICS, AND ACTIVITIES

Today's college fraternities are national or international organizations composed of undergraduate members and large networks of support provided by alumni members. Each group is governed by a national office and organizational structure, and local "chapters" of these groups are installed at individual campuses of colleges and universities. Fraternities that are officially recognized on this "local" level are supported by these national or international structures of government, resources, and leadership and are also hosted and guided by the college or university at which the chapter is located.

Many fraternities have chapters in both the United States and in Canada, making them truly *international* organizations; however, few, if any, have chapters or branches outside North America. Nationally and internationally, and usually on an annual basis, undergraduate and alumni members of fraternities gather for organization-wide events such as conferences, summer institutes, and training sessions to learn more from each other about ritual, values, scholarship, and leadership. This ongoing commitment to membership development is an investment in each organization's future; providing sound training and education for its members beyond the classroom walls helps to develop and prepare future leaders for each group and for greater society. Such activities are reminders of a shared vision of the past and the development of shared perspectives on the future.

Today's college and university campuses feature a wide range of fraternities that vary in size, purpose, mission, involvement level, age, and character. Although there are 66 nationally and internationally recognized fraternal organizations for college men, few campuses host a chapter of each organization. Instead, smaller Greek communities (on the campus level) are composed of chapters that have demonstrated interest and willingness to become an established part of the college or university community in that location. Campuses must recognize a chapter and often declare that a special relationship exists between the college or university and the chapter, outlining the support and contributions that each will provide, before the national organization will grant a charter at that location. Not all fraternities are affiliated with a national or international organization, however; some remain independent or "local," in order to retain more control and reduce organizational costs.

Some colleges and universities in North America do not allow fraternities (or sororities) to organize on their campuses. Among those that do, small to midsized institutions may typically host between 5 and 20 fraternities; some larger universities may feature more than 40 or 50 chapters. These organizations are governed locally by interfraternity councils, composed of chapter members from that campus who volunteer to help regulate and guide the fraternal community through structured governance. The North American Interfraternity Conference is the international body that provides oversight and standards for campus interfraternity councils and men's fraternities in both the United States and Canada.

Individual chapters are traditionally composed of a general membership led by officers and a committee structure. They operate on an annual calendar that features marketing, recruitment, education, social, athletic, and philanthropic events. Recruitment, formerly known as "rush," is the process by which new members are invited to learn more about the organization and affiliate with the chapter; a more intensive education period ("pledging") is the formal education or formation period for new members. Through a series of other programs, events, and activities, each chapter takes on its own "personality" on campus, often raising support for charities, competing against other student organizations in intramural athletics, developing a vibrant social atmosphere for members and other interested students, and otherwise making unique contributions to the campus and Greek community.

In terms of physical environments, Greek housing is often concentrated or grouped together or in close proximity on college campuses. "Greek Rows" of houses—each belonging to a particular chapter—dominate sections of campuses, and the homes of members of fraternities and sororities coexist near each other in a true and tangible, neighborly Greek community. More often than not, the shared experience of "being Greek" encourages friendships and relationships among men's and women's organizations, and chapters often cosponsor events or share responsibility for philanthropy projects. These partnerships continue to grow as today's fraternities and sororities rise to the challenge of portraying positive images for their organizations, and they continue to celebrate their rituals and to role model behaviors for their peers on campus and beyond.

Among members of Greek communities on some campuses there exists a friendly, competitive tension to visibly demonstrate a positive image on college and university campuses. A vibrant spirit of community is demonstrated by interfraternity athletic contests, charity fundraisers, homecoming float decorations, house landscaping, or other types of competition. Such activities express the spirit of "doing good" (philanthropy) through community building that is a foundational value of Greek life. More often than not, campuses benefit from the good that is done by fraternities and their members, but they also suffer from the few (but significant) episodes of unhealthy choices and destructive behavior often associated with fraternity life.

Unfortunately, some unique characteristics of men's fraternal groups—common interests, shared values, distinct housing, and the occasional lack of internal leadership or supervision—often can encourage "group think" and lead to poor choices and unhealthy decision making. In recent decades, the attention of campus administrators and the media has focused on fraternity members' alcohol and drug abuse, hazing, academic cheating, sexual assault, and other acts that either are criminal in nature or violate the values or standards of the organizations they pledged and of the institutions of higher education that host them. Currently, hazing and alcohol abuse lead the list of problems that are making colleges and universities the targets of legal action, followed closely by examples of offensive and insensitive behavior. Forty states have antihazing laws, some nearly 30 years old, but hazing continues. Research shows that members of fraternities are more likely to abuse alcohol than their non-Greek peers. Such forms of crime and misbehavior perpetuate a negative image for these groups, and exemplary chapters are often forced to battle the stereotypes created by other chapters' destructive behaviors. Because of these instances, some campuses have gone so far as to reduce or close the entire Greek community rather than to continually address the problems created by certain behavior. Yet, without proper guidance and support from alumni and institutional staff, fraternity members are left alone to (mis)manage an often dangerous environment.

Some of today's fraternities suffer the stigma of being "party houses" on campus, centers of debauchery and delinquency, and are devoid of any opportunities for positive role modeling. Those who support fraternities argue that these lackluster chapters have nothing in common with their founding organizations or values except the name, and other, values-driven, chapters of the same fraternity on other campuses take great displeasure in sharing their name with what they regard as their less-than-worthy brethren. Thus, there are tensions both within and outside of each group, making it ever more necessary to develop strong internal and external leadership for fraternities on every campus.

DIVERSITY, ACADEMIC, AND ETHICAL CHALLENGES

Fraternities today are being challenged to turn themselves into ethical learning communities that can address not only ways to eliminate or reduce crime and misbehavior but also ways to improve diversity, academic commitments, and ethical standards and expectations. These challenges are broad in scope and very different from those that their founders faced more than two centuries ago, but success in dealing with them is likely to be critical to the survival of fraternities as communities of scholars, friends, learners, and leaders.

A long-standing criticism of fraternities is that they are highly exclusive and lack diversity. Although the United States and Canada have been multicultural societies since their founding, multiculturalism has received increasingly explicit attention in recent years, and colleges and universities in both countries face increasing demands to prepare graduates who can live and work effectively in a multicultural world. Greek leaders assert that the Greek experience helps students appreciate individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures, but fraternities remain largely homogeneous in their ethnic and racial makeup. Research has shown that undergraduate students who participate in educational activities and programs focusing on diversity displayed greater openness to diversity than their peers who did not. Similarly, workshops and training programs designed to prevent sexual harassment and rape on campus have been found to reduce hostility toward and abuse of women. The challenge remains for fraternities to move closer toward a stronger commitment to—and appreciation of—diversity in the years to come.

Fraternity men are also being challenged to commit to high standards in academic honesty and achievement. Possibly because of a lack of highly regulated housing environments, fraternity house residents may not be held responsible for maintaining study hours, completing homework, or attending classes; other members may suffer from poor time management and the frequent choice to socialize more than study. These choices lead to lower achievement in scholarship, greater temptation to cheat, and lower rates of degree completion for some Greek communities, thereby increasing efforts by national organizations, institutional staff, and faculty to work closely with fraternity men to better strategize and maximize their academic potential. Although there are good examples on many campuses of fraternity scholars and those who achieve highly in academics, there remains a stigma against the efforts of fraternities to encourage their members to truly become "scholars among men."

Nevertheless, fraternities must consider cognitive outcomes (such as critical thinking, reasoning, and understanding) as a priority as they seek to redefine themselves as learning communities of scholars and leaders. Unfortunately, research has shown that early Greek involvement can negatively affect cognitive development, particularly because the first year of college tends to demonstrate lasting implications for a student's college career. Healthy involvement may lead to healthy outcomes; anything less may lead to more negative results.

Not only high academic standards but also clear, high ethical standards and expectations for student behavior are important if fraternities are to become true learning communities shaped by values, friendship, scholarship, and service. Unfortunately, studies show that fraternity membership influences ethical development in a negative way through pledge education and various social events that do not respect other people, values, or cultures. Historically, many fraternities have had codes of behavior and standards that stress moral values and personal integrity to which members commit at initiation. If these standards truly become part of the lives of chapter members, fraternities could indeed become effective and ethical learning communities. There must be a shared expectation and demand that members commit to and live out the positive values that they and their organizations espouse; to miss this goal is to disregard much that is positive in the heritage and the original purpose of their brotherhood.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Anson, J.L., & Marchesani, R.F., Jr. (Eds.). (1991). *Baird's manual of college fraternities.* Indianapolis, IN: Baird's Manual Foundation, Inc.

Horowitz, H.L. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

North American Interfraternity Conference. (n.d.). Retrieved May 22, 2006, from http://www.nicindy.org/

Whipple, E.G. (Ed.). (1998). *New challenges for Greek letter organizations: Transforming fraternities and sororities into learning communities.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Edward G. Whipple

Keith B. O'Neill

Masculinity and School Sports

Sociologists have conceptualized schooling as a process through which children are exposed to two types of knowledge. The first and most obvious is the formal curriculum in which information is “packaged” into different “subjects” and taught as “facts” that then become the focus of tests to establish a hierarchy of achievement among students. Although these packages change over time as new knowledge is developed and specialization increases, most of these subjects are not generally perceived as socially controversial. Health and religious education are notable exceptions because they include elements of the second type of knowledge that children encounter in schools. This is knowledge about morality and values, knowledge that has come to be labeled the “hidden curriculum” because it is not part of formal education but is developed as students interact with each other and adults during extracurricular activities often sponsored by the school when formal classes are over.

This chapter is about gender identity development, one of the most important and controversial issues of the hidden curriculum, and the role played by school sports (arguably the most important extracurricular activity in our schools) in shaping that identity. As the title implies, the development of a masculine identity is closely tied to school sports and has been seen by many as the reason why school sports have become such a powerful institution. Linkages between masculinity, sports, and “character building” have characterized the entire history of school sports since their origins in the nineteenth century. The contemporary value structure of school sports and the rituals that surround and support it show male (and female) students how boys should “do” masculinity. Given the history of gender stereotyping in which male and female “characteristics” have been defined as opposites, school sports also show females (and males) how not to “do” femininity. The power of school sports to legitimize a limited, hegemonic (or dominant) view of masculinity has received considerable criticism, and suggestions have been offered about how to use school sports to present more variety in gender identity choices.

ORIGINS OF SCHOOL SPORTS

Modern organized sport developed in exclusively male contexts as an archetypal masculinity right. Born out of the fear that Edwardian and Victorian middle- and upper-middle class British schoolboys were becoming "effeminate," team sports (called "games" by the British) were developed as a form of social control in the typically Spartan conditions of private boarding schools. According to contemporary historians, compulsory sports became an integral part of the curriculum and reached almost cultic levels in many schools. These sports "built character." By participating in them, boys learned to accept physical pain and deprivation without complaining, to strive for success for the honor of the school, and to accept victory and defeat with equanimity. In a popular phrase of the time they learned to "play up and play the game." These boys survived sports and demonstrated that they were the fittest examples of gentlemen, ready to fulfill their social Darwinist destinies in service to the British Empire by helping to "civilize" the lesser races of the world. Behavior in school sports defined "manliness" for that age and continues to perform this function even as contemporary definitions of "manliness" differ from the original British version.

The belief that participation in school sport "builds character" was exported to America as elite private schools adopted the curriculum characteristics of their British counterparts during the mid-to-late nineteenth century. A similar definition of manliness was accepted with the exception of the value attached to winning. Whereas the British gentleman was already morally superior by the fact of his birth, in America, moral superiority had to be earned through victory. Only through victory over one's opponents, it was thought, could one demonstrate morality, superiority, and character. The link between masculinity, winning, and elitism was "invented" in emerging American sports such as football. Participation in, or rather winning in, football was seen as exemplifying the best characteristics of American "manhood," and team sports became required activities in schools attended by the future leaders of the country.

The impetus to apply the "sport builds character" belief more widely, and within it the masculinity/winning connection, came from the social reformers of the Playground Movement. These leaders believed that urbanization and immigration were undermining "American" values and saw adult-supervised physical activity in city playgrounds and gymnasiums as a way of countering this threat. Physical activities and sports were believed to reduce juvenile delinquency, give a sense of moral purpose to youth, and allow them to break away from their ethnic roots and become "Americanized." Organizations such as the Young Men's Christian Association and the Public School Athletic League helped to bring organized games and sports to the masses. By the 1920s, Americans were convinced that team sports were essential for promoting ethnic harmony, physical vigor, moral direction, psychological stability, and social skills in urban youth, and interscholastic athletics became institutionalized in virtually every school district in America. Many contemporary coaches and school administrators would endorse this positive view of school sports without questioning the underlying problems that the winning/masculinity construct has for male (and female) athletes and, by association, for gender identity choices and constraints potentially affecting all adolescents.

DECODING SPORTS RITUALS IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Like their Edwardian and Victorian predecessors, contemporary schoolboys play sport in predominately homosocial groups. Their teammates are male, their coaches are male, their behavior defines masculinity for the student body, and their sports choices are often "gendered." The most prestigious sports they play, such as football, ice hockey, and wrestling, utilize the body as a weapon against opponents and are seen as "appropriate" only for boys. Symbolically these "power and performance" sports make violence and aggression legitimate as a male but not a female trait. “Female” sports and physical activities like gymnastics and dance are characterized by beauty of movement and aesthetics. These activities are stereotyped as not “appropriate” for boys. The choices that children (or their parents) make about participation in these sports influence how their masculinity and femininity are defined. Boys and girls who participate in gender “inappropriate” sport risk having their heterosexuality questioned.

Sports performance in contemporary high schools is located within rituals that naturalize the importance of victory and male entitlement. More specifically, although females are part of the picture because schools are usually coed, they tend to play a support role for the male achievement that mirrors traditional gender-based relationships in society. Consider a hypothetical pep rally—that most uniquely American of sport rituals. On one Friday afternoon in fall and spring (or sometimes every Friday afternoon during the high school football season in more traditional communities) classes finish early. The students, teachers, administrators, and sometimes parents and other community members gather in the auditorium to honor the sports teams. With words of praise and encouragement from coaches, the principal, and team captains, the athletes are presented as role models who deserve the students’ support in the upcoming season as they put their masculinity on the line for the glory of the school and the community. Students shout and clap and hold up banners exhorting the teams to win (no banners advocating fair play and respect for opponents are ever displayed), the band plays the school “fight” song, and the cheerleaders (predominately physically attractive females) provide symbolic support for male achievement with victory chants and coordinated movements.

Like all public rituals, this one naturalizes relations of power within and between groups, in this case relations within the student body where athletes are exalted as role models, and the superiority of boys over girls. The format of contemporary pep rallies may have changed to reflect the fact that large numbers of high school athletes are now girls, with female teams being honored alongside male teams, but the legacy of male superiority is still evident. In fall pep rallies, the football team is invariably introduced at the end, even though its last season’s win/loss record might be inferior to that of the girls soccer team. Also, the content of cheerleading is changing, and it has begun to resemble a “real” sport with difficult (and dangerous) human pyramid formations and gymnastic stunts. However, a closer look reveals that traditional gender stereotyping is retained. The male cheerleaders are doing the heavy lifting, not balancing on top of the pyramid.

In sports rituals such as pep rallies and homecoming, an event that involves former students and other community members supporting the school teams at a special game, the gender stereotyping is more discrete and below the surface. Other sports rituals provide more blatant examples of male superiority. For example, the powder puff football game is a popular end-of-the-season ritual in some schools. In it, high-status girls divide into two football teams coached by two of the football players and play a serious game. However, other high-status male athletes dress up as cheerleaders and mock the girls’ efforts, turning a role reversal ritual into a male superiority ritual.

More serious are bullying rituals that are associated with some groups of male athletes and hazing rituals in which athletes are initiated into male (and sometimes female) teams. These rituals reflect and make legitimate what some sociologists refer to as the “sports ethic,” a set of norms defining what is expected behavior of an athlete in power and performance sports and, by association, a restricted view of masculinity. These norms are dedication to “the game,” striving for distinction, accepting physical risks and playing with pain, and the obligation never to quit in the pursuit of victory (Coakley, 2007). Dedication to “the game” means that a commitment to the sport takes precedence over all other demands on the athletes' time and requires athletes to put the interests of teammates above all others in social and personal relationships. Striving for distinction means that the athlete is continually trying to improve performance and achieve perfection. Accepting physical risks and playing with pain means that athletes should be willing to inflict physical pain on their opponents and themselves in the pursuit of victory. Underlying this ethic is a narrow form of bonding in male sports teams based on intragroup competition, one-upmanship, sexually aggressive trash talking, and self-destructive behavior.

Values such as these become the hallmarks of masculinity in male adolescent groups and wrap athletes in an aura of elitism in their own eyes and in the eyes of their peers. Athletes, particularly male athletes, can sometimes abuse the power that their elite status gives them by bullying members of less popular cliques that they see as having a different or inferior gender identity. This bullying can take the form of verbal insults such as calling a lower status boy a "wimp" or a "fag" or actual physical intimidation. Of course, not all male athletes bully, and bullying is sometimes institutionalized in schools (e.g., Freshman Friday) so that many different groups practice it. However, bullying is another masculinity ritual that can be legitimized in male adolescent groups especially if male athletes use it as a "put-down" or as a masculinity test to see how well other boys cope with physical pain.

The practice of hazing is widespread in male and female high school sports teams. Hazing is a process by which potential members undergo some test or imposition in order to gain access to the group. In athletics, this test can run the gamut from freshmen having to carry sports equipment for seniors to extreme forms of psychological and/or physical (sometimes sexual) abuse. Most athletes (and some coaches) accept hazing as a positive exercise that develops team spirit and see it as a test of their commitment to the sports ethic that they must pass in order to gain the elite status of an athlete. Yet, it performs other functions for the group not usually recognized or acknowledged by its members. These include hazing as a way of controlling new members who might upset the current status hierarchy, as a form of entertainment, and (among male sport teams) as a way to reinforce a restricted view of masculinity. Initiates may be forced to drink to excess or to undergo verbal abuse or physical pain and are expected to take their punishment "like a man." The most extreme sports hazing can involve symbolic and occasionally physical attacks on the presumed heterosexual identity of the hazee, including acts of sodomy and other forms of sexual degradation. On occasions of such extreme hazing, public investigation is sometimes hampered by the athletes' commitment to the sports ethic that causes them to erect a wall of silence about the event to protect guilty teammates. Few athletes, coaches, and administrators make the link between extreme hazing and athletes' masculine identity, preferring to attribute the event exclusively to the deviant behavior of "a few bad apples."

BROADENING MASCULINE IDENTITY IN SPORTS

The information in the previous section is based mainly on qualitative research conducted with small groups of athletes. This research paints a rather negative picture of the contemporary relationship between high school sports and masculinity, one that would probably be contested by most athletes, coaches, and sports administrators who are more likely to accept the "sport builds character" belief that has reached almost mythical levels in our culture. Since believing is seeing, rather than the other way around, and the hidden curriculum is hidden, it is difficult to make simple definitive statements about the relationship between sports and masculinity in schools. The results of quantitative research with large-scale samples have shown both positive and negative effects of sports on character development, as well as no effects at all. One conclusion is that if high school sports involvement can encourage a masculine identity based on aggression violence, elitism, and homophobia, it can also nurture a masculine identity based on acceptance, love, and tolerance. This raises the question of how athletics can help to develop a broader concept of masculine (and feminine identity) than the one described above.

One example of an attempt to change the concept of masculinity reinforced by sports is offered by former professional football player Joe Ehrmann, now an ordained minister and football coach of Gilman High School in the Baltimore area. Ehrmann and head coach Biff Poggi argue that the importance attached to athletic ability, sexual conquest, and victory via violence are components of "false masculinity" that actually sets men up for failure in our society. Instead, they have developed a religious-based program they call "building men for others," which uses football experiences to teach life skills such as respect for opponents, accepting responsibility, empathy, and social responsibility (Marx, 2003).

This program and others that stress values outside the limited masculinity enshrined in the sports ethic are steps in the right direction, but they do not confront the underlying homosocial reality of male sports experiences in schools upon which the myth of masculine superiority is based. Even in the post-Title IX era, where participation in high school athletics has become a reality for three million or so girls, boys' and girls' sports experiences are separate. Women have yet to attain positions of power in coaching and sports administration, even in girls' sports. Traditional ideas of male superiority in sports make acceptable the idea of males coaching girls' sports teams, but it is unlikely that male high school athletes have ever been coached by women. On the extremely infrequent occasions that girls and boys compete against each other in power and performance sports (as sometimes happens in contemporary high school wrestling), it is still a "double jeopardy" situation for the boy. Losing is bad enough, but losing to a girl is unthinkable. However, interaction between male and female athletes on the same team may lead to respect and acceptance and a realization that gender differences between boys and girls (and by association men and women) exist on a continuum rather than as binary opposites. High school sports have the potential to legitimize a broader view of masculinity than has been popular in the past but only if the current model is perceived as problematic.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Coakley, J. (2007). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (9th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Marx, J. (2003). *"Seasons of life": A football star, a boy, a journey to manhood.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Messner, M.A. (2002). *Taking the field: Women, men and sports.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Miracle, A., & Rees, C.R. (1994). *Lessons of the locker room. The myth of school sport.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

C. Roger Rees

Service Learning and Activism

The relationship between service learning and feminism is a complicated one with deep philosophical differences sometimes masked by shifting terminology. Service learning is often used interchangeably with activism and with experiential education, the catchall term that includes any structured learning experience outside the traditional classroom. *Experiential education* might include the experiences of a business major interning in an accounting firm or a women's studies major interning in a radical direct action group. The term *internship* is usually applied to experiential education involving a major time commitment and preparation for a specific career area. It is typically unpaid work. While participating in an internship may enhance a student's future career possibilities, some students may not have the time or cannot afford to give up paid work to engage in this form of experiential learning.

Service learning tends to be the term used for experiential education projects that are short term and not necessarily connected to a career area. Service learning has proven to be a politically useful term for some since there are now national organizations, such as Campus Compact, dedicated to its promotion and funding. Some teachers who use the term focus on traditional service projects such as tutoring and working in homeless shelters, whereas others use the term to include projects that might be characterized as social change or advocacy work.

Because of these different definitions, service learning has proved to be a controversial concept, especially among those feminists who contrast it with activism aimed at challenging gender norms and changing the social structure. Nevertheless, women's studies programs have been particularly receptive to all forms of experiential learning, including service learning, but the possibilities for feminist activism and other forms of experiential learning depend upon the institutional constraints and political climate in which those programs find themselves.

FEMINIST UNEASE WITH SERVICE LEARNING

The term *service learning,* with its connotations of traditional charitable work, has long made many feminists uneasy. Although celebrated by some strands of feminist thought as embodying an ethic of care, charitable work has been regarded with suspicion by feminists who have seen such work as implicated in female subordination or as an attempt to prop up an unjust status quo. At the 1973 convention of the National Organization for Women (NOW), the Task Force on Volunteerism passed a resolution that advocated for political activism as opposed to the "band-aid" approach of service-oriented volunteerism. The resolution stated that NOW believed that service-oriented volunteerism was a hit-or-miss, patchwork approach to solving major social problems, most of which are reflections of an economic system in need of an overhaul. Worse yet, the political energy devoted to service-oriented volunteerism actually provided administrative support for the current system, thereby preventing needed social changes from occurring.

NOW has since changed its bylaws to remove its prohibition against service-oriented volunteerism. Although the 1973 NOW statement may seem somewhat extreme, it does raise some important questions and reflects a legitimate (and prescient) concern that a parsimonious government will abdicate its responsibilities to its citizens and try to substitute "hit-or-miss" volunteer efforts for much needed social programs.

The NOW members who argued for the removal of the prohibition against service-oriented volunteerism thought it missed something extremely important—the mutually reinforcing relationship between direct service and advocacy for social change. The political energy that NOW wanted to encourage is often developed as a consequence of the experience of direct service. Determination to attack a social problem at its roots can be an outgrowth of the experience of direct service.

The ambivalent responses of feminists to volunteerism (and by implication to service learning) is an extremely useful lens for exploring conflicts in contemporary feminist thought. The debate about volunteer work is intimately bound up with the difference/sameness debate that runs throughout the feminist thought of the past 150 years. Traditional service-oriented volunteerism is more likely to be valued by "cultural feminists" or "difference feminists" who value women's different voices and concerns and tend to emphasize women's special attributes. Volunteer work is most likely to be viewed with suspicion by the strand of feminist thought that focuses on the struggle for equality based on the assumption that men and women are fundamentally the same and should be treated the same in the public sphere. Such "equal rights feminists" are more likely to adhere to individualist values; "cultural feminists" are more likely to adhere to communitarian values.

Ironically, at the same time that some feminists were criticizing the volunteer ethic, a new kind of volunteer work—volunteering on the job—was emerging, a kind of volunteer work largely exempt from feminist critique and often encouraged by feminist organizations. This new kind of volunteer work has clear affinities with the kinds of charitable works women have traditionally performed throughout the history of American society. And, as was true in earlier periods, volunteers tend to come from the ranks of relatively affluent women. In contemporary society, volunteering on the job is mainly characteristic of professional women and tends to be most prevalent in the less-prestigious professions such as teaching and social work. For many women in education and human services, their jobs have become their volunteer work as they put in far more time than the hours for which they are paid. Volunteering on the job can become really insidious when a woman's job is also her cause. Some of the most compulsive volunteers on the job are directors of women's studies' programs and directors and staff of women's advocacy groups.

WHAT IS FEMINIST ACTIVISM AND WHAT MAKES IT POSSIBLE?

The debate about activism versus volunteer work has been part of the reflective component of many service learning/experiential education courses. NOW's encouragement of feminist activism (loosely understood as activities that challenge prevailing gender norms) rather than traditional volunteer work has resonated with many feminist educators. However, there is no clear consensus among feminist educators as to what counts as activism or the extent to which it is to be valued over traditional volunteer work. For some, the activist project is intended to help students develop a deeper understanding of feminist issues; for others, it is intended to promote the development of skills necessary for building a powerful feminist movement. Many feminist educators would no doubt lay claim to both goals with the emphasis shifting depending upon the level of the course. A focus on expanding awareness is more likely to be the top priority in the introductory course; an analysis of strategies for advancing the feminist agenda is more likely to be the focus of a senior seminar intended for women's studies majors.

To further complicate matters, projects that meet the usual understanding of activism might be characterized by some feminist educators as service learning. The shifting terminology and the use of the term service learning to characterize what might well be described as activism is apparent in recent collections exploring the relationship between service learning and activism, on the one hand, and the academic field of women studies, on the other. Naples and Bojar (2002) and Balliet and Heffernan (2000) present a wide range of possibilities that have been included under the rubric feminist activism or service learning.

Some feminist educators have found the term "service learning," with its connotations of charity rather than social change, politically useful when they are writing grants to fund an activist project or seeking support from college administrators. Academic administrators (even liberal ones) tend to be reluctant to channel resources to anything that might be considered controversial by their boards of trustees or by local political leaders, in the case of public institutions dependent on state and local funding. The compromises feminist educators make (or choose not to make) depend on institutional constraints, local political climate, and the extent to which feminist educators are in position to take risks.

Institutional constraints shape both the possibilities available to feminist educators and the language used to describe them. In women's studies courses that enroll large numbers of nonmajors, students are often resistant to feminism, in particular, and to activism. Furthermore, possibilities for community partners are very dependent upon location. Options abound in urban areas rich in feminist organizations. Frequently in such urban areas, institutions are managed by liberal administrators who provide support or at least are not actively opposed to efforts of women's studies programs to promote feminist activism. Once one leaves the Boston-Washington megalopolis, the Pacific coast, and a few urban centers in the South and Midwest (Atlanta, Austin, Chicago, and the Twin Cities), the range of potential community partners for feminist projects dwindles more generally.

In addition to institutional constraints such as geographical location and political climate, another powerful constraint is time. Residential campuses provide opportunities for campus-based projects not available at commuter colleges where students rush off to jobs and family responsibilities. Finding time for activist projects is an especially urgent issue for teachers at community colleges desperately trying to pack as much as possible into their introductory women's studies courses, knowing this may be the only women's studies course their students will ever take. The options available to them are worlds apart from those available to teachers of senior seminars for women's studies majors in four-year colleges.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ACTIVISM, SERVICE LEARNING, AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

Women's studies as an academic discipline has been particularly receptive to experiential education in its many forms. In the minds of many women's studies practitioners, women's studies and feminist activism are inextricably intertwined. Women's studies as an academic discipline has defined itself in terms of its subject matter, methodology, and pedagogy. A commitment to experiential education has been a major theme of feminist pedagogy, and many women's studies practitioners would argue that it is central to feminist pedagogy. In the early days of women's studies programs, the link between the academic study of women's lives and the feminist movement was, for the most part, unquestioned.

However, as women's studies programs became institutionalized, a note of anxiety about compromising one's scholarship by political engagement was sometimes heard; increasingly, some feminist scholars began to see feminist activism as something of a career risk. Of course, the riskiness of a public commitment to activism varies considerably depending on one's situation. A teacher in a community college might be rewarded for what is seen as laudable civic engagement; a feminist scholar seeking tenure in a traditional academic department at an elite institution might well worry that activism might jeopardize her career. Whether feminist activism is likely to reap rewards or punishment is clearly dependent on the political climate of the institution and its surrounding community.

Some women's studies programs, heavily influenced by postmodernist theory, disengaged from activism. Feminist scholars began to write what were seen by some as unintelligible theoretical articles that sought to "problematize" key concepts and categories—such as the category *woman.* These scholars argued that gender boundaries are permeable, that "woman" is an unstable category, and that ultimately there is no such thing as "woman." This shift to theory coincided with a shift from women's studies to gender studies. It is not surprising that navigating these minefields has led some feminist educators to use more politically acceptable terminology such as service learning or experiential education, rather than activism, to describe activist-oriented pedagogical strategies.

Interestingly, the activist projects (often characterized as service learning) developed by feminist educators usually do not include projects related to electoral politics. The service-learning movement itself is on every level shot through with the notion that politics is dirty business. Tobi Walker (see her chapter in Balliet & Heffernan, 2000), who is one of the few service-learning practitioners to argue for encouraging student involvement in electoral politics, cites numerous examples of leaders of the movement—such as a director of a student-run national service organization and government officials at the Corporation for National Service—who exalt service over politics and reflect what Walker calls "a troubling tendency within the community service movement to conclude that politics is evil." Much of the literature on women's grassroots activism, such as Temma Kaplan's (1997) *Crazy for Democracy* and Nancy Naples's (1997) *Grass Roots Warriors,* report similar distrust of participation in electoral politics on the part of community activists and the widely held belief that "authentic" grassroots activists must stay above the fray of electoral politics.

Whether defined as service learning, experiential education, or activism, there is agreement that these activities represent a labor-intensive approach to education and that the resources available are limited. Women's studies practitioners generally agree that there is a need to build support for their efforts to include experiential/service learning/activist components in their courses. This support could take many forms, such as smaller classes, additional resources such as teaching assistants, additional compensation either in the form of increased pay or released time, and recognition for such work when decisions are made regarding promotion and tenure. This agenda might seem hopelessly utopian to those who teach at financially strapped colleges that would have great difficulty providing additional financial resources or at elite institutions that would be very resistant to considering a commitment to experiential education when awarding promotion and tenure. Yet, there are other feminist goals that seemed hopelessly utopian in earlier times but have been at least partially realized. If feminist educators are committed to an experiential/activist approach, they must also build an institutional commitment to experiential education.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Balliet, B.J., & Heffernan, K. (Eds.). (2000). *The practice of change: Concepts and models for service learning in women's studies.* Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Kaplan, T. (1997). *Crazy for democracy: Women in grassroots movements.* New York: Routledge.

Naples, N.A. (1997). *Grassroots warriors: Activist mothering, community work and the war on poverty.* New York: Routledge.

Naples, N.A., & Bojar, K. (Eds.). (2002). *Teaching feminist activism: Strategies from the field.* New York: Routledge.

Report of the National Organization for Women Task Force on Volunteerism. (1973). Reprinted in *MS,* February, 1975, p. 73.

Karen Bojar

Sororities

Sororities are Greek-letter voluntary associations for college women and alumnae that aspire to foster a sense of belonging, character development, and cultural awareness through ritual, traditions, and the shared experiences of members. Inspired by secret societies, including the Masonic orders and men's Greek organizations, or fraternities, sororities have existed on American college campuses for over 150 years, functioning within the context of undergraduate student culture. Approximately four million women are affiliated with college sororities today.

Sorority membership first served college women to enrich the formal curriculum of the mid-to-late nineteenth century. As coeducation progressed, sororities conferred prestigious social standing upon members in male-dominant environments and enhanced their participation in student governance. Sororities flourished over time by meeting a range of member needs including providing meals and lodging, introducing suitable associates and good marriage prospects, promoting academic success and persistence among members, providing entrée into alumni-sponsored business and employment networks, and addressing the distinct needs of different racial and ethnic groups as student populations diversified.

While some sororities reside as isolated chapters on individual campuses, sororities also exist apart from colleges and universities as large, multichapter, national or international corporations with executive offices, million dollar budgets, independent philanthropic foundations, and extensive alumnae networks. Sororities, along with fraternities, receive special endorsements such as land and administrative staff support from colleges and universities. However, the nature of the relationship between sororities and academic institutions is best described as symbiotic, meaning sororities and their host colleges and universities exist in a mutually interdependent state but are not necessarily of benefit to each other. Campus prohibitions on Greek housing or policies that delay member recruitment until sophomore year, for example, demonstrate that colleges and universities may curtail sorority growth and operation. Well-documented incidents of hazing, high-risk drinking, and eating disorders among sorority women illustrate that at times members indulge in behaviors that may undermine the academic goals of individuals and the institution.

Despite the pervasiveness of sororities, limited research exists about their short- and long-term membership and community effects as well as their larger consequence to women's and men's education. Proponents claim that sorority membership promotes academic achievement, student involvement, institutional loyalty and pride, overall satisfaction with college student life, and alumni giving. Opponents contend that sorority membership promotes frivolity; detracts from student learning; perpetuates unhealthy behaviors; and accentuates women's appearance, manners, and traditional female roles. Thus, scholars, educational practitioners, students, and even sorority members themselves contest the purpose, value, and customs of sororities, and any conclusions about their contribution to the collegiate extracurriculum are contradictory at best.

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT

Although the term "sorority" may denote various civic clubs for women, a Syracuse University Latin professor coined the term "sorority" in 1874 in reference to Gamma Phi Beta, the first women's voluntary association to actively identify as a sorority on a college campus. Prior to that, sororities existed as isolated secret societies without Greek nomenclature or they were known as fraternities. The secret literary societies founded in 1851 and 1852 at Wesleyan Female College in Macon, Georgia, and known, respectively, as the Adelphean and Philomathean societies, are considered the first sororities. Only after the turn of the twentieth century did these two groups come to identify as Alpha Delta Pi and Phi Mu fraternities and expand their membership to other campuses.

I.C. Sorosis is the first sorority founded as a national women's "fraternity" and the first sorority to start chapters in other locations, although its chapters quickly folded. Founded at Monmouth College in Monmouth, Illinois, in 1867, I.C. Sorosis became Pi Beta Phi fraternity 21 years later when members perceived an advantage from the adoption of Greek letters. Founded in 1870, Kappa Kappa Gamma followed I.C. Sorosis at Monmouth by three years; and during that same year, creators established another sorority, Kappa Alpha Theta, at DePauw University. Interestingly, these two women's groups, Kappa Kappa Gamma and Kappa Alpha Theta, intentionally adopted the principles and practices of men's organizations.

Greek-letter sororities proliferated rapidly around the turn of the twentieth century. They arose at various institutional types; operated in concert with societal norms and discriminatory constraints related to race, religion, and ethnicity; and reflected women's opportunity and participation in various fields of study. The pattern of organizational beginnings shows that sororities often began in close proximity to others where an established group sparked competition and gave models to emulate. This happened at Longwood College (then the Virginia State Normal School in Farmville, Virginia) where Kappa Delta (1897), Zeta Tau Alpha (1898), and Sigma Sigma Sigma (1898) originated, and at Stephens College in Columbia, Missouri, then a junior college where three sororities—Kappa Delta Phi, Zeta Mu Epsilon, and Theta Tau Epsilon—began in 1921. Three groups primarily, but not exclusively, for African American women originated at Howard University, a historically Black university in Washington, DC, namely, Alpha Kappa Alpha (1908), Delta Sigma Theta (1913), and Zeta Phi Beta (1920). For Jewish women, three sororities began in New York City: Iota Alpha Pi (1903, Hunter College), Alpha Epsilon Phi (1909, Barnard College), and Delta Phi Epsilon (1917, Washington Square College of New York University). In addition, women created their own professional recognition societies in many academic fields including but not limited to Pi Kappa Sigma

(1894, education), Nu Sigma Phi (1898, medicine), Kappa Beta Phi (1908, law), Phi Upsilon Omicron (1909, home economics), and Gamma Epsilon Pi (1918, commerce).

Particularly among the early social sororities, fierce competition or “rushing” for the “best” women brought about informal agreements among sororities. To promote the extant agreements, curb problems like concurrent membership in different groups, and stave off external regulation by college faculty and deans, representatives from nine sororities came together in 1902 to create what later became the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC). Deriving authority from the unanimous agreements that its autonomous member sororities adopt and observe, the NPC offers advocacy and support for its 26 national and international member sororities and the local Panhellenic associations that oversee Greek women’s affairs on the individual campus level. Similarly, the National Panhellenic Council, Inc. (NPHC), established in 1930, acts as an umbrella organization that promotes and supports the distinct mission related to racial uplift of the nine international predominately Black Greek-letter organizations, including the three historically Black sororities, already mentioned, that were founded at Howard University and a fourth historically Black sorority, Sigma Gamma Rho, that was founded in Indianapolis, Indiana, in 1922 and became a collegiate sorority when chartered at Butler University in 1929.

In addition to the long-standing NPC and NHPC affiliated groups, a large number of local sororities emerged along with sororities designed to meet the distinct cultural needs of an increasingly diverse population of college women. Defined as a single chapter on a specific college or university campus, local sororities can be robust and lasting or fragile and fleeting. Sometimes, local sororities occur when universities forbid nationally recognized Greek organizations from colonizing or when existing chapters exclude new members with diverse backgrounds or characteristics. In fact, many of the multicultural or ethnic-interest groups that thrived in the last decades of the twentieht century started and continue as local groups. These emergent sororities include groups in support of Asians (e.g., Sigma Omicron Pi, 1930; Alpha Kappa Delta Pi, 1990), Latinas (e.g., Lambda Theta Alpha, 1975; Chi Upsilon Sigma, 1980), Native Americans (e.g., Alpha Pi Omega, 1994; Sigma Omicron Epsilon, 1997), South Asians (e.g., Sigma Sigma Rho, 1998; Kappa Phi Gamma, 1998), and Muslim women (Gamma Gamma Chi, 2005) as well as lesbians, bisexuals, and transgendered women (e.g., Gamma Rho Lambda, 2003). In addition, over 20 multicultural sororities formed for the purpose of bringing about multiethnic, multiracial organizations to promote multicultural awareness (e.g., Mu Sigma Upsilon, 1981; Lambda Sigma Gamma, 1986; Theta Nu Xi, 1997). Some of these emergent groups also created their own national advocacy and support agencies, including the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations and the National Multicultural Greek Council, Inc., both formed in 1998.

CHARACTERISTICS OF AND CONTROVERSIES ABOUT CONTEMPORARY SORORITIES

To the outside world as well as internally, sororities evidence their priorities and shared commitments through mottoes, crests, creeds, badges, songs, colors, flowers, calls or chants, grips, hand signs, member nicknames, and rituals. These representations also reveal the public history and predominantly, though not exclusively, Christian ideals of each group, often nestled in respect and reverence for founding members or “mothers.” Because Greek-letter groups often begin in proximity to other social sororities, tremendous similarity exists between organizational symbols and ideals among groups founded in similar eras with similar purposes and with slight variation in the sororities' surface characteristics. For example, many NPC sororities use Greek and Roman mythology, and NPHC sororities draw inspiration from African lore. Emergent groups reflect aspects of popular culture in their public identities, including a few who employ the terms "herstory" and "womyn" to emphasize a woman-centered purpose and knowledge of language as gender constructed among group founders and members. In addition, sororities also subscribe to philanthropy and, on the whole, members contribute thousands of service hours and raise millions of dollars on an annual basis for nonprofit, service-oriented, and community-based organizations.

This focus upon philanthropic work, combined with the various rituals and representations centering on the themes of "sisterhood" and "ideal or true womanhood," make sororities a legacy of the clubwoman era (mid-to-late 1800s through the early 1900s) when civic organizations and culture clubs, as a means to enter public affairs, gave purpose to a burgeoning group of middle-class women liberated from the constraints of the "domestic sphere" by industrialization. Just as rising middle-class clubwomen faced constraints against participation in public affairs, college women, though relatively privileged, faced a number of restrictions upheld by law and policy when they sought and eventually gained access to higher education. Once women gained admission to institutions of higher education, these restrictions included, but were not limited to, admissions quotas, ineligibility for enrollment in classes or majors, and being banned from participation in student government and many extracurricular clubs. In addition, women faced strict behavioral codes that enforced rules about attire, curfews, daily activities, and use of campus spaces. Early on, these affluent but relatively conventional college women embraced sororities as a tool for making inroads into student governance to bring about emancipation from oppressive restrictions.

For young college women establishing independence from their families, sororities serve as an instrument of female agency within historically conservative, competitive, male-regulated or centered educational institutions. At women's colleges, which can be similarly male ordered, sororities provide females a vehicle for working with faculty and administration as they navigate the passage into independent adulthood. Sororities do this at coed institutions, too, but they also ally members with the competitive and relatively privileged fraternity men whose interests and activities (e.g., athletics, drinking) dominate the extracurriculum. In this way, sororities help women date and mate the "best" men on campus.

Within this competitive, heterosexual milieu, sorority membership offers women increased control over their identities and sexualities prior to full adulthood with its requisite sobriety and substantial responsibilities. Hence, sororities offer a cocoon of sorts, permitting privileged members to indulge in lifestyle freedoms semiprivately with reputable and like-minded associates under the public protection of their Greek affiliation within a select or closed system. Within the campus or local context, this competition and exclusion often evolves into a gender-differentiated prestige hierarchy, whereby whole sororities and fraternities informally pair with an opposite gender group having members of equivalent appearance, economic status, and social standing. Because membership signifies status within the bounds of this community, simply stating identity as a member of a particular sorority conveys meaning about that member's place within the community that other community members implicitly recognize and understand. Thus, joining a sorority in general and a "better" sorority in particular provides "better" associates, protects a woman's reputation while engaging in permissive behaviors, and foretells future financial success, as well as membership in prestigious clubs and junior leagues.

On a typical college campus, the Greek system has spaces for all the women who would like to participate. Therefore, the membership recruitment process aligns each prospective new member with a chapter, ideally allowing for each side to have a say in the outcome of the selection, with some variation in the member recruitment or "intake" process for the historically Black, ethnic-interest, and multicultural groups. Often when women fail to attain Greek membership it is because they limit their opportunities, seeking only to join the highest status groups and refusing to take the places offered in groups of lesser standing within the campus Greek prestige hierarchy. On the whole, sororities maintain or attain status within the undergraduate cultural context when they are reputed to be more selective than others and when the majority of members display the desired social characteristics that advance or uphold the group's status within the local system. These implicit rules about maintaining reputation also apply to participating members; for those members who overindulge in lifestyle freedoms or bring disrepute to the group face consequences such as probation, suspension, or expulsion from the group.

From the outside looking in, it troubles some observers that sorority women frequently describe their association as a "sisterhood," and members often refer to each other as "sister" or "soror" in the predominantly Black and some ethnic-interest as well as multicultural sororities. But, sorting out this ideal of sisterhood and the role of sororities among relatively privileged women within the context of higher education requires wrestling with women's history in postsecondary education and the larger effects of socially constructed undergraduate campus cultures. Among participants in women's clubs, the Woman's Suffrage and Women's Rights movements, and, especially, African American women, the term "sisterhood" refers to a shared struggle in the face of oppression and signals women's collective power to bring about social change. Critics of sororities, including many feminists, believe the word "sisterhood" rings hollow for sorority women, especially those in predominantly White sororities, because of their exclusivity and focus on competition for men and social status. As well, these opponents argue that sororities promise little positive social change compared to early clubwomen who were concerned heavily with social welfare activities. Given the term's sociohistorical usage, especially its ties to feminism and to struggles against racial and class oppression, these opponents challenge the appropriateness of the term "sisterhood" as a description of the bonds of association among members of social sororities. Nevertheless, the term remains popular among sorority members themselves, including White members of predominately White organizations, who often use the term as a synonym for "close friendship" and who often cite sisterhood within their sorority as a positive—sometimes the most positive—experience of their undergraduate years.

The desire for and high value assigned to close friendship probably also explain why sororities continue to be popular among many undergraduate women and why women from minority backgrounds, cultures, religions, and ethnic groups that were previously excluded from sororities band together to establish similar associations with similar rituals and activities, rather than other forms of student organizations. For minority women, sororities offer not only close friendships but also kinship-like ties with other members of underrepresented groups in predominantly White college settings. The added dimension of a shared desire among members to sponsor educational, economic, political, and social advancement or "uplift" for other members of their gender, race, ethnicity, and culture fits the individual aspirations of many college-going members of these populations, too. This emphasis on uplift historically separated NPHC from NPC groups and their members. For example, the first public act of Delta Sigma Theta, now a member of NPHC, was to march in a woman's suffrage parade down Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, DC, on March 13, 1913. The activities of Black sororities, in partnership with Black fraternities, have included providing leadership for the American Council on Human Rights, the United Negro College Fund, the National Urban League, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to name a few.

In contrast to the NPHC sororities, those in the NPC have continued to place more emphasis on sociability. Their philanthropic work has rarely had the personal relevance or exhibited the intense commitment of the uplift work of NPHC sororities that has been rooted in racial and gender identities. Thus, it is surprising that even now, when women have increased their independence from men, have become more career oriented, and outnumber men in many academic fields and institutions of higher education, NPC sororities remain popular in contrast to fraternities whose numbers and popularity fluctuate. Given the demands of membership, including its financial costs, and the potential negative effects of being perceived as someone who focuses on superficial or status-oriented aspects of life such as appearance, popularity, wealth, and reputation, why would contemporary White women want to participate in them? Their popularity may result not only from the desire for close friendships, mentioned earlier, but also from the fit between organizational ideals and the values of the women they attract. Some studies show, for example, that women in traditionally and still predominantly White sororities are politically conservative, reject feminism, and hold traditional gender attitudes regarding dating and marriage as well as conventional stereotypes about male dominion in interpersonal relationships.

Sororities' popularity also has something to do with the fact that, just as sororities reflected their times, they also changed with them. Certainly, society and sororities, along with the colleges and universities that host them, indulge much more permissive behaviors and attitudes among female students than was true years ago. Not only a relic of the past, today's sororities adapt and meet new member demands for persisting in a male-ordered academy and offer keys to "succeeding" within the bounds of patriarchal society without undoing it or requiring that women give up becoming wives and mothers. Thus, even first-generation college students from diverse backgrounds and groups find sororities useful as a vehicle to support their career aspirations and personal success ideologies. So in addition to activities and practices that focus on appearance and perpetuate traditional notions of womanhood, sororities also strive for high scholastic achievement and leadership development among members. Sororities devote time and resources to member education on issues related to women's health, academic success, and professional networking, and their investment often pays off in members' academic persistence and success. Though much of the research examining the effects of the Greek experience does not separate effects of sorority membership from fraternity membership, researchers have found that Greek affiliation positively promotes greater feelings of belonging, involvement, increased academic effort, as well as higher levels of satisfaction with the college experience.

In a society where women are encouraged to want and have both successful careers and families, sororities have been found to help women achieve their romantic goals by establishing their femininity and value to men through their appearance, reputation, and attractiveness while simultaneously supporting their members' academic and career aspirations. While the advent of multicultural sororities helped to break the mold of sororities as racially and ethnically exclusive organizations, gender constructions among these groups most often fit familiar patterns with sororities claiming association with opposite gender "brother" groups, for example, and some groups participating in new member hazing or high-risk drinking activities. These conflicting tendencies within and among sororities to both promote and impede women's liberation and success contradict simple claims about their benefits and liabilities and also make clear the need for more and better research into their purposes, values, and contributions to the higher education of women in the United States.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bank, B.J. (with Yelon, H.M.). (2003). *Contradictions in women's education: Traditionalism, careerism, and community at a single-sex college.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Blair, K.J. (1980). *The clubwoman as feminist: True womanhood redefined, 1869–1914.* New York: Holmes & Meier.

Brown, T.L., Parks, G.S., & Phillips, C.M. (Eds.). (2005). *African American fraternities and sororities: The legacy and the vision.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Holland, D., & Eisenhart, M.A. (1990). *Educated for romance: Women, achievement, and college culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Horowitz, H.L. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate student cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing and binge drinking.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Amy E. Wells

Deborah Worley

Student Government

In the United States, student government is both an oxymoron and a central feature of the extracurriculum in secondary schools and institutions of higher education. Its seeming self-contradiction arises from the fact that in no educational institution do students have full governmental powers, and in many institutions, the powers of student government are severely constrained. Nevertheless, student government plays a central role in the extracurriculum, one that is rooted in the contradictory educational goals of promoting democracy and controlling student activities. Given this contradiction, it is not surprising that the relationships between student governments and the school or university administrations to which they report are often fraught with tension concerning the extent to which administrators have the power to control the agenda of the student government and to veto student votes and initiatives.

Tensions also exist between student governments and the student body they supposedly represent. Some of these arise when the student government is thought to represent the interests of only a segment of the student body, while ignoring or even working against the interests of other student groups. Other tensions occur when students feel that their government is failing to represent them and is, instead, simply carrying out the dictates of school administrators. Also, because student governments rarely have real power in school or on campus, they are often viewed with disdain or indifference by the student bodies they supposedly represent. Election turnouts tend to be low, and it is often difficult to get students to contribute their time and energy to the many activities for which student governments have come to be responsible.

As a result, campus and school personnel whose task it is to work with student governments often find themselves in the somewhat ironic position of having to figure out ways to make student governments stronger. And, parts of the contemporary literature about student government, and the extracurriculum more generally, read like recruiting brochures with a heavy emphasis on the rewards and benefits that individual students can gain by getting involved. To date, no publications have appeared that analyze student government using a gender lens, although both researchers and the mass media report that, in the United States, females now outnumber males in student government positions at the secondary level and on an increasing number of coeducational college and university campuses.

STUDENT GOVERNMENTS AND CAMPUS OR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIONS

Many of the student clubs and activities that are now called the extracurriculum were initiated and organized by students seeking some relief from the rigid, narrow academic curricula characteristic of U.S. colleges and universities during the eighteenth and most of the nineteenth centuries in the United States. Because the extracurriculum was outside of the official academic curriculum, it was also outside of the control of faculty and college officials who often found themselves in serious conflicts with students. It was not uncommon for students to use parts of the extracurriculum, such as debating and discussion societies, literary magazines, theatrical events, and "school" newspapers as instruments of criticism and attack on official school policies and practices. And, even more frivolous components of the extracurriculum, such as the football games, homecoming weekends, proms, and "socials," were occasions for student hedonism and acts of rebellion against the academic seriousness and hard work advocated by faculty and campus administrators.

During the Progressive Era of 1890–1920, administrators of most colleges and universities came to an accommodation with the students' extracurricular clubs, activities, and organizations. The mechanism for achieving this accommodation was the creation of student governments. By creating governments run by students who were elected by their peers, institutions of higher education gave official recognition to the students' own status system. Those elected were not necessarily the best students nor the students whom the faculty held in highest regard, but rather those who were most popular among their peers and considered by those peers to be good leaders. From the standpoint of institutions of higher education, the purpose of student government was not to give such students recognition, but rather to establish lines of communication with them and to co-opt them. Student governments rarely had the power to make the policies that governed students' lives on campus, but they could give college administrators advice about those policies and they could run the student courts that enforced them. Progressive Era ideology placed a heavy emphasis on citizenship and service, and colleges became increasingly successful over time in using student government to harness student energies to these progressive values.

In conjunction with the establishment of student government, many colleges and universities, especially those with more than a small number of students, also established a dean's office to supervise the nonacademic life of the students. As increasing numbers of men's and newly established universities became coeducational, most college presidents felt it necessary also to appoint a woman to guide and protect the women students and help them develop suitable activities. On many campuses, the women who did this work were not given the title of dean and were subordinate to a man who was. For example, a campus might have a dean of students who was a man with an associate dean of women students who was a woman. No associate dean of men students would be appointed; however, as it would be assumed that the dean of students was also the dean of men. It was also not unusual on campuses that became coeducational before World War I and the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution granting women's suffrage for the dean of students/men to work with an all-male student government, while the associate dean of women worked with an association of women students that functioned as a secondary student government concerned with the nonacademic activities of women students. Eventually, these separate women's governing bodies merged with the men's student government although some did not do so until after the rise of second-wave feminism in the 1960s.

At the very time that separate governments for women students were disappearing, separate student governments for graduate and professional students were appearing on many campuses, and a few predominantly White campuses also saw the development of separate governments run by and for Black and minority students. The growth of universities, especially in the period following World War II, also led to a growth in student service personnel and the metamorphosis of the dean of students office into the directorship of a large, multifaceted set of activities known collectively as the office of student affairs or the office of student life or the office of student services. Throughout this evolution, working with the student government(s) has been one of the major duties of such offices.

Not the least of the powers delegated to student governments on many campuses is the power to recognize and to fund student organizations, activities, and programs, thus putting student government at the heart of the campus extracurriculum. On some U.S. campuses today, student governments have oversight of millions of dollars of so-called student activity fees to use for this and other purposes. The other purposes vary from campus to campus, but may include involvement in such issues as student safety on campus, day care for student families, recycling and other environmental activities, campus smoking policies, race relations on campus, tuition increases, organizing state or national lobbies, drug testing, and alcohol use in student housing (see also Cuyjet chapter in Terrell & Cuyjet, 1994).

Although the scope of activities of student governments at the middle and secondary school levels are much more limited than in higher education, these student governments also received their major impetus during the Progressive Era. Many progressives saw education as the key to social reform, and some saw training in student government under the tutelage of teachers and school officials as a way to cure the many corruptions in civic society that the progressive movement was seeking to abolish. In the urban areas in particular, student government was seen as a way to train the children of immigrants for participation in democratic government and as an applied civics lesson for all. Of particular importance in promoting the development of student government nationally was the publication in 1918 by a commission of the National Education Association (NEA) of the now-famous *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education.* In general, this report advocated comprehensive high schools, but such schools offered very different curricula to the students, such as college preparatory, commercial, vocational, and general. To unite the students across these different curricula, schools were encouraged to develop the extracurriculum including not only a schoolwide student government but also school newspapers, athletic teams and games, and frequent assemblies. One of the cardinal principles advocated by the NEA was worthy leisure time, and many of the extracurricular clubs sponsored or recognized by the student government and school officials were justified on the ground that they helped students to fill their leisure time with constructive activities rather than indolence or deviant behaviors.

Joel Spring (1986) points out that even in the Progressive Era, the purpose of student government was not to run the school, and he quotes school administrators of the period who flatly assert their opposition to any plan that would give students real power. Thus, it is not surprising that studies conducted throughout the twentieth century (e.g., Cusick, 1973; Eckert, 1989; Gordon, 1957; Larkin, 1979) found that school administrators often intervened in the functioning of student governments. Sometimes they tried to determine who got elected. More commonly, they set the agenda for discussion in student councils or assemblies, ignored or resisted student proposals with which they disagreed, and got student leaders to approve actions already planned or taken.

Student members of governing councils and other student leaders have been found to respond to these control tactics by administrators in at least three different ways. First, they may adopt an apathetic, cynical posture toward student government. No attempt is made to challenge school officials in a sustained or serious way, although many complaints and jokes are made about the decisions students are asked to make. This response seems likely to be more common at the middle school or junior high school level than at the high school level and among student leadership groups that are not very cohesive because they represent many different peer cultures in the school.

The second response student leaders may adopt toward administrative controls is to identify with their controllers. An example of this response is described by Larkin (1979) who uses the name "politicos" to identify the distinct group of students at Utopia High School who held the student offices and were prominent in the committees that operated the student government. Unlike their predecessors in the previous decade of 1960s student activism, the politicos could no longer depend on the student body to engage in political action on its own behalf. As a result, the politicos often felt that they were shouldering the responsibilities and work that the rest of the student body was too lazy and apathetic to assume. This disdain for their apolitical peers made the politicos highly likely to accept adult definitions of the situation, thereby becoming agents of adult goals and values.

The third possible response student leaders can make to administrators is resistance or rebellion. Cusick (1973) describes an example of resistance by a committee of the Student Council at Horatio Gates Senior High School against Mr. Rossi, the vice-principal for students. The willingness of these students to confront Mr. Rossi was probably increased by the fact that they all belonged to the same chosen peer group. Because they were friends, they trusted and supported one another more than they probably would have done if they had been only political allies. It also seems likely that sustained acts of resistance by student leaders are more common in senior than junior high schools. Such actions also seem likely to occur when student leaders and their student constituency perceive that they share an identity, values, and interests distinct from those of school staff, as was the case in the 1960s (Larkin, 1979).

The fact that Mr. Rossi was "really shook up" by the students' rebellion probably resulted both from his fear of losing control of the Council, the student body, and the public image of the school and from his surprise that the Student Council would oppose him. Indeed, such opposition is rare in most schools not only because there is little support for student power in the broader culture at the present time but also because student leaders risk losing the privileges that they have gained by being elected to positions in student government. In middle and secondary schools, these privileges include being excused from class to attend meetings of the student governing body, being able to wander around the school building more or less at will, receiving greater leniency from teachers and administrators than other students receive, and having one's way paid to student leadership conferences.

Not only student leaders, but all who participate in extracurricular activities, are likely to gain some privileges like these. Which students teachers come to know well, and to favor, depends partly on teachers' own involvements in the extracurriculum and partly on the visibility of various extracurricular activities and organizations to the teaching staff. Thus, in contemporary schools, it is not always or only the better behaved or highest achieving students who gain favor with teachers and administrators.

STUDENT GOVERNMENTS, PEER CONSTITUENCIES, AND SELF-DEVELOPMENT

Aside from athletics, cheerleading, and the clubs that are organized to promote athletics, the most visible student organization across and within most U.S. schools is student government, sometimes called the student council, student senate, or student assembly. As is true for athletics and cheerleading, there is often intense competition for positions in student government. Thus, it is not surprising that researchers have found that, in some school settings, student government has been highly regarded by students, and election to student government has been a way for individuals to enhance their reputations as "Big Wheels."

In contrast to athletes, however, officers of student government often find it difficult to gain popularity in the school. To be popular, they need to exhibit an ability to get along well with everyone in the school, but the demands of their offices often require them to make choices among their peers. They may, for example, select performers for the annual variety show, choose members of the pompon squad, and allocate funding to competing student clubs and activities. Such choices leave student officers vulnerable to charges of bias and favoritism. In addition, where student government is controlled by only one or a few of the school's peer groups, student leaders are likely to be perceived as an exclusive clique. The popularity of student leaders is further undercut in schools where they are thought to be supportive of administrative efforts to limit student autonomy and to deal harshly with student misbehavior.

If students who participate in student government are unlikely to achieve popularity with their peers and true power over school policies and practices, how might they be motivated to run for office? One answer to this question is reported by Kuh and Lund (see their chapter in Terrell & Cuyjet, 1994) whose analysis of survey data collected from college seniors about the outcomes associated with their on-campus experiences revealed that participation in student government was the single most potent experience associated with the development of practical competence, which they defined as decision-making ability, organizational skills, such as time management, budgeting, and dealing with systems and bureaucracies. In addition, participation in student government made a significantly higher than average contribution to the participants' social competence, including their capacity for intimacy, for working with others, for teamwork and leadership, and for assertiveness, flexibility, public speaking, communication, and patience. In contrast, participation in student government was less important than other kinds of activities, on average, in the development of self-awareness, reflective thought, knowledge acquisition, and aesthetic appreciation. Taken together, these findings suggest that participation in student government may be a particularly good way to develop the job skills most employers indicate are needed for workplace competence.

The consequences of participation in student government in middle and secondary schools are harder to determine. Although the research literature tends to show that participation in the extracurriculum is positively associated with self-esteem, grades, school engagement, and educational aspirations, many of these studies are based on small, nonrepresentative samples and are correlational, which means it is not possible to determine whether participation in student government is the cause or the effect of the characteristics with which it is positively associated. Even longitudinal studies that use larger and more representative samples and can examine the effects of participation in the extracurriculum over time often fail to separate participation in the student government from participation in pep clubs and other kinds of school involvements (see, for example, Eccles & Barber, 1999). It seems likely, however, that students who have successfully participated in student government in secondary school would be more likely than those who have not to continue their participation in college or university with the positive impact on their job skills that were indicated above.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Cusick, P.A. (1973). *Inside high school: The student's world.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Eccles, J.S., & Barber, B.L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band? What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14*(1), 10–43.

Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks & burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gordon, C.W. (1957). *The social system of the high school: A study in the sociology of adolescence.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Larkin, R.W. (1979). *Suburban youth in cultural crisis.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Spring, J. (1986). *The American school, 1642–1985.* New York: Longman.

Terrell, M.C., & Cuyjet, M.J. (Eds.). (1994). *Developing student government leadership* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barbara J. Bank

Women's Centers

Women's centers emerged on college and university campuses in the United States in the late 1960s mainly as a response to the large numbers of nontraditional women entering or returning to college. Women's centers initially served as information houses to help these women negotiate their reentry to and progress through higher education. The centers often counseled women about their academic studies, career aspirations, and child-care issues, and helped them develop job skills such as resume preparation and interviewing.

The pressure to establish women's centers and to expand the services they provided increased as the women's movement took hold across the country in the 1970s. Women's centers quickly became locations on the college campus in which to house education programs and support services directed toward women of all ages, including antirape, antiviolence, and sexual assault hot lines and awareness programs. Given their roots in the women's movement, many centers were and remain committed to feminist principles and ideologies, and many have close affiliations with women's studies programs or departments on their campuses.

Today there are over 440 women's centers listed by Davie (2002) and 460 according to Kasper (2004a) providing services to meet a myriad of campus women's needs. New centers are being created even today (see Kunkel chapter in Davie, 2002). These centers take a variety of organizational forms, have many different missions, are relatively more or less successful than other centers, face similar but not identical challenges, and have evolved a variety of survival strategies.

ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS

Collegiate women's centers exist on all types of campuses, both public and private, community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and research universities. Students or a single determined faculty, staff, or community member started many of them, although sometimes the impetus for their founding was completely idiosyncratic as when the administration of a college, within a large university, wanted to retain control of a newly empty building and did so by turning it into a women's center (see Willinger chapter in Davie, 2002).

Women's centers are funded by various means. Some are funded in-house by administrations, through student fees, others from outside grants and through private donations.

Some are student based and student run, while others have full-time professional directors with administrative support. Some have operating budgets of nearly nothing while others have six figure budgets (Kasper, 2004b).

They are also structured in a variety of ways. Many are autonomous units, while others are affiliated with other campus offices or departments (Kasper, 2004b) such as student affairs, support services, a diversity or ethnically affiliated office, an office of women's affairs, or a women's studies department or program. Women's centers have various physical spaces as well. Some claim whole buildings while others are lucky to have their own phone line.

MISSIONS

Despite their variety, most women's centers see their central mission as one of meeting the needs of campus women. Five central needs were identified by Kunkel (1994) and are echoed in the mission statements of women's centers across the country. These needs are *safety, education, support and advocacy, equity,* and *community.*

With regard to *safety,* many women's centers are the central office for reporting sexual assaults and harassment, for counseling survivors, and, thus, for serving as sounding boards for sexual assault and harassment policies. Clothesline projects, Take Back the Night marches, eating disorder awareness projects, and, most recently, performances of the *Vagina Monologues* are common actions or events produced and/or supported by women's centers. Teaching nonviolence to the whole community is a way in which women's centers can promote proactive change instead of healing survivors after the fact (Allen, 2001). Myriad local actions are just the everyday common praxis supported by campus women's centers.

When it comes to *education,* some argue that this activity should no longer be central to the mission of women's centers especially on campuses where women's studies programs are well established. But, such arguments ignore the ways in which women's centers have been directly active in enhancing women's learning by engaging curricular issues. Many women's centers are linked to women's studies programs, and it is quite common for women's centers to sponsor speakers, workshops, conferences, and even scholarships for women that supplement the formal curriculum. Other women's centers have worked directly to change curriculum, for example, through curriculum transformation projects and summer programs training girls in science. Bryne (2000) suggests women's centers are instrumental in creating feminist pedagogy by linking theory to practice. Bryne sees the action programs sponsored by women's centers as prime locations for women's studies and other academic programs to develop internships, offer workshops, and organize conferences. Kasper (2004a) likewise sees the campus women's center as being fertile for the interactions of academic social workers, faculty and students alike. She urges social work faculty and students to get active in campus women's centers to gain experience in service, the community, serving clients, internships, and program evaluation.

Those who argue against women's centers also claim that the time when campus women needed special *support and advocacy* has passed. On most campuses, women constitute the majority of the students, and there are many offices on campus that serve the needs of women students as well as or better than those of men. Such arguments fail to make the important distinction between serving women and serving in women's best interests.

There are still sexist tendencies in the academy, for example, in tracking women out of science and math or into elementary education. There are real discrepancies yet today in both numbers of female faculty and in wages. Recently a woman student visited a professor during office hours. In the course of their conversation, the student told the professor that she was the first female professor the student had ever had. The student was in the spring of her second year, which means she probably had taken nearly 18 courses. Could a student really get through half of her college career and not have a female professor? Some informal investigation discovered there were other students who also had had only one female professor and several others who said they had had only two female professors in their college career. This was in 2006 at a liberal arts college.

At this particular college in that year, the full-time faculty composition was 37 percent female and rose to 43 percent female if part-time faculty were included. Women comprised 33 percent of the tenured faculty, and they numbered only 17, or 31 percent of full professors. The highest administration was 33 percent female (2/6) while department heads numbered just 6 out of 25 or 24 percent female. In contrast, the student body was nearly 60 percent female. These figures are consistent with those reported nationally. The American Association of University Professors reports that in 2003 women comprised only 38 percent of college and university faculty nationally and earned on average only 80 percent of what male faculty earned.

In 2006, the United States had not yet achieved gender equity on college campuses in terms of numbers of faculty or wages. We have not eradicated ideologies of gender inferiority, androcentrism or male bias, or the incidence of sexual harassment and assault on campus. Some suggest college women have a greater risk for sexual assault than their non-college bound peers. It is estimated that nearly 5 percent of college women are assaulted in a given year, although most students do not report their assault. A women's center can be a refuge for women who feel isolated, undervalued, or under siege. It can also be educational, supportive, and celebratory. Women are at the center of a women's center, which is why women's centers are still needed on college and university campuses today.

Women's centers can also give support to and advocate on behalf of women by coordinating services for women across the campus. At many colleges and universities, women's centers serve a vital role in building bridges and centralizing services for women on campus and in the community. Even if there are offices intended for women's special interests such as an Office of Women's Affairs or Committee on Women, Harassment Officers, Displaced Homemaker Programs, or Women's Colleges, these programs are not always coordinating with each other. They may even be duplicating services for women. For example, such offices as student health services, student life, a recreation or sports center, and a diversity center may each address issues of women's sexual health. Women's centers can serve as coordinators of services building bridges among programs and service providers. In fact, women's centers probably work best when they do not try to reproduce or take over these services, but when they are able to provide connections between these offices and to support students' efforts to gain access to existing services.

Support and advocacy for women can also take the form of action programs designed to promote gender *equity* and *community* among women. To achieve these goals, women's centers engage in a broad variety of activities including campus and community service, research, programming, producing publications such as newsletters and working papers, and providing library collections. They have often been instrumental in college policy making about issues important to women, such as racism, homophobia, sexual assault, or academic achievement.

On many campuses, women's centers are often more focused on social action that promotes the equality of women on campus and in society than are women's studies programs/departments. Whereas activism may be welcomed by the campus women's center, its struggling women's studies department may discourage it. Historically, many women's studies programs strategically distanced themselves from activism in order to achieve legitimacy as an academic discipline. Women's centers, thus, became the activist arm of the women's movement on many college campuses. Nevertheless, linking feminist ideologies and knowledge to practice is vital for social change, and Parker and Freedman (1999) have written compellingly about the renewed need for collaborations between women's centers and women's studies.

Celebrations of women's achievements and women's lives are a form of activism that women's centers can engage in to meet several of the central needs of campus women. Celebrating and honoring the women before us, and the women of today, creates community at the same time as it provides education about women's achievements. Celebrating women who are all too often missing from the standard curriculum provides educational enlightenment, promotes greater gender equity, supports women by providing them with role models, and highlights the achievements they have made in society.

EXEMPLARY CAMPUS WOMEN'S CENTERS

The successes of campus women's centers depend largely on knowing their own community, on acquiring broad-based support and funding, and on integrating women and women's needs into campus-wide goals. The most successful centers have a commitment to not marginalizing or ghettoizing the center by making it the only place to serve women. Women's services must be addressed throughout campus, but the successful women's center must gain recognition as an important and necessary provider of some (but not all) of these services.

There are many exceptional college and university campus women's centers. The Women's Resource and Action Center at the University of Iowa, the Women's Research and Resource center at Spelman College, the Women's Resource Center at Washington State University, the Women's Center at Miami University of Ohio, and the Newcomb Center at Tulane University are five that illustrate well how varied women's centers are and the different ways in which they have become successful.

The Women's Resource and Action Center at the University of Iowa is unique in its outright claim to serve not only campus women but women in the community and the state. It has an advisory board of 15 to 18 members drawn from students, faculty, staff, and the local community. The center reports serving over 10,000 clients a year with a very low staff turnover rate. They attribute their success to diversity, cooperation, and open and direct communication.

Spelman College is a historically Black college for women, and it started a women's center in 1981. The Women's Research and Resource Center has a threefold mission: curriculum development in women's studies with a focus on women of African descent, community outreach, and research on Black women (see Guy-Sheftall & Sanders chapter in Davie, 2002). The center at Spelman houses the women's studies program and has an outstanding record of achievements including hosting a journal, holding national conferences, winning grants, and sending delegations to international world conferences. Spelman's women's center is exceptional for both its academic excellence and its overtly political focus on Black women's agency and activism.

The Washington State University Women's Resource Center is exceptional for its very successful transit program, which provides free door-to-door service for women who are walking alone at night. In 2003, three transit vehicles provided 12,000 rides to women on 150 nights. The transit service not only prevents sexual assault but also gives the resource center widespread campus visibility. The service also has provided training and volunteer opportunities as drivers and dispatchers for 274 students (Kasper, 2004a). The program serves as a model for educating and involving students in outreach, service learning, and activism while providing safety for women. It clearly is a college-wide effort.

The center at Miami University (Ohio) is unique because it focuses on student concerns rather than developing and offering its own programming. The director of the women's center reports to each of the four university divisions and procures funding from each. This funding is awarded to students and groups who come to the center with problems or requests. The center aids these students and groups in creating solutions and implementing them. In other words, the activities of the center are truly student driven.

The Newcomb Center at Tulane University is notable in that it exemplifies the successful transition from what was primarily a resource center with a mission to provide "opportunities and programs focusing on personal growth, professional awareness, and educational planning" to a research center that aims to "produce and promote research for women and foster curriculum development in women studies." This transition was indicated by the change of names from the Newcomb Women's Center, at its founding in 1975, to the Newcomb College Center for Research on Women in 1985. The center today is thriving as a research center with actively involved faculty who are interested in the study of gender (see Willinger chapter in Davie, 2002).

CHALLENGES AND SURVIVAL STRATEGIES

Despite some notable successes, women's centers across the country are still struggling to be all that they can and to act in the best interest of campus women. Insufficient funding is most often cited as the number one obstacle inhibiting a center's mission because staffing and programming are most often contingent on funding. In times of education budget cuts, the women's center is often on the chopping block. The threat is real. Some centers have histories that include closing one year only to open a year or two later.

Visibility, factionalization, and prioritizing are a few more of the challenges women's centers face. Visibility is vital to women's center's success. Publicity is one way for centers to be known—make the news. Being seen is another. Sometimes women's centers are tucked away in an off-the-beaten path location, but a central location is key to visibility. The perception of the center is also important. Being known around campus is one thing. Being seen as open and welcoming to all women is even more vital to a center's success. For example, if the active voices are all perceived to be White or middle class, the center may struggle with serving women of color and working-class women. If the center takes an anti-Greek stance on some issues, it may alienate sorority women.

The center works best by diversifying staff and building alliances between groups of women. These alliances can be strengthened through broad programming and outreach programs to various campus women's groups. Even the perception of a center as "feminist" is sometimes perceived as negative. Center visibility and publicity emphasizing access and relevance to all women can combat these stereotypes.

Other challenges women's centers might face are those of factionalization. When centers are student run, faculty and staff may believe they are less welcome or not intended recipients of services. When centers are closely affiliated with women's studies or have a research focus, women staff and community members may not see the center as applicable to them. Including staff women in women's center programming is often challenging. Various centers have encountered challenges concerning racism and homophobia just as the women's movement in the United States has historically struggled with its own racism and homophobia. Women's centers must be careful not to reproduce these inequalities but rather to use their politics and location directly to challenge the matrix of dominations of sexism, racism, homophobia, and classism. Today there is also much more awareness of the power of involving men in eradicating inequality, and yet getting men involved is a particular challenge to women's centers.

Prioritizing goals and resources, including time, are also issues for many women's centers. This is especially true for those with perceived competing interests, multiple interest groups, and/or limited resources and staff. In addition, Kasper (2004a) identifies attitudes toward feminism, apathy, lack of administrative support, and territorialism as reported problems of women's centers. Many campus-based women's centers report negative perceptions of feminism, antifeminist sentiment, and just basic student indifference as challenges they face. Young women may not be aware of challenges that many women face and think the "women's movement" of their mother's generation solved all those problems.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Allen, S.L. (2001). Activist anthropology in a women's center. *Voices—A publication of the Association for Feminist Anthropology, 5*(1), 11–15.

Bryne, K.Z. (2000). The role of campus-based women's centers. *Feminist Teacher, 13*(1), 48–60.

Davie, S.L. (2002). *University and college women's centers.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kasper, B. (2004a). Campus-based women's centers: A review of problems and practices. *Affilia,19* (2), 185–198.

Kasper, B. (2004b). Campus-based women's centers: Administration, structure, and resources. *NASPA Journal, 41*(3), 487–499.

Kunkel, C.A. (1994). Women's needs on campus: How universities meet them. *Initiatives, 56*(2), 15–28.

Parker, J., & Freedman, J. (1999). Women's centers/women's studies programs: Collaborating for feminist activism. *Women's Studies Quarterly,* 27(3-4), 114–121.

Charlotte A. Kunkel

Part VII

Gender Constructions in the Hidden Curriculum

Overview

In the overview to Part VI, it was noted that the official school curriculum with its emphasis on the accredited courses necessary to achieve educational credentials, such as diplomas or degrees, is often in conflict with the values and demands of the extracurriculum. The official school curriculum is also sometimes in conflict with the hidden curriculum that is described and analyzed by the essays in this section of the encyclopedia. Although he was not the first educational researcher to use the concept, Philip Jackson is regarded as the first to use the term *hidden curriculum,* which he introduced in his 1968 book, *Life in Classrooms,* to refer to the institutional expectations and implicit rules that are used to evaluate students regardless of their academic performance. Thus, Jackson considered it useful to think of there being two curricula in the classroom, the official one focused on students' intellectual achievement and mastery of the subject matter, and the hidden one focused on students' conformity to institutional expectations about matters other than intellectual mastery. For students to be successful in school, they not only must learn the subject matter but also must "learn how to learn," by which Jackson meant learning to acquiesce to the network of rules, regulations, and routines characteristic of schools and classrooms.

Both in Jackson's book and in the large literature about education that has appeared since its publication, the concept of a hidden curriculum is extremely broad, referring to almost all the socializing influences and processes that occur in schools other than the highly focused effort to impart subject-matter learning. And, even that effort is often argued to be part of the hidden curriculum because, as the essays in Part IV and several in Part V make clear, what the teachers, textbooks, and other course materials say about the subject matter often contains implicit messages about topics, such as gender and race, that are not the overt focus of the official curriculum. Unlike the previous essays, however, the essays in this section do not focus on messages about gender that are embedded in specific lessons or courses in the official curriculum. Instead, these essays concern themselves with the ways in which messages about gender are conveyed without reference to either the specific lessons and courses that constitute the official curriculum, described in Parts IV and V, or the specific organizations and activities of the extracurriculum, described in Part VI.

What kinds of gendered messages are these, and how are they conveyed? Many of these messages concern the kinds of appearances and behaviors characteristic of "good" students versus "bad" students. Research in the United States, and some from other countries, finds that teachers consider good students to be those who work hard and are attentive, helpful, cooperative, considerate, polite, articulate, well groomed, and reasonably self-confident. As Barbara Morrow Williams points out in her essay on "Managing 'Problem' Boys and Girls," these also are characteristics consistent with the middle-class ethos of the United States. And, several researchers have noted that these also are characteristics more consistent with notions of ideal femininity than with ideal masculinity. Thus, even if teachers are sincere in their claims that they have no biases against students of a particular social class, racial-ethnic group, or gender, those biases may be built into the expectations that teachers have for appropriate and desirable student behaviors. As a result, as Morrow Williams points out, students are often rewarded for their "fit" with the dominant culture and their ability to blend into it. And, because students from White, middle-class backgrounds—especially girls—are more likely to fit the mold of the good student, they may be treated differently than their male counterparts and students from poorer, minority backgrounds.

Several of these differences in treatment are documented by Linda Grant and Kimberly Kelly in their review of "Teacher-Student Interactions." Among the many interesting points made in this essay is the observation that, although gender biases in achievement-related interactions, or what might be called interactions in the official curriculum, are decreasing, gender biases in control-related interactions, are not. These control-related matters are often parts of the hidden curriculum in that they have more to do with getting students to be "good" than with improving students' intellectual performance. And, Grant and Kelly, like Morrow Williams, suggest that boys are more frequently the targets of teachers' efforts at discipline and control than girls are. Partly as a result of these efforts, boys are more likely to receive punishments, such as detention, and are more likely to become disaffected and to drop out of school.

Teachers are not the only educators who have been found to bring gender biases to their interactions with male and female students. In the section of their essay about "School Counseling" that is devoted to "Career Development Programs and Gender," Daniel T. Sciarra, Kerri Keegan, and Bridget Sledz discuss the kinds of gender biases that may affect school counselors, and they make suggestions about ways in which these biases can be overcome. The notion that counselors or teachers can be made aware of gender biases embedded in their treatment of students and can be persuaded or trained to overcome those biases is common in writings about the hidden curriculum. In fact, a major purpose of much of that writing is to reveal the hidden curriculum by making educators aware of their differential treatment of boys and girls and of students from different economic, racial, and cultural backgrounds. Often educators will deny that their behaviors evidence gender, racial, or social class biases, but some researchers have been successful in convincing them of the biases in their behaviors by showing them videotapes of their classroom interactions with students of different backgrounds.

An assumption is often made that once counselors or teachers see their biases, they will want to eliminate them. This assumption is based on the notions that most teachers share values of equity and fairness; they not only do not want to appear biased but also do not want to be biased. Even those few who cling to their prejudices are assumed to know that discrimination is forbidden by school rules and by the legal system and that they had better comply or face negative consequences. From this perspective, revealing the hidden curriculum is a very big step on the way to revising it.

Such assumptions have been challenged, however, by research showing that the hidden curriculum is not just a set of behaviors that counselors, teachers, and administrators perform inadvertently because they fail to recognize the biased expectations and evaluative procedures they direct toward students. Instead, these expectations and evaluations about gender, race-ethnicity, and social class are deeply embedded not only in the structure and culture of the school, with its emphasis on what it means to be a good student, but also in the structure and culture of the broader society. Calling these culturally embedded expectations about gender *stereotypes,* the authors of "Expectations of Teachers for Boys and Girls" summarize research evidence showing that stereotypes have more powerful effects on student performance than the expectations of individual teachers, whose assumptions about gender have not been found to be strongly biased. It is because of these widely held and deeply seated stereotypes that teachers often find themselves in situations, described by Grant and Kelly, in which their silent failure to respond when sexism and racism are expressed by students is interpreted as support for gender and racial bias, rather than as disapproval or neutrality.

Silence is also the key to understanding the ways in which the official and hidden curricula (fail to) deal with sexuality. As the authors of "Heterosexism and Homophobia in the Hidden Curriculum" indicate, one of the more deeply held assumptions embedded in the hidden curriculum, as well as the official curriculum and the peer culture, is *heteronormativity,* a term that is used to refer to beliefs and behaviors premised on the assumption that heterosexuality is normal, natural, and universal. The fact that the official curriculum is silent about the homosexuality of some important literary and historical figures reinforces the notion that homosexuality is something to be embarrassed about or hidden rather than something that is normal, natural, or widespread. Along with homosexuality, the positive aspects of all forms of sexuality and sexual desire tend to be excluded from the curriculum. Even the depiction of the "good" student that is central to the hidden curriculum is a sexless portrait. Although it could be argued that there is an unspoken assumption that the good student is heterosexual in orientation, there seems also to be an unspoken assumption that this orientation is not too strong or too central. Good students have their sexual impulses under control, and they do not embarrass their teachers with overt displays of sexiness.

The dangers of being silent about sexuality are apparent when one reads Charol Shakeshaft's essay about "Educator Sexual Misconduct." One way to make sexual abuse in schools less common, she suggests, is to make expectations about sexual conduct explicit and public. Although her suggestion is focused primarily on the sexual conduct of educators, it seems likely that frank acknowledgment and open discussion of students' sexual curiosity, fantasies, and desires might also help students overcome the fear and guilt that so often prevents them from reporting sexual abuse by teachers, students, and other school personnel.

See also essays on "Attrition From Schools" in Part V; "Heterosexism and Homophobia in the Peer Group" in Part VIII; and "Pregnant and Parenting Teens" in Part X.

Educator Sexual Misconduct

Educator sexual misconduct is behavior by an educator that is directed at a student and intended to sexually arouse or titillate the educator or the child. These behaviors are physical, verbal, or visual. Examples include touching breasts or genitals of students; oral, anal, and vaginal penetration; showing students pictures of a sexual nature; sexually related conversations, jokes, or questions directed at students.

Surveys conducted in the United States in recent years reveal that most students experience harassment at the hands of other students. Of those students who report being sexually harassed in school—whether physical, verbal, or visual—21 percent were targeted by an adult employed in the school. Of all students, 9.6 percent in grades 8 to 11 report experiencing unwanted educator sexual misconduct at least once during their school career; 8.7 percent report verbal or visual sexual abuse; and 6.7 percent experienced physical sexual abuse.

While a higher proportion of females than males report being the target of an adult employed in a school, the difference is less than commonly believed. Of those students who report having experienced educator sexual misconduct, 57 percent are female and 43 percent are male. The proportions are similar across all types of sexual misconduct. Students of color (African descent, American Indian, and Latina/o) are overrepresented as targets of educator sexual misconduct in comparison to their relative numbers, while White and Asian students are underrepresented. Females, and particularly females of color, are overrepresented as targets of educator sexual misconduct in relation to their proportion of the population.

There are scant U.S. data on any type of sexual abuse of students with disabilities and none on educator sexual abuse of students with disability. However, studies of sexual abuse without regard to context indicate that children with disabilities are three times more likely to be sexually abused than those without disabilities.

Teachers who sexually abuse belie the stereotype of an abuser as an easily identifiable danger to children. Many are those most celebrated in their profession. Although we do not know how many or what percent of school employees are offenders, we do know that many are chronic predators; thus, the number of teachers who abuse is fewer than the number of students who are abused. Abusers are more likely to be male than female, but how much more likely is unclear. The most reliable data estimate that about two-thirds of abusers are male and one-third are female. The most common pattern is male abuser and female target, followed by female abuser and male target. Of those school employees who sexually abuse students, teachers are reported most often, followed by coaches. Teachers whose job description includes time with individual students, such as music teachers or coaches, are more likely to sexually abuse than other teachers.

Sexual abuse of students occurs within the context of schools, where students are taught to trust teachers. It is also a place where teachers are more often believed than are students and in which there is a power and status differential that privileges teachers and other educators. Sexual abusers in schools use various strategies to trap students. They lie to them, isolate them, make them feel complicit, and manipulate them into sexual contact. Often teachers target vulnerable or marginal students who are grateful for the attention. Moreover, students whom adults regard as marginal are unlikely to be accepted as credible complainants against a well-regarded educator.

In elementary schools, the abuser is often one of the people whom students most like and parents most trust. The abusers of children younger than seventh grade have different patterns than those who abuse older children. The educators who target elementary school children are often professionally accomplished and even celebrated. Particularly compared to their nonabusing counterparts, they hold a disproportionate number of awards. It is common to find that educators who have been sexually abusing children are also the same educators who display on their walls a community “Excellence in Teaching” award or a “Teacher of the Year” certificate. This popularity confounds district officials and community members and prompts them to ignore allegations in the belief that “outstanding teachers” cannot be guilty of such repugnant behaviors.

Many educators who abuse students work at being recognized as good professionals in order to be trusted by colleagues, parents, and students. For them, especially those who abuse elementary and younger middle school students, being a good educator is the path to children. At the late middle and high school level, educator abusers may or may not be outstanding practitioners. At this level, the initial acts are somewhat less premeditated and planned and more often opportunistic, a result of bad judgment or a misplaced sense of privilege. Whether premeditated or opportunistic, selection is influenced by the likelihood of compliance and secrecy. Because most educator abusers seek to conceal their sexual contact with students, offenders often target students whom they can control. In some cases, control is characterized by force. However, most abuse occurs within the much subtler framework of grooming and enticement.

During grooming, the abuser selects a student, gives the student attention and rewards, provides the student with support and understanding, all the while slowly increasing the amount of touch or other sexual behavior. The purpose of grooming is to test the child’s ability to maintain secrecy, to desensitize the child through progressive sexual behaviors, to provide the child with experiences that are valuable and that the child will not want to lose, to learn information that will discredit the child, and to gain approval from parents. Grooming allows the abuser to test the student’s silence at each step. It also serves to implicate the student, resulting in children believing that they are responsible for their own abuse because, “I never said stop.”

Grooming often takes place in the context of providing a child with extras like additional help learning a musical instrument, advisement on a science project, and opportunities for camping and outdoor activity. These opportunities not only create a special relationship with students, they are also ones for which parents are usually appreciative. Although not every instance of educator sexual misconduct includes a grooming phase, because grooming precedes sexual engagement, grooming has the added benefit to the abuser of being able to test a child's compliance. Any complaint can be discredited because it does not yet constitute identifiable sexual misconduct.

Some of the children who are sexually abused by educators do not characterize what is happening as abuse. That is not to say they do not identify what is happening as shameful, unwanted, wrong, or frightening. In many cases, they are told that what is happening is love. Many abusers of children of all ages couch what they are doing to the children as love, both romantic and parental.

Offenders work hard to keep children from telling. Almost always they persuade students to keep silent by intimidation and threats (if you tell, I'll fail you), by exploiting the power structure (if you tell, no one will believe you), or by manipulating the child's affections (if you tell, I'll get in trouble; if you tell, I won't be able to be your friend anymore). Thus, childish or adolescent naiveté is taken advantage of to keep children silent. Because many children who are targeted have previously been abused by others, the legacy of abuse increases the likelihood of silence. Fear of discovery and punishment or shame for doing something forbidden also keep children from speaking. Boys abused by men often do not tell because of homophobia.

Because children often get something positive in the transaction, such as attention, gifts, physical pleasure, and feelings of belonging or attractiveness, they can be made to feel responsible. Offenders use this to their advantage.

Finally, abuse is allowed to continue because even when children report abuse, they are not believed. Because of the power differential, the reputation difference between the educator and the child, or the mind-set that children are untruthful, many reports by children are ignored or given minimal attention.

An analysis of documentation from legal proceedings and from interviews with school officials and student targets indicates that sexual misconduct by educators occurs in the school, in classrooms (empty or not), in hallways, in offices, on buses, in cars, in the educator's home, and in outdoor secluded areas. Sometimes the abuse happens right in front of other students.

Notice of educator sexual misconduct comes to the attention of school officials in five ways: formal complaints, informal complaints, observed abuse, observed suspicious behaviors, or rumors and/or anonymous reports. Many students do not tell anyone about the abuse. Of those who do, most tell a friend and swear the friend to secrecy. The most common reason that students do not report educator sexual misconduct is fear that they will not be believed.

When students do report, they almost always report incidents of contact sexual abuse—touching, kissing, hugging, or forced intercourse. Verbal and visual abuse are rarely reported to school officials. Few students, families, or school districts report incidents to the police or other law enforcement agencies. When criminal justice officials are alerted, it is almost always because parents have made the contact. Thus, most abusers are not entered into criminal justice information systems.

Targets of educator sexual misconduct report that they suffer emotional, educational, and developmental or health effects. Student behaviors in response to educator sexual misconduct that negatively affect academic achievement include avoiding the teacher or other educator, failing to go to school, not talking in class, not paying attention, cutting class, and having difficulty studying. Students who are targets of educator sexual misconduct report academic or discipline repercussions that they attribute to the incident. They think about changing schools or do change schools, receive lower grades in assignments or classes, get in trouble with school authorities, and believe they are less likely to get a good grade.

Health effects such as sleep disorder and appetite loss are also experienced by targets of educator sexual misconduct. Students report negative feelings of self-worth such as embarrassment, self-consciousness, lack of security, and decreased self-confidence. These students also feel afraid, are confused about their identity, and report wondering whether they will ever be able to have a happy, romantic relationship.

The school or district rarely prescribes a therapeutic and healing intervention for targets of educator sexual misconduct or for others in the school. Policies and procedures that debrief other students or their parents are not available, nor are guidelines for the type of support a targeted student should receive from the school.

Where educator sexual misconduct is not adequately addressed, the negative effects spread to other staff and students. Studies of sexual harassment in the workplace indicate that the climate and culture changes when sexualization and abuse are not addressed. Studies also indicate that most abusers do not lose their jobs. Even when the abuser leaves a school district, the person rarely loses her or his license and can, therefore, move to another school.

The primary federal legal remedy for sexual misconduct in schools is Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. The language of Title IX does not mention sexual harassment but, rather, is a statute that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in any educational organization that receives federal funds. Title IX provides for federal enforcement of the prohibition on sexual discrimination and the possibility of loss of federal funds for any educational institution in violation of Title IX or its regulations.

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) enforces Title IX and its regulations and publishes guidelines to help schools recognize and effectively respond to sexual harassment of students in educational programs as a condition of receiving federal financial assistance. OCR provides technical assistance to schools in developing sexual harassment policies to clarify the responsibilities of school personnel. Schools are responsible for prohibiting and responding effectively to sexual harassment, and there are potential legal consequences for ignoring sexual harassment of students by staff or students.

Depending upon a number of factors (age of student, age of educator, type of sexual misconduct, etc.), educators who sexually abuse might be prosecuted under a variety of statutes. Criminal codes are not uniform across the states. While all states have laws that prohibit adults from having sex with children, each state defines that crime differently. Child sexual abuse, sexual assault, antistalking, and lewdness with a minor are legal categories under which state laws might exist. State laws regarding “consensual sex” (referred to generally as statutory rape laws) prohibit adult-child relationships but define childhood differently, depending upon the state. In addition to general sexual assault laws and criminal statutes prohibiting adult sexual contact with children, some states have adopted laws that specifically prohibit sexual abuse by educators or people in a position of trust.

Besides federal, civil, and criminal approaches to identifying and stopping educator predators, legally enforceable codes of professional conduct, generally in connection with state licensure, exist in most states. In addition, most states require criminal background checks that use FBI and state records in addition to fingerprinting, although these precautions generally do not identify educators who are sexually abusing since these predators are not entered into the criminal justice system.

Educator sexual misconduct has not been systematically addressed in schools. While the advent of awarding monetary damages to targets of sexual harassment, a result of Title IX legislation and newspaper and other media coverage, has prodded some school district officials to acknowledge educator sexual misconduct, educator sexual misconduct is still occurring.

All school districts need written policies prohibiting educator sexual misconduct and inappropriate educator-student relationships to include consensual relationships between staff and students. The behaviors prohibited should be described in the policy so that there is no ambiguity about what types of actions are unacceptable. In addition to making clear the prohibitions against adult-to-student sex, policies should include descriptions of educationally appropriate touching; limitations on closed-door and after-hours activities with only one student; investigatory rights without formal complaint; required reporting by other teachers and employees; required reports of any criminal investigation or conviction during period of employment; required chaperones, at least one male and one female, for off-site trips; deadlines for reporting allegations with the option for waiving the time limit.

A common form should be used for all employment applications that includes questions on work history, identification that will facilitate background checks, and all information on criminal history. The form should include a statement that incomplete or false information can result in termination. Interviewers should be trained to identify red flags in applicant backgrounds. Screening applicants requires multiple methods that include references, background checks, license information, and application information. Prior to making an employment offer, personnel information from the current employer should be reviewed.

Background checks with fingerprint screens should be completed for all current and new employees. Where collective bargaining agreements prohibit screening of current employees, steps should be taken to change these restrictions. While screening will not identify the majority of educators who have or will sexually abuse, it signals seriousness on the part of the district. To make background screens more effective, those who hire should check for gaps in employment, inquire into reasons for movement between schools or districts, contact school personnel in previous sites reaching beyond those listed as references, ask direct questions, and search DWI offenses. The social security numbers of new hires need to be verified. Finally, all offers of employment should include a probationary period.

One reason that educator sexual misconduct continues is that in most schools and school districts there is no one person to whom all rumors, allegations, or complaints are channeled. As a result, patterns of behavior are often not detected. Selecting one person to whom all school personnel must report any rumor, allegation, complaint, or suspicion is helpful in ensuring that no student falls through the crack and patterns of misconduct are quickly and effectively identified. Each school receiving federal financial assistance must designate at least one employee to coordinate its Title IX obligations. Schools also are required by the Title IX regulations to publish a policy that prohibits sex discrimination and outlines grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of sex discrimination complaints. Districts must record all allegations and outcomes in employee personnel files and agree not to expunge molestation findings.

While investigations are best done by those outside the school who are trained in sexual abuse crimes, if districts choose to do in-house investigations, the investigators must be trained appropriately. Ensuring that investigations are completed within 48 hours and reports are presented to school authorities, students, and parents will protect both students and adults. It is important not to terminate the investigation even if the employee who is under investigation resigns since complete investigation reports are required

With rare exceptions, the abuse prevention training that is required in most states for educators and school staff—whether preprofessional or while on the job—does not include educator sexual misconduct. These programs focus on what to do when sexual or any other kind of abuse or maltreatment is suspected from a source outside the school. Therefore, additional training for educators and other staff about educator sexual misconduct is important. Training outlines the behaviors that are not acceptable so that everyone —both those who abuse and those who do not abuse—are working from the same set of expectations. By making expectations explicit and public, school decision makers are also helping educators understand their own responsibility in reporting behavior that does not conform to those expectations. Thus, the training will educate employees about unacceptable behavior and remind them of their responsibility to report abuse.

Like staff, students need to understand the boundaries that educators should not cross. This is important both for students who might be targeted and for students who observe such behaviors. Both sets of students need to know that such behavior is prohibited and that there is a person to whom they can and should report such incidents. Materials and programs that have been developed to protect students from sexual abuse rarely include examples of predators who are educators. Students need to know that educators might cross boundaries and what to do if this happens.

To increase the possibilities for identification of educator sexual misconduct, educators, parents, and students need to know that: Any employee, including volunteers, might molest; educator sexual predators are often well liked and considered excellent teachers; special education students or other vulnerable students are often targets of sexual predators; adults who have access to students before or after school or in private situations are more likely to sexually abuse students than those who do not (coaches, music teachers, etc.); behavior indicators in students might include age inappropriate sexual behavior, late arrivals to class, changes in personality, and increased time at school with one adult; rumors are an important source of information on educator sexual misconduct; behaviors of adults who molest include close personal relationships with students, time alone with students, time before or after school with students, time in private spaces with students, flirtatious behavior with students, and off-color remarks in class.

In addition to district and school policies and practices, state and federal authorities need to develop systematic reporting and screening practices. The U.S. public and criminal justice systems have developed mechanisms for protecting children. For instance, millions of dollars in federal funding, scores of milk cartons, and episodes on television are devoted to preventing kidnapping and child abduction. Without diminishing the tragedy of abduction and kidnapping, it is worth noting that 4.5 million students in the United States experience educator sexual misconduct with 3.5 million reporting physical educator sexual abuse, nearly 150 times the number of U.S. children who are kidnapped or abducted by a nonfamily member. The numbers do not argue against the prevention of kidnappings, but they do argue for more attention to the prevention of educator sexual abuse.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Association of University Women. (2001). *Hostile hallways.* Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation.

Shakeshaft, C. (2004). *Educator sexual misconduct with students: A synthesis of existing literature on prevalence, planning and evaluation service.* Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Shoop, R.J. (2004). *Sexual exploitation in schools: How to spot it and stop it.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Charol Shakeshaft

Expectations of Teachers for Boys and Girls

Do the expectations of teachers shape different aspirations, self-perceptions, and achievement trajectories for boys and girls? That is, can the predictions made by others actually cause outcomes that confirm the original prophecy? Despite a large literature on teacher expectancy effects, most studies have investigated teacher beliefs about individual students—those believed to be more or less capable of learning. Far fewer studies have investigated student gender in interpersonal self-fulfilling prophecies or pursued, in systematic ways, linkages between teachers' gendered expectations, teachers' differential treatment based on their expectations, and the differential achievement of boys and girls. Thus, firm conclusions about gendered expectancy effects, as they have been studied, prove difficult to make. This topic, however, is worth pursuing in more nuanced ways.

Gender disparities in access to schooling and in educational and occupational attainment (especially in math and science) persist. Girls are generally at a disadvantage, especially evident at puberty and in higher levels of schooling. Despite performance differences between boys and girls, no consistent difference in aptitude or intelligence has been found, suggesting the workings of social forces. There exists strong evidence that parents socialize boys and girls differently with regard to achievement and along gender role lines. Thus, children enter school with gender-stereotyped preferences as well as behavioral patterns. Experimental and naturalistic research studies on teacher expectancy effects provide clear support that teachers' expectations about the capability of individual students *can* shape student achievement. The mechanisms underlying such effects include the allocation of differential opportunities to learn and differential reinforcements, supports, or messages of capability, about which even young children are aware. These expectancy effects can be magnified or diminished, dependent upon the characteristics of both individual and social setting.

When applied to student gender, most expectancy studies have looked at such effects on average. What can be concluded thus far is that teacher expectations are not consistently differentiated by gender. Teachers do treat boys and girls differently in the classroom, but student behavioral patterns drive some of these differences. A small number of studies have found that girls may be more susceptible than boys to confirming teacher expectations that are biased in negative directions. Stronger support from experimental studies of stereotype threat exists for the influence of societal gender stereotypes (rather than teachers' expectations) on girls' underperformance relative to males. These gender stereotypes are evoked in math test situations that are described as diagnostic of ability. Priming Asian American identity (a positive stereotype) rather than gender identity (a negative stereotype) was found to protect Asian American girls from underperforming in math tests.

Future research needs to invest in longitudinal studies (to control for student initial differences) in order to address linkages between gendered teacher expectations, differential treatment by teachers, and different achievement trajectories for boys and girls. Gendered interpersonal expectancy effects are likely complex and nuanced, conditional on contextual factors as well as student age and stage of schooling. Perhaps, such effects are heightened with teachers who are more susceptible to holding gender stereotypes, in classroom or school cultures that make ability difference salient and highly differentiate the teaching of boys and girls, and in contexts where parental, teacher, and societal views are aligned around the belief that girls have lesser abilities in math and science. It is also important to acknowledge that the gender disadvantage is not only about girls. Boys are placed at risk in early elementary schooling. Ethnicity and socioeconomic class intersect with gender, such that certain groups of ethnic minority boys may also be disadvantaged by negative stereotypes about inferior ability. Finally, research about the effectiveness of interventions to promote gender equity in the development of talent across disciplinary domains is vital.

GENDER DIFFERENCES AND/OR GENDER INEQUITIES

Gender is a key organizing principle in society. Real and/or imagined biological differences between the sexes are given meaning by cultures, institutions, and historical time, and gender roles are constructed. Historically, schooling has always been differentiated by gender, either with regard to differential access to education or to placement in separate forms of education, such as single-sex schools, or to different tracks and experiences within schools and classrooms. Further, when coeducation does occur, it is far from a simple phenomenon.

Worldwide, there exists gender disparity in access to schooling even at the primary level. In 2005, approximately 135 million children have not received any education at all, and of these, 60 percent are girls (UNICEF, 2005). World regions that continue to lag behind are the Middle East/North Africa, South Asia, and West/Central Africa. In contrast, however, in most Latin American/Caribbean regions, the gender disparity is reversed with more girls attending primary and especially secondary schools. More typically, girls face additional barriers that exclude them from school, such as cultural values, stereotyped gender roles, low social status, family need for economic support, and vulnerability to sexual assault. Thus, girls in developing countries are frequently not enrolled in school, the last to be enrolled, and, during hardships, the first to be pulled out of school. Being a girl and living in poverty pose a double disadvantage.

Even when many barriers of access to higher levels of education are lifted, such as in the United States, women's test performance, choice of careers, ultimate attainment, occupational rise, and earnings continue to reflect gender disparities. Career choices remain sex-typed, and higher levels of attainment and earnings generally favor males. At issue are the underlying determinants for these gender gaps—either nature (inborn) versus nurture (environment) or the possibility that nature may be potentiated by nurture.

One continuing arena of gender disparity is the predominance of males in the domain of mathematics, engineering, and science as represented by faculty in U.S. universities. It has been shown that girls outperform boys in grades in all major subject areas throughout elementary, middle, and high school. Yet, girls do not necessarily perform higher than boys on achievement or IQ tests. Are there sex differences in cognitive abilities? Despite some evidence of test performance differences that may be lessening (for example, men outperform women on math tests and women outperform men on tests of verbal ability), research over four decades has failed to support consistent sex differences in intrinsic aptitude for mathematics and science or in general intelligence. These findings underscore the importance of looking to social causes for the gender disparity in achievement—to gender stereotypes, family socialization practices, school experiences, and institutional support.

Do parents socialize girls and boys differently for achievement? Beginning at birth, children are provided steady signals about gender. Studies suggest that parents provide their sons and daughters with different learning environments through selection of gender-stereotyped toys and activities and through advice about gender-appropriate careers and aspirations. For example, in comparison to girls, boys are often given toys that can be manipulated and their play activities are set in large spaces, which can promote spatial abilities. Parents' gender role stereotypes about math and science have been linked with parents' perceptions of their own children's abilities in math and science as well as with children's beliefs about themselves. In addition, parents have been found to make causal attributions that are gender stereotyped when they attributed success in mathematics to natural talent for their boys and to effort for their girls. Longitudinal studies show that parental expectancies, attributions, and gendered socialization practices may differentially affect the cognitive development, competences, self-perceptions, interests, and aspirations of boys and girls. Such parent differences are not consistently demonstrated across studies. Among the reasons for the inconsistent findings are the differing ages and historical time at which children have been studied, a reciprocal chain of events whereby both child differences and parent responses mutually drive the interaction, and the possibility that these gendered messages and opportunities may be more subtly communicated than are typically measured.

The gender disparity in achievement is also reversed in the earlier grades where boys are more likely to read and mature later than girls. They are also more likely to be held back a grade and referred for special education services. But importantly, individuals are defined by more than their gender. Thus, we must consider gender as it is represented in the intersection between racial/cultural groups as well as socioeconomic class, especially at a time of increasing ethnic diversity and income disparity in the population. Much of the research on teacher expectancy effects is not as fine-tuned. Research at the intersection of gender and culture has found that ethnic minority boys are overrepresented in the discipline system (especially African Americans) and as school dropouts. Thus, in general, gender disadvantages boys in the early grades and girls in the later grades, but certain groups of ethnic minority boys continue to be disadvantaged at every stage of schooling.

LINKING TEACHER EXPECTATIONS AND GENDER

The expectancy construct and its potential for confirmation has had a long history in literature as well as in the social sciences. An early literary example of positive expectancy effects can be found in the ancient Greco-Roman myth about the sculptor Pygmalion where his love for the statue Galatea brought her to life. In 1948, based on his observations of bank failures during the depression, the sociologist Robert K. Merton coined the term "self-fulfilling prophecy," which he described as a false belief about a situation, which, when acted upon, makes the original conception become true. In the classic *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (1968), psychologist Robert Rosenthal and school principal Lenore Jacobson conducted the first empirical test of interpersonal self-fulfilling prophecies. In this experiment, teachers were provided false and positive test information about randomly selected children who were described as intellectual bloomers, expected to show great growth in their achievement. At year end, as seen in the early elementary grades, children who had been identified as bloomers performed higher than other children on intelligence tests. This single study cemented for the public the view that teacher beliefs about student capability created the achievement gap, particularly with regard to Black-White differences, and then extended to the underperformance of girls relative to boys. This study fueled a storm of controversy and thousands of replications, both experimental as well as naturalistic studies.

Overall, the research evidence supports a causal connection between teacher expectations and student achievement, but the debate still rages over the magnitude of effects. Shifting from behavioral to social-cognitive to ecological theory, the causal model has become more complex as qualities of both person (the susceptibility of both perceiver and target) and situation (the salience of expectancy cues) have been found to magnify or diminish the power of expectancy effects.

Research has addressed the formation of expectancy beliefs (including the role of stereotypes), differential treatment or the mechanisms by which expectations exert their effects on student achievement (directly through differential opportunity to learn and indirectly through messages about capability understood by students that come to shape self-perceptions, motivation, and behavior), and moderating factors that amplify such effects. Thus, individuals may differ in their susceptibility to such effects (for example, high-bias teachers and highly susceptible younger and stigmatized students). There also exists potential for teacher perceptual confirmation, even when student behavioral confirmation has not occurred, and for student disconfirmation of negative and even positive teacher expectations. Finally, while most of the studies have addressed interpersonal expectancy effects, these effects can occur at multiple and intersecting levels of systems, such as groups, classes, and schools. Small effects can have implications for subsequent years and accumulate over time.

Turning to studies of gender, how do teacher beliefs about boys and girls differ, how do these beliefs shape practices and policies in schools, and are there demonstrated links between gender-stereotyped beliefs, practices, and achievement?

While young children develop beliefs that boys are better than girls in mathematics, the support for gender-based teacher expectations is slim. A meta-analytic review of research studies on the bases of teacher expectations found little overall evidence that teacher academic expectations differed for boys and girls, but teacher expectancies about social/personality development were weakly related to gender. Girls were expected to get along better, have more self-control, and be neater and more helpful than boys. Given what we know about differential maturation and achievement, it is possible that girls are favored with higher teacher expectations in reading in the early grades and boys are favored with regard to math and sciences in the middle and secondary school grades. One well designed study at the first-grade level distinguished between teachers who thought that boys could learn to read as successfully as girls and teachers who believed that girls would outperform boys. With controls for entering reading readiness, the boys in classes where teachers believed in equitable outcomes outperformed the boys in classes where teachers expected differential outcomes. At the middle and secondary level, there is some evidence that teachers hold different expectations for girls and boys in math and science (favoring boys), but studies also suggest that these differences in expectations are more likely based on student personal characteristics such as performance and are thus accurate, not stereotyped.

The research on sex-differentiated expectations by teachers remains too sparse to draw firm conclusions. Promising directions for research appear to lie in distinguishing between teachers, classroom contexts, and levels of education that hold and, importantly, communicate differential beliefs about competence by gender. For example, researchers have labeled higher education as colder by degrees for females (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Ethnographic studies also point to single incidents of expressed gender-biased beliefs that appear more powerful than quantitative measures of expected performance.

There exists a large body of evidence that teachers treat boys and girls differently in the classroom. However, interpretations conflict regarding which sex is favored and the reasons behind the differential treatment (whether teacher or student driven). Because of sex differences in behavior, especially in the early grades, boys have been described as more salient in classrooms and thereby more likely to drive the attention of teachers in both academic and nonacademic activities. Boys have been found to have more interactions of all types with teachers including being called on, receiving more complex questions, and accorded more and different criticism, whereas girls are more often rewarded for quiet and obedient behavior. Some evidence, not always replicated, suggests that the criticism directed toward girls is focused on lack of ability and toward boys on lack of effort or poor behavior. These patterns of differential treatment as well as attribution (similar to what has been found with parents) could encourage the achievement of boys and discourage the achievement of girls. However, important for future research, the links between differential treatment and differential achievement have not been documented. Some argue that elementary classrooms are often unfriendly to boys and attempt to feminize them. In the early grades, female teachers require boys to suppress their activity level and behave in more compliant, self-controlled, and verbally interactive ways, like girls. Others argue that the rewarding of compliance in girls does not prepare them well for intellectual risk taking and higher levels of achievement, especially in math and science.

Other potential mediators of expectancy effects lie in differential opportunities to learn accorded by teachers. This might include the identification of reading as feminine and math and science as masculine, and the relative absence of influential females (and ethnic minorities) in the curriculum. This might affect student interest and different patterns of course taking, paving the way for sex-typed careers—a pattern that is lessening in secondary schools but not in universities. When gender and ethnicity are considered together, differential treatment has been documented toward African American and Latino males, who are more often assigned to remedial and lower-level educational tracks, and with regard to African American males, to the disciplinary system.

Longitudinal research linking differential teacher expectations for boys and girls (with prior achievement differences controlled) to differential performance is far too sparse for firm conclusions. However, several studies have found that the predictive relationship between teacher expectations in math and student performance in math (after controlling for prior math achievement) is stronger for girls than for boys. Also, children, who are members of academically stigmatized groups (in this case, girls with regard to math), were also found more likely than nonstigmatized children to confirm teacher underestimates of ability and less likely to benefit from teacher overestimates of ability. Thus, girls may be more susceptible to biased teacher expectations, especially when they are negative.

While links have not been made to teacher expectations or differential treatment, a vast research literature has documented gender differences in beliefs about competence and control, interest in subject matter, self-concept, and career aspirations. These beliefs and attitudes have been shown to predict performance and course taking. Girls are more likely than boys to have lower competence beliefs in math and sports (but not reading), take more internal responsibility for failure, have less interest in science and technical fields, and have more negative self-evaluations and increasing interest in sex-appropriate behavior as they approach adolescence. Researchers argue that these differences undercut the interest and motivation of girls in achieving, especially in math and sciences. While these self-views may result from gender stereotypes, research has not yet linked teacher transmission of stereotypes in the classroom to student attitudes. Again, when gender and ethnicity are examined together, it is ethnic minority boys whose attitude toward and investment in school are more negative.

Beyond teacher expectations and interpersonal expectancy effects, a growing body of work has focused on societal stereotypes that when experimentally primed in social situations create self-fulfilling prophecies. This phenomenon has been called *stereotype threat* by psychologist Claude Steele (1997), a concept that refers to the mechanism by which negative stereotypes about a group triggers beliefs and anxieties that adversely affect the performance of those who identify with that group. This threat can explain gender differences in performance. Many studies, most with college students with a few exceptions, have shown that students with stigmatized identities (such as African Americans with regard to intellectual ability and girls with regard to math ability) who are randomly assigned to a test situation that is described as diagnostic of ability underperform relative to the nonstigmatized students (Caucasians and males). In contrast, in a test situation that is characterized as nondiagnostic of ability, performance differences are not found. To the extent that teacher expectations may represent a form of evaluation, among members of stigmatized groups, low expectations may similarly invoke the threat of confirming a negative achievement stereotype.

Of interest, as gender is only one part of identity, experimental studies with Asian American women have shown that their performance was higher on a math test when their Asian identity was triggered than when their female identity was triggered. The cultural stereotype of Asians as excelling in math acted as a protective factor for these Asian American women while the stereotype of women as poor in math evoked a stereotype threat response. A similar pattern was found in experiments with Asian American women on a verbal test. Consistent with the societal stereotype that women excel in verbal ability, women performed higher on the verbal test when their female identity was triggered than when their Asian identity was evoked. This is promising evidence of a causal link between stereotype and performance, reflecting both enhancing (with positive stereotypes) and undermining (with negative stereotypes) effects.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Good, T.L., & Findley, M.J. (1985). Sex role expectations and achievement. In J.B. Dusek (Ed.), *Teacher expectancies* (pp. 271–300). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lippa, R.A. (2005). *Gender, nature, and nurture.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Merton, R.K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *Antioch Review, 8,* 193–210.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls.* New York: Scribners.

Steele, C.M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52*(6), 613–629.

UNICEF. (2005, April). *Progress for children: A report card on gender parity and primary education.* Retrieved February, 27, 2006, from http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_25937.html

Weinstein, R.S. (2002). *Reaching higher: The power of expectations in schooling.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Wigfield, A., Battle, A., Keller, L.B., & Eccles, J.S. (2002). Sex differences in motivation, self-concept, career aspiration, and career choice: Implications for cognitive development. In A. McGillicuddy-De Lisi & R. De Lisi (Eds.), *Biology, society, and behavior: The development of sex differences in cognition* (Vol. 21, pp. 93–124). Westport, CT: Ablex.

Rhona S. Weinstein

Miriam Hernandez Dimmler

Nilofar Sami

Heterosexism and Homophobia in the Hidden Curriculum

During the 1960s and 1970s, across Western societies, feminist, gay, and lesbian activists began to develop a vocabulary that identified the systematic discrimination experienced by women, gays, and lesbians. A number of key terms emerged that have provided the latter with a language to move beyond description of individual prejudice to that of explanations of collective discrimination. These terms included patriarchy, homophobia, and heterosexism. *Patriarchy* means that relations between men and women need to be understood in terms of living in a male-dominated society. Homophobia and heterosexism are closely related and sometimes interchangeably used. *Homophobia* refers to systematic discrimination against lesbians and gays. The term points to a sense of panic, suggesting an association with psychic or unconscious motives. *Heterosexism* refers to a predominant belief in a society or a presumption that male-female sexuality (that is, heterosexuality) is the only natural way of living your life.

In order to fully understand these concepts, it is necessary to place them in relation to similar terms that have been coined to capture a range of other significant forms of social discrimination. Two of them are of specific importance to making sense of both the history and the contemporary understandings of gender and sexual relations. First, *social class* has been identified by social scientists as a major influence in dividing up the population in terms of life chances within the workplace, education, and family life. Early feminists adopted some of the ideas of class analysts in trying to develop understandings of gender relations. For example, they spoke of women as occupying a different class from that of men in order to highlight that dominant institutional patterns of discrimination were operating against women. Equally significant historically has been the relationship between the development of gender/sexual terminology and Black theorizing about race-ethnicity. Some people maintain that the major cultural influence in producing the Western vocabulary of equal rights, social justice, and emancipatory politics has been the impact of Black power and the civil rights movement within the United States during the 1960s. The formation of heterosexual masculinities and femininities are produced at a dynamic interface between the immediate social environment (for example, that of the school), culturally available discourses of sexuality and masculinity/femininity, wider social relations, and the endless unfinished business of the unconscious.

The development of this vocabulary, identifying these diverse experiences of discrimination, enabled the emergence of general theoretical frameworks. At the same time, early theorists of gender and sexuality further developed a more nuanced language to capture the playing out of institutional discrimination within specific arenas. For example, schooling was identified as a key site for the making of particular gender and (hetero) sexual identities. In other words, institutional arenas, such as schools, did not simply reflect or reproduce wider social relations of gender and sexuality. Rather, they were active in producing local meanings that were central to the formation of a younger generation's sexual/gender formation. In order to make sense of this, theorists critically examined all aspects of schooling life. Of central importance was the *official* curriculum, which explicitly transmitted knowledge and skills in reproducing the dominant culture. Alongside this, theorists explored what educational theorists called the *hidden curriculum* consisting of specific institutional implicit or hidden values, meanings, attitudes, predispositions, and social skills. The hidden curriculum has been defined as a central mechanism that shapes how students experience the curriculum, their teachers, and each other; it informs their understanding of what school life means on a day-to-day basis. The concept of the hidden curriculum has been of major importance in exploring heterosexism and homophobia that emerged through critical educational studies. These concepts capture the shaping of schools as a cultural space in which sexualities and sexual relations of power are produced, reproduced, and negotiated.

EARLY FEMINIST AND SEXUALITY RESEARCH IN SCHOOLS

Earlier feminist work on the interplay between gender and the hidden curriculum built on class-based studies that illustrated the exclusionary effects of the social construction of knowledge on working-class students. This feminist work argued that the hidden curriculum was a major mechanism of socialization that served to reproduce sex roles within the arena of education. In other words, they argued that, through socialization, the biological basis of male and female becomes linked to social norms and expectations that are circulating through masculinity and femininity. This work was immensely important theoretically in identifying a wide range of ways in which the hidden curriculum operated to make female students and teachers "invisible." It was argued that a male-centered set of values underpinned all areas of school life, serving to reinforce a hierarchically ordered oppositional structure between boys and girls. This was manifest, for example, in relation to the allocation of subjects, with male students encouraged to take the high-status science subjects. Furthermore, exploring curriculum texts, research revealed a limiting range of female images in which women were linguistically erased or misrepresented. Politically, this work was a major educational intervention in challenging sexist stereotypes in the search for "girl-friendly" schooling. Interestingly, from an early 2000s perspective, the success of the latter has been cited as partly responsible for the crisis of masculinity that some theorists claim is currently occurring.

Similarly, earlier sexuality research in schools identified the pervasiveness of stereotypes, informed by homophobia and heterosexism. Importantly, they reported how students have grown up in a society in which there are no positive images of gay or lesbian people. There is no acknowledgement of gay and lesbian history, sensibility, life-style, or community. There is no recognition of gay or lesbian achievement. For example, the research showed that when texts written by gays or lesbians were read in class, no reference was made to the authors' sexual orientation. In fact, homosexuality and lesbianism were rarely discussed in lessons, and on the few occasions when they were introduced, they were presented in a negative way—for example, in relation to AIDS/HIV. For gay students, this silence—reflecting that in the wider society—pervaded the whole of the formal curriculum, serving to reproduce and legitimate dominant heterosexual hierarchies. From this perspective, heterosexuality was presented as natural, normal, and universal, simply because there are no alternative ways of being. Students emphasized the personal isolation, confusion, marginalization, and alienation that this engendered. Most significantly, without a positive reference group, some tended to internalize ambivalent negative messages about themselves as gays and lesbians.

Later feminists, alongside gay and lesbian scholars and queer theorists, addressed the limitations of this earlier approach. These limitations included fixed notions of gender (one way of being a girl or boy student), an underdevelopment of youth identity formation, and a failure to accommodate explanations of school life that made sense of the interconnections of diverse categories. Of particular significance here, in relation to heterosexism and homophobia, was the complex relationship between gender and sexuality. The conventional approach within sex-role theory serves to shape much sex education, erasing issues of sexuality by subsuming it within a broader discourse of gender. In contrast, Butler (1990, p. 238) suggests that gender is often spoken through a "heterosexual matrix" in which heterosexuality is presupposed in the expression "real forms of masculinity and femininity." This provides a useful framework within which to explore the interconnectedness between gender and sexuality as it is lived out in schools. In structuring the attributes of being a "real boy"/"real girl," the various forms of masculinity/femininity that are hegemonic in schools are crucially involved in policing the boundaries of heterosexuality, alongside the boundaries of "proper" masculinity/femininity. More specifically, for example, to be a "real boy" is often to publicly be in opposition to and distance oneself from the feminine and the "feminized" versions of masculinity.

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM AND THE INSTITUTION

At an institutional level, student identities are formed in relation to the formal curriculum —and what in the United States is called the extracurriculum—and the categories they make available, including the academic/vocational divide and those between arts and sciences and study and sport. These categories are highly gendered, with the "soft feminine" academic and arts subjects juxtaposed to the "hard masculine" vocational, scientific, and sporting options. Similarly, involvement in sport can be read as a cultural index of what it means to be a "real boy," while not to be involved in sport and its associated "lad" subculture is to be a "bit of a poof." At the same time, it is important to stress here the complex interconnections of class, ethnic, and age variations in these identifications. In particular, to be a "real" boy in school is to be in opposition to the feminine and to "feminized" versions of masculinity. This is illustrated in Redman and Mac an Ghaill's (1996) article "Schooling Sexualities: Heterosexual Schooling and the Unconscious" in which they discuss an English student's (Peter's) experiences of "becoming heterosexual" in an all-boys grammar school in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Using an auto/biographical methodology, they explore the meaning of Peter's investment in a particular form of heterosexual masculinity, what they called "muscular intellectualness." They argue that Peter's fascination with the muscular intellectualness he identified in his teacher, Mr. Lefevre, could be understood in terms of the access it promised to give him to the entitlements of conventional masculinity. The world of ideas and knowledge that Mr. Lefevre seemed to inhabit no longer seemed effeminately middle class and, thus, the object of ridicule or embarrassment but powerfully middle class, a source of personal strength, and a means to exercise control over others. Thus, as a source of "real" masculinity, muscular intellectualness "defeminized" academic work in the humanities and refused the label "bit of a poof."

An area where teacher relations also reinforce "normal" masculinity is through the legitimation of different teaching styles. Masculinities have to operate or be competent at operating with some degree of power and authority. An inability to be powerful and authoritative is a code for an inability to be a "proper man." Signs of "weakness" in many public arenas are associated with femininity. Masculinities in the workplace have competence as an essential feature, while incompetence is deemed as failure, weakness, or "womanly." Often in school, a competent teacher is one who is able to keep a class quiet regardless of the learning process. A quiet class is deemed a class that can be managed, therefore learning can be achieved. The most common way of keeping a class quiet is to use discipline and force. Often in schools, it is assumed that male teachers are able to use discipline. For example, although violence in many schools is illegal, other forms of physical force are often used to control students.

Research has highlighted that teachers often shake, push, and shove students in the classroom during the course of their everyday teaching. In some single-sexed schools, this corresponds with an ethos of schools for boys and men. The hidden curriculum does not simply target students, as teachers are often subject to implicit control and regulation. Teachers' awareness of other teachers' pedagogical styles—informed by notions of gender—judges whether teachers are "good" or "bad." As a result, "good teachers" are "real men" and "bad teachers" have "problems." There are pressing implications about the use of violence. First, there is the pressure on the teacher that, in order to be competent, violence has to be issued. Second, if a competent teacher is a male who can display violence, what part do women play in the school? Third, if violence is appropriate for teaching, what does this mean for child-centeredness and the ability to create positive working relations?

RECENT FEMINIST AND SEXUALITY RESEARCH IN SCHOOLS

Recent work, including that of queer theorists, have provided sophisticated theoretical frameworks to explore issues of more complex formations of sexual and gender formations among young people, marked by pluralism, fluidity, and contradiction. An important move in exploring the hidden curriculum and the accompanying implicit transmission of schools' values is to shift from a focus on sexual minorities, such as gay and lesbian students and teachers, to critically examine the concept of heterosexuality. A key issue that emerges is the question of what constitutes male and female heterosexuality? In response, it is argued that heterosexuality is a highly fragile, socially constructed phenomenon. The question that emerges here is, how does it become fixed as an apparently, stable, unitary category? Queer theorists suggest that schools, alongside other institutions, attempt to administer, regulate, and reify unstable sex/gender categories. More particularly, this administration, regulation, and reification of sex/gender boundaries is institutionalized through the interrelated social and discursive practices of management, staff room, classroom, and playground microcultures. One way in which theorists have explored this is through investigations of different sexual subjectivities within schools.

In our own studies, we have examined the constitutive cultural elements of heterosexual male students' subjectivity. We see these elements, which consist of contradictory forms of compulsory heterosexuality, misogyny, and homophobia, as being marked by contextual ambivalence and contingency. Our focus was the complex interplay of these cultural elements as specific institutional forms of gendered and sexual power. More particularly, we sought to explore how they were operationalized as key defining processes in sexual boundary maintenance, policing and legitimization of male and female heterosexual identities. In order to understand how students attempted to learn the sex/gender codes that conferred hegemonic (or dominant) masculinity, it was necessary to bring together social and psychic (unconscious) structures. As Butler (1993) points out, heterosexuality does not gain its form by virtue of its internal qualities but rather defines itself against abjected sexualities, in particular, homosexuality. For example, what emerged as of particular importance was the way in which heterosexual male students were involved in a double relationship, of traducing the "other," including women and gays (external relations), at the same time as expelling femininity and homosexuality from within themselves (internal relations). We have explored a wide range of student cultures, exploring the complex identity work that actively produces specific heterosexual dynamics within which young people live their school lives. In one situation, the rejection by a group of dominant heterosexually orientated males reinterpreted the identity of those males who concentrated on their schoolwork as being gay and "poncy." It was the disidentification with the other students that enabled the heterosexually orientated males to produce their own identities. These are the complex and contradictory processes in which heterosexual male student apprenticeships were developed within secondary school contexts.

As young people in recent studies show, they have diverse values, understandings, and feelings as well as local cultural knowledges that they bring with them into the classroom. These young people are active makers of sexual-gender identities. A major flaw in many progressive curriculum policies, exemplified in the "positive images" approach, has been a failure to conceptualize the complexity of student identity formation. We need to focus on the discursively produced subject positions of students and the power relations between students and teachers as well as those among students. As indicated above, in this process, schools can be seen as crucial cultural sites in which material, ideological, and discursive resources serve to affirm hegemonic masculinity while making available a range of masculinities and femininities that young people come to inhabit. At the same time, students illustrate that misogyny, homophobia, heterosexism (and racism) are not pervasively inherited in a unitary or total way. Located within local sexual peer group cultures, they actively select from a range of socially oppressive constructs and, in this process, make their own individual and collective meanings. For example, male heterosexuality can be seen as a highly fragile and fractured construction resulting in the contradictory social and discursive practices within which male students are positioned and, in turn, position others.

Institutional authoritarianism often prevents the development of formal mechanisms that would operate to democratize teacher-student relations and provide student representation and emancipation. For example, often there is no formal acknowledgment of students' perspective of how to manage curriculum policy development as a legitimate view. Through the framework of existing power relations, teacher responses are ideologically presented and represented as legitimate educational strategies, while student responses are juxtaposed as illegitimate. Earlier representations of working-class males and females within educational research have reinforced this dominant perception, with its overemphasis on the negative elements of their contestation of schooling. In such accounts, there is little acknowledgment of the participants' creative construction of "really useful knowledge" that combines rigor and relevance, academic success, and personal and collective empowerment. More specifically here, there is a concern with a search for "really useful sex/sexuality knowledge."

More specifically, gay and lesbian students have outlined an approach that includes a student-centered pedagogy with a focus upon the development of adolescent sexuality, an understanding of power relations that exist between and within social groups, and a discussion-based program that would include such items as feelings and emotional growth. As Fine (1988) points out, a discourse that highlights the positive aspects of sexual desire has traditionally been excluded from the curriculum. Most importantly, young gay men have pointed to the precariousness of all sexualities, suggesting that gays are a vital part of straight culture, with homosexuality always present in heterosexuality. James Baldwin (in Troupe, 1989), describing more graphically the dependence of straight culture on gays, points to the political significance of the male body, implying the Freudian insight that extreme personal and cultural antipathy is premised contradictorily on desire and need.

As this discussion has indicated, the links between gender and sexuality and the hidden curriculum have been a key theme of recent educational research. Much of this work has attempted to clarify some of the connections between schooling and "proper" gender and sexual designations. This work has also mapped out how the hidden curriculum needs to be historically and socially located within the power relations of existing society. Furthermore, much of this work tends to be qualitatively driven. One of the reasons for this is that the focus on the hidden curriculum tends to consider the structural rules of engagement alongside particular situational factors. An underlying philosophical position is that gender and sexuality are something to be achieved and that meaning making is central to explaining what is going on. More specifically, there is a need for more research that continues to prioritize the implicit forms of meaning making in the cultural arena of schooling.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity.* London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* London: Routledge.

Fine, M. (1988). Sexuality, schooling and adolescent females: The missing discourse. *Harvard Educational Review, 5*(1), 29–53.

Redman, P., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (1996). Schooling sexualities: Heterosexual masculinities, schooling, and the unconscious, *Discourse, 17*(2), 243–256.

Troupe, Q. (1989). *James Baldwin: The legacy.* New York: Simon and Schuster/Touchstone.

Mairtin Mac an Ghaill

Chris Haywood

Liviu Popoviciu

Managing “Problem” Boys and Girls

School culture sends powerful messages to students and their families about appropriate ways of behaving and being. “Problem behaviors” are a reflection of the individual child’s inability to interact productively with school culture. At the heart of most definitions and examples of problem behavior in the schools is the tendency of that behavior to disrupt the learning process. Whether students perform “problem behaviors” and subsequently come to be regarded as “problem boys or girls” depends on the kinds of cultural capital those students bring to school. Cultural capital—in the forms of knowledge, skills, and ways of being and acting—determine a student’s ability or inability to achieve a connection to the broader human community that is represented by the school community.

Because the “fit” between the cultural capital students bring to school and the school culture is affected by dominant cultural assumptions about gender, race, and social class, it is more likely that boys and minority students, rather than girls and majority students, will be considered “problems” and will become the targets of disciplinary actions designed to manage them and their behaviors. The ability of school leaders to understand the impact of gender, race, and class determines if teachers have training and support necessary to manage their classrooms fairly and effectively. Good management also can be enhanced by demonstrating to all parents strong concern for their children and by the improved, meaningful involvement of those parents, especially poor and working-class parents, in the schools in ways that enhance the welfare of their children.

SCHOOL CULTURE AND STUDENTS’ CULTURAL CAPITAL

The overall structure of schooling reproduces the dominant culture through its curriculum, its activities (after school, extracurricular, and sports), teachers, and administrators. Schools often have an implicit middle-class *ethos,* one that requires students to be self-confident and attentive (or at least quiet) and to have good social skills such as being helpful, cooperative with the teacher and classmates, and considerate of the feelings of others. Those students whose families and neighborhoods provide them with the cultural background expected and represented by the school are better prepared and more likely to be successful rather than a problem. These children have the social interest, the “tools for living” that enable them to make the transition to the broader community.

French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (2000) conceived of such tools as forms of *capital.* He defined *cultural capital* as resources of value, or *legitimate* in certain fields or markets, that are distributed among classes of people. For example, cultural capital would include a person’s knowledge, skills, or ways of being or acting that are more or less valued by others who are in relationships with that person. Individuals or groups all possess some type of cultural capital; but the value or worth of their capital depends on the reactions of others, such as teachers or fellow students with whom they may have some type of relationship.

The public expects the structure of schooling to act as a “leveler” enabling any child to gain the skills and knowledge to be successful in the broader world. In an ironic twist, students cannot gain from structures of schooling unless their own cultural capital is recognized as legitimate by the school; but the school will not recognize their capital as legitimate unless it is reflective of the dominant culture. At the same time, for students to be able to use the cultural capital they find at school, they must have the means to learn how to appropriate it; yet school does not prepare students to obtain those means and make that gain unless the students’ knowledge, skills, or ways of being or acting are valued by the school and other students. When the school affirms the usefulness and the connection of students’ cultural capital to the school, these students develop social interest and see themselves as a part of humanity. But when students see that they are not a part but instead they are actually the “Other,” wholly foreign and disconnected from the mainstream, they feel useless, anxious, and not safe, and they will engage in problem behaviors that further isolate them.

PROBLEM BEHAVIORS IN SCHOOL

Teachers and administrators identify problem behaviors as those that interfere with the business of learning, or the very structure of schooling, and occur anywhere in the school building or on the school grounds at anytime during the day or during after-school events. Certain areas stand out as particularly troublesome for schools, depending upon the grade levels assigned to the school building and the geographic location of the school in the community.

High on the list of unwanted behaviors at all grade levels is classroom disruption. In the referral slips used to report unruly behavior to the principal’s office or other disciplinarian in the building, teachers usually characterize “disrupting the classroom” as follows: not following the teacher’s directions for assignments; talking while the teacher speaks to the class or interrupting other children when it is their turn to speak (“talking out of turn”); disturbing other children who are working quietly; getting out of the assigned seating area or seat without permission; not having the appropriate materials for school assignments (such as pencil, paper, or assigned textbook); completely destroying or losing texts or library books; vandalizing school property; not completing homework, or not turning it in to the teacher; and, perhaps the most serious, fighting.

School personnel, parents, and even students cite passing time in the hallways and in stairwells as particularly stressful and threatening to safety and order in schools. School administrators encourage teachers and aides to go on “high alert” during passing time when students, particularly middle and high school students, change classes and engage in a volatile mix of adolescent angst and raging hormones. Some schools, particularly large high schools in suburban and urban communities (and increasingly rural union high school districts, which tend to be very large and take in students from many different communities) place security personnel or devices in the hallways to discourage behaviors that escalate into fighting between groups or individuals. Female students are particularly at risk for sexual harassment and even sexual assault during passing time; the inevitable crowding and chaos in the hallway creates the illusion of anonymity for the assailant or assailants who think they can be invisible.

Many urban and suburban school districts collaborate with the local city police departments who specially train and assign officers to the district as part of their Officer Friendly programs or as Community Service Officers; these officers become a part of the daily routine in the school building, and they help to minimize or eliminate the potential for various kinds of school violence and general bad behavior. For elementary schools, food fights or "unnecessary" loudness or roughness in the school cafeteria during lunchtime and on the playground during recess has prompted many schools to place additional adult aides or parent volunteers on site to ensure the safety of all children—and teachers.

Safety on the way to and from school has become another arena of frustration and alarm for schools and parents alike. Children who walk to school often get into skirmishes with other students or even neighborhood adults and otherwise act out improperly; but fights or acting out in the close, confined area of a school bus moving through heavy morning or afternoon traffic usually adds an extra element of danger not found walking to and from school. To ensure the safe arrival of everyone, district administrators develop elaborate safety rules and etiquette for the bus ride that parents and children must agree to follow each school year. In some districts, the bus ride to school has become so risky that adult monitors or video cameras are used to maintain order or to at least capture rowdy students on videotape for later identification and disciplinary action. School bus drivers usually report student misbehavior on the bus to the principal; and, depending upon the seriousness of the rule violation, students as young as eight or nine may be barred from riding the school bus or even suspended from school for a period of time.

School leaders and parents are generally in agreement that unwanted behavior is disruptive to the orderly conduct of school business—learning. However, studies show that children from families that are more in tune with the school culture will have more successful school experiences that are free of disciplinary actions and punishments, and those children are considerably less likely to be labeled "problem" boys and girls.

DISCIPLINING PROBLEM STUDENTS

Students who are perceived as "problems" are dealt with through an array of disciplinary measures that have become more punitive with each new school year. School officials (sometimes with the outright assistance of or at least the implied concurrence of major parent groups) have enacted "zero tolerance" policies with punishment (some of it draconian) frequently meted out to teens and to younger students alike as the concern for safe schools that are free of violence escalates. The nationally publicized tragedies of school shootings, schools' fears of the spread of drug use among preteens and teenagers, and school officials' desire to avoid legal liability for sexual harassment and other assaults on students advance strong and often questionable disciplinary polices in schools. In one example, a six-year-old African American boy who had been admiring a six-year-old White girl in his class was suspended immediately from school for sexual harassment when he placed his fingers under the waistband of her skirt. Although the school eventually reinstated him and apologized, his parents moved him to another school—after his mother tried to explain *sexual harassment* to the six-year-old child.

The gender of this child certainly affected the disciplinary response to his behavior, and it seems likely that racial identities also came into play. Walking through the average elementary or middle school, observers will see a disproportionate number of males, especially minority males, receiving disciplinary attention in the principal's office, in special rooms set aside for punishment, or sometimes at the back of the classroom or at the front of the classroom under the watchful eye of the teacher or an aide. Similarly, minority males, especially Black and language minority males (i.e., those for whom English is a second language), are disproportionately represented in classes for the low-functioning or educable mentally retarded students. At the same time, however, relatively low percentages of minority males, especially Blacks, are enrolled in talented and gifted classes.

As these observations indicate, schools apply disciplinary actions and academic judgments unevenly across students who have different racial, social class, and gender identities. When teachers and students are not culturally synchronized, the resulting conflict results in educational and social consequences for the students, increasing their sense of uselessness and disconnection. Students who are disconnected from the dominant culture of the structures of schooling lack a strong social interest in school. Disconnected and unsuccessful in school, they are more likely to act out behaviors that are considered disruptive to learning because they have not mastered the tools of living. As a result of their behaviors, they, and sometimes even their parents, are at odds with the school.

Minority students often bring to school cultural capital from families and neighborhoods that struggle with power relationships in the broader community; racism, sexism, poverty, unemployment, or lack of health care puts the entire community at a power disadvantage. Racial or language minority students and immigrant students each bring culturally distinct styles of speaking, knowing, and learning to the classroom and to the school building. In an American cultural climate that is increasingly stratified along wealth and class, race and language have specific implications for perceptions of social class and interactions with school structures.

The students who are most at risk for school failure are males, in contrast to females, and children of color of both genders, particularly African American, Hispanic, Native American, and South East Asian boys and girls. Although schools do convey messages about culture through teachers, administrators, and building environments or climates, as the number of male and minority teachers decreases across the nation, schools are dominated increasingly by females in charge, many of them White.

When White teachers are out of sync with African American students, studies show that they view their students' behavior negatively. A middle-class, White female teacher, for example, may see an urban, Black male student's behavior as boisterous and disruptive, and she may order him to leave the room. Male teachers, especially those from minority backgrounds, who tend to be more tolerant of the high levels of activity of young males, may see the same behavior and think of the student as energetic and intellectually curious. When cultural differences lead teachers to view student behaviors as problems, however, the teachers' disciplinary behaviors may result in the child failing and dropping out, usually preceded by perceptions of the child as "a problem." School drop-out rates of males continue to rise in the United States, and they are dropping out at an earlier age; as a result, fewer are attending college. Thus, it is no surprise that statistics show that American women are attending postsecondary education in higher numbers than American men.

When cultural values weighted heavily toward middle-class constructs of gender, race, and class dominate the school environment, children and young adults who do not bring that cultural capital cannot connect to the school. For example, the school culture regarding appropriate femininity may be channeled through the teacher who rewards girls for being nice and quiet in the classroom and in the hallways, producing neatly completed school assignments and turning them in on time, and generally being “good citizens” in the context of the school community. In subtle and unsubtle ways (think of the selection of cheerleaders, for example), the school community also may reward girls for being pretty or cute, for not being fat or large, or for meeting some other dominant cultural ideal of feminine beauty. In contrast, the school culture rewards boys for behaviors that lead to achievement in the classroom, particularly in math and the sciences, or achievement in sports.

Teachers’ direct feedback serves to reaffirm the differentiated messages that boys and girls receive in the school community according to their gender. For example, researchers exploring the evaluative feedback given to fourth- and fifth-grade girls and boys have found gender differences in both negative and positive feedback. When girls failed, they were encouraged to blame their personal lack of ability, while boys were encouraged to blame their own lack of effort, or they were encouraged to blame a source external to them, like a challenging situation or a person.

Positive feedback given to girls encouraged them to give credit to trying hard or being nice or to credit reasons that were external to the girls’ self-control. In each case of negative and positive feedback given to boys and to girls by the teachers in the study, girls were encouraged subtly to internalize failure and externalize success, while boys were encouraged to internalize success and externalize failure to be considered successful in that school situation.

Further, schools often discriminate against female students by forcing roles on them that fail to enhance their self-esteem and narrow their options for success in later life—for example, disparaging their answers in science and math classes and excluding them from class participation by not recognizing them when they raise their hands to speak. Similarly, gay and lesbian adolescents heighten the contradictions of gender identity and sexual identity in an environment with strong heterosexual cultural norms. Increasingly, these students are organizing, particularly at the high school level and above, to resist and challenge the discrimination, misunderstanding, and neglect they experience in school. The resistant and challenging behavior in these “Other” students is a result of their exclusion from the mainstream structures of schooling.

Students who do not “fit” into subtly or overtly applied and narrowly constructed roles that schools establish for girls and for boys become the “Other,“ and they generally are unsuccessful in the environment of the school. These students very likely become the “problem” boys and girls. They are considered problems because they do not act in ways that make positive impressions on the adult gatekeepers in the school. Black girls, for example, who are loud talking, tough, aggressive, and large in stature, or who otherwise do not fit the local Euro-cultural norm for feminine beauty, often find themselves punished for their ways of being (i.e., “attitude” and other behaviors that annoy adult gatekeepers who are culturally out of sync with the girls).

Similarly, South East Asian boys who are quiet-spoken, slender, and short in stature may be ignored by teachers or, in the alternative, they may be singled out by other students or teachers because their behaviors and appearances do not fit in to the cultural norm for boys in that school. In both examples, these students become the racialized, gendered “Other.” In sharp contrast to the girls and boys who are rewarded by their “fit” with the dominant culture and their ability to blend into it, the “Other” students earn the disapproval of adult gatekeepers at the school. It is easy to single them out for disciplinary action because of their cultural discontinuity with the school.

TOWARD FAIRER MANAGEMENT

The school's ability to understand and manage the impact of gender, race, and class divisions on relationships in the building and in the district determines if some families feel that the school has a strong interest in their children's best welfare or if they feel that they will be perpetually at odds with the school over everything involving their children. The strategies schools use to address the unwanted behaviors in students can heal or it can create a breach between the school and the diverse communities it serves. School districts, as a general rule, should find creative ways to regularly acknowledge and highlight the value of the cultural diversity of district families and neighborhoods.

Successful school reform has occurred when efforts have focused on organizing poor and working-class parents to recognize the value of identifying and forming their own network resources so that they can influence and improve outcomes for their students. These successes suggest that school leaders should advocate publicly for parent involvement that improves the school's academic performance and lowers its behavioral problems. Effective school leadership can mediate between the structures of schooling and the community by opening the doors to make parents an active, meaningful part of teaching and learning in the school.

Better management also requires that education programs continue to improve teacher preparation and in-service training, including the ability to teach in culturally diverse communities. Helping teaching candidates and professional teachers to reflect on their own ideas about race, gender, and class and how they interact in the classroom is critical to creating positive learning and teaching environments that do not incite resisting behavior from students. The importance of male teachers and minority teachers to schools and ultimately helping problem boys and girls connect to the school must not be overlooked. Students spend their entire days in interaction with teachers and other school personnel, and they need someone in the classroom to whom they can connect and who will connect to them culturally. To this end, all teachers need to be given positive encouragement and support to struggle with cultural discontinuity in the classroom and to make school a place where children feel safe, connected, and useful to the human community.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bourdieu, P. (2000). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Arum & I.R. Beattie (Eds.), *The structure of schooling: Readings in the sociology of education* (pp. 56–69). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Carter, P.L. (2003). "Black" cultural capital, status positioning, and school conflicts for low-income African-American youth. *Social Problems, 50*(1), 136–155.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York: New Press.

Graybill, S.W. (1997). Questions of race and culture: How they relate to the classroom for African-American students. *Clearinghouse, 70*(6), 311–319.

Jackson, D.B. (2003). Education reform as if student agency mattered: Academic micro cultures and student identity. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(8), 579–585.

Lareau, A., & Horvat, E.M. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion: Race, class, and cultural capital in family school relationships. *Sociology of Education, 72*(1), 37–53.

Lei, J.L. (2003). (Un)necessary toughness?: Those "loud Black girls" and those "quiet Asian boys." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 34*(2), 158–181.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Slate, J.R., & Jones, C.H. (2003). Helping behaviorally at-risk middle school students with the No Bad Actions Program: Winning with the N.B.A. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 8*(3), 351–362.

Barbara Morrow Williams

School Counseling

There are over 80,000 licensed professional counselors within 48 states, in addition to the District of Columbia. (Two states, Nevada and California, do not currently license master's level counselors.) In states without licensure or certification laws, professional counselors are certified by the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC). In 2005, the NBCC had on its active members list 39,176 National Certified Counselors, 2,092 National Certified Gerontological Counselors, 1,192 Certified Clinical Mental Health Counselors, 668 National Certified School Counselors, 617 Master Addictions Counselors, and 165 National Certified Career Counselors. The role of a counselor is to assist people with a wide variety of problems related, but not limited to, relationships (intimate/family/friends), academic, psychological, career decisions, and substance abuse. The responsibilities and duties of a counselor vary depending both on the population they are working with and on the settings in which they work.

In order to become a *school* counselor, all states require an individual to complete at least some graduate coursework, although most states typically require individuals to complete a master's degree. Most public school systems require advanced degree courses that include the following topics: Human Growth and Development, Theories, Individual Counseling, Group Counseling, Social and Cultural Foundations, Testing/Appraisal, Research and Program Evaluation, Professional Orientation, Career Development, Supervised Practicum, and a Supervised Internship (American Counseling Association, 2006). Although many school counseling programs follow this outline, no mandated training outline currently exists for school counselors.

In addition to graduate coursework, school counselors must also receive state certification. Some states also require public school counselors to have teaching certificates and some teaching experience prior to receiving certification as a school counselor. It is extremely important for aspiring counselors to familiarize themselves with the educational and training requirements, in addition to local and state certification requirements, they must meet in order to become certified school counselors. Requirements tend to differ from state to state and from one school district to another.

The lack of a system for training and certifying school counselors dates back to the early years of school counseling when counselors were simply selected from the teachers in a given school, a practice that may have favored the appointment of women rather than men. Even today, women continue to outnumber men among school counselors although their reasons for doing so may differ from those in the past.

In addition to the lack of uniform training and certification, the American School Counselor Association has identified major problems that plague counseling programs in schools and has developed a model school counseling program that schools can follow. Central to this model and the cornerstone for the role of the professional school counselor is the focus on students' academic, personal/social, and career development. School counselors are in a position to influence students' development and choices, but gender biases on the part of the counselor, while not always conscious, can undermine student development in a variety of ways.

WOMEN IN COUNSELING

The school counseling profession, historically, has been predominantly made up of White females. According to information recently gathered by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), the predominance of White women still holds true today. Currently, females make up close to 80.3 percent of all certified school counselors, while males make up only 19.7 percent. Racial representation within the field of school counseling includes Whites (89.5 percent), African Americans (5.5 percent), Hispanic/Latino (3.5 percent), Asians (0.7 percent), other (0.9 percent).

Years ago, when there were no set requirements for becoming a school counselor, it was common for teachers within a school to be approached by administrators and be recommended to become the school counselor. Although there is no systematic evidence concerning how and why certain teachers were chosen to be counselors, it seems likely that, compared to their male colleagues, women teachers were perceived by school administrators to have more of the people-oriented interests and skills that counseling requires. Much has changed since those days. The field of school counseling is continuing to grow, with more and more graduate programs being created in universities across the United States. Although they vary in content, specific criteria have been implemented by each state that one must meet in order to become a school counselor, and these state criteria have significantly reduced the number of certified teachers simply being placed in the role of a school counselor.

Although this reduction might also have reduced the preponderance of women in school counseling, other social trends have served to sustain or increase the desirability of school counseling for women. One of these trends is the large increase over time in the number of working mothers. Even though gender roles have evolved significantly, it is still more likely for mothers to be the primary caretaker of children. Since this is the case, the hours worked by a school counselor can be accommodating as they allow women to work during the day, while their children are in school, and end early enough to enable those women to spend quality time with their children. Lastly, the same perceptions that may have led to women teachers, rather than men teachers, being chosen for those positions by school administrators probably continue to affect those administrators and the women who become counselors. If school counseling is perceived as a job that requires a person to possess certain characteristics, such as empathy, compassion, and nurturance that are assumed to be associated with women, these beliefs would make the field of school counseling appear to be a nicer fit for women than for men.

STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND COUNSELING PROGRAMS

Counseling in schools dates back to the early nineteenth century. Since that time, the role of the school counselor has been and continues to be debated. To impose some uniform standards on the role of the school counselor, the American School Counselor Association (2004) recently adopted a new description of the role of the school counselor that stresses the need for counselors to have certification, good training, qualifications, and skills to assess students' developmental needs. In addition, professional school counselors were charged with the duty of implementing a comprehensive school counseling program that pays attention to developmental stages of student growth and promotes and enhances student achievement.

The role of the school counselor, however, varies greatly from state to state and even from school district to school district. Although some state education departments—Missouri, Tennessee, and Texas, to name a few—have adopted standards and guidelines for school counseling programs, more often than not the school counselor's role is defined by the building's lead administrator. As a result, counselors do everything from leading drug and violence prevention programs to sharpening pencils for standardized tests.

Like the counselors, school counseling programs have been the focus of considerable scrutiny. In recent years, six fundamental problems in those programs have been identified (Hart & Jacobi, 1992): (a) lack of a basic philosophy; (b) poor integration of the school counseling program in the overall mission of the school; (c) insufficient student access; (d) inadequate guidance for some students (especially minority students); (e) lack of counselor accountability; and (f) the failure to utilize other resources.

To overcome these problems, the ASCA (2003) developed a national model for school counseling programs. The four basic elements of this National Model are *foundation, delivery system, management system,* and *accountability.* Goals and standards are set for each element. *Foundation* goals, for example, are that every school counseling program should be based on a set of beliefs, a philosophy, the three developmental domains (academic, career, personal-social), and the national standards for school counseling programs.

Delivery systems should consist of the guidance curriculum, individual planning, response services, and system support. The *management system* coordinates the delivery system by specifying the counselor's responsibilities, collecting and analyzing data for monitoring students and closing the achievement gap between White students and students of color, defining action plans to achieve wanted outcomes, and allocating time to be spent on each area of the delivery system.

To meet the goal of *accountability,* every school counseling program should report the results of projects carried out, evaluate the school counselor's performance, have an advisory council to review results and make recommendations, and conduct a program audit to ensure that the program is aligned with the national model.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND GENDER

The focus on student development (academic, personal/social, and career) is the cornerstone for the role of the professional school counselor. While separated in the National Model, these three developmental domains are intricately intertwined. Career development, for example, cannot take place without consideration of a student's personal/social and academic development, and career development is an integral part of a school counselor's job. This development takes place through programmed activities such as *computer searches, career days, field visits, vocational programs, course selection, and work with parents.* Each of these activities can be affected by gender biases. Because they occupy a position that influences the career decisions of young people, school counselors need an awareness of these biases and how they can be overcome.

The purpose of *career searches using computer based programs* is to allow students to explore their interests and give them a general starting point. For example, either Web-based programs such as Guidance Direct (2006) or computer programs such as Choices (1997) allow students to take interest inventories. Students are asked to respond to how interested they would be in doing particular activities. For example, Guidance Direct asks students to respond to questions such as "How would you like to build kitchen cabinets" with "Like," "Dislike," or "Unsure." Based on their responses to 180 questions, results are produced indicating which of six areas of interest—social, investigative, artistic, conventional, enterprising, and realistic—are the strongest for the student. Based on these interest areas, students are able to see what occupations or careers best match what they are interested in. This list of careers is a starting point for students to begin exploring possible avenues for them to pursue in the future.

Gender may play a role in these computer searches for several reasons. First, the questions that are asked in these interest inventories are supposed to be gender neutral. However, some of the questions that are asked during the inventories seem to favor one sex over another. For example, the first question on Guidance Direct's interest inventory ("How would you like to build kitchen cabinets?") is a question about carpentry or construction, typically male-dominated occupations. Second, more often than not students take these interest inventories in a classroom with their peers. The chances of them selecting interests that would stereotypically be considered outside their gender are highly unlikely. Surrounded by their peers who are giggling at questions and asking one another how they responded, students are not likely to answer with responses that go against the norm.

In order to avoid reinforcing the gender stereotypes during these computer search activities, counselors can encourage students to do several things. First, suggesting that students take more than just one type of interest inventory can ensure that students are getting information from several different sources, a procedure that will reduce biases based on test-specific stereotypes. Second, having students take these inventories alone in school is ideal but not realistic given the busy schedules of both counselors and students. Counselors, however, can have students take these inventories and use these computer searches at home. This is more ideal compared to the classroom setting, since there are fewer distractions and less pressure to answer in a way that is desirable to one's peers.

Career days are another guidance activity that many schools organize for their students. Individuals from the community come to the school and either speak to students in the classroom setting or set up tables for a fair-like setting. Both scenarios allow students to obtain information from professionals in the field and ask questions about careers they are considering. Having the opportunity to ask real people questions and get facts and opinions gives students information that is invaluable. Even though both scenarios have their positives and negatives, the fair setting allows students to specifically spend more time on careers that interest them.

The issue of gender arises at these career days as well. First, the professionals who come into the schools must be considered. More than likely, their gender reinforces the gender stereotypes that already exist in the field. For example, having a female come to represent the field of nursing may reinforce to male students that nurses are females. Second, because a career fair usually allows students to visit "booths" with their friends and peers, some students may hesitate to explore some of their interests that defy the gender stereotypes due to fear of ridicule from their friends.

At these career days, counselors can invite professionals who actually break the gender stereotypes in a particular field. For example, inviting a male nurse or a female lawyer would encourage students who may have avoided these tables in other circumstances to approach these individuals and ask questions. Another idea would be to have both a male and a female come in to represent every occupation. In this case, students see that both males and females are capable of pursuing whatever career they choose.

Field days are similar to career days in that students are given the opportunity to visit with professionals in various fields at the work site of the professionals. For example, one may go visit a law firm, observe the day-to-day activities, and speak to a multitude of people who work in a particular field. Some schools may even require that students do an "internship" of sorts in a field that interests them, requiring a certain number of hours be spent at a certain placement. Students have been known to do these mini internships at places such as banks, hospitals, animal hospitals, and law firms. These types of field days or internships are beneficial in that they give a student a comprehensive view of a particular occupation, not just one person's opinion. They provide students with somewhat of a hands-on experience.

The gender-related problem that may arise during these field visits is that students may encounter gender division that already exists within certain occupations. During their site visits, they may have negative experiences or attitudes expressed toward them if they are trying to break through an existing barrier. Considering that students very often make field visits after school, teachers or school counselors are not able to soften the blow of how a student is received. These negative experiences may discourage students from pursuing particular careers if they are given the impression that they are not welcome or will not be successful. Another possible discouraging aspect of internships is that very often students may experience discrimination based on their gender. Possible internship sites may turn away an applicant for an internship because that person is not of the "appropriate" gender. Places of business may not explicitly state their gender preference, but often times there is one.

Counselors do not have the power to change the attitudes of the people their students may encounter in the world. However, they do have the opportunity to educate and discuss with students their present and future encounters in the workplace. These types of discussions in the classroom prepare students to handle potential discrimination/negative attitudes experienced in the workplace and allows them to vent any frustrations they may have.

Vocational programs in schools are another piece of the career development program. Very often schools provide students with the opportunity to explore their interests in vocational programs such as automotive repair, carpentry, or cosmetology during their junior and senior years of high school. Sometimes these programs are based within the school so they are easy to attend, or sometimes students attend alternative programs during the school day. Students who believe college may not be the path they will choose to pursue can begin to explore a vocation and learn the skills needed to obtain a position within that field.

Very often these vocational programs are divided by gender, although perhaps not intentionally. The students who take automotive courses are generally male, while cosmetology's roster is primarily female. To overcome these stereotypic choices, the vocational programs that are offered in schools should be advertised equitably to male and female students. Vocational program choices should be offered to students with explanations and descriptions that are unbiased and have no opinions about gender attached to them. Counselors should also be careful not to judge negatively or react with surprise to a request made by a student if it breaks traditional stereotypes. Counselors should support any choice or interest a student may be interested in pursuing.

The *course selections* students make are influenced by the school counselor. It is the school counselor's job to make sure that students are signed up for the correct classes, in the right placement area (level of difficulty), and are on a path toward successfully completing high school. Aside from ensuring that students are taking the correct number of credits of math, English, social studies, science, and other graduation requirements, the school counselor also assists in helping students decide what electives they are going to take. The course booklet that students are provided with oftentimes can be overwhelming for students—the differences between classes, what interests them, and what is going to allow them to have the most options in the future. This is when students turn to their counselors, having faith that the counselor will guide them in the right direction. The level of work that students pursue during high school also affects their performance and preparedness for college.

Very often, however, gender can have an influence in what classes students are directed to take. The suggestions a female is given versus what a male is given can reinforce the gender stereotypes that have existed for years. For example, a female would probably be given the options of an art class or a cooking class to fill in her open elective; while a male would be given the option of a business class or a computer class. In addition, the level of classes or types of classes may also be influenced by gender. Male students are sometimes pushed to take math and science classes more than are females. This undoubtedly affects the number of females who pursue careers in math and science.

In order to ensure that gender does not play a role in what classes a student takes, a counselor should set a goal to urge every student to take the most rigorous course of study of which she or he is capable. Many school counselors have set unofficial rules that every student has to take a math course of some sort in order to continue practicing math skills. Research has shown that there is a strong correlation between success in college and number of advanced math and science courses taken in high school. Counselors are urging their students to continue to take math and science courses in high school so that they will be better prepared when they get to college. Many colleges require new students to take placement tests with math components; students who continue taking math through their senior year of high school may be at an advantage to place out of certain undergraduate classes. Also, in taking these math and science courses, students provide themselves with more options in regard to what courses of study or majors they will be able to pursue in college. Very often colleges will look at a student's high school course of study to determine whether he or she can be admitted to a particular program. Especially in the science and medical fields, math and science are important for admissions.

Parents also have an influence on their child's education and very often are a force in deciding what a student's educational program looks like. A school counselor should always make an effort to *work with parents,* keeping them involved and informed of what is going on in their student's life at school. However, this may become a problem when families have certain stereotypical ideas about gender. Depending on the cultural background of families, some may value education for males or females more than others. This can potentially pose a problem for a school counselor. One example may be that the parents of a male student insist that he is going to be a doctor or lawyer, but it is clear that this student is not interested in doing so. Instead, he wants to pursue a career as a nurse or hairdresser. Some families may not be open to these types of decisions, and it is the counselor's job to assist the student in dealing with the gender stereotypes his family values. Another example may be of a female student who intends to pursue a rigorous course of study and wants to attend college. Her family does not support her decision because it feels her education is not as important as education for the males in the family and that her role is to get married. Cultural values may become a barrier for some students depending on their gender.

In dealing with parents and gender issues, counselors must be sensitive to the cultural values and backgrounds of students. It is imperative to try and understand where a family is coming from and be empathic to such issues. At the same time, however, it is important to be a child advocate and present the child's point of view as important as well. Counselors should be sure to develop a realistic plan for the student when working with parents and be firm when plans are unrealistic. The goal is to help the student and family reach a decision that is both in the best interest of the student and acceptable to, even if not preferred by, the family.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Counseling Association. (2006). *Answers to common questions about counseling. Frequently asked questions.* Retrieved March 21, 2006 from http://www.counseling.org/Home/Faq.aspx?

American School Counselor Association. (2003). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2004). *ASCA role statement: The role of the professional school counselor.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Choices (USA Version). (1997). [Computer software]. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Careerware: ISM Corporation.

Guidance Direct. (2006). [Computer Program]. Rockville Centre, NY: Centris Partners.

Hart, P.J., & Jacobi, M. (1992). *From gatekeeper to advocate: Transforming the role of the school counselor.* New York: College Board.

National Board for Certified Counselors and Affiliates. (2005). *Statistics.* Retrieved March 21, 2006, from http://www.nbcc.org/stats

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. (2006). *Counselors. Occupational outlook handbook.* Retrieved March 21, 2006, from http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos067.htm

Daniel T. Sciarra

Kerri Keegan

Bridget Sledz

Teacher-Student Interactions

Teacher interactions with students are at the heart of the hidden curriculum and are important means by which informal lessons about gender are transmitted in schools. Teacher-student interactions function in part to reproduce and occasionally challenge and transform traditional gender roles in school settings. However, they do not operate in isolation from other dimensions of schools that meaningfully affect gender relations. They are interconnected in complex ways with peer interactions, curriculum, administrative and counseling practices, gender practices originating outside of school, and structural constraints on the roles of teachers and students.

Teacher-student interactions may be initiated by either party, although teacher behaviors directed toward students have been studied far more than the reverse. The nature of interactions are influenced not simply by gender but also by other socially meaningful characteristics such as race/ethnicity, social class, nativity, disabilities, and sexual orientation. Teacher-student interactions embody messages about gender, but these can be strengthened, modified, or contradicted by other influences in schools. Thus, understanding the impact of teacher-student interactions is more complex than it may initially appear.

Two types of encounters initiated by K–12 teachers or by their students have frequently been studied: students' academic work and behavioral and social control. Of these two, academic-related interactions have shown more movement, albeit slow movement, toward gender equality than control-related interactions. Not only can teachers' equitable or inequitable treatment affect student outcomes for boys and girls, but so also can teacher *inaction:* What teachers do *not* do in relation to gendered encounters has consequences for students' informal learning about gender.

HISTORICAL TRENDS IN THE STUDY OF TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTIONS

Concern about the influence of teacher-student interactions on gender dates back to popular writings of the 1960s suggesting that routine interactions between women teachers and young boys contributed to the poorer performance of boys compared to girls in reading. With the rise of feminism and feminist scholarship, attention shifted to the ways in which girls were disadvantaged in teacher-student interactions. This research often concentrated on mathematics and science, areas where girls' educational attainment lagged behind boys'.

A series of reports sponsored by the Association of American University Women (AAUW) appeared in the 1990s that analyzed the multiple ways in which schools "shortchange" girls, including girls' interactions with teachers. In that same decade, as girls' educational attainments improved but boys' underattainment in schools persisted, attention shifted back once again to the schooling experiences of boys.

The current consensus views boys—especially minority boys—as disadvantaged in schooling. Nevertheless, White boys from affluent families are still the most advantaged group educationally. It is now recognized that strategies that have proved successful in raising girls' achievement are not always successful with boys. Hence, researchers are now seeking ways to improve boys' attainment without sacrificing gains made by girls.

The renewed concern about the educational experiences of boys also presents challenges to teachers who are expected to find new ways to interact with diverse groups of boys to improve their schooling experiences and attainment but without undermining the stronger performances of girls. In an era of greater government scrutiny of teacher work and conservative backlash against progress toward gender equity, progressive work on the part of teachers may be undermined.

INTERACTIONS FOCUSED ON ACHIEVEMENT

Substantial research has documented boys' academic work receiving the majority of teacher attention. Summaries of research in several academic fields report that girls experience less overall teacher attention in classrooms, less complicated and challenging interactions with teachers, less constructive feedback on academic work, and less encouragement in failure situations than do boys.

Although some studies in the United States and some parts of Europe and Australia suggest movement toward greater equity in patterns of teacher attention in recent years, others find substantial persistence of earlier-reported patterns. One implication of these latter findings may be that the behaviors teachers regard as girls' classroom strengths—good conduct, a desire to please teachers, and diligence in completing tasks—could actually be detrimental to their academic achievement. Boys' supposed weaknesses as students—poor behavior and frequent off-task activity—may actually benefit them academically by bringing them more teacher attention. In contrast, teachers may sometimes avoid giving girls detailed critiques of their academic work for fear of hurting their feelings.

Patterns of differential teacher attention to boys and girls in K–12 schools are fairly consistent throughout private, public, and parochial schools, and they appear in both coeducational and single-sex classrooms. They also remain steady across subject areas. In nearly all contexts, teachers still give more attention to the academic behaviors of boys. Patterns are particularly skewed in favor of boys in classes focused on mathematics, natural science, and computer science, and girls still lag behind boys in these areas. The introduction of computer-assisted, technology-based instruction does not eliminate and, in fact, often intensifies gendered patterns of teacher-student interactions.

The AAUW's most recent report (2000) indicates that established patterns of interaction are hard to break. For example, teachers are generally tolerant of established achievement behaviors of boys and girls and accept, rather than attempt to modify, the reluctance of Asian American and Native American girls to participate in class unless specifically called upon. Teachers allow boys to dominate class discussion in computer and hands-on science lessons. As a result, the gender gap in technology use widens between grades

K–12. Patterns of male dominance may emanate from peer interchanges and teachers may not be wholly responsible for gender gaps, but they rarely intervene successfully to disrupt them.

Teachers are more apt to call on boys than girls for responses in classrooms and to accept unsolicited responses from boys. In Japan, research suggests that men teachers foster sexism in classrooms by imposing higher academic standards for boys and giving preference to boys in class discussions. In the United States and much of Western Europe, both women and men teachers pay more attention to boys' academic work (Good & Brophy, 2003). Teachers overselect boys for special learning opportunities, leadership roles, and academic awards, especially in mathematics and science.

When students experience academic difficulty, teachers differentially evaluate the source of academic difficulty based on gender. Boys receive far more referrals for remedial reading and other academic interventions. This appears to be the result of disruptive behavior on the part of boys with reading difficulties while girls with the same difficulties exhibit fewer undesirable behaviors, receive less teacher attention, and get less remediation (Shaywitz et al., 1990). The effects of teacher interventions in addressing the academic needs of boys remain a matter of debate. While some have seen the greater tendency to evaluate and assign boys to special classrooms as stigmatizing, others have argued that the educational deficiencies of boys, more so than girls, are apt to come to the attention of teachers at a point when they stand the best chance of effective remedy. In contrast, studies link the relative inattention to girls' academic work to slides in their self-esteem and diminished aspirations for higher-level study in mathematics and science. To further complicate this issue, the differential attention to the academic work of boys and girls is largely unintentional on the part of teachers, who believe they provide similar amounts and quality of academic feedback to boys and girls. Only with videotaping and systematic analysis do teachers become aware of their bias toward greater attention to boys (Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Despite the institutional limitations on teachers' roles, some teachers, especially women, do take on care work or change their interactions with students in an effort to address gender inequality in their classrooms. Extensive debate surrounds the definition of teachers' appropriate roles vis-à-vis students. An idealization of teachers as the maternal figures of schools influences teacher-student interactions. They sometimes are expected to provide for the general well-being of students in ways that go far beyond the duties involved in academic instruction. Teachers frequently accept this caregiving role, especially when it is not met by family or other social institutions, and they use their effectiveness in providing emotional labor as a measure of success in the profession. Stronger teacher-student bonds can result in higher achievement and lower likelihood of disciplinary problems, especially among Latina and Caucasian girls, and may even compensate when parental involvement is lacking (Crosnoe & Elder, 2004).

Students pick up important, if unintentional, lessons from the gendered division of labor of school staff. Additionally, differential assignment of women and men teachers to certain subject areas may reinforce students' perceptions that certain subjects are masculine or feminine domains. Girls' and boys' varying achievement patterns across subjects reflect the dominance of men teachers in math and science and women teachers in language arts and the perceived appropriateness of each subject for a given gender.

Not all boys are advantaged in classrooms, and studies suggest that teacher relationships with minority boys are more hostile than those with White boys. Although minority boys get substantial attention from teachers, much more of it is focused on behavioral control than on academic work. Boys from some minority groups show considerable estrangement from teachers and are among the least likely to initiate interactions with teachers around academic issues or other matters. Higher rates of dropping out, suspension, and expulsion for boys may be attributable, at least in part, to strained relationships between teachers and minority boys (Riordan, 2003).

Other research shows that teachers pay less attention to the academic work of Latina, Asian American, and Native American girls in comparison to White girls and that teachers may be reluctant to encourage more active classroom roles for these girls. Thus, patterns of teacher-student interactions may vary not only by gender but also by racial and ethnic group, and these patterns rely upon actions of both teachers and students.

The marginalization of girls in teacher-student interactions leads some commentators to call for the establishment of all-girl schools or classrooms. Proponents claim teachers in single-sex schools or classrooms focus exclusively on girls, who do not have to compete with boys for teacher attention. However, studies of single-sex education rarely show appreciable benefits for boys, and the impact on girls is unclear. While studies of postsecondary education show that women benefit in certain ways from attending single-sex institutions, studies of K–12 schools reveal few differences between patterns of teacher interaction in coeducational and single-sex educational environments in the United States. Research in Britain also fails to uncover consistent differences in girls' achievement levels across single- and mixed-sex classrooms. The results are mixed, and, although single-sex educational settings are occasionally associated with benefits for students, other factors beyond patterns of teacher-student interactions may be at play.

INTERACTIONS AROUND BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Unlike patterns of academic-related teacher-student interactions, where some studies show movement toward greater equity by gender, patterns of interaction concerning discipline and social-control-related interactions show little change over time. Boys undoubtedly receive the bulk of teacher attention aimed at discipline and social control in classrooms, with minority boys particularly likely to be heavily monitored by teachers. Such monitoring can have both positive and negative effects. It can keep boys on task and ensure that they complete academic work, but intense scrutiny and public criticism of behavior by teachers can make classrooms more hostile and alienating environments for boys. Girls of working-class and certain minority statuses also can be subjected to exaggerated teacher social control, especially if their actions defy expectations of the behaviors of "good girls" or evoke images of explicit sexuality.

Teachers frequently misinterpret the resistance of students of subordinated racial and/or class status to schooling and control as further misconduct and resort to heavier monitoring, especially of African American boys. These complex interchanges between students and teachers ultimately exacerbate the alienation of youth, which may be implicated in patterns of educational failure of boys.

In most schools, boys make more discipline-related visits to principals, spend more hours in detention halls, receive more suspensions and expulsions, and drop out of school more readily than do girls (Riordan, 2003). It is worth noting the messages about gender and authority that disciplinary measures send to students. Principals and other administrative staff are more likely to be men, and classroom teachers are overwhelmingly women who serve as the first corrective measure if a student misbehaves. If the student cannot be made to conform to classroom rules by the teacher, she/he is sent to a masculine authority figure for further punishment. This may send a signal that women and girls need not be taken as seriously as men and boys or that women's authority is less legitimate relative to men's.

Messages about the relative importance of masculinity and femininity can also be conveyed through *shaming,* a method of social control (used by students and teachers) wherein some characteristic of a student is used to place that student outside of peer norms, thus humiliating him/her and providing deterrence to future improper behaviors. Teachers use femininity as a shaming device geared toward controlling the behavior of boys telling a boy he is "acting like a girl" in order to embarrass him in front of his peers. To reestablish their masculinity with other students, a shamed boy will accept physical pain administered by other boys without complaint or insult girls in front of these other boys. Thus, teachers may be reinforcing a form of masculinity that is consistent neither with academic achievement nor behavioral standards in schools.

Shaming does not run along parallel lines for girls. Reprimands for behaving in ways thought appropriate to the other gender are not universal; girls are not reprimanded for "boyish" behavior, although they may be criticized for being unfeminine or unladylike. By stigmatizing boys with a feminine label, but not viewing masculine labels as insulting to girls, teachers may participate in the devaluation of feminine-linked attributes.

TEACHER INACTION

Gender is influenced by what teachers do *not* do as much as what they do. Teachers' inaction is often in response to institutional rules more so than personal preferences or professional training. For example, school rules can require teachers to enforce gender-linked dress codes for students, and teachers might be prohibited from discussing certain topics in the classroom. Such restrictions forbid teachers from challenging gender norms they might otherwise find undesirable. In addition, teachers may inadvertently perpetuate gender inequality by tolerating peer-initiated sexist behavior in classrooms. British studies indicate teachers frequently see students commit homophobic acts, yet do not interfere, feeling that any intervention they offer will have little effect. Misogynist bullying of girls often goes unacknowledged as well, and some teachers who do intervene do so by labeling the girls as promiscuous rather than the boys as bullies and intercede accordingly. The silences that many schools observe around these controversial issues make it difficult for teachers and students to have meaningful interchanges about important gender-related topics (Smith, 2000).

Although silences are sometimes due to institutional rules, teachers still bear some responsibility for these omissions. A desire to avoid classroom disruptions might lead teachers to "undereducate" girls by steering discussion away from controversial topics of particular relevance in the lives of girls, for example, workplace gender discrimination, sexual desire, sexual orientation, contraception, sexually transmitted diseases, or sexual harassment. Teachers, thus, are complicit in the perpetuation of normative teacher-student interactions that can disadvantage girls, lower their self-esteem, and lead them to restricted visions of career options. Teachers also rarely confront bullying by boys or girls, nor critique dysfunctional forms of masculinity prevalent in schools, thus failing to intervene in behaviors that can harm girls and boys. Students are not oblivious to teacher inaction and such omissions in teacher-student discourse define teachers as less trustworthy in the eyes of some students.

As these students realize, teachers do have the power to influence the perpetuation, or the disruption, of gender inequalities and, as such, teacher-student interactions remain an important focus of sociological and educational research. Among the more pressing questions to be addressed over the next several years include the following: How do race, social class, sexuality, and nativity status affect the analysis of gender and teacher-student interactions in the United States and in other countries? How do lesser-studied topics such as role modeling or mentoring shape gender roles? How might the needs of boys in schools be successfully addressed, without eliminating gains or creating new disadvantages for girls? Finally, how can progress toward gender equity in teacher-student interactions stay at the forefront of agendas for schooling in the face of multiple new challenges facing teachers and schools?

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Association of University Women. (2000). *A license for bias: Sex discrimination, schools, and Title IX.* Washington DC: American Association of University Women Legal Advocacy Fund.

Crosnoe, R., & Elder, G., Jr. (2004). Family dynamics, supportive relationships, and educational resilience during adolescence. *Journal of Family Issues, 25*(5), 571–602.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting white." *Urban Review, 18*(3), 176–206.

Good, T.L., & Brophy, J.E. (2003). *Looking into classrooms.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Riordan, C. (2003). Failing at school, yes; Victims of war, no. *Sociology of Education, 76*(4), 369–373.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Smith, D. (2000). Schooling for inequality. *Signs, 25*(4), 1147–1151.

Shaywitz, S.A., Shaywitz, B.E., Fletcher, J., & Escobar, M. (1990). Prevalence of reading disability in boys and girls. *Journal of American Medical Association, 264*(88), 998–1002.

Linda Grant

Kimberly Kelly

Part VIII

Gender Constructions in the Peer Group

Overview

The term *peers* is generally used to refer to persons who occupy equivalent positions in an organization or social network. These positions are usually designated by identity labels, and those with legitimate claims to the same label are said to be peers. Thus, students in a school are peers, as are teachers in a school, but students and teachers hold different positions and are not peers. Students in different schools may also be regarded as peers, especially when the students are at the same grade level. Students may also be regarded as the peers of those who drop out of school, but in such cases, a label other than student, such as adolescents, gang members, or 16 year olds, will be used to identify the basis of their peer status. Although teachers or principals or school bus drivers or academics who judge one another's scholarship meet the definition of peers just as much as students do, the term is used in Part VIII to refer to young people, especially children and adolescents.

Peer groups consist of two or more peers who are linked together by more than their common identity label. These linkages usually include contact, interaction, and positive, sociometric choices, such as putting a person's name on a list of friends or naming that person when asked to list classmates whom you like. Peer groups vary in size and in closeness. Closeness is difficult to define precisely because it is based on multiple linkages, but increases in number of contacts, duration and variety of interactions, and reciprocated sociometric choices should all be indicators of increased closeness in peer groups. Network theorists have also stressed the importance of density by which they mean the extent to which the members of a group are interconnected. The more of a person's friends who are friends of one another, the more dense his or her friendship network is said to be. Similarly, the higher the proportion of peers who identify themselves and one another as members of the same group, the more dense that group. Dense peer groups are likely to be perceived as not only closer but also more exclusive than peer groups that are less dense.

Peer groups may be important to their members even when the groups are not dense or particularly close. Peer groups may also serve as positive reference groups for people who do not belong to them. In such cases, people may identify with a group, seek to emulate it, and wish to join it, but they may have little, if any, contact and interaction with group members. Nor would such people be the target of positive, sociometric choices by group members. Indeed, group members may not even be aware of the people who use them as a positive reference group, although researchers have found that some peer groups work very hard to become the most popular or leading crowd in their school.

Some of the research on peer groups has focused on their internal dynamics, and this section contains essays that look at the ways in which children and adolescents construct peer cultures for themselves, the "insiders," and contrasting group identities for those they reject, the "outsiders." Gender and sexuality are often used for these constructions, and large literatures have emerged documenting the ways in which young people develop boundaries between the sexes and contrasts between acceptable and unacceptable forms of masculinity and femininity.

Although these boundaries and contrasts may be somewhat different as one moves across age groups, schools, and national contexts, there seems to be a cross-contextual tendency for young people (and many older ones) to engage in heterosexism, behaviors premised on the assumption that male-female sexuality is the normal, natural way of living one's life. Major corollaries of this assumption are homophobia and beliefs in gender inequality. As part of heterosexism, beliefs in gender inequality take the form of convictions that the best kinds of male-female relationships and sexuality are those in which men are dominant and women are more subservient. Thus, it is not enough for a woman to choose a man for her sex partner; she should also be willing to defer to the wishes and desires of that man with regard to the kind of sex acts they will practice and with what frequency. Homophobia refers to words and actions that express fear and loathing of same-sex sexuality and of those who practice or advocate it. Most studies suggest that, compared to girls and women, boys and men are more likely, on average, to endorse heterosexism, gender inequality, and homophobia, and this difference is thought to be a reason for the higher rates of aggression, violence, and rebellious behaviors among boys and men. There also is a growing body of evidence from research done in the United States suggesting that expressions of heterosexism and homophobia seem to reach their peak among students enrolled in middle schools or junior high schools, but more research in other countries is needed to determine if this finding is truly age-related or if it is a consequence of the structure of schooling and national culture in which U.S. youngsters are embedded.

Considerable evidence exists showing that teachers and school administrators sometimes foster the heterosexism of their students. When teachers create student groupings for learning or disciplinary purposes, gender is often an easy way to separate students. In elementary schools, for example, there probably still are geography or spelling bees that heighten gender identities and differences by pitting the boys against the girls. Even among the teachers who carefully avoid creating gender-based groupings, there are many who allow the students to create such groupings for themselves. When students are asked or allowed to choose teammates or workmates, it is highly likely they will choose their own friends. At some age levels, these are highly likely to be same-sex choices. And, at all age levels, it is likely that boys deemed to be unmasculine and girls thought unattractive will be chosen last or will remain unchosen. Once having given the students their choice, most teachers would be reluctant to challenge them even if they privately disapprove.

Usually, heterosexism, gender discrimination, and homophobia among students have to become highly public and fairly violent before school authorities are willing—or are forced—to take action against the offenders. The same is true of students' disaffection with school, which is often tolerated as long as it does not take the form of overt rebellion. Even when students act out, the focus of disciplinary action by the school is usually directed at a specific, misbehaving student with little attention given to the peer groups or "gangs" that often support the misbehavior and are likely to promote its reoccurrence.

This lack of attention to the peer group reflects a general tendency among educators and educational researchers to adopt an individualistic approach toward students. As part of this approach, it is assumed that the focus of education should be on learning and that the teacher should help each of her or his students to attain the highest level of achievement of which that student is capable. Thus, the most important relationships in the classroom are between the teacher and each of the students. Relationships among the students themselves are seen as secondary and usually become important to the teacher only when they hinder the learning process. When that happens, the tendency of the teacher is to identify one or a few "troublemakers," to subject them to discipline, and to restore classroom order so that learning continues to happen.

There are, however, a variety of teaching-learning strategies, known as cooperative learning, that recognize that there are important ways in which group processes and relationships can interfere with or aid classroom learning. Some forms of cooperative learning were designed specifically to break down prejudices and discrimination among students and to improve their social relationships, especially relationships among students of different race-ethnicities and social classes. The starting point for cooperative learning is the construction of a variety of dyadic and small-group instructional formats that bring together students of different social and economic backgrounds. Contact alone is rarely enough to reduce prejudices, however. To the contrary, some studies have shown that increased contact across racial lines is more likely to increase than to decrease both perceptions of racial dissimilarity and interracial antipathy. To prevent such outcomes, student dyads and small groups have been designed to foster not only contact among heterogeneous students but also interdependence and cooperation. According to a growing body of research, more positive interpersonal relationships, including improved race-ethnic and social-class relations, can be achieved in classrooms if students participate in instructional groupings that are deliberately and carefully structured to meet these goals. What is less certain are the effects that interdependent, cooperative peer groups initiated in school settings will have on prejudices concerning gender and sexual orientation and on the peer groups students choose for themselves both in and out of the classroom.

See also "Fraternities" and "Sororities" in Part VI, and "Heterosexism and Homophobia in the Hidden Curriculum" in Part VII.

Bullying, Harassment, and Violence Among Students

Our nation's elementary and secondary schools are filled with abundant examples of student-to-student gender-based harassment and violence. Despite requirements for compliance and monitoring articulated in state and federal laws and continuing guidance issued by federal agencies and the federal courts on Title IX of the Education Amendments that were passed by the U.S. Congress in 1972 to eliminate sex discrimination in educational institutions that receive federal financial assistance (meaning just about all public K–12 schools), results from surveys attest to the ugly entrenchment of sexual and gender harassment in our schools. Yet, sexual or gender-based harassment rarely shows up in any of the standard analyses of school violence—gender is missing.

Not only is gender missing, but many of these analyses also suffer from a failure to distinguish between acts that meet legal standards for violence and harassment and acts of noncriminal misbehavior. While the latter may require that students be subject to limit setting, retraining, or even discipline of some kind, they do not rise to the standard of criminality implicit in the "zero tolerance" policies now being imposed by many U.S. schools. These policies often fail to distinguish between crimes and minor infractions of school rules with the result that they pose a threat to civil rights and liberties in the schools. Masking the failure to distinguish illegal violence and harassment from bad deportment is the increasing use of the term "bullying" to refer to a broad range of student behaviors considered unacceptable by school authorities. This term not only hides the gendered and sexualized nature of a great many acts of violence and harassment among students but also shifts the responsibility for those acts to the students who perform them and away from the schools that are legally required to provide an environment free from gender-based harassment and violence.

ZERO TOLERANCE POLICIES

The nation was horrified by the April 1999 shootings at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. Overnight, reports appeared on the topic of "school violence" with many urging measures that would allegedly make a school safer than before by suspending and/or expelling more students under the “one-strike, you are out” framework of zero tolerance.

Within this framework, schools have been quick to suspend students for anything that could be deemed a weapon, a drug, or a threat, and the result is that students are being controlled in ways that shred their Constitutional rights. Students have been suspended for papers they have written, thoughts they have had, and drawings they have created (*Commonwealth v. Milo, M.,* 433 Mass. 149 [2001]). Elementary school children have been suspended for comments made in the heat of a touch football game or in response to a teacher denying permission to go to the bathroom, comments that schools characterized as “death threats.” In a case from Jonesboro, Arkansas, an eight-year-old boy was suspended for pointing a chicken nugget toward a teacher and saying “Pow, pow.”

Zero tolerance is a deeply flawed approach, leaving no room for teachable moments, graduated interventions, or progressive discipline. It is a policy that insults teachers and violates the civil rights of students. The judgment of educators is discounted, and one punishment is meted out for a dizzyingly broad range of acts. Standards are subjective, but sentences are uniformly severe. Not surprisingly, zero tolerance has racial implications —disproportionate numbers of students of color have been suspended and expelled under policies (The Civil Rights Project, 2000; Skiba, 2000).

Zero tolerance mania in schools is part of the pervasive punitive ideology and social policy that also includes trying minors as adults (California’s Proposition 21 passed in March 2000), deterrence theories, and mandatory sentencing. Educators are now including bullying behaviors under the ever-broadening umbrella of zero tolerance. Schools proudly state that they will not tolerate bullies; there are bully buster posters around school buildings, and new rules to cover bullying and eradicating bullies are all the rage with state legislators, school officials, and consultants.

The zero tolerance approach has taken over the good senses of the educational and legislative establishments. What has gotten lost in this surge of reports and frenzy to reduce a rather expansive notion of bullying in schools are the rights of students to go to school in an environment that is gender-safe, free from gender-based harassment and violence.

HARASSMENT OR BULLYING?

The extremely popular framework of bullying represents a problematic formulation of violence as it both degenders harassment and removes it from the discourse of rights by placing it into a more psychological, pathologizing realm. Objections to these anti-bullying efforts embodied both in the new laws and the training efforts that have accompanied them are multiple: (a) The laws largely do not hold school administrators liable in the same ways to resolve the problems that Title IX requires but instead put the responsibility for solving the problem on the victim; (b) most of these anti-bullying laws are overly broad and arbitrary with the result that students are suspended or expelled from schools for a variety of minor infractions; and yet (c) sometimes egregious behaviors are framed as bullying when, in fact, they may constitute illegal sexual or gender harassment or even criminal hazing or assault (Stein, 2003, 2005).

In the United States, the discourse around bullying is a relatively new phenomenon, in large part imported from the Europeans and the research conducted there since the 1970s (e.g. Ahmad & Smith, 1994; Olweus, 1993). Prior to the emphasis on bullying as a new trend for U.S. educators and researchers, redress of injustices and wrongs were addressed through civil and Constitutional rights. However, those linkages and legacies are now in jeopardy: The discourse of bullying may ellipse the rights discourse (Stein, 2003).

Consider the case *Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education* heard in the U.S. Supreme Court in 1999, the details of which demonstrate the implications of the bully versus harassment distinction. LaShonda Davis was repeatedly touched, grabbed, and verbally harassed by a male classmate in her fifth-grade class. The boy, who is known only by his initials, G.F., repeatedly attempted to touch LaShonda's breasts and genital area, rubbed against her in a sexual manner, constantly asked her for sex, and, in one instance, put a plastic doorstop in his pants to simulate an erection and then came at her in a sexually suggestive manner. By no stretch of the imagination was this boy subtle or was his behavior ambiguous; rather, it was persistent and unrelenting. Should these behaviors have been called bullying or sexual harassment? The answer to this question has vitally important consequences for LaShonda, for her assailant, and for the teachers and school administrators.

LaShonda did not respond passively to the boy's behavior. Besides telling G.F. to stop, she also told her teachers. Her parents also complained to her teachers and asked to have LaShonda's seat moved. But, her teachers and school officials did nothing, not even to separate the two students who sat next to each other. G.F.'s behavior was clearly affecting LaShonda both psychologically and academically. After several months of this harassment, LaShonda's grades fell and she wrote a suicide note. Her parents filed a criminal complaint against the boy and also a federal civil rights lawsuit against the school district for permitting a sexually hostile environment to exist. In the criminal action, the boy pled guilty to sexual battery. And, after five years of legal battles and appeals, their case was heard in the U.S. Supreme Court. In a five-to-four decision, the Court ruled that schools are liable for student-to-student sexual harassment if the school officials knew about the sexual harassment and failed to take action.

It is highly unlikely that if these behaviors had been framed as bullying that LaShonda's case would have ever been heard in a federal court, let alone in the U.S. Supreme Court. As it was, the conduct that was inflicted upon her, by both the male classmate and the treatment that she received from the school personnel, were framed as civil rights violations. To have viewed this conduct as bullying would have relegated her case to the principals' office, a place where she had not received justice or redress prior to filing a federal lawsuit or a criminal complaint. Moreover, the context and timing of the *Davis* decision proved to be crucial. It came one month after the shootings at Columbine High School (April 1999) putting the subject of sexual harassment in schools into the midst of the national conversation about school safety.

A typical example of the problems associated with the conflation of bullying and harassment can be found in the April 24, 2001, issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA). This study of nearly 16,000 sixth to tenth graders from public and private schools came from a larger sample of those who had filled out a World Health Organization (WHO) instrument administered in 1998 in 30 countries. To be applicable, the original instrument had to use questions, definitions, and terms that would make sense in all of the 30 participating countries, from France to Indonesia. Thus, behaviors that legally could be sexual harassment or assault in the United States were framed as bullying for purposes of this survey—for example, being hit, slapped, or pushed, spreading rumors, or making sexual comments.

In the United States, the results showed that nearly 30 percent of the sample reported moderate or frequent involvement in bullying, either as the bully (13 percent), one who was bullied (10.6 percent), or both (6.3 percent). Males were more likely than females to be both perpetrators and targets of bullying. But, the term "sexual harassment" was never raised—not by the researchers nor in the accompanying article in JAMA written by two public health researchers. To engage sixth through tenth graders in this discourse of bullying without acknowledging the realities of sexual or racial harassment is to infantilize and mislead them because some of the behaviors described as bullying are, in fact, criminal conduct or could be covered by sexual harassment or other civil rights in education laws.

There is a striking contrast between the research findings reported in JAMA and the findings of two other studies released two months later, both of which received scant publicity. In *Hatred in the Hallways,* Human Rights Watch considered the harassment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students in U.S. schools. In *Hostile Hallways II,* the American Association of University Women (AAUW) Foundation and the Harris poll reported the results of a study of students of the same ages as those studied in the JAMA article who were surveyed about their experiences with sexual harassment and gender harassment.

In these two studies, the euphemism of bullying was not used as it was in the two JAMA articles when describing behaviors that constitute sexual and gender-based harassment. In the AAUW study, sexual harassment was found to be widespread in schools with 83 percent of the girls and 79 percent of the boys indicating that they had ever been sexually harassed. Thirty percent of the girls and 24 percent of the boys reported that they were sexually harassed often. Nearly half of all students who experience sexual harassment felt very or somewhat upset afterwards, a finding that points to the negative impact that sexual harassment has on the emotional and educational lives of students. In the Human Rights Watch study, 140 gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students along with 130 school and youth service personnel in seven states were interviewed. The results showed an alarming portrait of daily human rights abuses of the students by their peers and, in some cases, by some of their teachers and administrators.

Rather than suggesting that the word "bullying" be purged from the language entirely, it might be used more appropriately only with young children. Young children, unlike teenagers, might be hard pressed to understand the concepts of sexual harassment or sexual violence. But, even if the term "bullying" is used instead of "harassment" with young children, school officials cannot dismiss their legal liability to abide by sexual harassment laws and to ensure that schools do not discriminate on the basis of sex. Moreover, to use the word "bullying" to cover some behaviors that may constitute criminal or civil violations is to perform a great disservice to young people; the word "bullying" may infantilize them but the law will not.

OMISSIONS AND DENIALS OF GENDER

Psychologists seem to dominate the field of bullying research and largely seem unfamiliar with nearly 30 years of research from the fields of education, sociology, anthropology, and feminist legal scholarship—fields that might instead frame the bullying behaviors as gendered violence or sexual harassment. While the bullying researchers may acknowledge the existence of sexual harassment in schools, they generally cite only surveys or court decisions from the U.S. Supreme Court and largely have ignored a wealth of studies and articles from researchers who have employed widely different methodologies and have long argued for a gendered critique of children's behaviors. In addition, the omission or denial of gender from the dominant construction of school safety and violence contributes to the disproportionate focus on the most extreme, rare forms of violence while the more insidious threats to safety are largely ignored (Lesko, 2000; Stein, 1995; Stein, Tolman, Porche, & Spencer, 2002). An example of this failure to factor in the saliency of gender in school violence is reflected in the many reports and analyses of the spate of school shootings—the form of school violence that has attracted the most national attention and incited the most panic. In general, the school shootings were widely reported in a gender-neutral way, when, in fact, the majority of these tragedies were perpetrated by White middle-class boys who were upset about either a breakup or a rejection by a girl (e.g., Jonesboro, Arkansas; Pearl, Mississippi) or who did not meet traditional expectations and norms of masculinity (e.g., Columbine, Colorado) and were thus persecuted by their peers.

This failure to consider the role of gender is also endemic to much of the bullying research. Researchers of bullying, for the most part, have unfortunately failed to consider the ways in which adolescent boys (and adult men) unmercifully police each other with rigid and conventional notions of masculinity and the imposition of compulsive heterosexuality. Not to factor in or even recognize these potent elements is to deny a central and operating feature in boy culture, namely the maniacally driven, tireless efforts to define oneself as "not gay." Researchers such as Joe Pleck, R.W. Connell, Michael Kimmel, and Michael Messner have written about this phenomenon and its consequences for several decades, yet most bullying researchers have failed to draw upon their findings.

Teen dating violence is also on the increase. There are two questions on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), a comprehensive survey about general behavior of teens from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, that ask about violence in teen dating relationships. The first question inquires about physical violence in a dating relationship, and the second question asks about sexual violence in a dating relationship (www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs).

Data from both versions of the YRBS (the state-by-state versions and the national version, with its sample of 13,000 students between the ages of 14 and 18 years old) show that in some states, up to 20 percent of girls experience violence from a dating partner—some of that as physical violence and some as sexual violence. Moreover, a recent analysis of the national 2001 data from 6,864 female students in grades 9 through 12 found that 17.7 percent of the girls reported being intentionally physically hurt by a date in the previous year (Silverman, Raj, & Clements, 2004).

However, prevalence data on sexual violence in elementary and middle schools has not been consistently collected, disaggregated, or reported. Researchers lack a complete picture about the violence that children younger than 12 years old experience, whether that violence happens at home, in the streets, in public spaces, or at school. This lack of information may lie largely with the resistance of the parents who will not permit researchers to ask these sorts of questions to children younger than 12 years old.

CONSEQUENCES OF ANTI-BULLYING POLICIES

"Bullying" has become the stand-in term for other behaviors that school and public health officials as well as scholars, legislators, and researchers do not want to name, like racism, homophobia, sexism, or hate crimes. It is an expression that makes adults feel more comfortable but it does not do anything to stop gender harassment and sexual violence. This loose and liberal use of the term "bullying" may be part of a general trend to label children, particularly in a culture that tends to psychopathologize behaviors.

Unfortunately, the new anti-bullying laws may serve to dilute the discourse of rights by minimizing or obscuring harassment and violence. When schools put the new anti-bullying laws and policies into practice, the policies are often overly broad and arbitrary, resulting in students being suspended or expelled from schools for a variety of minor infractions (Stein, 2001). In an era when school administrators are afraid of being sued for civil rights/harassment violations—as a consequence of the May 1999 decision of the Supreme Court in the *Davis* case—naming the illegal behaviors as "bullying" serves to deflect the school's legal responsibility for the creation of a safe and equitable learning environment onto an individual or group of individuals as the culprit(s) liable for the illegal conduct. Under the prevailing definition of bullying, almost anything has the potential to be called bullying, from raising one's eyebrow, giving "the evil eye," making faces (all very culturally constructed activities), to verbal expressions of preference toward particular classmates over others. There may be a tyranny of sameness that is implicitly being proposed in this pursuit to eradicate bullying behaviors.

Why have school administrators been so quick to embrace the anti-bullying movement and to abandon the anti-harassment focus? If behaviors are labeled "bullying," administrators and their school districts cannot be sued in federal court. Harassment and discrimination based on race, disability, gender, or national origin are civil rights violations and rigorous standards of proof must be met. Bullying is not against any federal law, and it is not tied to civil rights. Subsuming serious violations under the bullying umbrella means schools avoid the liability they would face if sued successfully in federal court for a civil rights violation. It may also mean that students who have been bullied lose their rights to redress.

Approaching the subject of bullying without also talking about harassment and hazing leads us in the wrong direction. Rather than assuring civil rights and equal educational opportunities for all students, there will be more suspensions and expulsions under zero tolerance for bullying. Before long, we will be suspending students for all sorts of "discomfort" that they may have caused. Bullying is too arbitrary, subjective, and all encompassing a concept to be the basis for a sound disciplinary approach. Because there is no threshold for bullying, its use as a criterion is rife with opportunities for abuse of power. The broad sweep of the anti-bullying movement and zero tolerance laws are very troubling and need to be challenged at every turn and ultimately dismantled.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Ahmad, Y., & Smith, P.K. (1994). Bullying in schools and the issue of sex differences. In J. Archer (Ed.), *Male violence* (pp. 70–83). New York: Routledge.

American Association of University Women Foundation and Harris Interactive. (2001, June). *Hostile hallways II: Bullying, teasing and sexual harassment in school.* Washington, DC: Author.

Brown, L.M., Chesney-Lind, M., & Stein, N. (2004). *Patriarchy matters: Toward a gendered theory of teen violence and victimization.* (Working Paper No. 417). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Human Rights Watch. (2001, June). *Hatred in the hallways: Violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students in U.S. schools.* New York: Author.

Lesko, N. (2000). *Masculinities at school.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Silverman, J.G., Raj, A., & Clements, K. (2004). Dating violence and associated sexual risk and pregnancy among adolescent girls in the United States. *Pediatrics, 114*(2), 220–225.

Skiba, R. (2000, August). *Zero tolerance, zero evidence: An analysis of school disciplinary practice* (Policy Research Report #SRS2). Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Education Policy Center.

Stein, N. (1995). Sexual harassment in K–12 schools: The public performance of gendered violence [Special issue]. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(2), 145–162.

Stein, N. (2001). Sexual harassment meets zero tolerance: Life in K–12 schools. In W. Ayers, B. Dohrn, & R. Ayers (Eds.), *Zero tolerance: Resisting the drive for punishment in our schools* (pp. 130–137). New York: New Press.

Stein, N. (2003). Bullying or sexual harassment? The missing discourse of rights in an era of zero tolerance. *Arizona Law Review, 45*(3), 783–799.

Stein, N. (2005). Bullying and harassment in a post-Columbine world. In K. Kendall-Tackett & S. Giacomoni (Eds.), *Child victimization* (pp. 16-1–16-11). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

Stein, N., Tolman, D., Porche, M., & Spencer, R. (2002). Gender safety: A new concept for safer and more equitable schools. *Journal of School Safety, 1*(2), 35–50.

The Civil Rights Project. (2000, June). *Opportunities suspended: The devastating consequences of zero tolerance and school discipline.* (Report from A National Summit on Zero Tolerance, Washington, DC). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, The Civil Rights Project.

Nan Stein

Gangs and Schools

The subject of gangs has become a hot issue over the past couple of decades. Since the majority of those who belong to youth gangs or have friends who are in gangs are attending school, at least for part of the year, it should come as little surprise to find surveys documenting the existence of gangs on school campuses. Most of the research on gangs has focused on *males,* largely ignoring the role of *females.* A special section devoted to girls and gangs is included in this essay.

WHAT IS A GANG?

The terms *gang* and *gang member* can have many different definitions and be subject to gross misinterpretation. Criminologist Gil Geis of the University of California–Irving has provided one of the *more* interesting comments about the etymology of the term, noting that the early English usage of *gang* was "a going, a walking, or a journey." The definition given by the *Random House College Dictionary* provides similar meanings of a positive or neutral nature, such as "a group or band," "a group of persons who gather together for social reasons," "a group of persons working together; squad; shift; *a gang of laborers,*" along with the more negative meanings. The thesaurus of the word processing program used to type these words gives such synonyms as "pack," "group," "company," and "team."

Not surprisingly, there has existed little consensus among social scientists and law-enforcement personnel as to what these terms mean. One writer defined gangs as groups whose members meet together with some regularity, over time, on the basis of group-defined criteria of membership and group-defined organization. In many studies, researchers have often used whatever definition was used by the police. Many researchers have apparently confused the term *group* with the term *gang* and have proceeded to expand the definition in such a way as to include every group of youths who commit offenses together.

Adding to the ambiguity of the term "gang" is a recent "National Youth Gang Survey" sponsored by the U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. In this survey of about 5,000 agencies, a "youth gang" was defined as a group of youths or young adults in your jurisdiction that you or other responsible persons in your agency or community are willing to identify or classify as a "gang." Omitted from this definition were such groups as motorcycle gangs, hate/ideology groups, prison gangs, or other exclusively adult gangs. In other words, a "gang" is whatever an agency says it is.

Two noted researchers, David Curry and Irving Spergel (see Spergel, 1995), define *gang* as a group or collectivity of people with a common identity who interact on a fairly regular basis. The community may view the activities of the gang as legitimate, illegitimate, criminal, or some combination of these. Gangs are distinguished from other groups by their communal or fraternal, different, or special interstitial character. Curry and Spergel define *street gang* as a group or collectivity of persons engaged in significant illegitimate or criminal activities, mainly threatening and violent. The emphasis is placed on the location of the gang and their gang-related activities. Finally, they define the *traditional youth gang* as a group that is concerned primarily with issues of status, prestige, and turf protection. Such gangs may have a name and a location, be relatively well organized, and persist over time. They often have implicit or explicit leadership structures, codes of conduct, colors, special dress, signs, symbols, and the like. They also may vary across time in such characteristics as age, gender, community, race/ethnicity, or generation, as well as in scope and nature of their delinquent or criminal activities.

Another noted gang researcher, Ron Huff (2002), alerts us to a distinction that has gained more significance in recent years, namely, that existing between gangs and organized crime. As he notes, *youth gangs* historically were largely groups of adolescents (mostly male) who engaged in a variety of deviant activities, especially turf battles and gang fights. Now they are increasingly involved in major crimes, especially those that are violent or drug related. *Organized crime* has traditionally meant *adult* criminal enterprises operating businesses. Today such organized activities characterize many youth gangs. As a result, Huff's definition of a *youth gang* includes their frequent and deliberate involvement in illegal activities as well as their tendency to express their collective identity by claiming control over certain "turf" (persons, places, things, and/or economic markets). Youth gangs differ from organized crime groups, according to Huff, because the latter consist primarily of adults who are frequently and deliberately involved in illegal activities directed toward economic gain, primarily through the provision of illegal goods and services. Like participants in youth gangs, those in organized crime groups interact with one another frequently, but organized crime groups generally have better defined leadership and organizational structures than do youth gangs.

A BRIEF HISTORY

Gangs—or groups that have been labeled as such—have been in existence in America since the early nineteenth century. A study of a Philadelphia newspaper covering the years 1836 to 1878 found 52 different gangs identified. The report noted that in the pre-Civil War era Philadelphia was "plagued" by gangs. A report by the *New York Tribune* stated that the northern suburbs of Philadelphia during the years 1849 and 1850 were crawling with "loafers who brave only gangs, herd together in squads" and mark their names on the walls. In New York City in 1855, there were an estimated 30,000 men who owed allegiance to gang leaders and through them to the political leaders of Tammany Hall and the Know Nothings or Native American Party, according to one contemporary account. While public concern about gangs arose again briefly in the 1940s and 1950s, it was during the 1980s when the issue became headline news; and it has remained so into the twenty-first century. The rediscovery of gangs has been augmented by an escalation of media presentations about youth gang activities—particularly those gangs located within America's inner cities.

CONNECTIONS BETWEEN GANGS AND SCHOOLS

Not surprisingly, gangs are more likely to be found within urban than suburban or rural schools. In many parts of the country, the development of gangs can be traced directly to various conflicts in or near public schools. Los Angeles is a case in point. One of the earliest references to a "gang problem" in Los Angeles appeared in African American newspapers during the late 1940s. This was in reference, ironically, to *White* youths ("gangs?") who attacked Black people. There were reported "racial wars" in several Los Angeles area high schools during the late 1940s and early 1950s. Much like the groups of Hispanic youths who were called "gangs" by the White-dominated press when they sought retaliation against White sailors who had attacked Hispanic youths in the "Zoot Suit" riots of 1942, African American gangs emerged as a defensive response. These African American gangs defined themselves mostly in terms of school-based turfs. Some of the earliest of these gangs went by such names as the Slausons, Gladiators, Watts, Flips, Rebel Rousers, Businessmen, and the like. Some of them modeled themselves after the White "car clubs" so common throughout Southern California (e.g., the Slausons and the Flips). Some of these groups divided themselves into two factions, one group on the "Westside" (usually with more money and more sophistication) and the other on the "Eastside" (less money and less sophistication). Some of these "gangs" were merely the extension of intramural athletic rivalries, common in those days.

During the mid to late 1960s, a transformation began with the emergence of groups that called themselves Crips. There is some debate as to the exact origin of this term; some say it came from a movie starring Vincent Price, *Tales from the Crypt,* while others say it came from the word cripple because the original gangs crippled their enemies or suffered a similar fate. Another story was that it referred to a style of walking (i.e., walking as if one were crippled in some way). The most popular story was that the Crips were founded by a group of youths from Fremont High School (a youth named Raymond Washington is generally credited as the founder) that had one member who walked with the aid of a stick and who was referred to as a "crip," short for cripple. Some have suggested that the original gang used walking sticks as a sort of symbol and that the police and the media began to apply the name and so eventually the gang did, too. Several imitators came from the city of Compton. One group called themselves the Westside Crips, founded by a student from Washington High School known as Tookie Williams (whose execution in California in December 2005 caused much controversy nationally and internationally). They borrowed one of the cholo traditions of wearing railroad bandannas, and they added to this the color of blue. Other Crip sets soon began to imitate them by wearing blue bandannas and other blue clothing, a color that set them apart from others. (Some of these sets currently wear the colors brown, purple, and black.) Thus, during the early formation of Los Angeles gangs, schools played a key role. As several researchers have noted, school desegregation ironically contributed to the growth of the gang problem by placing rival gang members in the same schools and, in the process, destroying some of the turf connections of these gangs (more detail is given in Shelden, Tracy, & Brown, 2004).

Today gangs are found within practically every major urban high school in the country. In a study conducted in the early 1990s, Spergel (1995) provided the following percentages of those within the Chicago school system who reportedly were in gangs: 5 percent of the elementary school youths, 10 percent of all high school youths, 20 percent of those in special school programs, and, more alarmingly perhaps, 35 percent of those between 16 and 19 years of age who had dropped out of school. It is normal to find more than one gang within the same school, often resulting in conflicts taking place. This may, of course, result from a certain gang seeking to expand its “turf” or just plain ordinary conflicts over minor matters (e.g., someone “dissed” someone else, fights over girlfriends, etc.). Also common are fights between rival gangs from different schools, such as during athletic events. Although rare, some of these disputes result in a youth being killed, whereupon gang members seek revenge by engaging in a “drive-by shooting,” either before, after, or even during school hours.

On some school campuses, certain gang members engage in drug dealing. Studies have shown that the school grounds may be ideal places to engage in such activity. Some gang members have devised rather sophisticated techniques for getting the drugs onto the campus and distributing them, not unlike regular business enterprises. Despite the media attention devoted to the connection between drugs and gangs, the illegal drug market is not dominated by street gangs. To be sure, there is a small number of what are called “drug gangs” who engage in drug dealing, but the evidence is overwhelming that most of the serious illegal drug dealing is done by people who are not involved in such famous street gangs as the “Crips” and the “Bloods.”

As almost every study of gangs has found, one very important key to understanding why kids join gangs is the school experience. A close look at the development of Latino gangs in Southern California is a case in point, as school became a serious problem for many second-generation Latinos in this area. This applies equally to other gangs in other cities, as one of the key characteristics distinguishing gang members from other youths from similar backgrounds is that of school failure. A high incidence of dropping out and/or exclusion or expulsion from school resulted in what Latino gang expert James Diego Vigil (1998) called a situation in which significant numbers of barrio youngsters are socialized to a considerable degree in the streets. The majority of the gang youths Vigil studied began to withdraw from school life by the third or fourth grade. For many, their school careers began with skepticism, limited parental encouragement, and early exposure to street experiences that did little to promote self-discipline. Long before they officially dropped out (usually around age 16), they had been turned off by school. Some began to have problems as early as kindergarten, with the language barrier being the predominant cause. Many had experienced a great deal of prejudice and discrimination. Most of the problems at school began long before any involvement with a gang.

A typical experience in school is related by Felix Padilla (1992) in his study of a Chicago gang. He describes the gang members he studied as being labeled deviants and troublemakers by school officials, usually during their elementary school years (some as early as the fourth grade), long before they joined the gang. These youths responded as if their labels were a self-fulfilling prophecy: They joined with others so labeled and engaged in corresponding behavior. These youngsters began to develop various forms of oppositional behavior such as fighting, cutting classes, and not doing homework. Many began to develop a distinctive subculture within which they could examine and interpret what was going on in their lives and in school. In short, very early in their lives these youths began to respond in ways that were almost identical to gang behavior. In effect, says Padilla, they were undergoing early preparation for a later stage in their teenage years (during high school) when they would finally join the gang.

It is important to note that these particular youths experienced a form of public humiliation from some of their teachers and some of their own peers. This humiliation often took the form of negative evaluations of their own Puerto Rican culture. Such experiences were quite painful, and the youths quickly sought out others who were similarly branded and, therefore, perceived to share a common fate. With support from these others, these youths reported that they sometimes talked back to or laughed at the teacher and hit other students, trying by such actions to be as bad as the teacher thought they were.

Another response to the school-based problems faced by the Puerto Rican youth whom Padilla (1992) studied was that most concluded that it was better to simply stay out of school than be victimized by the constant verbal assaults by their teachers. So, they began skipping school, most as early as elementary school. This became a regular experience, one in which they found pleasure. Instead of being facilitators of the goals of these youngsters, the institution of education and its agents—the administrators and teachers—were experienced as antagonistic elements in their socialization.

Like the Puerto Rican youths Padilla studied in Chicago, the Latino youths Vigil (1998) studied in California often experienced marginalization as a result of conflicts between the Latino and White cultures. This conflict has created problems for Latino families, which in turn has meant that these families have lost some of their effectiveness as a social-control institution. As a result, schools and the police have taken over this function.

For gang members, a lack of strong attachment to the home and to the school has created an environment in which the gang provides answers. It is here, in the gang, where they associate and identify with similarly marginalized youths. Vigil noted that the gang has served to "resocialize" members of a group by teaching them alternative norms and behaviors. In this way, gangs help troubled youth feel a sense of importance, self-esteem, and self-identity.

Padilla's Chicago gang members indicated that one of the turning points in their lives came during high school. Prior to this time most of these youths were marginal members of the gang, engaged mostly in hanging out on the street corners or at school; "turning" (becoming regular and committed gang members) came during their early high school years. Throughout their elementary school years, most of the gang members referred to themselves as "neutrons"—that is, those with no affiliation to any of the many gangs within their neighborhood. However, this status was constantly being challenged by members of the various competing gangs. The punishment that they received from these gangs was aimed not so much to pressure them to turn but rather to ensure that they would remember the importance of remaining neutrons. Among gangs there is constant fear that these neutrons might become informants for another gang or, even worse, be informants for the police. The decision to turn came rather informally without much thought.

Over time, youngsters become embedded in the street subculture, which has become institutionalized—that is, a permanent fixture in poor communities. The streets provide these kids with a network of support that is available in neither their families nor their schools. In short, the gang subculture takes the place of the family and the school.

GIRLS, SCHOOLS, AND GANGS

Girls' involvement in gangs has never been as frequent as that of their male counterparts. When they have been involved, it has usually been as so-called auxiliaries to male gangs. However, the extent to which girls have been involved in gang life may be understated because of the vague definitions of gang, gang member, and even gang involvement. Because most male gang members have relationships with females, such females are, almost by definition, at least associate gang members.

There is a general consensus in the research literature that girls become involved in gang life for generally the same reasons as their male counterparts, namely, to meet basic human needs such as belonging, self-esteem, protection, and a feeling of being a member of a family. The backgrounds of these young women—poverty, single-parent families, minority status, and so on—are about the same as those of male gang members.

The case studies of girl gang members in many different parts of the country reveal the common circumstances in their lives. The crimes that they commit are, for the most part, attempts to survive in an environment that has never given them much of a chance in life. Most face the hardships that correspond to three major barriers—being a member of the underclass, being a woman, and being a minority. The gang, while not a total solution, seems to them a reasonable solution to their collective problems (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004).

Not surprisingly, school problems figure prominently in the lives of girl gang members. Most girl gang members are, like their male counterparts, highly likely to drop out of school. For instance, a study of San Francisco gangs found that the median number of years of education was 10, and only about one-third were actually in school at the time of the interviews. These researchers concluded that the prospects for these young women—unmarried, with children, less than a high school education, and few job skills—can only be considered bleak. A study of the Vice Queens in Chicago found that most attended school only sporadically because they experienced much conflict with school officials (for more details about these studies, see Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004).

Many analysts have noted that school is often deemed totally irrelevant to the lives of gang members, and this perception motivates them to drop out and become part of a gang. For most girl gang members, success is elusive, as avenues of opportunity for girls living in poverty are blocked in several different ways. These include lack of education, training, access to meaningful employment, and few, if any, career possibilities.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Chesney-Lind, M., & Shelden, R.G. (2004). *Girls, delinquency and juvenile justice* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Huff, C.R. (Ed.). (2002). *Gangs in America* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Padilla, F. (1992). *The gang as an American enterprise.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Shelden, R.G., Tracy, S.K., & Brown, W.B. (2004). *Youth gangs in American society* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Spergel, I. (1995). *The youth gang problem: A community approach.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Vigil, J.D. (1998). *Barrio gangs.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Randall G. Shelden

Heterosexism and Homophobia in the Peer Group

Comments hurled at one another in the hallways, on the field, in the locker room, in the classroom, in the cafeteria, on the bus, and virtually everywhere on school grounds, such as “That’s so gay,” “Stop being so gay,” “You throw like a girl,” “Dyke,” “Bitch,” “Ho,” “Be a man,” “Slut,” have become common epithets in the relational culture among students. Kids put each other down as routinely as they comb their hair, often without regard to the impact of their words. Students admittedly *do not mean* anything bad about gay people when they say, “That’s so gay!” (object-directed) and “You’re so gay” (person-directed), and yet the implications are blatantly negative—“nasty,” “disgusting,” “stupid,” “gross,” “weird,” or “idiotic.” Never would a student go up to his friend and say, “Wow, I love your sneakers! They’re so gay!”

Such terminology serves to put each other down while, at the same time, it keeps both girls and boys inside narrowly defined gender scripts. For those who do not conform to these scripts, this language is the genesis of fear and power in the peer culture. The pressures, especially in middle schools, are daunting, and students quickly become aware of what is and is not acceptable. Homophobia and heterosexism permeate the peer culture and affect *all* students (heterosexual, as well as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, and questioning students). Inherent in the complex nature of peer socialization are both subtle and overt homophobic and heterosexist language by means of which students police each other’s behaviors and identities. Thus, whether a student is gay or lesbian is not the focus but rather how students police each other’s identities and behaviors through the subtle yet overt use of homophobic and heterosexist language and behaviors.

GENDER AND SEXUALITY MESSAGES IN THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM AND PEER GROUP

Heterosexism—the belief that heterosexuality is normal or homosexuality is abnormal—is ingrained and so powerful. Heterosexist ideology in schools lies behind the message to students, still, that they must display heterosexual behaviors and largely remains an overt yet unspoken requirement in developing an appropriate gender identity in middle school (Mandel & Shakeshaft, 2000).

Homophobic and heterosexist social messages are learned very early in school in a hidden curriculum that has no book and no tests, the implications of which are powerfully clear. For example, heterosexist messaging is inherent in an elementary teacher's comment such as "Isn't that cute—Melanie and Zachary are holding hands. What a cute couple they make!" This type of statement affirms the heterosexual behavior displayed by Melanie and Zachary. But, if Zachary wanted to hold his best friend's hand, regardless if he was gay or not, the heterosexist response would be different: "You know boys aren't supposed to hold other boys' hands, don't you?"

When a girl and boy go to the school Valentine dance together as a "couple," their heterosexuality is not questioned. It is not only a given, it is understood. In fact, most people think it is cute or sweet or romantic. Conversely, this same type of affirmation is not extended to homosexual youth or questioning youth. Teachers and other adults say such things as, "You must just really like him as a friend," "You haven't dated enough girls," "You just haven't met the right girl." Often, gay and lesbian students are told, "It's just a phase" or "You must be misinterpreting your feelings." Even though homophobia and sexism are not in the lesson plan, the attitudes are still taught, and still learned.

Peers do the same to each other. For example, a heterosexual seventh-grade boy who does not show interest in girls is subject to his friend's comments such as, "You don't like a girl? What are you, gay?" It is not at all only gay students who are at risk. Appearing less than masculine or being perceived as gay or lesbian is just as harmful. The Safe Schools Coalition of Washington released research findings in 1999 showing that heterosexual students who had been harassed because someone believed they were gay were three times as likely as nonharassed heterosexual peers to report having missed school out of fear for their safety.

The peer culture has its own curriculum. Homer Simpson echoes the power of the peer culture in an episode of the popular U.S. TV show *The Simpsons* when Marge came home with a new shirt for Homer. He looks at the shirt and says, "I can't wear this pink shirt to work. Everyone will make fun of me! I'm not popular enough to be different." A boy who does not dare wear (or own) a pink shirt consciously, or perhaps unconsciously, fears the (homophobic) implications—"If I wear a pink shirt, does that mean I'm gay? Will others think I'm gay?" or "If I wear a pink shirt, I'll make sure I hang out with a girl so no one will bother me." Fitting in is key, and boys learn early on that not adhering to gender role expectations invites homophobic-driven mockery, laughter, ostracism, ridicule, and isolation.

As Homer Simpson's remark indicates, popularity is a social currency that allows students to transcend homophobic and heterosexist barriers. Boys with social status, for example, those who tend to be athletes, popular, attractive, etc., carry a social currency that allows them to step outside the gender box largely without threat to their image and identity.

MIDDLE SCHOOL EXPECTATIONS

As gender and sex-role expectations become more pronounced in middle school, so do heterosexist and homophobic messages. For example, boys who step outside of traditional cultural gender role expectations or who display traits that are perceived as less than stereotypically masculine, a misogynist component of homophobia, are often subject to ridicule, teasing, and harassment by peers. Boys know and internalize the message that being a sensitive male or a gay male in middle or junior high school is the worst possible thing to be.

Compulsory heterosexuality, especially for boys in middle or junior high school, is essential; the peer culture is often hostile and unwelcoming otherwise. Boys police their own and each other's masculinity. Explicit homophobia and implicit heterosexism found within schools derives from and feeds macho and misogynistic versions of masculinity (Epstein, 1997). Further, being a "proper" boy involves investing in a heterosexual identity within which girls are central to the formation of boys' gender cultures and identities (Renold, 2005). Feelings of homophobia reinforce one's heterosexuality through hypermasculinity. Males who commit date rape or other sexual assaults often adhere to stereotypes about gender and sex roles that view feminine attributes as inferior and, therefore, unacceptable for men, creating a misogynistic mentality and a need to prove their masculinity.

Heterosexism plays a part in the peer socialization and development of gender identity for girls as well, though it may appear to have a more acceptable presence than the ubiquity of homophobia in male peer socialization. It is largely the case that girls buy into and exploit their femininity and sexuality largely to attract attention from boys. The fashion and media moguls marketing to teenagers and tweens are potentially undoing years of great advancements among the work of feminists and gender pioneers. According to a report published in 2004 by the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, 65 percent of girls and boys ages 12 to 19 agreed that teen girls often receive the message that attracting boys and looking sexy is one of the most important things they can do. Girls feel that they are not looked at by boys unless they are perfect (i.e., having a decent body). In a culture where stores are cropping up everywhere enticing young girls to have glamorous makeup parties in dress-me-up clothes, beauty blast accessories, and, of course, Hollywood starlet mood mist and a never-leave-home-without-your-tiara attitude, the messages girls receive blatantly reinforce traditionally stereotypic gender and sex roles now more than ever. Add to this the fact that teen girls are now being given gift certificates for plastic surgery for their 16th birthdays and high school graduation presents.

With growing rates of depression and pressure to be attractive and sexually active at younger ages, heterosexism inherent in this ideology is rarely named or called what it is, especially in schools. We question girls' resistance and resilience to these pervasive images and messages in which females are valued solely by their appearance and their attractiveness to males. Although girls can and do have more leeway than boys to develop a wide range of feminine and masculine attributes, many girls put tremendous emphasis on and energy into their popularity, appearance, and relationships with boys, overemphasizing appearance over intelligence and aspirations.

Another notable disparity that exists in the peer culture is with regard to antigay harassment against lesbian and bisexual girls, which often goes unnamed and unchallenged. For example, boys who stare and make gestures about a girl's body or behavior, refer to girls as "bitches," or ask a girl if they can party with her and her girl friend are engaging in sexual harassment layered with homophobic violence (Goldstein, 2001). These actions are just as antigay as the more familiar type of name-calling and schoolyard bullying. Yet, too often the behaviors boys exhibit toward girls or the statements about wanting to "watch" or "join" the girl and her girlfriend are not perceived by girls (or adults) as an invasion with an implicit threat of sexual violence because of the mixed gender script of the expectation and the girls' conditioning to attract male attention. Despite an expanded role for girls in developing gender identities, girls continue to experience sexual harassment by the simple act of being female. Additionally, girls who question their sexuality are often viewed as doubly enticing to males, further bolstering their masculinity while, in a real sense, invalidating female sexuality.

GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDERED YOUTH

A decade ago, the *Harvard Educational Review* (1996) was the first of three education journals to publish a special issue on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered (GLBT) people and education, a chapter of which was dedicated to writings by high school and college students offering their firsthand accounts of the world of pain and alienation they and other young people face when forced to live a secret life. Ten years later, gay and lesbian characters on MTV, in magazines, and on television shows are more visible; high schools are more welcoming to gay and lesbian students; and kids are disclosing their homosexuality with unprecedented regularity and at much younger ages. Nevertheless, the battle for equity is far from over.

Many of the advances just mentioned have not been enjoyed at the middle school level. Violence, bias, and harassment of GLBT students continue to be the rules, not the exceptions, in America's schools. According to a 2004 report by the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), 84 percent of GLBT students report being verbally harassed because of their sexual orientation and between 92 percent and 97 percent of students report hearing remarks, such as "Faggot", "Dyke" or "That's so gay" from peers in school. Additionally, 45 percent of GLBT youth of color report being verbally harassed because of both their sexual orientation and race/ethnicity.

Adults are often desensitized to the negative, derogatory impact of such language and kids excel at not getting caught. GLSEN reported in 1999 that 76 percent of the largest school districts in the United States provided no training for staff on issues facing gay youth. The acceptance of derogatory comments by school staff—part of the "hidden curriculum"—continues at unacceptable levels and is too often ignored. Perhaps this is not so surprising given that 41 states have no laws or educational policies that explicitly protect GLBT students. Only eight states legally protect students on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity: California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin; and these states enroll only 25 percent of the country's schoolchildren.

Further research indicates that GLBT high school students have reported being subjected to either verbal or physical harassment, including genital groping, sexually offensive labeling, shoving, spitting, bra snapping, underwear stealing, being stripped, being tied up, and being mock raped. GLBT students try to make themselves invisible so their sexual orientation and gender identity or expression will not be detected and, as a result, limit their learning experiences. In the peer culture, too often students who are—or who are perceived to be GLBT—are threatened with physical violence as well: "You faggot —I'm gonna kick your ass on the way home from school." "What a dyke—be careful in the locker room, lezzy!" The fear instilled by such threats begins to dictate their actions and even their thought patterns.

GAY-STRAIGHT ALLIANCES IN SCHOOL

One approach to addressing homophobia and heterosexism in adolescent peer groups is by means of gay-straight alliance clubs (GSAs). GSAs are school-based student clubs that provide a safe space for students and staff to advocate for the needs of

GLBTQ(uestioning) students and to promote social justice with students who want to make a difference. GSAs are school-sanctioned clubs that highlight the need for GLBT and heterosexual student allies to come together to promote safety, respect, understanding, and support. According to GLSEN, the number of GSAs has increased during the past 10 years from 100 clubs on U.S. high school campuses to nearly 3,000 clubs today—nearly 1 in 10 high schools has one.

Students who have started gay-straight alliances in their high schools are making notable strides in changing school peer cultures largely because they believe that antigay language and sentiments are actually uncool and, moreover, politically incorrect. Heterosexual students contribute greatly to these inroads by outwardly expressing support for their peers and by responding to offensive homophobic slurs—whether or not a student is homosexual.

In middle schools, far fewer GSAs exist, only 290 nationally. Yet, there are at least three important reasons why addressing homophobic language and sexuality in middle school/junior high school is extremely important. First, the age of sexuality awareness has dropped. The issue of sexuality in general peaks in seventh and eighth grades, and many kids are questioning their sexuality at this age. Although the average age a gay person comes out is around 17 to 18 years old, individuals develop attractions to each other much earlier. Between the 1960s and 1990s, studies indicate that the age of the first same-sex attraction dropped from age 14 to 10 for males, and from 17 to 12 for females —that is, fourth through seventh grades. And, many sense something different about themselves as early as age four or five.

A second reason to address sexuality and homophobia in middle school is that these schools tend to have very homophobic peer cultures that need change. Fortunately, there are many students at this age who sense the injustice of heterosexist and homophobic language and want to make things better. These students want to make a difference, and GSAs are a way to do this. Thus, support for students' good impulses provides a third reason for addressing issues of homophobia in middle schools.

Yet, comments from students in a middle school who joined a GSA reveal that doing so was very difficult. Students who walked through the door of the after-school club meetings had to face their peers who made comments to them such as "There's the GSA kid" when they saw them in the hallway. They even got spit on in the cafeteria, and, during meetings, notes would often be slipped under the classroom door that read, "Look at those fags" or "You're queer!" Non-GSA students would huddle outside the door waiting for the meeting to be over just to see who had attended. Several students shared how they were judged by kids in school and even how some students stopped being friends with them because they were attending GSA meetings.

Addressing gay issues at the middle/junior high school level is difficult and controversial not only for the peer group but also for parents who often fear that mentioning the topic is an invitation for their son or daughter to be gay. Though this homophobic fear is not accurate, it can seem very real. Many parents and adults believe that kids do not really know or understand their sexuality until high school or college and that introducing any discussion in middle school threatens their belief system. In the middle school where the students talked about their GSA-related difficulties, a parent of an eighth-grade student wrote a letter to the principal that stated: "I request that you notify me prior to any classroom discussion of any issues of sexuality, including any discussions of homosexuality or alternative lifestyles in school or in any after school activity so that I may have my child opt out of such discussions."

Even those parents who truly embrace their children expressed their difficulty in accepting or understanding their 13- or 14-year-olds' interest in being in the GSA. These students who believe that speaking out for acceptance and respect is important in middle school express that they do not feel supported by their parents largely, perhaps, because they do not understand that a GSA is a gay-*straight* alliance, not just a gay alliance. Said one youngster, "My dad doesn't understand why I'd be in this club since I'm not gay. He doesn't get it." And, another who reported that her mother did not want her to participate in GSA said in a tearful voice, "I think this is such important work—we're about tolerance. So what if people are gay, or lesbian, or whatever?"

TEACHERS CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Although it is encouraging to witness students working to change the peer culture in their schools by joining GSA clubs that oppose antigay language and educate about antigay language and heterosexist attitudes, these students, especially younger ones, cannot, nor should they be expected to, lead this effort alone. Administration, faculty, and other adults are key in this effort. The importance of a teacher's intervention is nicely illustrated by the case of Jared.

"Try to get 'em now, you fag!" a middle school classmate shouted after kicking Jared's keys down the hallway as they fell out of his backpack. Walking into English class, boys on the lacrosse team whispered, "So who do you like Jared, huh? We know you like him!" They cracked up just as the bell rang for class. These seemingly subtle incidents, along with being shoved in the hallway, spit on in the cafeteria, and finding "Go home you faggot" written in red marker on his locker are only some examples of the taunting Jared endured on a daily basis in eighth grade.

Several months into the school year, Jared's art teacher began a visual communication project in class in which she facilitated a discussion about social issues that they wanted to communicate a message about in their art projects. Students shared about how kids label each other, how peer pressure is difficult, how the media influences kids, etc. Jared raised his hand and said, "I want to do something about sexual harassment." "Why would you want to do it on that?" asked a student. "There's this kid in math and every day—I'm not kidding—he sexually harasses me." One girl immediately shouted, "Ewe!" Another said, "He can't be sexually harassing you!" And a boy snapped, "Uh, I don't think so!" The teacher replied, "Well, wait a minute, what is he doing or saying to you?" "Everyday he blows me kisses and says, 'Hiiiiiii Jarrrrrrred!' I tell him to stop and he doesn't," Jared said. A student said, "Well then he's telling you you're gay!" Another said, "He's putting you down." And, a third said, "That's not sexual harassment, Jared!"

The teacher asked the class, "If a boy blew kisses to a girl everyday, and she didn't like it or didn't like him, but he did it everyday even after she told him to stop, would that be considered sexual harassment?" There was silence. The teacher applauded his courage and affirmed that what Jared described *is* a form of sexual harassment.

The peer culture at the middle school level is fraught with adolescents trying on new roles and identities while at the same time vying for peer acceptance, approval, and belonging. Jared is an example of how heterosexism and homophobia impact all students, not just gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. Though a heterosexual male, Jared has been ostracized, made fun of, sexually harassed, and verbally threatened because he engenders cultural traits deemed by students as less than masculine.

Administration, faculty, and staff are key in addressing, and helping students address, homophobic and heterosexist language, behaviors, attitudes, and assumptions. But, too often schools treat violence not as a problem engendered by the climate of the school but as an individual's problem. It is as if they were saying, "See—if you didn't act that way, or if you weren't gay or lesbian, then people wouldn't treat you differently," instead of identifying heterosexism as the problem.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

California Safe Schools Coalition and 4-H Center for Youth Development. (2004). *Consequences of harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender non-conformity and steps for making schools safer.* Davis: University of California. Available at http://www.nclrights.org/publications/pubs/SafePlacetoLearnLow.pdf

Cianciotto, J., & Cahill, S. (2003). *Education policy: Issues affecting lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth.* New York: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.

Epstein, D. (1997). Boys' own stories: Masculinities and sexualities in schools. *Gender and Education, 9*(1), 105–116.

Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual People and Education. (1996). [Special issue]. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(2).

Goldstein, N. (2001, September 12). *Invisible women: A closer look at anti-gay harassment shows many have yet to see what young women face daily in school.* Available as an independent source from GLSEN Education department www.glsen.org

Lee, C. (2002). The impact of belonging to a high school gay/straight alliance. *High School Journal, 85*(3), 13–26.

Mandel, L., & Shakeshaft, C. (2000). Heterosexism in middle schools. In N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at school* (pp. 75–103). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Renold, E. (2005). *Girls, boys and junior sexualities: Exploring children's gender and sexual relationships in the primary school.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Laurie Mandel

Robert Vitelli

Peer Cultures and Friendships in School

Peer cultures consist of descriptive and evaluative meanings that peer groups assign to behaviors and relationships, and the interactions among peer group members consist of talk and behaviors that construct, maintain, consolidate, challenge, or change these meanings. The interpretations peer group members construct for themselves and their own experiences are usually part of a broader process in which meanings are also assigned to other groups and individuals. This seems to be particularly true in school settings where peer groups often construct their identities in contrast to those of "outsiders." A classic example of this process is provided by "the lads," the group of rebellious, English, working-class students studied by Willis (1977), whose conversations make abundantly clear that they defined themselves and their experiences in opposition to attitudes and behaviors attributed to the conformist students they called "the ear'oles." The lads also constructed their own efficacy and superiority through processes of interaction in which limited, sexualized identities were assigned to girls, and ethnic minorities were labeled "wogs" and "bastard Pakis" and treated as "smelly" interlopers.

"The lads" and "the ear'oles" are examples of two kinds of peer cultures: a *chosen peer culture* that is constructed by friends within a given peer group, and a *labeled peer culture* that is constructed by those outside that culture to refer to people different from themselves. Both chosen and labeled peer cultures are often based upon demographic characteristics such as age ("tweens"), social class ("yuppies"), race-ethnicity ("wogs," "brothers," or "bros"), and gender ("lads," "debs"). An extensive research literature has appeared detailing ways in which demographic similarities and differences affect the social construction of peer cultures, with the more consistent findings being reported for social class and gender differences across chosen peer cultures.

A central concern among those who study peer cultures in schools has been the extent to which such cultures support or undermine the official school culture's emphasis on academic achievement. Much concern, even hysteria, has been expressed about the conflicts between adolescent peers and adults both in and out of schools. Criticisms of specific peer cultures and of students, more generally, are often premised on the notion that schools are focused principally, or even entirely, on important academic endeavors that the students fail to understand and respect. Although this notion is fallacious, there is evidence that high academic demands and fair treatment of students may encourage peer cultures to become more positive toward and involved in their schooling.

CHOSEN VERSUS LABELED PEER CULTURES

The literature on peer cultures in schools has yielded a colorful array of identity labels. In addition to the lads, ear'oles, bros, and debs mentioned above, there are normals, freaks, politicos, rads, greasers, rah-rahs, crispies, grits, brains, trendies, grinds, hoods, populars, dweebs, workers, nerds, geeks, outcasts, preppies or preps, debaters, executioners, the power clique, cool kids, and the leading crowd. This list does not exhaust all the names that appear in the existing literature nor would an exhaustive list necessarily be a useful basis on which to construct a systematic typology of peer cultures. Some of the identity labels appear in only one study, and others take on different meanings as one moves from school to school. In addition, many of the labels reflect the national context in which the research was done. It would be most surprising to find North American students calling one another ear'oles, and the lack of cheerleaders in British schools makes it unlikely that students in that country would form rah-rah cultures.

What seems more likely to be comparable across national and school contexts is the fact that names given to groups of children, adolescents, or young adults may be either the accepted names of chosen peer cultures or the names that others give to labeled peer cultures. Cultures based on peer choice are those in which participants choose one another to be friends and construct their own culture out of their interactions. In research, such cultures are often identified by using ethnographic techniques, but some researchers use formal sociometric techniques that ask students to nominate their friends or to list those classmates they associate with most and least. Instead of being free and unbounded, however, both the choices students make and the cultural possibilities available to chosen peer groups are constrained by the contexts in which peers find themselves.

Despite these constraints, members of chosen peer cultures will see themselves and one another as members of the same group who choose to be with one another. Sometimes the group will be given a name like those listed above, but sometimes the identity of the group will not be linked to a specific name ("They're my friends." "They're the guys I run around with."). Personal claims to group membership will be validated by other members of the group and by the interaction patterns that exist among members.

In contrast to chosen peer cultures, labeled peer cultures are identified and defined by outsiders. These outsiders may be other students, parents, teachers, school administrators, researchers, or the mass media. Sometimes the peer cultures identified by outsiders actually exist as the cultural constructions of chosen peer groups, but this is not always true.

Labeled peer cultures serve two major purposes. One is to establish and elaborate the cultural identities of those who construct and label the peer culture. A good example of a peer culture constructed for this purpose is the ear'oles whose passivity and conformity were emphasized by Willis's (1977) lads as a means of asserting their own superior ability to create fun and excitement. Similarly, the students whom Eder (1995) observed at Woodview Middle School bolstered their own social standing by constructing a peer culture known as the grits whom they regarded as losers in the struggle for social status. A second purpose of labeled peer cultures is that they help to shape interaction and relationships. Once people can label one another, they become more certain about the ways in which they can and should behave toward one another. So, even if the students at

Woodview School could not agree on a precise definition of grits, they all knew that students who were grits were not desirable friends or associates.

When researchers construct peer cultures to which they do not belong, their purpose is to advance their analytic and theoretical arguments about adolescent or child cultures in school, national, or international contexts. A classic example can be found in the study of ten high schools by Coleman (1961). Although Coleman presents considerable information about the peer groups that were chosen by the students he studied, the primary argument of his work is that an adolescent culture is emerging in industrial societies. Adolescents are becoming increasingly peer oriented, and they share values, such as prizing athletics above scholarship, that are contrary to the values of their parents and teachers. These trends are particularly evident in large urban schools (vs. smaller rural schools) and among the students who are reputed by their peers to be in “the leading crowd” (vs. nonelite students). To support his arguments, Coleman (1961) presented a large amount of survey data.

Coleman’s arguments were paralleled by many of the arguments about the youth culture that were advanced in the decade following the publication of his book. When social constructions such as youth culture and adolescent culture become known to their supposed constituents, they can have important effects on peer cultures in many parts of the world. Connell, Ashenden, Kessler, and Dowsett (1982) observed that the Australian students whom they studied were able to sustain conflict with their parents’ views on schooling and other matters because they now had a strong group identity independent of their families, namely, the large complex of peer networks known as the youth culture that is largely outside of adult control. Like the labeled peer cultures identified by adolescents, those that are “discovered” by researchers and popularized by journalists both affect and are affected by the interaction patterns and cultures adolescents choose to construct for themselves.

SIMILARITY AND DIFFERENCES WITHIN PEER CULTURES

Chosen peer cultures are far more likely to consist of students who have the same background characteristics than of students with heterogeneous backgrounds. The reasons for this homogeneity are both structural and social psychological. *Structural reasons* include any features of school organization that promote segregation of students from different backgrounds. Age-grading has become an almost universal feature of schools worldwide. Also common are the tendencies to send students to schools in their own neighborhoods or communities, which are often homogeneous in social class and race-ethnic composition. Where they exist, private and parochial schools deliberately recruit students of particular social backgrounds. In addition, researchers have identified a broad range of school characteristics that affect proximities among students and, therefore, possibilities for friendship formation. These school characteristics include architectural features of the school building and grounds, school size, equipment and supplies, the organization of extracurricular activities, the authority structures of the classroom and school, and instructional groupings, such as curricular tracking or streaming.

Even when structural limits are taken into account, students still tend to choose friends who are similar to themselves. Two *social psychological reasons* seem to account for these tendencies. One is social pressure, which has been found to inhibit the development of friendships that cross age, gender, social class, or racial-ethnic lines. Adults often intervene to make certain that children select “appropriate” friends, and peers frequently do likewise. A second reason is the set of assumptions people tend to make about those who are similar to them. Social psychologists have found that most people make the assumption that similar others will like them more than dissimilar others. This assumption, coupled with the well-documented tendency of people to like those who like them, produces more reciprocal liking among those who are similar than among those who are not. Both assumed and actual reciprocity of liking, in turn, have been found by researchers to be strong predictors of friendship selection and stability.

If peer groups were less homogeneous internally, their cultures would probably become more similar to one another. Instead, research completed in the past half century suggests that the differences across peer cultures in background characteristics continue to be large and socially significant, and there is no indication that these differences are declining in size or importance. The sharpest and best substantiated of these differences are those produced by social class and by gender. The differences produced by age are more debatable, despite the large literature concerned with peer relations among children of various ages (see Bank, 1997, for a review). Surprisingly little research has appeared that directly contrasts the peer cultures of different racial and ethnic groups, and the research that has been done on the nature of minority peer cultures in schools tends to parallel the arguments about working-class cultures, but with less convincing evidence.

The major dimension for characterizing middle-class versus working- or lower-class peer cultures is orientation toward schooling, and a large literature contrasts the more positive orientation of middle-class groups with the negative orientation of those who come from working-class homes. Most of the researchers who have produced this literature agree that working-class and poor adolescents experience fewer successes and more failures in school than their middle- and upper-class counterparts. As a result, participation in peer cultures that rebel against schooling give working-class and poor adolescents (and unsuccessful middle-class students) an opportunity to gain the social support and status that they cannot gain in the official school culture. Although most researchers see these peer cultures as social problems, some argue that the major problem lies in the schools that fail to interest disadvantaged students, denigrate them, and treat them more harshly than students from more privileged backgrounds.

In the United States, researchers have argued that African American adolescents also participate in peer cultures that rebel against schooling. To do well in school is dismissed by these adolescents as “acting White,” a sign of betrayal not only of their peer culture but also of their entire race-ethnic community. Evidence to support this argument is mixed, with many studies showing that African Americans value schooling and high achievement in school as much as or more than White Americans, but other studies showing that doing poorly in school is explained by African American students as part of their rebellion against racism. And, as is true of arguments about working-class peer cultures, some researchers see rebellious African American peer cultures as a social problem, whereas others see the problem as one that is created by a racially inequitable educational system. Still others assert that the underlying problem is social class, which is highly correlated with race, and that the same differences in attitudes toward schooling that have been found between White peer cultures of predominantly working- and middle-class students also can be found between Black peer cultures of different social classes.

Unlike working-class peer cultures, middle-class peer cultures (of all race-ethnicities) help to perpetuate the educational system by embracing its central tenets, particularly competitive achievement. Students from middle-class backgrounds, and especially those who are members of elite groups within their schools, tend to value social and academic competition and are more likely to base their friendships on interests and activities, often switching friends as their interests change. In contrast, working-class students have been found to exhibit more support and loyalty to their friends, often to the point of avoiding those activities in which their friends are uninvolved. This has led some researchers to argue that working-class adolescents are more likely than their middle-class counterparts to view their personal networks, including their chosen peer cultures, as the most self-affirming element in their lives.

Although the findings about social class differences in competition versus loyalty to friends have been reported for both males and females, the literature concerned with peer cultures and resistance has tended to focus on boys rather than girls. In addition to being more likely to resist the official school culture, boys' cultures have been found likely to stress a form of masculinity based on toughness and sexual domination, and boys whose behaviors fail to be "masculine" enough are often declared to be homosexuals. Given the centrality of "masculine" aggression in the peer cultures of boys, it is hardly surprising that they tend to view girls as sexual objects and treat them accordingly. Because many of the sexual comments and behaviors boys direct toward girls are unwelcome, they meet the standard definition of sexual harassment, and a large number of studies have documented widespread sexual harassment in elementary and secondary schools.

It is often difficult for girls to resist these forms of harassment effectively. Ignoring them or countering them with sexual comments or behaviors directed at their male harassers may only serve to intensify the attacks directed at the girls. It is also difficult for girls (and boys) to know how to interpret some of the sexual comments and behaviors of their peers. Are these acts of unwanted sexual harassment or tokens of sexual and romantic interest? Popular cultural milieux that put so much emphasis on sex appeal and romantic relationships as the keys to self-fulfillment and happiness create contexts in which most girls would not want to ignore sexual and romantic overtures. In addition, the peer cultures girls construct for themselves often place a high value on attractiveness to the opposite sex.

The emphasis on sex appeal, romance, and boyfriends that is so often characteristic of the girl's peer cultures greatly strengthens the power that boys have over girls. Femininity comes to be defined as attractiveness to boys. Sexually aggressive behaviors by boys come to be seen as normal, even admirable. Similar behaviors among girls are deemed unacceptable and are likely to be sanctioned with derogatory terms, such as "slut," "slag," and "ho" or "whore." These terms do not reference only sexual behaviors. They also function to denounce and control behaviors by girls that are deemed too independent, assertive, or challenging. Not only boys, but girls themselves use these terms against one another. Acceptable girls come to be seen as those who are agreeable and passive.

Not all peer cultures are constructed around these styles of femininity and masculinity, but considerable research has now emerged suggesting that these are dominant cultural constructions in male and female peer cultures, at least in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. Although these cultural constructions are undoubtedly more common among middle school and high school students than among younger students, Thorne (1993) reports that the elementary school boys whom she observed used sexual insults and approached relations with girls in a daring, aggressive manner. Generally, however, research on children younger than middle-school age reveals gender differences that are less sexualized. This research has found that friendships of girls are intensively focused on one or a few friends and exhibit high levels of expressive intimacy, but boys both report and are observed to have more extensive friendship networks focused on activities, rather than "just talking."

As these findings suggest, researchers have also found a substantial amount of gender segregation in the peer cultures of children. This segregation is substantial even in preschools, and it tends to increase during the elementary and middle school years. High school peer cultures seem to be somewhat less segregated by gender, but the data to support this claim are often sociometric choices that are subject to alternative interpretations. It is possible, for example, that when asked to list their best friends, high school students include dating partners even though they and their partners are members of different, gender-homogenous peer cultures. Conversely, it is possible that high rates of dating across certain groups in a school may lead to a merger of those groups as when male athletes and female cheerleaders join to become ”rah-rahs” or “the leading crowd.”

CONFLICTS BETWEEN OFFICIAL SCHOOL CULTURE AND PEER CULTURES

Official school cultures include elements of an individualistic, competitive ideology that is particularly characteristic of the United States. In schools, the purpose of this individualistic competition is presumed to be high achievement, particularly in academic work but also in the nonacademic activities sponsored by the school. Although school staff assume that not all students can achieve at the highest levels, all are expected to take achievement goals seriously. Seriousness can best be demonstrated by working hard, respecting school staff, and obeying school rules. This portrait of official school culture is not unique to the United States, and it seems reasonable to assume that most schools throughout the world expect students to make serious efforts to perform well.

One of the more surprising findings to emerge from ethnographic studies of peer cultures in schools is the relatively low emphasis those cultures give to anything associated with the academic life of the school. This finding gains further support from studies using surveys and other research methods that have also found little emphasis within peer groups on academic matters. Studies in which students were asked to describe and evaluate chosen or labeled peer cultures in their schools report negative associations with being in an academically oriented peer culture (usually called by such names as “the brains” or “scholars”), and none reports that such peer cultures received the highest evaluation given to various peer cultures. The negative associations with being “a brain” include being “a grind,” lacking social skills and dating partners, being a teacher’s pet, and being “a nerd.”

Although the finding that peer cultures ignore academic matters or are hostile to high levels of academic achievement is a common finding, it is also contradicted by a substantial amount of research. Studies have found that many students of all races and social classes admire academic achievement; that less popular and more rejected students are judged to be less able academically; that popularity is positively associated with scores on measures of achievement; that students who struggle scholastically or have to be placed in remedial classrooms lose peer recognition; that high-ability peers are given more positive or neutral (“neither like nor dislike”) ratings than negative ratings; and that most students believe that their friends encourage academic achievement, at least to a moderate degree.

How can such findings be reconciled with findings that peer cultures devalue academic achievement? Some answers seem to lie in the age of students, the gender of students (and their friends), and the nature of the official school culture. With regard to age, it is noteworthy that peer support for academic achievement is more likely to be reported by students in elementary schools than in middle schools or high schools. In contrast, for nonacademic behaviors, especially “deviance,” most studies report that peer influence increases with age up to mid-adolescence (15–16 years of age) and then begins to decline.

With regard to gender, Riegle-Crumb, Farkas, and Muller (2006) have recently found that same-sex peer influence on academic striving of high school students is greater for girls than for boys. Specifically, they found that for girls, having female friends with higher subject-specific grades increases the probability that those girls will take advanced courses in all subjects the researchers considered: physics, precalculus/calculus, and honors English. For science and math, but not English, they also found that the effects of same-sex friends' grades on advanced course taking were stronger for girls who were in a predominantly female friendship group compared to girls who were not. In contrast to the girls, the effects of same-sex friends' grades on boys' subsequent advanced coursework was not significant. Interestingly, Riegle-Crumb and her colleagues suggest that this finding may result from a tendency among boys, in contrast to girls, to see their high-performing same-sex friends as competitors rather than as peers who can support, encourage, assist, and validate their own academic pursuits.

A third way of reconciling contradictory findings about the academic orientation of peer cultures is to look at the official school cultures in which different peer cultures exist. Many studies support the conclusion that undemanding official school cultures are likely to be found in the same schools as peer cultures that are unconcerned about or hostile toward getting knowledge, and there also are studies suggesting that high academic demands may be a necessary, albeit not a sufficient, condition for producing peer cultures that respect intellectualism. More research is needed to clarify the interaction processes by means of which a positive correlation is produced between the academic values (or lack thereof) of an official school culture and the values and behaviors of the peer cultures in that school. What is already clear from existing research is that many schools violate the popular image that they are places where an official culture that is focused on academic matters and is characterized by high achievement standards clashes with peer cultures that have failed to internalize the academic values of their schools. Instead, official school cultures often fail to develop themselves as contexts in which academic striving is expected, commonplace, and prized and in which all students—even those in "difficult" peer cultures that teachers do not like—are treated fairly and with respect.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bank, B.J. (1997). Peer cultures and their challenge for teaching. In B.J. Biddle, T.L. Good, & I.F. Goodson (Eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching, Part Two* (pp. 879–937). Dordrecht, Boston, & London: Kluwer.

Coleman, J.S. (1961). *The adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Connell, R.W., Ashenden, D.J., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, G.W. (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, families, and social division.* Sydney, Australia: George Allen & Unwin.

Eder, D. (with Evans, C.C., & Parker, S.). (1995). *School talk: Gender and adolescent culture.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Riegle-Crumb, C., Farkas, G., & Muller, C. (2006). The role of gender and friendship in advanced course taking. *Sociology of Education, 79,* 206–228.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Boys and girls in school.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Barbara J. Bank

Playgrounds and Recreational Activities

Gender equity plays an important role in children's education. Children whose educational experiences provide information about the varied roles of men and women and equal learning opportunities for boys and girls are better prepared for adulthood. Thus, it is not surprising that increased focus has been placed on the importance of gender equity in educational settings. Less attention, however, has been given to playgrounds and recreational activities as a stage for gender equity. Nevertheless, playgrounds are important settings for children's interactions with one another and can serve as platforms on which children act out and experiment with social roles both in the preschool years and in the elementary school years.

Before children reach elementary school, they have formed a cognitive foundation concerned with what it means to be a boy or a girl. This formation can be thought of as a process of self-socialization in which children begin to link their growing awareness of gender constancy to their own behavior and interactions with others. Young children actively engage in gendered behavior throughout the day. Through social interaction with others, children extract meaning, assign interpretations, and infer intentions that form the basis of gender construction. Thus, parents and teachers as well as other children contribute to what a child understands about gender and what she/he thinks about the social world.

The playground is an important forum for children to experiment with social roles and activities as well as to receive reinforcement for engaging in certain activities. Cues from such interactions help shape children's cognitive gender schemes and subsequently drive future behaviors and activity choices. Teachers need to be aware of the importance of gender equity on the playground and promote equal access of space for boys and girls as well as engagement in diverse activities. Through modeling, promoting mixed-gendered play, and emphasizing a multitude of activities for all children, teachers can help enhance children's experiences and expand their understanding of gender. To promote gender equity, this work needs to begin when children are young, and it needs to be continued throughout children's school years.

SELF-SOCIALIZATION OF GENDER

In their early years, children develop ideas of gender-appropriate behavior as a function of (a) their categorization of the self and others in the world; (b) the development of individual schemas, consisting of organized patterns of actions and thoughts assumed to be gender appropriate, that cognitively guide each of them in processing new information about gender; and (c) the social learning and behavior of gender-specific behavior. The development of gender concepts is sometimes referred to as self-socialization.

Through the process of self-socialization, children begin to connect their understanding and development of gender constancy to their social behavior choices and interactions with the social environment. When children understand what it means to be a boy or girl, then the environment plays a significant role in cuing what is appropriate behavior across multiple settings such as in the classroom or on the playground.

Children receive valuable information through reinforcement and punishment regarding what is gender appropriate. Reinforcement and punishment may come from multiple social partners. As a result, children's past and current experiences and interactions with others are critical to their construction of social roles.

Through processing environmental and social cues, children revise their gender schemas through self-socialization. These revised schemas, in turn, drive children's behavior and interactions, which then leads to further self-socialization and additional gender schema revisions. This cycle of interactions, schematic modification, and self-socialization is constantly taking place in young children. Therefore, how a child interprets certain activities and interactions in regards to gender will change with cognitive growth, time, and experience. Moreover, children's ideas about gender-appropriate behavior also change. Self-socialization connects the children's understanding of gender constancy, gender roles, and gender-appropriate behavior to the social behavior choices they believe (rightly or wrongly so) are available.

Children's complete understanding of what it means to be a boy or girl typically develops between the ages of two and seven years. Also during this period, masculine or feminine values develop from the child's understanding of what it means to be a boy or a girl as well as his/her ideas about sex roles. In turn, a boy (or girl) will come to value what is perceived as most like the self. These values lead to behaviors the child perceives as appropriate. As with children's knowledge and understanding of gender, what is considered to be appropriately masculine or feminine behavior changes over time.

The primary gender identity achievement of toddlerhood is the ability to label oneself accurately as either a boy or a girl. A simple and fun test of this is asking a child, "Are you a boy or girl?" and then, "Are you a girl or a boy?" Very young children have no understanding what the terms boy and girl mean and will answer the above questions by choosing the last label given. Children who correctly answer both questions may have a better understanding as to their own gender. Two year olds often cannot label other children as boys or girls. They may know the names of their friends, but gender is typically not a factor of consideration when toddlers play together. This is largely due to the type of play that children engage in at this age. Toddlers often engage in solitary play or parallel play on the playground with boys and girls intermingled together. It is not until around three years of age that children know their own gender as well the gender of others based on physical characteristics and appearances.

Next, children will come to believe that gender is stable and unchangeable. Between the ages of four and five years, children categorize the gender of a person based on rigid gender distinctions. Much to adults' disappointment, this is the age when teachers and parents will hear children say that women can be nurses, but not doctors, and only men can be mechanics. This can happen even when a child's own mother is a physician or a mechanic. This rigidity can lead to rigid rules to distinguish between the two genders. This can also lead to overgeneralization in order to cognitively categorize gender. For example, a male came to a child-care center to complete a carpentry project. He dressed and looked like a man and even had a mustache. But, his long hair tied back in a ponytail confused the children and led to a long child-led discussion as to his gender. Some children pointed to his activity and his mustache and said he was a man, while others pointed out his long hair and said he was a girl. In the end, the children asked the teacher, and his gender was established (no child would talk to the carpenter and just ask).

Once children understand gender constancy, they begin to identify strongly with their own gender and show a preference for same-gender playmates as well as same-gender toys and activities. Same-gender peers will positively reinforce gender-appropriate behaviors. This reinforcement will encourage and lengthen the time spent at gender-appropriate activities. Over time, children will learn what members of his/her in-group (same gender) do and do not do and will learn what is considered as gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate behavior and activities.

At approximately six or seven years of age, children begin to understand that gender is constant despite changes to appearance. In addition, it is not until six or seven that children realize that genitals are the central basis of gender categorization. As children become more cognitively mature, they are flexible in gender typing due to their increased involvement and experiences with diverse groups of people. They will also feel less uncomfortable about occasional deviations from their gender roles and less rigid about gender-role behavior.

INFLUENCES OF PEERS, ADULTS, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The environment, including the toys and activities, is crucial in the preschool years because with same-gender identification same-gender behaviors and values grow. Hence, if the child's environment offers or indicates gender roles that are narrowly defined, his or her gender schema will limit the choice of behaviors considered to be gender appropriate. As a result, the child can be limited in his/her choice of behaviors, activities, and toys.

On the preschool playground, young children will perceive the best choice as the one that goes along with what the in-group perceives as gender appropriate and then will engage in perceived gender-appropriate behaviors. Often what happens inside the classroom translates to what happens outside on the playground. For example, if the housekeeping area inside the classroom is a magnet for girls and not boys, then a small house-like structure on the playground will, even if it is not called a house, attract preschool girls who may call it a house. If boys do not see other boys or male teachers in the structure, then they will likely find other activities to participate in on the playground. The choosing of what is believed to be gender appropriate becomes a form of self-reinforcement. Such reinforcement leads to positive feelings about the behaviors and activities selected. Likewise, gender-inappropriate behaviors will be thought of negatively and will tend to be avoided.

The peer group is important to children of all ages. In the preschool years, as has been mentioned, young children often play with same-gender children and they reinforce each other's gender-typed behaviors. It is not uncommon to see separate groups of preschool girls and preschool boys at play on the playground.

Often, preschool-age boys engaging in what is considered to be gender-inappropriate behavior will receive greater criticism in comparison to girls. Preschool girls who engage in perceived gender-inappropriate activities may be ignored by same-gender peers and teachers. However, preschool boys who engage in female-preferred activities may receive both negative reinforcement and criticism from both same-gender peers as well as from teachers and parents. They may also receive criticism from members of the other gender. For example, doll play brought out to the playground by boys may be frowned upon by peers, teachers, and parents. Instead of valuing the nurturing aspects found in doll play, some adults fear that boys will lose their masculinity by engaging in such activities and will try to put a stop to such behavior.

Parents and teachers of young children can do much to promote gender equity in recreational activities both on and off the playground. Adults need to consider the kinds of toys they give their children of all ages. Often parents choose toys based on what they feel are appropriate interests for either a boy or a girl. As has been noted, parental treatment is very influential in the process of self-socialization and the development of gender concepts. Children use the information gained from parents and teachers about gender roles and gender-appropriate behavior when forming their own ideas about gender-appropriate behavior as well as their values. They also use such information in their development of gender constancy.

If parents and teachers teach the strong points of both genders, then the information children receive to process may be less gender stereotyped and rigid. The values a child then associates with his or her own gender may be less gender stereotyped as well. Children will probably still pass through the same stages and will process information based on gender, but the values, ideas, and schemas the children develop about gender, gender roles, and gender-appropriate behavior will be more flexible, and the behavior choices the child perceives as open will probably be wider and more varied.

The promotion of mixed-gender play broadens a young child's choices for activities and play. The more diverse children's experiences are, the more opportunities children have to learn a variety of skills. When adults and teachers support a child's gender schemas to be more varied, flexible, and broad and when their behaviors are likewise associated with both genders, then children have the opportunity to observe, practice, and learn skills needed with respect to school readiness as well as for later in life.

On the playground, teachers and other adults need to promote a set of shared goals in fostering each child's development of a positive gender identity without promoting only gender-typed behavior. Adults need to provide activities for both boys and girls that will lead to skills needed for school and life. These activities should include a variety of games and materials for both boys and girls that have traditionally been thought of as gendered. Teachers also need to promote both same-gender and mixed-gender play. It is important that teachers be aware of the negative reinforcement of children engaged in other-gender activity and to be aware of criticism, teasing, or exclusion based on a child's gender or choice of activity coming from other children as well as adults. Teachers must notice children who may feel excluded from an activity due to their gender, such as a girl who sits on the edge of the sand-building area showing interest but not joining the activity. Teachers need to watch for such children and invite them to join in with the other children and the teacher.

In addition, teachers need to make sure that the classroom and outdoor space facilitate children's involvement in a range of activities. For example, outside on the playground there may be dramatic play materials placed on top of the climbing structure, thus allowing boys and girls to engage in gross-motor play as well as dramatic play. Or, dramatic play materials, including dolls, toy people, and cars, as well as shovels and sand toys, can be added to the sand area. If there is a house-like structure on the playground, then woodworking and other tools could be added to it. This would promote mixed-gender play.

Teachers should involve themselves in activities in all areas. Women teachers should play on the climbing structures and men teachers should participate in outdoor art activities and doll play. In addition, teachers need to spend time in areas that are traditionally gender specific. Adults and teachers who keep the goal of gender equity in mind during the early years must continue to be vigilant in the elementary years because children will continue to separate themselves according to their gender. In fact, the highest degree of gender separation may occur among preteens on the playground. At this point in time, children are still actively constructing their social worlds and developing social skills. Through play and other activities, elementary school children actively shape their understanding of gender through social interactions.

On the elementary school playground, children explore and experiment with what they consider to be the norms about friendship, leadership, appearance, and competition through their social interactions. Many elementary schools have a time on the playground, also known as recess, which often occurs after lunch. What goes on during recess is not what one would always consider to be play. During a 20- or 30-minute recess, one may see aggression, romance, anger, embarrassment, humiliation, joy, and fear all mixed together along with play. Gender plays a role throughout all these interactions.

Gender-stereotyped clothing is also a common element seen on elementary school playgrounds. Elementary school children try to follow what they consider to be social rules and wear what they perceive as gender-approved clothing. The addition of coats on the playground is also gendered, and children are very aware of what colors are appropriate as well as what styles are acceptable.

Girls on the playground have many choices during recess. Girls group as dyads, socialize in small groups, participate in all-girl sports or mostly all-boy sports, join skill-building groups, socialize or hang with the adults present (usually monitors), or stand or sit alone. Girls may engage in sport or physical activities, social relationships, or creative arts such as singing or drawing. Boys on the playground have choices, too, but most become involved in sports. A few other boys not interested in sports tend to stick together as small groups. There are also some boys who stand and watch others. Overall, gender is reinforced in that, in almost all choices, children choose and interact with same-gender playmates.

Oftentimes, monitors, usually mothers, stand and watch children as they play but do little else. Girls are more likely than boys to spend time engaging them in conversation. Conversely, boys often try to stay away from monitors, especially when boys are more often than girls the ones that monitors admonish for incorrect behavior.

Most preteens do gender-specific work on the playground by playing in same-gender groups, playing gender-specific games, and conforming to the stereotypic dress. During the recess of preteen children, one will find a variety of team sports such as soccer or kickball. Most of these games are dominated by boys, which reinforces their competency on teams as well their competitive tendencies. The girls who do participate in these sports are often very good and highly skilled. Many girls will walk and talk on the playground and increase their social-relational skills. Girls who are more athletic can choose between walking and talking or joining a sports team with any choice acceptable by the larger groups of boys and girls.

Preteen boys and girls often exhibit border work on the playground. Border work is a term coined by Barrie Thorne (1993). On the playground, border work is behavior that reinforces the boundaries between the genders. Often one can see border work by observing girl versus boy contests on the playground, including team sports with all girls on one team and all boys on the other. Another example of border work is gendered chasing involving boys chasing girls or girls chasing boys. Invading one gender's space or game is done by both genders, but observational research indicates that it is more commonly done by boys. Sometimes the main purpose of invading is to join the game while at other times the invasion itself is the main purpose.

Excluding on the basis of gender is also done on the playground, and boys have been observed to practice more gender exclusion than girls and to be more likely to ignore girls who wish to join in their game. In contrast, one may also see troupes of girls who spend their recess time seeking out boys to talk with even if for a brief time. These troupes' main purpose is to talk with boys and get their attention.

The intent of border work can be just for fun. Other times, the intent appears to be a bit aggressive or it can include a romantic or sexual edge. Overall, boys tend to control the power by using more of the playground space, by being more aggressive, and by dominating mixed-gender play. Teachers need to be aware of these tendencies and work to promote equitable use of space and mix-gendered play that is productive rather than invasive in nature, such as establishing mixed-gendered teams of play. Teachers also need to facilitate and be involved with a diverse range of activities on the playground to promote activities as appropriate for both genders.

Teachers and adults need to do so much more than monitoring on the playground in order to promote children's sense of gender equity. Sometimes a male teacher or monitor will engage the children in a soccer game or other team sport on the playground. However, boys are often the children primarily drawn to such an activity. If the teacher would invite girls to join in and if female teachers or monitors would also take a more active role on the playground, team sports may become something both genders can choose to take part in. This may result in both boys and girls actively engaged in team sports on the playground, and the children might even participate as mixed-gender teams.

The layout of the playground should be considered so that boys do not dominate the area and take up a majority of the space with team sports. Teachers, other adults, and the children could work together to plan how the space of a playground can be equitably used by all the children. If there is room for only one team sport at a time, perhaps mixed-gendered games could be encouraged or a schedule could be implemented.

Gender equity is an important construct throughout children's education and should be considered across multiple settings, including the playground. Through social interactions and environmental cues, children interpret and assign meaning to experiences. These experiences form the basis for children's development of self-socialization and schemas about gender. The playground is an important forum for children to experiment with social roles and activities as well as to receive reinforcement for engaging in certain activities. Cues from such interactions help shape children's cognitive gender schemas and subsequently drive future behaviors and activity choices.

Teachers need to be aware of the importance of gender equity on the playground and promote equal access of space for boys and girls and engagement in diverse activities. Through modeling, promoting mixed-gendered play, and emphasizing a multitude of activities for all children, teachers can help enhance children's experiences and expand their understanding of gender. To promote gender equity, this work needs to begin when children are young, and it needs to be continued throughout children's school years.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Marshall, N.L. (Ed.). (2003). The social construction of gender in childhood and adolescence. [Special issue.] *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(10).

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in schools.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Wendy Wagner Robeson

Joanne Roberts

Part IX

Gendered Teaching and Administration

Overview

Both in the United States and in many other countries, educational institutions are characterized by a labor force that contains unequal numbers of men and women. The size and nature of this gender inequality varies considerably as one moves across job types and educational levels. Essays in this section of the encyclopedia focus primarily on teaching and administrative jobs, but even in only these two occupational categories, the distribution of men and women varies considerably across educational contexts. In general, it seems fair to say that men tend to outnumber women in the teaching and administrative jobs that command the highest salaries and give their incumbents the most autonomy, power, and prestige. In contrast, women tend to outnumber men in lower paying jobs. In addition, the jobs in which women predominate are often seen as being more "feminine" than the jobs held primarily by men.

At the present time in the United States and most other countries, the overwhelming majority of teachers at the elementary, middle, and secondary school levels are women. That this was not always the case is documented and explained in "Feminization of Teaching." For more than a hundred years, however, the cultural images of teachers, particularly elementary school teachers, have been dominated by nineteenth-century idealized assumptions about the nature of women and, especially, of mothers. Included among these assumptions are notions that women have maternal tendencies that attract them to infants and young children, that women are naturally more nurturant and caring than men, that women are more interested than men in building relationships with children, that women find mothering to be their primary source of self-fulfillment, and that mothers are willing to sacrifice for their children.

These notions have negative consequences for teachers of both sexes. The assumption that dealing with children is easy and natural for women hides the hard and stressful nature of the work done by women teachers and tends to keep their salaries at a low level. For men, one consequence is that those who choose teaching jobs are seen as making an unnatural, unmanly choice—unless, of course, they are using it as a stepping stone into educational administration. And, if supportive interaction with young children is seen as less natural for men than for women, it may also be assumed that men who teach in the primary grades must work harder to be as successful as women. This might discourage men from becoming elementary school teachers, but it could also have the ironic consequence of allowing them to earn more credit than their female counterparts for being nurturant, caring, and dedicated to their students.

This latter possibility gains some support from Gary Dworkin's extensive research, summarized in "Teacher Burnout," which shows that male teachers at the elementary levels where they have only token, or minority, representation were less likely to experience burnout or alienation from teaching than their female counterparts until educational reforms came along that changed the conditions of their work and caused the burnout rates of these male tokens to rise along with the rates of all the other teachers. Changing work conditions can affect not only the burnout rates of teachers but also the ways in which gender is constructed in schools. The essay on "Masculinity, Homophobia, and Teaching," for example, suggests that the restructuring of state schooling in England in the 1990s has remasculinized teaching with the greatest status accorded to those who have technical bureaucratic knowledge and a commitment to managerial efficiency and economic rationality. Although this change favors men over women, it also favors certain kinds of men over others.

Despite their large numerical majority, women teachers have not been able to control either the images people have of their work or the conditions of the work itself. As Marilyn Tallerico demonstrates in "Career Patterns in Schools," one reason for this lack of power is that women, as well as racial-ethnic minorities, are underrepresented in positions of authority, especially at the highest levels of school administration. Although it is true that teachers have some individual control over their classrooms and their pupils and that they have sometimes engaged in collective action to improve their working conditions, it is also true that their behaviors and outlook are crucially affected by the actions of administrators. Given current efforts on the part of many (male) school administrators to implement the kinds of "reform" efforts by government, described by Dworkin, that are aimed at controlling the day-to-day work of (women) teachers and holding them accountable for student outcomes, it does not seem too farfetched to suggest that some schools are becoming battlegrounds in a war between the sexes.

Would the battle be less intense and the power of women teachers greater if there were more women in school administration? Margaret Madden tackles this question in "Leadership Styles." By the definitions she provides, it is true that female administrators who engage in communal leadership will be more relationship-oriented, more supportive of teachers, and more willing to listen to them than male administrators who adopt an agentic style of leadership that is task oriented and assertive. Even though women may be more comfortable than men with communal styles of leadership, Madden discusses several reasons why it may not be possible for women administrators to behave in a supportive and collaborative manner.

One obvious reason is the fact that women are still far less likely than men to find themselves in leadership positions. Although optimists point out that women are more likely to hold positions in educational administration than they did 30 years ago, realists like Tallerico point out that this is not, in itself, a reason to assume that the proportions of women in educational administration will continue to increase. Reasons to be less optimistic can be found in the essay on "Work-Family Conflicts of Educators," which explains the ways and the reasons why women's teaching and academic careers are more likely to be negatively affected by their family responsibilities than the careers of men.

Not that men have it so easy either. In "Faculty Workloads in Higher Education," Sarah Winslow-Bowe and Jerry Jacobs provide substantial evidence to support the argument that men and women in academic positions are working harder than ever. The heavy demands that must be met to gain tenure and promotions make it increasingly unlikely that men who hold academic jobs will be willing to spend more time helping out at home. Thus, the burdens of home and family life will continue to fall more heavily on women. Even in the academic workplace, where women faculty are expected to meet the same heavy demands as men faculty, those women are often subject to additional job-related demands that their male colleagues can avoid. These demands and the stresses that accompany them are described in “Advising and Mentoring in Graduate Education” and in “Career Patterns in Higher Education.”

Despite their extra burdens, women faculty in the United States continue to be paid less, on average, than male faculty. One big reason for this difference is that women are proportionately more likely than men to hold part-time and adjunct positions, rather than tenure-track or tenured positions. Another reason is the fact that women are more heavily concentrated in lower status colleges and universities where salaries are also lower than in higher status, higher paying institutions. Even when men and women are employed at the same college or university, a third reason for women’s lower salaries is the fact that they are concentrated in fields of study, such as the humanities or home economics, that pay their faculty less than male-dominated fields such as the sciences or engineering. A fourth reason, central to the discussion of “Salaries of Academics” by Debra Barbezat, is the fact that salaries increase with rank, and women are less likely to be promoted up the ranks in the same proportion or at the same pace as their male counterparts. When women are compared to men who hold the same tenured or tenure-track rank in the same departmental and institutional context, and the women also have the same educational background, years of job experience, and research output as the men, the studies Barbezat reviews show that the gendered salary gap was greatly reduced during the last 30 years of the twentieth century. This is good news for women in academe and for everyone who favors gender equity, but the remaining question is how to eliminate all of the other gender gaps and occupational disadvantages that are documented in the essays contained in this section.

See also “School Counseling” in Part VII; “Evaluation Policies for Academics,” “Feminist Pedagogy,” and “Work-Family Reconciliation Policies” in Part X.

Advising and Mentoring in Graduate Education

The terms “advising” and “mentoring” are used in different ways within and across countries by those involved in graduate education. In this essay, “advising” and “supervising” are used as synonyms that refer to the assignment of a relatively experienced academic with responsibility for the research work (thesis or dissertation) of an associated student. Although “mentoring” is sometimes used as another synonym, it usually refers to a more intense, extended, and idealized relationship than advising. Both advisory and mentoring relationships are shaped by elements of power and control, positionality, diversity, and contextualization.

Advising is only one aspect—albeit an important one—of the graduate experience. Depending on the national, institutional, departmental, and disciplinary context, students may enjoy more or less funding, fulfill various course and examination requirements, and work alone or with a research team. Sometimes the metaphor of the “journey” is used, especially for doctoral studies, to signify the attainment of a distant goal, reached by traveling across difficult and unknown terrain. Advising falls awkwardly between the more well-known academic functions of teaching and research and, perhaps as a result, has received less scholarly attention. Although there is a widespread belief that it makes a critical difference within the “journey,” there is not much consensus over exactly what difference it makes or how it should be done. Similarly, only a small fraction of writing on gender and education takes as its subject this aspect of educational studies.

WHAT IS THE ADVISORY ROLE?

This question is one that is surprisingly difficult to answer. Although the advisor is similar to a teacher, instructors do not usually have a long-term relationship with a student based on a piece of work that extends over a number of years and is examined by other academics. Graduate students (also called postgraduates or research students in some countries) have as their main goal the production of a book-like piece of work called a thesis or dissertation based on original research. The supervisor, who normally has some expertise and authority in the area of the student’s research, is charged with the responsibility of assisting the student to conceptualize, plan, carry out, and write up the results of the research. Beyond the student-teacher depiction, the relationship has been expressed in more colorful terms such as master-servant, guru-disciple, parent-child, and so forth. Supervisors have been characterized by analogies as diverse as midwife and business manager. All such depictions imply that an advisor will facilitate the production of the thesis and initiate the student into the secrets of academe. The midwife advisor might help the student give birth to the knowledge already inside; the business manager advisor might make sure the student has dates, goals, objectives, and the means of accomplishing them.

Some writers believe that the process of thesis production and the associated supervisor/student relationship can be made subject to control and prediction. The model could be called the "technical-rational" approach to supervision and finds its place in many policy documents and how-to textbooks for students and supervisors. The ultimate goal is to improve the chances that a student will finish the journey. Others prefer a "negotiated order" model that stresses the mutual negotiation and interaction between the participants. Any advice that can be given about best practice, this model says, will have to be modified by what happens in real life as well as by the expectations and understandings each person brings to the table. For example, not all students intend a career in academe, while supervisors generally think that is the desirable goal, at least for the superior scholars. Or, if a student desires nurturing and warmth from the supervisor but the supervisor prefers a strictly professional approach prizing student independence, either the parameters will need to be negotiated in some way or the relationship may end in tears.

Some literature about women's preferred styles of learning suggests many women students would prefer a nurturing supervisory style. A Canadian study found women academics in faculties of education struggling to meet the expectations of the many women students who wanted to work with women supervisors and expected a high level of interest and mentoring (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996). Whatever these patterns, studies also show that the majority of students are satisfied with the advising they receive (although a small minority are very dissatisfied) if only because they do not have many other experiences with which to compare their situation.

KNOWLEDGE AND CONTROL

One way to think about the supervisory process is as a site for expression of power or control. As a "deeply uncertain practice" (Grant, 2005), supervision contains elements of power and knowledge that are shifting rather than constant. Supervisors have the most obvious access to resources that produce power. They have the disciplinary knowledge, the academic position, and the gatekeeping role. Many aspects of academic life are tacit or unspoken, part of a "hidden curriculum" (Acker, 2001). First, there is a proliferation of what the French theorist Michel Foucault would see as "disciplinary technologies"—deadlines, rules, forms, timetables, reports, examinations—the cumulative effect of which is to produce docility or conformity. Second, there are many specific subject-area conventions that make up a kind of culture or what Pierre Bourdieu, another French sociologist, called a "habitus." For example, in English or political science, the production of a published book is an expected early career achievement, while in economics or accounting, junior faculty rarely write books but instead devote their energies to accumulating publications in "top tier" high-status journals. Graduate school is a time for learning at least some of these conventions. Departments may provide various ways for students to become informed such as orientations, workshops, and seminars, but advisors are in a key position to communicate the rules of the game to their students, both directly and by example.

Other features of the supervisory dyad relate to shifting power relationships. Generally, there is a generation gap with the supervisor being older, although in some professional fields, students may not be chronologically "young," having already accumulated work experience outside the ivory tower. Gender also invokes power. Given the numerical dominance of men in the academy, especially in higher ranks and in scientific specialties, we are more likely to find men supervising women than the reverse. The supervisor may control financial resources that impact upon the student.

Nevertheless, some writers believe that students have more power than they normally realize. If the pairing does not match the expected power dynamics, for example, if the supervisor is female and the student is male, or the student is older than the supervisor, or the supervisor but not the student is from a minority ethno cultural group, some readjustment—and possibly even some conflict—is likely to take place (see Acker, 2001). Some students with clear goals find themselves taking the lead in advisory sessions. As the research progresses, the student will come to know more about the specific topic area than the supervisor does. In some cases, the advisor relies on the student to do an important part of the work of a research team. More generally, students' success brings credit to their supervisor; conversely, poor completion rates or rumors of inadequate supervision will do some harm to the supervisor's reputation and equanimity.

The power of the supervisor may also be mitigated where it is conventional to have supervisory committees or co-supervision. It may also be reduced intentionally, as in efforts to develop *feminist* mentoring (Humble, Solomon, Allen, Blaisure, & Johnson, 2006) analogous to feminist pedagogy, one of the critical or liberatory pedagogies that attempts to work "against the grain" of teacher authority normally found in classrooms and in hierarchical relationships between faculty and students. Humble and her colleagues point out that conventional mentoring is not very compatible with radical pedagogies because it aims to socialize individuals into an existing environment rather than to create conditions for change. The concept of feminist supervising or mentoring is almost unknown and could bear further development.

IS IT MENTORING?

The title of this essay suggests that advising and mentoring go together. In common usage, mentoring would be the stronger concept, evoking a long-term investment in the welfare and future of a protégé(e), going well beyond the specific goal of producing a thesis or completing a doctorate. Mentoring has also been a popular innovation in efforts to assist women and minority members of organizations or to support persons from disadvantaged communities in an effort to improve their life chances. Graduate students—again, especially women and/or minority students—are sometimes encouraged to find mentors who will help them achieve career success.

However, as Helen Colley (2003) shows, the idea of mentoring is suffused with romantic myths and gendered paradigms. Although the original paradigm for mentoring may have been males helping males, the dominant model is now one where the female-associated virtues of endless caring and self-sacrifice are incorporated into the mentor persona. In her study of mentoring in a program for disadvantaged youth, Colley describes a dysfunctional pairing of two young women who become trapped within a perpetual cycle of accepting and caring from the mentor and indifference from the mentee.

Studies of women and minority academics suggest a parallel downside to mentoring, namely the extra layer of work expected by students, other faculty, the academic herself, and even the wider community, quite possibly occurring at the same time that junior faculty members need to put extensive efforts into research production to secure their own positions. Problems are exacerbated in situations where the representation of women or minorities among the faculty is less than among the student body, for example, in a field like education. In Canadian faculties of education, for example, women are about 43 percent of tenured faculty (i.e., those with permanent positions and likely to be allowed to supervise theses) but 70 percent of doctoral students. If we assume students try to affiliate with supervisors in the same gender and/or ethnic group, then we have a numerical pressure point and a predictable overload for women and minority faculty such as the one reported by Romero (1997), whose interviews with Chicana faculty (women in the United States of Mexican descent) revealed that they were highly isolated, inundated with students and other workload responsibilities, and conscious of a class, race, and gender disparity between themselves and majority faculty.

An extended one-to-one relationship may easily become intense and emotional and present uncomfortable aspects of dependence or desire. At the very least, there are boundary issues that must be negotiated. Not all boundary problems lie in the sexual realm. For example, questions sometimes arise about who should lay claim to the intellectual property generated by the student.

In considering mentoring, we should also beware of too-easy generalizations, such as assuming that same-sex advisor-student pairings are always better. In contrast, there are some hints in the literature that women supervisors (in part, because they may be more junior in the academy) have fewer resources to put at the disposal of their students. A study by Kurtz-Costes, Helmke, and Ülkü-Steiner (2006) found that women students in predominantly male departments like chemistry did not want to work with the women faculty in their field because they found them too "driven" and unlikely to be role models for combining family and work. These researchers suggest that the gender balance of the faculty is probably more important than the gender of a mentor in influencing the climate.

In practice, mentoring in its sense of an intense and extended relationship is probably hit or miss. Few academics can take on a protégé(e) for life. There are too many students, and some will inevitably be disappointed.

POSITIONALITY, DIVERSITY, AND CONTEXTUALIZATION

"Positionality" is important: The group someone belongs to and where they are located in the institution (and society) influences both opportunities and perceptions. A problem with much of the writing on graduate students is that they have been written about as if they are all interchangeable: "the" graduate student (Acker, 2001; Leonard, 2001). Yet the graduate student population is increasingly diverse. Forty or more years ago, the situation was different: Most students were male, White, middle-class, young, living on campus, and studying full time. Many social trends have changed this picture. In some places, numbers have risen steeply while the composition of the student cohorts has changed. For example, in Britain, the number of full-time postgraduates more than quadrupled in 30 years from 1970 to 2000, while the international student proportion rose from 13.7 percent to 41.1 percent (Chiang, 2003, pp. 9–10). Students now have a variety of backgrounds and characteristics, although some marginalized and minoritized categories of the population (e.g., Aboriginal students, those from working-class backgrounds, disabled students) are still greatly underrepresented.

Women remain concentrated in certain fields such as education, health, and social work and scarce in others such as engineering and computer sciences; but overall they are found in much greater numbers than in the past. In many countries, they are now a small majority among master's degree recipients and approaching parity at doctoral level. For example, in the United States in 2002 to 2003, women earned 47 percent of doctorates. The figure was 43 percent in both Canada (2003) and the United Kingdom (2004 to 2005).

Different disciplines require and permit different modes of study. Students who work in laboratory environments are likely to see their supervisors regularly and may well be working on a joint project, while the library (or increasingly home) based student or part-time student may have relatively little such contact. Chiang (2003) refers to the main models as "teamwork" and "individualist" research training structures and uses chemistry and education, respectively, as illustrations. Regardless of the structure, some students may be better positioned than others for excelling and networking. It is likely that academics are most comfortable with others like themselves, a practice that has in the past ensured the continuity of male domination in universities through same-gender patronage. An extension of the same point may account for cases where academics show discomfort with international students and adhere to some cultural stereotypes. However, there is little likelihood that instructors and students can be matched with any precision: Gender alone does not address the myriad of other characteristics (age, class background, religion, race, sexual orientation, etc.) that make up someone's identity. There are also preferences regarding style and closeness/distance of supervision and reasons for undertaking further study and research, all of which vary idiosyncratically.

Students who work on professors' research projects or who can afford to "hang around" a department may be first in line for the important socialization and mentoring experiences. Conversely, those who are working outside the academy to make ends meet, looking after children as a single parent, responsible for caring for an elderly dependent, or commuting several hours to the university may not have the same advantages. Studies of women academics suggest that they are often working against the biological clock to establish their careers; those with children get little sleep as they struggle to keep up with expectations still based on a family-free male model. Although there are not many similar studies of graduate student women, it is likely that many of the same problems exist. Gender, class, race, ethnicity, dis/ability, and other attributes all singly and together influence the experiences of graduate students.

We need to remember that the supervisor-student dyad is not located in a vacuum—far from it. The impact of particular disciplinary cultures and structures has already been mentioned. Many institutional features are relevant. Institutional and departmental status, resources, size, location, cultures, and policies influence the opportunities graduate students have. For example, some universities provide training and/or workload credit for supervisors, while many do not. It is likely that students, especially early in their programs, do not have a full appreciation of most of these contextual factors that impinge on their experience.

Funding policies, both internal and external to the university, are especially important in shaping the graduate environment. In Britain, changes in the social science funding council's practices in the 1980s led to universities providing more research training, keeping better track of students, and putting pressures on students to complete their research more quickly (Leonard, 2001). Funding policies may have gender-differentiating effects. In the United States in the 1960s, there were prestigious foundations—and, indeed, universities—that routinely excluded women from their lists of scholarship recipients. In Australia, a funding formula that emphasized a university's record of dissertation completions as a determinant of its funding for graduate research has been thought to encourage some universities to shift graduate student places into fast-completion fields like physical science and engineering and away from part-time study. Both practices could work to the detriment of women, who are more likely to be in slow-completion fields in social sciences and humanities and more likely to study part time.

A myriad of other policies and practices also impact on graduate students and sometimes women in particular. Again, in the United States in the 1960s, child-care facilities were practically unknown and hiring policies openly discriminated against academic couples. Although there is now child-care provision in many universities, it may be difficult to access, and student parents may lose their university funding while on a maternity or parenting leave. Overt discrimination against couples (which mainly impacted on the women) has declined, yet accommodating partners is still a "problem" for universities. On the surface, we have "come a long way," and the barriers are now more subtle, located in disciplinary cultural traditions, women's competing external responsibilities, and a residue of bias.

Contextual influences go beyond individual institutions to labor market conditions, state policies, and even international events. At the same time as apparently more enlightened policies like maternity leave and child-care provision spread, academic work—and by extension graduate study—has been altered by global trends. Academics do more work in the same or less time, often with fewer resources. Their output is also repeatedly audited, not only by the traditional peer-review procedures assessing the suitability of research for publication but by new modes of what some call performativity: reaching a level of accomplishment *and* showing publicly that the level has been reached, for example, by reports to external assessors or annual reviews. Universities are thought to have become more like businesses and are managed by "executives" who put the emphasis on the bottom line and market-driven priorities.

Although this level of analysis may at first seem remote from the experiences of graduate students and their supervisors, it has important shaping effects. International students may be recruited for the money and contacts they bring with them; in some countries faculty are expected to teach offshore or to find other ways of initiating entrepreneurial activity. Successful graduate student degree completions may be one of the ways in which departments can demonstrate value for money and thus receive further funding. More insidiously, academics are so stretched that they have less and less time to look after their students. Increased reliance on temporary and part-time faculty means that students have fewer individuals available for supervision. And finally, students look at these harried and distracted academics and wonder what attractions are left in academe. We may be heading for an ironic outcome: students—including women—look at their mentors and decide *not* to be like them.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Acker, S. (2001). The hidden curriculum of dissertation advising. In E. Margolis (Ed.), *The hidden curriculum in higher education* (pp. 61–77). New York: Routledge.

Acker, S., & Feuerverger, G. (1996). Doing good and feeling bad: The work of women university teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 26*(3), 401–422.

Chiang, K.-H. (2003). Learning experiences of doctoral students in U.K. universities. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 23*(1/2), 4–32.

Colley, H. (2003). *Mentoring for social inclusion: A critical approach to nurturing successful mentoring relations.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Grant, B. (2005). Fighting for space in supervision: Fantasies, fairytales, fictions and fallacies. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18*(3), 337–354.

Humble, A., Solomon, C., Allen, K., Blaisure, K., & Johnson, M.P. (2006). Feminism and mentoring of graduate students. *Family Relations, 55*(1), 2–15.

Kurtz-Costes, B., Helmke, L., & Ülkü-Steiner, B. (2006). Gender and doctoral studies: The perceptions of PhD students in an American university. *Gender and Education, 18*(2), 137–155.

Leonard, D. (2001). *A woman's guide to doctoral studies.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Romero, M. (1997). Class-based, gendered and racialized institutions of higher education: Everyday life of academia from the view of Chicana faculty. *Race, Gender & Class, 4*(2), 151–173.

Sandra Acker

Career Patterns in Higher Education

During the past 30 years, women have increased their presence among faculty members in the United States. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), women now are 40 percent of the 816,000 faculty in four-year colleges and universities. However, their careers and the positions they ultimately hold differ from those of men. They are more likely to be employed in offtrack positions that do not lead to tenure where they hold 46 percent of the part-time positions but only 23 percent of the full-time faculty positions. As a group, women are more likely than men to be in part-time positions (42 percent compared to 34 percent, respectively) and less likely than men to be in full-time positions (58 percent compared to 66 percent). The significance of full-time tenure-line faculty appointments is considerable. Incumbents receive higher wages and employment benefits; they influence research agenda and the allocation of university resources, shape the direction of a field, and mentor graduate students.

Preparation for a faculty career takes place through graduate education in departments of research-oriented universities. Doctoral students' experiences induct them into the discipline or field by developing skills, influencing their research productivity, and shaping their first networks—which become a foundation for a career of research and teaching. Progress in an academic career principally occurs by successfully negotiating three gatekeeping processes—hiring, tenure review, and promotion—in order to arrive at the visible and valued achievement of a tenured, senior position, the institutionalized optimum faculty employment standard (see chapter by Glazer-Raymo in Sagaria, 2007).

In contrast to faculty careers, which succeed by moving step-by-step up a well-defined ladder of positions, administrative careers in higher education are less well defined. Recent years have seen an increase in middle managerial positions, but the relationships between such positions, faculty positions, and higher level administrative positions are poorly defined. Although recent years have seen an increase in the proportion of women in the higher levels of university administration, they remain a relatively small minority of college and university presidents nationwide and worldwide. In contrast, there has been a striking feminization of lower levels of campus administration, especially in those positions concerned with the provision of external services to client groups.

SEX DIFFERENCES IN FACULTY CAREERS

Despite the increasing proportions of degrees awarded to women, their employment differs across fields. NCES data show that women are most underrepresented among academic employees in engineering (10 percent), natural sciences (23 percent), and business (27 percent). They tend to be better represented in agriculture/home economics (36 percent), social sciences (36 percent), fine arts (37 percent), and humanities (41 percent). In the health sciences, they are close to parity with men (48 percent), and in education the majority of faculty are women (58 percent). Gender representation within a field has a profound influence on women's careers.

A successful faculty career begins with passing through the formal gate of hiring into a tenure-track position, usually directly after a doctoral program or, as in the life and physical sciences, after a postdoctoral appointment. The appointment is likely to begin at the rank of assistant professor for a maximum probation period of seven years. In many fields, qualified female candidates are not being recruited or hired into tenure-track positions proportionate to their presence in the PhD pool. Nelson's (2005) study of faculty representation in the top 50 ranked departments in 14 disciplines showed that women were underrepresented even in fields such as biology, where women earn more PhDs than men. The percentage of women in those departments ranged from a high of 45 percent (in sociology) to a low of 17 percent (in chemistry). Nelson's study further corroborated previous research showing that lack of representation is particularly acute for women of color who may be subject to tokenism, a process whereby they are treated as representatives or symbols of their group and not as individuals as was considered to be the case in leading departments in economics, political science, and sociology (Beutel & Nelson, 2006).

The second gatekeeping process is the tenure review. Promotion and tenure review is conducted in accordance with institutional policies that vary by institutional mission. Nevertheless, there is usually a peer review process in which research, teaching, and service are evaluated, placing most weight on the activity considered central to the institution's mission. Thus, in a research university a faculty member is evaluated principally for the quality and quantity of her or his research and grants. An individual is either tenured and promoted to associate professor or her or his contract is not continued.

Women in the social sciences, sciences, and engineering are less likely to receive tenure than male colleagues. Among women tenure-track faculty who were employed in Research I universities (those that award 50 or more doctoral degrees per year in at least 15 disciplines) in both 1995 and 2001, 54.5 percent of the women received tenure, compared to 59.2 percent of the men. Of individuals not tenured in a Research I university, women (8.5 percent) are half as likely as men (15.3 percent) to move to jobs outside the academy, but women are more likely to be unemployed (2.5 percent) than men (0.6 percent) (National Academy of Sciences, 2006). Moreover, women are more likely to leave a tenure-track position for an adjunct appointment than men.

Across Research I universities, tenure rates are roughly 50 percent or more. Although rates vary by institution, they also vary by field. Field-specific analyses show that women are 1–3 percent less likely than men to receive tenure in physical sciences, 2–4 percent more likely than men to receive tenure in the natural sciences and engineering, and 8 percent less likely than men to earn tenure in the social sciences (Ginther & Kahn, 2006).

Career progression and the tenure review process are likely to differ for men and women in some fields. In the aggregate, women are promoted more slowly than men.

The difference begins early with men being promoted and tenured earlier in their career than women. After tenure, men are also promoted more quickly to full professor than women. These patterns were discerned principally from institutional studies, such as those at the University of California, Berkeley, MIT, and Duke University. These differences become even greater by race. According to the National Academy of Sciences (2006), within 15 years of earning the PhD, African American women were almost 10 percent less likely than men to be promoted to full professor. Possible explanations are that women are expected to meet higher standards for promotion, and they may feel less ready to apply for promotion to full professor.

The gatekeeping process to the rank of full professor is more unyielding for women so that they are less likely than their male counterparts to be promoted to the senior rank. Although sex discrimination has been illegal in academe since 1972, there continue to be fewer women at each career step. According to the NCES, women account for 35.9 percent of assistant professors, 30.2 percent of associate professors, and 15.8 percent of full professors in research universities. This pattern represents different career progressions and experiences for men and women resulting in terrible losses, both in terms of opportunities for individual women and in institutional potential for solving problems and increasing economic performance (Sagaria & Agans, 2006).

When tenure-track faculty change jobs, they are likely to do so for multiple reasons—most importantly, salary and promotion, regardless of field. Yet, women leave tenure-track positions for reasons different from men. Rosser's (2004) study, using a national data set of faculty across four-year colleges and universities, showed that female faculty members are less satisfied than their male counterparts with advising, course workload, the quality of their benefits, job security, and salary levels, and that this affects their intent to leave—a good indicator of actually leaving. A national study of actual job changers among tenure-track faculty members in engineering and the life, physical, and social sciences corroborated the Rosser study regarding the importance of pay and promotion for women and men. Across fields, however, female academics consistently rated working conditions, family, and job location higher than males among reasons for changing jobs (National Academy of Sciences, 2006).

THE CONTEXT OF FACULTY CAREERS

Changing political and economic forces are shifting the orientation of universities from serving the public good to entrepreneurial efforts. Within the current competitive context, universities are striving to increase their economic strength by preparing individuals for the labor market and contributing to profitable research (see chapter by Sagaria & Agans in Sagaria, 2007). In the competitive market context, the higher the prestige or reputation of an institution, the greater its competitive advantage.

For universities, increasing economic strength can mean increasing cost efficiency and strategic reallocation of funds. Some universities have restructured by reducing or not increasing funding for tenure-track, full-time faculty lines, opting instead for adjunct, part-time faculty. In universities that have reallocated funds, the recipient departments have most often been those that are expected to contribute to the institution's competitive advantage by way of external research funding and prestige. Consequently, retrenchment and selective investment strategies tend to redirect funds from the humanities, social sciences, and education, where the majority of women faculty members are found, toward life and physical sciences and engineering, which have a small percentage of women faculty. Thus, strategic redirection of funds has had disproportionately adverse consequences, reducing the number of tenure lines and the amount of resources in disciplines and fields where the largest concentrations of women faculty work (see chapter by Sagaria & Van Horn in Sagaria, 2007). The importance of a department to an institution (and the department's resources) influences a faculty member's work, which may have career consequences that can differ for men and women. In a study of highly valued (core) departments and less valued (periphery) departments in a public research university, Volk, Slaughter, and Thomas (2001) found that departments powerfully influence faculty members' access to institutional resources. They report that funding for departments characterized by male, full-time faculty, graduate degrees, grants, and contracts tend to be more highly resourced than departments characterized by female faculty, high use of female adjuncts, undergraduate teaching, and degree granting.

In addition to education and position, an academic career depends on productivity and recognition. For purposes of hiring and advancement in rank, research productivity, usually in the form of peer-reviewed publications and significant books, is weighted most heavily in universities. This is the case regardless of whether a faculty member's responsibilities also include substantial teaching and administration or service. Moreover, advancement involves judgment and recommendations of academic referees. Yet, a substantial body of research shows that these judgments can be arbitrary and linked to sponsorship and networks that may disadvantage women in fields where they are in the minority. Although women's productivity in many fields is now equal to men's (National Academy of Sciences, 2006), women continue to experience subtle, often unexamined gender bias by both men and women, which is even more oppressive with the interlacing of racism that women of color in predominately White institutions confront.

In many fields and disciplines, women are the leaders and most distinguished scholars regardless of whether they are a part of a numerical majority or minority. Even more women will be able to thrive as colleagues and institutions continue to chip away at the factors that contribute to cumulative gender disadvantages, the small preferences and subtle forms of discrimination that can accumulate and create large differences in prestige, power, and position.

ADMINISTRATIVE CAREERS

While full-time faculty careers are highly defined, many administrative careers have evolved as higher education has changed. The changing nature of colleges and universities, especially the shift to being highly managed entrepreneurial organizations, has resulted in a significant increase in the need and actual numbers of administrators and staff. The National Center for Education Statistics reports that in 2003 women held approximately 48 percent of the 96,340 executive, administrative, and managerial positions in four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Describing administrative careers is complicated because of the lack of current research as well as agreement in terminology for the various groups or categories and levels of jobs. The senior-level, or top-level, refers to positions of institution-wide leadership such as presidents or chancellors (chief executive officers) along with those who are likely to report to those positions while having administrative and financial authority and responsibility for major functional areas of an institution such as provost (chief academic officer) and vice presidents such as chief financial officer and chief student affairs officer. In many colleges and universities, this level may also include deans of academic units. Mid-level positions include directors of units across the full set of organizational functions from development (institutional advancement or fund raising), campus life, athletics, campus planning, technology, and assessment. The next group of jobs are staff or professional positions that are located at various levels of the university. Some require highly specialized skills and knowledge such as legal counsel while others require more general qualities and skills such as academic advising. Thus, the prerequisite education for administrative positions is directly related to that which is expected in a particular functional area.

Careers advance through job changes and with the help of opportunity structures, networks, sponsoring, and mentoring. Recruitment for mid-level and professional positions is from an internal labor market (inside the organization), a local labor market, and, at times, the national labor market. The search is likely to be national for executive positions and those requiring highly specific advanced skills and/or extensive experience.

More women of color, White women, and men of color than White men depend upon opportunity structures and internal institutional job changes to build their career (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2000). Although there is little systematic information about opportunity structures because they differ from one institution to another, university reports by women's commissions and diversity committees are likely to be reliable sources about campus climates and opportunity structures. With the exception of senior-level positions, it is common practice that internal candidates are considered for job vacancies before undertaking an external search.

Sagaria and Johnsrud (1992) found that in a public research university policies intended to benefit women and men of color and White women had unintended adversarial consequences for them because White senior male administrators were likely to hire individuals like themselves. Describing the experiences of a small group of female provosts, Lively (2000) observed that women can benefit from internal hiring for senior-level positions when a university has racial, ethnic, and gender diversity among administrators and staff and when senior administrators are willing to take risks with hiring decisions.

Networks, sponsors, and mentors are particularly important when there is not a definable career path to a position and competencies must be extrapolated from one job to another, such as in new positions like director of diversity. Sponsors and mentors have also been important by creating new positions for protégés. In particular, this strategy has advanced the careers of women who have taken on additional and/or new responsibilities in order to meet changing institutional priorities and needs (Miner & Estler, 1985).

Search committee chairs and hiring officials are the gatekeepers of administrative advancement. Individuals in those roles are more likely to exclude someone unknown to them than someone whom they know and do not perceive as likely to be a risk, threat, or embarrassment to them. Also, because search committees rely heavily on known sources to make personal judgments based upon personal preferences and biases, Black and White women and Black men without an advocate who is known by a White male search committee member are more likely to be screened out of competition for positions than White men (Sagaria, 2002). Furthermore, fit, a philosophy and style compatible with those of search chairs and the ability to work well with others, is an important criterion for being offered a job. However, White men are less likely to perceive women and men of color and White women as a "good fit." Therefore, a sponsor or mentor may be able to reduce or eliminate concerns that White men may have that a female's assertiveness is perceived as too aggressive or argumentative, which can prevent women candidates from being hired (Sagaria, 2002).

Search firms are increasingly becoming gatekeepers for advancement to senior administrative positions. In half of the presidential searches reported to the American Council on Education, search firms were involved in the process. These firms rely on referrals and informal networks throughout the country to identify and recommend candidates.

Until more women gain senior administrative positions, this may be more of a disadvantage for women than for White men because White women and women and men of color tend to have different networks than White men, who occupy the majority of senior-level positions (Sagaria, 2002).

The growth of new managerialism (Pritchard & Deem, 1999) has resulted in an increase in the number of women in higher education administration. For example, institutional support systems positions at the University of California system increased by 104 percent between 1966 and 1991, nearly two and a half times faster than instructional positions (Gumport and Pusser, 1995). Administrative and nonteaching professional positions have been the fastest growing group of positions. This trend has continued to the present with the creation of a new administrative sector. As universities have attempted to become more entrepreneurial, to drive down costs, and to increase the rate of return from faculty members, there has been a feminization of the lower tiers of administration. In these positions, with their focus on accountability, external relations, and client services, women are expected to challenge opposition to management practices and to monitor faculty activities (Pritchard & Deem, 1999).

Women are continuing to make their way into senior-level positions. Most notable is the increase in women university presidents. Women now account for 17.8 percent of institutional leaders. This is an increase of approximately 7 percent from 1986, but it falls short of the female representation among the administrative cohort. Equally important as their numeric representation is the fact that women now lead several of the major research universities including Brown, Michigan, Michigan State, Ohio State, Pennsylvania, and Princeton. Although there are multiple career paths to the presidency, the majority of the women leading Research I universities, unlike their male counterparts, have stayed close to the (supposed) traditional presidential career path of faculty member, department chair, dean, provost, and president. Many women on this path have been able to use their provost position to convince boards of trustees of their potential as a president.

As more women assume senior leadership positions, leadership stereotypes are being challenged to open up new ways to consider how to lead higher education. These female leaders also are opening more gates through creating networks (Lively, 2000) and providing sponsorship and mentoring that have great potential to create more career opportunities for current and future female faculty, administrators, and staff.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Beutel, A.M., & Nelson, D.K. (2006). The gender and race-ethnicity of faculty in top social science research departments. *The Social Science Journal, 43*(1), 111–125.

Ginther, D., & Kahn, S. (2006). Does science promote women? Evidence from academia 1973–2001 (NBER SEWP Working Paper). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economics Research. Retrieved October 24, 2006, from http://www.nber.org/~sewp/GintherKahn_Sciences_promo_NBER.pdf

Gumport, P., & Pusser, B. (1995). A case of bureaucratic accretion: Contests and consequences. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(5), 493–520.

Johnsrud, L.K., & Rosser, V.J. (2000). *Understanding the work and career paths of mid-level administrators.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lively, K. (2000). Women in charge. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(41), A33–35.

Miner, A.S., & Estler, S.E. (1985). Accrual mobility: Job mobility in higher education through responsibility accrual. *Journal of Higher Education, 56*(2), 121–143.

National Academy of Sciences. (2006). *Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering.* (Report of the Committee on Maximizing the Potential of

Women in Academic Science and Engineering, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine). Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11741.html

Nelson, D.K. (2005). *A national analysis of diversity in science and engineering faculties at research universities.* Retrieved October 25, 2006, from http://cheminfo.chem.ou.edu/~djn/diversity/briefings/Diversity%20Report%20Final.pdf

Pritchard, C., & Deem, R. (1999). Wo-managing further education: Gender and construction of the manager in the corporate colleges of England. *Gender and Education, 11*(3), 323–342.

Rosser, V.J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3), 285–309.

Sagaria, M.D. (2002). An exploratory model of filtering in administrative searches. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(6), 677–710.

Sagaria, M.D. (Ed.). (2007). *Women, universities, and change: Gender equality in the European Union and the United States.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sagaria, M.D., & Agans, L.J. (2006). Gender equality in U.S. higher education: Inter/national framing and institutional realities. In K. Yokoyama (Ed.), *Gender and higher education: Australia, Japan, the U.K. and USA* (pp. 47–68). Hiroshima, Japan: Higher Education Institute Press.

Sagaria, M.D., & Johnsrud, L.K. (1992). Administrative promotion: The structuring of opportunity within a university. *Review of Higher Education, 15*(2), 191–212.

Volk, C.S., Slaughter, S., & Thomas, S.L. (2001). Models of institutional resource allocation: Mission, market, gender. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(4), 387–413.

Mary Ann Danowitz Sagaria

Lyndsay J. Agans

Career Patterns in Schools

Career patterns refer to the regularities and differences that occur among the positions typically held by men, women, and people of color employed in PreK–12 schools and districts. For the past century, three marked patterns have endured in the United States. First, women are disproportionately represented in teaching, men in administrative leadership. Second, educators of color, whether teachers or administrators, are predominantly found in schools or districts with high numbers of students of color. Third, overall, most teachers and administrators are White. African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and other people of color are significantly underrepresented, both in relation to the demographics of the U.S. population generally and to PreK–12 student enrollment more specifically.

The gender difference between teachers and administrators is one example of a broader sexual division of labor and, like most such examples, the division of labor in PreK–12 is usually seen as inequitable. Even when women move from teaching into school administration, they tend to occupy positions with less prestige and power than those of their male colleagues. The reasons for these gender differences are complex and include individual, institutional, and cultural influences on the career patterns of men and women. Complexities also surround the future career patterns of men and women in PreK–12 schools and districts. While it is possible that current trends toward more women in school administration are the harbingers of a movement toward genuine gender integration, past history suggests that it is more likely that either gender resegregation or a return to traditional sex stratification will occur.

SEXUAL DIVISIONS OF LABOR

Career patterns in schools can be understood as part of the sexual divisions of labor that characterize work universally. That is, sexual divisions have been found to hold true in the home and paid employment, in the United States and internationally, and in education as well as other fields.

Although the essence of the distinction is that there are two kinds of work—men's and women's—the divisions take a variety of forms. In one form, all or almost all of the entire population of paid employees in a particular industry or professional specialty consists of one sex. For example, most preschool teachers are females, and most school superintendents are males. Another form manifests itself as stratification by sex within the same work setting. For example, within PreK–12 teaching, the higher the grade level, the greater the proportion of teachers who are male.

Sexual divisions of labor are enduring, but they are not static. Historians have noted that, from the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries, schoolteaching, bank telling, and secretarial work transformed from almost exclusively male to predominantly female occupations. More recently, women have made inroads into predominantly male occupational roles such as the principalship, but there have been concomitant internal redivisions by sex and school level: Women have integrated elementary school principalships in much higher proportions than high school principalships, in which men continue to be overrepresented. Thus, even when longitudinal changes in the division of labor occur, separation between men's and women's work persists.

Research on the reasons for women's movement into previously male-dominated occupational roles indicates that new opportunities for women have typically resulted from significant increases in job vacancies (due to occupational growth, turnover, incumbent exits, wars, major technological change, and the like) and/or from the deterioration of the job's working conditions or rewards, with subsequent loss of attractiveness to males. As illustrated in PreK–12 career patterns in schools, teaching shifted from a predominantly male to a predominantly female occupation as both the number of public schools increased and teachers' salaries and autonomy declined in comparison to other job opportunities for males. This shift illustrates the complex and dynamic nature of sexual divisions of labor.

Feminist scholars and other advocates of social justice have long been interested in gendered career patterns and sexual divisions of labor, largely because these separate spheres are often accompanied by differential treatment and unequal consequences. For women, the latter can include lower pay and status, fewer opportunities for advancement, devaluing of the labor itself, subordination to males, and exclusion from men's work realms. In schools, another problematic aspect of such gender asymmetries is the biasing messages they communicate to students about appropriate work roles for females and males. Conceptually, the problematizing of sexual "divisions" of labor is reflected in the use of terms more suggestive of inequities such as occupational sex segregation and sex stereotyping, stratification, ghettoization, or marginalization of women's work. Conceptually, these concerns with bias are reflected in the replacement of the more neutral language of "sexual divisions of labor" with terms that are more suggestive of inequities.

GENDERED PATTERNS

So where are the women and men in PreK–12 schools? What are the regularities that occur among the positions held by males and females?

The most recent data available from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) indicate that 75 percent of all teachers were female in 1999 to 2000, up from 72 percent in 1990 to 1991 and 67 percent in 1981. Although NCES data are not disaggregated by grade level and sex, some states provide that information. For example, in New York, 89 percent of elementary and 71 percent of secondary teachers were female in 2002 to 2003. In North Carolina, 94 percent of elementary and 63 percent of high school teachers were female in 2000. State data illustrate that, while females predominate at all grade levels of teaching, their proportional representation is highest in elementary schools.

Like nursing, social work, and elder care, the prevalence of women in schoolteaching echoes and reinforces cultural norms that value the "helping professions" as appropriate spheres for women's work. The data indicating greater proportions of males in the secondary than elementary grades may reflect commonplace assumptions about increased rigor and complexity (therefore status) at higher levels of schooling, as well as increased opportunities to coach sports, thus elevating job attractiveness to men. Lower proportions of male teachers at the elementary level may also reflect social biases and fears about men working with young children.

The historic and persistent underrepresentation of women in educational administration is accentuated by this backdrop of female overrepresentation in classroom teaching since, in most states, administrative certification requires prior teaching experience. In other words, it is clear that there have been ample numbers of women in the teaching workforce pool from which administrators are drawn.

Nationally, 44 percent of all principals were women in 1999 to 2000 compared to 35 percent in 1993 to 1994 and 25 percent in 1987 to 1988. While contemporary data for principalships show solid increases for women since the early 1980s, over half of all principals were women in the late 1920s. Consequently, many scholars recommend prudence when examining recent trend data about females' inroads into school administration.

In some ways, the demographic patterns among principals parallel the gendered stratification by grade level evident in teaching. That is, the proportion of women in the principalship decreases as grade level goes up. National data indicate that 55 percent of elementary, 31 percent of middle, and 21 percent of high school principals were female in 1999 to 2000. In North Carolina, 58 percent of elementary and 24 percent of high school principals were female in 2000. In New York, 60 percent of elementary and 30 percent of secondary principals were female in 2002 to 2003, up from 46 percent and 23 percent in 1995 to 1996. In addition to the influence of social norms already mentioned, the persistence of male dominance of the high school principalship may also be related to the history of gender bias in the United States against women controlling large organizations, given that high schools typically serve greater numbers of students than elementary schools. Historians and occupational sex segregation theorists trace the roots of this bias to nineteenth-century struggles of men and women to define their work roles in a newly industrialized society. As much larger, systematized, and hierarchical organizations proliferated (e.g., factories, schools, and hospitals), it became socially unacceptable for women to assume the expanded authority associated with the leadership of these more complex structures, especially those employing men as well as women. Hence, even when new types of work developed, the belief persisted that there should be separate spheres of work for men and women. Other national data indicate that, in the year 2000, approximately 13 percent of superintendents were female, up from 6 percent in 1992, and 1 percent in 1982. In 1998 (the most recent national data available), 33 percent of assistant/associate/deputy/area superintendents were female. In New York State in 2002 to 2003, 21 percent of superintendents and 46 percent of assistant/associate/deputy superintendents were female compared to 13 percent and 32 percent, respectively, in 1995 to 1996. Especially in the superintendency, but in all counts of educational administrators, experts advise caution when considering summary data. Historically and today, it has been difficult to systematically and accurately track career patterns and position occupancy by sex and virtually impossible by sex and race/ethnicity together. Often, years of data collection, job definitions, and grade-level aggregates are not consistent across studies. In the case of superintendents, for example, all manner and types may be mixed together, including county, state, vocational school district, PreK–8 systems, PreK–12 systems, and intermediate unit superintendencies. Also, some counts collapse superintendent and assistant superintendent data together, exacerbating the challenges of longitudinal or cross-state comparisons. Overall, however, the superintendency has clearly been the slowest of all school leadership positions to integrate women.

In general, women administrators are found in greater proportions in "staff" rather than "line" leadership roles in schools. The former include positions such as program coordinators, directors, district wide supervisors, and administrative assistants of various sorts. In contrast, line positions are typically defined as those with direct authority over others, often with formal evaluative responsibilities for subordinates (e.g., principals and superintendents). Since job titles for central office and other administrative staff positions vary widely and national data are scarce, state data are typically relied upon.

For example, 2002 to 2003 New York data indicate that 74 percent of assistant directors/coordinators, 61 percent of supervisors, 55 percent of directors/coordinators, 46 percent of deputy/associate/assistant superintendents, 41 percent of business managers, and 21 percent of superintendents were women. (Women's representation in school administration in New York has tended to be higher than national averages, perhaps because the state is generally considered one of the more liberal or progressive politically.) These staff data may be interpreted to illustrate the persistent pattern, in both education and other careers, that, as the formal power, status, or authority of the leadership position increases, the percentage of women occupying that role decreases.

Taken together, these patterns of position occupancy by sex in PreK–12 schools illustrate continuing gender stratification and sexual divisions of labor. More specifically, regularities and differences include: the relative scarcity of males and preponderance of females in teaching; the persistence of men managing and women teaching in schools nationally; the pattern of women administrators being more likely to occupy staff rather than line and elementary rather than secondary leadership positions; and the increasing percentages of men in administration as the scope of authority, status, and salaries of particular leadership roles rise (e.g., from elementary to secondary school principalships, and, at the central administration levels, from coordinator to assistant superintendent to superintendent).

The reasons for these patterns are multiple and complex. Contributing factors cited in relevant literatures include ideologies and social pressures about appropriate sex roles, stereotypes about women as child rearers and nurturers of the young, perceptions of a need for "tougher" management as students grow older, cultural biases about who looks and acts like a leader, the bureaucratization of schooling that was built on separate spheres for women (teaching) and men (leadership), the conceptualization of schooling and its leadership in ways that emphasize competition and authority (stereotypically masculine strengths) rather than collaboration and service, and educational employment practices that perpetuate gender bias.

Scholars provide helpful conceptual handles for these and other contributing factors by underscoring three different levels of influence on career patterns: the individual, the institutional, and the cultural. For example, from an individual perspective, it is possible to theorize the underrepresentation of females in educational administration by looking to person-centered explanations. This perspective considers factors such as parental background, family's academic and career expectations, and the individual's education, work experience, and initiative. Individual-oriented hypotheses center on inherent differences between men and women, on sex-typed psychological traits and personal characteristics, or on dissimilar job aspirations. That is, for example, perhaps women are simply unattracted by, or ill suited for, upper management positions. On the one hand, such reasoning emphasizes individual agency, choice, and self-responsibility for career outcomes. On the other, exclusively person-centered rationales have been criticized for ignoring the many additional factors that impact employment opportunities and decisions. At worst, such explanations have been accused of illustrating a “blame the victim” perspective on the differential outcomes associated with gender, class, or color that characterize many aspects of our social worlds.

In contrast, cultural explanations for gendered career patterns center on broader sociopolitical influences on individuals, groups, and organizations. They look to society as a whole, underscoring, for example, the different ways that boys and girls are socialized as well as American traditions and norms about who occupies the highest-level leadership positions, whether in government, religious, corporate, or educational sectors. The ideological and ethical climate of the times is also considered to have an effect on the composition of educational occupations by sex (e.g., Are these friendly times for acting affirmatively? Should men or women have priority in employment during economic recessions?). From this perspective, what happens in PreK–12 school careers is but one small piece of a larger culture in which gender equity is not universally valued or attained.

Closely related to the cultural are institutional perspectives. When applied to schooling, institution-centered explanations for gendered career patterns look to the education system and its structures, policies, practices, and professional norms that contribute to stratification by sex. For example, some barriers to women’s advancement in educational leadership are overt, such as prejudicial or illegal application or employment interview questions (e.g., Do you think she could handle burly adolescent boys?). Others are subtler, such as the presence or absence of same-sex role models in particular occupational roles in schools. Also included in this domain is the influence of structures of opportunity for visibility within the school or district (e.g., coaching a high-profile interscholastic sport, leading the teachers’ union) and power structures (e.g., networks and alliances of influentials). Policies and practices concerning recruitment and promotion provide both overt and subtle forms of institutional stratification by sex (see below).

Of course, these three levels of influence are overlapping and interactive, mutually shaping the dynamics at the other levels to jointly affect who occupies which career position. For example, cultural norms about responsibilities in the home and parenting differentially influence females’ and males’ personal contexts and individual actions for career pursuits. So do access to informal networks of influential others and whether or not there is a critical mass of female or male incumbents in a particular occupational stratum.

Overall, studies of gendered labor patterns conclude that the positive effects of personal and socialization factors such as aspirations, qualifications, and experience do not assure women equity with men in career development, given the powerful gender-stereotyped contextual, structural, and social forces that serve to counterinfluence individual action for employment and advancement. This conclusion holds true for PreK–12 educational administration as well as other historically male-dominated leadership roles. Some particularly relevant structural and contextual forces are illustrated in employment recruitment and promotion practices in schools.

RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION

Recruitment refers to both formal and informal processes aimed at eliciting applicants for position vacancies. The history of PreK–12 schooling includes deep-seated traditions of informal recruitment leading to administrative hiring. That is, employment in educational leadership has not relied exclusively on unsolicited applications submitted in response to publicly announced job openings. Instead, experienced administrators (and, frequently, college professors) have always played active, influential roles in targeting, supporting, and paving the way for selected associates' entry into, and career advancement within, the field. The essence of these employment practice traditions is reliance on incumbent administrators to encourage, make contacts on behalf of, vouch for, and promote the career advancement of known prospects.

Informal recruitment often involves publicly invisible processes such as veteran educational leaders selectively communicating job opportunity information to friends, acquaintances, and other preferred potential candidates; advocating for protégés for particular position vacancies; networking with others who share common interests, affiliations, or backgrounds; seeking referrals from others in positions of power and influence in education; and grooming favored successors by providing special counsel, coaching, or opportunities to enhance leadership skills. Such practices are often referred to as "sponsorship" or sponsored mobility.

It is worth noting that the popular and professional literature about successful teacher development frequently underscores the term "mentoring," with its connotations of guidance, tutoring, advice, and support by those more experienced and knowledgeable. Parallel literatures about administrator development are much more likely to emphasize both mentoring and sponsorship as critical to initial and continued success. While sponsorship shares many of the same educative and counseling connotations as mentoring, it also includes elements of advocacy (e.g., proposing a new law; providing funding for an artist or athlete; accepting responsibility for the development of a godchild) and persuasion toward particular ends (e.g., commercial advertisement by sponsors). Additionally, the notions of sponsorship for acceptance into particular social groups (e.g., sororities, fraternal organizations) or admittance into elite organizations (e.g., country clubs, honorary societies) suggest a kind of exclusivity not associated with the more benign concept of mentorship.

Because of sponsored mobility traditions in educational leadership, commonplace recruitment and promotion practices have been criticized for being more closed than open and for contributing to the persistent overrepresentation of men in school administration. In the vernacular, these processes are sometimes referred to as a self-perpetuating "good old boys" system at work, since most of the people doing the sponsoring (incumbent superintendents, other administrators, consultants who assist school boards with administrative hiring, leaders of state and national professional organizations, and college professors) are White males.

Research on superintendent search and selection practices further illustrates how professional norms, institutionalized routines, and cultural biases can combine to impede women's access to, and advancement within, the most elevated strata of administrative careers. Prior studies reveal a mix of unwritten selection criteria that influence superintendent recruitment and hiring. These criteria do not appear in either advertisements of desired qualifications or public forums typically associated with employing a new superintendent. Instead, they manifest themselves behind the scenes in the private conversations and interviews critical to prospective candidates' advancement. These unwritten rules involve search consultants' (who are typically either veteran administrators or college professors) and school board members' stereotyping by sex, defining "best qualified" in terms of hierarchies of particular job titles, and hypervaluing "good chemistry" in determining interview success.

Examples of prejudicial gender stereotyping in this context include questioning whether a district or community is ready for a woman superintendent (a concern not raised for male candidates) or assuming strong disciplinary and other noninstructional technical abilities of males, but doubting them for females (Can she be tough enough? What does she know about construction projects and school bus maintenance?).

Moreover, the experiential backgrounds routinely described by these same key decision makers as best or strongest reflect career patterns much more likely to be followed by males than by females. The favoring of positions infrequently occupied by women (that is, previous superintendencies, assistant superintendencies, and high school principalships) diminishes women's chances of advancing through the final selection gates in superintendent search processes. Thus, narrow definitions of quality as specific positions —rather than broader leadership skills, regardless of the educational role or grade level where acquired—disproportionately benefit men and contribute to perpetuating gender stratification in school administration.

Similarly, the extraordinary influence of recruits' and applicants' interpersonal "chemistry," as judged by school board members and search consultants, can be prejudicial to the superintendent hiring process. These key decision makers describe the fuzzy nature of value filters having to do with feelings of "being on the same wavelength," where "things really clicked," and interviewers "just felt so comfortable with" particular candidates. How is it that the hypervaluing of connecting with and feeling "good in the gut" about some candidates is more likely to disadvantage females than male applicants?

Prior studies of employment decision making suggest that reliance on an interpersonal sense of connection and ease fosters the introduction of subconscious preferences for affiliations with those most like ourselves. This phenomenon is captured in similarity-attraction theory and may be expressed in the vernacular as "the comfort syndrome" in recruitment, hiring, and promotions. The concept refers to a proclivity to bond with people similar to those we are most accustomed to working with. Taken together, the demographics of school board members, search consultants, and incumbent school leaders (mostly White male), what is known about similarity-attractiveness, and the predominance of gut feelings, chemistry, and intuition in critical interview interactions (i.e., factors that foster the introduction of subconscious bias) have combined to favor male rather than female prospects for the superintendency.

HISTORY AND PROSPECTS

It remains true that, in PreK–12 schools, the prevailing career pattern is that women teach and men lead. It is also true that women's proportional representation in several administrative leadership positions has increased considerably during the past 35 years, following the rise of the modern women's movement of the 1970s.

Historians note that there had also been a decades-long increase in women's representation in PreK–12 administration between 1910 and 1930, in connection with the first women's (suffrage) movement. That earlier time period was referred to as a "golden age of women administrators," and some expected continued integration of females to eventually lead to a more gender-balanced profession. Subsequent to that golden age, however, multiple social, political, and economic factors contributed to a resegregation of the field, with women's representation in administration declining significantly over the next four decades (1930 to 1970).

The question of whether the recent upswing in women's occupancy of principalships and superintendencies will be temporary or enduring is a difficult one. Feminist researchers generally concur in recommending caution about drawing overly optimistic projections from recent gains. The accumulated scholarship points out that women have not yet attained, or ever sustained over time, equitable representation in school administration; that affirmative action legislation, Title IX protections, and other policies prohibiting sex discrimination in employment have been enforced weakly and intermittently; that sex stereotypes and bias against women in leadership persist; and that, accordingly, continued vigilance is warranted if occupational integration by sex is to be achieved.

If contemporary trends mimic history, a peak in women's proportional representation followed by a period of significant decline may be expected. That scenario would be one form of career resegregation, that is, a return to overwhelming male dominance, with women occupying small or minimal percentages of line administrative positions.

Another form of resegregation could also occur. Women's inroads into superintendencies or principalships could accelerate and endure so persistently that, over time, the positions would take 180-degree demographic turns, from predominantly male to predominantly female. Women would essentially "take over" these administrative roles, much like they did schoolteaching at the turn of the twentieth century. As with other occupations that became completely feminized, factors such as labor shortages, work quality depreciation in the view of men and society, and "male flight" from the occupation all contribute to increasing access for women.

But resegregation is just one of three possibilities that gendered career pattern experts theorize. Another scenario—genuine integration—is also possible. That is, perhaps school administration will become gender balanced with men and women represented equitably. This scenario assumes that talent and leadership potential are distributed equally among the sexes. It presumes that the work conditions and benefits of administrative work will be attractive to both males and females in the labor market. It also presumes that sponsors, other informal gatekeepers, and employers will rank male and female prospective administrators at similar levels of attractiveness. This scenario would likely be associated with a significant ideological shift culturally, with leadership viewed as the shared domain of females and males rather than primarily as "manly work." Research and theory suggest this is unlikely to occur, however, given the persistence of sexual divisions of labor to date.

A third possibility for administrative leadership career patterns is what was referred to earlier in this essay as stratification and what some theorists call ghettoization. In this scenario, women's gains in proportional representation will either be short-lived or marginalized. An example of ghettoization as marginalization would be if women completely overtook smaller, lower-paid elementary principalships but remained underrepresented in higher-status, larger, or better-paid elementary and high schools. Another example comes from studies of superintendents in the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s, which found that women disproportionately occupied superintendencies in the smallest, most rural, or least desirable school districts.

Of course, it is impossible to say how contemporary gendered career patterns will change in the future. Familiarity with these three theoretical possibilities, however, may provide conceptual grounding for the kinds of research and disaggregated data needed to recognize and analyze future shifts. Also, awareness of how individual plans and aspirations are mediated by institutional and cultural factors can lead to deeper understanding of trends and patterns yet to appear.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Blount, J.M. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendency, 1873–1995.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ortiz, F.I. (1982). *Career patterns in educational administration: Women, men, and minorities.* New York: Praeger.

Ortiz, F.I., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 123–142). New York: Longman.

Riehl, C., & Byrd, M. (1997). Gender differences among new recruits to educational administration: Cautionary notes to an optimistic tale. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19*(1), 45–64.

Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender-inclusive profession. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 99–118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tallerico, M., & Blount, J.M. (2004). Women and the superintendency: Insights from theory and history. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(5), 633–662.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820–1980.* New York: Basic Books.

Marilyn Tallerico

Faculty Workloads in Higher Education

The story of gender equity and education is, at all levels, one of progress and bottlenecks. In higher education, for example, women are now the majority of college and graduate school enrollees and degree recipients, but they have made fewer inroads as faculty, especially in the natural sciences and engineering (Jacobs, 1996). One important element of this story is the high level of career commitment expected from faculty. Although the public often does not fully understand the nature and rhythm of faculty life, faculty positions are, in fact, highly demanding. The demands of these jobs are pervasive. Moreover, the requirements of faculty positions are often more intensive during the childbearing and child-rearing periods of young faculty's lives.

The data discussed in this essay were drawn from the 1998 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) administered by the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). The survey, designed to collect information on faculty and other instructional staff in institutions of higher education, is currently the most comprehensive study of postsecondary faculty. This cross-sectional survey has been administered three times: during the 1987 to 1988, 1992 to 1993, and 1998 to 1999 academic years. For the present analysis, the sample was restricted to those faculty members at four-year institutions who considered their academic appointment to be their primary job and who did not spend the majority of their time in administrative activities. This resulted in a final sample size of 11,162 faculty members of which 10,092 were full time. Selective reports from the 1992 administration of the same survey are also presented. Because the NSOPF did not solicit information on spouses of faculty members, information about those married couples in the 1990 Census in which either spouse reported her or his occupation as "postsecondary teacher" were rearranged to fill this gap.

THE FACULTY WORKWEEK

Time is a valuable—yet finite—resource about which individuals have to make allocation decisions. Juliet Schor brought this issue into the spotlight in her 1991 book, *The*

Overworked American, arguing that, after a century-long decline, working time began to increase in the 1980s. The lengthening of the average workweek, Schor contended, is the principal source of time pressure faced by individuals. Jacobs and Gerson (2004) find that a diversifying workforce has been accompanied by a bifurcation in working time, with more jobs requiring either very long or short workweeks. This time divide among jobs tends to mirror the class divide as well, with long working hours concentrated among managerial and professional workers and shorter working hours for workers with more modest educational and occupational credentials.

Working time among academic faculty reflects this larger pattern. Professors put in very long hours. Full-time male faculty report working 54.8 hours per week on average; their female counterparts report working almost as many hours (52.8 hours per week). Although a sizable minority of male (34.4 percent) and female (27.0 percent) full-time faculty do some paid consulting work, the amount of time they spend doing such work is minimal (approximately 5 hours per week). Thus, the majority of faculty working time is devoted to their main position, with outside consulting representing a minor fraction of total work effort.

Faculty work more hours per week than do those in most other occupations, even those in comparable professional positions. In 2000, the average employed man worked 43.1 hours per week, while the average male professional or manager worked 46.0 hours per week, a full nine-hour day less than professors (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004). Female professors exceed their same-sex counterparts in paid working time by an even larger margin. The average employed woman worked 37.1 hours in 2000, and female professionals and managers worked 39.5 hours on average.

Moreover, extremely long workweeks are pervasive in academia. The averages detailed above clearly indicate that a 50-hour workweek is normative, with roughly two-thirds of faculty reporting working such long hours. But a 60-hour workweek is also common; among full-time faculty, 38.1 percent of men and 32.5 percent of women report working at least 60 hours per week.

Long hours are pervasive across institutional types and academic rank. While faculty in research institutions report working the longest hours (an average of 55.8 for men and 54.0 for women), the average workweeks of full-time faculty in other institution types are quite similar. For example, male full-time faculty in liberal arts colleges work 54.0 hours per week, and their female counterparts put in 53.4 hours per week. Both male and female full-time faculty at all institutional groups average above 50 hours per week. Similarly, faculty at all ranks put in over 50 hours per week. Assistant professors work long hours but so too do tenured associate and full professors. Male assistant professors put in slightly longer hours than do their female counterparts (55.8 hours per week for the men versus 53.5 hours for the women). For men, there is a slight post-tenure slump with the length of the workweek declining by two hours, only to rise again for full professors. For women, the workweek actually grows steadily as they advance from the ranks of assistant to associate to full professor. The gender gap in working time for assistant professors is a bit sharper among those working 60 plus hours per week—43.2 percent of men and 33.5 percent of women put in these long workweeks. But long hours are not restricted to those on the tenure track. Even lecturers and instructors put in over 50 hours per week.

WORKING TIME FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF FAMILIES

Individual workweeks are only one part of the time crunch facing faculty members. American family structure has changed dramatically in recent decades, and this has profound implications for analyses of work-family conflict. Whereas just over half of married couples fit the breadwinner-homemaker model in 1970, by 2000 three in five were dual-earner couples. Census data indicate that dual-earner couples are common in academia, particularly among female faculty. Just over half (56.2 percent) of married male faculty and nearly all (88.5 percent) of married female faculty have spouses working full time. Moreover, a sizable minority is married to other faculty members and most have spouses in a managerial or professional occupation. Women faculty are more likely to be married to male faculty (18.2 percent versus 12.5 percent), but the partners of both groups are typically professionals or managers (69.5 percent for female faculty, 70.7 percent for male faculty).

What does this mean for the work-family conflicts facing academic faculty? In earlier work, Jacobs and Gerson (2004) argued that, in order to fully understand the time crunch facing American men and women, researchers must examine working time from the perspective of families. The family workweeks of married faculty are long: 84.1 hours per week on average for male faculty and 89.3 hours per week for female faculty. A sizable minority are in couples devoting 100 plus hours per week to paid employment (17.3 percent for men versus 25.4 percent for women). Thus, the pressure generated by the long faculty workweeks discussed above are compounded by the fact that most faculty, especially most women faculty, have spouses who themselves are putting in long hours. Are academic careers family friendly? On the one hand, one might argue that the answer is yes. Faculty members do not have to punch a time clock and are not closely monitored on an hourly basis, as is the case in many occupations. The measure of control and flexibility inherent in academic work allows faculty, especially those who are parents, to be available when children are sick or when breakdowns in child care inevitably occur. However, much of this compatibility rests on the implicit assumption that faculty members are able to wait until after receiving tenure to have children.

The strategy of delaying childbearing until after receiving tenure is quite appealing in that the most demanding phase of child care would occur after the pressure and risk associated with being an untenured assistant professor is completed. But clearly this strategy depends on getting tenure relatively early in life. In other words, the "tenure first, kids later" approach relies on a certain ordered, uninterrupted life-course sequencing in which one receives his or her PhD at age 27 or 28 (which itself relies on the assumption of beginning graduate school immediately or soon after receiving one's undergraduate degree and completing the degree in five or six years) and receives tenure at roughly the age of 34. This poses an important empirical question: How old are assistant professors? If this ordered life-course sequencing is occurring, we would expect assistant professors to be in their early 30s. Is that the case?

The average age for male assistant professors is 42.4; for women, it is slightly older at 43.7. The average age of assistant professors is higher in some fields, such as education and nursing, than others, such as the physical sciences. But the average exceeds 37 years of age in all of the academic specialties. Thus, the dilemma of whether to wait until tenure to have children is a daunting one in all areas of academia with the data suggesting that most assistant professors are too old to wait until receiving tenure to start their families.

Why is it that assistant professors are older than the ordered life-course sequencing perspective would lead us to expect? One reason is that faculty members are not receiving their degrees until after their 30th birthdays. The average age at degree is 33.4 for men and 35.5 for women. Again, there is variation across specialties between fields with faculty in some fields, such as education, obtaining their degrees much later in life than in other fields, such as architecture and engineering. Nonetheless, in all fields the average

age for doctoral degree recipients is at least 30. As a result, questions about getting married and having children before achieving tenure, whether that is when one is in graduate school, holding postdoctoral fellowships or other temporary positions, or is an assistant professor, arise in all fields of academic specialization.

Another possible explanation for an age profile that does not support the "tenure first, kids later" pattern might be that faculty members are starting families before receiving their PhDs. While the cross-sectional data available to us do not allow for exact pinpointing of these events, one may make some life-course inferences about these data. For example, women obtaining PhDs in the physical sciences are slightly younger than their male counterparts (average age of 30.2 for women versus 31.4 for men). Thus, it is likely that few women in this area are having children in advance of receiving their PhD since there is no evidence of a slowdown relative to their male counterparts. In other fields, such as the arts and humanities, education, and biological sciences, women are obtaining their doctoral degrees two or more years after their male counterparts. Childbearing in advance of the degree may well be the explanation for these differences.

Finally, it may be the case that academics do not progress directly from degree receipt to a tenure-track faculty position. The data indicate that assistant professors have been at their current institution for an average of just over three years. This figure is exactly what one would expect given a six- or seven-year tenure clock, but it leaves several years unaccounted for. In other words, age at degree plus years at current institution does not add up to the respondent's current age. What explains this gap? In some fields, like biology, respondents typically worked five or more years at another institution, presumably as a postdoctoral fellow, before starting as an assistant professor. The number of years elapsed before starting as an assistant professor is much lower in other fields, including business and the social sciences. Thus, the fact that assistant professors are often in their late 30s or early 40s is due to a combination of obtaining the doctoral degree in their early 30s and spending several years in postdoctoral fellowships or temporary positions after the receipt of the degree. Taken together, these results indicate that the "tenure first, kids later" strategy is not a viable option for many in academia. For many faculty members, the most demanding years of child rearing likely coincide with the demands and uncertainty of the pretenure years.

WORKLOAD, PRODUCTIVITY, AND SATISFACTION

How can we make sense of the long workweeks put in by faculty members, particularly in light of the fact that, for many, they are combined with a spouse's lengthy employment hours and the demands of raising children? Are these hours self-imposed or are they rooted in institutional and professional expectations?

An optimistic view might hold that academia is a context in which devotion to work is self-imposed. Professors do not punch a time clock and, even at the most teaching-intensive institutions, classroom time rarely exceeds 15 hours. The time demands experienced by faculty are, thus, in some sense discretionary. Moreover, this argument holds that faculty members love their work and deeply identify with their professional role. In this sense, academia represents a secular "calling" with faculty embracing the "work devotion" schema outlined by Blair-Loy (2003). That faculty do not relinquish their professional titles or affiliations upon retirement (i.e., "Professor" simply becomes "Emeritus Professor") suggests that many professors keep working diligently into retirement as long as their strength and stamina allow. All of this might logically lead to the conclusion that, if the faculty workweek seems excessive to some, it certainly does not to faculty because it is what they chose to do.

In contrast to the view that faculty work time is self-imposed, an alternative view is that professors often find themselves caught in a set of institutional and professional expectations. In other words, normative expectations about what it means to be a good or successful academic drive many faculty members to put in excessive hours. While the institutional demands perspective would acknowledge the many attractions of academia, such a view stresses the practical challenges that large numbers of faculty confront at both elite and less selective colleges and universities.

If professors' long workweeks are due to "structural constraints," what are these structures and what are the sources of these constraints? There are four main sources of growing time pressures on faculty. First, the rising cost of higher education has brought renewed public scrutiny and, with it, calls for more emphasis on teaching. While the source of the scrutiny may differ across institution type (with public institutions often responding to budget cuts and private institutions justifying rising tuition by focusing on how much faculty attention students receive), the pressure to increase the quantity and quality of time devoted to teaching has been evident in public and private institutions of higher education. Second, the increased emphasis on teaching has been accompanied by rising expectations for research productivity. Both the form and the content of the tenure review system, formerly most developed in the elite schools, have been adopted by colleges and universities at all levels of higher education. Third, technological changes associated with the information economy have paradoxically increased the time demands and intensity of faculty jobs. Although this claim cannot be assessed with NSOPF data, anecdotal evidence strongly suggests that faculty spend countless hours reading and responding to e-mail and are often assumed by students to be available 24 hours per day. Moreover, the adoption of computers was also accompanied by a decline in secretarial support for faculty.

Finally, the rise of part-time employment in academia increases the pressures on full-time faculty members. Part-time employment in academia has risen sharply over the past 30 years as extremely low-paid part-time faculty are available to teach for a small fraction of the cost of full-time members of the standing faculty. In 1999, more than two in five (42.5 percent) postsecondary faculty were employed part time, a substantial increase from 21.9 percent found in 1970 (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The growth in the number of part timers increases pressures on full timers in two ways. First, the reduction in the number of full-time positions makes entry into the ranks of full-time faculty that much more competitive. Furthermore, since part timers are rarely asked to serve on committees and take on other administrative roles, the growth of part-time employment means that a smaller fraction of faculty are saddled with a growing amount of administrative responsibilities. In sum, a perspective emphasizing structural constraints and normative expectations suggests that multiple course preparations, endless committee meetings, seemingly limitless productivity standards, and a relentless stream of e-mails make today's faculty work experience less than the idealized world of academia suggested by the self-imposed viewpoint outlined above.

Which of these views fits the data more closely? While it is clear that faculty overwhelmingly report being satisfied with their jobs (84.8 percent of men and 81.8 percent of full-time women report being somewhat or very satisfied with their jobs), they do voice complaints about salary, benefits, and their workload. By focusing on whether faculty report dissatisfaction with their workload, we can assess the extent to which the length of the faculty workweek is self-imposed and willingly chosen. If the self-imposed perspective is correct, then we would expect that those who put in the longest hours express few if any complaints about their workload since these faculty love teaching and research and cannot get enough of it. On the other hand, if one's workload is largely driven by institutional and professional demands such as increasing course loads and expectations for publishing, then we may find a significant number of professors who are not satisfied with their jobs. A key question, then, is whether satisfaction with workload increases with time on the job. If so, then those working the longest may not be doing so completely voluntarily. Instead, work patterns may be the result of many pressures, some stemming from the institution, others from normative expectations set by other faculty. A related question concerns the connection between working time and research productivity: Do long workweeks play a key role in contributing to success in publishing? If so, this relationship may provide insights into the reasons for the amount of time faculty spend on the job.

Faculty dissatisfaction with workload increases with hours on the job. For example, one in three (30.3 percent) female faculty working less than 50 hours per week report being dissatisfied with their workload, compared with more than two in five (44.1 percent) of those working more than 60 hours per week. The idea that greater hours are associated with more complaints about an excessive workload may seem simple, but it runs counter to the notion that people working the longest hours are all doing so simply out of a love of their jobs. So what explains the excessive workweeks that are so pervasive in academia? Our data clearly indicate that those who put in the longest workweeks are likely to publish more books and articles. The differences between those putting in over 50 hours per week versus those putting in less than 50 hours per week are substantial. However, the impact of working over 60 hours per week is even more dramatic and seems especially critical for women. If research productivity is indispensable for success in academia and if a 60-hour workweek is key for success in publishing, then working 60 or more hours per week essentially becomes a requirement of academic jobs.

Academic positions are highly sought after and very satisfying, but they are also very demanding and pose significant challenges to those striving to maintain a fulfilling family life. This remains particularly true for married women faculty whose husbands are typically very busy professionals themselves. The risk of maintaining the current systems is the loss of talent, both in terms of faculty lost through the "leaky pipeline" as well as those deterred from pursing careers in this profession. The first step in addressing these concerns is to understand that there is a problem that needs to be addressed. Policies designed to manage the demands of faculty jobs can be devised (see Jacobs, 2004) but only after recognizing that some limits need to be set on the demands posed by academic positions.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Blair-Loy, M. (2003). *Competing devotions: Career and family among women executives.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jacobs, J.A. (1996). Gender inequality and higher education. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22,* 153–185.

Jacobs, J.A. (2004). The faculty time divide. *Sociological Forum, 19*(1), 3–27.

Jacobs, J.A., & Gerson, K. (2004). *The time divide: Work, family and gender inequality.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jacobs, J.A., & Winslow, S. (2004a). Overworked faculty: Job stresses and family demands. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 596*(1), 104–129.

Jacobs, J.A., & Winslow, S. (2004b). Understanding the academic life course, time pressures and gender inequality. *Community, Work, and Family, 7*(2), 143–161.

Schor, J. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure.* New York: Basic Books.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2001). *Background characteristics, work activities and compensation of faculty and instructional staff in postsecondary institutions* (NCES 2001-152). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Digest of education statistics.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Accessed April 5, 2004, at http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/

Winslow, S. (2005). Work-family conflict, gender, and parenthood, 1977–1997. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(6), 727–755.

Winslow-Bowe, S.E. (2006). *Husbands' and wives' relative income: Persistence, variation, and outcomes.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Sarah E. Winslow-Bowe

Jerry A. Jacobs

Feminization of Teaching

Some occupations are dominated numerically by one sex. An occupation that is predominantly made up of women is said to be "feminized." Although it is easy to find examples of occupations that are feminized, either historically or in the contemporary United States, relatively few occupations have undergone a substantial change in gender composition over time. One example is clerical work in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Another is teaching.

"Teaching" is a highly diverse occupation. Some teachers teach young children; others teach young (or older) adults. Some teachers specialize in a single subject, while others teach many subjects. This essay is not about teaching in all of its diversity but rather focuses primarily on individuals employed in elementary and secondary education—that is, grade school and high school. It is useful to begin with some figures from the federal population census. Taken every 10 years, the census provides a (mostly) representative "snapshot" of the American population. Since 1860, the censuses have recorded the occupations of men and women who had an occupation to report. Although there are many issues involved in the interpretation of the census beyond the scope of this essay, for our purposes the data shown in Table IX.1 are sufficiently accurate to establish two major points.

Throughout the twentieth century, including up to the very present, the overwhelming majority of teachers have been women. At the turn of the twentieth century, the proportion of teachers who were female was 74 percent. The proportion climbed to a high of 84 percent shortly after World War I and then slipped back down to 71 percent just after World War II. From 1950 to the present, the female share held steady in the range of 71 percent to 76 percent. In 2000, the most recent year for which census data are available, the proportion of females among teachers was 76 percent.

Fluctuations aside, teaching in the United States was feminized throughout the twentieth century. The twentieth century witnessed an enormous expansion in the range of occupations held by women, particularly in professions such as law, medicine, and business management. An obvious question, which we return to later in the essay, is why this expansion evidently did not siphon more women from teaching.

Table IX.1 Percent of Females in Teaching: United States, 1860–1900

Census year	Percent of female teachers
1860	59.9 (N = 1,134)
1870	66.8 (N = 1,320)
1880	67.6 (N = 2,310)
1900	74.0 (N = 2,088)
1910	80.4 (N = 2,474)
1920	83.8 (N = 7,321)
1930	80.2 (N = 1,888)
1940	74.8 (N = 10,786)
1950	71.3 (N = 10,627)
1960	76.7 (N = 21,944)
1970	73.8 (N = 36,403)
1980	71.6 (N = 44,471)
1990	74.0 (N = 53,695)
2000	75.5 (N = 58,560)

Source: All years, integrated public use microdata samples of the U.S. census; see www.ipums.umn.edu. To be included in the calculations, individuals had to be between the ages of 15 and 79 and report their occupation as "teaching" (occupation code #93). For further details, contact the authors.

The twentieth-century pattern also invites a second query. Was teaching similarly feminized in the nineteenth century? Perhaps women have always dominated instruction in the "lower" subjects from the earliest days of the Republic, if not before.

The census data in Table IX.1 give a mixed response to this question. It is clear that the percent female was rising from 1860 to 1900. Did the upward trend begin in 1860 or predate it? This is an important question because the 1860s was no ordinary decade—it was the decade of the American Civil War and reconstruction efforts that followed.

The experience of the twentieth century suggests that wars can bring about changes in the gender composition of occupations. The economic rationale is simple: Men who would be performing certain jobs during peacetime are otherwise occupied during war and the jobs are too valuable to be left undone. During World War II, women took on numerous occupations formerly held by men, particularly in durable goods manufacturing, as the imagery of "Rosie the Riveter" attests. We know that some of the occupational gains experienced by women in the 1940s were sustained for older women (Goldin, 1990).

The figures in Table IX.1 are suggestive of a Civil War effect, because the percent female rose sharply in the 1860s but not in the 1870s. However, this is only suggestive because we do not have an estimate for 1850; it is possible that the percent female rose as strongly in the 1850s as in the 1860s. In addition, the percent female rose during the 1890s almost as much as during the 1860s—and the 1890s increase cannot be attributed to the Civil War, for obvious reasons.

Fortunately, it is possible to roughly estimate the magnitude of the Civil War effect on the percentage of females in teaching. The census is the only nationally representative source on the gender composition of teaching in the nineteenth century, but it is hardly the only source. Various states published annual education reports, and these sometimes included the gender breakdown of the teaching force. The state data are not fully comparable to the federal data nor are all states covered, but we believe the data are sufficiently reliable and the coverage sufficiently broad to provide some insight into the impact of the Civil War.

A statistical analysis, conducted by the authors, of the available data for 13 states over the period 1840 to 1915 suggests that, during the War itself, the percent female, on average, was elevated by nearly 12 percentage points above what it would have been otherwise. Although some of this effect eventually eroded (as similarly happened for women's work in general during the two World Wars), slightly more than half (approximately seven percentage points) appears to have been a long run or permanent effect. The permanent impact equals approximately the increase in feminization that would have occurred over about a decade and a half in the absence of the Civil War.

Why did the wartime substitution of female for male teachers persist after the end of the conflict? The commentary of school boards prior to the War suggests that many school officials harbored reservations against employing female teachers, especially in the winter sessions when the student population included teenage boys. Female teachers, according to this view, were less capable of disciplining older boys than male teachers. This prejudice appears to have eroded, however, during the War when the practical experience of female teachers proved otherwise. The practical experience also validated a fundamental economic advantage that female teachers had over male teachers: They were cheaper to employ. A school board could staff its schools entirely with female teachers and save money. But cost considerations were decisive only if school boards—and, ultimately, taxpayers and parents—could be persuaded that female teachers could deliver the same quality of teaching services as male teachers.

This had long been the belief in New England. During the colonial period, women taught very young children in so-called "dame schools," an organizational form that migrated from England along with the colonists. The argument, familiar to a modern audience, was that women were the "natural" caretakers of young children and hence their natural teachers.

From the early beginning of the dame school, the school year in New England evolved into a two-tier system divided into winter and summer sessions. Women quickly dominated teaching in the summer sessions but lagged behind in the winter term when older boys attended and the subjects taught, such as Latin, required a high degree of preparation. But gradually, as institutional structures and attitudes changed in ways that facilitated girls' continued learning beyond some rudimentary level, the pool of females qualified to teach more advanced subjects expanded. Women eventually came to dominate the winter sessions, as well, most likely because of these improvements in their educational qualifications. In Massachusetts in 1842, 95 percent of the teachers during the summer session were women, whereas only 33 percent during the winter session were women. By 1860, the overall percent female among Massachusetts teachers was 78 percent compared with 62 percent in 1842. This increase cannot be explained by increases in the percent female during the summer session (since this was already close to 100 percent) nor by increases in the summer session's proportion of the total teaching force; rather, the increase can only be explained by a rise in the proportion of female teachers during the winter term.

The Northeast was in the forefront of early feminization. Elsewhere a distinctive regional pattern was apparent, perhaps nowhere more prominent than below the Mason-Dixon Line where men, not women, dominated in teaching. Even right up to the eve of the Civil War, only 65 percent of teachers in urban areas and 36 percent of those in rural areas of the South were female. By comparison, females comprised 81 percent and 84 percent of the teaching force in New England for urban and rural areas, respectively. Many factors may have contributed to the stark regional divide. To take one example, economic historians have documented that the wages of women relative to men outside of teaching were higher in the South than in the North before the Civil War; other things equal, a higher relative wage would mean fewer women hired relative to men. While there is some evidence in favor of this economic explanation for the lag in feminization in the South as well as elsewhere, detailed statistical analysis suggests that the primary factors involve institutions and culture. The South, unlike the North, did not develop dame schools nor did it develop a two-tier system. These institutions, it seems, provided the necessary experience with female teachers to overcome prevailing stereotypes.

The role of culture and institutions in shaping attitudes toward female teachers is also evident in regional variation in the North. Analysis of the geographic variation in the prevalence of female teachers on the eve of the Civil War reveals the potent effect of settlers' origins. Illinois offers an instructive case study. In Illinois counties that were predominantly settled by Yankees, female teachers were quite common; but where settlement was dominated by Southerners, male teachers predominated. This pattern remains after a detailed statistical analysis that takes account of a myriad of other factors that might have affected the relative use of female teachers.

Table IX.1 demonstrates that the proportion of females in teaching continued to rise in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries before peaking shortly after World War I. By 1870, slightly more than 80 percent of teachers in New England were female, and, thus, there was relatively little scope for further change. However, elsewhere in the country, particularly in the South where only 33 percent of teachers were women in 1870, there was considerable room for further increase.

We should note that aggregate data for Southern states after the Civil War obscure the fact that two separate school systems existed, one for African American students and another for Whites. Although prior to the Civil War the proportion of African Americans in teaching was negligible, perhaps 1 percent in both Northern and Southern regions, by the 1880s African Americans comprised about 20 percent of the teaching force in the South. Despite sharp differences in other respects between the two types of schools, the extent of feminization was similar. In 1880, 52 percent of African American teachers and 56 percent of White teachers in the South were female. In 1910, these figures were 77 percent and 76 percent, respectively.

We have already touched upon the effect of experimenting with female teachers during the Civil War and the evidence that this experimentation had a permanent impact. But the size of this effect cannot account for all the feminization that took place over the half century after the War.

Another important factor was the spread of graded schools. In a graded school, students were segregated in classrooms according to their educational level (grade), which, for the most part, meant that they were segregated by age. Older children, including older boys, could be taught by men while younger children could be taught by women; there was, in other words, the possibility of "division of labor." Grading depended on population density and, especially for a given population of school age, on the enrollment rate. A small town or village could "afford" a graded school only if a sufficient number of persons of school age were enrolled in school. There is abundant evidence that grading was associated with a higher proportion of female teachers. For example, in Michigan in 1880, the proportion of female teachers in graded schools was close to 80 percent, 11 percentage points higher than in schools lacking grades. The share of graded schools in total enrollments increased rapidly after the Civil War, except in the South where the growth occurred somewhat later in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As graded schools expanded relative to ungraded schools, the proportion of female teachers increased.

Yet it would be a mistake to attribute all, or even most, of the increased use of female teachers after the Civil War to the spread of graded schools. Detailed individual-level data on teachers and their locations from the federal censuses of 1860, 1880, and 1910 reveal that the majority of the feminization of the teaching force between 1860 and 1910 occurred in purely rural areas where the expansion of graded schools could not have been the driving force. The Michigan data just noted are telling on this point because they identify graded and ungraded schools. Between 1880 and 1910, the proportion of female teachers rose from 69 percent to 84 percent in Michigan's ungraded schools. While the proportion of female teachers in graded schools in Michigan in 1910 was higher than this—88 percent—the gap is small relative to the change over time. The conclusion is clear: A significant shift toward female teachers took place before World War II in ungraded schools and, therefore, cannot be attributed to changes in school organization. This shift, it seems, reflected a diffusion of ideas that originated elsewhere—that women could be employed successfully as teachers even if it were uneconomical to grade the schools. By the late nineteenth century, boys and girls were mastering the same basic curriculum, and objections to female inability to discipline older children seemed to have eroded. When female teachers were seen as capable of supplying the same "bundle" of educational services as male teachers, school boards hired them in increasing numbers. The boards also realized that, in hiring female teachers, it was possible to shift expenditures on teachers (as long as class sizes did not decline) to other, worthwhile endeavors like increasing the length of the school year. The increased demand for female teachers bid up their wages relative to men but not by so much as to eliminate the economic incentive for hiring them.

Although women came to dominate teaching by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this does not mean that teaching was "gender neutral" with respect to economic rewards. Analysis of personnel records of school systems reveals that, early in the century, women were far less likely than men to "manage"—that is, become a principal or another type of administrator—even if their qualifications on paper (education and experience) were similar.

This gender gap in administrative positions effectively widened the gender gap in teacher's pay, both directly and indirectly. Because administrators were paid much better than teachers, had the gender gap in administrative positions been smaller, the gender gap in teacher's pay would have been smaller. Also, administrators set policies on issues such as salary schedules and hiring policies (for example, the marriage bars discussed below). The absence of women in this decision-making process likely perpetuated the creation of gender-specific opportunities for higher pay. Indeed, data from four cities where extensive annual personnel files were available indicate that up to 58 percent of the gender gap in promotion was due to gender discrimination.

A gender gap in teacher's pay existed long before the twentieth century—indeed, we emphasized earlier that the gap was a financial incentive to employ female teachers. But, while some of the gap in the early part of the century can be attributed to gender differences in education and experience, much of the gap is a pure difference with no explanation other than that it was possible to pay women less and get away with it. Analysis of the personnel files just mentioned indicate that between 63 percent and 84 percent of the observed gap in female/male wages was unaccounted for by differences in education or experience and, thus, attributed to wage discrimination. Indeed, school systems throughout the country were more than willing to embody such differentials in formal salary schedules—one for women, the other for men. Women's progress in teaching was also affected by marriage bars; a school board with such a bar either refused to hire a married woman (a hire bar) or fired a woman upon marriage (a retain bar). These policies reinforced the gender gap in wages since female teachers who were likely to ever marry had fewer incentives to acquire training or experience that would increase their pay status. Marriage bars were extremely common in teaching during the first half of the twentieth century but eventually gave way during World War II.

For much of American history, teaching was one of a few occupations that were readily open to educated, intellectually talented young women. In recent decades, however, women have entered many professions formerly dominated by men, notably law and medicine. The labor force participation rate of married women especially has risen over the twentieth century. A common index of gender representation, the percent female in the occupation divided by the percent female of the entire labor force, illustrates this gender desegregation well. In the 1960s, within the field of medicine, for example, this index ranged from 0.20 to 0.33; for law it was nearly zero (0.08). By 1990, the proportion of women in these professions was much more representative and the index was 0.79 for medicine and 0.94 for law (Corcoran, Evans, & Schwab, 2002). Regional differences existed in the timing and magnitude of gender desegregation, with the most rapid and extensive changes occurring in the Northeast region. Also, increases in the proportion of college-educated women in professional occupations were slightly smaller for Black women than their White counterparts. For example, the share of White college-educated women in medicine, law, and engineering increased by 33 percentage points between 1960 and 1990, while the share increased by 29 percentage points for Black women. Despite these differences, the overall trend of expanding opportunities for females during the twentieth century was undeniable.

Has the expansion of job opportunities for women outside of teaching in recent decades made teaching less feminized? At present, the answer appears to be no. The percent female in teaching has shown no sustained downward trend since 1960, the period over which educated women entered occupations other than teaching (see Table IX.1).

However, while the percent female in teaching has remained stable in the face of expanding job opportunities, there is some evidence that the most able women are increasingly opting out of teaching. The strongest evidence of such "opting-out" concerns trends in standardized test scores. For example, bringing together several sources of data, Bacolod (forthcoming) finds that the percent of female teachers who scored below the twentieth percentile on various standardized tests increased from 8 percent of female teachers born in the 1940s to 19 percent of those born in the 1960s. The fraction of those scoring above the 80th percentile fell from 41 percent to 19 percent across these same cohorts. These trends are important because, if teaching commands a smaller share of highly able women than in the past, the aggregate rate of growth of human capital in the economy and therefore the overall rate of economic growth may slow.

While important for other reasons, concerns about the quality of teachers may have few implications for overall gender composition. In particular, the supply of college graduates has grown much more rapidly among women than men in recent decades, thereby ensuring a ready potential source of female teachers. While other occupations have opened up, teaching still remains an attractive option for many women. Thus, it seems likely that teaching in the United States will remain feminized for the foreseeable future.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bacolod, M.P. (forthcoming). Do alternative opportunities matter? The role of female labor markets in the decline of teacher quality, 1960–1990. *Review of Economics and Statistics.*

Corcoran, S., Evans, W., & Schwab, R. (2002). *Changing labor market opportunities for women and the quality of teachers 1957–1992* (Working Paper No. 9180). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Goldin, C. (1990). *Understanding the gender gap: An economic history of American women.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Murnane, R.J., Singer, J.D., Willet, J.B., Kemple, J.J., & Olsen, R.J. (1991). *Who will teach? Policies that matter.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Perlmann, J., & Margo, R.A. (2001). *Women's work? American schoolteachers, 1850–1920.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Podgursky, M., Monroe, R., & Watson, D. (2004). The academic quality of public school teachers: An analysis of entry and exit behavior. *Economics of Education Review, 23*(5), 507–518.

Linda K. Carter

Robert A. Margo

Leadership Styles

In education, as in other types of organizations, gender and situational characteristics interact to construct patterns of gender differences that vary with circumstances. When gender differences are evident, they tend to be characterized by agentic and communal behavior. Agentic leadership is task oriented, assertive, and directive; communal leadership focuses on interpersonal relationships, supporting others, and not seeking attention. When gender differences are evident, men display more agentic behavior and women more communal behavior. The extent of gender differences in leadership style depends on characteristics of schools, such as the prevalence of gender stereotypes and discrimination, proportions of women and men in leadership and subordinate roles, hierarchical organization, emphasis on stereotypically masculine tasks, and historical reliance on masculine leadership models that stress coercive power and competition. In educational settings, women prefer leadership styles that focus on organizational and social transformation, collaboration, and empowerment of others. Even in educational settings that have the characteristics that promote masculinized leadership patterns, women have developed coping strategies that allow them to be successful leaders, contributing to a larger proportion of women leaders at all levels of education and to transforming both institutions and the definition of leadership.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP

Are there gender differences in leadership styles in educational contexts? While there is considerable scholarly research on gender in educational literature, little addresses this question, and what does is generally anecdotal or qualitative and relies on very small samples. Research on gender and leadership in broader managerial contexts is helpful, in that it demonstrates quite clearly that leadership behavior is strongly influenced by social context, that is, gender differences exist in some social situations, but not in others. Social scientists can make equally plausible cases to support both the absence and existence of gender differences in leadership styles. The key to this apparent contradiction is understanding the context in which leadership occurs. Hence, rather than dwelling on the extent of differences, it is more productive to discuss situational characteristics that are correlated with gendered stylistic patterns.

What are those stylistic patterns? Alice H. Eagly and her colleagues use the distinction between agentic and communal attributes to describe these differences. Agentic leadership behavior includes focus on tasks and problems, assertive speech, influence attempts, and calling attention to oneself; communal behaviors include focus on relationship and interpersonal problems, tentative speech, supporting others, taking direction from others, and not seeking attention (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Popular and academic literature that purports to describe gendered leadership styles generally proposes a distinction along the lines of agentic and communal behavior, using terms such as task-oriented and interpersonally oriented style, participative and directive, or democratic and autocratic. A review of multiple studies on leadership behavior by Carli and Eagly (2001) found that women display more positive social behavior and agreement than men, whereas men are more task oriented and disagree more than women.

However, this distinction is not a dichotomous dimension, but rather agentic behavior is defined more by the status of participants in an interaction regardless of their gender. In contrast, communal behavior is related to gender, with women engaging it more, often especially when interacting with other women. Research looking at the interaction of gender roles and organizational roles implies that women and men in the same leadership role behave more similarly than not, so some gender variations may be the result of gender differences in the roles occupied by women and men. Informal actions that are not functional aspects of a given leadership role may be the most discretionary and most likely to vary with gender, such as the topics of casual office conversation.

An important element of gendered leadership patterns is the influence of stereotypic expectations of women's and men's behavior. Female and male leaders are evaluated differently in experimental studies where behaviors are equated; women using direct language, disagreement, and autocratic behavior are regarded more negatively than men exhibiting the same behavior. Women leaders appear to be more constrained by gender stereotypes than men. Thus, women may learn that they are more effective when they employ communal leadership strategies, possibly to the extent that they internalize gender-stereotypic expectations and leadership styles. These kinds of factors lead to the argument that congruity of leader roles and gender roles is a critical factor in people's choice of leadership behavior, evaluations of that behavior by others, and effectiveness as leaders. Therefore, the question of whether women and men lead differently is meaningless without concurrent analysis of relevant contextual variables.

Furthermore, emphasis on the question of whether women and men have different leadership styles encourages analyses that overgeneralize, or essentialize, female and male differences. As with most gender differences, women's and men's behavior overlaps greatly, and there is much more variability within each gender than between them. Focusing solely on gender differences legitimizes a dualistic view of gender that can be seen in much of the literature on leadership in education, greatly oversimplifying the role of gender and exaggerating differences out of context.

THE CONTEXT OF EDUCATION

What are characteristics of the educational context that influence the extent that gender interacts with leadership style preferences? While there is little controlled experimental evidence about these interactions, much of the literature on leadership in education implicitly discusses context variables that promote or mitigate gender differences. Although many of the resources for this section concern higher education in the United States, authors writing about elementary and secondary school principals and superintendents and about educational systems in other English-speaking countries describe similar characteristics.

As in most areas of human endeavor, historically men have been leaders in education at all levels. Women leaders in higher education emerged at women's colleges or as deans of women in early coeducational schools at the beginning of the twentieth century. Interviews with women leaders from different generations demonstrate that leadership styles vary with changing sociohistorical contexts. For example, in one study, those who came of age during the Depression and World War II emphasized the value of education for achieving equality for women and often adopted male models of leadership. Those who came of age during the 1960s, with the civil rights, anti-Vietnam war, and feminist movements, focused on concerns about equal opportunity in education and other work settings and the inclusion of women in scholarly and curricular concerns. Those who were ascending to leadership positions in the 1990s extended those values to creating alternative modes of leadership.

Also, like other areas of human behavior, education is heavily influenced by gender discrimination and stereotyping. Work on the nature of gender stereotypes is instructive for understanding dynamics in regard to leadership. Stereotypes of out-groups often invoke the characteristics of sociability and competence, which for women take the form of the false dichotomy of sociable housewife versus competent career woman, as if sociability and competence were mutually exclusive. Such stereotypes interact with other situational factors, as when women in male-dominated businesses experience contradictory expectations more than those in gender-balanced offices. The gender imbalance in higher education, which is more pronounced in higher leadership positions and more prestigious institutions, indicates that women are under more pressure to perform competently than male peers. Countering stereotypes may be necessary to establish credibility as leaders, hence the advice frequently offered to women pursuing academic administrative careers to develop extensive expertise in finance, strategic planning, and research to overcome stereotypes of women's weaknesses. Furthermore, gender stereotypes and other stereotypes certainly interact. For example, gendered ethnic stereotypes that African American women are aggressive and hostile and Asian, Native American, and Hispanic women are deferent and passive impact perceived leadership ability. In general, women are stereotyped as less likely to demonstrate important leadership behaviors than men. The incongruity between leadership roles and female gender roles leads to prejudicial actions, such that men are more likely to have opportunities and to emerge as leaders than women.

The hierarchical organization of education is another contextual factor. Either overtly or implicitly, hierarchies assume gendered constructs. Hierarchies are endemic to education. Schools are ranked in prestige and reputation, disciplines vary in status, size of tuition is equated with value, and faculty salaries are related to institutional prestige. While it would be simplistic to argue that hierarchy and masculine values are perfectly correlated, traditional hierarchical management does mimic masculine qualities, in the extreme, a "military model" designed to control the role of emotion and caring in organizations. Feminist writers often note that organizations change to value human needs more when a critical mass of women employees is reached, particularly women leaders. While the numbers of women in education at all levels have increased, women administrators remain in the minority and are in the smallest proportion in the most prestigious colleges or positions. As schools adopt business models, hierarchical line management has replaced collegial governance in many places, perhaps undermining changes normally facilitated by increased proportions of women.

Male dominance in education has been ignored, perhaps because it seems obvious. However, ignoring male dominance has lead to failure to thoroughly analyze how deeply embedded gender constructs are in organizations. Meta-analyses of studies of leadership effectiveness corroborate the relationship between perceived effectiveness and situational expectations, as women leaders are seen as less effective when the proportion of male subordinates is greater, in highly masculinized environments like military organizations, and when a larger percentage of male raters are evaluating them. In highly masculinized organizations, men are the numerical majority, tasks are stereotypically masculine, the main goal is task completion, and hierarchy and coercive power are stressed. Leadership in masculinized contexts depends on status, self-promotion, competition, and autocratic behavior, all of which are viewed negatively when engaged in by women. Despite some evidence that education provides more opportunity than other work settings, in that women are perceived as somewhat more effective in education, government, and social services than in other kinds of organizations, education remains masculinized to some extent. For example, historical accounts of leaders in the community college arena focus on a few "great men" who have shaped the role of these colleges in higher education using frontier, pioneer, athletic, and military images. To the extent that leadership characteristics are inferred from these metaphors, the leadership styles of women and ethnic minorities are seen as deficient, limiting their access to leadership positions.

Gender is a status characteristic in our culture, giving men an edge in any situation where status matters. Women attempting to improve their own stature face a double bind because self-promotion by women can backfire. Women who are modest about their successes are recognized more than women who are moderately self-promoting. Furthermore, women must demonstrate greater competence than similar men to gain recognition, even when they have achieved high status positions. As educational management adopts corporate models, women may be further disadvantaged. Solving financial and political problems has become more prominent in the role of president. Women college presidents comment often that they feel they must work harder than male presidents to gain the confidence of their boards of trustees and are given a second chance less often after failure. Women of color believe they are especially vulnerable in this regard.

Too little is known about the interaction of gender with other cultural identities, such as ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability, but gender and these other identity characteristics undoubtedly interact with status in complicated ways. Some educators feel that race stereotypes overpower gender expectations in treatment from others; others feel that gender is more salient; others say that gender and ethnicity are so intertwined that the debate is pointless. The role of these highly salient characteristics requires considerable further research.

GENDERED LEADERSHIP STYLES

Although readers must be mindful of these complex multivariate interactions and gaps in knowledge about leadership, analyses of leadership style do suggest patterns associated with gender that may be either the result of gender-related values or choices based on an understanding of what is effective in gendered contexts.

Women leaders often value institutional transformation explicitly, considering the ultimate reward for their persistence in academic administration creating a more congenial environment for future generations of both female and male administrators. Women leaders also report commitment to broader social transformation. For example, African American administrators frequently mention an obligation to give back to the community and mentor others. Other administrators focus on transforming the very nature of leadership by transforming the culture of one's own organization or broader societal notions of leadership. Social values go beyond focusing only on women to explicitly include work against racism, violence, and heterosexism, as well.

Another theme in writings by women administrators is the importance of understanding power relations. To succeed and transform leadership, people must understand their position and relative power in an organization. While acknowledging that women must be politically attuned to these power dynamics in their institutions, women academic leaders often say they are ambivalent about the perceived need to play power games to advance before being able to change the rules of the game. They also feel ambivalent about being pleased by their ability to use power to accomplish goals, simultaneously recognizing that it plays into the masculine definitions of leadership. In addition to finding it difficult to become assimilated while articulating a critique of male management models, feminist administrators are seldom concerned with obtaining power or establishing strong personal claims to authorship. But leaders must understand the leadership culture of their organizations, since the masculinized context so frequently found in higher education includes the assumption that effective leadership depends on status and power manifested through autocratic behavior. Understanding politics essentially means understanding the nature of formal and informal power in academe in general and in a particular institution. One way of reconciling ambivalence about playing power games is to define power as the ability to influence outcomes, rather than the ability to influence people, as one writer noted, using a metaphor of "expanding the pie" of influence, rather than a "fixed boundary" view of power (Valverde, 2003).

This ambivalence is one of many strains women leaders discuss. Organizational transformation often evokes resistance that creates stresses for women administrators, such as isolation, difficulty balancing work and personal life, self-doubt, and institutional intransigence. Fortunately, women educators also give advice about survival strategies to aspiring administrators. For instance, African American women administrators consistently describe specific tactics they use to cope with ethnic and gender discrimination, such as emphasizing the importance of self-knowledge and self-care. They counsel African American educators to develop a strong sense of their own values, beliefs, and abilities and adopt reflective leadership, attuned to long-term goals when short-term tactics require compromise.

Another prominent theme is defining situations rather than being defined by them, emphasizing that survival depends on interpretation and the meanings applied to situations, as well as on actions. If, rather than using military metaphors to describe leaders, one used metaphors of weaving, cultivating, and networking, leadership becomes a process of creating, empowering, facilitating, collaborating, and educating instead of a personality characteristic. Women often try to articulate how they lead with the express purpose of educating others about alternative modes of leadership.

Avoiding simplistic dichotomies and listening to many opinions are also values reported by women leaders. But senior administrators or boards of trustees, who define leadership as making fast and firm decisions, may misunderstand inclusive discussion; those who expect administrators to "fix things" easily will not recognize the leadership needed to arrive at complex solutions. Once again, this evokes the double bind: Women who are directive and autocratic are less effective than those who are not.

Collaboration is another important element of women's leadership styles and is consistently considered a fundamental tenet of feminist leadership. Collaboration is effective because participatory decision making is satisfying for participants and produces results and plans that people feel they own. Not only do women use collaborative leadership more often than men, they are expected to and are less effective if they choose more authoritarian leadership tactics. While much of this research focuses on women leaders in general, descriptions of women's leadership styles in higher education are consistent with researchers' conclusion that women are expected to be warmer and more collaborative in their leadership styles than men, who are expected to be more task oriented. For example, in interviews, women administrators emphasized interdependence with followers, community service orientation, and ability to create conditions of trust, caring, fairness, objectivity, focus, and vision. Skills they depend upon included empowerment, team building, and facilitation, along with problem solving and risk taking. In the framework of relational psychology, authors discuss academic presidential leadership based on connectedness, rather than control and domination. Women define their identity in terms of interdependent relations, viewing the world as made up of interconnected physical and social entities governed by needs other than control.

Despite its value, collaboration is not an easy solution to leadership problems. As noted previously, it may limit women's ability to be seen as leaders. Women presidents may be misunderstood, marginalized, or trivialized when they choose strategies different from conventional views of leadership, inadvertently reinforcing the stereotype of women as nurturers. In masculinized institutional cultures, hostile members or those fearful of the consequences of outspokenness may undermine collaboration so thoroughly that a leader has no opportunity to demonstrate the benefits of collaboration.

The expectations that women will always be collaborative can also create dilemmas for women leaders. Female and male faculty of colleges with women presidents perceive their presidents to be less collaborative than the presidents believe of themselves. Women faculty who are passionate about wanting collaborative presidents may have naive expectations about situational constraints under which presidents operate. The strengths that women leaders may bring can be overshadowed by expectations that they have complete freedom or control over decision making. Women presidents are keenly aware of this paradox, reporting that they try hard to identify when collaboration is inappropriate, as one respondent said, to distinguish when the outcome of a decision is more important than the process. For example, college leaders themselves often report anecdotally that highly masculine leadership behavior is expected by boards of trustees or central system administrators, creating a situation in which some important constituency will be dissatisfied with any leadership style.

Women from ethnic backgrounds that conflict with their preferred feminist modes of leadership encounter other dilemmas. For example, Native American and Samoan educational leaders report that being respectful of elders—men in their cultures—sometimes clashes with empowering women or makes it difficult for them to supervise men. Women also sometimes report the confusion between new leadership styles and selfless giving and motherhood. Because motherly nurturance is not expected to be reciprocated, women feel their efforts are taken for granted and not seen as evidence of leadership ability. Nurturing behavior, therefore, may discourage others' kindness and reduce recognition of leadership skills.

The desire to collaborate and help others may pose career problems for women, who see service to the community and to others similar to them as important, while service in academic departments does not necessarily enhance prospects for administrative leadership positions. In higher education, for instance, scholarly work is sometimes more important than administrative experience in selection of administrators.

Negotiating paradoxical values and expectations is necessary to survive long enough to be a change agent. Women who are uncomfortable with a double standard about appropriate leadership behavior often choose to work to change either gender-based expectations about leadership or conceptions of leadership to include more facilitative and socially positive behavior.

Thus, women lean toward leadership styles that emphasize organizational and social transformation, sensitivity to power dynamics, and collaboration. Educational contexts produce paradoxes that require women to negotiate through sociohistorical and stereotypic expectations, hierarchical organizations and masculinized cultures, and interactions of status with gender and other identity characteristics. Despite these constraints, women leaders have developed strategies to cope with these expectations and are making gradual, but steady, advancement in leadership positions in education at all levels.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Benjamin, L. (Ed.). (1997). *Black women in the academy: Promises and perils.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership and educational change.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Carli, L.L., & Eagly, A.H. (2001). Gender, hierarchy, and leadership: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 629–636.

Eagly, A.H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 781–797.

Eagly, A.H., & Karau, S.J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573–598.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Madden, M.E. (2005). Gender and leadership in higher education. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*(1), 3–14.

Nidiffer, J., & Bashaw, C.T. (Eds.). (2001). *Women administrators in higher education: Historical and contemporary perspectives.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reynolds, C. (Ed.). (2003). *Women and school leadership: International perspectives.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Valverde, L.A. (2003). *Leaders of color in higher education.* New York: Alta Mira.

Margaret E. Madden

Masculinity, Homophobia, and Teaching

Feminist theory and men's studies have provided important insights into the relationships between gender, sexuality, and schooling. These fields of inquiry are varied in their theoretical analyses. One of the shared grounds of these diverse approaches has been to establish the gendered nature of schooling processes. Much mainstream work on schooling tends to see it as gender neutral. This means that at a commonsense level, schooling practices, discipline and control, the formal and hidden curriculum, streaming and administrative systems are assumed to operate beyond the sphere of gender relations. This framework is highly dependent on viewing schooling practices outside of meanings. Thus, educational research within this framework has focused on teaching as a practice that is simply connected to neutral educational objectives. However, research on schooling has highlighted how men, women, gays, and lesbians have differential access to schooling processes and hierarchies within them. Thus, the teaching profession itself contains differential power relations that are circumscribed by gender and sexuality. The usefulness of this argument is that it assists in identifying the particular patterns and structures of gendered relationships that are apparent in schools.

In response, it is argued that the mapping of gender and sexuality can involve looking at teaching practices themselves. In other words, teaching and administration are not neutral practices but contain a series of gendered and sexualized meanings and understandings. Thus, masculinity, homophobia, and teaching contain gendered values, and this is crucial to understanding how power relations are distributed. Haywood and Mac an Ghaill (2003) consider this area in great detail and argue that schooling is not simply a profession that meets educational objectives; it does this through the constitution of identity, subjectivity, and desire. This is not to displace more materially orientated accounts but to consider that such accounts need to be contextualized by how schooling processes are gendered through experience, understanding, and the attribution of meaning. Work on gender has suggested that schools through these meanings offer interpretations about what it means to be "male" or "female." More specifically, schooling processes contain gendered attributes that prioritize certain gendered identities while subordinating others. As a consequence, a focus on teaching has tended to consider the effects of teaching on the formation of student gendered and sexual identities. However, it is becoming increasingly important to consider how teaching itself is gendered. Furthermore, in order to understand more fully the specific gender dynamics of teaching in schools, it is necessary to examine the interrelationship between broader themes, such as dominant conceptions of power, authority, management, and emotional commitment.

Thus, the area of masculinity, homophobia, and teaching is complex. There is no "direct effects" model that can adequately capture how teaching impacts gender and sexual identities. What can be done is a process of establishing how masculinity and homophobia constitute teaching. Central to this constitution is the changing (state-led) nature of teaching practice.

At local levels, a reconstruction of teaching has taken place, and masculinity and homophobia are relevant in that process. Schools do not stand outside other social relations, and there is much work to be done in exploring how race/ethnicity impact masculinity, homophobia, and teaching. Alongside this, a relatively hidden area of teaching concerns how gender and sexuality impact the categories of adult/child. This is important as there continues to be a conflation between student and child and we need further data on how this relationship is lived out. Finally, schools need to be understood as shaped by a broader cultural imagination. They often become the space for the living out of values, memories, myths, national identities, and traditions, all of which contain gendered and sexual significances.

MASCULINITY

During the 1980s and 1990s, research in education opened up the discussion of masculinity, arguing that masculinities should be conceptualized in terms of relationships. Moving away from the singular "role" model based on gender, it was suggested that masculinities need to be conceptualized in relation to other categories. For example, studies indicated that the social, ethnic, class, and sexual specificities of male identities within local sites of schooling influence the range of masculinities that are inhabited. As Connell (1993) has claimed, different masculinities are constituted in relation to other masculinities and to femininities through the structure of gender relations. This led to the theorizing of masculinity in terms of multiple masculinities. For example, teaching involves a number of masculine styles. As a result, there are different masculinities with differential access to power, practices of power, and differential effects of power. If we assume that the curriculum produces spaces in which masculinities are produced, it follows that as the curriculum changes, so will masculinities. It should be added that the interplay between teaching and masculinity does not work in a deterministic way; students can effectively negotiate curriculum agendas. They do, however, represent a structure, a technique, or practice of power that is relatively fixed, closing off and opening up potential masculine subjectivities. At different times, dominant institutional styles sanction acceptable and unacceptable gender and sexual identities.

TEACHING MASCULINITIES

At a time of rapid change, teachers are currently constructing their work identities within the context of selecting and combining strategic responses to contradictory workplace demands. However, teacher "choices" cannot be understood in terms of any simple commercial metaphors. In other words, they do not take place in a sociohistorical vacuum. Dominant state and occupational discourses circumscribe the "gendering" and "regendering" of these different work practices. The restructuring of state schooling has resulted in increased complexities and contradictions. A highly salient feature is the promotion of new gender-specific hierarchies of domination and subordination. There is a long history of female teachers identifying discriminatory sex-role allocation of male teachers to positions of authority and management. More recently, this has been displaced by a growing concern with the remasculinization of the whole workplace. More specifically, in England, a legacy of the restructuring of state schooling in the 1990s is the masculinization of the administrative functions that have come to predominate school life. High status has been ascribed to the "hard masculine" functions of: the accountant, the curriculum coordinator, and the information and communications technology expert. At the same time, female teachers are associated with and directed into the "soft feminine" functions of pastoral support and counseling. In short, the remasculinization of teaching is being played out within conventional cultural forms that split that of the rational and that of the emotional. This reflects a broader division in the social world where reason is defined in opposition to nature, and nature is conceptualized as emotions, feelings, and desires.

In a study of an English secondary school, Mac an Ghaill (1994) identified three teacher occupational types: the Professionals, the Old Collectivists, and the New Entrepreneurs. These constituted the teachers' microculture, which served to mediate the production of a range of contradictory and fractured masculine identities that the teachers inhabited. The school principal as an institutional moral gatekeeper sponsored and elevated a hybrid form of new masculinity, whose main contradictory themes included bureaucratic centralization of control, rationality, overt forms of career ambition, collegiality, and delegation. They could be located within the projected post-Fordist era with its emphasis on small-scale, flat hierarchies and flexible teamwork, within a differentiated marketplace, in which new school systems are helping to shape new teaching cultures. They are representative of a new "masculine" authoritarianism in which overt forms of technologies of power are being displaced by "modern" forms of technical bureaucratic knowledge. They are developed in the high-tech offices of modern administration with their dominant discursive themes of managerial efficiency and economic rationality.

The Old Collectivists, who embodied an older style of public sector masculinity, were in the descendancy within the school, with the New Entrepreneurs—including the principal—in the ascendancy as the emerging dominant mode of modern masculinity. They were the "ideal teachers," whose masculinity was developed within the political nexus of managerialism, vocationalism, and commercialization, with its values of rationalism, possessive individualism, and instrumentalism. They were key agents in the development of curricular and pedagogical changes, in which education initiatives are primarily concerned, with the quantitative "masculine" world of the technology of change rather than the qualitative world of values. Their managerialist approach produced a positivist-based, technicist response that was overly preoccupied with the "how" rather than the "why" of curriculum change. The establishment of this entrepreneurial curriculum involved the reworking of conventional "masculine" commercial and industrial images in the process of aligning schools with commerce and industry.

Importantly, these ideological positions and styles manifested themselves in working relations and, more specifically, in their responses and resistances to changes in the school organization. The potential for conflicts became heightened as teachers were not only acting out their micropolitical interests in response to curriculum changes, they were simultaneously acting out their sexual politics through the deployment of masculinities. In other words, it is the teachers' relationship to the labor process that mediates their masculinity.

By representing the teachers' labor process as embodying ideas about what it means to be a man, we have illustrated that teachers' work is a set of relations in which masculinities are worked out. Teachers' work exists as another space where gender relations are producing masculine forms. Teachers' identities, ideologies, and pedagogical styles demonstrate a particular purchase on certain masculinities. It is a purchase on what kind of men they are.

HOMOPHOBIA

Contemporary accounts of masculinity and teaching tend to leave out issues of sexuality. Where it does appear, it is added on as part of a panoply of analytic tools including gender, race, ethnicity, class, and age. With the recent emergence of safety and protection as key themes of education, teaching practice has come into sharper critical focus with a range of publicly documented incidents problematizing professional conduct in schools. More recently, debates over age of consent for gay and lesbians and a moral panic around teenage pregnancy and HIV/AIDS have publicly connected issues of gender with issues of sexuality. In these debates, schools are often discursively constructed as desexualized. However, if we see sexuality as enmeshed in a set of power relations, this serves to highlight that rather than individualizing sexuality; the deployment of sexuality works within social relations of domination and subordination. Lesbian and gay theorists have argued that sexuality is a key element in the construction of our identity, both internally as a significant dimension of the self and externally as a social category imbued with cultural expectations by others and as a primary marker of difference. There is much evidence from lesbian and gay literature of the physical, psychological, and verbal abuse that lesbian and gay people systematically experience in homophobic and heterosexist societies. However, there continues to be little work available on this form of sexual oppression within schools. Stressing that sexuality is part of a process, it is suggested that sexual oppression, violence, and discrimination are a continual everyday phenomenon and not confined to extraordinary incidents, specific aspects of the curriculum, or student cultures. Sexual power relations are an implicit part of everyday schooling experiences. The sexual harassment of subordinated groups illustrates how these experiences embody normalized hegemonic masculine (hetero)sexualities.

Sexuality in schools has been seen to evidence itself through homophobic practices. It is suggested that homophobia is made up of two elements. First, homophobia is deemed to depend upon a derogatory understanding or perception of homosexuality. This depiction, it is argued, is often constituted by a fear or hatred of homosexual acts, behaviors, and identities. This means that homosexuality is often described as unnatural, abnormal, and dangerous. In contrast, heterosexuality is seen as natural, normal, and safe. The second element of homophobia is that it is premised on interactions with the emotional response to homosexuality, represented in a number of different ways. For example, in the field of social psychology, researchers have explored how homophobia can be internalized. As a result, individuals direct their own fear and loathing of homosexuality in on themselves. Such negative perceptions often result in physical, psychological, and emotional damage. At the same time, homophobia has been considered as something that is applied and used against individuals, groups, cultures, religions, or even nations.

In educational research, there is an overwhelming tendency to associate homophobia as something that concerns male teachers with the suggestion that the fear and loathing of homosexuality is a key feature of masculinity. Thus, in order to demonstrate masculinity, male teachers and students have to perform and display homophobia. For example, homophobic abuse may be directed at boys who do not correspond to the school's ideology of what a real or proper boy should do. This may concern wearing the right clothes, participating in appropriate sporting activities, and pursuing particular relationships with girls. From this perspective, homophobic practices are deemed to operate through and support gender relations; homosexuality is viewed as a nonmasculine characteristic. Building on the previous section on masculinity, it can be suggested that hegemonic masculinities secure their dominance through the use of homophobia. Thus, it operates to consolidate particular masculine styles and is central to gendered power relations, policing what are acceptable and unacceptable attitudes and behaviors.

At the same time, the centrality of masculinity may simplify a more complex picture. By suggesting that the use of derogatory language secures masculinities, an important question emerges over the position of female teachers. Can female teachers be homophobic? Do female teachers experience it? Much educational research has overwhelmingly associated homophobia as a male experience through its interconnection of homophobia with masculinity. A concept that runs parallel with homophobia is that of lesbophobia—a hatred and fear of lesbianism. This is usually applied to those who problematize the connection between heterosexual attractiveness and desirability. Although politically important to differentiate the gendered experience of fear and loathing toward different sexual minority communities, homophobia tends to operate across gendered categories. However, sexuality and gender are not identical, and the dynamics of power articulations cannot be automatically embedded within gender relations. This means that, by definition, sexuality can be "agendered," with the sexual working through a range of dimensions such as human/animal, adult/child, or animate/nonanimate. Although not dispensing with gender (for example, sometimes the mutual constitution between gender and sexuality in these accounts becomes blurred), those working within gay and lesbian frameworks articulate a politics of desire that operates through sexualities. Therefore, homophobia should be firmly located within the schools themselves as sexualized rather than simply gendered.

TEACHING HOMOPHOBIA

At the center of recent work on gay and lesbian issues in the school arena are the interconnections between sexual visibility and invisibility. Much of this work can be divided into two key areas. First, schools can be identified through an administrative structure that supports heterosexuality. Second, there is an invisibility of homosexuality in everyday school life. Homosexual visibility can be found in places such as homophobia. In one way, the (in)visibility couplet demonstrates the local specificity and diversity of sexual difference in the school context. In another way, this couplet provides entry into a gay and lesbian phenomenology, highlighting the effects of what is often institutionally led social injustice. Contained within the notion of (in)visibility is a policy of omission. Schools often make unavailable gay and lesbian sexualities as legitimate templates for sexual practice. Rather, heterosexuality becomes the model by which other sexual practices are defined. It is important to note that heterosexuality is deemed natural and normal and, thus, at an administrative level is conflated with neutrality. This means that sexuality may be present in schooling practices and procedures even though they appear to be neutral.

Research by Mills (1996) illustrates that such neutrality is an active shaper of how sexuality can enter into the schooling arena. In a secondary school in New Zealand, a number of students attempted through the use of posters to bring the issue of homophobia to the school's attention. The school refused the students' request to display the posters. In advocating neutrality, the students were silenced. In response, a number of school staff joined the students to get the issue heard. An important impact of this was that the teachers, in joining the students, contested the teacher/pupil binary. According to Mills, the issue of homophobia became contained as administrators deployed a discourse of professionalism. This discourse incited teachers to maintain hierarchies between teachers and pupils as a matter of professionalism. Alongside this, a discourse of consensus was also invoked to force the abeyance of the administration. Finally, through a discourse of maturity, the pupils' activities were named as immature. As a result, containing this antihomophobic movement served to normalize its invisibility and to legitimize homophobic abuse. This enabled teachers to be publicly homophobic without official condemnation.

What Mills' work highlights is how gay and lesbian issues are important to sexual majorities (heterosexuals). This can involve naming gay and lesbian issues as social problems, rather than being *subject* to social problems. By reconceptualizing gay/lesbian as disruptive and marginal identities, the sexual majority can dispel the possibilities of its own dysfunction. For example, by pathologizing sexuality in schools, invariably via the formal curriculum of health or sex education, schools educate young people into appropriate and acceptable sexual practices. As a result, Quinlivan and Town (1999) note how young people in their sample expressed their discomfort when, in sex education, the only mention of homosexuality was in the context of disease. One effect of this for the young gay men was that they felt uncomfortable with their sexual identities. Other effects included preventing them from expressing their sexual feelings at a physical level due to fears of inadequacy. At the same time, institutionally led conversations about female sexuality generated different feelings for lesbian students. As schools tend to discuss female sexuality through notions of passive sexual reproduction, lesbian identities are projected as deviant. This is often because of their assumed independence from mothering. Thus, there appears a greater sense of silence surrounding lesbians in schools than for gay men. Schools' institutional cultivation and sanctioning of normative heterosexual families situates male sexuality as active. In this context, gay sexuality corresponds with masculinity. In contrast, lesbian identities contravene the passive sexual femininity. This is reinforced through sex education in schools that tends to presume heterosexuality as a natural phenomenon.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Connell, R.W. (1993). *Gender and power.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2003). *Men and masculinities: Theory, research and social practice.* Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling.* Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Mills, M. (1996). "Homophobia kills": A disruptive moment in the educational politics of legitimation. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education, 17*(3), 315–326.

Quinlivan, K., & Town, S. (1999). Queer as fuck? Exploring the potential of queer pedagogy in researching school experiences of lesbian and gay youth. In D. Epstein & J.T. Sears (Eds.), *A dangerous knowing: Sexuality, pedagogy and popular culture* (pp. 242–256). London: Cassell.

Mairtin Mac an Ghaill

Chris Haywood

Liviu Popiviciu

Salaries of Academics

In 1892, Sidney Webb was asked to prepare a paper that was eventually titled "The Alleged Differences in the Wages Paid to Men and to Women for Similar Work." Despite Webb's admitted reluctance to undertake the task, the study was completed. But, he noted, "The problem is apparently one of great complexity and no simple or universal solution of it can be offered" (Webb, 1892, p. 635). The accuracy of Webb's words has been borne out by 30 years of research on pay differences between men and women in academia. Female to male salary ratios for current faculty in higher education are readily available from several sources. While calculating these salary differences might appear to be a straightforward task, researchers encounter greater difficulties in uncovering the source of the gap and reasons for its persistence over time. One complication is that, historically, male and female academics have exhibited unequal levels of productive characteristics including experience, academic rank, discipline, and scholarly output. With continued methodological developments and more representative data sets, researchers seem to be making progress. Closer examination of these gaps, however, never fails to raise new issues, and the task will not be straightforward until there is more similarity in the characteristics of men and women in academia.

THE GENDER SALARY GAP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Salary differences between male and female workers exist across all occupations, and higher education is no exception. During the academic year 2004–2005, women teaching full time at four-year public institutions earned $57,931 and men earned $71,748 (all ranks, including instructor and lecturer, combined). In private (not-for-profit) four-year institutions, the figures, across all ranks, were $59,404 for women versus $73,140 for men. The estimated female-male salary ratio, therefore, was approximately 81 percent in both types of institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006). Additional information comes from the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) recent Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2004–05. The AAUP's salary equity index, which shows the ratio of female to male salaries (all ranks, full time, and all institutional types), is also 80 percent in 2003 to 2004. Interestingly, this salary ratio is virtually identical to the ratio of female-to-male weekly earnings of full-time workers across all U.S. occupations in 2004, which was 80.4 percent according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Whereas the ratio across all occupations has risen roughly 20 percentage points in as many years, the gender salary ratio for faculty has been close to 80 percent since data by gender were first collected by the AAUP in the late 1970s.

The collection of salary data by gender was largely a response to important antidiscrimination legislation that was passed in the United States during the 1960s, including the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. With respect to higher education, Executive Order 11246 was amended to prohibit sex discrimination in government contracts in 1968, and in 1972 Title VII was extended to higher education institutions via the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. Similarly, in 1972, the Equal Pay Act was extended to cover faculty and administrative salaries in higher education. The legal obligation to comply with a nondiscriminatory standard was one reason for increased research on pay differentials in academia, although the statistical methodology lagged behind the legal impetus.

Economists maintain that salary discrimination exists when equally productive workers receive different salaries, and a major research question has been whether female faculty members have been systematically underpaid relative to equally productive men in the profession with productivity usually defined in terms of qualifications (degrees earned, position held), years of experience, and output (publications, teaching).

To this day, men and women in academia still differ with respect to many characteristics affecting salary. For example, female faculty members are disproportionately found in part-time positions, and women are more prevalent in lower-paid disciplines. The same AAUP report mentioned above indicates that in 2003 to 2004, the ratio of full-time female faculty to male faculty in the full professor rank (all institutions) is roughly 50 percent, and the situation is worse at doctoral universities where women are less than half as likely as men to be full professors. Across all types of institutions, the AAUP report found that women are 10 percent to 15 percent less likely than men to be in tenure-eligible positions. Female faculty members tend to publish less than their male colleagues, and women may have less experience on average. Differential access to endowed chairs and administrative positions would further widen the gender salary gap.

Such differences raise a very difficult point. If discrimination occurs when equally productive workers receive different remuneration, how do we define “equally productive?” Statistical techniques distinguish the portion of the pay gap due to “discrimination” versus differences in “legitimate,” “productive” characteristics. These terms are generally defined in the context of particular statistical models. The real issue comes down to how much of the remaining gender gap in salaries is voluntary (i.e., the result of rational, informed, choices by male and female academics). To take one example, if researchers determine that a large portion of the gender gap in salaries results from women’s tendency to specialize in low-paying disciplines, do those researchers conclude that there is no discrimination or do they explore further why women may choose, or be directed into, different specialty fields? Alternatively, the fact that women tend to hold lower academic rank (a “legitimate” productive characteristic) explains much of the gender difference in salary. But, are there some reasons to believe that discriminatory promotion systems contribute to the gender difference in rank? Researchers have grappled with these subtle yet undeniable issues since the first studies appeared during the 1970s.

EXPLAINING THE GENDER SALARY GAP

A large literature attempts to explain the persistent gender gap in academic salaries. Many of the early studies, which tended to focus on individual campuses, were largely done in response to the legal imperative imposed by new legislation. This was also a time when budget-conscious administrators and concerned faculty members were interested in the salary determination process, including identifying the pecuniary reward to teaching versus research activities. One benefit of a campus-wide investigation of salary differences is that certain factors affecting salary (e.g., institutional type, control, size) are held constant. The facts that campus-wide studies were not representative of higher education and that they were generally performed for only one period, such that trends over time were not discernible, decreased the usefulness of early studies. Still, they provide important documentation that women were generally underpaid relative to comparable male faculty. The studies suggested ways in which men and women were treated differently and, maybe more importantly, began to question how any inequities might be measured. Researchers' questions spawned innovation in the methodology of measuring pay gaps and even the portion of the gap that might be attributable to discrimination. In conjunction with these statistical findings, college and university administrators would also need to develop procedures to remedy existing pay gaps perceived as discriminatory.

The majority of studies conducted throughout the 1970s uncovered a statistically significant salary advantage in favor of men, with few exceptions. In some studies, the male salary premium was apparent only at particular academic ranks. In at least one case, affirmative action programs resulted in a statistically significant salary advantage in favor of women. It also became clear that estimates of the male salary advantage were very sensitive to which faculty traits were controlled by the researcher.

The simplest research studies viewed faculty salary as the outcome of numerous faculty and institutional characteristics, including the professor's sex. If the variable representing sex achieved statistical significance, meaning that it was unlikely that the result occurred by chance, the interpretation was that, holding all other characteristics constant, the salaries of men and women differed by a fixed amount. During the 1970s, it became increasingly common to estimate separate salary models for men and women. The advantage in this approach is that researchers could determine whether women and men were paid varying amounts for each particular characteristic.

As noted throughout the literature, men and women differ with respect to many characteristics that influence salary. If women had lower levels of productive characteristics, on average, then failure to consider this fact would cause researchers to overestimate salary discrimination against women. There are also possible biases in the opposite direction. Discrimination might lead to women having lower average levels of these productive characteristics. For example, discriminatory evaluation procedures might cause female academics to occupy lower ranks, making it inappropriate to control for rank when calculating salary gaps. The resulting salary gap would constitute an underestimate of the true amount of gender discrimination. Some researchers have found that, if you compare gender salary gaps for academics across all ranks, rather than faculty members in a given rank (the latter case implies "controlling" for rank), women's salary disadvantage doubles. Not surprisingly, researchers have repeatedly returned to the issue of which characteristics should be controlled when calculating salary gaps. Academic rank appears to be one of the more problematic of these characteristics.

The methodology of computing salary gaps improved during the 1970s with the publication of Oaxaca's first paper on salary decomposition techniques and the availability of national faculty survey data, including the 1968 Carnegie Commission database and the 1972–1973 American Council on Education survey. In addition to a larger sample size, national databases offered information about many faculty characteristics. Examination of repeated cross sections would become critical in establishing trends in male-female salary gaps over time.

Oaxaca's (1973) pioneering study changed how researchers viewed and defined discrimination. According to Oaxaca, discrimination exists when the relative wage of males exceeds the relative wage that would have prevailed if men and women were paid according to the same criteria. To understand how this definition is put into practice, it helps to consider an example. Suppose that Conor and Brittany work in a factory producing chairs. Conor makes 10 chairs a day, and he is paid $5 per chair. He earns, therefore, $50 a day. By contrast, Brittany makes only six chairs a day, and she is paid $4 for each chair she produces for a total salary of $24 a day. There are two sources of the $26 salary gap between these individuals. First, Brittany is less productive (i.e., she assembles fewer chairs per day). Her lower productivity might be called a legitimate source of the resulting salary gap. But, the fact that she is paid $1 less for each chair produced is discriminatory. The Oaxaca technique breaks down total salary gaps into a portion that reflects discrimination (unequal payment for each unit produced) and a portion that is legitimate (she produces fewer units). One simple way to estimate what Brittany might earn in the absence of discrimination is to assume that she would be paid $5 for each of the six chairs she produced (a total of $30). In this nondiscriminatory world, the gender salary gap would only be $20 rather than $26.

For readers interested in statistical techniques, there is a more technical language for describing how to apply the Oaxaca technique to a large number of Conors and Brittanys: In all decomposition methodologies, the researcher estimates separate salary regressions for men and women. If one multiplies the average values of the explanatory variables for women by the estimated coefficients from the men's salary regression, one can derive an average salary for women as though they were compensated as men. The difference between women's average salary and their predicted salary, when paid as men, constitutes one estimate of discrimination. By calculating the difference between men's average salary and their predicted salary, when paid as women, one can derive a second discrimination estimate, producing a range of results. The Oaxaca technique essentially allows researchers to decompose, or partition, a total salary gap into two portions: a "legitimate" part of the salary gap derived from differences in men's and women's levels of the explanatory variables and a discriminatory gap, which stems from differences in the return to given characteristics (i.e., unequal regression coefficients from the male and female salary regressions). In recent years, several additional decomposition techniques have been developed, but they all have a similar objective, differing mostly with respect to how they define the nondiscriminatory salary system.

During the 1980s, researchers conducting campus pay studies tended to find continued evidence of salary discrimination against women, although a number of published estimates were lower than comparable figures for the 1970s. By the 1990s, campus pay equity studies were commonplace and few were actually published. The real innovation in the field was researchers' growing access to national faculty survey data, particularly studies by the National Center for Education Statistics. The common Oaxaca methodology, in conjunction with large data sets containing detailed information on individual faculty members, made it easier to detect time trends in academic pay gaps.

Table IX.2 summarizes the effect of sex on faculty salaries over time in the United States. These estimates are based on numerous studies employing national faculty data.

All of these studies are examined in either Barbezat (2002) or Barbezat and Hughes (2005). These estimates show the total salary gap between male and female faculty members holding constant a large number of institutional and individual characteristics, including highest degree, experience, publications, academic discipline, and type of institutional employer. When comparing findings across studies, it is imperative to recognize differences in the characteristics of faculty members that are available, as well as how measures are constructed and how the faculty in the study were selected. Some of these differences are unavoidable and result from changes made to the actual surveys. Many analysts investigate more than one model specification, and factors such as rank and marital status may or may not be included in their models. With few exceptions, however, the samples and salary models represented in Table IX.2 have substantial commonality. Because the researchers have controlled for so many factors, the resulting salary differences are relatively small.

The salary gap estimates found in Table IX.2 are derived from single-equation regression models. In such a model, the salary advantage accruing to one group is measured, approximately, by the coefficient on a variable representing the respondent's sex. The interpretation of Table IX.2 would be that when Ashraf (1996) studied 1969 salary data, he found roughly a 12 percent salary advantage in favor of male faculty. Using a different data sample from that same year, Barbezat (1991) calculated a 16 percent salary premium in favor of men, and Ransom/Megdal found that women earned 12.5 percent less than male colleagues. Thus, all three studies found that even when female faculty had similar research output, experience, degrees, and academic employer, as well as were located in the same fields, they experienced a substantial salary disadvantage in the late 1960s.

If you continue across the table, it becomes evident that the male salary advantage fell during the 1970s and, by 1977, male faculty members earned between 2.5 percent and 7 percent more than comparable female colleagues. If we ignore Ashraf's 1984 estimate (the only estimate in the table that was not statistically significant), there was no further progress in achieving pay equity during the 1980s. In fact, women may have lost some ground. Estimates from 1984 to 1989 indicate that the salary premium in favor of men ranged from approximately 6 percent to just over 8 percent.

This lack of‘ progress during the 1980s only heightens interest in what occurred during the 1990s. Unfortunately, only two studies are available for this period. Toutkoushian's estimate for 1993, which indicates a 7.5 percent salary disadvantage for women, falls squarely within the range of estimates for the 1970s. In this context, the Barbezat and Hughes estimate for 1999, which indicates that men earned just over 4 percent more than comparable female faculty members, might, finally, signal continued progress toward salary equity in academia.

If we control for all relevant factors influencing faculty salary, the figures in Table IX.2 might be considered good estimates of salary discrimination against female faculty members. There are more sophisticated approaches to deriving the effects of sex on salary, specifically, the decomposition techniques of Oaxaca and others. The advantage of these techniques is that they take the total salary gaps presented in Table IX.2 and identify a unique portion of the gap that can be attributed to discrimination. Barbezat (2002) summarizes these alternative techniques and presents these more precise discrimination estimates for the same 30-year period. Briefly, the results of these alternative techniques are that male faculty members earned between 23 percent and 30 percent more than similar female colleagues in 1969. A number of researchers agree that as much as half of that salary

Table IX.2 Estimated Coefficients for Sex Effects on Salaries from National Studies, 1969–1999

	1969	1972	1975	1977	1984	1988	1989	1993	1999
Ashraf (1996)									
Male coefficient	0.12 (N = 29,672)	0.07 (N = 14,780)		0.06 (N = 2,549)	0.01 (N = 3,210)		0.06 (N = 3,258)		
Barbezat (1991)									
Male coefficient	0.163 (N = 13,613)		0.095 (N = 2,202)	0.025 (N = 3,021)	0.07 (N = 1,791)		0.066 (N = 3,077)		
Barbezat (2002)									
Male coefficient						0.081 (N = 4,607)			
Ransom/ Megdal (1993)									
Female coefficient	–0.125 (N = 53,258)	–0.105 (N = 30,638)		–0.07 (N = 3,492)	–0.073 (N = 2,599)				
Toutkoushian (1998)									
Female coefficient								–0.075 (N = 9,790)	
Barbezat/ Hughes (2005)									
Male coefficient									0.042 (N = 6,905)

difference constituted discrimination (meaning it could not be explained by differences in the men's and women's productive characteristics).

Consistent with Table IX.2, total salary gaps tended to fall over the 1970s, but the trend is less clear with respect to the 1980s. So, again, estimates for the 1990s have great importance. The most recent estimate by Barbezat and Hughes (2005) suggests that the total salary gap was approximately 22 percent in 1999. The optimistic news is that when the total gap is divided, Barbezat and Hughes find that discrimination constitutes a relatively small portion of this gap (21 percent to 27 percent), and this result is confirmed by alternative statistical techniques.

In terms of evaluating this literature, it is worth noting that the part of the salary gap that researchers designate as discriminatory may reflect faculty and institutional characteristics that the researcher has failed to consider. To take another example, researchers may attempt to compare professors with similar characteristics, say, publications, but if varying quality of publications is not considered, this biases their estimate of the portion of the salary gap attributable to discrimination. In short, even the relatively sophisticated statistical techniques have shortcomings. As they await results from new national faculty surveys, many unresolved issues occupy scholars in the field. Most of these issues revolve around academic ranks and promotions.

Researchers have debated the desirability of including academic rank in faculty salary models for some 30 years. Again, the argument against including rank is that gender discrimination may influence rank assignment, so when researchers control for rank, they underestimate the extent of salary discrimination. Although several researchers have investigated gender differences in rank attainment, few of them go on to estimate how gender differences in rank attainment contribute to the gender gap in academic salaries. Another related issue is that the promotion process from assistant to associate professor, which usually corresponds to the grant of tenure, has been studied more thoroughly than the promotion to full professor. All of these issues are summarized in Becker and Toutkoushian (2003). Moreover, Becker's and Toutkoushian's application of a new estimation method suggests that previous studies including rank may have produced more accurate gender salary gaps than those omitting rank. The authors also found discrimination in favor of men in the promotion process to full professor. While their findings are limited to one institution, their new methodology may be employed by other researchers.

Ginther's recent work also emphasizes the importance of'investigating rank and salary differences simultaneously as well as the possibility that salary gaps and the processes generating them might differ across academic discipline. In 2001, Ginther found large salary differences across ranks for faculty in the natural sciences based on Survey of Doctorate Recipients (SDR) data. By contrast, Ginther and Hayes (2003), using the same SDR data for 1977 through 1995, concluded that, among humanities faculty members, the average gender salary differences for tenure-track assistant, associate, and full professors were not statistically different from zero. Despite this favorable finding, women in the sample were less likely to be promoted and took longer to be promoted than men. The authors conclude that promotion differences largely resulted from unequal treatment of women with respect to work experience, children, and number of employers. Trying to explain why female academics tended to fare better in the humanities than the natural sciences, the authors note women's higher representation in the humanities and the fact that, because humanities salaries may be lower than average faculty salaries, paying men and women the same in the humanities may be less costly. Many researchers would agree that we need to examine salary gaps "within the context of promotion," rather than focusing on salary differences alone.

Finally, researchers are beginning to appreciate the importance of pay structure in determining gender gaps in salary. For example, Barbezat and Hughes (2005) used the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty to show how differences in salary dispersion influence the gender pay gap across various types of higher education institutions. At liberal arts colleges, the unexplained portion of the gender salary gap was smaller than at research universities, perhaps due to a greater focus on overall pay equity at smaller campuses. Nevertheless, while female professors at research universities were at a bigger disadvantage relative to male colleagues, they still enjoyed a salary advantage over women teaching at liberal arts colleges. In short, the issue of how institutional salary structure affects gender salary gaps must be considered as well.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Association of University Professors. (2005). Inequities persist for women and non-tenure track faculty. *Academe, 91*(2), 21–30.

Barbezat, D. (2002). History of pay equity studies. In R. Toutkoushian (Ed.), *Conducting salary-equity studies: Alternative approaches to research* (pp. 9–39, New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 115). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barbezat, D., & Hughes, J. (2005). Salary structure effects and the gender pay gap in academia. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(6), 593–730.

Becker, W., & Toutkoushian, R. (2003). Measuring gender bias in the salaries of tenured faculty members. In R. Toutkoushian (Ed.), *Unresolved issues in conducting salary-equity studies* (pp. 5–20, New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 117). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ginther, D., & Hayes, K. (2003). Gender differences in salary and promotion for faculty in the humanities 1977–1995. *Journal of Human Resources, 38*(1), 34–73.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006, January). *Employees in postsecondary institutions, fall 2004, and salaries of full-time instructional faculty, 2004–05* (Table 3). Available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006187

Oaxaca, R. (1973). Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets. *International Economic Review, 14*(3), 693–709.

Webb, S. (1892). The alleged differences in the wages paid to men and women for similar work. *The Economic Journal, 2*(5), 635.

Debra Barbezat

Teacher Burnout

The concept of “burnout” originated in a publication in the *Journal of Social Issues* by the clinical psychologist H.J. Freudenberger in 1974. For him, burnout represented a malaise frequently experienced by human service professionals, including social workers, mental health workers, nurses, and teachers, who come to see themselves as “wearing out.” When their clients, patients, and students do not seem to improve, recover, or learn, the human service workers experience emotional exhaustion and lose their sense of accomplishment. They no longer perform their tasks effectively and sometimes even no longer care about the welfare of their clients. Soon after publication of Freudenberger’s article, other psychologists isolated three central themes in burnout: emotional exhaustion, loss of a sense of personal accomplishment, and depersonalization or the blaming of the client, patient, or students for the malaise experienced by the human service professional (Maslach, 1993). Most psychological researchers describe burnout as an inability to cope with an array of life stressors. This approach tends to ascribe “blame” for burnout to the victims of burnout and proceeds to offer a panoply of strategies to enhance coping ability.

Alaya Pines (1993) characterized burnout as an existential crisis linked to a sense of meaninglessness. That is, to the extent that professionals come to incorporate their work into their self-image, a frequent occurrence in industrialized and postindustrialized societies, any condition that diminishes the personal assessment of the value of that work likewise diminishes the assessment of self-worth. When this happens, Pines argues, human service professionals come to ask, “Why am I doing what I am doing?”—a question reflecting self-doubt and a crisis of existence.

Not all views of burnout focus on individual factors associated with the ability to cope with stress. The sociological view arises out of the structural construct of alienation. Here, burnout includes all of Seeman’s (1975) dimensions of alienation including powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and estrangement. Alienation has organizational and social structural roots and, therefore, its redress ought not to focus on improved individual coping skills but rather on structural change. Stress can still be a precipitating factor, as it is in the psychological models, but the causal elements of burnout are seen within the structure of the school or the structure of the educational system that creates teacher expectations (Dworkin, 1987, 1997, 2001; Dworkin, Saha, & Hill, 2003; Dworkin & Townsend, 1994; and LeCompte & Dworkin, 1991).

When professionals are unable to negotiate agreements on role performances or to determine what the role expectations are within a human service organization, they develop a sense of powerlessness, which soon leads to a sense of meaninglessness. In addition, individuals withdraw from social relationships within the organization (isolation) and question whether continued participation in the organizational role is consistent with their self-conception (estrangement). The burned-out individuals also begin to blame their clients, students, or patients for failing to improve. Finally, burned-out professionals come to feel that the organizational setting is characterized by a degree of normlessness. That is, they feel that either there are no rules or that following the rules tends to be dysfunctional. Sparks and Hammond (1981) reported that burned-out professionals report that the rules of the organization are either unenforceable or uninterpretable.

SCHOOL REFORM AND TEACHER BURNOUT

School reform movements are based on the assumption that the public schools are failing to educate the nation's future labor force, thereby jeopardizing the economic future standing of the country. In their various manifestations, school reformers have frequently noted that teachers fail to do their jobs properly and competently. Many reform efforts make the assumption that teachers will not work hard unless their livelihoods are threatened. Job stress and fear of job loss are assumed to be necessary to motivate better teaching and learning. Even in a benign form, school reform implies change, and change itself can be stressful. Since job stress precipitates job burnout, it is reasonable to assume that the implementation of school reforms will lead to heightened levels of burnout among public school teachers.

In fact, there is evidence that the morale of America's teachers has been negatively impacted by the various waves of school reform implemented at least since the Reagan administration's publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983. Detailed analyses by Dworkin and his colleagues (Dworkin, 1997, 2001; Dworkin, Saha, & Hill, 2003; and Dworkin & Townsend, 1994) have displayed the changing effects of school reform legislation on teacher burnout. School reform activities do not, however, impact all teachers equally. Differences in burnout level exist across teaching populations demarcated by race and ethnicity, gender, and years of teaching experience.

A Nation at Risk (1983) decried the poor academic performance of American students and predicted that, unless there were monumental changes made in public education, the country would no longer be a leader in the global economy. The year following the report, the Secretary of Education observed that the nation had responded to the challenge and had produced sweeping changes in every state. The first wave of these reforms sought to impose uniformity through standardized curricula, teacher evaluations, and rigorous requirements for student performance, promotion, and graduation. The 1980s reform attempted to guarantee that only competent teachers were in the classroom and that students who graduated from high school were proficient at the skills that would make them competent employees in American industry.

By the end of the 1980s, it was apparent that student achievement had not risen to the levels promised by the legislated reforms following *A Nation at Risk*. If legislated, centralized reforms did not appear to work; state legislatures turned to mandating reforms that stressed decentralization. Localized, site-based decision making was proposed as the remedy to raise student achievement. The argument raised by state education agencies was that if decision making is focused at the site of instruction, the quality of decisions will be better and students will more likely succeed academically.

At about the same time, the administration of President George H. W. Bush called for education to "break the mold" and establish new schools that promoted "world-class standards" under the aegis of a program called *America 2000.* The standards movement, focusing on more testing, was rejuvenated and new, private-sector models under the name "New American Schools Development Corporation" (NASDC) emerged. Many of the programs developed under the aegis of the NASDC failed to achieve "comprehensive, systemic change" through the creation of "break the mold schools." The products of the NASDC often shifted their goals from world-class student achievement to feelings of satisfaction among participants. The *America 2000* reforms (and those that followed in the Clinton administration under the name *Goals 2000*) failed to achieve most of the academic results promised by their promoters. Likewise, the more locally developed site-based decision-making plans more often resulted in "turf battles" among principals, teachers, and stakeholder groups, each contending that the control of the local schools was their own within their own mandate. Dworkin and Townsend (1994) noted that such feuds over control of the schools resulted in heightened levels of teacher burnout.

The Standards Movement (establishing statewide, uniform academic standards for children), launched following *A Nation at Risk* and exacerbated following *America 2000* and *Goals 2000,* culminated in high-stakes testing in the mid- and late-1990s. High-stakes testing involves the use of standardized achievement tests (norm-referenced or criterion-referenced) to evaluate student learning and to assess the performances of teachers, school administrators, schools, and school districts. Rewards are offered by state education agencies to school personnel and schools when test scores or passing rates are high. Punishments, including termination, school reorganization and restaffing, and loss of accreditation, are threatened when scores or passing rates remain low.

Critics of high-stakes testing have contended that such practices: narrow the curriculum taught only to that which is tested; lead to cheating by teachers and other school staff; rely on single indicators to assess outcomes (in violation of good test theory); and widen the gap between groups of students while increasing the drop-out rate in schools. However, analyses by Toenjes, Dworkin, Lorence, and Hill (2002) suggested that the high-stakes testing has forced Texas schools to take more seriously the education of their poor and minority students. Nevertheless, holding teachers responsible for a single test-score performance of their students has created additional stressors in the lives of school personnel. The consequence of the high-stakes testing reform has been a continued elevation of teacher burnout scores over those found prior to the era of no reform (Dworkin, 2001).

The most recent incarnation of the Standards Movement is found in the reauthorization of P.L. 8910, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, currently known as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The framework for NCLB was developed from the accountability system adopted in Texas. States wishing to continue to receive federal funds, including under the federal subsidized lunch program out of the Department of Agriculture, as well as other programs, had to submit to the Secretary of Education a plan by which 95 percent of the children in the state would be 100 percent proficient on the state-selected standardized test by the academic year 2013–2014. Adequate yearly progress (AYP) has to be demonstrated by each school; the schools that fail to meet the AYP standards can face draconian measures, including loss of some Title I monies, public school choice for their students to transfer to a school meeting its AYP goals, removal of school staff, and even closure of the campus and reorganization as a charter school. (See the "Perspectives on Critical Issues" essays in the April 2005 issue of *Sociology of Education.*)

As noted above, studies by Dworkin and his colleagues have indicated that teacher morale and burnout tend to be adversely affected by the school reform policies over the past 20 years. These studies were based on data on Texas teachers drawn generally from the 54 school districts in the Houston metropolitan area. However, there is every reason to believe that the results can be generalized to at least urban schools in the state and to most urban districts in the nation. What were the changes in the burnout scores of the teachers studied by Dworkin and his colleagues during the different reform activities?

To answer this question, data from six cohorts of teachers were studied, each consisting of teachers with varying years of teaching experience. The six different samples provide information about the relationship between teacher burnout and years teaching in an era prior to the reforms (the pre-reform 1977 sample), the reforms instituted in Texas in the mid-1980s following *A Nation at Risk* (the 1986 sample), the reforms associated with site-based decision making and the *America 2000* program (the 1991 sample), the reforms involving high-stakes testing in Texas and greater teacher accountability (the 2000 sample), and finally two samples drawn in the initial year of No Child Left Behind and two years later, after the state application was accepted by the U.S. Department of Education.

The measure of teacher burnout is derived from the "Dworkin Teacher Burnout Scale," originally presented in Dworkin, Chafetz, and Dworkin (1986) and fully discussed in Dworkin (1987). The scale consists of 10 items that represent the sociological perspective on burnout as an extreme form of role-specific alienation. In order to compare teachers across different waves of reform, their responses to the scale items were recombined and scored in a manner reflecting the relative ranking in terms of burnout of each cohort of teachers compared to all other cohorts. This permits the following interpretation as to whether burnout scores have risen or fallen during different eras of school reforms.

The 1977 pre-reform cohort had the lowest level of burnout, with burnout scores lower for more senior teachers than for new teachers. A small rise in the burnout scores at three years of experience reflects the fact that at that point a decision is made to offer teachers a permanent contract (essentially, tenure) and such a time period tends to be stressful. However, when compared with all post-reform waves, even the newest teachers had relatively low levels of burnout. There were 3,165 teachers in this sample. Burnout was highest among teachers assigned to schools where the principal was not supportive and defined them as expendable. Burnout levels were also higher among inexperienced White teachers than among any other group.

The 1986 data set consisted of 1,060 teachers, who were experiencing Texas's House Bill 72 based on *A Nation at Risk,* which imposed competency testing on teachers. The test was relatively easy and approximately 95 percent of the teachers passed it, although minority teachers passed the test at lower rates. Burnout levels during this era are the highest found for any cohort. The pattern indicates that change is stressful and particularly so when most teachers had no prior experience with school reforms that assessed the performances of teachers. The highest levels of burnout in this reform wave are for teachers with 5, 10, and 15 years experience. Burnout is three times higher for teachers with 10 years of experience in this wave than similarly experienced teachers in the pre-reform wave. The legislation mandated competency tests and established a career ladder in which all teachers who passed the test were placed at the same level on the ladder. Thus, the state denied the teachers their seniority and doubted their claims to being master teachers. The denial of a teacher's claim to expertise demoralized the experienced teachers, while the competency testing resulted in higher burnout rates among minority teachers. The racial makeup of the burnout groups changed. In the pre-reform sample, burned-out teachers were more likely to be inexperienced and White. In the 1986 sample, burnout was highest among minority teachers with 10 to 15 years of experience.

There were 261 teachers in the 1991 cohort that experienced *Site Based Decision Making*. Burnout levels for these teachers are lower than for the previous groups of teachers, as the dire prophecies (such as mass firings) had not come true. Teachers were more accustomed to reform and so, while burnout levels were higher than in the pre-reform era, differences among cohorts with different years of teaching experience were not very different, except for those with 15 or more years of experience. The lower levels of burnout among the more experienced teachers might reflect that they now had a greater share in the decision-making process (although they could still have "turf battles" with the principal).

Many of the 2,961 teachers in the 2000 data set had experienced *high-stakes testing* since the state had adopted the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, a criterion-referenced test in 1994. However, by 2000, all of the accountability mechanisms were in place, including the possibility that schools could be closed and teachers fired for continued low student performance. The state education agency maintained an "erasure report" on teachers, indicating whether their students were changing more answers on the machine scanned answer sheets than was expected. There had been cheating scandals in districts by 2000, and some school personnel had been fired. Burnout scores for teachers almost paralleled those found in 1986 during the first reform wave, with one exception. The highest burnout levels exist among the most experienced teachers. Experienced teachers, especially teachers in high-poverty, inner-city schools, have considerable difficulty raising test scores. Their students bring to school few educational resources from home and the teachers' expertise is in classroom management, not in teaching to a new standardized test (by law each year a new test was implemented). Texas has a retirement model, termed the "Eighty System," whereby when one's age plus years teaching totals 80 one is eligible to retire at full benefits. Many of the teachers were just short of the threshold and were hoping to be able to maintain their jobs for just a few more years. The performance of their students on the standardized test became the determining factor.

There are two No Child Left Behind cohorts. Data from the first cohort were collected in the fall semester of 2002, during the first year of the federal act. This was the year immediately prior to the end of social promotion in Texas schools. While the social promotion law was passed in 1999, it was not to be enforced until 2003. Third-grade children failing the reading section of the newly created Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test, which replaced the TAAS as the high-stakes test, would be required to repeat third grade. Teachers had to cope with both a new test and the prospect of retaining students. There were 2,869 teachers in the 2002 data set.

The second wave of data from the No Child Left Behind era collected in the fall semester of 2004 consisted of 1,771 teachers. No Child Left Behind had been fully implemented in the schools. The teachers were aware that successive low performance by their students would result in their schools' failure to meet AYP goals and the possibility of the loss of some of their students to higher-performing schools, as well as the potential reorganization of their school, accompanied by job loss.

The two No Child Left Behind waves closely parallel one another. Burnout levels for teachers with up to 15 years of experience resemble the pattern first found in the era of the implementation of high-stakes testing (in the 2000 data set). Many of the teachers in the earlier data set were drawn in the 2002 and 2004 samples. However, the implementation of NCLB resulted in a shifting upward of burnout levels for each experience cohort in 2002 and 2004 over the pattern for 2000. The small spike in the 2002 data set for teachers with 10 to 15 years of experience may reflect the growing recognition that the high-stakes testing practices will have greater ramifications for schools, given that the federal government has implemented the Texas policy. Teachers with 10 to 15 years of experience, like their counterparts during the *A Nation at Risk* era in the 1980s, consider themselves to be master teachers and may resent the state and now the federal government demanding that they prove it. Additionally, NCLB had begun to implement a definition of "highly qualified teachers" based on certification and an academic degree in the specialty area in which one instructs students. However, the two NCLB waves differed from the high-stakes testing data set of 2000 in one respect. Rather than a spike upward among teachers with 20 to 30 years of experience, there was a lower pattern of burnout among the most senior teachers. This pattern resembles the pattern for all the other data sets, where the most experienced teachers tend to be the least burned out.

GENDER, TOKENISM, AND BURNOUT BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL REFORM

While the overwhelming majority of teachers in public schools are women, men have maintained a proportional advantage in administrative roles. Male teachers have traditionally had an easier time leaving the classroom to become administrators without leaving public education and to rise within school organizations to higher salaries and greater responsibilities and esteem than have female teachers. In turn, the attainment of greater power, prestige, and rewards mitigates burnout. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 70.5 percent of U.S. public school teachers in grades K–12 were women during the 1980s. During this same time period, 87.6 percent of elementary school teachers and 53.0 percent of secondary school teachers were women. In contrast, during the 1980s and early 1990s, no more than 1 in 11 and 1 in 10 principals were women. By 2000, however, NCES reports that 51.8 of all public elementary school principals and 21.8 of all public secondary school principals were women.

Deployment patterns of teachers by gender have resulted in the creation of "token group" statuses for males in elementary schools and comparable statuses for females in some departments in high schools, especially during the pre-reform era of the 1970s and 1980s. Most male teachers are in high schools, where disproportionate numbers teach science, mathematics, industrial arts, and athletics. There were relatively few female teachers in those departments, particularly prior to the 1990s. Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977a, 1977b) proposed that tokens are likely to have many negative job experiences that heighten their sense of job dissatisfaction (and burnout). Tokens are visible and subject to specialized scrutiny by their co-workers. They may find themselves in marginal situations in which they are expected to represent their social category and also to "fit in" with members of the more dominant category. Kanter (1977a) defined "token status" as conditions in which 15 percent or fewer of a group are represented in the work setting, department, or organizational unit. She noted that the high visibility of tokens create "performance pressures" because tokens are not seen as individuals but as representatives and symbols of the stereotyped category to which they belong. Their behaviors are scrutinized to degrees beyond which their dominant peers (who represent 85 percent or more of the organization) are not. Their behaviors, and especially their mistakes on the job, are generalized to their social category (e.g., women). When tokens perform exceptionally well, another stereotyping mechanism comes into play. Stereotypes serve both as "stipulative definitions" and "empirical generalizations" (Richter, 1956). That is, evidence that supports the stereotype is accepted as further proof of the correctness of the stereotype (the empirical generalization), while evidence that is counter to the stereotype leads to the conclusion that the individual does not belong to the stereotyped category or is an exception to that category (the stipulative definition).

Dworkin, Chafetz, and Dworkin (1986) examined gender tokenism of public school teachers. In their analysis, tokens included male teachers in elementary schools and female teachers in the science, mathematics, and industrial arts programs in high schools in the 1970s and 1980s. These investigators noted that tokens carry two labels that are subject to stereotype attribution: a societal level label associated with the status of one's gender and a contextual level label depicting the scarcity of one's group within the organizational and occupational context of the individual. Male teachers in primary grades, while of token status, nonetheless were accorded the higher status of males in a female-dominated organization. The opposite was true for female teachers in a predominantly male organizational setting. The male teachers were likely to be seen as leaders and received respect and even deference. The female teachers became isolated and their input disregarded. Thus, women faculty teaching in high school science and mathematics, industrial arts, and shop departments reported greater levels of burnout than did women in programs where the percentage of female colleagues was higher. The reverse was the case for male faculty. Male faculty in elementary schools and especially those in primary grades reported less of a sense of alienation and burnout than did male teachers in grades where their percentages were significantly higher.

How are these patterns of gender, tokenism, and burnout affected by school reforms? To answer this question, the same information about burnout in the cohorts described above were examined. Generally, in no wave of data were there significant differences in the average burnout scores of males and females. Differences existed only for conditions of tokenism. Only in the 1977 and 1986 data sets were there significant numbers of female teachers who were tokens in their schools. In the 1990s and 2000s data, women were not tokens even in science, engineering, and other magnet schools.

What about the male teachers? In each wave, there were sufficient numbers of male tokens to assess the effect of that status on burnout. It seemed likely that the results of that assessment would be affected by the accountability systems following *A Nation at Risk.* Because they evaluate teachers in terms of the learning outcomes of their students, the accountability systems fundamentally alter the criteria by which teachers are evaluated. The societal status of a teacher's gender group has a reduced influence on the level of esteem in which teachers are held. Rather, the test score performances of the teacher's pupils became the paramount criterion. Additionally, the gender demographics of the teaching population changed in high school departments that had previously been predominantly male. To redress the paucity of public school girls interested in careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (the STEM disciplines), more women were recruited to teach in the physical sciences and even industrial arts. Furthermore, the percentage of women leaving the classrooms to assume administrative roles in school districts also increased.

Of course, these changes had not occurred in the *pre-reform period* with the result that there were no significant differences in the burnout scores of males and female teachers in 1977. However, female tokens experienced higher burnout levels and male tokens experienced significantly lower burnout levels than did nontoken female teachers as a whole. Being tokens is associated with a greater sense of role-specific alienation for women in token statuses and a lesser sense of role-specific alienation for male tokens. Male tokens acquire the societal stereotype of leadership and become central in the hierarchy of their schools. Female tokens become more marginalized due to the same stereotyping mechanisms.

As in the pre-reform era, there were no statistically significant differences in the burnout levels of men and women in 1986 after the passage of *A Nation at Risk.* However, the reliance on testing may have militated against the advantages of male tokens. They now had burnout scores that were equal to that of the nontoken male teachers. Female tokens, by contrast, had substantially higher burnout levels than nontoken females and than female tokens had in the pre-reform era. With heightened accountability, male teachers began to worry that female tokens were becoming a potential burden in opposite-sex dominated departments due to stereotypes that the specialties of these departments were beyond the scope of women's work. Further, data collected in that 1986 sampling indicated that males in male-dominated departments tended to "stick together" more in light of the pressures from the accountability movement.

By holding teachers accountable for the standardized test learning outcomes of their children, *high-stakes testing* was threatening to all teachers, evidenced by the continued elevation of the burnout scores over those of the pre-reform era. By the late 1990s, schools no longer had a few female tokens in what had previously been male-dominated departments. Consequently, there are no data on female tokens in the waves of the 1990s and beyond. In 1998, male teachers and female teachers were, again, no different in their burnout levels. Male tokens, generally in elementary schools, had burnout levels that did not differ from those of the nontoken males.

As school accountability measures focused on student achievement and standardized test scores of the student body, males and male tokens were no longer judged by the societal stereotypes of male leadership. Rather, the only criterion by which teachers were judged was the test score performances of their students. The probabilities that only the token males would produce high student test scores is minimal. In the organizational setting, the dominant group, by simple numbers, is more likely to include teachers whose classes do well on the tests (and also who do poorly). Female teachers whose students do well counter the stereotype of expertise of the male tokens and militate against male advantage in token settings. Since the 1990s, there have been no public school settings in which female teachers are tokens. Thus, only male teachers are likely to suffer from the impact of high-stakes testing on the burnout of gender tokens.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Dworkin, A.G. (1987). *Teacher burnout in the public schools: Structural causes and consequences for children.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Dworkin, A.G. (1997). Coping with reform: The intermix of teacher morale, teacher burnout, and teacher accountability. In B.J. Biddle, T.L. Good, & I.F. Goodson (Eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching* (pp. 459–498). Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Dworkin, A.G. (2001). Perspectives on teacher burnout and school reform. *International Education Journal, 24*(2), 69–78.

Dworkin, A.G., Chafetz, J.S., & Dworkin, R.J. (1986). The effects of tokenism on work alienation and commitment among urban public school teachers: A test of Kanter's approach. *Work and Occupations, 13*(1), 399–420.

Dworkin, A.G., Saha, L.J., & Hill, A.N. (2003). Teacher burnout and perceptions of a democratic school environment. *International Education Journal, 4*(2), 108–120.

Dworkin, A.G., & Townsend, M. (1994). Teacher burnout in the face of reform: Some caveats in breaking the mold. In B. A. Jones & K. M. Borman (Eds.), *Investing in United States schools: Directions for educational policy* (pp. 68–86). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues, 30,* 159–165.

Kanter, R.M. (1977a). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kanter, R.M. (1977b). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*(5), 965–990.

LeCompte, M.D., & Dworkin, A.G. (1991). *Giving up on school: Student dropouts and teacher burnouts.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout, a multidimensional perspective. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 19–32). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Pines, A. (1993). Burnout: Existential perspectives. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 33–52). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Richter, M.N., Jr. (1956). The conceptual mechanism of stereotyping. *American Sociological Review 21*(5), 568–571.

Seeman, M. (1975). Alienation studies. *Annual Review of Sociology, 1,* 91–123.

Sparks, D., & Hammond, J. (1981). *Managing teacher stress and burnout.* Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Toenjes, L.A., Dworkin, A.G., Lorence, J., & Hill, A.N. (2002). High-stakes testing, accountability, and student achievement in Texas and Houston. In J. E. Chubb & T. Loveless (Eds.), *Bridging the achievement gap* (pp. 109–130). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Anthony Gary Dworkin

Work-Family Conflicts of Educators

Work-family conflicts result from difficulties in responding satisfactorily to the competing demands of both the work role and the family role in an individual's life. Outsiders often assume that the unique working conditions of educators buffer them from significant work-family conflicts: Teachers at all levels perform some of their work from home, have summers off from active teaching duties, and (especially at the college and university level) have more flexible schedules than most workers. However, some of these very qualities lead to significant work-family conflicts among educators. Regular on-site hours are shorter than in other jobs, but both off-site grading and class preparation as well as frequent on-site evening and weekend events can encroach upon an educator's personal and family commitments.

Although the autonomy of educators means that both K–12 teachers and college professors will share some of the same sources of work-family conflict, the gendered expectations governing different levels of the educational system lead to some diverging sources of conflict. Specifically, K–12 teaching, especially at the elementary level, has traditionally been gendered as female work; in higher education, the increasing reliance on part-time and nontenure-track faculty creates a more complicated gendering of teaching work, with tenure-track faculty positions gendered "male" and marginalized teaching positions gendered "female." In part, the cultural gendering of these teaching positions leads to different sources of work-family conflicts for the individuals who hold them.

Educators often create solutions to work-family conflict at the individual or family level, but this "privatization" of the problems of achieving work-family balance ignores the possibility of creating broader cultural change through public responses to work-family conflict. Ideas about gender and gendered interpretations of specific educational work roles have important influences on the work-family conflicts experienced by educators at all levels. Although individual and family level accommodations can do much to alleviate work-family conflict, a larger reconceptualization of ideas of work and gender are necessary for fundamental and lasting change.

SOURCES OF WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

At its most fundamental level, work-family conflict stems from conflicts between life roles as workers and life roles as family members. Whereas specific instances of conflict arise when work requirements affect family life (W|F conflict) or when family needs interfere with one's work performance (F|W conflict), work-family conflict exists as well at a psychological level, resulting from both individual and cultural ideas about gender and role balance.

As a culture, we tend to believe that individuals understand and perform their roles hierarchically and that it is impossible for women, in particular, to be equally committed to both family and work roles. Because a man's culturally endorsed family role of "breadwinner" coincides neatly with his work role, a man can avoid some of the psychological distress that a woman faces when her expected family role of "nurturer" comes into conflict with her worker role. Women are more likely to believe that, in their actions and thought, they must prioritize either work or family. For this reason, women often understand the choices they make in specific situations as reflecting a broader orientation, either "choosing family over work" or "choosing work over family," either of which can lead to distress.

The cultural idea that individuals will order and perform their roles hierarchically leads to the expectation that individuals who consciously and emphatically prioritize one role over the other will experience less work-family conflict. What this idea ignores, however, is the extent to which cultural prescriptions regarding role hierarchies and gender constrain such choices in advance. Those who consciously "choose" to opt out of either family or work commitments make these choices in the context of a culture that believes that work-family conflict will always result when a woman attempts to succeed at both work and family roles. Although women who explicitly reject either the family or the work role may experience fewer episodes of situational work-family conflict, they are not immune to such conflict at the psychological level.

Primary and Secondary Teachers

Relatively few studies have examined work-family conflicts among K–12 teachers, and this neglect stems in part from the gendering of this teaching work as female. From this gendering arise the presumptions that primary and secondary teachers are more committed to their family roles than to their work roles and that the K–12 educational workplace is uniquely accommodating to workers with family obligations. Based on these assumptions, K–12 teachers are seen as not experiencing significant work-family conflicts, but this perception is inaccurate.

Social scientists in the 1960s and 1970s conceptualized teaching and other female-dominated fields as "semi-professions," a term that suggests both a deficiency in professional expertise and limited career commitment on the part of teachers. This understanding of the status of teaching rendered research attention to work-family conflicts of K–12 teachers less likely, because researchers have tended to focus on work-family conflicts among those assumed to have strong commitments to their work roles (e.g., women in fields traditionally dominated by men).

However, research has not supported the beliefs that primary and secondary teachers have a low level of commitment to their work and that they strongly prioritize their family roles over their work roles. Numerous qualitative studies have illustrated a strong commitment to the work role among samples of teachers, and recent quantitative research by

Cinamon and Rich (2005b) found that 70 percent of a sample of 187 Israeli teachers attributed high importance to the work role.

Like all individuals with strong commitments to both work and family, especially those with young children, teachers with a dual commitment will likely experience some work-family conflict. However, some sources of work-family conflict are unique to the K–12 educational context, suggesting the importance of more research on this population. Particular conflicts may arise from the nature of the work itself, from the current political emphasis on accountability and high-stakes testing, and from the lower status accorded teaching in comparison with other professions.

As mentioned earlier, the need to perform some teaching-related work off-site makes work encroachments on family life more likely than in other fields. Additionally, the emotional work of teaching, which mirrors the kind of emotional engagement required in rearing children, can leave teachers emotionally depleted at the end of the workday, another way in which work life can affect one's home life (Claesson & Brice, 1989).

Cinamon and Rich (2005b) found significantly higher levels of W|F conflict among high school teachers than among junior high school teachers, and they hypothesized that the emphasis on testing at the high school level in Israeli schools may have contributed to this difference. In the U.S. context, the standards and accountability movements of the 1990s, followed by the testing required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, have put considerable pressure on teachers, and this pressure may well have contributed to increased W|F conflict among primary and secondary teachers.

Finally, the status of teaching as a female-gendered "semi-profession" may also contribute to work-family conflict among K–12 teachers. Interactions with parents and members of the public make it all too clear to teachers that the culture does not accord them full status as professionals. Teachers may react defensively to this perception, attempting to raise the status of the profession by acting as a professional is thought to act—that is, minimizing encroachments of family upon one's work life. In fact, research has documented a tendency for teachers to meet the demands of work over those of family when the two conflict (Blase & Pajak, 1986), suggesting that at least some K–12 teachers engage in what Drago, Crouter, Wardell, and Willits (2001) describe in the higher education context as "bias avoidance," that is, behaviors intended to minimize any seeming or actual intrusions of family life on work commitments in order to be taken seriously as a professional. To the extent that teachers wish to be respected as members of a true profession, they may adopt some of the same strategies that mothers in academic positions use to minimize F|W conflicts.

College and University Faculty

Whereas K–12 teaching in general lacks a clearly hierarchical career ladder, the extreme rigidity of the career hierarchy in higher education creates significant tensions between work and family. The normative career path, gendered male, involves moving smoothly through graduate school and then to a tenure-track job, where one advances at regular intervals from assistant professor to associate professor to full professor. The assistant professor years put the most pressure on young professors, as they struggle to prove themselves worthy of tenure. For female professors, the coincidence of the pretenure years with prime childbearing years leads to problems in adapting the female life span to this male-oriented model.

Over the past several decades, increasing numbers of women have earned doctoral degrees and begun academic careers, such that percentages of male and female assistant professors are roughly equal. However, disparities in percentages of women and men holding positions at the associate professor level suggest that more women than men fail to receive tenure. Childbearing and rearing play an important role in these different rates of tenure achievement. Mason and Goulden (2002) studied the effects of “early babies” (those born either while the parent is in graduate school or within the first five years after completing the PhD) versus “late babies” (those born more than five years after completion of the PhD) on rates of tenure achievement for male and female faculty. Though the timing of initiating parenthood does not affect men’s chances of earning tenure, having a baby early makes a big difference for women: Women with early babies are significantly less likely to achieve tenure than women with late babies or no children.

The rigidly hierarchical career model of professorial work leads to a work culture that is remarkably intolerant of employment interruptions. Because of this, the common practice of temporarily drawing back from full engagement in the workforce during especially demanding caregiving periods remains essentially unavailable for academics. The tight academic job market renders temporarily cutting back on one’s academic work even more problematic: Graduate students feel the need to get a tenure-track job as soon as possible, knowing that a few years after graduation, their ability to land a tenure-track job will start to decline. Pretenure faculty know that if they leave a tenure-track job to care for children, they might never get another one.

Part-time and nontenure-track faculty members face different challenges. Called lecturers, instructors, or adjuncts, they are disproportionately female, and they have less job security and are paid less—usually significantly less—than professors. Many women in marginalized academic positions hold the jobs they do because of family related aspirations or commitments that conflict with the expectations of the academic career model. Such women include those without doctoral degrees for reasons related to family or those with doctoral degrees whose family work renders the demands of a professorial academic career unappealing or impossible. The decision to work for lower pay and status than are accorded to tenured and tenure-track faculty, though sometimes narrated as a free choice, is made in response to the cultural ideology that views women, but not men, as “choosing” either work or family over the other.

SOLUTIONS TO WORK-FAMILY CONFLICTS

Most people develop individual and family level responses to work-family conflict rather than envisioning a culture-wide reconceptualization of the connections between gender and work/family roles. Whether at the individual or family level, these private strategies aim either at reducing work encroachments on family life or at minimizing family intrusions into the workplace. Research on the former has focused on general populations of dual-earner couples, whereas much of the research focused on academic populations has examined the latter.

Becker and Moen (1999) report that the majority of dual-earner couples avoid at the family level the pressures of two high-pressure careers by means of strategies to scale back in order to protect the family from work encroachments. They identify three specific strategies: placing limits on work engagements, having a “one-job, one-career” marriage (most often, the man has the career and the woman the “job”), and trading off, allowing priority to both partners’ work lives, but at different times in the life course.

Because of the unusually high pressure of the pretenure years for professors and the difficulty of returning to the tenure track after exiting academia for whatever reason, these strategies are less available for those in academia, and so efforts to reduce F|W conflict become salient, particularly for female assistant professors with children. Research by Finkel and Olswang (1996) quantifies female junior faculty members' sense of the necessity of limiting F|W conflict in order to achieve tenure. Of their sample of 124 female assistant professors, 30 percent had decided not to have children and a further 49 percent had chosen to postpone childbearing. Forty percent of their study participants cited "Time required by children" as a serious barrier to achieving tenure, including 82 percent of the subsample of women with at least one child under the age of six.

A female assistant professor's decision to avoid or delay childbearing, a "free choice" made in the context of a culture that requires women to choose work or family, is a clear example of bias avoidance. Female academics who do have children in the pretenure years often attempt to limit F|W conflict by making their maternal status as invisible as possible. Such efforts can begin with timing conception attempts to ensure summer childbirth, thus avoiding interruptions of the academic semester. More problematic is the underutilization of family friendly policies increasingly in place at colleges and universities, including paid parental leaves, flexible scheduling, and the option of stopping the tenure clock for a year. Although studies have repeatedly demonstrated wide support for such policies among both male and female professors, actual utilization rates suggest that the majority of eligible faculty members do not request to use them.

Researchers assume that academic parents do not fully utilize family friendly policies because of concerns that, even when institution-wide policies support them, they may still be penalized at the department level, where decisions about tenure are made. An assistant professor's colleagues, like the larger culture, may perceive work-family balance as a zero-sum game, such that an "orientation" to work or family necessarily implies a corresponding deficit of attention to the other sphere. In a workplace governed by this model, any utilization of family friendly policies will be perceived as signaling a lack of scholarly seriousness.

These private strategies to balance the demands of work and family often provide individuals with a satisfactory experience of succeeding at multiple life roles. However, the problem with private solutions to problems rooted in culture and ideology is that approaching problems with work-family balance as a series of free choices made by individuals ignores the ways in which the possible choices—and the necessity of "choosing" work or family at all—are constrained by cultural forces that remain invisible as long as they are ignored. Fundamental change—as opposed to individual and family level accommodations to the way things are—requires broader public solutions to the problem. Starting in the early 1990s and continuing to the present, college and university administrators have implemented increasing numbers of family friendly policies, including parental leave policies, stopping the tenure clock, job sharing, employment assistance for spouses, and other policies. As policies relating to parental leaves and tenure-clock stoppage become widely accepted, researchers and faculty activists interested in work-family conflict are envisioning policy changes that go even further to make academia welcoming to those who seek to balance their commitments to work and to family.

Currently, work-family theorists are pressing for policies that recognize that child rearing involves a time commitment considerably longer than the one year of a stopped tenure clock or formal policies based on a reconceptualization of gender roles and family structure. Specifically, in light of the continuing changes in family structures and women's increased participation in paid labor, colleges and universities need to commit resources to address the needs of all members of the community, including adjunct instructors and staff members, rather than creating family friendly policies in ways that benefit primarily tenured and tenure-track faculty. As a response to the lengthy time commitment involved in rearing children, Robert Drago and Joan Williams (2000) propose the creation of half-time tenure-track faculty positions, which would allow parents to work half-time for up to 12 years before coming up for tenure.

Jerry A. Jacobs (2004), however, believes that even these policy changes, by focusing attention exclusively on the work-family conflicts of faculty members with children, ignore the root problem: the ever-increasing demands on professors' time. In his view, the creation of part-time tenure tracks, which he suspects would be populated almost entirely by women, would thus serve to reinstitutionalize gender inequity; and tenure-clock stoppage, by giving parents extra time to "catch up," diverts attention from the fact that some departments' tenure requirements cannot be met by anyone with any reasonable definition of work-life balance. In Jacobs's opinion, addressing the root cause of work-family conflict requires policy changes to limit the workweeks of *all* professors, not just those with children. Before such a policy can be implemented, however, attitudes and ideas across the culture and within particular workplaces will have to change considerably. To speed such changes along, some are attempting to facilitate work-family balance by means of cultural interventions.

Policy changes alone are not enough to affect culture-wide changes in levels of work-family conflict. Low utilization rates for family friendly policies are the norm in both academia and the nonacademic world. Sweden provides a useful example of disparities between the ideal, expressed in policy, and reality: Despite egalitarian policies designed to maximize women's workforce participation and men's parental involvement, Swedish women take the majority of leaves and perform the majority of child care; men are reluctant to take family leaves for fear of being perceived as less serious workers. Until our understanding of work shifts to allow recognition of women and men with significant caregiving responsibilities as valuable and effective workers, fundamental change will be impossible.

The cultural intervention efforts of Cinamon and Rich (2005a) in the K–12 workplace could serve as models for similar interventions at both the K–12 and the college/university levels. Cinamon and Rich used a two-pronged approach in their program for alleviating work-family conflict, one focusing on school managers (e.g., school principals and administrators) and one on teachers at high risk for work-family conflict (e.g., novice teachers who are also parents of young children). For both targeted groups, intervention focused on changing both attitudes and actions; for managers, this involved sensitivity training to enhance managers' understanding of work-family conflicts of educators as well as skill-oriented work to increase managers' effectiveness in dealing with work-family conflicts from the perspective of family friendly managerial practice.

In higher education workplaces, making such cultural interventions at the department level is essential for changing the climate for parents in academia since department-level colleagues, rather than administrators, play the most important role in tenure decisions for junior faculty members. The limited use of sensitivity training initiatives such as those just described, even at universities that are leaders in family friendly policy implementation, suggests that administrators should follow up such initiatives with concrete measures to shift attitudes of the senior faculty who actually decide the fates of junior faculty members' careers.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Becker, P.E., & Moen, P. (1999). Scaling back: Dual-earner couples' work-family strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*(4), 995–1007.

Blase, J.J., & Pajak, E.F. (1986). The impact of teacher's work life on personal life: A qualitative analysis. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 32*(4), 307–322.

Cinamon, R.G., & Rich, Y. (2005a). Reducing teachers' work-family conflict: From theory to practice. *Journal of Career Development, 32*(1), 91–103.

Cinamon, R.G., & Rich, Y. (2005b). Work-family conflict among female teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(4), 365–378.

Claesson, M.A., & Brice, R.A. (1989). Teacher/mothers: Effects of a dual role. *American Educational Research Journal, 26*(1), 1–23.

Drago, R., Crouter, A.C., Wardell, M., & Willits, B.S. (2001). *Final report of the Faculty and Families Project.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved June 9, 2004, from http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultyfamilies.htm

Drago, R., & Williams, J. (2000). A half-time tenure-track proposal. *Change, 32*(6), 46–51.

Finkel, S.K., & Olswang, S.G. (1996). Child rearing as a career impediment to women assistant professors. *Review of Higher Education, 19*(2), 123–139.

Jacobs, J.A. (2004). The faculty time divide. *Sociological Forum, 19*(1), 3–27.

Mason, M.A., & Goulden, M. (2002). Do babies matter? The effect of family formation on the lifelong careers of academic men and women. *Academe, 88*(6), 21–27.

Rachel Hile Bassett

Part X

Gender and Educational Policies

Overview

The term *policy* is an elusive concept. It basically refers to official statements of intentions to act on certain problems. Or, for purposes of this encyclopedia, policy can be defined as official statements of intentions to act on problems surrounding gender and education. But, even this definition remains obscure until the terms *official statements, intentions to act,* and *problems of gender and education* are clarified. This can best be accomplished by reading all of the essays in this section plus related ones in other sections listed at the end of this overview. Taken together, they provide a wide-ranging, richly nuanced, and sophisticated understanding of the nature of policies concerned with gender and education. Each essay is designed to stand alone, however, and each provides valuable, expert information about the specific gender and educational policies referenced in its title.

As the essays show, *official statements* are institutionally and organizationally formulated and enacted. Although individuals and voluntary organizations can and do influence policies, they cannot issue official statements of policy unless they hold legitimate positions of authority over educational matters. Those who do have such authority include international organizations such as the United Nations and its various agencies; multinational development agencies, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund; national governments; state or provincial governments; and educational officials at all levels, including the local schools. The official policy statements of these authorities can take various forms, including reports, international conventions, laws, executive orders, court decisions, governmental or agency regulations, faculty and student handbooks, and course syllabi. Some of these statements—such as Title IX of the 1972 Amendments to the U.S. Education Act, which prohibits sex discrimination in all federally aided educational programs—deal explicitly with education and gender. But, two other kinds of statements should also be considered: education and gender policies. One of these consists of general policies against gender discrimination that cover all institutions, not just education. The U.S. Civil Rights Act of 1964, the British Sex Discrimination Act of 1975, and the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women are primary examples. The second consists of policy statements specific to education that do not view gender as a major issue even though they may have important gender effects. Examples of this kind of policy include the British Education Reform Act of 1988 and the U.S. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Defining official policy statements as *intentions to act,* rather than as actions, is designed to emphasize the fact that policies may or may not lead to effective action. One reason they do not is because of the enormous complexity of policy interpretation and implementation. A law, executive order, or court decision is not an unambiguous rule that everyone understands in the same way; that can, must, and will be supported and followed by everyone; and that has clear and anticipated consequences. The ambiguity of laws is nicely illustrated by the fact that, although Title IX, described above, was enacted into law in 1972, it was not until 1975 that the U.S. Congress specified how Title IX should apply to school and college athletics, and it was not until 1976 that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) disseminated the guidelines and regulations for implementing the law. Nor did these guidelines clarify Title IX for all times and all people. Additional clarifications were issued by DHEW in 1979, by Congress in the form of the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, and by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education (DOE) in 1996.

Many of these clarifications were stimulated by Court challenges that were raised to determine whether the DHEW and, after 1980, the DOE had correctly interpreted the law; whether all programs in an educational institution were covered by the law or only those that received federal funds; whether athletic programs for men and women could be "separate but equal"; whether schools should be required to pay compensation to students whose rights under Title IX had been violated, etc. Even if the judicial opinions that resulted from these challenges had been totally unambiguous, which they were not, there still would be problems in using court decisions to define the law without Congressional or executive action. One problem results from the fact that decisions made by most federal courts are limited to the jurisdiction of that court, and even Supreme Court decisions that affect the whole country are limited to situations that are similar to the one on which the Court based its judgments. The famous *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas,* decision in 1954, for example, outlawed educational segregation by race but not by gender.

The policy process does not embrace only those in government whose job it is to enact, interpret, and enforce laws about gender and education. The process also involves school administrators, teachers, parents, and pupils, all of whom have their own interpretations of what gender is or should be, what gender equity means, what the intention of the law "really" is, how seriously they must take it, and what effects it will or should have on school programs and practices. Consensus about these issues among the many actors involved is unlikely to be high, particularly when the policy in question is controversial, as gender policies inevitably are.

Although the enormous complexity of policy interpretation and implementation often prevents effective action, complexities and misunderstandings can sometimes be used as excuses for inaction that are designed to cover up deliberate resistance to policies. This resistance is particularly likely when policies are designed to shift power arrangements by increasing resources of previously underprivileged groups and, thereby, reducing the relative advantage of previously dominant groups. Policies of this type include those intended to promote gender and other forms of educational equality. As demonstrated in the readings in this section, such policies have challenged and continue to threaten the relative power and advantages of White males. These policies have already produced more opportunities for girls and women and, if fully implemented, would bring about even more extensive changes in educational structures and processes. Opposition to them has come from all levels of the political and social hierarchy, and it is not surprising that the most effective resistance has come from the higher levels of those hierarchies. President Reagan and his Cabinet, for example, were famous for their decisions to simply stop funding the enforcement of laws passed by earlier sessions of Congress with which Reagan disagreed. These included civil rights laws, such as Title IX, aimed at reducing discrimination in education, and it was not surprising that by the end of his years in office Congress felt it necessary to pass the Civil Rights Restoration Act, mentioned above, over Reagan's veto. Although this Act seems to have helped Title IX survive the Reagan onslaught, a more dismal fate, documented in the penultimate essay in this encyclopedia, befell the Women's Educational Equity Act. That essay should be read by anyone who seeks evidence for official resistance to the implementation of gender equity policies in the United States.

Evidence for official resistance to gender equity policies also comes from other countries. In those with Parliamentary governments, where the sharp separation between executive and legislative branches does not exist, the more common way of undermining popular laws passed by previous Parliaments is simply to replace them with new laws. And, the authors who describe recent developments in the educational policies of Britain, Canada, and a sampling of other developed and developing countries (see "International Policies") all confirm governmental attempts to avoid or move away from a concern with gender equity.

In the United States, this attempt clearly indicates a reversal of the course established by the government in response to the efforts of the Women's Liberation Movement, now called second-wave feminism, to define the major *problems of gender and education* as problems of gender inequities in schooling, particularly the disadvantages girls were then experiencing in comparison to boys. Within this broad, major concern were such specific problems as the underperformance of girls, compared to boys, in the fields of mathematics, science, and technology; the underrepresentation of women, compared to men, in most areas of higher, graduate, and professional education; the existence of sexist teaching materials and pedagogical practices in which girls and women and their accomplishments were invisible or undervalued; and the sexual harassment and violence directed at girls and women throughout their years of schooling.

In order to provide both fairness and equivalent role models for boys and girls, second-wave feminists also fought for policies that would foster gender parity among teachers and school officials at the elementary and secondary levels and among all academics and administrators in higher education. In particular, it was argued that more women should be recruited into academic and administrative positions and into teaching subjects, such as science and mathematics, in which male teachers predominated. Like faculty members, educational administrators should be made aware of their different behaviors toward males and females and should be required to treat and to evaluate students and faculty members of both sexes in an equitable manner, free of stereotypic assumptions about gender differences.

The official policies designed to achieve these goals had barely begun to be implemented in the United States and in other countries around the world when they came under attack by those who did not agree that equity should be a primary goal of education. Over the past 30 years, the arguments against equity policies have taken a number of forms, varying somewhat over time and across countries. A major argument has been the one that pits equity against excellence. By focusing on equity, this argument contends, schools have neglected their best and brightest students, not met their responsibility to help all students achieve at the highest levels possible, and failed to produce a labor force that can compete effectively in a globalizing, capitalist economy. Educational research does not support the claim that an emphasis on equity undermines student achievement, but research evidence has not deterred those who oppose equity policies from developing alternative educational policies—based on what are called teacher accountability, high-stakes testing, and school choice—and claiming that these newly developed policies will improve student performance. Some of those who participate in the development and implementation of these policies continue to argue against the goal of equity, but others claim that the policies they are proposing will improve the performance of all children, including those, such as disadvantaged minorities, on whose behalf educational equity policies were originally formulated. Policies that promote school choice, including the choice of single-sex schooling, for example, are sold to the public as policies that will open more opportunities for girls and boys and, thereby, result in more gender equity than policies directly aimed at equity (see "School Choice and Gender Equity" for a research-based refutation of this argument).

These mixed arguments about the goal of equity can also be found in the large amount of attention that has recently been given to the "Boy Problem." In general, this problem is defined as the underachievement of boys, compared to girls, in elementary and secondary schools. The finding that boys score lower, on average, than girls on tests of verbal ability is seen as part of the problem, as is the greater tendency of boys to drop out of school. Some of the concern with this problem reflects a genuine commitment to gender equity and to making certain that boys and girls of all backgrounds are given equal educational opportunities, attention, and support and are held to the same standards in all areas of the official, extra-, and hidden curricula. But, some of this concern flows from darker motives, including a misogynous fear that girls are usurping the higher status that boys once enjoyed in educational institutions. These critics claim correctly that girls have been making more gains in academic performance than boys and that boys are subject to far more disciplinary action and alienation from school than girls. But, these research findings then lead them to the incorrect and unsupported conclusions that girls are no longer disadvantaged, that all boys (regardless of race-ethnicity and social class) suffer from similar educational disadvantages, and that the reason for boys' failures and misbehaviors is the anti-male bias of the feminist policy agenda and the presence in the schools of too many women teachers. Those who promote these latter conclusions provide another good example of the kinds of resistance to policies that arise when those policies are designed to shift the power balance by increasing the resources of previously disadvantaged groups.

A more sophisticated criticism of gender equity policies has also emerged during the past four decades. This criticism comes from people, often feminists, who strongly believe in the goal of gender equity, but who feel that policies cannot achieve these goals unless they recognize certain basic differences between the sexes, in particular the differences surrounding reproduction. Pregnancy, for example, should not be treated as if it is an illness or a condition similar to something experienced by boys and men. Nor should motherhood be treated as if it is the same as fatherhood. Some reproduction-related differences, like pregnancy, are biological, but others, like the assignment of primary child-care responsibilities to women rather than men, are deeply embedded social and historical constructions. In either case, these critics claim that gender equity policies that ignore these differences will not be successful. Only by recognizing the very real differences, and constructing policies accordingly, can pregnant and mothering students have real opportunities to continue and complete their educations (see "Pregnant and Parenting Teens"). And only if their employers adopt and implement policies of this kind will pregnant and mothering faculty and administrators be evaluated fairly and have real opportunities to develop their careers (see "Evaluation Policies for Academics" and "Work-Family Reconciliation Policies").

In addition to the official statements of intentions to act on problems surrounding gender and education that are called policies, or sometimes public or official policies, there are also relevant *policy initiatives* that are unofficial efforts to promote opportunities and empowerment for disadvantaged groups, including women. As several essays in this and earlier sections of the encyclopedia indicate, many initiatives of this type emerged from the social movement now called second-wave feminism, and some have been enacted into official policies. Other examples are the activities of nongovernmental organizations, commonly referred to as NGOs. As Karen Monkman documents, NGOs participate in policy discourse and formulation and are often crucial determiners of the effects that policies have on the people in the areas of the world in which the NGOs operate. Women-centered NGOs have been particularly important in making certain that international development policies are implemented in ways that empower women and educational policies are interpreted and implemented in ways that increase gender equity. Some of these NGOs also are proactive in promoting gender-equitable processes and goals outside of what is required by the international funding agencies responsible for official policies.

Going beyond what is official, required, and routine is also characteristic of the large number of educators around the world who are engaged in the development of feminist pedagogy. As Berenice Fisher's essay explains, this grassroots and unofficial policy initiative takes different forms, but all who advocate feminist pedagogy are united in a passionate—and sometimes dangerous—effort to transform teaching and learning processes to the greater advantage of girls and women.

For more on gender and educational policies, see "Home Schooling," "Military Colleges and Academies," and "Public Single-Sex and Coeducational Schools" in Part III; "National Curricula" in Part IV; "Curricular Tracking" in Part V; "Educator Sexual Misconduct" in Part VII; and "Salaries of Academics," "Teacher Burnout," and "Work-Family Conflicts of Educators" in Part IX.

The “Boy Problem”

An *Education Week* editorial proclaims a “Silent Gender Gap: Reading, Writing, and Other Problems for Boys.” A 2006 *Newsweek* cover decries a “Boy Crisis.” A headline in the *Chicago Sun-Times* warns that “Boys, Not Girls, on Worse End of Education Gap.” A bestselling book by Christine Hoff Sommers appears in 2000 trumpeting *The War Against Boys.* A *USA Today* contributor complains that “Girls Get Extra School Help While Boys Get Ritalin.” *U.S. News and World Report* ponders “Are Boys the Weaker Sex?” Seemingly more and more frequently, media outlets and pundits are focusing their concern on the so-called “boy problem” in schools that holds boys are not faring well in academics, in social settings, or in health concerns compared to their female peers. This debate is occurring not just in the United States but all over the world.

Indeed, from Australia to England, from the United States to Canada, and from Iceland to Germany, a noticeable panic has developed and grown around the education of boys. Grabbing newspaper headlines, taking up bookstore shelves, and even capturing major attention from the research community and practitioners, boys’ educational issues have in many ways overshadowed the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s much-needed focus on girls’ education. This has elsewhere been called the “boy turn” in gender and education research and practice (Weaver-Hightower, 2003). This turn to boys, though, has not been easy or uncontested. While much panic and work has focused on the “boy problem” in education, much feminist and profeminist thought has been directed at tempering the hysteria and establishing nuance within the emotionally heated terrain of gender reform. What are the concerns that the public, educators, and policy makers have about boys? Where has this new focus on boys come from? What has been done to try to intervene in these problems? And, what are the dangers of this new focus on the problem(s) of boys in so many places?

WHAT ABOUT THE BOYS?

“What about the boys?” has become an oft-heard refrain in the debates over boys around the world. While it can be meant or taken in many ways, it has largely come to represent the position of antifeminist backlash against the gains made for girls in schools; it is, in other words, an abridgement of a sentiment that says something like “Enough has been done for girls in schools. Now what about the boys?” Rather than using it in this sense, this question can be considered in the alternative sense of trying to delineate the issues that are commonly identified as problems for boys. In general, these problems fall into two categories: (a) academic and (b) social, physical, and medical.

Within the category of academic problems for boys, concern has centered largely on literacy. Put simply, boys tend to do less well than girls on tests of school-based literacy. In the United States, the gap between the average scores of males and females in reading at all age levels on the long-term National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has been between 7 and 15 points (on a 500-point scale) throughout the 35 years of the test's administration (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). On writing, the gap stands even wider, with boys behind girls 17 to 24 points on the 2002 NAEP writing test, this time on a 300-point scale (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003). Similar reading results to those in the United States have been found cross-nationally, as well. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2003), a group representing 30 "Western," industrialized countries, finds that in all its member nations, females in the fourth grade have a statistically significant advantage over boys in tested literacy. For 15 year olds, the gap stands even wider across the countries. Many other cross-national studies similarly find that girls outperform boys on nearly every measure of literacy tested.

Other indicators of academic performance have also been of concern regarding boys. In England, for example, the number of girls getting grades A through C on General Certificate of Secondary Education exams (or GCSE, the comprehensive, subject-based exams at the end of secondary education) have surpassed boys in many subjects. Some worry that boys do not receive as many academic awards as girls, while others decry the rising gap in college and university enrollment that has begun favoring females. Some even hold that the school has become a feminine environment that hurts boys' ability to succeed in schools, an argument that has recurred often through history. The main rationale for such an argument contends that boys have biological differences in brain construction or different learning styles that are not met by current modes of teaching, though some allege that feminist efforts to make boys more like girls are behind it. Some, finally, assert that teachers and boys are emotionally disconnected from one another, which hinders boys' ability to succeed in school, as well.

The second category of concern, encompassing social, physical, and medical issues, has been treated as if interconnected with academic issues. Much concern has been expressed over attention deficit disorder and hyperactivity (ADD/ADHD) in popular discussion, particularly because the majority of those diagnosed and medicated for it are males. Males are also more likely than females to be diagnosed for special education, to be diagnosed with autism and dyslexia, to have drug and alcohol problems, to engage in risk-taking behavior, to be the victims and perpetrators of violence and crime, and to complete suicide attempts. In school, boys are more likely to receive negative feedback, they and girls think teachers like boys less than girls, and boys are far more likely to be suspended or expelled (excluded) from school or to drop out. Violence, particularly, sometimes in the form of rampage school shootings in the United States, has been a central issue that propels boys and their problems to the public stage. Clearly, such physical, emotional, and medical indicators have relevance to schools and to the general state of males during school and after.

Largely, the veracity of the indicators—boys' relative advantages and disadvantages—are not in dispute. Rather, what they mean, what has caused them, and what should be done about them has been the most contentious aspect. A diversity of opinion exists on these central questions.

CONSERVATIVE AND (PRO)FEMINIST ARGUMENTS

The debates over "the boy problem" have largely been led by conservative voices, whether antifeminist scholars or right-wing religious personalities. These writers have largely painted the issue of boys' education as one in which liberal feminist forces have polluted or destroyed time-tested practices for raising and educating boys to be "real men." Blame is laid on a lack of male role models and teachers, feminist cover-ups of boys' difficulties in order to privilege those of girls, and a lack of attention to—or "forgetting" of—school structures, curriculum, and pedagogy that fit the ways boys purportedly learn.

Feminist women and profeminist men—hereafter combined in the term "(pro)feminist" since these two groups largely agree—have objected to such portrayals of the boy problem, some questioning whether a problem really exists. Some, for example, argue that many of these effects do not indicate disadvantages based on gender but rather the *costs* of male privilege in other areas. Underachievement in literacy, for instance, can be seen as a cost of the privileged status of math and science compared to the lower, sometimes feminized, status of the humanities. Other scholars suggest that the small gaps in literacy and other achievement measures are of little consequence, for it remains true that males do better in employment rates, are paid better on average for the same work, and dominate the positions of power in business, government, sports, and culture. In other words, males' relative lack of achievement during schooling does not appear to hurt them after school. There are also concerns that concentration on boys will take attention, not to mention already scarce resources, from those programs that address problems for girls in math, sciences, and technology. Some fear that the masculinist discourses of boys as victims, schools as failing boys, and boys being allowed to "be boys" will create an environment in which girls' concerns are seen as secondary or, worse, as the privileged trying to get more advantages.

Perhaps the most important intervention in the debates over the boy problem by (pro) feminists has been countering the question, "What about the boys?" with the question, "Which boys?" This question asks advocates for boys to disaggregate the category "boys" or, in other words, to break this category down by race, socioeconomic class, sexuality, disability and ability, and so on. This (pro)feminist intervention reminds us that not all boys are having problems and, perhaps more importantly, that some boys suffer more than others. African American, Aboriginal Australian, and Afro-Caribbean British males, for example, are far more likely than European American and Anglo males to be caught up in disciplinary systems in schools and criminal justice systems outside schools. African American boys are also further behind than their White counterparts in literacy scores. Gay, bisexual, and questioning boys, as another example, face a greater disconnect with the curriculum and face more harassment at school than heterosexual boys. To not break "boys" into categories of race, class, sexuality, and so on skews the indicators in deceptive ways, making it appear as if all boys were in dire straits. Seeing the data in such limited ways might lead to wasting valuable and limited resources on those who need them far less and could further compound the oppression of those boys.

Another important impact of (pro)feminist scholars has been pointing out that the problems of boys are not new. If such indicators of boys' problems have been true for many years, why all the panic and concern now? A number of social dynamics have been driving this panic (Weaver-Hightower, 2003). A large portion of the driving force has been the popular press books and newspaper headlines mentioned earlier; these have increased the visibility of such anxieties. Parent and educator interest in these topics—their need for solutions to very real problems—encourages such work to be done, of course. Other dynamics push the boy problem debates forward, too. Feminists, as well as men's rights and mythopoetic advocates of the 1990s (stereotyped as middle-age men beating drums in the woods), have contributed a language for and awareness that males have a gender, too. Liberal feminist educational measurements that have been used successfully in the past to spur legislation to help girls, particularly equal participation rates and equal test scores, have now ironically turned in ways that highlight the problems of boys. In addition, though, much of the renewed concern can be considered a backlash against feminism, with some explicitly attempting to reestablish male dominance in education and the workforce. Similarly, the predominance of conservative, rightist educational reform has, because boys' issues have also been highly conservative, increased the visibility of test score gaps for boys and altered "common sense" about education in reactionary and antifeminist ways. Too, a global "crisis of masculinity" over civic and economic participation has spurred attention on boys, as have changes away from industrialized factory-based labor (a traditionally male domain) to service labor (a traditionally female domain) in most Western nations. Finally, the interest of publishers in a hot, new, and controversial (thus, profitable) topic has driven publication toward concerns of boys.

Though debates over the boy problem can seem polarized, it should be noted, however, that the majority of those invested in the issues lie somewhere in the middle. These people do not subscribe to either camp but rather largely are worried about the everyday necessity of raising and teaching boys. Often, such groups become a political prize, and much rhetorical energy has focused on enlisting this large set of ground forces. In the current context, conservative voices have been more successful in this effort because they have been willing to take seriously the practical concerns of parents and educators.

INTERVENTIONS

A large portion of those who have attempted to solve the practical concerns of parents and educators have written in what has been called the "practice-oriented" tradition of boys' education literature, "boyswork," or, more disparagingly, "tips for teachers." The quality of such interventions has been variable, from nuanced examination of gender as socially constructed to rather simplistic and stereotypical teaching practices (like having boys "high five" a construction paper cutout of a hand when they leave class as a way to get boys to be more active). In general, though, practice-oriented work has sought to address the major problems outlined earlier in this essay, including literacy achievement, behavior, and social ills. Collections by Bleach (1998) and Browne and Fletcher (1995) provide case studies of schools' attempts to deal with boys' issues. Alloway and Gilbert (1997) and Salisbury and Jackson (1996) suggest practical strategies and lessons to examine masculinity from progressive and feminist veins as a way to deal with the problems of boys.

A particularly well-trod ground of research on practice for boys has been literacy with the general aim being to make boys more prolific and better readers. The majority of such work has concentrated on the social aspects of literacy, particularly the supposed lack of "fit" between boys' socialization and literacy habits and the literacy expected or done in classrooms. In the tradition of mythopoetic notions of males, some suggest teachers select books that feature male archetypes and traditional male interests to get boys more interested in reading. Others suggest that teachers get over their apprehensions about violent or gross books because these are materials in which boys—stereotypically—are most interested. Still others suggest that boys lack the emotional vocabulary to succeed in tasks that current English language arts pedagogy and curriculum demands, so teachers should help boys learn this vocabulary. Research from a (pro)feminist perspective has developed critical literacy approaches that encourage students to practice social critique of reading materials, to use with boys to simultaneously address literacy skills and the features of masculinity that prevent boys from full participation in literacy.

A number of programs for African American males (answering the "Which boys?" concern) provide good examples of community-based interventions into boys' education issues. Most visible of these were the court-thwarted attempts to create Afrocentric all-male schools in Detroit, Michigan, in the early 1990s. This program and others like it across the United States spawned from concerns for the lagging educational achievement of African American boys and the increasing social ills growing from this. Boys Booked on Barbershops (called B-BOB) provides another example, in this case particularly focused on literacy skills and attitudes. Started in Memphis, Tennessee, using barbershops—traditionally one of the most stable businesses in African American communities—the program seeks to provide high-interest books and have men and boys read together. Such programs and others at the community services level often provide male mentors, often particularly targeting boys without fathers at home, along with academic enrichment opportunities and (sometimes religious) counseling that are culturally relevant to the participants, are integrated into local institutions, are staffed by people who live and work in the communities and schools, and are responsive to local needs.

THE POLICY TERRAIN FOR BOYS' EDUCATION ISSUES

The local, diffuse, informal nature of the programs described above typifies the policy terrain for boys' education in the United States. The state-centered, often judicially mandated policy structure of American education has thus far limited action on "the boy problem." Instead, interventions and programs have sprouted in local schools and districts with little or no state support (with the exception of Maine) and no policy mandate whatsoever.

The same has not been true in other countries. Perhaps more than any other country, Australia has taken on the boy problem through official, state-level, and now federal-level policy on the education of boys. The Australian House Committee's report *Boys: Getting it Right,* released in 2002, identifies learning differences, social and economic changes, and pedagogical shortcomings that, the Committee contends, limit Australian boys' ability to succeed in schools. Growing from this report and interest in its findings, the Australian government has sponsored conferences, commissioned research, and spent millions of dollars on Boys' Education Lighthouse Schools and Success for Boys grant programs. These programs have given moderate-sized grants directly to schools to develop and disseminate "best practices" in educating boys.

A great deal of policy attention internationally has also focused on the low number of male teachers, a reason often given as part of boys' difficulties in schools. The issue particularly concerns the widespread lack of male teachers in the younger grades. In Australia, the report referred to above also touches on this issue, for *Boys: Getting it Right* calls for male-only teacher education scholarships, and debate has, thus, been sparked over changing sex discrimination laws to allow such scholarships. (Pro)feminist advocates have viewed the arguments for increasing the numbers of male teachers with great skepticism. First, there is little research to suggest that male teachers are more capable of teaching boys. Second, such arguments imply a criticism of female teachers as being at fault for any problems boys have. Further, some male teachers can cause more gendered problems than they solve by, for instance, being hypermasculine or being intimidating to girls. Having more *good* teachers, not necessarily *male* teachers, has been the frequent call from (pro)feminists. These scholars also predict that scholarship schemes are unlikely to alter the reasons males avoid teaching, namely low status, low salaries, the perception of teaching as "women's work," suspicions of males as gay or pedophiles if they work with children, and other working conditions that some contend are not conducive to males staying in classrooms.

Though formal policy has been limited thus far, especially in the United States, much potential for growth in programs and even for policies to address the "boy problem" exists in many countries. In the United States, specifically, the rolling back of federal women's policy infrastructure, revisions to (some say "attacks on") Title IX sex equality legislation, renewed attention on testing that might highlight boys' deficiencies, growing cultural conservatism that drives boys' education concerns, and media coverage of the topic have all created fertile ground for the growth of interventions on the boy problem. Signals from high-ranking U.S. education officials serve to confirm the existing political will to pursue this issue. One telling example is a press release for a report on *girls'* equity issued by Rod Paige, former U.S. Secretary of Education, on November 19, 2004. "The issue now," said Paige, "is that boys seem to be falling behind. We need to spend some time researching the problem so that we can give boys the support to succeed academically." Whatever policy or practice gets created, it seems likely that the "boy problem" will command attention for several years to come. While some welcome the attention on boys' education, others vigilantly watch so that these reforms do not overshadow other equity issues.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Alloway, N., & Gilbert, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Boys and literacy—teaching units.* Carlton, Australia: Curriculum Corporation.

Bleach, K. (Ed.). (1998). *Raising boys' achievement in schools.* Staffordshire, England: Trentham Books.

Browne, R., & Fletcher, R. (Eds.). (1995). *Boys in schools: Addressing the real issues—behaviour, values, and relationships.* Sydney, Australia: Finch.

Ferguson, A.A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of black masculinity.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gilbert, R., & Gilbert, P. (1998). *Masculinity goes to school.* London: Routledge.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *NAEP 1999 trends in academic progress: Three decades of student performance* (No. NCES 2000-469). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2003). *The nation's report card: Writing highlights 2002* (No. NCES 2003-531). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2003). *Education at a glance: OECD indicators 2003.* Paris: OECD.

Salisbury, J., & Jackson, D. (1996). *Challenging macho values: Practical ways of working with adolescent boys.* London: Falmer Press.

Weaver-Hightower, M.B. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(4), 471–498.

Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower

Evaluation Policies for Academics

Merit is often invoked as the objective basis upon which recruitment, tenure, and promotion decisions are made within the academy and outside of it. In many institutions of higher education in the United States, merit is also the major criterion that is said to be used to determine appropriate annual increases in the salaries of individual faculty members. Merit, it is argued, is the fairest way to evaluate faculty because it ensures that the best and brightest will rise to the top and that evaluations will be unaffected by personal biases of evaluators in favor of or against specific individuals or certain groups of faculty. Thus, it has been claimed that basing important personnel decisions on a merit system of evaluation will diminish gender inequalities in the academy, such as the poor placement of women and racial or ethnic minorities.

The concept of merit is troublesome, however, because it is grounded in a neoclassical economic theoretical perspective that limits one's understanding of, and responses to, organizational inequality. In principle, merit-based appointments ought to provide an equitable basis for recruitment, salary, and promotion decisions yielding more equitable outcomes for women because women, and other minorities, have a chance to be judged as equally meritorious. Where structural disadvantage exists for whole groups, however, the application of the merit principle is difficult, if not impossible. Reliance on more socially embedded theoretical perspectives on inequality provides a way of explaining such structural disadvantage and calls into question the existence of an even playing field, where all players can be judged on the same merit criterion.

These theoretical challenges to the theoretical framework of neoclassical economics suggest two alternatives to the merit systems currently used in higher education. At the very least, merit ought to be defined and measured in more inclusive ways so that women have a chance to be judged as equally meritorious with their male counterparts. A more radical response would be to eliminate merit from our lexicon and look to new ways to address gender inequality in universities. What may be happening instead is that market principles of neoclassical economic theory are being adopted by universities, in combination with merit, to determine who obtains favorable evaluations.

NEOCLASSICAL ECONOMICS AND THE MERIT SYSTEM

Neoclassical economics is rooted in the work of Adam Smith (1776). According to this perspective, the market is competitive and business organizations operate best when allowed to interact in free and unfettered competition. Society is not as important as individuals, "atomized" individuals, who each make quite independent choices for, or against, some particular product or service. The idea is that such choices are made using particular criteria, like price, quality and availability, and the organization that delivers the best mix of these "wins" the support of consumers. To achieve this, business must maximize efficiency (inputs to outputs); the most efficient organization wins under free market conditions. In this way, according to this particular theoretical perspective, some producers are appropriately rewarded over others.

This perspective is based on a series of simplifying assumptions like perfect information, rational action, and free entrance into and exit from the market. It also relies on an "invisible hand" to set things right. A key tenet of this perspective is that, left alone, the market itself is efficient and will deliver the best result for society.

Moreover, this theoretical perspective marries individualism and the idea of a meritocracy to explain how society works. According to this perspective, individuals act in the market as rational, independent players and, as far as their placement in society is concerned, individuals succeed only through their own talents and hard work. Race, ethnicity, gender, and social class are irrelevant in this view of the world. Instead, an open social system is assumed, meaning that an individual's placement in society is not constrained by anything other than that person's own merits. The key idea is that anyone can move up the social hierarchy if he or she is able and willing to work hard enough.

As a theoretical perspective, neoclassical economics is optimistic, perhaps overly so. Certainly classical theorist Adam Smith expected wealth to be generated without end under free market conditions. Society as a whole would benefit from the upward spiral of economic growth delivered by the free flow of market forces as needs were met in the marketplace and efficient owners became richer and rewarded workers by sharing this wealth with them, to the greater good of all. There is an explicit judgment here that owners and workers who succeed do so through their own merits and will be rewarded in proportion to their merit.

Neoclassical economics has become the dominant paradigm promulgated by most business schools, and most of the disciplines that drive their approaches are embedded within it. It is also the dominant paradigm in the West, in general. But, this is not to suggest that this is the only, or even the best, explanation of economy and society. Alternative explanations also inform our understanding.

ALTERNATIVES TO NEOCLASSICAL ECONOMICS

In general, these alternative perspectives developed in reaction to neoclassical ideas. Karl Marx offered one of the earliest reactions to Smith's theory. Marx lived in England during the Industrial Revolution, and he did not see the upward spiral of wealth for all that Smith had so optimistically predicted. Instead, he witnessed the horrors and atrocities of life in the sweatshops and "satanic mills" of the time. Marx, philosopher, revolutionary, and, then, social scientist, set himself the task of trying to figure out what went wrong: why Smith's perfectly reasonable theory did not result in wealth for all and a universal increase in the quality of life.

In the end, Marx ([1857–1858] 1965, [1867] 1918) argued that the system of production itself, the free market or capitalism, is the problem. It sets people against one another as only some people have ownership and control of the means of production, while others have only their labor to sell. Under free market conditions, as producers try to become the most efficient and responsive in their industry, it is rational for owners/managers to try to extract as much from workers as possible and give them as little as possible in return. This would not work in the long term, according to Marx, as not only would workers become wretched in such a system, but they could no longer afford to buy the very products they produce. Without a mass consumer market, business itself would collapse. This is the key contradiction in capitalism that Marx thought would lead, ultimately, to the destruction of that system of production. Moreover, Marx argued that capitalist society is inherently unequal, by virtue of the existence of the power differential between these two groups: owners of capital and labor. A meritocracy cannot exist where whole groups in society, particularly labor in his view, begin at a disadvantage. To suggest that everyone has an equal chance to move up the social system, to accumulate wealth, is simply a deception, according to Marx.

Later theoretical development in explanations of business, economy, and society were reactions to the ideas of both Smith and Marx. These works include those of Max Weber and the critical theorists. Although Weber (1958a, [1918] 1958b, 1968) is most famous for his analyses of formal organizations, particularly bureaucracies, and for his analysis of why market capitalism developed when and where it did, he also wrote extensively about social stratification, and much of that writing is relevant to the notion of meritocracy. Weber argued that society is layered and people reside at different locations in the social stratification system depending on their economic class (similar to Marx), social honor or status, and political power. Movement up the hierarchy is possible, but it is not simply a matter of individual effort and hard work, and most people remain roughly where they started. Placement in the hierarchy depends less on individual effort than on group memberships. In other words, people are located at positions in the social stratification system as much by their race-ethnicity and social class as by their individual merits. Occupational groups were of particular interest to Weber who saw them as not only establishing relationships to capital and wealth (as did Marx) but also determining status (prestige) and power.

Another theme of Weber's work relevant to the concept of meritocracy was his concern that economic efficiency was becoming the major criterion against which all human behaviors were being judged. Because bureaucracy, with its routinized systems, files, and hierarchy of control, was technically the most efficient form of social organization, Weber was convinced that it would come to displace all other forms. He anticipated that increasingly business—and education—would be run by large bureaucracies because of the technical and economic efficiencies they permit. He was concerned that single-minded pursuit of this economic principle was propelling this criterion for action into center stage. He was most concerned that, ultimately, society would lose the ability to judge social action and organization on anything but purely economically rational grounds. In fact, he saw that society was coming to value the economic criterion of efficiency so highly that efficiency was becoming the only legitimate basis for action. Under these conditions, making decisions based on grounds like equity or justice cannot be understood to be rational. Weber's analysis led him to the pessimistic conclusion that humanity is trapped in an iron cage of a narrow and distorted economic rationality and there is no way out.

Like Marx and Weber, theorists of the so-called Critical School provide critical insights into the nature of social organization. Forerunners of this school, writing in the 1920s, tried to explain why, despite the atrocious conditions under which much of the Western world lived, workers did not revolt and usher in a new society as Marx had optimistically hoped. Lukacs ([1923] 1971) came to the view that most people were kept happy enough, through access to sufficient food and entertainment, not to seek to change the basis of society. Gramsci (1971) argued, similarly, that it had become conventional wisdom that economy and society is naturally unequal and competitive, that it is good and proper that some people are wealthier than others, and that this is merely their reward for their talent and hard work. According to these theorists, things do not change even under difficult conditions where whole groups are systematically disadvantaged as these same people fail to see how things could be otherwise. Gramsci called this taken-for-granted, conventional wisdom that dominates our thought and action a "cultural hegemony."

Critical School theorists, like Horkheimer and Adorno ([1947] 1972) and, more recently, Habermas (1984), picked up on this idea of a cultural hegemony, and Habermas, in particular, set himself the task of trying to work out how this overly economic-rational view of the world might be challenged. His solution is startling. Habermas argues that what we need is more rationality, not less. To rely only on an economically rational view of the world—precisely what neoclassical economics does—is to consider valid only one of a number of equally valid bases for social action. At the moment, we judge social action and explain the nature of organization and gender inequality using only economic principles. More particularly, we judge most social action on the basis of its economic efficiency. The more economically efficient the answer to a particular problem, the better. This is what counts. But, as Weber (1968) argued, there are other bases that we can use both to judge social action and to guide notions of the appropriateness of social organization. These other bases include truth, truthfulness, and rightness (social justice). Habermas (1984) argues that societies need more rationality, not less, and certainly not more of the narrow and, consequently, distorted rationality that only judges action using the economic criteria that are dominant in Western thinking at the present time.

Although not explicitly concerned with the merit systems, the theories of Marx, Weber, and the Critical School make it easy to understand that an objective meritocracy, where individuals are located along a social hierarchy solely on the basis of individual aptitude and action—on their own merit—is not possible. There is no level playing field. There is no objective place to stand. People are located at positions in the socioeconomic hierarchy as much by their race/ethnicity, social class, and other group membership as by their individual merits. Under such conditions, to judge on "merit" is nonsense as not all groups have a chance to be equally meritorious. To be non-White and poor is to be at a disadvantage when decisions are made on some supposedly objective, merit-based criterion.

FEMINIST THEORIES

Although Marx, Weber, and the theorists of the Critical School moved social thought away from the emphasis on competition and individual merit of neoclassical economics, their emphasis on social stratification and group disadvantage rarely extended to women. It fell to the feminists to examine the merit system through a gender lens, but when they did so, some were more likely to reject merit systems of evaluation than others.

Most likely to embrace the merit system and the neoclassical economic theory on which it is based have been advocates of *liberal feminism.* From this perspective, women have lagged behind men economically because they have been prevented from achieving the same education, training, and job experiences that men have historically enjoyed. Once the barriers holding them back are removed and an equal opportunity structure is created, women and men will be able to compete on a level playing field, and there is every reason to assume that, over time, women will become just as meritorious as men and do just as well as men economically. In support of their theory, liberal feminists point to the advances over the past 40 years that women have made, relative to men, in educational attainments, employment status, and salaries. If women have not yet achieved the same economic level as men, argue the liberals, the remedy lies in individual efforts to increase their merit by, for example, taking more math and science courses in school; choosing college majors, such as engineering, that lead to more lucrative jobs; demonstrating higher levels of job commitment; and being more assertive and competitive.

In contrast to liberal feminism, other forms of feminist theory are more likely to reject the merit system and other individualistic solutions to gender inequality. These feminists see gender as more than an individual characteristic. Instead, it is a major organizing principle in our society. To some, called *Marxist feminists* or *socialist feminists,* gender is as important or almost as important as social class in determining where people stand (rich men highest, poor women lowest) in the organizations and institutions of societies. To others, called *Black feminists* or *multicultural feminists,* gender is as important as race or ethnicity in making this same determination (White men highest, Black or minority women lowest). To still others, *radical feminists,* gender is the most enduring and most important basis for organizing societies, and the gender hierarchy as patriarchy is based on a system of male superiority and power over females.

In contrast to liberal feminism, all of these forms of feminism share in common the notion that the differences between men and women are not differences of individual characteristics, such as merit, but are categorical differences based on the hegemonic power of men to determine how people (including less powerful men, but especially all women) will be evaluated and treated. The playing field for men and women is far from level. Men control the field and the ways in which the game can be played and scored. They define what is and is not meritorious; these definitions will be used to maintain their own power; and they will not give up this power willingly. An individual academic woman might find herself accorded high status if she were able to acquire all of the credentials and accomplishments regarded (by hegemonic men) as meritorious. But, she would probably also be regarded as atypical, or even mannish. And, if increasing numbers of women began to acquire those meritorious credentials and accomplishments, they would probably find that the criteria for merit had shifted in ways that downplayed their achievements and put increasing emphasis on the achievements of their male colleagues.

Despite their greater support for the merit system, liberal feminists would join with other feminists to argue that the poor representation of women at the senior-most levels of universities and other organizations is not simply a matter of choice. There is an argument that women choose family or family/career or career, thereby making an active decision about their career trajectory. While many women choose to commit to family, the argument runs, many successful men have made a career choice, often with the help of supporting partners who take primary responsibility for the domestic domain, subjugating their own extradomestic goals in support of this choice. However, feminist and other alternative theoretical perspectives indicate that, in many cases, such “choices” are an illusion. Social structures and expectations reinforce the position of whole groups in society. In this case, women remain primarily responsible for social reproduction roles, and this severely constrains the choices women may make. While individual women may have some choice —particularly those who, through the seniority of their position, can afford to pay for child-care and domestic assistance or who do not have a family or who receive the support of a partner who elects to subjugate his/her extradomestic goals to that woman's career—general social expectations mean that most women's choices are tightly constrained. They must negotiate both social reproduction and production or work roles, taking the lead in domestic and family matters, even as they seek to measure up against supposedly objective merit-based criteria.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE MERIT SYSTEM

The difficulty of shifting away from current merit-based approaches is underscored when alternatives to the *status quo* are considered. One approach may be to fundamentally redefine "merit," perhaps even eliminating it from our lexicon, so that recruitment and promotion decisions can be made on other bases. This approach would require universities to "reality check" current recruitment/promotion criteria, involving a review of existing positions and ranks with a view to establishing what is actually required to perform these roles competently. The idea is to establish criteria for competence. This would mean challenging assumptions that, for example, the candidate with the most publications "wins" when all that is really required is evidence of some appropriate level of productivity. Moreover, continuous service may not be as important as the caliber or quality of that service. Once a pool of competent candidates has been established, recruitment, tenure, salary, and promotion decisions can be made on other, appropriate and work-related criteria. Remedying the underrepresentation of particular groups may be one such criterion. The core idea here does not involve appointing individuals who are not competent to undertake a particular role. Rather, it is about accurately specifying the role and then selecting among competent candidates on other, relevant criteria.

Another alternative is to turn this process on its head. For example, if women are underrepresented in a particular area, the approach may be to invite applications in the first round only from women (Bacchi, 1993). This latter approach constitutes the sort of direct and unapologetic affirmative action that is, in all likelihood, necessary to ensure appropriate levels of participation by women and minorities in senior positions. Whether approaches like these are best described as redefining merit or eliminating merit is open for debate. Irrespective of this labeling, such approaches are sensible only if the notion of a meritocracy aligned with the dominant hegemony of economic rationalism is dismissed. The idea that fair and objective judgments can be made and rewards allocated solely in proportion to worth, to individual merit, is, at best, naive and, at worst, a deception.

Alternative perspectives encourage a broader view of social organization and inequality that permit strategies aimed at delivering equitable outcomes. By contrast, neoclassical economic assumptions and the troublesome concept of merit, as currently conceptualized and applied, work against any improvement in the status of women and other minorities. Rather than an adoption of evaluation policies based on alternative perspectives, however, recent years have seen an increased reliance on neoclassical economic assumptions about not only individual merit but also the importance of market competition. In the United States, in particular, but to some extent internationally, market considerations now affect academic salaries to a far greater degree than they once did. Academics in fields perceived to be in "high demand" are likely to be recruited at higher salary levels than those in fields that are overcrowded, and the most certain way to gain a large salary increase at one's home university is to obtain an attractive salary offer from a comparable university elsewhere. Grantsmanship also enters the picture with large salaries being demanded by and awarded to those who are able to bring large research grants to their campus. Such market considerations have an impact on merit systems in that they promote definitions of merit that are increasingly based on financial considerations. The worth of faculty members comes increasingly to be defined by the grants and the salary offers that they can obtain. And, although advocates of the merit system would argue that there is nothing stopping women academics from getting grants, it is easy to document the fact that the larger grants and salaries are likely to be found in those academic fields that are dominated by men. Once again, the evidence suggests a clash between the merit and market values of neoclassical economic theory and the goal of improving the status of women and other minorities.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bacchi, C. (1993). The brick wall: Why so few women become senior academics. *Australian Universities Review, 36*(1), 36–41.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from prison notebooks.* London: New Left Books.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Vol. 1: Reason and the rationalisation of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Bacon Press.

Harding, S.L. (2002). The troublesome concept of merit. In G. Howie & A. Tauchert (Eds.), *Gender, teaching and research in higher education: Challenges for the 21st century* (pp. 248–260). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. ([1947] 1972). *Dialectic of enlightenment.* New York: Herder.

Lukacs, G. ([1923] 1971). *History and class consciousness.* London: Merlin Books.

Marx, K. ([1857–1858] 1965). *Pre-capitalist economic formations* (Introduction by E. Hobsbawm). New York: International Publishers.

Marx, K. ([1867] 1918). *Capital.* London: William Glaisher Ltd.

Smith, A. ([1776] 1937). *The wealth of nations.* New York: Random House.

Weber, M. ([1918] 1958a). *From Max Weber* (H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1958b). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Scribner.

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society* (Vols. 1–2) (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sandra Harding

Feminist Pedagogy

Why do some teachers describe what they do as “feminist pedagogy?” What issues arise when instructors use this approach? Feminist pedagogy is the name applied by many late twentieth and early twenty-first century teachers to their ways of teaching women’s studies and other courses with a feminist orientation. Writings and discussions about this topic tend to focus on college and university settings, where most of these courses are offered. Those who see themselves practicing feminist pedagogy share a commitment to social justice for women. But such teachers diverge in how they view social justice and how they hope to promote it in the classroom.

Although feminist pedagogy is often described as employing certain techniques (e.g., sitting in a circle, keeping journals that include personal reactions, engaging in action projects), these methods may be used by teachers who lack commitment to women’s liberation. Feminist teachers may or may not adopt particular strategies in their version of feminist pedagogy. Thus, the differences and similarities in feminist teaching are best understood not by describing techniques but by looking at what feminist teachers hope to achieve in their classrooms. Four major goals are equality, caring, collective resistance, and deconstruction. A given teacher may adopt more than one of these goals.

THE LIBERAL VIEW OF EDUCATION: FEMINIST TEACHING FOR EQUALITY

Many teachers of women’s studies and related classes are attracted to the liberal view of education for equality and freedom that dominates Western industrial societies. Drawing on these liberal values, feminists have opposed the exclusion of females from access to equal education: Like boys and men, women and girls must be offered the knowledge and intellectual tools that all individuals need to make independent decisions. Feminist teaching for equality means making sure that student development is unfettered by discrimination (e.g., barring females from certain schools or courses of study) or attitudes that discourage female talent and ambition. The curriculum, too, must be free of gender bias: Everyone should learn to identify and reject the gender stereotypes and misinformation that permeate virtually every field of study. A truly liberal education prepares female students to develop as full human beings, to participate equally in a democratic society, and to compete successfully in a capitalist world.

This approach to feminist teaching contains both strengths and weaknesses. Its strengths lie in the insistence on equal treatment and on cultivating the ability and yearning that girls and women bring to their schooling. No one calling himself or herself "feminist" is likely to dispute these principles. The weaknesses of this approach lie in its conception of teaching as a narrowly rational process and in a tendency to minimize the impact of race, class, sexuality, physical ability, nationality, and other sites of inequality. A woman may be disadvantaged by her gender but privileged in terms of class. Or she may be disadvantaged not only by gender but also by race and class. For an individual woman, equal educational opportunity may help her to escape the limits of her situation —to become what is sometimes called an "exceptional" woman. But, the liberation of some women as individuals, however rewarding, leaves unjust social structures in place.

FEMINIST PEDAGOGIES BASED ON CARING

In response to these weaknesses, feminist teachers have called into question the individualism on which the liberal view is based and proposed alternatives to it. The liberal ideal of individual achievement, critics note, applies unequally to men and women. The model for the fully developed, independent individual is male. This model ignores the fact that men are dependent on women's support. In societies based on the ideal of individual success, women tend to be held responsible for taking care of others and compensating for the damage done to them by competition. At the same time, these societies often denigrate caring. Such denigration is evident in higher education institutions, especially research universities, where academics routinely demean pedagogical ideas and practices that seem too caring by labeling them "touchy-feely," mothering, and/or therapy.

In contrast to the liberal perspective, feminist pedagogies based on caring pay special attention to relationships. Feminist researchers and scholars have pointed out that women tend to give priority to relationships and have argued that schooling should develop the caring capacities of both boys and girls. Feminists have contrasted the distanced teaching style of so many academics with a more "connected" approach in which teachers guide students into jointly constructing new ways of knowing. Rather than remaining remote, instructors share their own intellectual struggles as researchers. Teachers nurture students so that women in particular—who so often are excluded from the public world—become fully connected to it.

The need to create a culture of caring in the classroom becomes more evident as feminist teachers and their students encounter the risks entailed in teaching for social justice. Students in women's studies and other feminist-oriented courses confront research and arguments about women's oppression. Female students face the possibility that they may have been physically, intellectually, morally, and/or politically harmed. Female as well as male students have to consider how they may have profited from gender oppression. Furthermore, students are often asked to evaluate or construct alternatives. Such classroom assignments easily evoke fear, anxiety, denial, guilt, anger, and feelings of helplessness and isolation in the face of so much systemic injustice. Course requirements may raise students' fears that they cannot live up to the teacher's feminist ideals and consequently could be punished (e.g., through humiliation, low grades).

Such fears are often expressed as a concern about "safety." The more extensively a class explores injustice, the more frequently students see differences in their own situations (and differences between themselves and women discussed in the texts). Depending in part on the gender and race of the teacher and the mix of students, a White woman student may feel unsafe in expressing confusion or guilt about her lack of awareness of racism. A student of color may feel that it is not safe to describe his own experiences of racism. A White teacher's attempts to express caring toward a student of color may easily (and sometimes correctly) be seen as patronizing. A lesbian teacher who acknowledges her sexual orientation may find that this disclosure leads some heterosexual students to feel "unsafe" or to interpret her caring gestures (usually incorrectly) as sexual harassment.

As these examples suggest, no matter how sincerely feminist teachers try to foster caring in the classroom, socially structured inequalities deeply influence what students and teachers are willing to say and do. In a given educational setting, lesbian teachers may not speak personally because they fear losing their jobs or failing to be promoted. Students of color may not voice their ideas about racism because they fear being labeled as "difficult" or "troublemakers." However, constraints on full expression do not necessarily deter it. Many lesbian teachers disclose their sexual orientation, despite fears this might generate in others. Many students of color express their anger with racism, despite the fact that some White students see this as disrupting an orderly classroom procedure, making them feel "unsafe." A general commitment to care does not dissolve the tensions that arise with such confrontations. Indeed, as feminist critics have noted, a caring attitude that fails to recognize conflict resulting from inequality of power and privilege easily turns into pity or a maternalistic form of control—attitudes that perpetuate injustice.

FEMINIST PEDAGOGIES OF COLLECTIVE RESISTANCE

Unlike teaching theories that put caring at their center, feminist pedagogies of collective resistance pay special attention to how power differences affect the relation of students and their teachers to questions of gender injustice. These pedagogies were directly or indirectly inspired by social justice movements and theories that proliferated in the 1960s—including the civil rights and Black power movements, community organizing, radical student and national liberation movements, Mao Tse-tung's revolutionary thought, and Paulo Freire's Brazilian blend of socialism and Catholicism. In part because of the influence of Marxist and socialist ideas, activists often emphasized "consciousness-raising"—the process of people talking to others in similar circumstances about their common experiences of oppression. Such discussions were seen as a catalyst for resisting injustice and transforming society into a just one.

In this spirit, radical feminists developed a specifically feminist version of consciousness-raising in which women would share their experiences and feelings of gender oppression, analyze these reports, and develop actions to promote women's liberation. Socialist feminists wanted to include attention to class exploitation as part of their discussions. Black feminists drew on their community traditions of Black women talking together about their oppression by White and Black men as well as by White women. Women of color from numerous ethnic and national traditions, lesbians, disabled women, older women, and other feminist activists adapted this collective approach to their particular situations.

Moved by such social justice initiatives, many feminist teachers in higher education have sought to integrate some form of consciousness-raising into their classrooms. Such teachers place great value on building community through mutual learning and discovering shared concerns about injustice. These discussions and projects reveal both obvious and surprising commonalities that practitioners of a feminist pedagogy of collective resistance can weave into the process of creating community in the classroom.

But, as with teachers trying to practice a pedagogy of caring, there are serious obstacles. These include the priority that higher education gives to intellectual expertise over learning from everyday experience, the academic tendency to view strongly expressed emotions as irrational, reliance on bureaucratic authority as opposed to equality of participants in consciousness-raising discussions, and the liberal denial that difference continues to play an important role in feminist teaching.

Teaching that tries to incorporate consciousness raising often creates tension within teachers as they attempt to balance their own expertise with what students can learn from everyday experience. Teachers in general are more aware than students of the limits of experiential learning. At times, students cite experiences that reinforce ignorant and prejudiced thinking. Yet, student challenges based on their own experiences also have a great deal to contribute to feminist research and teaching. The very disciplines in which feminist academics have been educated are permeated with false and questionable assumptions. Feminist scholarship, too, contains misperceptions and gaps, many resulting from an insufficient understanding of differences in power and privilege among women.

For instance, students with disabilities who question the interpretation of a text or the choice of a certain course assignment because it assumes that all women are able-bodied dispute the assumptions of feminists who have not integrated disability issues into their teaching and research. Even socially privileged students who relate experiences that employ racial and/or class stereotypes pose an intellectual challenge to feminist teachers. Such experiences, as this last example especially suggests, do not have to be accepted at face value. Rather, they can be explored for their argumentative assumptions, tested for their degree of generality, and evaluated for their implications–just like any other contribution to a full and robust discussion.

Similarly, the emotional aspect of consciousness-raising can broaden collective understanding. Feelings, too, contain assumptions that can be respectfully explored without either condemning them out of hand or assuming a self-evident meaning. If a student becomes angry in response to a feminist text on the subject of battering, a feminist teacher can help both the student and class to explore the meaning of that anger. Is a female student angry because she or someone close to her has experienced battering, or because she blames battered women for their situation, or because she thinks she should not have to read about such painful things in a college course? Is a male student angry because he is afraid he will be identified with such abuse, or because he actually condones it but cannot admit this, or because he is horrified by male violence? What can be learned from these feelings?

Although attention to feelings does not fit well with the mainstream culture of higher education, feminist teachers can draw on their intellectual authority, emotional resources (including their passion for the subject matter), and position in the educational hierarchy to bolster their counterculture values. Yet, when feminist teachers attempt to use the positive aspects of their bureaucratic authority to help validate a feminist pedagogy of collective resistance, they encounter profound contradictions.

Consciousness raising emphasizes the equal authority of participants. Feminist teachers have various degrees of bureaucratic authority over students including, in particular, the power to enforce rules, to evaluate through grading and other means, and to give or withhold institutional support. The tension between this power and student awareness of its potential for harming or helping them can create an almost insuperable barrier to working together to understand and seek alternatives to gender injustice.

At the base of this tension is the question of trust: whether it is possible for students to trust teachers who have the power to do them harm. There is no simple formula for cultivating trust, but pedagogies of collective resistance stress how consciousness-raising enables students to get to know each other and the teacher. The more teachers as well as students are able to tell their stories, the more likely students are to have a realistic picture of the risks involved in sharing experiences, feelings, and ideas. For instance, during a discussion about the impact of sexism on schooling, a female student may want to bring up her own fears of intellectual inadequacy. But, she may be understandably worried that this information could be used to harm her academic standing in the class or the school. Her ability to trust the teacher and her classmates often is and should be shaped by what she knows about them—their own experiences and values.

Teachers who seek to practice a feminist pedagogy of resistance are likely to be especially aware of the kinds of harm that result from unequal power relations. Even where the student population is relatively homogeneous, differences in privilege become apparent. A class consisting mostly of students of color may be sharply divided by ethnicity, a class composed mostly of lesbians by race and/or class, and so forth. Despite important commonalities, experiences of oppression may differ greatly. Again and again, teachers committed to a feminist pedagogy of resistance struggle with this complex question: whether a diverse group of people can reach a common understanding of injustice and whether resistance to injustice can be truly collective.

Many feminist teachers and activists have argued that, rather than being a liability, differences among women can be a source of great collective strength. Some have sought to explore this potential by working with the concept of "bridging"—the intellectual and political role that women of color, often lesbians, have been able to play in showing the points of connection between the many and seemingly incompatible social locations they occupy. Another related concept is "positionality"—the notion that social positions like gender and class are not simple or fixed but consist of complex and potentially changing relationships that involve both privileges and disadvantages (a person might be advantaged by sexual preference but disadvantaged by class and both may change). Concepts like these help teachers and students to describe the complicated and shifting network of commonalities and differences entailed in any problem of gender injustice they seek to understand and solve. A more subtle understanding of difference enables teachers and their students to evaluate feminist or nonfeminist texts or policies in terms of what has been omitted—such as consideration of how age or nationality impacts opportunity—as well as what is named.

FEMINIST PEDAGOGIES OF DECONSTRUCTION

Feminist teachers of all varieties pay particular attention to how women have been excluded from mainstream definitions of knowledge. But for teachers identified with a feminist pedagogy of deconstruction, the dynamics of exclusion have more far-reaching implications. Inspired by the work of French theorists such as Foucault and Derrida and, sometimes, by the "queer" activism of the 1980s and 1990s, these feminists focus on how language (or "discourse") continually constructs the world into mutually exclusive and often hierarchically arranged opposites (or "binaries"). Gender or racial or sexual distinctions such as man/woman, White/Black, and gay/straight assume that all individuals can be categorized in one or the other group and that one in each pair must be dominant. By uncritically employing these categories, the critics argue, feminists themselves reproduce the patterns of oppressive thought they should be disrupting. Feminist teachers who value caring and connections, the critics continue, too often assume that people called women are more naturally caring than those called men. Similarly, feminist teachers trying to practice a pedagogy of collective resistance falsely assume that sharing a common identity (such as "woman") will lead to a common understanding of injustice and collective resistance to it.

The alternative offered most frequently by deconstructionists is teaching for criticism: the continuous process of taking apart any kind of text—whether an academic article or a film or an everyday conversation—to reveal how it erases and demeans certain people or events or activities. A teacher might show the students the way in which a manifesto demanding "lesbian" rights actually excludes from consideration bisexual, transgender, or pansexual people whose sexual preferences and behaviors resist such categorization. The same instructor might help the students deconstruct a text that takes for granted categories like "working class" or "women of color." This teacher might point out, instead, that "selves" are complex and fluid social constructions, dependent upon often changeable sexual histories or class positions or racial identities. From this viewpoint, nothing can be taken as "natural"—neither anatomy nor any social distinctions based upon it.

In some respects, pedagogies of deconstruction present a profound critique of pedagogies based on caring and collective resistance. Deconstruction refuses to accept any linguistically reinforced fate—whether it involves feminist teachers believing that they should be especially nurturing or students being characterized in certain ways because they are a "woman," or a "woman of color," or a "lesbian of color," or a "working-class lesbian of color." Yet, this refusal comes at a high price. In the context of such critical teaching, no room is made for the kind of compassionate connection that pedagogies of caring value and try to cultivate. Indeed, the emphasis on criticism tends to reproduce the very reason/emotion split pervading higher education.

The deconstructionist criticism of identity politics (that is, the view that political analysis and resistance grows out of sharing a common identity) also can reinforce the relations of dominance and subordination that feminist teachers are committed to challenging. Student experience, like teacher experience, no longer can serve as the basis for disputing expert knowledge because experience itself has become highly suspect. It has become material for deconstruction rather than a base on which an argument can be developed.

Imagine a lone student who identifies as a working-class lesbian of color sitting in a class in which the teacher models criticism by deconstructing these categories. The criticism may be perfectly sound—or not. But the real-life consequences for relationships in the classroom, for connections to others outside the classroom, cannot be ignored. Perhaps the student feels liberated by being freed from the constraints of these categories. Or, perhaps she becomes even more isolated, more hesitant to participate in class, and skeptical of political groups that promote collective action by women like herself. The contexts in which the student lives her life, the subtle or not-so-subtle power dynamics of the classroom as well as the structures on inequality that she encounters outside that classroom, profoundly shape the implications of the critical viewpoints she is being taught.

CONTEXTS FOR FEMINIST PEDAGOGIES

All feminist teachers continuously make ethical and political choices not only about whether to question assumptions but whose assumptions to question, and when and how to do so. Feminist teachers drawn to the liberal vision of society base their teaching choices on belief in the value of each individual. Teachers who put care at the center of their work give priority to teaching assignments and techniques that support caring and connection. Partisans of collective resistance to injustice try to create the kind of classroom community that cultivates the search for common understandings and solutions amidst difference and conflict. Deconstructionists assign texts and set requirements according to what they believe most needs criticism.

Yet, the meaning of any choice depends on its context. In choices related to feminist teaching, two factors are especially influential. First is the actual institutional and social context in which feminist teachers do their work. Whatever their preferred pedagogy, such teachers are affected by the size and mission of the school, the kind of department in which they work, the nature of the student body, and their position within the institution —or whether they do not have a regular position and must move from school to school. Given the particular combination of conditions, teachers find themselves adopting, combining, and/or rejecting aspects from the various theories of feminist teaching: stressing individual development at one point, responding in a caring mode at another, encouraging the collective spirit for a certain classroom task, and emphasizing criticism for a different one.

The other important factor influencing the practice of feminist pedagogy is the political and intellectual climate of the institutional, local, national, and global context in which a feminist teacher works. The costs and/or benefits of putting any theory of feminist pedagogy into practice influences how teaching is actually done. For instance, a teacher who gravitates toward a feminist pedagogy of resistance might find considerable support in a small liberal arts college with a history of defending feminist activists. But, if that college is located in a city or state or province that has a conservative leadership, and/or in a country where the government is actively suppressing social justice values by limiting civil liberties and withdrawing financial support, the teacher's ability to fulfill the potentials of feminist teaching may become highly problematic.

If teachers attempting to practice feminist pedagogy share a commitment to social justice for women, such teachers also share the challenge of trying to realize their commitment in the face of backlash. Feminist teachers must cope with often intense opposition to their efforts. They may be fired, penalized, or undermined by rules and reorganizations aimed at hampering their work. Yet, feminist teachers have rich resources to draw on: their transformative values, their passionate scholarship, and their continued dedication to forging connections between their classrooms and feminist activism. Through innovative writing, ongoing debates, and conferences and workshops devoted to trying to answer the question, "What is feminist pedagogy," they show that the challenge is being met and that the work of feminist teaching continues to nurture both their students and themselves.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bannerji, H., Carty, L., Dehli, K., Heald, S., & McKenna, K. (Eds.). (1991). *Unsettling relations: The university as a site of feminist struggles.* Toronto, Canada: Women's Press.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (l986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Cohee, G.E., Daumer, E., Kemp, T.D., Krebs, P.M., & Lafky, S.A. (Eds.). (1998). *The feminist teacher anthology: Pedagogies and classroom strategies.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Diller, A., Houston, B., Morgan, K.P., & Ayim, M. (Eds.). (1996). *The gender question in education: Theory, pedagogy and politics.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Fisher, B.M. (2001). *No angel in the classroom: Teaching through feminist discourse.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gallop, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Pedagogy: The question of impersonation.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Garber, L. (Ed.). (1994). *Tilting the tower.* New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Luke, C., & Gore, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Feminisms and critical pedagogy.* New York: Routledge.

Macdonald, A.A., & Sánchez-Casal, S. (2002). *Twenty-first century feminist classrooms: Pedagogies of identity and difference.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Maher, F.A., & Tetreault, M.K.T. (1994). *The feminist classroom.* New York: Basic Books.

Naples, N.A., & Bojar, K. (Eds.). (2002). *Teaching feminist activism: Strategies from the field.* New York: Routledge.

Weiler, K. (l991). Freire and a feminist pedagogy of difference. *Harvard Educational Review, 61*(4), 449–474.

Women's Studies Quarterly. (1993). [Special issue]. Feminist pedagogy: An update. *21*(3 & 4).

Berenice Malka Fisher

Gender Equality Policies in British Schooling

Gender equality policies in British schooling have played a formal part in educational policies through legislation on sexual equality introduced 30 years ago, while specific educational legislation or reforms around schooling have paid much less explicit attention to gender per se. In this essay, the origins and sociopolitical contexts of the legislation on sexual equality and the subsequent changing practices at global, national, and local levels are reviewed from the perspective of educational and social researchers. The review is located within the context of changing research practices around education and gender issues (David, 2003). It provides a reflexive account of these changing policies and practices and demonstrates that, although there have been major changes in the official and public rhetoric about gender and education, especially with respect to the balance between boys' and girls' educational (under)achievements, examination successes at school, and involvement in various forms of education and employment, these are still not fully taken into account in the public policy debates about forms and expansions of schooling nor in the wider debates about what is now called widening participation in higher education (or universities).

Consideration is also given to changing language and/or discourses about sex or gender equality, especially with respect to education and schooling, and the ways in which these notions were and still are linked to discourses about poverty, social and economic disadvantages, or social class and race and/or ethnicity, and how these have been transformed to notions of diversity and changing notions of religious diversity and affiliation, including especially the relatively recent rise of debates about faith-based education and schooling. Disabilities and sexualities or sexual orientation is also now included in the overall question of school policies for social inclusion or exclusion.

Discussion of these policy and legislative developments over the past 30 years will necessarily also have to be linked to consideration of changing policies and practices with respect to education and schooling, with regard to educational achievements, or underachievement, examination and/or academic successes, social inclusion or exclusion, and transformations in notions of teaching and learning—now sometimes referred to as pedagogies. In particular, a key shift over this period of time has been from turning invisible issues about gender matters in education into explicit debates and research questions. However, the initial focus on making explicit questions of girls' education and schooling and ensuring adequate provision for girls in a range of different types and levels of school and further or higher education has been transformed into major public policy debates about boys' education, underachievement, and "raising boys' achievement in secondary schools"—the title of a recent major educational research publication (Younger & Warrington, 2005).

Although there is considerable research evidence about the links between social class, economic or social disadvantages and family backgrounds, racial and ethnic groupings, and boys' achievements or underachievements, these are not used in the public policy debates.

Boys have become the center of attention in professional educational circles, and the question of girls' relative disadvantage across educational provisions and in forms of vocational education and employment has been relatively occluded. This is particularly the case with respect to the evidence about boys' and girls' achievements on examinations taken at the end of secondary schooling and through their performance or successes in the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE). The national benchmark standard of five examination passes at grade A* to C is still not achieved by 50 percent of the age cohort of 15 to 16 year olds, but girls now do relatively better than boys at achieving this benchmark standard, with over 50 percent of girls achieving this standard while it is a little over 40 percent of boys who do so. Thus, arguments have shifted to how to deal with boys rather than girls.

In some curiously contradictory way, however, much of the education research and public policy debate about forms of secondary schools in the past five years has again focused on social class advantages or disadvantages and achievements or underachievements within schools and education without explicit attention to gender matters. For example, the current public policy debates about the New Labour government's educational reforms of secondary schools which are creating a major furore have not, however, paid any attention to whether or not the changes will have any bearing on either boys' or girls' educational successes or underachievements in examinations. Rather, the focus has been on whether the reforms will further advantage middle-class families at the expense of working-class and economically disadvantaged families, including especially Black and ethnic minority families and their children. While the Equal Opportunities Commission has remained silent in these debates, the Commission for Racial Equality has argued, in defense of these reforms, that the critics of the planned school reforms ignore the experiences of Black Britons in education and their desire for community and parental involvement in order to deliver high standards and personalized education that will address Black underachievement.

GENDER EQUALITY POLICIES: ORIGINS, ISSUES, AND LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

Gender equality policies in British schooling were formally introduced through national legislation in the 1970s, namely the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 and the linked Equal Pay Act of 1970 that came into force in 1975, although neither piece of legislation was chiefly concerned with either education or schooling. The Sex Discrimination Act (SDA) created the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) to be responsible for monitoring the implementation and progress of moves to achieve equal opportunities between men and women and to deal with sex discrimination and inequality relating to gender, including the definition and implementation of good practice in the fair and equal treatment of men and women. This policy covered educational provisions, but the legislation did not provide many strong measures with respect to forms of schooling, allowing for the continuation of single-sex schooling rather than requiring coeducation or mixed schooling in state or private schools, nor about forms and content of the school curricula.

Over the following 30 years, the form and workings of the EOC have changed as the social and global political contexts have changed and especially as the British involvement in Europe and the European Union has become stronger. New and relatively separate bodies for equal rights have been established for parts of the United Kingdom as Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales have acquired new powers of regional and domestic administration. Nevertheless, despite these administrative developments, the EOC for England has not taken up many issues with respect to education compared with other public policies such as employment and services because of its relatively limited powers with respect to education. The EOC for Scotland and Wales have been slightly more proactive with respect to particular aspects of schooling, and each has had a very directive EOC Commissioner and Director.

There has also been the establishment of relatively similar and separate bodies to deal with disability discrimination and good practice in relation to disabled people through the Disability Rights Commission (DRC), established through the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, and racial discrimination and good practice in relation to Black and minority ethnic people through the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), which was established through the Race Relations Act 1976. Both of these bodies have acquired relatively stronger powers with respect to education and schooling—the DRC especially around school exclusions and the CRE through crucial amendments to the legislation and also through the implementation of educational policies in relation to the Race Relations Act.

Since the 1990s, the British government has created and developed special administrative and political responsibilities for women, including an administrative unit for women's equality that was initially located in the Cabinet Office of the British Prime Minister. More recently, under the New Labour government and in its second term of office, this unit was renamed the Women and Equality unit and its responsibility relocated within the Department of Trade and Industry. While there is now a governmental responsibility for women, the post has not always carried a special ministerial remuneration.

The EOC has also developed a gender equality duty that comes into force for public bodies in 2007. The terms of this gender equality duty draw upon European legislation and policies through the European Union (EU). Indeed, many of the rights British women now have flow from Europe, and British law is influenced by the EU.

There is also legislation going through the British Parliament, the Equality Bill 2006, to develop equality and fairness for all and to create a new body—the Commission for Equality and Human Rights (CEHR)—to provide oversight of a range of forms of discrimination in respect of equality and diversity, in which gender constitutes but one dimension and where there are other issues such as disabilities, ethnic and/or racial and religious groups or minorities, as well as sexuality and sexual orientation.

There have also been some critical changes in policies and practices through other forms of legislation, local or school practices, and the practices of educators, including educational and social researchers.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY REFORMS AND CHANGES

Over the past 30 years, there have also been major changes in the form and content of educational policies and the legislative framework that sets the context for such policies in the United Kingdom. The key legislative framework for education was set during the Second World War, namely the 1944 Education Act, which was established on the principle of creating equality of educational opportunity for all, especially through extending and expanding the provision of secondary schools for all children from the age of 11 until initially 15, and later to the age of 16, with primary education for all children from the ages of 5 up to 11. This remained the cornerstone for almost 50 years, although there were major controversies about how provisions should be made and what form the schools should take—whether they were to be provided by the government centrally or through local education authorities. A key question was about whether the principle of equality of opportunity covered each school in terms of social or educational mixing of children from different social class family backgrounds or in terms of their abilities or merits. Gender was not explicitly addressed, although there were many single-sex schools (for boys and girls), especially at secondary level, that were provided by the government nationally, locally, or privately.

By the late 1980s, this legislative framework was deemed to be inadequate for a globalizing and modern economy. The Conservative government, under Thatcher, aimed to transform education through the Education Reform Act 1988. This and much subsequent legislation began a process of introducing new principles of parental choice and raising educational standards, through specifying the core and compulsory elements of the curriculum and allied assessment and achievement levels, into the public policy process. Despite this principle of choice, gender was not seen as a major issue (Arnot, David, & Weiner, 1999).

CHANGING CONCEPTS

Chief among the changes over this recent 30-year period has been shifts in the language or discourses about gender and/or sex equality both at the level of public policy and debate and within social research practices. In the 1970s, public debates focused upon notions of women's position in society and the question of forms of sex or sexual discrimination in areas of public life encompassing economic and social institutions. In particular, the focus was on the question of equal opportunities, drawing on a liberal and individualistic social agenda. This focus drew from other social movements for change and from the extension of social and human rights within the polity and internationally throughout Europe and North America. In the British arena, social movements for social justice and individual rights in relation to the rise of social democracy gave rise to movements for sexual equality and women's rights. The women's movement or women's liberation movement, strongly associated with movements for sexual liberation not only in the United Kingdom but also in Europe and North America, developed campaigns and so-called demands for women's rights and equal opportunities with respect to education, employment, and pay. Other questions of women's sexuality—abortion and contraception—were also raised, and women's family responsibilities were addressed through the campaign for child care and early child care in nurseries. Equal educational opportunities were a strong focus in these campaigns. Indeed, the demands were commonly associated not only with women workers and trade unions but also with educational movements and the students' movement in particular.

Gender as a term did not feature strongly in these public policy debates and campaigns and was not a term in common parlance or in the lexicon of social science and educational research until the 1980s. Similarly, notions of feminism as a political and social movement, and subsequently as an academic and research pursuit, were only beginning to take root. However, by the end of the 1970s, the idea of the movement for women's liberation or sexual equality being dubbed "second wave feminism" had begun to take hold, and many female education and social researchers began to adopt the term feminist for their political and academic pursuits. These drew on, and compared with, the first wave women's movement and self-styled feminism at the turn of the twentieth century in Europe and North America.

Some key academic sociologists began to distinguish sex and gender, engage with, and write about them. For example, Ann Oakley, one of the foremost British feminist sociologists, recently introduced her own work from the early 1970s by noting that the paired terms "sex" and "gender" met the need felt at that time for a conceptual distinction between the bodily constraints and social oppression that were of concern to second-wave feminists in Europe and North America. Whereas "sex" signaled bodily prescriptions and proscriptions, "gender" referred to the limits set by culture, economics, and traditions (Oakley, 2005).

Since the 1970s, however, the terms sex and gender have taken on significantly different meanings in both public policy and academic arenas, and especially with respect to what became a burgeoning field of academic and feminist endeavor—namely, work on gender and education or schooling, both nationally and internationally. By the mid-1990s, the term "gender" had eclipsed the term "sex" in relation to both educational research and public policies, although notions of sex and sexuality continued to have a place within the lexicon of social and educational research, with specific reference to social norms for the "bodily prescription and proscription" to which Oakley (2005) referred. Nevertheless, debate has raged about these terms and meanings, especially with respect to connotations about sexuality and/or sexual orientation.

For example, Judith Butler, an American feminist social philosopher, has had a major impact upon social and educational research through her work on what she initially called "Gender Trouble" (Butler, 1990). More recently, she has written that the terms "gender" and "sexuality" are very problematic and yet it is important to keep them distinct for both theory and politics. Her thinking about the term "gender" has been influenced by the "New Gender Politics" that emerged in the 1990s, a combination of movements concerned with transgender, transsexuality, intersex, and their complex relations to feminist and the new so-called "queer" theory (Butler, 2004). However, she argued that it would be a mistake to subscribe to a progressive notion of history in which various frameworks are understood to succeed and supplant one another, with notions of "sexuality" replacing notions of "gender" or vice versa. She further argued that the ideas and stories constructed about "gender" and "sexuality" are continuing to happen in simultaneous and overlapping ways since they happen, in part, through the complex ways that they are taken up by each of the political movements and theoretical practices (Butler, 2004).

Indeed, it is the case that the social and political movements around gender politics in Britain have transformed the notions and meanings of sex and gender. Within public policy arenas, these terms have an even more complex set of meanings, and legislation around gender has begun to replace legislation on sex and sexual discrimination. Government bodies and agencies concerned with sexual equality and gender have mushroomed, and the terminology has shifted in complex ways.

These questions of definition are important. For example, the Gender Recognition Act of 2004 is about sexual orientation and sexuality, and gender is now used for what used to be called sex changes. However, the legislative framework for equal opportunities for women still remains the SDA, but, as noted above, there is a new equality bill going through Parliament at the time of writing which aims to establish a commission on Equality and Human Rights (CEHR). This would replace the individual commissions such as the EOC and CRE and bring together the various different practices around gender, race/ethnicity and/or diversity, including religious diversity, disabilities, sexual orientation, and sexuality.

CHANGING CONTEXTS

There have been similar complex political and social changes with respect to education legislation, policies, and reforms, as well as our understandings of these processes. Underpinning these, too, have been changing conceptions and notions about equal educational opportunities and the links to and expressions of commitment in favor of reducing social and economic disadvantages and/or advantages on grounds of family background, defined largely in terms of social class. These are challenging and contested notions about equality of educational opportunity on individual or collective, social grounds. Throughout the 30 years under review, the issue of using educational reforms to accomplish either individual or social rights to equal opportunities for education and/or employment has been a particularly vexed question. Moreover, the question of whose individual rights should be the focus of educational reforms has been highly contested around social class, poverty or social disadvantage, ethnic/racial and religious diversity, educational and/or academic merit, and examination performance and achievements, as well as in relation to difference types and forms of state, public, and private schooling.

While this debate has raged, however, gender and/or sex or sexuality has not been at the forefront of the debates. Indeed, there is a controversial debate at the time of writing about a new piece of legislation to transform secondary schooling, through the creation of new types of secondary schools such as quasi-independent trust schools. Yet, again, neither gender nor sex is raised as part of that controversy. Indeed, hitherto, the New Labour government in the late 1990s, shortly after they came to power in 1997, had raised the question of how their education policies contributed to wider questions of social inclusion or exclusion, with an emphasis on questions of poverty and social disadvantage.

The notions of social inclusion or exclusion, as Levitas (1998) argued so cogently, are linked to wider policy matters about social welfare strategies, such as economic redistributive policies, or more moral questions about the social class system and whether or not particular policies create and sustain an underclass. They also draw on notions about social policy strategies from Europe and, indeed, the ideas about social exclusion as a proxy for social disadvantage, linked to diversity questions such as ethnicity, migrant status, race, or religion, have been developed in the European context.

Although questions of gender were tangentially linked to definitions of social class through types of family, they were and are not of central importance. The only issue raised in linked fashion has been the question of sex and sexuality in relation to young people's behavior as adolescents or teenagers. Indeed, teenage pregnancy as a major public policy issue was initially raised as part of a question of social exclusion by the incoming New Labour government in 1997. This was based upon a review of research evidence from across Europe and North America, and the "teenage pregnancy strategy" emerged as a key plank of the government's new policy for dealing with social inclusion. This was a policy in which young women who were at risk of social exclusion through their sexual behavior were to be educated to transform their behavior. A major element of this strategy, therefore, became that of providing sex and relationship education in schools.

This was also part of a wider program of transforming the styles of teaching and learning in schools, with moves toward what has been called personalized education or a focus on the individual as a key element in their processes of learning. However, personal and social education has also been mandated as part of the curriculum of schools, together with citizenship education. These are all part of the wider strategy on socially inclusive policies within education and schooling, but gender is not seen as a major policy component, despite the fact that much education and social research is now focused on these questions (David, 2003).

There is also the question of recent extensions of these debates about personalized education through schooling and into further and higher education—especially the public policy debates on education for 14 to 19 year olds and also about widening participation to and in higher education—but, again, gender is barely the focus in rhetoric. It is, however, a major facet of the studies conducted by social and educational researchers.

Quite clearly, there are resistances to the incorporation of a gender perspective into the current public debates in the United States and the United Kingdom about educational reforms and specific policies. As Stambach and David (2005) have argued, in public debates there is a focus on gender as a category rather than as a concept drawn from feminist and gender research for imagining and realizing school reform. Through an examination of the histories of educational reforms and mothers' narrative accounts of choice programming, they asserted that if the debates took up the concept of gender drawn from feminist theory and gender research, it would move discussions of school choice and mothers' school involvement in new and important theoretical and practical directions (Stambach & David, 2005). They reviewed the debates around family or parental *choice* in order to demonstrate the public resistances, and yet they showed the strong evidence of insights and experiences from feminist and gender research on women's involvement in education and schooling over the past century. They argued that gender continuously underlays the history and present-day contours of parent-school relations and school choice policies in the United States and Great Britain. They also demonstrated that women and men had held different positions within the system of formal education in the past and that their supposedly separate but equal places were, in part, being reproduced in debates and research on school choice nowadays.

COMPLEXITIES

From the vantage point of the early twenty-first century, it is clear that the origins of the policies and practices around gender equality and education derive from a complex mix of public policy developments or reforms and legislation, links with movements for emancipation, social change, and human rights, and changing international contexts—in particular, the trends toward globalization. Indeed, in order to understand gender equality policies for and in education, it is important to understand not only the legislative context but also the transformations in educational policies themselves as they are deeply embedded within other forms of social and economic transformation. Understanding this complexity has been one of the tasks of social and educational researchers, especially from a feminist and social justice perspective.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Arnot, M., David, M.E., & Weiner, G. (1999). *Closing the gender gap: Postwar education and social change.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity.* New York & London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender.* London & New York: Routledge.

David, M.E. (2003). *Personal and political: Feminisms, sociology and family lives.* Stoke on Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Levitas, R. (1998). *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and New Labour.* Basingstoke, England: Macmillan.

Oakley, A. (2005). *The Ann Oakley reader: Gender, women and social science.* Bristol, England: Policy Press.

Stambach, A., & David, M.E. (2005). Feminist theory and educational policy: How gender has been "involved" in family-school choice debates. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 26* (2), 485–509.

Younger, M., & Warrington, M. (2005). *Raising boys' achievement in secondary schools. Issues, dilemmas and opportunities.* Maidenhead Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Miriam E. David

Gender Equality Policies in Canadian Schooling

Gender equality policy in Canadian schooling has been rendered almost invisible by the politics of neoliberalism and educational restructuring. Marked by a belief in the ability of competition, privatization, and the market to deliver services more effectively and efficiently than the state, the turn to neoliberalism has led to efforts to downsize government, discipline the labor force, and reduce state spending on those public services, including education, that are essential in women's lives. As the state increasingly withdraws from the provision of social services, female teachers, like all women, have been expected to assume greater personal burdens for the care of children, the sick, and the elderly. In schools, teachers meet children whose families are living in poverty, have lost important supports in the mental health or special education arenas, are homeless, or are otherwise marginalized by cuts to government services. As wages, working conditions, professional autonomy, and the right to collective bargaining have been attacked, teachers, more than 70 percent of whom are women, have been forced to protect their own positions as workers. At the same time, educators have been called on to mount a defense of the very idea and practice of public education itself. In this context, and with the exception of "the boy problem," gender equality as an explicit policy issue has struggled to survive as an identifiable element in the broader efforts to protect the goals of equality and democratic citizenship embedded in the very concept of public education.

This was not always the case. In the period between 1970 when the final report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women appeared and the mid-1990s when the neoliberal agenda for education became dominant, considerable activity in the realm of gender equality occurred. Women's groups, operating within the constructs of what is called the Keynesian welfare state, were able to agitate for policies and practices that would improve educational opportunities for girls and women. The passage of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 and Canada's international commitments expressed through covenants such as the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women provided the constitutional and legal frameworks for equality demands. While women's groups persistently lobbied for gender equity initiatives in education, committed teachers who worked individually, in small networks and through their teacher federations, were central to the implementation of gender equity policies. The efforts of women's groups and teacher organizations also received real assistance from the femocrats (i.e., feminist bureaucrats) employed in ministries of education and school boards. However, because education in Canada is, by constitutional authority, a provincial responsibility, gender equality, or gender equity as it is more commonly called, found expression in an uneven patchwork of policies and practices across the nation. Policy variance occurred not only across the ten provinces and two (later three) territories but also within them as local school boards developed and implemented gender equity initiatives with differing degrees of enthusiasm and commitment. By the mid-1990s, however, there was a real and visible presence to gender policies in the educational domain. Gender was on the agenda.

Gender equity was seen largely in terms of curricular, pedagogical, and school climate issues as they related to girls and young women. Based on theories of sex-role socialization and liberal feminist notions of equal opportunity, gender equity policies were most often manifested in efforts to promote girls' entry to science, mathematics, and computer courses, develop nonsexist teaching materials, encourage the growth of female self-esteem and empowerment, and implement antiharassment and antiviolence initiatives. Research studies of sex-role stereotyping in textbooks led to guidelines for producing nonsexist teaching and learning materials. Posters, pamphlets, and videos featuring women in nontraditional work encouraged young women to take up a skilled trade. Workshops, conferences, dramatic productions, learning kits, and lesson aids on a range of topics including women's history, body image, date rape, and employment issues were developed for female students. Speakers' bureaus and mentoring programs were staffed by successful women who volunteered their time to share their experiences with young women and encourage them to "reach for the stars" or "be all that you can be." There were even some limited programs for boys designed to encourage them to understand gender relations or develop their empathetic, caring side.

By the early 1990s, some educators began to realize that analyses of sexism in schooling that emphasized sex-role stereotyping and socialization were relying on an oversimplified understanding of complex issues and hid the ways in which the gendered nature of education is played out in the content and practices of schooling. There was a shift to talking about the systemic nature of inequalities and developing antisexist (as opposed to nonsexist) teaching practices. At the same time, teachers began to understand the need to include race, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and disability issues in their teaching. The 1994 validation draft of a gender equity support document issued by Ontario's Ministry of Education and Training provides one example of the changes in the theorizing of gender equity that were emerging. Prepared by a diverse group of educators during the tenure of a social democratic government, the document criticized the "add women and stir" approach to curriculum building and called for a more fundamental transformation that would look for the causes of and links among all forms of discrimination. The document went on to argue for antisexist approaches to learning that would name inequitable power relations between men and women and take into account the whole social context and the intersections of race, class, and sexual orientation with gender. However, in the same year and in the same province, Ontario's Royal Commission on Learning identified sex-role stereotyping, the absence of women in physics, engineering, and technology, and the lack of women's awareness about the range of career opportunities available as key gender issues. In this understanding they were not alone, and studies in a number of provinces at about the same time reached very similar conclusions. None claimed gender equality had arrived, but few saw the necessity for any radical or substantive change.

For most teachers, this was an easy and acceptable assessment. From their relatively privileged position as incorporated professionals, teachers saw education as basically fair and female students as just being in need of some small adjustments so they could enjoy the full benefits of schooling and become more like their male counterparts. In the existing political arrangements of the welfare state, educators tended to view government as a relatively unproblematic and benign institution. Teachers had close working relationships with ministries of education and were comfortable members of the state apparatus, although, of course, there had been some disagreements and public displays of resistance around workplace issues. Women teachers did have one concern—increasing the number of women in administrative positions in schools. In Ontario, this was resolved by a 1988 employment equity (affirmative action) amendment to The Education Act that established specific requirements for hiring women into leadership positions as supervisory officers, principals, and vice-principals. By 1990, eight provincial ministries of education and school boards in six provinces had some form of employment equity policy designed to improve the representation of women in school administration. Gender equity initiatives of this kind that supported women's representation, participation, or presence and enhanced what was called "the status of women" were not always easy to achieve and were often resisted, but there was a real sense among women that progress was being made toward equality in education.

By the mid-1990s, however, instruments such as the 1988 Free Trade Agreement with the United States and the 1992 North American Free Trade Agreement had codified some of the key elements of a neoliberal transformation in Canada. Predictions that the harmonization of the Canadian, American, and Mexican economies would result in decreased funding for education, limits on collective bargaining rights for teachers, and growing efforts to impose privatization and marketization on the delivery of educational services have proven prescient. And, if the ongoing negotiations for the General Agreement on Trade in Services within the World Trade Organization are successful, the ability of national governments to ameliorate the worst excesses of capitalism and provide a measure of social justice and fairness for citizens will be further restricted. Initiatives to downsize government, deregulate the economy, discredit the Keynesian welfare state, and rework existing discourses of social justice and equity are already well underway in Canada, although the actual processes of implementation have taken different forms in specific local settings, have never progressed in a linear fashion, and often have faced strong resistance.

It is clear that teachers and school systems were specifically targeted by corporate leaders and other supporters of neoliberalism for "reform" and "restructuring." Blame was laid at the school door for Canada's lack of economic competitiveness and entrepreneurial spirit. Schools were accused of failing to produce the kinds of workers Canada needed. Teachers were criticized for emphasizing equity and social justice goals at the expense of individual merit and the academic rigor that would bring outstanding results in national and international testing. Excellence was positioned against equity. On the basis of this critique, governments, driven by the demands of the new right, which emphasized the "logic" of the market, set about reconfiguring the nature, purpose, and organization of schooling.

In response, there has been an unprecedented explosion of teacher militancy as educators sought both to protect their own position as workers and to defend public education. Two events bookend the past decade of struggle by teachers. One of the most potent manifestations of militancy occurred in Ontario in the autumn of 1997 when 126,000 teachers walked out of their classrooms to engage in a two-week political protest against the educational restructuring inscribed in Bill 160, The Education Quality Improvement Act. A similar teacher revolt occurred in British Columbia in October 2005, when 38,000 public school teachers in the province left their classrooms in an act of civil disobedience to defend their collective bargaining rights and, in particular, the right to negotiate working and learning conditions in the schools. The willingness of teachers to take job actions seen as "illegal" (although it should be noted that teacher unionists reject that definition), coupled with their ongoing efforts to challenge educational restructuring, funding cutbacks, and reform measures that intensified and deprofessionalized teaching work, is part of a wider resistance of educators and their allies to the incursion of the market and corporate rule into the public sector. That some of the strongest opposition to neoliberal initiatives should come from the teaching profession, dominated as it is by women, should come as no surprise for there is a consistent gender gap in Canadian politics as women, still largely responsible for child care, housework, and elder care, continue to bear the brunt of cutbacks to social services at the personal level and understand more viscerally what the welfare state delivered and what has been lost.

An unfortunate consequence both of educational restructuring itself and of teachers' responses to it has been the disappearance of explicit and concerted work on gender equality policies in schooling. As activist feminist teachers have been confronted with rapid and relentless changes in their workplace, they have had to make difficult decisions about what to fight and what to accommodate, about where to direct their energies and organizational efforts, and what battles to concede. Perhaps for strategic reasons having to do with promoting a shared understanding of professional identity and establishing political solidarity between women and men, the gender dimensions of educational restructuring appear to have been largely ignored by teachers and teacher unions. There is also little evidence that teachers have kept explicit discourses of gender equity alive in their classrooms. Thus, despite the fact that teaching is really women's work in Canada and that cutbacks to public services disproportionately affect women, with few exceptions, neither educators nor researchers have focused their efforts on understanding educational reform as gendered or on protecting gender equity policies and practices in schools. It is sometimes even argued that equality for girls and women in education has been achieved and that if there is any problem, it is with the underachievement of boys and the absence of men in teaching, especially elementary teaching.

In fact, many gender equity policies affecting women teachers have been stripped away over the past 10 years. For example, in Ontario, a right-wing Progressive Conservative government, headed by Mike Harris as premier, was elected in 1995 and immediately repealed all employment equity legislation. The absence of legislation, coupled with the underfunding of education, meant that school boards rid themselves of equity officers, most of whom were women, and closed their employment equity programs. Educational equity programming run out of school board offices was also eliminated as a result of funding cuts. This has had a major impact on the ability of classroom teachers to sustain gender equity teaching and programs at the school level because the leadership, resources, and professional development offered through central equity offices was lost. Explicit references to sex equity in curriculum and pedagogy have often disappeared from programs of study and have been replaced with more generic statements opposing discrimination in a general sense and emphasizing individual effort and narrow notions of equality of opportunity and personal choice. Explanations of discrimination as systemic have been expunged. Indeed, educators working on the Ontario curriculum developed in the late 1990s report being told they could not even use words such as equity in provincial documents.

Even more significant have been the challenges to collective bargaining rights. Since 1982, more than 170 regulations and laws have been passed by Canadian governments to restrict collective bargaining or roll back workers' rights. Some of these legislative changes have been directed specifically at teachers because they are organized in relatively strong unions across the nation and because they have vociferously resisted changes to their terms of employment and working conditions and have opposed the privatization and commercialization of education. By targeting teachers' labor rights, governments are, in effect, attacking an important segment of the female workforce for it is unionization and collective bargaining that have made teachers the female aristocracy of labor in Canada. Through organized action, women teachers have won decent salaries, excellent pension plans, some control over working conditions and terms of employment, maternity and family leave plans, protection from sexual harassment, and other polices of direct benefit to women. Thus, moves to curtail union and collective bargaining rights are a direct challenge to women's equality in the teaching profession and to their ability to negotiate further improvements in their work lives.

Efforts to discipline teacher unions have taken a number of forms. In British Columbia, the government rescinded the closed shop legislation that required teachers to belong to the teachers' federation in order to work in publicly funded schools. In some other provinces, there were also hints that compulsory membership provisions might be threatened although, to date, no action has been taken. In British Columbia and Ontario, however, school principals and vice-principals have been removed from bargaining units. Hence, just as more women were moving into school administration, they lost the protection of their unions, and the work environment became more adversarial and hierarchical. In addition, because of the fund-raising demands now made of schools and the introduction of a wide range of accountability mechanisms, the role of principal has shifted from instructional leader to business manager. As research in Australia and elsewhere demonstrates, this shift to the new managerialism in schools exploits the emotional labor of female vice-principals and principals in handling teacher and parent stress and distress. At the same time, lip service is paid to team approaches in schools while masculinist and hierarchical models of managing are actually imposed.

Even more damaging to teachers have been the consistent attempts to engage in contract stripping and to reassert management rights at the provincial level as part of wider efforts to reduce government expenditures and impose central control while devolving responsibility to local school boards. In some cases, teachers' salaries have been arbitrarily reduced as in Ontario and Alberta. Teachers in British Columbia faced imposed salary settlements of 0 percent. In fact, a recent study from Statistics Canada, which looked at cumulative wage increases for various occupational groups from 1997 to 2006, revealed that the real salaries of teachers and professors in Canada increased during this period by 0 percent. The flexible labor market has also found its way into teaching as the number of part-time teaching positions continues to grow. A 2003 study by the Council of Ministers of Education Canada noted that between 1989 and 1999, the number of full-time teachers in the country declined slightly while the number of part-time educators in Canada grew from 30,606 to 46, 439, a change of 52 percent. Of the part-time teachers working in 1999, 8,742 were male and 37,697 were female. As school boards continue to try to do more with less, it is likely that part-time employment for teachers may well continue to increase.

Teachers' work has also intensified. A 2005 survey conducted for the Canadian Teachers' Federation by an independent polling firm revealed that 83 percent of teachers reported having a higher workload than in 2001. Taking into account assigned classroom instruction, lesson and course planning, grading and reporting, meetings, individual help to students, parent-teacher interviews, and supervision of students in cocurricular and extracurricular activities, teachers were working, on average, 55.6 hours per week. For 51percent of teachers, class sizes had grown, and 74 percent reported increases in the numbers of special needs learners in their classrooms. Teachers are also spending increasing amounts of their own money to buy resources for their classrooms. On top of this, teachers find new expectations added to already very full workloads. Ontario, for example, has just introduced a program for beginning teachers that will require experienced teachers to add the mentoring of new colleagues to their already long list of responsibilities. The intensification of work comes at the same time as teachers face increased scrutiny of their activities through mechanisms such as detailed performance evaluations. To date, however, government attempts to implement compulsory recertification policies have been unsuccessful. Finally, it should be noted that teachers, especially female teachers, report a growing number of cases of bullying and harassment in the workplace and threats of violence from students as young people react both to the harsher conditions of their lives inside and outside of schools and to the new neoliberal discourse that situates students as consumers and education as a product.

Some mention must also be made of that special, female-dominated class of educational worker, the educational assistant or teacher's aide. These women provide before and after school supervision as well as lunchroom supervision and complete other tasks assigned by teachers. Many of them work intensively with special education students, providing individual instruction, but also administering medications, toileting students, and managing behavioral outbursts, which often means risking their own safety. As a recent strike in Ontario highlighted, educational assistants often work longer hours than they are paid for because of their dedication to children and young people and they are laid off every summer, a particular hardship because their hourly wages during the school year are low. These women are also among the most likely to lose their jobs when financial cutbacks by school boards are needed to balance budgets. Like child-care workers, another female-dominated occupational category, educational assistants experience the raw gender discrimination still apparent in the Canadian labor market.

Finally, it is important to note that shifts to standardized curriculum and new regimes of student evaluation, along with the regular round of provincial and national testing that now occurs in Canada, have affected teachers' professional autonomy in the classroom. A growing number of studies in Canada and elsewhere demonstrate how these "reforms" have narrowed the curriculum, constrained pedagogical diversity, and redefined who is competent and who counts as a student. Cutbacks to funding and changes in teaching styles forced by the new curriculum and testing programs mean that many young people are, in fact, getting left behind or thrown out as schools lack the resources to support students experiencing difficulties. In fact, educational restructuring as it has occurred in Canada places the blame for failure on individual students and their "choice" to evade hard work. The neoliberal rhetoric and practices of competitive individualism seek to subvert discourses of systemic discrimination and silence analyses that insert more collective concerns about gender, race, or class into the equation. Hence, teacher federations, concerned with the wider equity implications of educational restructuring and the commercialization and privatization of public education, are again urging more attention to equality, with a particular focus on intersections of gender, race, and sexual orientation. Many classroom teachers, however, argue that it is difficult to take time away from the prescribed curriculum to focus on equality.

There is one exception. As testing programs point to gaps between girls' and boys' achievement levels, there has been a blossoming of initiatives to deal with the "boy problem" in literacy learning and, concomitantly, with the declining numbers of men in teaching. While some of the policy debates take on the hysterical tone of the antifeminist men's rights movement and assail the schools as overly feminized and a threat to "real" boys, other responses have been more measured and raise bigger questions about what kinds of boys are experiencing difficulties, how schools and popular culture gender both boys and girls, and why we need to return to looking at gender equity program development for males and females. A study by the British Columbia Teachers' Federation in 2000 also reiterated that gender is a set of social relations shaped by the wider changes in school and society. Explicit links were made between gender troubles and the socioeconomic conditions resulting from neoliberal reforms to the economy. Thus, paradoxically, the focus on boys and men has the potential to promote a new look at gender equality policy in Canadian schooling. Another hopeful trend is a resurgence of feminist activism among young women. One example is the Miss G__ Project, a group of university and high school students, that is lobbying intensively for the inclusion of a women's studies course in the secondary school curriculum.

It is also fittingly ironic that by imposing new regimes of work intensification, control, and surveillance, governments have helped create a more politically conscious teaching force, willing to confront the neoliberal agenda and make common cause with the wider trade union movement and with social movements in Canada and internationally. A growing number of teacher unions have affiliated with local labor councils, provincial labor organizations, and the Canadian Labour Congress. Teachers have taken to the streets in the tens of thousands to protest the loss of labor rights and cutbacks to funding for public education and social services. In 2001, teachers participated in the People's Summit in Quebec City to voice their opposition to the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas. Canadian teachers also have joined colleagues from the North and South to defend public education through organizations such as the Trilateral Coalition for the Defense of Public Education and Initiatives for Democratic Education in the Americas. Through Education International, Canada's teacher federations have supported efforts to build teacher unions in the South. Since unionization is the best predictor of stable incomes and decent benefits for women workers, this initiative will likely do more to assist gender equality for female teachers and students internationally than many foreign aid programs.

Women teachers continue to work with their male colleagues in teacher federations, with other women through the larger women's movement, and with parents' groups largely run by the volunteer labor of mothers in order to protect public education as a democratic right. The goal is to contest the language, ideology, and material practices of neoliberalism, offer alternative visions of citizenship and civil society, and defend gender equality as part of a larger commitment to equity and social justice.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bouchard, P., Boily, I., & Proulx, M-C. (2003). *School success by gender: A catalyst for masculinist discourse.* Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.

Bourne, P., & Reynolds, C. (Eds.). (2004). Girls, boys, and schooling [Special issue]. *Orbit, 34*(1).

Coulter, R.P. (1999). "Doing gender" in Canadian schools: An overview of the policy and practice mélange. In S. Erskine & M. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender issues in international education* (pp. 113–129). New York & London: Falmer.

McCaskell, T. (2005). *Race to equity: Disrupting educational inequality.* Toronto, Canada: Between the Lines.

Schaefer, A.C. (2000). G.I. Joe meets Barbie, software engineer meets caregiver: Males and females in B.C.'s public schools and beyond. Vancouver: British Columbia Teachers' Federation. Retrieved June 26, 2007, from http://bctf.ca/uploadedFiles/Publications/Research_reports/report(2).pdf

Young, B. (2002). The "Alberta Advantage": "De-Kleining" career prospects for women educators. In C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Women and school leadership: International perspectives* (pp. 75–92). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rebecca Priegert Coulter

Gender Equity and Students with Disabilities

The prevalence of disability in the United States population is estimated to be between 15 and 20 percent based on the U.S. Department of Education and Census Bureau figures. Legislation in the United States is designed to improve the educational experiences of people with disabilities. However, inequities appear in the rate of identification and type and provision of special education services on the basis of gender, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. The disability community has experienced a shift in paradigm from a deficit model that places the problem in the individual with the disability to a sociocultural model that examines societal response to individuals with disabilities. Accompanying this shift is the emergence of a transformative research paradigm that provides a framework for understanding the complexity of the intersection of diverse dimensions of difference and leads to modifications in the environment that allow for fuller participation by people with disabilities.

LEGISLATION CONCERNING GENDER EQUITY AND STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In the United States, the civil rights law that protects girls and boys from sex discrimination in education programs is Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. However, this law does not address the full range of diversity in terms of disability, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status manifest within the categories of girls and boys. Groups who brought pressure on the legislature to pass laws on civil rights issues tended to be single-issue groups. Gender-equity professionals who fought for Title IX did not press for inclusion of equity on the basis of race or ethnicity or disability. Similarly, advocates for access for students with disabilities did not press for equity in terms of gender and race/ethnicity. Thus, the strides made in the name of gender equity ignored issues related to males and females with disabilities (Lloyd, 2001).

To understand the intersection of disability and gender equity, it is necessary to consider the protections offered by disability rights laws, such as the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act, Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Despite the fact that these pieces of legislation were patterned, in part, on previous statutes that prohibit discrimination on other grounds in federally assisted programs or activities, such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Law of 1964 and Title IX, the disability-related legislation refers to gender in a limited way.

The Education of the Handicapped Act, passed in 1975, was changed to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990 and was reauthorized in 1997 and again in 2004. IDEA (and its predecessor legislation) resulted in fewer students with disabilities being educated in separate schools or classrooms.

IDEA contains several references to gender in Section 618. Specifically, states are required to report annually to the U.S. Department of Education on the number and percentage of children with disabilities by race, ethnicity, limited English proficiency status, gender, and disability category who are either receiving services under IDEA or have experienced disciplinary actions, including suspensions of one day or more. The statute does not mention the need to disaggregate data by gender and disability in its other provisions, such as the number of children with developmental disabilities or the section on disproportionality on the basis of race and type of disability. Another part of the IDEA legislation reauthorization aims to reduce the overidentification of African Americans for special education by requiring the federal government to better monitor special education enrollment and investigate racial disparities.

Section 504 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) are both civil rights laws to prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability. ADA focuses on discrimination in employment, public services, and accommodations. Section 504 focuses on discrimination in programs and activities, public and private, which receive federal financial assistance. Unlike IDEA, Section 504 does not require the school to provide an individualized educational program that is designed to meet the child’s unique needs and provides the child with educational benefits. Fewer procedural safeguards are available for children with disabilities and their parents under Section 504 than under IDEA. If the child has a disability that adversely affects educational performance, the child is eligible for special education services under IDEA. Children who are eligible for special education services under IDEA are protected under Section 504 (but the converse is not true). If the child has a disability that does not adversely affect educational performance, then the child will not be eligible for special education services under IDEA but will usually be entitled to protections under Section 504. Interestingly, the U.S. Department of Justice Title IX Legal Manual suggests that the Section 504 and Title IX Coordinators may be the same person.

Outside of the United States, the majority (80 percent) of the world’s approximately 300 million women and girls with disabilities live in developing countries and face discrimination from birth (World Bank, 2004). If a baby girl is born with a disability and is allowed to live, she must contend with negative attitudes and beliefs about disability from her family and community. Often girls with disabilities are hidden within their homes, have less access to health care services, will not attend school or work, will be subject to physical abuse, sexual abuse, and higher risk for HIV infection, will not receive rehabilitation services or HIV/AIDS education, testing, or access to clinical programs, and will receive less care and food in the home than her siblings

Only 1 percent of girls in developing countries with disabilities attend school. The literacy rate for girls with disabilities is under 5 percent. Girls who do attend school attend for a shorter amount of time than boys (United Nations, 2002). Women with disabilities do not have equal access to paid employment and are twice as unlikely to find work as men. Most girls are kept at home where they care for children and relatives, cook, clean, and do daily chores.

DISABILITIES: TYPES, DEMOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY, AND EDUCATIONAL EFFECTS

Within the United States, both the ADA and the IDEA define disabilities as a consequence of impairment. The ADA does not specifically name all of the impairments that are covered, but defines an individual with a disability as a person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a person who has a history or record of such impairment, or a person who is perceived by others as having such impairment. The IDEA legislation includes 13 categories of disability: mental retardation (MR), hearing impairments, speech or language impairments, visual impairments, serious emotional disturbance (ED), orthopedic impairments, other health impairments, specific learning disabilities (LD), multiple disabilities, deafness/ blindness, autism, and traumatic brain injury. Additionally, the text includes discussion of infants and toddlers with disabilities and persons with developmental delays and those at risk.

The U.S. Department of Education is required to report annually to Congress on the implementation of IDEA. Recent reports have identified approximately 9 percent of students aged 6 though 21 as having a disability. Unfortunately, these reports do not disaggregate type of disability by gender and other background characteristics. Nevertheless, gender and other forms of diversity are important in the population with disabilities, not only diversity among the factors specifically associated with the disability, such as the age of onset, severity, identification with cultural groups, preferred communication mode, and capacity for independence, but also diversity among other demographic characteristics, including age, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.

Comparisons of the gender distributions from 1987 to 2001 for people ages 3 to 21 indicate no significant change over time in the gender distribution of students with disabilities. Males were significantly overrepresented among students receiving special education relative to students in the general population in both time periods. Greater identification across the high-incidence disability categories is evident for males. The greatest gender disparity in identification rates is found in the ED category (80 percent male), followed by LD (70 percent male) and MR (60 percent male). The definitions of LD, ED, and MR may have sufficient latitude that teachers can identify boys with behavioral problems under all three categories as a means to get them help or to move them out of the classroom. A similar overrepresentation of males (61 percent) was evident even among infants and toddlers with disabilities.

Differing identification rates are also evident within the emotional disturbance category of disability by gender, ethnicity, and age. For major racial/ethnic groups, males are at over three times the risk for being classified as emotionally disturbed than are females in the same racial/ethnic group except for Asian/Pacific Islander (for whom males are still more than twice as likely). However, females experience higher rates of internalizing psychopathology, such as anxiety, eating disorders, and mood disorders, while men exhibit higher rates of externalized psychopathology, such as aggression. Rates of depression are equal for boys and girls until the onset of puberty when the ratio of females to males diagnosed with depression increases to 2:1 and remains higher throughout adult life. Females also experience a higher rate of anxiety disorders, such as panic disorder, agoraphobia, and simple phobias. In actuality, it may be that males do not suffer anxiety and depressive disorders less than females but that it is manifested differently, for example, as hyperactivity, irritability, or irrational explosiveness.

This raises an important question of the possible underidentification of girls, with the consequence being lack of needed support services for them (Wehmeyer & Schwartz, 2001). For example, researchers report that females obtained lower scores on standardized IQ tests at the time of their admission to special education and were more likely to be placed in self-contained education settings. Boys were 10 times more likely to have behavioral factors cited in their reasons for referral. Thus, it appears that girls have to manifest more significant deficits to access special education services than boys, and, upon identification, they are more likely than boys to be placed in a more restrictive setting. It seems that girls are not as likely to act out and are, therefore, less likely to be referred for help. They must experience more significant problems than boys in order to get the support they need.

In terms of developmental disabilities, boys exhibit higher rates of autism, attention deficit, hyperactivity disorder, learning disabilities, and Tourette's syndrome (Thompson, Caruso, & Ellerbeck, 2003). The ratio of male to female rates of autism is 4:1 (and 10:1 in high-functioning autism and Asperger syndrome). Reasons for this differential are not clear, perhaps because most research in developmental disabilities has paid little attention to gender differences. A review of 563 articles that contained the word "autism" published in major psychological journals between 2000 and 2002 found that only 2 percent of the studies included comparative analyses for males and females. Typically, these studies focused on prevalence, rather than on a description of how autism is manifested or treated in males and females. It may be that autism is manifested differently in girls than boys and, in milder cases, their autism is undiagnosed, delayed, or inaccurately diagnosed as, for example, anxiety disorder or anorexia nervosa.

Overrepresentation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education is a fact based on both legal and research findings (Mertens & McLaughlin, 2004). On the one hand, overidentification can be traced to unfair, unreliable, and invalid assessment and diagnostic practices. On the other hand, disproportionality can result from a lack of cultural competency, understanding of cultural diversity, or ability to accommodate the diverse needs and preferences of students who are culturally and linguistically diverse. The 2000 U.S. Census suggests that the number of ethnic minority group members will increase significantly in the future, and by the year 2020, the majority of school-age children in the United States will be from racial or ethnic minority groups. At the same time, the number of teachers and other service personnel who are European American comprise over 85 percent of the education workforce. The resulting imbalance may lead to inappropriate referral decisions and placements in special education.

The increase in the racial/ethnic diversity of the general student population is also evident among students with disabilities in comparisons of 1987 and 2001 data. Hispanic students exhibited the largest increase for both groups, being half again as large in 2001 as in 1987 (14 percent vs. 9 percent). In contrast, the proportions of students with disabilities who were White or Black declined by just over two percentage points. Consistent with the increase in the Hispanic population, there was more than a fourfold increase in the proportion of students with disabilities who did not use primarily English at home: the percentage grew from 3 percent to 14 percent. Schools serving students with disabilities whose first language is not English increasingly face challenges of communicating in two languages and accommodating two cultures, in addition to the challenges posed by students' disabilities.

According to the Civil Rights Project at Harvard University, Black children constitute 17 percent of the total school enrollment and 33 percent of those labeled mentally retarded—only a marginal improvement over the 30 years that the U.S. Office for Civil Rights has collected these data (Losen & Orfield, 2002). During this same period, disproportionality in the area of ED, MR, and LD grew significantly for Blacks. Minority students, specifically Black and Native American students, are significantly more likely than White students to be identified as having a disability. For example, in most states, African American children are identified at one and a half to four times the rate of White children in the disability categories of MR and ED.

U.S. Department of Education data from 2000 to 2001 reveal that in at least 13 states more than 2.75 percent of all Blacks enrolled were labeled MR. The prevalence of MR for Whites nationally was approximately 0.75 percent in 2001, and in no state did the incidence among Whites ever rise above 2.32 percent. Moreover, nearly three-quarters of the states with unusually high incidence rates (2.75 percent to 5.41 percent) for Blacks were in the South. Based on national data, Latino and Asian American children are underidentified in cognitive disability categories compared to Whites, raising questions about whether the special education needs of these children are being met. The incidence of disability reveals gross disparities between Blacks and Hispanics, and between Black boys and girls, in identification rates for the categories of MR and ED. Most disturbing was that in wealthier districts, contrary to the expected trend, Black children, especially males, were more likely to be labeled MR. Moreover, the sharp gender differences in identification within racial groups mirrors the incidence of male/female differences in the overall population.

Being identified as a student with disabilities has had and continues to have important educational consequences. Historically, female students in secondary schools for students with disabilities were enrolled more often in life skills courses, whereas more males were enrolled in vocational education. The consequence of this is that women with disabilities are less likely to be employed and, if employed, they hold lower-paying occupations in clerical, service, and helping occupations.

The number of students with disabilities quitting high school decreased by 4 percent between 1994 and 1998 (35 percent dropped out in 1994, compared to 31 percent in 1998), and the number of students with disabilities graduating from high school with a diploma increased (51.7 percent in 1994 to 55.4 percent in 1998). The U.S. Department of Education reported that high school students with disabilities drop out at twice the rate of their peers without disabilities. Parents report that 1 percent of males with disabilities drop out because of marriage or parenthood, yet 23 percent of females drop out for the same reasons.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, women with disabilities between 18 and 34 years old have lower educational attainment than women without disabilities. Those who are not currently enrolled in school in this age group are more likely than women without disabilities *not* to be a high school graduate (26.3 percent vs. 15.3 percent) and less likely to have a bachelor's degree or greater (9.2 percent vs. 26.3 percent). Men with disabilities have even lower educational attainment, being more likely than men without disabilities *not* to be a high school graduate (30.1 percent vs. 19.1 percent) and less likely to have a bachelor's degree or greater (6.8 percent vs. 21.3 percent).

DISABILITY RIGHTS AND PARADIGM SHIFTS

The struggle for disability rights shares an extensive overlap with the rights sought under the feminist banner. Disability and feminist theorists have similar goals in that both are concerned with the elimination of the exploitation and oppression of their respective constituencies. Specifically, females with and without disabilities have less access to appropriate educational resources and evince poorer educational and employment-related outcomes than do their male peers. Thus, Rousso and Wehmeyer (2001) conclude that disparities on these indicators support the idea that girls and women with disabilities are in a state of double jeopardy. The combination of stereotypes about women and stereotypes about people with disabilities leads to double discrimination that is reflected in the home, the school, the workplace, and the larger society.

While the disability rights movement shares many of the same concerns with feminists, important differences between the feminist and disability rights agenda exist. Feminists have overlooked women with disabilities, and, on some issues, conflict exists (Lloyd, 2001). For example, a point of tension exists between feminists and women with disabilities related to issues of sexuality, reproduction, and motherhood. Women with disabilities have to fight the prejudices that exclude them from fulfilling the traditional female roles relating to childbearing, motherhood, and self-presentation as a sexual human being. A second point of tension between feminists and women with disabilities arises in the reproductive rights issue around abortion. Feminists have argued for a woman's right to choose abortion, particularly when the fetus is developing abnormally. Women with disabilities reject the assumption that there is no place in this world for people who are physically and/or intellectually "abnormal." Additionally, the views of males and females with disabilities on caring and dependence are sometimes at variance with feminist views. Rather than viewing caregiving as a burden, men and women with disabilities reframe the issue in their demands to be allowed to undertake the caring responsibilities in their personal relationships, including the right to have the practical support they may need to accomplish the tasks associated with caring.

Both similarities and differences between the feminist and disability rights movements can be seen in the contemporary perspectives used to understand women and men with disabilities. People with disabilities have been viewed from various perspectives that have shifted through time and have been summarized as paradigms in terms of the moral model, the medical model, and the sociocultural model of disability. A paradigm is a way of looking at the world with accompanying philosophical assumptions that guide and direct thinking and action. The moral model suggests that the disability is a punishment for a sin or a means of inspiring or redeeming others. The medical model sees the disability as a problem or a measurable defect located in the individual that needs a cure or alleviation that can be provided by medical experts.

The disability community experienced a paradigmatic shift from a model that viewed disability as a defect in the individual to a sociocultural model that focuses on the adequacy of the environmental response to the disability. The deficit model has been described as preparing the child to go to school, rather than preparing the school to receive and serve an increasing number of diverse children. The sociocultural paradigm is more congruent with a feminist stance in that it evolved from the efforts of people with the lived experience of having a disability. Within this paradigm, disability is framed from the perspective of a social, cultural minority group, such that disability is defined not as a defect, but rather as a dimension of human difference. Furthermore, the category of disability is recognized as being socially constructed with its meaning being derived from society's response to individuals who deviate from cultural standards. Thus, the goal for people with disabilities is not to eradicate their condition but to celebrate their distinctness, pursue their equal place in American society, and acknowledge that their differentness is not defective but valuable.

This paradigmatic shift in the disability community serves as a basis for the transformation of the ways decisions are made about the provision of services for, and research about, people with disabilities. Previously, much of special education research derived from a deficit perspective that located the problem in an individual and focused on the disability as the reason that the individual could not perform certain functions or activities. More recently, special education researchers have shifted to a transformative perspective that focuses on the dynamic interaction between the individual and environment over the life span.

A transformative paradigm for research has emerged parallel with the emergence of the sociocultural view of disability (Mertens & McLaughlin, 2004). The transformative paradigm is a philosophical framework for research that is compatible to feminist theory. While feminist theory puts central importance on gender, transformative theory explicitly addresses multiple dimensions of diversity associated with discrimination and oppression. Transformative research focuses on the strengths of the individual and ways to modify the environment to remove barriers and increase the probability of success. It is significant that the disability communities, as well as the research community, are experiencing a paradigm shift as they reexamine the underlying assumptions that guide their theory and practice. Research framed within the transformative paradigm puts social justice at the forefront with an explicit goal of furthering human rights. Such research could yield an improved basis for policy for people with disabilities by providing insights into this community with its full spectrum of diversity.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Lloyd, M. (2001). The politics of disability and feminism: Discord or synthesis? *Sociology, 35*(3), 715–728.

Losen, D.J., & Orfield, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Racial inequity in special education.* Boston: Harvard Educational Press.

Mertens, D.M., Wilson, A., & Mounty, J. (2007). Achieving gender equity for populations with disabilities. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving gender equity through education.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mertens, D.M., & McLaughlin, J. (2004). *Research and evaluation methods in special education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rousso, H., & Wehmeyer, M.L. (Eds.). (2001). *Double jeopardy.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Thompson, T., Caruso, M., & Ellerbeck, K. (2003). Sex matters in autism and other developmental disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 7*(4), 345–362.

United Nations. (2002). *Hidden sisters: Women and girls with disabilities in the Asian and Pacific region.* Retrieved January 23, 2004, from http://www.un.org/Depts/escap/decade/wwd1.htm

Wehmeyer, M.L., & Schwartz, M. (2001). Research on gender bias in special education services. In H. Rousso & M.L. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *Double jeopardy* (pp. 271–288). Albany: State University of New York Press.

World Bank. (2004). *Impact of HIV/AIDS on disabled community largely overlooked.* Retrieved January 23, 2004, from http://Web.worldbank.org

Donna M. Mertens

Amy Wilson

Judith Mounty

International Policies

Public policies are authoritative courses of action emanating from above. Gender policies can take the form of legislation, programs, regulations, administrative practices, and court decisions. In the global context, gender policies acquire forms ranging from international conventions and declarations at global forums to programs and projects.

Public policies signal the identification of governmental priorities and, while they indicate a decision to act, they remain little more than pieces of paper until they are implemented as intended. Consequently, policies should be seen as a package that comprises four inseparable elements: enactment of intentions, drafting of regulations, implementation, and assessment of impact. These components do not occur in a mechanistically linear way, as they are part of an active political process; nonetheless, they represent essential components of all policy.

GENDER FRAMING AND POLICY DYNAMICS

If policies are solutions to perceived problems, what is the problem regarding gender? There are different perceptions of what constitute problems of gender in education. Among economists, highly influential in decisions concerning national development, the view is that the women should be given access to the labor force and that society should make use of women's contribution, which otherwise would presumably go to waste. Among state officials and political representatives, who usually follow the advice of economists, the logic of women's inclusion in the labor market leads to proposals of equal opportunity measures, which in turn center on educational parity between women and men. These officials see gender problems in education, if any, as circumscribed to access to and completion of schooling, primarily of primary and secondary levels. Among other groups, which include individuals in the women's movement and feminist scholars, the gender problem in education is much more complex. Access to schooling is crucial, but also critical are changes in mentalities and in the social relations of daily life both within and outside schools (Arnot & Dillabough, 2000; Connell, 1995).

Policies should be recognized not only as initiatives that seek change but also as initiatives that generate forces that counter perceived inequities. Gender policies tend to be contested because they are situated at the intersection of democratic values and status quo (patriarchal norms). The analysis of public policy from a gender perspective needs to be extremely sensitive to those factors and actors that either promote or oppose the formulation and implementation of gender policies.

Empirical evidence identifies *five main policy entrepreneurs in the gender area:* state administrative staffs, organized religious groups, teachers' unions, organized women's groups, and international development organizations. These groups hold different positions toward the treatment of gender in education.

In the context of the economic crisis affecting many developing countries, the common response of *state administrative staff* is to give priority to the satisfaction of basic needs and the reduction of poverty levels among national populations. The tendency of administrative staff is to assign the gender perspective in educational (and other) policies the status of peripheral issue. Moreover, the majority of politicians and civil servants in ministries of education see the problems confronting women as lying within the purview of culture or economics rather than education.

Sacred beliefs and religious practices tend to be detrimental to the advancement of women. While most *organized religious groups* grant women their right to education, they also tend to define knowledge in ways that assign motherhood as women's primary responsibility. The Catholic Church in Latin America has been a major source of resistance to curriculum changes, particularly those in sex education that have attempted to depict new forms of family arrangements and less traditional expressions of sexuality.

Mostly nationwide organizations, *teachers' unions* often exert considerable pressure on governments. They have tended to focus on the protection of salary and career interests; except for a few cases in industrialized countries, they have seldom promoted new training and curriculum materials sensitive to gender.

Organized women's groups, both international and national in character, are strong advocates of women's education. They have supported efforts to secure gender parity in schools and to introduce sex education in the curriculum. In particular, these groups have promoted the education of adult women through various nonformal education programs focused primarily on such issues as health, reproductive rights, domestic violence, income generation, and political representation.

The work of *international development organizations,* such as bilateral development agencies and some UN agencies, has been crucial to the development of policies seeking to advance the education of girls and women. These organizations concentrate on issues of access, however, leaving questions of transformative and contestatory curriculum aside. Often, these organizations define gender problems as those affecting only women and mostly those in low-income or minority groups.

GLOBAL GENDER POLICIES

Since 1990, through a series of international conferences and agreements, women's education has been identified as being crucial to national development and to the emergence of a more democratic world. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, enacted in 1979 and signed by 185 nations (as of November 2006), stands as a strong example of legal obligations to advance women's conditions, including their formal schooling. Two current global policies bring gender in education to the fore: the Education for All (EFA) Framework for Action, approved by most governments in Dakar in 2000, and the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), approved by all 191 countries, also in the same year (United Nations, 2000).

EFA comprises six goals covering early childhood education, primary and secondary schooling, and adult literacy. It seeks universal access to basic education for both girls and boys by 2015. It seeks *gender parity* in primary and secondary education by 2005 and *equality* in education by 2015 (World Education Forum, 2000). UNESCO recognizes equality to be a complex concept and currently defines it as equal survival to the fifth grade of primary school (UNESCO, 2003).

MDGs policy covers eight areas of social and economic action, one of which is education. In the education area, MDGs incorporate two of the EFA goals: universal access to basic education by 2015 and gender parity in primary and secondary schooling by 2005 and at all levels by 2015 (United Nations, 2000). While the MDGs continue to recognize the importance of education, they weaken the intent of the EFA goals by avoiding early childhood education, by failing to include the goal of improving the equality of educational treatment, and by limiting the efforts in favor of literacy to the population aged 15–24 only, thus missing important demographic bands among women, such as the 25–45 age group, which would seem crucial in intergenerational social and political processes. On the other hand, while the MDGs do not recognize the issue of equality, they do consider gender parity *at all levels* of education, which includes tertiary education.

The MDGs meant to constitute an endorsement of the goals expressed and approved at previous global forums. However, the MDGs reduce the measurement of basic education to the completion of four years. The attainment of gender parity in primary education is a high goal for some developing countries, primarily those in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, but for several others, notably some Latin America countries, the goal has been long surpassed since parity in primary education has been achieved since the mid-1960s. The enactment of the MDGs has not been accompanied by an examination of the impacts of previous policies, and there have been no studies to explain the difficulties in implementing them. This raises questions about the seriousness of global policies, which typically are unanimously agreed upon by government delegates, occasionally enacted into law, and seldom executed.

From a gender perspective, the MDGs seem responsive to women, as Goal No. 3 explicitly addresses their empowerment. It proposes four indicators to measure empowerment: the girls/boys enrollment ratio in primary schooling, the ratio of literate females to males in ages 15–24, gender parity in labor force participation, and the proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments. The tying of empowerment to education is warranted, yet it is clear that not *any* knowledge automatically empowers. Focusing on literacy acquisition of the age group 15–24 exclusively ignores the reproductive effect that the older generations may have on the younger. One needs to think of empowerment as multidimensional; it is achieved not only through an understanding of gender relations and the ways in which these can be changed, but also through the set of mechanisms and opportunities that must be put in place in order to develop a sense of self-worth among women (Stromquist, 2002).

Since the Fourth World Conference on Women (held in Beijing, 1995), the principle of gender mainstreaming has been advocated in international circles. Mainstreaming is a principle that theoretically makes profound sense: if gender cuts across all features of our social world, gender should also be present in all policy decisions. The reality, however, is more challenging. Gender mainstreaming needs people with understanding and specific training to visualize gender dimensions and plan accordingly. Otherwise, gender mainstreaming risks lack of accountability; it cannot be easily monitored if all the expenditures are combined, and yet everyone can claim it has occurred.

GENDER POLICIES IN EDUCATION AT NATIONAL LEVELS

No comprehensive account of gender policies throughout the world exists, but there are both industrialized and developing countries for which research studies have been produced.

Several European countries have educational policies with gender perspectives. Perhaps the earliest country to adopt any is Sweden, whose policies predated the women's movement and have focused on curriculum change. By 1980, Sweden was undergoing its third curriculum change to treat boys and girls equally and to challenge traditional sex roles. An evaluation done 10 years subsequently found that teacher training was still unaffected by the consideration of gender differences, gender equality, and the implication of gender roles for classroom practices with girls and boys. However, traditionally sex-typed subjects such as sports and woodwork and needlework are now taught in coeducational classes. In the 1980s, gender equality in Sweden had turned into promoting "girls to science and technology," efforts that have been followed later in other industrialized countries. In Wernersson's view (1989), this emphasis shifts the issue of fairness and inequality to a matter of educational choice.

Educational policies have included equal opportunity legislation in Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. As a result of these measures, there has been greater protection for women against negative and discriminatory environments. In the United States, in particular, women have made gains in some previously closed fields such as medicine and law and have gained access to a diverse set of sports and sports scholarships. The United States has also enacted proactive policies, seeking to foster the development of nonsexist materials and the provision of gender-aware teacher training. In general, proactive policies have been characterized by limited funding and small scale.

Recently, the United Kingdom and Australia have expressed concern about the cognitive gains made by girls, who sometimes perform better than boys in standardized tests. This has been characterized as a "boys' failure," and critics have questioned the fairness of policies seeking to advance girls' education. Arnot and Miles (2005) respond to this preoccupation by noting that school officials are drawing on outmoded socialization theories rather than on contemporary understandings of gender identities and subjectivities about the ways in which competitive school cultures aggravate gender differences and produce disaffected masculinities.

A number of developing countries have explicit policy documents, subsequently translated into national plans. Other countries rely on major initiatives that may not be necessarily part of national plans.

Among the latter is the Female Secondary School Stipend Program enacted in Bangladesh, which grants monetary support to rural girls so that they may attend secondary schooling. This program had reached over 500,000 girls by 1995. Another instance is the PROGRESA initiative in Mexico (now called *Oportunidades*) that grants stipends to rural students and offers slightly higher stipends to girls than boys in secondary schools; by 2005, the program had reached about 5 million families. In higher education, the World Bank has engaged in measures such as scholarships, creation of new residences for young women attending university, and vocational or technical education programs, reserving a small number of places for women in nonconventional fields of study, particularly engineering and agriculture. These initiatives are mostly pilot studies that receive little follow-up.

India reports having a new plan, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, to have all children complete fifth grade by 2007 and will invest $1 billion to that end. A nonformal education program

(Mahila Samakya), now implemented in 9,000 villages in 10 states, is aimed at rural girls' education. Some 750 residential colleges for girls, emphasizing the enrollment of girls from scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and other minorities are now in place. India enacted a National Policy for the Empowerment of Women in 2001, which seeks to provide comprehensive services to adolescent girls. The government of India seems to be the only one in the world that has instituted a 2 percent tax to secure universal education for all children of ages 6–14. In improving access to all, girls will presumably benefit. According to its government, India has improved its gender parity index for basic education from .38 in 1950 to .85 in 2002 (India, 2005).

Data from Latin America indicate that few countries have developed comprehensive gender equity policies. These include Argentina, Paraguay, and Bolivia. Argentina has been a pioneer in gender policies in education. Its National Program for Equality Opportunity for Women in Education (PRIOM), which functioned 1991 to 1995, succeeded in training a large number of teachers, producing useful gender-sensitive materials, and making the General Education Law (approved in 1993) incorporate the principle of equal opportunity and the eradication of sexual stereotypes in educational materials. The Catholic Church opposed the national adoption of new curricular materials proposed by PRIOM on the grounds that they would destroy the family and encourage homosexuality by questioning the "natural differences between men and women." In consequence, many of the PRIOM staff members resigned; milder curricula were subsequently developed by the Church. Paraguay's gender policies in education sought curriculum reform, teacher training, and a review of textbooks. As a result of these changes, modules on gender and sexuality were produced but as supplementary, not core, materials. Bolivia's policies sought to make gender a crosscutting theme throughout the curriculum and to incorporate such issues as health, sexuality, equity, and sustainable development. By 2002, gender reformers had been able to provide training to resource teachers (i.e., those assisting classroom teachers) and to design general guidelines and curriculum content with a gender perspective for the first three years of primary schooling. In Peru, a national plan for the education of rural girls, strongly promoted by a bilateral development agency, was adopted in 2001; a particular commission of notables is in place to facilitate plan implementation, and, while resources and action are modest, some workshops with regional and local authorities on the promotion of women's leadership are taking place. In Chile, current educational policies include gender as a crosscutting theme in the curriculum, and, since 1994, a bidding process to write and publish textbooks requires a gender equality factor.

Multinational agencies such as bilateral development agencies and those in the UN family have proven essential to the promotion of educational policies from a gender perspective in developing countries. UNESCO and UNICEF are engaged in several efforts to address gender issues in both public education and nonformal education. Bilateral agencies enable the holding of international forums by financing the preparation of documents and meetings preparatory to those conferences. They also sponsor the participation of women from developing countries. Furthermore, these agencies enter the policy picture because, under the current economic and political context, many developing countries are unable to address pressing issues in their educational budgets without the support of industrialized countries.

A long-standing pledge by bilateral development agencies has been the allocation of 0.70 percent of their GNP to developing countries, though at present, they give an average of 0.25 percent. Sachs (2005) calculates that in order to reach all of the MDGs, development assistance must increase to $135 billion by 2006—or double the current assistance.

In May 2005, European Union countries committed themselves to increasing their financial contribution for development to 0.6_percent of the GNP by 2006 and to 0.7 percent by 2015. These dates seem rather late if the MDGs goals are to be reached according to schedule.

A review of various policy papers and position documents by six international organizations influential in Latin America between 1998 and 2001 was conducted by Krawczyk (2002). This author found that these organizations promote privatization, decentralization, school autonomy, higher student achievement, and better management of resources. They also promote targeted policies (i.e., those concentrating on specific groups) as these tend to "produce important redistributive effects," and to "improve the equity of the educational system without requiring greater resources." Krawczyk found educational policies in Latin America to be "fragmented, contradictory, minimalist, targeted, and aimed at privatization." From her document analysis, it can be seen that gender issues do not emerge as a priority among these organizations.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

A crucial stage in the policy cycle concerns implementation. It is at this moment that the proposed intentions become a reality.

The core mechanism for national implementation of EFA goals was to be the national action plan, to be developed by "2002 at the latest" (World Education Forum, 2000, p. 22). By June 2005, the UNESCO Web site for EFA listed plans of action for only 43 countries. The emerging statistical evidence indicates that gender parity in primary education was not reached in sub-Saharan Africa by the target date of 2005 (UNESCO, 2006). EFA policies have been termed "target-setting exercises," namely, centrally identified benchmarks, with little recognition of the characteristics of the problem nor any formulation of actual steps to accomplish and evaluate the benchmarks (Goldstein, 2004).

The main means by which to assess how countries comply with the MDGs is through their submission of annual reports to the United Nations Development Programme, the agency in charge of monitoring progress in implementation. A 2005 report by the United Nations Development Fund for Women found that only 55 countries had produced such annual reports by that year.

Rarely do governments establish contact with women's groups that advocate gender-sensitive education. One exception is the Forum for African Women Educationalists. In existence since 1991, this group's core membership comprises women who are or have been ministers of education, vice chancellors, or similar educational authorities. This group has succeeded in establishing effective alliances with donor agencies and in securing funds not only to advocate girls' access to schooling but also to conduct campaigns to raise public awareness of the importance of girls' education and to implement interventions that introduce gender-sensitive teaching methodologies into the classroom. There is no counterpart organization in the other developing regions.

PREDOMINANT FEATURES OF GENDER POLICIES IN EDUCATION

Synthesizing public policy efforts thus far, the following pattern emerges:

- Universal access to education is acknowledged as a human right that is also open to women. Public policies emphasize basic education over higher levels of education. They emphasize access over content and the lived experience of education. In all, these policies are minimalist.

- The average gender policy in education is based on the principle of equality of opportunity, defined as equal treatment. As Blackmore (1999) notes, this delimitation subtracts attention from the ideological context of schooling, which tends to reproduce the social relations of gender.
- Teacher training efforts are not explicitly identified in policy documents and often the regulations that follow do not consider them. In consequence, there are very few instances of sustained reforms to introduce gender-aware preservice teacher training programs. Several countries have engaged in in-service training programs from a gender perspective.
- New curriculum materials that seek to transform gender relations in society and to address sexuality issues comprehensively tend to be highly contested. In several countries, these materials have been discarded. In others, their production has been mostly on a pilot basis and their actual use confined to the status of supplementary rather than core materials.
- In developing countries, with very few exceptions, most efforts to address gender issues in education have occurred through the input of international development agencies, both in the form of policy guidelines and in financial resources to develop new programs and projects.
- Compensatory policies, seeking to provide girls with additional resources to redress substantial inequities, are limited to a few countries. Gender policies should take into account the large gaps between rural and urban areas all over the developing world, but this should not define gender as affecting only poor women.
- In many instances, policy implementation has lagged behind policy enactment, and evaluations of gender policy impacts, particularly in developing countries, are practically nonexistent.

EXPLAINING PUBLIC POLICIES IN GENDER

Discrepancies between objectives and actual practice are not unique to gender policies, but it would seem that there the disconnect is much greater. Wernersson (1989) has observed that school policy is a step behind by necessity because ideological principles must be formulated before they are incorporated in the “official” socialization of the young. Public policies, thus, may not contribute significantly to altering power structures. But how do we explain the limited compliance, even when gender policies are modestly framed? Three rival hypotheses emerge.

The first hypothesis is that detailed features of the new gender policies are unclear and civil servants, untrained in gender issues, are unable to translate the new legislation into specific guidelines and regulations.

The second hypothesis is that the states do not receive enough pressure from gender policy entrepreneurs. Women’s organized groups and feminist nongovernmental organizations spend considerable energy on other urgent issues, not on formal education. Disruptive voices are necessary to promote both policy enactment and policy implementation.

The third hypothesis is that states continue to be male and patriarchal. They go through the rituals of giving to social problems. Education accords the states compensatory legitimation because it plays up the powerful symbols of legality, rationality, and democracy. Symbols are crucial for meaning making and unavoidable in social interaction. Here we are not negating the importance of symbols but underscoring the unfortunate fact that some gender policies may serve only as useful “illusions.”

Because of these possibilities, gender policies “from above” (i.e., those formulated from state arenas) need to be formulated in very precise terms to avoid uncertainty in their translation into practice, and state actors have to be given proper training both to provide them with new knowledge about gender and to erode previous ideological conceptions.

Moreover, gender policies need to be promoted by "policies from below"—characterized by persistent action and supervision by women's organized groups.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Arnot, M., & Dillabough, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Challenging democracy: International perspectives on gender, education and citizenship.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Arnot, M., & Miles, P. (2005). A reconstruction of the gender agenda: The contradictory gender dimensions in New Labour's educational and economic policy. *Oxford Review of Education, 31*(1), 173–189.

Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women. Feminism, leadership and educational change.* Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities.* St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Goldstein, H. (2004). The globalization of learning targets. *Comparative Education, 40*(1), 7–14.

India. (2005). *National plan of action.* Retrieved June 5, 2006, from http://Portal.unesco.org/education/en/file_download.php/9a2cbbbea059f70c23fd46a98ae9096bEFANPAIndia.pdf

Krawczyk, N. (2002). La reforma educativa desde la perspectiva de los organismos multilaterales. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa, 7*(16), 627–663.

Sachs, J. (2005). *Investing in development: A practical plan to achieve the MDGs.* New York: Millennium Project.

Stromquist, N.P. (2002). Education as a means for empowering women. In J. Parpart, S. Rai, & K. Staudt (Eds.), *Rethinking empowerment. Gender and development in a global/local world* (pp. 22–38). London: Routledge.

UNESCO. (2003). *EFA global monitoring report 2003/04. The leap to equality.* Paris: Author.

UNESCO. (2006). *EFA global monitoring report 2006. Literacy for life.* Paris: Author.

United Nations. (2000). *UN millennium development goals.* New York: United Nations General Assembly.

Wernersson, I. (1989). Gender equality—Ideology and reality. In S. Ball & S. Larsson (Eds.), *The struggle for democratic education. equality and participation in Sweden* (pp. 88–102). New York: Falmer Press.

World Education Forum. (2000). *Dakar framework for action.* Paris: UNESCO.

Nelly P. Stromquist

NGOs and Their Impact on Gendered Education

Education and development processes in low-income countries of the Global South should benefit everyone; yet, historically access to and quality of education have often been unevenly distributed across gender, ethnic/tribal, rural-urban, and religious dimensions of society. Despite the aims of Education for All and other initiatives designed to increase equity in educational enrollment, attainment, and quality, gender and other disparities remain. Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have emerged during the past several decades as crucial actors in more effectively bridging these gaps. In particular, women-centered NGOs have been the key force in framing development efforts, including those focused on education, around the actual conditions lived by women in the Global South, and in shifting the attention to the necessity of empowering women and transforming gender-biased social structures. These educational efforts beyond the scope of traditional schooling seek to create more gender-equitable communities and societies within which schooling can then better serve both boys and girls.

NGOs work alongside and in relation to governments, multilateral organizations (including United Nations agencies such as UNESCO and UNICEF), the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, bilateral donor agencies such as the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) that provide development assistance to low-income countries, communities, societal and community institutions such as schools and religious groups, and, of course, families. NGOs can be international organizations, known as INGOs (such as Oxfam and Save the Children), national in scope, or local.

Many mainstream NGOs offer a necessary alternative to state-oriented development and education efforts in ways that strengthen local institutions and achieve more positive results at less cost. Many NGOs lack bureaucratic and historical constraints that hamper innovative, experimental, and flexible efforts. Historically, however, the activities and structures of mainstream NGOs are less likely to have prioritized gender equity or included strategies that are participatory and community based, which are central to feminist educational and social change perspectives. If gender equity is to be achieved, gender must be at the center of the analysis that informs policy and practice (Moser, 1993). In addition, when gender equity is defined broadly to include not just educational indicators but also the roles of education and of women in social change, it is women-centered NGOs that tend to be more active in consistently and holistically promoting gender equity (Ruiz Bravo & Monkman, 1988; Stromquist, 2006).

This chapter discusses: (a) the role of NGOs in gender and development work internationally, as this is a backdrop for understanding; (b) how NGOs are involved in education; and, in turn, (c) how education is implicated in gender equity work through NGOs. This is followed by a focus on the transnational advocacy work of NGOs and a discussion of current issues that are important to consider, as they are influential in the work NGOs do relative to gender and education. The chapter ends with acknowledgement of the role of local NGOs in empowering women and building civil society.

NGOs, GENDER, AND DEVELOPMENT

Development work relating to gender encompasses several priorities, beginning with a focus on recognizing the role of women in development, followed by an examination of the assumptions underlying various approaches to gender issues in development, and finally an internal emphasis on how gender is embedded in the work done by NGOs and other development organizations.

Boserup (1970) revealed that the exclusion of women from development initiatives hinders development. Her research also set the stage for a more focused critique of development as not just economic development but also social development, as including education, health, and family well-being as integral dimensions. Similarly, education was deemed integral to the ability of women to participate in development, as they had been denied the knowledge and skill development to engage in their usual activities (e.g., growing food, taking care of families). During the 1970s and 1980s, researchers also recognized the relationship of mothers' educational attainment to social indicators such as fertility rates (and, therefore, family size), age of first birth, family health, and likelihood of sending daughters to school. These early gender analyses of education and development focused on including women in development. The field then moved beyond this approach of "adding women" to one in which gender relations became a focal point for change, thus shaping the development agenda; this has become known as gender and development (GAD). While this work focuses primarily on development agencies, it also relates to the work of NGOs either directly or indirectly. Many NGOs are dependent on development agencies for funding, and so their work reflects the same types of trends. Often, however, it is the women-oriented NGOs that are at the forefront of promoting a more active gender agenda, thus indirectly raising issues to be addressed by the development agencies.

Moser (1993) finds, in her analysis of gender-related development initiatives, five types of approaches: welfare, equity, antipoverty, efficiency, and empowerment. The "antipoverty" approaches recognized the importance of small-scale NGOs in reaching marginalized populations due to their familiarity with local cultures and communities. Equity and empowerment approaches went beyond trying to meet immediate practical needs, such as feeding families and finding work, and shifted the focus to strategic needs. Strategic needs are those that eliminate the basis of the practical needs by, for example, eliminating barriers to agricultural resources, to credit for income-generating activities, and to schooling for women. NGOs have been the primary providers of gender-equitable programs of these types.

A third major contribution of work done in relation to GAD is gender mainstreaming in development agencies and NGOs (Moser, 1993). During the late 1980s, increased attention was focused on the internal processes of organizations and whether they were promoting or unintentionally ignoring gender equity in their projects. Many multilateral and bilateral agencies developed requirements that all project proposals include a gender analysis to examine the impact the project would have on gender equity. In education, for example, this would mean that a project designed to increase enrollment would need to specifically consider how their strategies would impact girls. Pressure to report data by gender was also increasing in this period; gender disaggregated data are now more frequently available. It is within these changes in development work that educational initiatives have also become more gender equitable. NGOs that receive funding from other development organizations are expected to comply with these changing expectations. Some NGOs are more proactive at promoting gender-equitable processes and goals outside of what is required by the funding agencies, thus leading the way for others.

NGOs AND GENDER EQUITY IN EDUCATION

NGOs are involved in gender-equity educational initiatives through formal schooling, nonformal education initiatives for girls and women, and informal learning components in social change projects. Increasingly, the boundaries between formal school, nonformal education, and learning for social change are becoming blurred, as development workers and educators recognize the complexities of confronting gender equity and education.

Studies of *formal schooling* reveal that more than 100 million of the world's children are not in schools, and about 60 percent of these children are girls. In some countries and regions, the gender disparity is significantly larger. Gender differences in enrollment rates, school attainment, retention, literacy rates, and the like reflect sociocultural, political, and economic barriers that disadvantage girls more than boys in some regions, particularly South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. Governments of many low-income countries undersupport formal schooling, in part, because of the structural adjustment policies that have required, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s, reduced spending on social services (education and health) and more investment in the development of market economies. At the same time, international entities such as UN agencies have promoted increasing levels of education for all children, and the inclusion of girls and other marginalized groups through such initiatives as Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals. Because governments' education budgets have been insufficient for supporting schools for all children, NGOs have been used increasingly often to provide those services because they can do so at a lower cost and because local NGOs are thought to be more in touch with local communities and, therefore, better able to serve them.

At the same time, families in most low-income countries are often not able to pay for school expenses (direct fees, uniforms, etc.) or the opportunity costs of sending all children to school, so difficult choices must be made, and they often choose to educate sons over daughters. Cultural beliefs or social conventions that situate boys in society as primary wage earners or as the source of old age care for parents, support family preferences for educating boys. Educating parents about the advantages of educating girls is another task often undertaken by NGOs. Other barriers to girls' enrollment relate to safety concerns (e.g., the distance girls must travel to schools is too far and they are not well-supervised in that journey; male teachers or students can take advantage of unsupervised girls); lack of latrines (girls cannot use the out-of-doors like boys can); and ineffective teaching (e.g., teachers sometimes use girls for school housekeeping tasks while teaching the boys). In addition, schools can be perceived as challenging local social norms that can make parents reluctant to send children to them. In development circles, it is understood that increasing educational rates of all children, including girls, is related to better job opportunities and more access to income-generating opportunities; both are necessary for community and national development. Formal education is also implicated in socialization processes that build national character and encourage social cohesion. With education being framed increasingly as a human right, the emphasis on equity is also strengthened.

United Nations conventions such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the international educational initiatives such as EFA aim for gender parity in education (equal numbers of girls and boys), along with increased enrollment rates for both boys and girls. With these motivations, development agencies and NGOs have increased their attention to gender in educational participation. Save the Children, for example, promotes "community schools" as a strategy to increase access of girls, rural residents, and other marginalized populations to education. Community schools are typically supported through local community contributions, such as labor to build schools or donations of land for school sites; they are organized by NGOs and funded by the government and/or donor agencies. Typically, the government pays a teacher after a community has provided a school site. Community schools are designed to attract more community involvement (and buy-in) and achieve higher rates of enrollment for girls. They operate on lower budgets. Sometimes they outperform traditional government-run schools.

Nonformal education (NFE) includes projects that serve both children and adults. Historically, most NFE served adults as it was intended that formal schooling served school-age children and youth. With the continuing challenges to government-run schools involving funding, access, and quality, more NFE for children has been promoted. NGOs are the primary providers of NFE, particularly national and local NGOs, but they often work through INGOs or international development agencies.

BRAC, a Bangladeshi NGO, is well known for using nonformal education as an alternative to, and feeder into, formal schooling, particularly for girls. BRAC was formed in 1972 as the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, a small-scale development project designed to fight poverty and empower the poor; they now are known simply as BRAC. Substantial growth beginning in the early 1980s was followed by increasing attention to gender in the late 1980s. Today, in all of their programs, BRAC employs over 97,000 people and reaches about 100 million people in their various programs. Women constitute 99 percent of those served by BRAC's microcredit division. BRAC health workers have taught oral rehydration therapy to 13 million women in all 68,000 villages, reaching virtually all poor, rural families. They have organized men and women into more than village organizations; 65 percent of their members are women. BRAC's Education Programme initiated its Non-Formal Primary Education Programme in 1985 with 22 schools and now has over 34,000, accounting for about 11 percent of the primary school population in the country. These schools provide primary education and, more recently, secondary education to out-of-school youth, 65 to 70 percent of whom are girls. In 2002, BRAC initiated nonformal education for girls in Afghanistan, and currently runs about 90 schools there.

The BRAC primary education curriculum in Bangladesh includes the same content as the formal school curriculum but is completed in four years instead of five. (This began as a three-year program equivalent to the formal schools' four-year cycle, but has been expanded.) Married women teachers are preferred in order to provide role models for the girl students. Teachers must have 10 years of education; BRAC then trains them as teachers. They commit to four years and work with a small group of students through their four-year cycle of primary education. Teachers are recruited locally in order to accommodate travel to the school site and to ensure teacher knowledge of the local community and culture. More recently, an adolescent program for primary education has been created;

these older students complete a full five years of primary education in four years. A preprimary program, a postprimary program, and teacher education initiatives have also been instituted, and BRAC has a government partnership program focused on providing community schools and improving the quality of formal schooling. Most nonformal education initiatives worldwide have found it difficult to interface with the formal school system. BRAC was among the first NGOs to create a program that was of sufficient quality that the graduates could pass the government exams and transition back into the formal system.

BRAC's successes have been impressive in increasing girls' enrollment, enabling them to reenter the formal school system and/or continue their education beyond the primary level, and creating jobs and providing training for local women as teachers. BRAC's focus on the "poorest of the poor" has been challenged during the 1990s, however, as they scaled up to serve more communities and focused on communities somewhat easier to reach (Ebdon, 1995; Rao & Kelleher, 2000).

BRAC has also been criticized for inequities in gender relations within the organization, failing to accommodate the needs of female staff (e.g., by enabling women to work in the office during menstruation instead of doing field visits), favoring new college graduates over long-term staff, and opting for strategies that achieve quick results but not necessarily deep structural change (Rao & Kelleher, 2000). In 2001, BRAC began the Gender Quality Action Learning Programme to improve gender relations within BRAC by raising gender awareness and fostering a positive working environment for both male and female staff (BRAC, 2004).

NGOs are perhaps the primary providers of NFE for women in a wide variety of program initiatives, including community development, income generation, microcredit, health education, literacy, and basic education. Early programs focused on providing women with opportunities from which they have historically been excluded and programs that focused on immediate or practical needs. More recently, some NGOs, those most influenced by feminist analyses of development processes, target patriarchal social relations in an attempt to alter the basis of social inequities based on gender.

Tostan is a Senegalese NGO whose NFE program has now been implemented in Senegal, the Sudan, Mali, and Burkina Faso. Tostan's curriculum began as a literacy program for women and has developed over more than 20 years into a participatory project focused on village empowerment through the active participation of women. In Mali, both men and women attend Tostan classes, and in the Sudan, men in the community have been recruited as support to the classes that primarily serve women. With their attention to gender relations, men's involvement is critical, as they are integral to the social relations that are expected to change. The curricular modules focus on community hygiene, human and women's rights, reproductive health, and social change strategies, with the latter then being implemented through grassroots associations that are formed to address locally chosen social concerns. Initially, trash collection, hygiene at community wells, and the like are the focus of this work; as the participants gain experience with collective social change, their focus has shifted to more sensitive issues such as domestic violence and female genital cutting (Easton, Monkman, & Miles, 2003). Learning, in this sense, is a means to an end: gender equitable social change.

While much of the gender work done in education has focused on women and girls, NGOs have been at the forefront in shifting the focus solely from girls and women to gender relations, thus, acknowledging the complex social processes that underlie inequities based on gender. As educational initiatives move toward including men and boys in a broader approach to gender equity, a deeper engagement in understanding social dynamics such as patriarchy will be important.

NGOs' POSITIONING IN GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

NGOs have collectively become a more powerful voice in global educational and development discourse. Leading up to the Fourth International Women's Conference in Beijing in 1995, attention was focused on the women's NGO community; they proved to be a powerful coalition in bridging communication across socioeconomic, political, and cultural boundaries. Voices of poor women, through the NGOs, were heard by the UN organizations in that conference, and NGO coalitions were built across regions and countries. Numbers of women's NGOs increased in this period. Similarly, NGO activism at the World Education Forum in Dakar in April 2000 reflected the increasing power of the NGO community to influence educational policy internationally. During the 1990s and 2000s, NGO coalitions and other types of partnership initiatives have arisen in which coordinated work across organizations is intended to minimize duplication and to benefit from the strengths of the various partners. NGOs, especially local NGOs, are thought to be more in touch with local communities, their values, and traditions, and better able to implement programs. The United Nations Girls' Education Initiative is a partnership that includes UN agencies, national governments, donor countries, NGOs, civil society, the private sector, and communities and families. NGO partners in this initiative include the Campaign for Female Education International, Campaign for Popular Education Bangladesh, Forum for African Women Educationalists, Global Campaign for Education, World Vision, among others. With NGOs involved as key partners in this initiative to coordinate efforts to improve education for girls, the hope is that the local knowledge of NGOs and communities will filter up to the international organizations and the resources from the top will filter down to the local organizations.

Whether this hope is realized depends on how a number of issues will evolve in the near future, including: (a) partnerships, (b) funding, (c) continuity and sustainability, and (d) scaling up. The politics of *partnering* focuses attention on how power is shared among entities that, by their very nature, are not equal. Whose agenda takes precedence in a partnership, for example, that involves entities such as the World Bank or USAID, international NGOs and local NGOs? How are the various ideologies that inform their diverse interests played out on a global stage in which this partnering occurs? While partnering is intended to coordinate efforts, it also has the potential of silencing those not in agreement with the dominant discourse. As the power of such a coalition expands as it gains broad support, those with alternative or minority opinions can be all but ignored. The changing role of NGOs from being primarily service providers to partners with other entities, to advocates is a dimension of this political dynamic that should be watched carefully.

Because of the dependence of NGOs on donor agencies, multilateral organizations, and foundations for funding, strategies for *funding* shape the work that NGOs can do. An overemphasis on evaluation may be leading NGOs to focus on measuring their output and, therefore, choosing activities that result in quick and recognizable outcomes at the expense of activities that address deeper and more complex concerns (Smillie, Helmich, German, & Randel, 1999). In addition, many NGOs find an increasingly competitive environment in which they must attract funding. With limited staff and, particularly with local NGOs, limited ability to spend time on complicated funding applications, the smaller or newer NGOs are disadvantaged in this process.

Closely related to funding is a concern with *sustainability and coherence* over time. Funding is often short term and based on short-term goals that can be evaluated; this can discourage goals that require long-term commitment. While sustainability is an important dimension of development and educational initiatives, social programs such as education do not have money-earning possibilities as they are not economic in nature. Therefore, sustainability should be conceptualized in terms other than economic. Sustaining social change around cultural notions of gender equity is a common element of feminist-oriented projects; this is neither quick nor easy and, so, requires continued support from funding agencies if enduring change is to be achieved. In the work of Tostan, for example, evidence of success in the form of seeing communities mobilizing around locally chosen issues that relate to gender equity tends to occur six months or more after the NFE program has ended; it takes time for the participants to practice skills learned in the program, experiment with “safer” initiatives, and, finally, engage more sensitive social issues directly. To sustain this movement the Tostan villages in Mali and Sudan found that occasional support for locating resources, getting advice, and other short-term help was needed in order to fully develop self-sustaining initiatives toward gender equity. By that time, the NFE projects were no longer funded and so the NGOs either could not comply or they had to use funding from other sources.

A final issue of concern is the *scale* of NGO projects. Increasing pressure on small, successful projects to scale up (expand the numbers of those served) can create tensions that challenge the very strengths that NGOs, especially local NGOs, have brought to bear on gender and education. While reaching more people is critical, scaling up can potentially increase bureaucratization in the NGO and distance them from the communities they intend to serve, thus reducing their success.

WOMEN AND EMPOWERMENT THROUGH NGO WORK IN EDUCATION

NGOs serve communities that larger organizations are not knowledgeable about or in touch with; they are often seen by local communities as allies, whereas the state or international organizations might be perceived more suspiciously. Beyond the ways in which NGOs contribute directly to making education more gender equitable, they are also important in providing accessible opportunities for leadership development and capacity building. Locals, who would not have access to jobs or training in larger, more distantly located organizations, are key to the work in local NGOs, and, through this work, their knowledge and skills are enhanced. This, in turn, enables local women to play a more central role in the building of a gender-equitable civil society that is better positioned to address educational issues from multiple directions.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee. (2004). *BRAC annual report.* Dhaka: Author.

Boserup, E. (1970). *Woman’s role in economic development.* New York: St. Martin’s Press.

Easton, P., Monkman, K., & Miles, R. (2003). Social policy from the bottom up: Abandoning FGC in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Development in Practice, 13*(5), 445–458.

Ebdon, R. (1995). NGO expansion and the fight to reach the poor: Gender implications of NGO scaling-up in Bangladesh. *IDS Bulletin, 26*(3), 49–55.

Moser, C. (1993). *Gender planning and development: Theory, practice & training.* New York: Routledge.

Rao, A., & Kelleher, D. (2000). Leadership for social transformation: Some ideas and questions on institutions and feminist leadership. *Gender and Development, 8*(3), 74–79.

Ruiz Bravo, P., & Monkman, K. (1998). Women-centered nongovernmental and grass-roots organizations. In N. P. Stromquist (Ed.), *Women in the third world: An encyclopedia of contemporary issues* (pp. 486–497). New York: Garland.

Smillie, I., Helmich, H., German, T., & Randel, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Stakeholders: Government-NGO partnerships for international development.* Paris: OECD & London: Earthscan Publications.

Stromquist, N.P. (2006). *Feminist organizations and social transformation in Latin America.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Karen Monkman

Pregnant and Parenting Teens

School-based policy responses to teen pregnancy and parenthood need to be viewed in sociohistorical and political contexts. Across many highly industrialized countries, for example, schools face a crisis of consensus over inclusiveness. Those who want schools to sort and reward students who are most "productive" within a competitive economy that offers limited numbers of "knowledge-based" jobs are pitted against those who see the classroom as a public arena for challenging social injustices, that is, for countering the sorting process their opponents encourage. Despite having won the legal right of formal inclusion in many nations, pregnant and parenting teens often find themselves segregated in alternative settings; unable to participate in regular school settings, classes, or activities; or allowed to remain in a regular school but without support services such as on-site child care. These tensions—between de facto tracking (or streaming) versus meeting special needs, between formal inclusion versus informal exclusion—shape policy debates over whether or not to use pregnancy and parenthood as a basis for grouping students and the nature of the curriculum on offer to pregnant and parenting teens.

At this moment, school districts throughout North America and elsewhere—especially in urban areas—are poised to move beyond formal integration of pregnant and parenting students, are inquiring into the meaning and practice of inclusion, and are at a crossroads. Some policy researchers and pundits recommend separate schools, while others urge supported integration.

To date much of the literature on pregnant and parenting teens has largely ignored the educational policy issues that affect their decision to remain in or return to school. But, a growing number of researchers have emphasized such factors as school organization, program focus, curriculum, and pedagogy as central to providing a gender equitable education for pregnant and parenting teens.

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXTS OF SCHOOL RESPONSES

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, it was common policy to exclude pregnant and mothering students from public schools on the grounds that they posed a threat to control of sexual behavior. This is still the case in various countries around the world, particularly where primary and secondary school enrollment rates are low and the exclusion of pregnant and mothering girls opens up scarce spaces to boys.

By the 1960s, attitudes had begun to shift. In the United States, various experimental "rehabilitation" projects offering a range of educational, health, and welfare services to low-income, predominantly African American, pregnant schoolgirls were established in major cities. The projects were often affiliated with public school systems but did not enroll pregnant teens or unwed mothers in regular classes.

By decade's end, the exclusion of pregnant and mothering girls from the regular school system was still prevalent, while young men were rarely if ever expelled from school based on their parental or marital status. The civil rights movement for racial equality, however, and the second wave of the women's movement were helping to set the stage for legal inclusion. Young women and their parents, supported by community action groups, began filing lawsuits to protest their exclusion based on pregnancy and marital status.

In 1971, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Ordway v. Hargraves* that it was illegal for schools to expel from regular classes students who were known to be pregnant. Congress added force to this decision by passing Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which took effect in 1975. Title IX expressly prohibits the exclusion of students from their "education program" or "any extracurricular activity" on the basis of pregnancy, parental status, or marital status; schools that do not comply face the loss of federal funds. Related struggles and changing public attitudes in places like Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia led to a move from a policy of formal exclusion to formal inclusion of pregnant and mothering students in the mid-1970s. Special programs for pregnant and parenting teens began to spring up in the latter decades of the twentieth century in many urban centers.

Over the past 25 years, as school systems in Western industrialized countries have responded in various ways to address the needs of pregnant and parenting teens, the high school graduation rates of those teens have increased accordingly. Their rates still lag behind graduation rates for those who did not give birth in their teens. And, school officials—under pressure from the rise of high-stakes testing and increased high school graduation requirements—do not always want to accommodate pregnant and mothering teens in regular high school settings, classes, or activities.

As researchers in Canada, the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom have documented, while official policies express commitment to gender equity, it is not uncommon to find pregnant and parenting students coerced into nonmainstream settings or disciplined for excused absences related to pregnancy and parenthood. School districts commonly establish special programs and day cares off-site, forcing pregnant and parenting teens to choose between needed support services and access to a core or university preparatory curriculum or apprenticeship opportunities. Some schools have discouraged pregnant and mothering students (but rarely young fathers) from holding leadership positions or have prohibited their membership in academic societies and other extracurricular activities. For example, Amanda Lemon (age 18) was excluded from the Xenia, Ohio, chapter of the National Honor Society in the late 1990s when it was discovered she was a mother.

Local school districts in both the United States and Canada wield the most control over what services, if any, will be provided to pregnant and parenting teens, mainstreamed or not. Because the provision of education is decentralized in both countries, it is difficult to know what is typically provided and how the programs are organized. Pregnant and parenting teens appear to have remained largely segregated in alternative (sometimes remedial) programs, often off-campus or otherwise self-contained. Showcased programs tend to feature education, health, counseling, and child-care components.

More commonly, pregnant girls go on home correspondence (particularly in rural areas) or attend a temporary alternative class or school, then return to their regular school after delivering their babies. Upon their return, support services, including on-site child care, are lacking. So while they are formally included in regular classes with nonparenting peers, young mothers (because they, rather than young fathers, tend to be the primary caregivers) are effectively excluded from the larger school culture.

Because such policies are comparatively rare, it is instructive to examine the case of British Columbia (B.C.), Canada, where a policy of supported integration was pursued during the 1990s and nine out of every ten programs in the province enabled young parents to attend regular classes while providing them with child care and other support services. Three factors came together to support a full integration policy. First, a B.C. school act, passed in 1989, mandated the integration of special education students (those with learning, behavioral, and physical disabilities) into neighborhood schools, and this legislation provided ideological support for integrating pregnant and parenting students more fully into regular classes. A second factor was the commitment to developing school-based day care by the B.C. Ministry of Women's Equality. Dovetailing with this "equal opportunities" feminist perspective was a third factor, namely, a shift in government policy regarding single mothers from treating women as mothers *and* wage workers to treating women as primarily wage workers. This shift has been particularly evident in the public debates about welfare reform across a number of Western, industrialized nations in the rise of welfare-to-work ideology and in the targeting of single mothers, particularly teen mothers, as welfare "problems" if they are not working for pay outside the home or preparing to do so.

STIGMA AND GENDER

For those who position themselves as reformers or streamliners of the welfare state, teen pregnancy prevention is their primary focus. Interventions designed to reduce unwanted teen pregnancy have had mixed results. One common approach, media campaigns that stress the harsh reality of single parenting, reinforces stigmas attached to pregnant teens. Those young women who do find themselves pregnant (and 40 percent of all young women in the United States become pregnant before they turn 20) are likely to feel blamed and shamed.

The current backlash against the welfare state has included some attempts to stigmatize the men who father children born to teen mothers. One common label, "deadbeat dads," reinforces the traditional equation of fatherhood with breadwinner and may discourage young men without access to the primary labor market from taking responsibility for actual child rearing. Adult men who father children born to teen mothers have been targeted in some jurisdictions as "statutory rapists." This stigma can shift attention from unequal gender relations to age differences, though age differences may be less significant, given the difficulty that women of *all* ages have in negotiating sexual relationships with men. Furthermore, it is still quite easy for men, who do not bear the visible mark of pregnancy and who are less likely than women to take primary responsibility for child rearing, to evade scrutiny and avoid stigma, making the talk about deadbeat dads and child abusers often more rhetorical than real in its consequences.

By contrast, women's sexuality—spotlighted during pregnancy—has, historically, been used as a means to devalue and exclude them from public places such as the workplace and school. Even today, there is little room in supposedly gender-neutral organizations for reproductive concerns, and students are often treated as asexual. As discussed in the previous section, although it is no longer legal in many countries to deny pregnant and mothering girls access to an education, it is still common to segregate them, sometimes coercively and in ways that are not always in their best interest.

The gendered power relations (as well as racial, sexual, and social class power relations) at play in the construction of policies help to explain why so few young men appear to participate in school-based programs for pregnant and parenting teens. (Programs targeted specifically at young fathers are an exception, of course, but even in this case, participation rates have often been problematic.) In various qualitative studies of such programs, young men are virtually absent as formal participants. There are a number of possible explanations. First, the fathers are usually older (although usually by only two or three years), out of school, or both, so school-based programs do not reach them. Second, the vast majority of teen mothers are the primary child-care givers, and when and if their relationships with their male partners end, the women almost always retain custody of the children. Third, available services are tailored to mothers as primary caregivers. Fourth, staff members working in young parent programs are typically women, which reinforces the idea that child rearing is mainly women's work. And, to the extent that programs have a therapeutic component where, for example, the issue of male violence against women is addressed, counselors and other service providers find it complicated to include men. Fifth, the ideology of fathers as breadwinners is still prevalent so that, even when fathers are school-aged, they feel more pressure to try to obtain paid work to provide for the baby rather than to learn about child rearing.

MAINSTREAM OR ALTERNATIVE SETTINGS?

Practitioners and policy makers disagree over whether pregnant and parenting teens would be best served in mainstream or alternative settings. The debate is shaped by how prevalent and accepted teenage pregnancy and parenthood is in a particular community, which, in turn, affects the cost of providing services in a centralized or decentralized manner. In rural areas, the debate may be moot because the size and geography of a rural school district may preclude any group provision of services.

In more densely populated school districts, proponents of providing services in a separate facility typically cite one or more of the following reasons: (a) the difficulty of guaranteeing the safety of pregnant students; (b) the difficulty in a large setting of controlling negative comments from peers and school staff members that can affect pregnant young women's self-image and lower their aspirations; (c) the ability to provide flexible scheduling, special curriculum, and individualized instruction; and (d) avoidance of community controversy by minimizing other students' contact with pregnant and parenting teens.

In contrast, proponents of mainstreaming argue that their approach: (a) avoids the difficult transition to and from an alternative facility; (b) allows pregnant and parenting students to remain close to established friends; (c) allows access to a more diverse, usually more academically challenging curriculum; and (d) treats young parents as full citizens and does not add stigma by shunting students off to a separate facility.

To cast this policy debate in more theoretical terms, the tension between addressing students' "special" needs and separating and stigmatizing them exemplifies what feminist scholars have termed the *dilemma of difference*. The dilemma of difference refers to the risk people run of further stigmatizing a historically subordinate group when they either focus on the group's difference or attempt to ignore it. One risk of the mainstreaming approach is that it can fail to support students adequately and risks losing them. Yet the segregation-in-a-special-program approach risks stigmatizing students. So, for example, official school district policy may allow pregnant girls to remain in their neighborhood schools thereby allowing preexisting friendship groups to provide support while not "ghettoizing" pregnant teens. But, teen pregnancies (and births) occur at higher rates in relatively impoverished neighborhoods, and the odd girl who finds herself pregnant at an upper-middle-class school with a strong university preparatory ethos might be made to feel unwelcome by staff and peers.

Once students are identified as teen parents and are provided with services based on that difference, school adults may begin to notice traits—both positive (e.g., "teen parents are more mature than other students") and negative (e.g., "teen parents use their babies as excuses")—that distill into stereotypes. Yet, were these school adults simply to ignore the differences of the teen parents from other students, then the teen parents might not receive due consideration of their heavy responsibilities and, as a result, might fail their courses or be asked to leave school due to poor attendance.

Meeting the diverse needs of pregnant and parenting teens without separation and stigma may involve reorganizing conventional schools (perhaps to an extent unforeseen by proponents of mainstreaming) so that these needs are no longer considered "special." Such a policy of supported integration might include, for example, providing a school-based health clinic, on-site child care for students as well as school adults, flexible scheduling, and a curriculum that fosters nurturance in all students, female and male.

Researchers have identified a number of strategies and practices aimed at a policy goal of supported integration for pregnant and parenting teens. These include:

- creating community buy-in through such mechanisms as joint partnerships (e.g., between schools and community-based organizations, various branches of government, or both) and advisory boards composed of "stakeholders";
- placing programs in centrally located schools and in schools that are accepting, even promoting, of diversity;
- building political support within ideologically diverse schools by managing teacher resistance and cultivating teacher acceptance, where teacher attitudes toward pregnant and parenting teens are assumed to influence how students treat one another;
- communicating realistic expectations for, and monitoring, student attendance and progress;
- providing material and emotional support and accommodation, including on-site child care;
- enabling teen parents to communicate complex realities rather than serve as examples of what not to do or what not to be; and
- advocating with and for teen parents to challenge stereotyping, showcasing individual and program-wide success (broadly and realistically defined), and lobbying for schoolwide policies that enable increased success.

Not all strategies aimed at promoting integration and inclusion are equally effective at coping with—or, in some cases, transcending—the dilemma of difference. Norm-challenging institutional practices (e.g., adopting a schoolwide policy of excusing and accommodating student absences related to sick child care) are superior to both individual adaptations and isolated, one-on-one arrangements between a teacher and her or his colleague or between a teacher and a student. These latter arrangements, while perhaps temporarily helpful to individual teen parents, aim only to fit them into structures otherwise thought to be acceptable rather than transforming an institution that excludes on a routine basis a wide number of people because they are said to have “special” needs. For example, young parents need flexibility with regard to attendance expectations, pacing of instruction, nature of assignments, and workload. But, so, too, do students living independently, those working long hours to supplement their family’s income or to care for younger siblings, and those sometimes needed by immigrant parents to serve as translators in important matters affecting the family.

TOWARD A GENDER EQUITABLE CURRICULUM

Besides their parental status, school-age parents are often different in ways that mark them as “abnormal” and in need of “special” treatment. While the specifics vary by locale, region, and nation, a disproportionate number of pregnant and parenting teens live in poverty, are academically underprepared, belong to an oppressed racial minority or historically disadvantaged group, or are not proficient in the official language of school instruction.

For marginalized groups such as teen parents, gaining formal access to schools is not enough to satisfy a strong democratic imperative. Inquiring into what (whose knowledge) is being taught and how—in other words, asking questions about curricular content and pedagogy—is equally central. Students need to develop their sense of self-worth, find out what they are entitled to as citizens, and learn the full range of acceptable means of communicating their needs to others. Schools, for example, should aim to develop students not only as workers and citizens (among other worthy goals) but as members of families in all their diversity.

Few researchers have examined the curriculum on offer to pregnant and parenting teens and even fewer from a critical or feminist perspective. Based on the available evidence, two curricular visions (discussed here as ideal types) staking out opposite ends of a continuum of programmatic approaches exist. One vision is that of a *microcosm of the “real world,”* where the student and future worker identities take precedence and teen parents are expected to give birth, return to school, eventually obtain a paying job, and adjust to the status quo. The other vision is that of a *therapeutic haven,* which exists as a girls-only environment where the mother identity takes precedence and students are provided a safe space, albeit sometimes at the expense of gaining the confidence and skills they need to succeed in the wider world.

Once again, the dilemma of difference is in evidence in the curriculum, variously enacted. The haven vision rests on the idea of difference, in this case pregnancy and motherhood, associated with womanhood; this carries with it the risk of gender essentialism by reinforcing the idea that caregiving is only women’s work and limiting women to the domestic sphere. By contrast, the microcosm vision rests on the idea of sameness or commonality with other students; this carries with it the risk of gender blindness or androcentrism by taking men’s current life patterns (i.e., economic provider with minimal domestic responsibilities) as the norm.

Feminists have noted that the dominant construction of mother has been associated with domesticity or privacy, in contrast to the more public social identities of student, worker, and citizen, which have been forged according to unstated male norms. This gendering of identities is obscured in part when the embodied nature of study, work, and citizenship is ignored. For example, the student identity is assumed to be gender neutral and universal, whereas in actuality the traits and activities commonly associated with women—including pregnancy, breast-feeding, and caring for children—are not associated with the image of the student. Still very much at issue is who counts as a "good" mother or father, worker, and citizen within the school and hence, in the end, who counts as a good student.

The ideology of the providing father may hurt poor men (as well as women) because it associates fathering solely with being an economic provider. Yet, because many young fathers face high rates of unemployment and poverty, the path by which they would consider themselves truly to be fathers—becoming breadwinners—is blocked. Young men are not encouraged to become nurturing caregivers.

The normative (White, middle-class) view of mothering, in North America and elsewhere, holds that the good mother is someone who always puts her child's needs above all else, meaning, for example, making sacrifices in order to provide (ideally) full-time, stay-at-home caregiving. The ideology of the good mother can be just as destructive as the ideology of the good father because young women are sent conflicting and hurtful messages about how to construct their self-image. Young women are thus encouraged to neglect their own desires and purposes and, to the extent that they do not prepare themselves for above poverty-level paid work, they make themselves even more vulnerable to the risks of the labor market and the gendered politics of the family.

Even as the meanings of motherhood, fatherhood, sexuality, paid labor, marriage, family, and citizenship are politically contested outside of schools, students seldom get the opportunity to discuss and debate the relations between the school, the family, and the paid workplace. For example, educators could ask students to explore the competing images of the good parent—full-time caregivers, economic providers, people who balance multiple roles and responsibilities and want their children's lives, too, to be balanced—and discuss who benefits and who is marginalized by such images.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Burdell, P. (1995–1996). Teen mothers in high school: Tracking their curriculum. *Review of Research in Education, 21,* 163–208.

Dawson, N. (1997). The provision of education and opportunities for future employment for pregnant schoolgirls and schoolgirl mothers in the U.K. *Children & Society, 11*(4), 252–263.

Kaplan, E.B. (1997). *Not our kind of girl: Unraveling the myths of Black teenage motherhood.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kelly, D.M. (2000). *Pregnant with meaning: Teen mothers and the politics of inclusive schooling.* New York: Peter Lang.

Kelly, D.M. (2003). Practicing democracy in the margins of school: The Teen-Age Parents Program as feminist counterpublic. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(1), 123–146.

Lane, T.S., & Clay, C.M. (2000). Meeting the service needs of young fathers. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 17*(1), 35–54.

Luker, K. (1996). *Dubious conceptions: The politics of teenage pregnancy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Luttrell, W. (2003). *Pregnant bodies, fertile minds: Gender, race, and the schooling of pregnant teens.* New York: Routledge.

Milne-Home, J. (with Power, A., & Dennis, B.). (1996). *Pregnant futures: Barriers to employment, education and training amongst pregnant and parenting adolescents.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Pillow, W.S. (2003). *Unfit subjects: Educational policy and the teen mother, 1972–2002.* New York: Routledge.

Solinger, R. (1992). *Wake up little Susie: Single pregnancy and race before Roe v. Wade.* New York: Routledge.

Wong, J., & Checkland, D. (Eds.). (1999). *Teenage pregnancy and parenting: Social and ethical issues.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Deirdre M. Kelly

School Choice and Gender Equity

Efforts to expand school choice within the public school system have been unabated over the past decade. Fueling the choice movement are conservative social and political arguments regarding the power of the free market to inspire educational innovation, improve achievement, increase accountability, and regain parental support for public schooling. Choice is a key strategy of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in improving educational outcomes for all students. Increased school choice has been pushed through various forms, including magnet schools, charter schools, and voucher programs. Charter schools, in particular, have experienced tremendous support over the past decade. The RAND Corporation reports that there are approximately one million students in 3,500 charter schools throughout the nation (Zimmer & Buddin, 2006). NCLB supports charter schools by offering financial assistance for program design, initial implementation, planning, and evaluation (NCLB Charter Schools Program, 2004).

Alongside increased support for school choice have been concerns about gender equity in schooling. Many studies over the past 25 years have documented gender bias against girls in coeducational classrooms. Girls receive less teacher attention than boys, feel less comfortable speaking out in class, and face threats of sexual harassment in school. Though the achievement gaps between boys and girls are closing in some areas, girls' achievement still lags behind boys' in math and science and most significantly in computer science and technology majors and careers.

There is also concern that gender equity solutions have reached girls of different ethnic groups unequally. For example, low teacher expectations have been shown to disadvantage African American males in public school classrooms, but African American females fare more favorably by comparison (Hubbard, 1999). Teacher expectations are typically lower for low-income and African American students than they are for middle- and upper-income White students (Diamond, Randolph, & Spillane, 2004). Similarly, Latino males and females face different social and academic pressures from each other and from their White peers, and these pressures themselves vary depending on whether the students live in urban or rural locations (Gibson, Gandara, & Koyama, 2004). Latinas perform less well than other racial and ethnic groups of girls in several key measures of educational achievement, but they have steadily increased their high school and college graduation rates over the past 20 years, placing them ahead of their male peers (Cammarota, 2004).

While gender equity has long been discussed in terms of remedies designed to raise girls' achievement, more recently, some scholars have begun to ask, "What about the boys?" Public discourse has centered on a "crisis" for boys, focusing on their lower reading and language test scores and higher rates of special education referrals as compared to girls, as well as boys' greater propensity to be involved in violent crimes. All boys are seen as at risk of these problems, but most notably boys of color. Increasing rates of dropout and higher rates of incarceration are particularly salient for African American boys and men.

Meanwhile, many feminist researchers believe that gender equity is still problematic for girls in the United States after 20 years of weak enforcement of Title IX, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in public educational programs. They argue in favor of remedies for the problem of low academic performance of women in certain disciplines. As these arguments make clear, gender bias is now understood as affecting both girls and boys, as neither group is immune to social pressures and expectations. For feminist educators and researchers, achieving gender equity in schools means acknowledging that gender bias exists in both subtle and overt forms, eliminating sexist language and stereotyping regarding girls and boys, and offering a socially critical and gender inclusive curriculum. Many argue that educators must address how the social and political agenda befitting males is embedded in school structures and practices, and they must make pedagogical, organizational, and curricular changes to even the playing field. Such educational changes are believed to benefit both boys and girls and society as a whole.

CHOOSING SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLS AND CLASSES

Over the past several years, public schools in at least 15 states have addressed concerns about the achievement of boys and girls through experiments with single-sex education. Most often, these experiments have been in the form of separate math or science classes for girls. Other manifestations of public single-gender schooling include Afro-centric academies for boys in Detroit, Baltimore, and Milwaukee and the Young Women's Leadership schools in Harlem and Chicago. Some of these experiments have been found in violation of Title IX and have been forced to close or become coeducational.

Significantly, however, in May 2002, the federal government revealed its intent to draft new regulations that would provide more flexibility for, encourage, and help support single-sex public schools. The support for single-sex schooling is seen as part of an overall plan to increase school choice and provide additional opportunities for students to choose a "better" school (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Because of the loosening of Title IX regulations, we might expect to see many more experiments with single-sex schools in the public sector over the next few years. Up to now, most instances of single-sex schooling have been in the private sector in the United States.

Why the interest in single-sex public schooling, especially given the context of what many (see Datnow & Hubbard, 2002) see as conflicting research evidence? Most studies on single-sex schools have been conducted primarily in the private sector and, therefore, results may not generalize to public schools. Because these studies have been mostly quantitative, comparative studies of student performance, teacher-student interactions, the school context, and the context of students' lives have not been examined in great detail. Moreover, because most studies of single-sex schools have failed to examine the larger social, economic, and cultural context in which students live, we lack an understanding of the relationship between school context, family background, and academic achievement.

Despite the limitations of this research, advocates of single-sex education point to studies of Catholic single-sex and coeducational schools that find academic achievement benefits for girls and low-income and minority boys attending single-sex schools. Girls who attend all-girls schools are more apt to adopt leadership roles, become engaged in traditionally male-dominated subjects like math and science, and show improvements in self-esteem. Research on gender development conducted in the 1980s, arguing that women learn differently than men, has also helped to provide justification for all-female schooling.

All-boys classes or schools are now being looked upon as ways to improve literacy achievement and discipline and are said to improve character development. Advocates of all-male Afro-centric academies in public schools argue that the presence of African American role models and a focus on multicultural curricula can be beneficial in developing leadership skills and improving achievement for African American boys. Proponents of single-sex education also argue that the separation of the sexes is the most effective way to manage classroom behavior by eliminating distractions and peer pressures for both boys and girls. Clearly, the reasons behind the recent establishment of single-sex schools are no longer simple; they represent efforts to address not only gender bias, but also racial and cultural issues as well.

Is single-sex schooling truly a panacea, or does the answer to improving social and academic outcomes for boys and girls lie in a school's ability to provide quality teachers, peer relations, special resources, and/or other factors? In a study we conducted of 12 public single-sex academies (6 boys; 6 girls) in California, we found that three important interrelated conditions contributed to the positive experiences of some low-income and minority students in the academies: the single-sex setting, financial support from the state, and the presence of caring proactive teachers. Organizationally, the arrangement provided social benefits for the students who attended them. The single-sex organizational arrangement spared students the distractions and negative aspects associated with coeducational schools. It offered the girls, for example, the freedom to make decisions about their appearance without harassment from the boys and provided them with a safe haven to concentrate on their academic work. Funding also had an enormous impact on the schools. With the grant money provided by the state, schools were given the ability to provide special resources and support for the students who attended them, benefits that were previously absent for these children before the single-gender experiment. Students benefited from small classes and, in some cases, from extra teachers, special academic tutoring, on-site health care facilities, counseling, and field trips. Several schools also provided computers with the newest and most sophisticated software.

Although the organizational arrangements and financial support were important, they were not enough to explain the success of the single-gender schools in our study. It was the influence of caring educators who worked closely with the students that was crucial. In gender-segregated classes, these teachers reported that they were able to have candid and focused discussions designed to meet the social and moral needs, as well as the academic needs, of their students.

School administrators reported that attracting and keeping good teachers at these schools with children who had tremendous academic and emotional needs was very difficult (see Hubbard and Datnow chapter in Datnow & Hubbard, 2002). Teacher and administrative turnover created dire consequences for students whose lives were already plagued by instability. Some students complained they could never be sure who the teacher might be because substitutes appeared frequently. This instability added to their feelings of confusion and anomie. Even when students had permanent teachers, they were often new, inexperienced, and frequently knew little about working with low-income and minority youth—a scenario that compromises the success of many public schools that educate predominately low-income and minority students throughout the nation.

Students' experiences were also less positive when teachers shaped curriculum, instruction, and discipline in ways that reinforced gender stereotypes. Many teachers were unwilling to challenge traditional gendered expectations concerning academic interests and student behaviors, finding it difficult to move from a biological to a social construction of gender. However, the exceptions we observed among some teachers suggested that teachers in single-sex (and coed schools) can have a positive effect on students' understandings of gender if they have a gender equity agenda, which many of the teachers who taught in the schools in our study did not have. Overall, our study revealed that students need more than school choices that allow them to be segregated by sex. If the single-sex arrangement is to be successful, we argue that it must be expanded to include a more comprehensive agenda of opportunity (Hubbard & Datnow, 2005).

TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE AGENDA OF OPPORTUNITY

Separating students by gender is not by itself likely to achieve either equity or excellence for boys and girls. Our own prior work and review of the literature suggests that efforts to improve schooling options for girls and boys in the public sector should include adequate funding and caring teachers who understand the importance of personalizing the educational experience for children who come to school with a range of academic and social needs. Importantly, the schools need to be driven by a strong theory of gender equitable education. If we are to attract and train highly qualified teachers in these public schools, teachers need access to relevant training and administrative support in order to become aware of critical issues in students' lives, including gender and racial biases, harassment, sexuality, and homophobia. Educators need to have a strong sense of why they are implementing gender equity solutions or special programs for girls and/or boys.

There are two major obstacles to creating a strong sense of mission of gender equity in K–12 education. First, educators perceive that they have many other pressing issues to address, including strong pressures for accountability and for elimination of persistent racial inequities. Gender bias is not viewed as a serious concern and/or one for which they are responsible or prepared to tackle. Second is the fact that many educators and the public at-large believe that gender equity issues have been solved, at least with respect to girls. Recent news media reports about the number of girls exceeding the number of boys enrolling in and graduating from four-year colleges helps to fuel such beliefs. However, when we look at the achievement of women postcollege, we see that the proverbial glass ceiling still exists, with women occupying far fewer high-level positions in politics, the corporate world, the sciences, and academia. The societal conversation about gender equity is made even more complicated by media reports of a trend toward more women "choosing" to stay home to raise children. Such reports give an erroneous sense that equal opportunities exist for women in the working world and that women are simply not taking advantage of them. The lack of affordable, high-quality child care and the unwillingness of many employers to help women balance family and work are rarely considered in the equation. This larger societal conversation about gender equity and gender roles and the role of K–12 teachers in addressing the problem needs to be taken up when we consider programming for girls and boys.

Conversations deliberately designed to break down gender stereotypes need to occur in both single-sex and coeducational classrooms. As gender bias persists in society, it is incumbent upon educators to respond to this inequity by educating students about the negative impact gender bias has on both boys and girls. In addition to promoting self-esteem, gender identity, and enhanced achievement, programs for girls and boys should (arguably at a minimum) raise antisexist attitudes to a level of political awareness aimed at trying to alter socially constructed gender patterns (Kruse, 1996). Ideally, we would expect single sex *and* coeducational classrooms to actively promote an emancipatory agenda for girls and boys. In order for teachers to engage in this kind of education, however, the problem of gender bias has to move to the radar screen along with other issues of inequity. Teachers need support to construct a curriculum that will raise awareness and empower students. They need assurance from school administrators and state and federal policy makers that their efforts are important. In other words, if single-gender classrooms are going to contribute in a meaningful way to the societal discourse on gender equity and impact the negative consequences of gender bias, teachers should be held accountable for their efforts in this area as well.

Single-sex settings offer the potential to advance gender equity, but the organizational arrangement alone does not ensure it. Decisions about choosing programs specifically focused on girls or boys also need to guard against becoming a new form of tracking or resegregation. Segregation might lead to a safe or comfortable space for some populations, but it can create tensions for race and gender equity. As Kruse (1996) has warned, sex-segregated education does not guarantee a particular outcome because it can be used for emancipation or oppression. What is crucial are the intentions, the understanding of people and their gender, and the pedagogical attitudes and practices.

Consideration needs to be given to the reasons why such programs are important for students and what is gained and what is lost as a result of their implementation, both for students who leave and for those who remain in mainstream options. If schools—especially single-sex schools—pursue a gender blind approach under the guise of equal opportunity and choice, and if policies refocus attention on the plight of boys (or girls) without a careful analysis of equity, the gendered culture of schooling and society is likely to continue.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Cammarota, J. (2004). Gendered and racialized pathways of Latina and Latino youth: Different struggles, different resistances in the urban context. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 35* (1), 53–74.

Datnow, A., & Hubbard, L. (Eds.). (2002). *Gender in policy and practice: Perspectives on single-sex and coeducational schooling.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Diamond, J., Randolph, A., & Spillane, J. (2004). Teachers' expectations and sense of responsibility for student learning: The importance of race, class, and organizational habitus. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly 35*(1), 75–98.

Gibson, M., Gandara, P., & Koyama, J. (Eds.). (2004). *School connections: U.S. Mexican youth, peers and school achievement.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hubbard, L. (1999). College aspirations among low-income African American high school students: Gendered strategies for success. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 30*(3), 363–383.

Hubbard, L., & Datnow, A. (2005). Do single-sex schools address the needs of low income and minority students? An investigation of organizational, financial and social factors. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 38*(2), 115–131.

Kruse, A.M. (1996). Single sex settings: Pedagogies for girls and boys in Danish schools. In P. Murphy & G. Gipps (Eds.), *Equity in the classroom: Towards effective pedagogy for girls and boys* (pp. 173–191). London: Falmer.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2004, July). *NCLB charter schools program. Title V. Part B. Non-regulatory guidance.* Available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/cspguidance03.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *Federal register: March 9, 2004* (Vol. 69, No. 46). Retrieved June 14, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/proprule/2004-1/030904a.html

Zimmer, R., & Buddin, R. (2006). *Making sense of charter schools: Evidence from California.* Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation. Retrieved July 25, 2006, from http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2006/RAND_OP157.pdf

Amanda Datnow

Lea Hubbard

Sexual Harassment Policies and Practices

Margaret Mead once argued that a new taboo is needed in educational institutions, one that requires faculty to make new norms based on caring as a central and active value. The need to make sexual harassment a taboo continues in schools and colleges as evidenced by the high incidence of harassment reported by students. An adequate policy for getting to the heart of harassment problems in the educational system not only requires a clear definition of harassment, policy statements against the behavior, and the enactment of laws to enforce such policies but also requires the efforts and support of the school's administration at all levels and continual training of all individuals, as well as procedures that *encourage,* not just allow, complaints. Success requires action to prevent and remedy sexual harassment as well as to train the entire school/campus on legal and psychological aspects of sexual harassment. With both a policy and the procedure for carrying it out in place, not only will the school be on stronger footing in any legal action, it will find that, human relations–wise, the entire school benefits from an environment of cooperation and respect.

DEFINITIONS AND LEGISLATION

Sexual harassment is defined legally as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when any one of three criteria is met: (a) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the individual's employment or academic standing; (b) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions affecting the individual; and (c) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or learning performance or creating an intimidating, hostile,, or offensive work or learning environment.

As these criteria indicate, there are two types of sexual harassment situations that are described by this legal definition: quid pro quo sexual harassment and hostile environment sexual harassment. *Quid pro quo sexual harassment* involves an individual with organizational power who either expressly or implicitly ties an academic or employment decision or action to the response of an individual to unwelcome sexual advances. Thus, a teacher may promise a reward to a student for complying with sexual requests (e.g., a better grade, letter of recommendation for college, or a job) or threaten a student for failing to comply with the sexual requests (e.g., threatening to not give the student the grade earned). *Hostile environment sexual harassment* involves a situation in which an atmosphere or climate is created by staff or other students in the classroom or other area in the school that makes it difficult, if not impossible, for a student to study and learn because the atmosphere is perceived by the student to be intimidating, offensive, and hostile.

The legal definition identifies the conditions under which a behavior may constitute sexual harassment, but generally does not give specific examples. Empirical definitions of sexual harassment are derived from men's and women's descriptions of their experiences of sexual harassment. Examples include: *gender harassment,* which consists of generalized sexist remarks and behavior not designed to elicit sexual cooperation but to convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women or men; and *sexual bribery,* which is the solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by promise of a reward (e.g., passing grade) (Fitzgerald et al., 1988).

Because U.S. courts have recognized that sexual harassment is a form of gender discrimination, it is covered by antidiscrimination legislation such as Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, which states that: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal assistance."

In order to promote effective and equitable resolution of sexual harassment complaints, it is necessary for educational institutions to have an explicit antiharassment policy that complies with the provisions of Title IX. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has emphasized that educational institutions have an affirmative duty to issue a strong policy prohibiting sexual harassment on which students and employees are trained, to conduct a full investigation of all complaints of sexual harassment, and to administer appropriate disciplinary action toward individuals who have violated the school's/campus's policy statement.

Schools, similar to workplaces, should exercise "reasonable care" to ensure a sexual harassment-free environment and retaliatory-free environment for students. This "reasonable care," adapted from the Supreme Court ruling in *Faragher v. Boca Raton* (524 U.S. 775, 1988), includes the following at a minimum: establishment and dissemination of an effective antisexual harassment policy and an effective investigatory procedure and the provision of training in sexual harassment, in general, and in the school's policy and procedures specifically.

INCIDENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The first scientific national study of academic sexual harassment of children and adolescents was conducted by the American Association of University Women in 1993. In this study, incidence rates of students' experiences with sexual harassment was collected from 1,632 girls and boys in Grades 8 through 11 from 79 schools across the United States. Students were asked the following question, adapted from the legal definition of sexual harassment: "During your whole school life, how often, if at all, has anyone (this includes students, teachers, other school employees, or anyone else) done the following things to you when you did not want them to?"

The list of types of sexual harassment that followed this question included: (a) made sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks; (b) showed, gave, or left you sexual pictures, photographs, illustrations, messages, or notes; (c) wrote sexual messages or graffiti about you on bathroom walls, in locker rooms, and so on; (d) spread sexual rumors about you; (e) said you were gay or lesbian; (f) spied on you as you dressed or showered at school; (g) flashed or "mooned" you; (h) touched, grabbed, or pinched you in a sexual way; (i) pulled at your clothing in a sexual way; (j) intentionally brushed against you in a sexual way; (k) pulled your clothing off or down; (l) blocked your way or cornered you in a sexual way; (m) forced you to kiss him or her; (n) forced you to do something sexual other than kissing.

Results indicated that four out of five students (81 percent) reported that they had been the target of some form of sexual harassment during their school lives. With respect to gender comparisons, 85 percent of girls and 76 percent of boys surveyed reported that they had experienced unwelcome sexual behavior that interfered with their ability to concentrate at school and with their personal lives. African American boys (81 percent) were more likely to have experienced sexual harassment than White boys (75 percent) and Latinos (69 percent). For girls, 87 percent of Whites reported having experienced behaviors that constitute sexual harassment, compared with 84 percent of African American girls and 82 percent of Latinas.

The AAUW study also found that adolescents' experiences with sexual harassment were most likely to occur in the middle school or junior high school years of sixth to ninth grade. Although the majority of harassment in schools is student-to-student or peer harassment, 25 percent of girls and 10 percent of boys reported they were harassed by teachers or other school employees. Comparable incidence rates have been reported in the literature subsequent to this AAUW report.

In addition, in 2001, AAUW found results similar to their earlier research. They sampled 2,064 students in public school in Grades 8 through 11. Eighty-one percent of students experienced some form of sexual harassment during their school lives, 59 percent occasionally, and 27 percent often. This study also found that girls were more likely than boys (85 percent vs. 79 percent) to experience sexual harassment ever or often (30 percent vs. 24 percent often). In addition, 32 percent of students reported being afraid of being sexually harassed, with girls more than twice as likely as boys to feel this fear (44 percent vs. 20 percent). Eighty-five percent of students reported peer sexual harassment, and 38 percent reported being harassed by a teacher or other school employee.

In the first large-scale study with college students, Fitzgerald and her colleagues (1988) investigated approximately 2,000 women at two major state universities. Half of the women respondents reported experiencing some form of sexually harassing behavior. The majority of these women reported experiencing sexist comments by faculty. The next largest category of sexually harassing behavior was seductive behavior, including being invited for drinks and a back rub by faculty, being brushed up against by their professors, and having their professors show up uninvited at their hotel rooms during out-of-town academic conferences.

More recently, Hill and Silva (2005) reported findings from their nationally representative survey of 2,036 undergraduate students (1,096 women; 940 men) commissioned by the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. Their research found that sexual harassment is experienced by the majority of college students. Approximately one-third of the students reported physical harassment, including being touched, grabbed, or forced to do something sexual. Hill and Silva (2005) also reported that men and women are equally likely to experience sexual harassment although in different ways. For example, women were more likely to report experiencing sexual comments and gestures while men reported experiencing homophobic comments. Furthermore, Hill and Silva (2005) found that men are more likely than women to harass.

For certain student groups, the incidence of sexual harassment appears to be higher than for others. Graduate students, for example, report more harassment than undergraduates. Other groups reporting higher than average experiences of sexual harassment include women of color, especially those with “token” status; students in small colleges or small academic departments, where the number of faculty available to students is quite small; women students in male populated fields, such as engineering; students who are economically disadvantaged and work part time or full time while attending classes; lesbian women, who may be harassed as part of homophobia; physically or emotionally disabled students; women students who work in dormitories as resident assistants; women who have been sexually abused; inexperienced, unassertive, socially isolated women, who may appear more vulnerable and appealing to those who would intimidate or coerce them into an exploitive relationship.

Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1993) concluded that it is reasonable to estimate that one out of every two women will be harassed at some point during her academic or working life, a proportion indicating that sexual harassment is the most widespread of all forms of sexual victimization. This estimate has been supported by countless numbers of empirical research studies, using different methodologies to collect incidence data, in different parts of the world, including Australia, Brazil, China, Italy, Israel, Pakistan, Puerto Rico, Sweden, and Turkey (see chapter by DeSouza & Solberg in Paludi & Paludi, 2003).

IMPACT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON STUDENTS

The 1993 AAUW study reported that approximately one in four students who had been sexually harassed did not want to attend school or cut a class. In addition, one in four students became silent in their classes following their experience of sexual harassment. With respect to the emotional aspects of sexual harassment, the AAUW study reported the following experiences, in rank order, among the students who were sexually harassed: embarrassment; self-consciousness; being less sure of themselves or less confident; feeling afraid or scared; doubting whether they could have a happy romantic relationship; feeling confused about who they are; and feeling less popular. In addition, 33 percent of girls who reported experiencing sexual harassment no longer wished to attend school. Thirty-two percent of girls stated that talking in class was more difficult, and 20 percent indicated they had received lower grades. Girls further reported that they altered their behavior to decrease the likelihood of sexual harassment by avoiding people or places, including avoiding school events. Twelve percent of the boys who reported experiencing sexual harassment did not want to attend school; 13 percent of the boys indicated they talked less in class following incidents of sexual harassment.

Fineran and Gruber (2004) reviewed the impact of sexual harassment on children and adolescents. They noted that the outcomes of sexual harassment can be examined from three main perspectives: learning-related, social/emotional, and health-related. Responses include depression; feeling sad, nervous, threatened and angry; loss of appetite; feelings of helplessness; nightmares or disturbed sleep; loss of interest in regular activities; isolation from friends and family; and loss of friends. Fineran and Gruber (2004) also reported long-term effects from sexual harassment: depression, loss of self-esteem, lowered grades, lost educational and job opportunities that affect students after high school graduation that may cause fewer career choices.

Similar to the research findings with children and adolescents, studies with college students have documented the high cost of sexual harassment to individuals. Research with college students indicates that there are career-related, psychological, and physiological outcomes of sexual harassment. For example, women students have reported decreased morale, decreased satisfaction with their career goals, and lowered grades. Furthermore, women students have reported feelings of helplessness and powerlessness over their academic career, strong fear reactions, and decreased motivation. College students have also reported headaches, sleep disturbances, eating disorders, and gastrointestinal disorders as common physical responses to sexual harassment (see chapter by Lundberg-Love & Marmion in Paludi & Paludi, 2003).

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OPPOSING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

One change over eight years identified in the 2001AAUW study of sexual harassment of students was that 69 percent of students, compared to 26 percent in 1993, indicated that their schools have a sexual harassment policy statement. In addition, in the 2001AAUW study, 36 percent of students compared to 13 percent in 1993 reported that their schools distribute training/educational materials on sexual harassment.

A disturbing finding from the 2001 study, however, is that, despite more schools having policy statements and offering students educational materials on sexual harassment, students continue to engage in sexual harassment and rarely tell school administrators about being victimized. Similar findings have been reported by college students. If they do tell anyone about their experiences, it is usually a friend. Males are twice as likely as females to tell no one about being sexually harassed. Research with college students across the world indicates that, despite the fact they report experiencing behaviors that fit the legal definition of sexual harassment, they do not label their experiences as such.

Although the existence of laws and policies opposing sexual harassment are no guarantee that it will be reported, there is considerable evidence indicating that students are less likely to experience teacher/student sexual harassment and peer sexual harassment if they attend schools/colleges that have a policy prohibiting sexual harassment that is widely disseminated and enforced. A policy alone will not solve sexual harassment, but it is the foundation on which to build a strategy of prevention.

According to OCR, a comprehensive approach for eliminating harassment includes developing and disseminating strong, written policies specifically prohibiting harassment. These policies should take into account the significant legal factors relevant to determining whether unlawful harassment has occurred and should be tailored to the needs of the particular school or school district. Components of an effective policy statement that have been identified in the sexual harassment literature that accomplishes OCR's recommendations include a statement of purpose of the policy, legal definition of harassment, behavioral examples of harassment, a statement concerning the impact of sexual harassment, a statement of the school's responsibility in responding to complaints, a statement concerning confidentiality of complaint procedures, a statement concerning sanctions available, a statement prohibiting retaliation and establishing sanctions for retaliation, a statement concerning false complaints, and identification and background of individual(s) responsible for hearing complaints, including telephone numbers and office locations.

A school or campus that pays attention to each of these will be doing what is necessary to put together a program that will meet the needs of students and stand the ultimate test in courts, if that should ever become necessary. A court test of a policy probably will never happen if the policy is designed to do what it would be tested for: its ability to prevent and handle problems before they get out of control and before the level of legal liability is reached.

Once the policy is completed, it must be clearly and regularly communicated. OCR recommends that the policy statement be reissued each year by the senior administrator as well as placed prominently throughout the school/campus. In addition, the policy statement should be published in student, faculty, and employee handbooks.

The responsibility for communicating the policy statement must be made a part of the job description of anyone with authority in the school/campus. It is also recommended that students sign a sheet that they have been given a copy of the policy and that they understand their rights and responsibilities (Paludi & Paludi, 2003).

Results from the AAUW studies as well as other empirical research on students' experiences with sexual harassment suggest that procedures for investigating complaints of sexual harassment must take into account the psychological issues involved in the victimization process. These issues include individuals' feelings of powerlessness, isolation, changes in their social network patterns, and wish to gain control over their personal and career development. Research has indicated that the experience of participating in an investigative process can be as emotionally and physically stressful as the sexual harassment itself. Therefore, it is important not only to build in several support systems but also to help complainants and alleged perpetrators cope with the process of the complaint procedure. Counselors may work with the investigator for this purpose (Paludi & Barickman, 1998).

Although each school district and college typically establishes its own complaint procedure that fits with its unique needs, OCR has identified three guidelines that apply to investigations of sexual harassment. One of these is that the school has an obligation to make the environment free of sexual harassment and free of the fear of being retaliated against for filing a complaint of sexual harassment. A second guideline is that individuals should be informed that the school will not ignore any complaint of sexual harassment. And, the third guideline is that investigations of sexual harassment complaints will be completed promptly.

In addition to these guidelines, OCR offers several "practical considerations" for establishing effective grievance procedures. These considerations take the form of questions that should be answered in the document describing the procedures for grievances: How many levels will the procedure have, and what will be the time frame for each level? Who may file complaints on behalf of the injured party? Should investigations be conducted by building administrators, other building staff, or district-level officials? Should an evidentiary hearing be part of the process? Should district-level administrators review the investigator's decision in all instances or only when the decision is appealed?

TRAINING AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Schools and campuses are required to take reasonable steps to prevent and end sexual harassment of their students as well as their faculty, administrators, and employees, including facilitating training programs on sexual harassment awareness. Training programs involve more than a recitation of individuals' rights and responsibilities and what the law and school/campus policy requires. Training also requires dealing with individuals' assumptions and misconceptions about power as well as the anxieties about the training itself. Stereotypes about females, males, sex, and power often remain unchallenged unless individuals participate in effective trainer-guided intervention programs (Paludi & Paludi, 2003).

In addition, training programs on sexual harassment must provide all individuals with a clear understanding of their rights and responsibilities with respect to sexual harassment. Training must also enable individuals to distinguish between behavior that is sexual harassment and behavior that is not sexual harassment. Training programs also provide individuals with information concerning the policy statement against sexual harassment and investigatory procedures set up by the school. Finally, training programs have as their goal to help empower individuals to use their school's procedures for resolving complaints.

There has been relatively little empirical research on the impact of training programs on individuals' attitudes and behavior with respect to sexual harassment. The available research has indicated that training increases the tendency to perceive and report sexual harassment and makes college students more sensitive to incidents of sexual harassment especially when case analyses are used. Training also assists sexual harassment contact persons with listening and helping skills and confidence, and it increases knowledge and changes attitudes (see Paludi & Paludi, 2003).

To supplement the training programs in sexual harassment awareness, there are additional educational programs that have been recommended in the literature. These suggest including information on sexual harassment in new student/employee orientation materials; facilitating a "sexual harassment awareness week" and scheduling programs that include lectures, guided video discussions, and plays; reporting annually on sexual harassment; encouraging teachers to incorporate discussions of sexual harassment in their classrooms; encouraging students to start an organization with the purpose of preventing sexual harassment; providing educational sessions for parents about sexual harassment and the school district's policy and procedures (see Sandler & Stonehill, 2005, for additional suggestions).

Interventions created to combat sexual harassment should involve students in making policies intended to alter the school climate with regard to these forms of victimization in order to promote positive interaction among students; this will serve to promote inclusion and empowerment for students. Interventions should also send a clear message that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. Teachers, administrators, parents, and all school staff should be included as well as students. It is only when the entire school community is included that successful change can occur.

REMEDIES THROUGH THE OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

The OCR enforces Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments. When their investigations indicate a violation of Title IX has occurred, OCR provides an opportunity to the school district/campus to voluntarily correct the problem. If the school refuses to correct the situation, OCR initiates enforcement action.

Remedies sought by OCR for harassment include corrective and preventive actions to stop the harassment and minimize the chance of its recurrence. This can take the form of counseling and/or discipline of the harasser and age-appropriate training for students and staff on how to recognize harassment and what to do if they are harassed or observe harassment. Other corrective and preventive actions include psychological or other counseling; compensatory education to make up for any time lost from the educational program as a result of the harassment; adjustment of any grades affected by the harassment and/or the opportunity to repeat a course (without additional cost at the postsecondary level). If the complainant was forced to leave the academic program due to the harassment, reimbursement for any costs that occurred as a result and/or an opportunity to reenroll should be provided. An example would be tuition reimbursement for a public high school student who was forced to leave the high school because of the harassment and enrolled in a private school instead. Another example would be an opportunity for a student who was forced by the harassment to drop out of college to reenroll.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. (1993). *Hostile hallways: The annual survey on sexual harassment in America's schools.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. (2001). *Hostile hallways: Bullying, teasing, and sexual harassment in school.* Washington, DC: Author.

Fineran, S., & Gruber, J. (2004, July). *Research on bullying and sexual harassment in secondary schools: Incidence, interrelationships and psychological implications.* Paper presented at the Association for Gender Equity Leadership in Education, Washington, DC.

Fitzgerald, L., & Ormerod, A. (1993). Sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. In F. Denmark & M. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (pp. 553–582). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Fitzgerald, L., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Oermerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*(2), 152–175.

Hill, C., & Silva, E. (2005). *Drawing the line: Sexual harassment on campus.* Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.

Paludi, M., & Barickman, R. (1998). *Sexual harassment, work, and education: A resource manual for prevention.*Albany: State University of New York Press.

Paludi, M., & Paludi, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A handbook of cultural, social science, management and legal perspectives.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Sandler, B.R., & Stonehill, H. (2005). *Student-to-student sexual harassment in K–12: Strategies and solutions for educators to use in the classroom, school, and community.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Michele Paludi

Students' Rights in U.S. Higher Education

When considering the topic of students' rights in U.S. higher education, it is important to recognize that the rights of college students at public institutions of higher education are fundamentally different from those of students attending private institutions of higher education. As the Supreme Court noted in *Tinker v. Des Moines Ind. Comm. School Dist.* (393 US 503, 1969), "It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers [at public institutions] shed their constitutional rights. . . at the schoolhouse gate." However, private institutions of higher education have no legal obligation to afford students the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The courts will, instead, demand that private institutions afford students the rights promised in various institutional documents including the student handbook. Beyond constitutional rights, public institutions will also be expected to afford students those additional rights set forth in institutional documents. The courts have treated those documents as the foundation of a contractual relationship between institutions and students. Another source of students' rights in higher education is federal legislation, which typically places obligations on all institutions that are recipients of federal financial assistance.

FROM UNFETTERED AUTHORITY OF COLLEGES TO DUE PROCESS FOR STUDENTS

For the first 300 years of the history of American higher education, colleges and universities were assumed to have basically unfettered authority over college students. In 1913, the Kentucky Supreme Court formally articulated the legal theory that would continue to hold sway for another 50 years. In *Gott v. Berea* (156 Ky 376), the court ruled that colleges and universities stand *in loco parentis,* or literally in place of the parents. The court observed:

> College authorities stand *in loco parentis* concerning the physical and moral welfare, and mental training of the pupils, and we are unable to see why to that end

> they may not make any rule or regulation for the government, or betterment of their pupils that a parent could for the same purpose.

The court placed few limits on the rules that colleges and universities could establish beyond those rules that were "unlawful or against public policy."

For almost five decades following this decision, the courts rejected virtually every attempt to challenge an institution's authority to discipline students in the manner the institutions considered appropriate. During this period, most institutions enforced rules that severely limited student behavior and often placed greater restrictions on women students than men. Common parietal rules during this period included curfews for women students—although less commonly for men—prohibitions against smoking in public, dress codes, and restrictions on riding in cars.

The turning point in the history of students' rights occurred in 1961 with the decision from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* (294 F. 29 150). This case arose as a result of disciplinary action taken by the state of Alabama against a group of students at Alabama State College for Negroes in Montgomery (now Alabama State University). Six students filed suit against the Alabama State Board of Education after they were removed from the institution for their involvement in civil rights protests. The students participated in demonstrations at a segregated lunch counter in the basement of the Montgomery County Courthouse as well as in a demonstration on the steps of the state capitol. The day following the demonstration at the state capitol, which involved more than 600 students, Governor John Patterson convened a meeting of the State Board of Education to consider disciplinary action against 29 students whom the governor considered the "ring leaders" of these civil rights protests. The students did not attend the hearing. In fact, the students were not even informed that the Board was meeting. The State Board of Education voted, based largely upon information from the Governor, to expel nine students and to place the other students facing charges on probation. The students were notified in writing by Dr. Trenholm, president of Alabama State, of this action in letters dated March 4 or March 5.

With the support of the Legal Defense and Education Fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, including Thurgood Marshall and Jack Greenberg, six of the expelled students brought suit in federal court against the Alabama State Board of Education claiming that their constitutional rights had been violated. After the district court ruled for the state, the students appealed the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. That court ruled that due process requires notice and some opportunity for a hearing before students at a tax-supported college are expelled for misconduct. The court ruled that when the state takes action against an individual, the Constitution demands that due process be afforded. The court noted:

> In the disciplining of college students there are no considerations of immediate danger to the public, or of peril to the national security, which should prevent the Board from exercising at least the fundamental principles of fairness by giving the accused students notice of the charges and an opportunity to be heard in their own defense.

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of the court's ruling in *Dixon.* Although the Supreme Court did not hear the *Dixon* case, it later described the ruling as a landmark decision in the area of student discipline in public higher education. While the *Dixon* case is now more than 40 years old, the court's decision remains the foundational statement of student due process in public higher education. The rights to notice of the charges and an opportunity for a hearing at which to present a defense against the charges remain at the heart of students' due process rights in public higher education. More broadly, *Dixon* represents the federal courts' first application of the U.S. Constitution to the legal relationship between public institutions of higher education and students. This decision is grounded in the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause.

In the years that followed, numerous courts have reinforced and expanded the rights articulated in *Dixon* and, despite some difference in legal interpretations, courts usually will accord students the right to hear the evidence against them and to present oral testimony or, at minimum, written statements from witnesses. There are, however, issues upon which various courts have reached different conclusions. Most notable is the right to counsel in student disciplinary proceedings. In *Gabrilowitz v. Newman* (582 F.2d 100 (1st Cir., 1978)), the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit concluded that, because the student was facing criminal charges resulting from the same set of facts, he was entitled to receive advice of his attorney during the disciplinary hearing. However, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in *Osteen v. Henley* (13 F.3d 221, 223 (7th Cir., 1993)) concluded that the right to counsel was potentially even more limited.

In addition to the specific requirements of due process, the Supreme Court also requires that institutions avoid rules that are unconstitutionally vague. In *Connally v. General Const. Co.* (269 US 385, 1926), the Court noted that rules must be clear and specific enough that people are not forced to guess at their meanings and differ as to their applications. Because the Supreme Court has not directly addressed the rights enjoyed by college and university students at public institutions, the specific requirements of due process are not as clearly established as other areas of constitutional law and requirements may vary somewhat from one jurisdiction to another.

It is important to recognize, however, that not all disputes between a student and the institution demand the same level of due process. The Supreme Court has clearly distinguished between the process required when students are dismissed for academic reasons and the process required when they are dismissed for reasons related to their conduct. In *Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz* (435 US 78, 1978), the Supreme Court ruled that students facing suspension or dismissal for academic performance are only entitled to be informed of the faculty's dissatisfaction with their academic performance and that the faculty's decision was careful and deliberate.

OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

In addition to their rights under the due process clause of the Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment, students at public colleges and universities in the United States are also granted rights under the First and Fourth Amendments and the Fourteenth Amendment's equal protection clause. While private institutions are not required to afford students constitutional rights, private institutions will also be expected to provide the rights described within the institution's contracts with students. Under the First Amendment, students at public colleges and universities are entitled to freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of association.

Many of the cases through which these rights were established took place during the student protest era of the 1960s and early 1970s. In *Healy v. James* (408 US 169, 1972), for example, the court noted that state colleges and universities are not immune from the sweep of the First Amendment and that First Amendment protections should apply with no less force on college campuses than in the community at large. The courts have granted the greatest protections under the First Amendment to expression that takes place in a public forum. While institutions cannot base restrictions on the content of student expression, institutions can place reasonable time, manner, and place restrictions on student protests. More recently, the courts have invalidated institutional policies that prohibited or punished racist or intolerant speech. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the courts overturned hate speech codes at a number of institutions including the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, and George Mason University. Hate speech codes referred to institutional policies that were developed to prohibit racist or intolerant speech, particularly when directed at women or students of color. In more recent cases, the courts have invalidated such policies even if they have never been enforced because, by their very existence, they have a "chilling effect" on freedom of speech. These cases, along with Supreme Court precedents, make it clear that public institutions are extremely limited in their ability to lawfully restrict student speech. However, institutions can constitutionally punish conduct or behavior, as distinct from speech, which is motivated by bias or intolerance.

While the First Amendment does not include a clear right of association, the Supreme Court has noted that it was implicit in rights articulated in the First Amendment. In the previously cited *Healy v. James* decision, the Supreme Court ruled that Central Connecticut State College had violated the First Amendment in refusing to recognize a student chapter of Students for Democratic Society because the college's president disagreed with the group's beliefs. However, the court did identify three forms of behavior for which an institution could justifiably refuse to recognize a student organization: refusing to follow reasonable campus rules, interrupting classes, and engaging in illegal activity or inciting imminent lawless action. In subsequent cases, the court's decision was extended to require that institutions that grant student groups access to institutional funding and the right to reserve rooms on campus must also do so without regard to the content of the group's beliefs. In *Rosenberger v. Rector and Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia* (515 U.S. 819, 1995), the Supreme Court ruled the institutions making funding decisions for student organizations must be viewpoint neutral in the decision-making process. The Supreme Court returned to the issue of funding student organizations when students at the University of Wisconsin challenged, as violating the First Amendment, the use of their mandatory student activity fees to support student organizations with which they disagreed. In *Board of Regents v. Southworth* (529 U.S. 217, 2000), the court ruled that mandatory student activity fees did not violate the First Amendment as long as the fees were distributed in a manner that was viewpoint neutral.

Students at public institutions also enjoy protections under the Fourth Amendment against unreasonable searches and seizures. However, these rights are generally less extensive than the rights enjoyed by citizens in their homes. The primary exceptions that limit students' Fourth Amendment rights are institutions' ability to conduct certain administrative searches. For example, institutions can legally engage in searches for the purpose of protecting health and safety. Violations of institutional policy discovered in the course of these searches can be used as the basis for disciplinary action or even criminal prosecution. The courts have also often allowed warrantless searches when the purpose of the search is the enforcement of institutional policies rather than criminal prosecution. Other exceptions include searches conducted with consent, items in plain view, and searches conducted in emergency circumstances. As with other areas of constitutional law, these restrictions do not apply to administrations at private institutions unless they are acting at the direction of the police.

RIGHTS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

College and university students also enjoy two types of protection against illegal discrimination. First, students at public colleges and universities are protected in part by the Fourteenth Amendment's equal protection clause. The Fourteenth Amendment served as the foundation for the Supreme Court's decisions in both *Brown v. Board of Education* (347 US 483, 1954), which made racial segregation in public schools illegal, and *United States v. Virginia* (518 US 515, 1996), which ordered that women be admitted to Virginia Military Institute and the Citadel in South Carolina.

Second, students at colleges and universities that receive federal financial assistance are also protected under a number of pieces of federal civil rights legislation. All public universities and almost all private universities are recipients of federal financial assistance that includes not only direct federal aid to the institution but also any federal financial aid received by students. There are only a small number of private institutions of higher education that do not allow their students to participate in any federal financial aid programs. These institutions include Bob Jones University (SC), Grove City College (PA), and Hillsdale College (MI). At institutions that receive any federal funds, the relevant aspects of federal civil rights legislation to students include:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §2000d)
  > No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.
- Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. §1681 *et seq.*)
  > No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.
- Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §794)
  > No otherwise qualified individual with a disability in the United States . . . shall, solely by reason of her or his disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

Two issues related to federal civil rights legislation require additional consideration: affirmative action and sexual harassment. The Supreme Court addressed the legality of affirmative action programs in higher education in its 2003 decisions in *Gratz v. Bollinger* (539 US 244) and *Grutter v. Bollinger* (539 US 306). Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, writing the majority opinion in *Grutter,* reinforced Justice Lewis Powell's decision 25 years earlier in *Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke* (438 US 26 5, 1978). Justice O'Connor ruled that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution does not prohibit the narrowly tailored use of race in admissions decisions to further a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body. However, the legal issues related to affirmative action were not resolved fully by the *Gratz* and *Grutter* decisions as the court has yet to articulate the parameters of a narrowly tailored admissions process.

When considering Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, the issues reach far beyond admissions. The courts have extended protections against sexual harassment in the business context to the educational field. The Supreme Court has addressed sexual harassment in education twice in recent years in *Gebser v. Lago Independent School Dist.* (524 U.S. 274, 1998) and *Davis v. Monroe County School Dist.* (526 U.S. 629, 1999).

Although both of these cases are from K–12 settings, the rulings also apply to colleges and universities. Under the *Gebser* ruling, colleges and universities can be held liable for monetary damages for sexual harassment as a violation of Title IX. In order to succeed in a sexual harassment claim against an institution for sexual harassment by an employee, a student must demonstrate that actual notice was made to officials who have authority to act and who responded with deliberate indifference. The *Davis* ruling extended *Gebser* to address student-on-student sexual harassment that creates a hostile environment in violation of Title IX. The student must demonstrate that the sexual harassment was so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it can be said to deprive the victims of access to the educational opportunities or benefits provided by the school. In addition to lawsuits, students can also file a complaint with the U.S. Department of Education for violations of Title IX. While the student cannot receive monetary damages, the U.S. Department of Education has the authority to order institutions to make policy changes.

STUDENT PRIVACY RIGHTS

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) was passed by Congress as part of the Educational Amendments of 1974. FERPA was an amendment to this larger piece of legislation sponsored by Senator James Buckley. FERPA conferred upon parents, or eligible students, three primary rights related to their education records: (a) the right to inspect and review/right to access education records; (b) the right to challenge the content of education records; and (c) the right to consent to the disclosure of education records. In the context of higher education, it is important to understand that, by definition, the rights under FERPA rest with the students regardless of their age. This differs significantly from the K–12 context where the rights rest with parents until the student turns 18.

Under FERPA, the records cover what the regulations refer to as “education records” and are defined very broadly to include all records that are directly related to a student and maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a party acting for the agency or institution. There are various documents or records that are excluded from the definition of education records including: sole possession records, records of a law enforcement unit, employment records (except when a student is employed as a result of his or her student status), certain medical records, and alumni records. Students may request access to their education records, and institutions are required to provide a student access to, but not generally copies of, the education records in question.

FERPA also generally limits the release of students’ education records without written consent. However, Congress has enacted numerous exceptions to the written consent requirement since FERPA’s passage. These exceptions include:

- release to school officials with legitimate educational interest,
- release to the parents of dependent student as defined by the IRS,
- release in a health or safety emergency,
- release of directory information,
- release of the final results of a disciplinary proceeding to the victim of alleged crime of violence,
- release of information regarding violations of institutional alcohol policies or laws to the parents of student under the age of 21, and
- release of information regarding the final results of a disciplinary proceeding to the public when a student is found responsible of a violation that corresponds to the definitions of a crime of violence.

Congress has continued to expand the exceptions to the written consent requirement in recent years. The Supreme Court also ruled that students could not use 42 U.S.C. §1983 as the grounds for a civil lawsuit against an institution for violations of FERPA. The court placed the responsibility for enforcement of FERPA's mandates on the U.S. Department of Education (*Gonzaga Univ. v. Doe,* 536 U.S. 273, 2002).

GENDER AND STUDENTS' RIGHTS

There are inherent gender issues in any discussion of students' rights in U.S. higher education. In the era of *in loco parentis,* male and female students were subjected to disciplinary systems that severely constrained behavior and addressed violations of those rules in a manner that did not place a high value on students' rights. However, it should be acknowledged that female students faced even greater restrictions on their behavior. The decisions in *Dixon* and other student discipline cases of the 1960s and 1970s, coupled with broader societal changes, helped to remake student life on campus. While all students enjoyed new freedoms on campus, the past restrictions may have made this change more profound for female students.

In more recent years, rules governing students' rights have dealt with gender in two distinct ways. Some have explicitly focused on gender, especially on abolishing gender and other forms of discrimination. Others purport to be gender-neutral rules concerning the rights of all students, regardless of gender. Not surprisingly, the former are often more controversial than the latter. Title IX, for example, has evoked controversies on campuses, in courts, and in Congress ever since its original passage. Even today, it is viewed by some as having failed to achieve equity for women in school sports, while others see it as a law that has imposed reverse discrimination on men by eliminating some of their athletic scholarships and teams in favor of giving undeserved support to women.

Even when rules are gender neutral in formulation, they may not be so in perception or in practice. Rules of conduct, for example, may make no mention of gender but may raise important gender issues in those student discipline cases that arise from the roles of male students as perpetrators and female students as victims of violations of the code of student conduct. While not the most commonly adjudicated cases on campus by far, cases that involve students as both victims and perpetrators create a tension between the rights of the accused student and the rights of the accusing student. Under the laws and court cases summarized here, public institutions of higher education have a legal obligation to address the rights of both groups, whatever their gender composition, when dealing with student disciplinary cases, including student-on-student sexual harassment and physical assaults.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Dannells, M. (1997). *From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, *25*(2)). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Downs, D.A. (2005). *Restoring free speech and liberty on campus.* Oakland, CA: The Independent Institute.

Kaplin, W.A., & Lee, B.A. (2006). *The law of higher education* (4th ed., Vols. 1–2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lancaster, J. (Ed.) (2006). *Exercising power with wisdom—The bridge from legal to developmental practice.* Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.

Paterson, B.G., & Kibler, W.L. (Eds.). (1998). *The administration of campus discipline: Student, organizational, and community issues.* Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.

Silverglate, H.A., & Gewolb, J. (2003). *FIRE's guide to due process and fair procedure on campus.* Philadelphia: Foundation for Individual Rights in Education.

Stoner, E.N., II, & Lowery, J.W. (2004). Navigating past the "spirit of insubordination": A twenty-first century model student conduct code with a model hearing script. *Journal of College and University Law, 31*(1), 1–77.

John Wesley Lowery

Title IX and School Sports

According to figures provided by the National Women's Law Center (2002), the number of girls and women participating in school-based sport in the United States has skyrocketed over the past 35 years. During 1971 to 1972, the 300,000 girls participating in high school athletics in the United States made up only 7.4 percent of all high school athletes. By 2000 to 2001, almost three million girls were participating in high school athletics and the percent of girls among all high school athletes rose to around 42 percent. At the collegiate level, in 1971 to 1972 only 30,000 women participated in intercollegiate sport, accounting for only 15 percent of all college athletes. By 2000 to 2001, there were 150,000 women participating in college sports and 42 percent of all college athletes were women. The single factor that best explains the 800 percent increase in girls' participation in high school sports and the 400 percent increase in women's participation in intercollegiate sports is Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, an equal opportunity law that prohibits sex discrimination in education. Despite the progress toward gender equity within school-based sport, women still do not enjoy equal or equitable opportunities in athletics relative to men. Although there is widespread public support for Title IX and gender equity within sport, the controversy around dismantling male dominance within athletics remains.

EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF TITLE IX LEGISLATION

Building on the successes of the civil rights movement, in the late 1960s and early 1970s women's rights activists worked on drafting legislation to address discrimination against women. Using the language of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as a model, advocates for gender equity in education developed the federal Title IX legislation that prohibited sex discrimination within educational institutions in the United States that receive federal monies. In 1972, Congresswoman Edith Green and Senator Birch Bayh introduced the Title IX legislation to Congress, and without too much fanfare or controversy Congress passed the legislation that same year (Suggs, 2005). On June 23, 1972, President Nixon signed Title IX of the Educational Amendments into law. In part, the statute reads: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.).

Although Title IX applies to all types of educational programs and addresses issues such as sexual harassment, the law quickly became associated with gender equity in athletics. Partly by design, there was very little discussion during the congressional debates of how the antidiscrimination bill was to affect school-based sports. However, in 1974 when the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) was drafting the Title IX regulations on college sports, debate over how Title IX was going to affect college sports emerged. Senator John Tower of Texas proposed an amendment to Title IX that would exempt revenue-producing sports (i.e., men's football) from being tabulated when determining Title IX compliance. Congress rejected the Tower amendment. Senator Jacob Javits of New York then put forth an alternative amendment that cleared the way for the passage of Title IX regulations for interscholastic and intercollegiate athletics. In 1975, Congress passed and President Ford signed into law the Title IX regulations.

The Title IX regulations established the following: (a) sex discrimination is prohibited in any interscholastic, intercollegiate, club, or intramural athletics; (b) separate sport teams for women and men are allowed; however, if a sport is not offered to one group, the excluded sex must be allowed to try out for the team provided that the sport is not a contact sport; and (c) equal opportunity in treatment and participation must be provided, whereas equal expenditures for female and male teams is not mandatory. Elementary schools were given one year to comply with the regulations, and secondary and postsecondary educational institutions were given three years to comply. Currently, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) at the U.S. Department of Education oversees Title IX compliance, complaints, and violations. The OCR assesses Title IX compliance on a program-wide basis. The ultimate penalty for noncompliance is the withdrawal of federal financial assistance to the school. To date, no institution has lost federal funding because of noncompliance with Title IX regulations.

In 1979, Title IX regulations were further developed and adopted by HEW through the document "Policy Interpretation: Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics." This document set out the basis of the Title IX three-prong test of compliance. In 1996, these compliance requirements were clarified by the OCR through the document "Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletic Policy Guidance: The Three-Part Test." These policy interpretations specify three dimensions of gender equity in athletics: *participation, scholarships,* and *other benefits of sports programming.* Postsecondary institutions have the flexibility of complying with Title IX in the area of *participation* through any one of three prongs, which has become known as the three-prong test. The first way for a school to comply with the participation requirements is to demonstrate that female and male students participate in intercollegiate athletic programs in numbers substantially proportionate to their undergraduate enrollment at the school. This prong is known as substantial proportionality and requires a comparison of the ratio of female and male athletic opportunities to female and male full-time undergraduates. The second way a school can meet the participation requirement of Title IX is to show a history and continuing practice of program expansion for the underrepresented sex. The third way an institution can comply is to demonstrate that the athletic department is fully and effectively accommodating the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex.

The OCR has no preferred way for an institution to comply with the Title IX participation regulation; however, the first prong of substantial proportionality has been deemed a "safe harbor" for Title IX compliance (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). During the 1990s, courts repeatedly ruled that if an institution complies with the substantial proportionality prong the institution is essentially immune from lawsuits and complaints filed with the civil rights office (Suggs, 2003). Courts have cited figures of plus or minus 3 to 5 percentage points as the criterion to determine if a school is offering proportional opportunities in athletics to women and men students. According to a report by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO, 2000), from 1994 through 1998, the OCR reviewed 74 cases involving Title IX participation complaints. Of these, 28.4 percent (21 schools) were held in compliance under prong one and the rest of the schools complied under prongs two or three.

In the area of *scholarships,* Title IX requires that an educational institution must ensure that the athletic scholarships given to female and male student athletes are awarded in about the same ratio as the percentages of females and males participating in the athletic program. If women make up 42 percent of the athletes at the institution, then women must receive about 42 percent of the scholarship money awarded by the athletic department. In the area of *other benefits of sports programming,* an institution must ensure that female and male athletes are treated equitably in the provision of (a) equipment and supplies, (b) scheduling of games and practice times, (c) travel and daily allowance, (d) access to tutoring, (e) coaching, (f) locker rooms, (g) practice and competitive facilities, (h) medical and training facilities and services, (i) publicity and promotions, (j) recruitment of student athletes, and (k) support services.

ENFORCEMENT CONTROVERSIES AND LEGAL CHALLENGES

Since the law was enacted, there have been many rounds of heated debates and controversies about how Title IX should be enforced (Staurowsky, 1995, 1996; Suggs, 2005). As HEW was drafting the Title IX regulations for athletics in the late 1970s, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), which offered few programs for women, rallied against the regulations. Conservative members of Congress, such as Senator Jesse Helms, also attempted to curtail Title IX enforcement. Nonetheless, the positive effect of the legislation on girls' and women's participation in athletics was immediate. Even before the three-year grace period had ended in 1978, women's sports grew by leaps and bounds. Schools hired women coaches, added girls/women's teams, and converted existing girls/women's intramural programs into varsity programs. These changes reflected and contributed to the growing women's movement in the United States during the period.

However, by the early 1980s, progress toward equal opportunities for girls and women in sports slowed. The election of President Reagan in 1980 ushered in a backlash against civil rights laws and gains. In 1980, the U.S. Department of Education was established and the OCR began to oversee Title IX. In the mid-1980s, the control of women's intercollegiate sports shifted from the women-dominated Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women to the male-dominated NCAA, even though the takeover was contested in a legal battle that reached the U.S. Supreme Court. Another major setback to gender equity for women in sports came with the 1984 court case of *Grove City College v. Bell* (465 US 555). In this pivotal case, the Reagan administration argued that only entities within universities and colleges that were direct recipients of federal funding should have to comply with Title IX regulations. The U.S. Supreme Court agreed and the ruling effectively exempted athletic departments from Title IX regulations. The power of Title IX in the area of athletics was immediately lost.

As the political and economic climate started to change in the late 1980s, Congress passed, over a veto by President Reagan, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, which restored the original power of Title IX in the area of athletics. The Civil Rights

Restoration Act, which passed in 1988, explicitly states that all programs supported and offered by a school that receives federal monies must comply with Title IX regulations. Athletic departments were no longer exempt from Title IX. As an indication of the political and legal shift regarding Title IX, in 1990 the OCR issued a Title IX Investigation Manual for schools to evaluate Title IX compliance. With Title IX restored, female athletes seized the moment to use the courts to force schools to comply with Title IX. In 1992, one of the most critical Title IX legal cases—*Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools* (503 US 60)—came before the U.S. Supreme Court. The case involved a sexual harassment allegation from a high school student against a coach at her school. The student claimed that school officials knew about the harassment but did nothing to stop it. In their decision, the Supreme Court ruled for the first time that plaintiffs suing institutions for Title IX violations could seek monetary damages for alleged intentional sex discrimination. The decision immediately gave Title IX more enforcement teeth. Schools that ignored the law before were put on notice that financial penalties could be awarded by the courts in Title IX cases. Schools took note and athletes began demanding their rights.

In situations where schools dropped women's sport teams to deal with financial shortfalls, women athletes were particularly successful in their strategy of turning to the courts. Simply threatening a lawsuit was also an effective strategy to gain more opportunities and resources for women in athletics (Pelak, 2002). One of the most important victories for Title IX during the 1990s was the class action suit against Brown University, which was filed in 1992 and made its way to the Supreme Court in 1997. The case was initiated when Brown University dropped its varsity programs for women's gymnastics and women's volleyball. The Brown case revolved around the appropriateness of the three-prong test and particularly the issue of proportional representation of women students in athletics. Lawyers for the administration of Brown University claimed that men were more interested in sports and, thus, it is appropriate to offer men students more opportunities to participate in sports. The Supreme Court disagreed and refused to hear the Brown case. Thus, the ruling by the lower court, the First Circuit, that Brown University was in violation of all prongs of the three-part test for equitable participation held. Brown University was forced to reinstate women's gymnastics and women's volleyball (Haworth, 1997).

This was a symbolically important Title IX case because Brown University spent millions of dollars fighting the case and had a large number of groups and institutions sign onto the case on their behalf, including 60 colleges and universities, numerous collegiate coaching associations, various athletic and higher-education associations, USA Wrestling, USA Swimming, United States Water Polo, 48 U.S. Representatives, and one U.S. Senator. In the end, the administration of Brown University and the many other opponents of Title IX lost the case. The court decision made it clear that stereotypes purporting that women do not want to participate in competitive athletics was not a valid argument at the turn of the twenty-firs century.

The 1990s also brought new legislation that encouraged heightened enforcement of Title IX. In 1994, Congress passed the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA), which requires coeducational institutions that participate in any federal student financial aid program and have an intercollegiate athletics program to disclose, with annual reports, certain information regarding their athletics program. The EADA requires athletic departments to report roster sizes of women's and men's teams, as well as budgets for recruiting, scholarships, coaches' salaries, and other expenses. These data are proving to be useful in highlighting the persistent gender inequalities in collegiate athletics and are helping in local efforts to make educational institutions more accountable. The National Women's Law Center, which has litigated many of the Title IX lawsuits and lobbied heavily in favor of strong enforcement of Title IX, has used the EADA data to file complaints against institutions with gender imbalances in their athletic departments. During the 1990s, the Clinton administration also demonstrated strong support for enforcement of Title IX. Norma Cantu was named the Assistant Secretary of Education for Civil Rights in 1993 and fought hard to improve enforcement of Title IX. As mentioned above, in 1996 the OCR issued a policy guidance document that clarified in a strict fashion the regulations around equity in participation opportunities known as the three-prong test.

With the successes of Title IX court cases and enforcement during the 1990s, a backlash emerged. Opponents of Title IX claimed that gender equity regulations were hurting men's sports and that the way the courts were applying the three-prong test was an illegal quota. Male wrestlers and their supporters, who believed that Title IX was the reason why men's wrestling programs and other nonrevenue men's sports were being cut, led the organized opposition. In 2002, the National Wrestling Coaches Association and other Title IX opponents filed a federal lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Education challenging Title IX regulations and policies. After the Supreme Court refused to hear the case, the wrestlers and others opposing Title IX regulations found a sympathetic ear in the Bush administration. During June 2002, Roderick Paige, the new Secretary of the Department of Education under President George W. Bush, convened a Commission on Opportunity in Athletics to supposedly see that athletic opportunities were expanding and to ensure fairness to all athletes. The women's rights community was outraged by the commission, which they saw as an effort to undermine Title IX enforcement and reinforce male dominance in athletics. The Commission proceedings were fraught with tensions, and observers claim that concern for the inequities that women still face in athletics was rarely expressed during commission debates (Suggs, 2005). At the end of the six months of proceedings, the commission submitted a report with recommendations to the U.S. Secretary of Education. Commission members Donna de Varona and Julie Foudy strongly disagreed with the report and submitted a minority report urging the U.S. Department of Education to step up enforcement of Title IX. One year later, the OCR issued a clarification of Title IX policy that did nothing to change existing Title IX regulations but emphasized the flexibility of the three-prong test and discouraged schools from dropping sport teams to comply with Title IX regulations.

According to the empirical evidence, blaming the decline in men's wrestling teams on Title IX regulations is simply unfounded (National Women's Law Center, 2002). Between 1984 and 1988, a time when Title IX did not apply to athletic departments because of the *Grove City* court case, the number of NCAA men's wrestling programs dropped by 55 from 289 to 234. Since Title IX was not in effect during these years, it is hard to blame the loss of the wrestling programs on the gender equity legislation. In contrast, between 1988 and 2000, a 12-year period in which Title IX applied to athletic departments, there were about the same number of men's wrestling programs dropped. If Title IX were responsible for the loss of wrestling programs, one would expect that far more programs would have been dropped during the 12-year period than the earlier four-year period. Moreover, during this same period, women's gymnastics also suffered a substantial decline. Between 1982 and 2000, 90 of the 179 women's gymnastics programs sponsored by the NCAA were dropped, representing almost of half of the existing programs.

Schools decide to drop teams for a number of reasons including decreasing interest in specific sports, liability considerations, and/or preservation of the budgetary dominance of masculine flagship sports such as football. Despite the claims by the wrestling coaches and other opponents of Title IX, the evidence shows that between 1981 and 1998 the overall number of men's sport teams increased and men's intercollegiate athletic participation rose (National Women's Law Center, 2002). While certain men's sports like wrestling have declined, other men's sports, such as baseball, crew, football, lacrosse, and soccer, have increased. Likewise, some women's sports such as field hockey and gymnastics have also declined while other women's sports such as ice hockey and soccer have increased. Blaming the loss of wrestling or other nonrevenue producing men's sports on Title IX is misplaced and contributes to an unhelpful antagonism between women's and men's sport programs (see Staurowsky, 1996). Rather than looking to needless expenditures and/or inflated participation rates within high profile men's football and basketball programs, opponents of Title IX scapegoat women athletes, who still are not enjoying equitable opportunities within school-based sport.

TITLE IX, ATHLETIC ASSOCIATIONS, AND STATES

Lawsuits and public debates around high school athletics have centered on the inferior treatment of girls rather than centering on the issue of unequal participation rates of girls and boys (Suggs, 2005). Compared to boys' teams, girls' teams are often relegated to inferior fields and gyms and often use inferior equipment and uniforms. The issues surrounding practicing and game times are also important at the high school level. In Michigan, gender differences in the seasonal sport schedules are currently being debated in a lengthy court battle. A group of parents sued the Michigan High School Athletic Association in 1998 over the atypical seasonal sport schedule that had high school girls, in contrast to boys, playing basketball in the fall and volleyball in the winter, even though in the rest of the country high school athletes play volleyball as a fall sport and basketball as a winter sport. The parents argue that the irregular schedule systematically disadvantages girls in general and in particular girls seeking college scholarships, which are typically given after playing seasons. In 2004, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit sided with the parents and ruled that the Michigan High School Athletic Association violated the constitutional rights of the girls. While an appeal in the case is still pending, the girls at Michigan high schools continue to play an off-season schedule.

An earlier case with important implications for the promotion of gender equity at the high school level involved the Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Association (TSSAA), which the U.S. Supreme Court heard in 2000. This case involves the question of whether the TSSAA, a nonprofit corporation that regulates interscholastic athletics in Tennessee's public and private high schools, should be considered a state actor and, thus, be required to comply with the equal protection clause of the Constitution. The Supreme Court ruled that the TSSAA was subject to the U.S. Constitution because the association operates as an arm of the state. This decision is important to Title IX because it means that state athletic associations cannot insulate themselves from liability for civil rights violations when they limit girls' opportunities to participate in interscholastic athletics.

Unlike state athletic associations at the high school level, the NCAA has not been held subject to Title IX or constitutional protections. In *National Collegiate Athletic Association v. Smith* (525 US 459, 1999), the Supreme Court held that the NCAA was not subject to Title IX simply because it receives funding from federally funded schools. Their decision, however, left open other legal arguments for coverage of national athletic associations in Title IX compliance. Although the NCAA is not currently subject to Title IX legislation, the association has an interest in encouraging member institutions to comply. In 1991, NCAA published a landmark gender equity study on its member institutions. The study found that women were only 30 percent of athletes on varsity teams and women's teams of NCAA member schools received only 23 percent of operating budgets of athletic departments.

Although the NCAA has not been a perennial supporter of Title IX, during the 1990s, their actions and statements in reference to Title IX became more positive. In response to the findings of their 1991 gender equity study, the NCAA established a Gender Equity Task Force in 1993. The task force has continued to track gender inequalities at NCAA member schools and has served as an important body to encourage institutional progress on gender equity. One process that the NCAA put into place during the 1990s is the requirement that Division I schools conduct a self-study of gender equity as part of their cyclical certification process. In addition, when the OCR issued a clarification that allows Internet surveys of undergraduate students to be used as a way to measure women's interest in athletics, the NCAA came out opposing the new policy interpretations because they believed, along with women's rights advocates, that the Internet surveys could be used to dismantle progress on Title IX compliance. These and other efforts have encouraged NCAA member schools to take positive steps toward increasing women's opportunities within athletics and demonstrate the NCAA's growing commitment to Title IX.

States have also acted, or failed to act, in terms of encouraging gender equity within school-based sports. At least 20 states have either passed legislation or have legislation pending that aims to improve gender equity in athletics. Some states have also provided monetary assistance in the form of tuition waivers for women athletes and monies for building facilities for women's athletics. In 1998, the National Organization for Women negotiated an out-of-court settlement with the whole California State University system to comply with a state law that mandates immediate progress toward gender equity in athletics. There are, however, important differences across states in terms of Title IX compliance. Research has found that schools located in southern states offer far fewer opportunities to girls and women in athletics than schools in non-Southern states. Educational institutions in the northeast and far west offer the most equitable athletic opportunities for girls and women in the country.

THE STATUS OF TITLE IX TODAY

Despite the progress made toward achieving gender equity within education-based sports, girls and women are still not receiving their fair share of opportunities, resources, and attention. As the percentage of women students increases at college campuses across the country, athletic departments are finding it increasingly difficult to reach gender proportionality within athletics. During 2003 to 2004, just over 57 percent of college students were women, but only 42 percent of college athletes were women. At the high school level, the percentage of female student athletes appears to be stalled around 42 percent. Monetary expenditures, such as scholarships and team budgets, remain woefully unequal even at the turn of the twenty-first century. Although gender relations within athletics have changed dramatically over the past 35 years, much work remains to be done. The resistance to fully dismantling male dominance within athletics and the persistence of stereotypes that purport that boys and men deserve more opportunities within athletics than girls and women suggest that equitable opportunities in education are secured only through continued struggle.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Haworth, K. (1997, April 4). Colleges, sporting groups, and lawmakers back Brown University's appeal in Title IX case. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* A36.

National Women's Law Center. (2002). *The battle for gender equity in athletics: Title IX at thirty.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nwlc.org

Pelak, C.F. (2002). Women's collective identity formation in sports: A case study from women's ice hockey. *Gender and Society, 16*(1), 93–114.

Staurowsky, E. (1995). Examining the roots of a gendered division of labor in intercollegiate athletics: Insights into the gender equity debate. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 19*(1), 28–44.

Staurowsky, E. (1996). Blaming the victim: Resistance in the battle over gender equity in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 20*(2), 194–210.

Suggs, W. (2003). A federal commission wrestles with gender equity in sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(17), A41.

Suggs, W. (2005). *A place on the team: The triumph and tragedy of Title IX.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Further clarification of intercollegiate athletics policy guidance regarding Title IX compliance.* Washington, DC: Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/title9guidanceFinal.html

U.S. General Accounting Office. (2000). *Gender equity: Men's and women's participation in higher education* (Report to the Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives. Report number: GAO-01-128). Washington, DC: Author.

Cynthia Fabrizio Pelak

Women's Educational Equity Act

The Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974 reflects the historic federal role in education in the United States. Indeed, while the history of education in the United States is a history of local control, the traditional federal role in education policy and law has been a significant and powerful one for more than a century—from the establishment of land grant universities to make higher education widely available nationwide to passage of federal laws to promote equity and access to education for disenfranchised groups. The GI bill, for instance, made college possible for military veterans, including low-income men who otherwise would never have had the opportunity to gain postsecondary education. In many ways, this important federal education policy helped to create the middle class in the United States.

The 1960s and 1970s marked a new era in which the federal role in education sought to ensure equality of opportunity and overcome decades of discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, and—ultimately—sex. The "War on Poverty" launched by President Lyndon Johnson, for example, produced the landmark 1965 *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* and the *Higher Education Act*—to provide new federal funds to schools, colleges, and communities to address poverty which, as President Johnson said, is the "taproot" of unequal and inadequate educational opportunities. Indeed, 40 years later, it is clear education, particularly postsecondary education, remains the most sustainable route from poverty to social and economic self-sufficiency.

In the 1960s, Congress passed new civil rights statutes and put money behind them with new education funding programs. Title VI of the *Civil Rights Act of 1964* for the first time outlawed discrimination on the basis of race in all federally funded programs, including education. And, the law's Title IV established a small federal funding program to assist schools in their efforts to comply with desegregation mandates. In addition, the aptly named *Emergency School Aid Act* authorized new federal funds to help school districts end racial segregation and improve schooling for African American students and overcome two centuries of official racial discrimination the Supreme Court had overturned in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954).

Continuing in this tradition, Congress took a bold step in 1972 to confront sex discrimination in education. The passage of Title IX of the *Education Amendments of 1972*—a new civil rights law—marked a new era in our nation's antidiscrimination law and policy. Modeled on the major civil rights legislation of the 1960s—particularly Title VI of the *Civil Rights Act of 1964*—Title IX for the first time banned discrimination on the basis of sex in federally funded education programs.

Shortly thereafter, Arlene Horowitz, a young staffer in Congresswoman Patsy Mink's [D-HI] office, suggested perhaps Congress should create a new program (similar to the Title IV funding program) to help schools, colleges, and communities implement the mandates established by Title IX. The result was the *Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974* (PL 95-561) sponsored in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman Mink and in the Senate by Senator Walter Mondale [D-MN]. The statute also created the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs whose members were appointed by the President and confirmed by the U.S. Senate—a rarity among education advisory committees.

The Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) was, and is, the only federal education program whose sole purpose is the promotion of equal education for women and girls. Since its first funding year in 1976, the WEEA program supported model programs in every possible aspect of education—and many of these programs became permanent fixtures in the educational equity arena.

Although its funding never exceeded $10 million per year—a pittance in the context of federal education funding—WEEA targeted its resources effectively. In its early days, beginning with its first funding year (1976), WEEA supported a range of programs designed to bring educational equity into the schools and colleges. These included, for example, leadership development programs to enable women to qualify for management positions in education—as principals, superintendents, and college presidents; teacher training programs designed to enable classroom teachers to promote educational equity through both pedagogy and equitable treatment of students; and programs to promote equity for girls and women in "nontraditional" curricula and professions—math, science, and engineering, in particular. WEEA funding also supported the development of new educational materials to eliminate sex bias across the curriculum, efforts to confront sex discrimination and sexual harassment in schools and colleges and to ensure compliance with Title IX, and efforts to provide equitable educational and training programs for "re-entry" women returning to higher education.

To ensure widespread dissemination of materials produced by WEEA grantees, the WEEA office (then part of the Office of Education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) awarded a contract to the Education Development Center to establish the WEEA Publishing Center. The Center would review and publish the products of WEEA grants and sell them at reasonable cost, thus disseminating WEEA's successes nationwide. The WEEA office also convened annual meetings of WEEA grantees and provided a range of technical assistance services to grantees.

Beginning in 1979, the newly reauthorized WEEA program, with a new director (this author, who came to the program from the civil rights and feminist movements and from federal government service in civil rights), launched a "new WEEA" with a new set of funding priorities—based on extensive public comments on the proposed regulations for the WEEA program, which had been reauthorized by Congress. These priorities revolutionized WEEA in many ways—and perhaps contributed to the backlash to come. To begin, WEEA targeted substantial resources to projects specifically addressing educational equity for women and girls of color and to projects that focused on educational equity for women and girls with disabilities. This represented the first, and perhaps last, federal effort to support efforts to confront the impact of combined race/ethnicity and gender discrimination, bias, and stereotyping as well as combined gender and disability discrimination, bias, and stereotyping.

For many grantees, in fact, this was the first time they had received any federal education funding—and these WEEA grants helped to launch many organizations and leaders in the struggle for educational equity and women's leadership nationwide. For example, a recent front page article in the *New York Times,* "As Tribal Leaders, Women Still Fight Old Views" (February 17, 2006, A1), referred to a WEEA grantee as the source for data on the number of Native American women in tribal leadership: "In 1981, a study paid for by the Department of Education and called 'Ohoyo One Thousand' found that 69 of the more than 500 federally recognized American Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages were headed by women" (A1–A9). Under the new WEEA funding priorities, Ohoyo (which means "woman" in Choctaw) conducted national and regional conferences of Native women leaders, which built a powerful network that lasted long after the end of WEEA funding.

Asian Women United received WEEA funding for materials development (books such as *With Silk Wings,* for example) and for a program for Asian immigrant women that later became an independent organization that continues to grow and flourish. The Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund received WEEA grants for a range of curricular and training programs—and the original program staff and participants continue to be leaders in promoting equity for women and girls with disabilities. These are only three of the many institutions and programs that flourished with this newly focused WEEA funding. Further, the new WEEA funding priorities also inspired colleges and schools, as well as other organizations, to address the needs of women and girls of color and women and girls with disabilities.

The implementation of these new funding priorities marks one of WEEA's most significant accomplishments—making the response to combined sex plus race/ethnicity and disability discrimination, bias, and stereotyping a centerpiece of federal educational equity policy and practice. In addition, the new WEEA continued the program's traditional focus both on Title IX implementation and on promotion of women into educational leadership —but with a new twist in each arena. First, the new WEEA established a very specific priority designed to promote actual compliance with Title IX by schools and colleges—with funding not only targeted to school districts, colleges, and universities but also to those nonprofit organizations whose mission is promotion of educational equity for women and girls.

Second, rather than focus on further training of women for educational leadership—the regulations responded to the fact that exceptionally well-trained women still were being passed over for senior management positions in education. The new WEEA, therefore, established a funding priority to provide real nondiscrimination and equity training for those educational decision makers—members of school boards and boards of trustees, for instance—who are responsible for hiring educational leaders and whose bias—though often unconscious—excluded many women from positions as principals, superintendents, and college presidents.

Finally, the new WEEA regulations required all applicants, regardless of their proposed program, to demonstrate that their activities would promote educational equity for women and girls of color and for women and girls with disabilities—thus transforming the focus of the WEEA program across the board.

Despite—or perhaps because of—these successes, the Reagan Administration in the early 1980s rejected educational equity as a primary function of federal education policy. A hallmark of this policy change was the assault on the Women's Educational Equity Act. Although the full story has not yet been told, both Susan Faludi (1991) and Myra and David Sadker (1994) discuss the attacks on WEEA as emblematic of the backlash against women's equality and the assault by the New Right on federal support for educational equity.

Indeed, *Mandate for Leadership,* the Heritage Foundation's 1981 blueprint for the incoming Reagan administration on strategies to implement its agenda, specifically targeted the WEEA program for elimination—describing WEEA as "an important resource for the practice of feminist policies and politics." In 1982, an anonymous article in the magazine *Conservative Digest* attacked the WEEA Director as a "monarch in a feudal Washington bureaucracy" and recommended her "swift dethronement" because she was "twisting the grant approval process" and turning WEEA into "a money machine for a network of openly radical feminist groups."

The Reagan administration proposed substantial cuts to the WEEA appropriation, which a bipartisan coalition on Capitol Hill attempted to reverse. Then, in 1982, the WEEA Director was transferred to a nonexistent task force and the expert proposal field readers were fired and replaced with conservatives who neither understood nor supported educational equity, as Faludi has noted. Finally, in 1983, the WEEA Director was fired as the WEEA program office was demoted from its perch in the immediate office of the Assistant Secretary to a "section" at the lowest bureaucratic level.

The attack continues to this day—now formulated to suggest that promoting educational equity is no longer necessary because the "problems" WEEA was designed to solve no longer exist and women and girls are doing well, or "better than boys," in school. Clearly, a visionary WEEA program would evolve to respond to these allegations. Indeed, such a WEEA program would develop new funding priorities that would address the educational equity issues of the twenty-first century—which continue to plague our schools and workplaces. However, while WEEA continues to be reauthorized by Congress and funded at a minimal level (less than $3 million per year) despite administration requests for zero funding, the essence of the forward-thinking WEEA program has not survived. WEEA no longer is a voice for systemic change in education, its grants program is small and limited to more "traditional" educational activities, and its WEEA Publishing Center (later called the WEEA Equity Resource Center) no longer distributes WEEA products (as of early 2003)—its long-standing contract with the Education Department having ended.

The WEEA mission—to ensure truly equal education for all women and girls—has yet to be fulfilled. It is a transformational mission, as it requires that schools and colleges not only change their curricula and pedagogy but also work with other organizations and institutions to eliminate the patriarchal structures of U.S. society and to replace them with more egalitarian structures. In 1885, Lucy Stone declared that: "In education, in marriage, in everything, disappointment is the lot of woman. It shall be the business of my life to deepen that disappointment in every woman's heart until she bows down to it no longer." Today, supporters of educational equality for women and girls understand that their transformational mission must continue to be the business of their lives, for the benefit of generations yet to come.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women.* New York: Crown.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Leslie R. Wolfe

Work-Family Reconciliation Policies

Work-family reconciliation policies are institutional and organizational arrangements designed to secure adequate care for children and to help adults cope with the conflicting demands of employment and family life. The need for such policies has grown along with women's increased participation in the labor force and the concomitant reduction in the time and energy they have to spend on unpaid care work, not only for children, but also for their partners, their home, and their extended families. Although the traditional model of the male breadwinner and female homemaker has become increasingly rare, men continue to invest their time primarily in the workplace while women struggle to combine employment with unpaid work in the home. As a result, work-family policies are often seen as women-oriented policies rather than as policies designed to increase gender equality.

Like most workers, educators often face competing demands in their roles as employees and caregivers in the home. However, unlike most workers, some educators, especially female teachers, have often chosen their occupation in the hope that it will help reduce work-family conflict. Their reasoning is that teachers' work/school hours, holidays, and vacations will correspond more closely to those of their own children than will the work schedules of nonteachers. Such reasoning as a basis for choosing teaching over other jobs is a good example of the kinds of private solutions to the problems of work-family conflict that are common in the United States. Although such private solutions can be adaptive for individual women and their families, they also exacerbate long-standing problems of gender inequality at home and in the labor market. Women who choose a job because it may be compatible with caregiving in the family are likely to settle for lower incomes. These choices can also render them more economically dependent and more at risk in the event of family dissolution than their male counterparts who are likely to have both higher status and higher paying jobs.

To overcome gender inequalities while at the same time providing high-quality care for children and solutions to work-family conflicts, Janet Gornick and Marcia Meyers (2003, 2004, 2005) have recently proposed a set of policies designed to achieve what British sociologist Rosemary Crompton (1999) has labeled a "dual-earner/dual-carer society." This is a society that recognizes the rights and obligations of women and men to engage in both employment and caregiving and is committed to meeting children's needs for intensive care and nurturance. According to Gornick and Meyers, achieving a dual-earner/dual-carer society in the United States would require the expansion of government policies that socialize the costs of rearing children and help both women and men to blend employment with care work. They argue that forcing parents to rely on personal solutions, such as cutting back on paid working hours or placing their children in substitute child care for long hours, exacerbates gender inequalities and places many children at developmental risk.

Employers can help to solve these problems through, for example, voluntarily granting flexibility in work schedules or paid leaves. Employers' efforts provide helpful but insufficient support for parents. Because these workplace accommodations are targeted primarily on women in high-status jobs, they can also contribute to inequalities among women and across families. Public policies that use the redistributive and regulatory powers of government have the potential to help parents manage the competing demands of employment and caregiving while promoting gender equality and reducing inequalities among children from different social class backgrounds. There are two critical areas for government intervention: policies that support shared earning and caregiving by both mothers and fathers through the regulation of working time and family leave policies, and policies that provide high-quality, affordable substitute care through public early childhood education and care programs.

The good news is that the United States does not have to develop such policies and programs in a vacuum. Many Western industrialized, democratic nations provide existing models for how government can help families resolve the conflict between caring and employment responsibilities and how children can be treated as national resources. Although none of these countries has yet achieved a fully egalitarian, dual-earner/dual-carer society, they do provide many good examples of ways in which government can support men and women in their efforts to share earning and caring work and to provide quality early childhood education and care.

POLICIES THAT SUPPORT SHARED EARNING AND CARING

In the absence of public policies that support dual-earner/dual-carer arrangements, parents in the United States craft a variety of private solutions for managing competing demands. One of the most significant is adjustments to working hours and schedules. Although adaptive in the short term, these adjustments often exacerbate gender inequalities and impose substantial costs on parents, particularly mothers.

One common adjustment to working hours and schedules by American parents consists of a reduction in the labor force attachment of only one parent, and it is overwhelmingly the mothers who take this action. Unfortunately, this solution turns out to be costly for women as they suffer what some social scientists refer to as the "mommy tax" for reductions in employment and consequent losses in earnings throughout their working years. By one estimate, the "mommy tax" is as much as $600,000 to $1,000,000. Other mothers manage child-care demands through part-time employment compatible with their household duties. They, too, pay a penalty. This penalty is particularly great in the United States because policies to protect part-time workers lag those in much of the industrialized world. American labor laws provide very little protection against employers paying part-time workers less (per hour) than their full-time counterparts, or denying them benefits such as health insurance. Some estimates show that women who work part time in the

United States earn 20 percent less per hour than comparable full-time workers, and they often forgo employment benefits as well as opportunities for advancement.

These private solutions are costly for women. They also exacerbate gender inequalities by devaluing caregiving work as "women's work." Men rarely incur the financial costs associated with parenthood because their employment rates and hours of work are generally insensitive to the presence or ages of their children. These arrangements do penalize men in another important respect, however, by marginalizing their participation in the home and in the care of their children.

Government policies that currently exist in many European countries support parents' decisions to limit their labor force engagement by providing national health insurance programs that cover all citizens and by prohibiting discrimination against workers who choose part-time work. The European Union Directive on Part-Time Work encourages member states to eliminate obstacles to part-time work and requires pay and benefit parity. Without such discrimination measures, a woman who chooses to work part time instead of full time may be forced to sacrifice substantial compensation and career opportunities. The European approach also serves to improve the quality of part-time work by reducing the segregation of part-time workers into a limited range of occupations and industries. Many of these policies are not new. Since 1978, for example, Sweden has offered parents the right to work six hours a day at prorated pay until their children reach the age of eight.

Other parents in the United States solve their child-care needs by adjusting their work schedules, for example, with couples working opposite shifts and engaging in "split-shift parenting." One-third of all parents in the United States and one-half of single parents work nonstandard hours. Split-shift parenting has the advantage of engaging fathers in caregiving and providing parental care for children. It is also problematic. Research indicates that couples who rely on one parent working nonstandard hours report more health problems, lower marital quality, and a higher likelihood of divorce. Children in these families have also been found to fare worse on developmental and school outcomes than other children.

To improve the lives of these children and their families, certain societal shifts are necessary. For instance, in the United States, men still face gendered expectations in the job market that limit their caregiving choices. Despite the existence of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993, employer surveys report that the majority of managers believe that parental leaves are inappropriate for men. A dual-earner/dual-carer society would require crucial changes in attitudes, as men and women would engage symmetrically in both paid work and unpaid domestic labor. That outcome would involve men shifting a substantial number of hours from the labor market to the home while women would shift a more modest number of hours from the home to the labor market. Families, however, will not be able to bring about these societal shifts on their own. Instead, employer cooperation and public policy provisions are necessary.

One crucial government policy is paid family leave. Paid family leave policies encompass: programs such as maternity leave (granted to mothers around the time of childbirth), paternity leave (granted to fathers around the time of childbirth), parental leaves (granted to both mothers and fathers for extended periods of time, generally following maternity or paternity leaves), and leave for family reasons (provided to attend to children's unpredictable needs throughout childhood). Many Western nations provide various forms of leaves, helping to ensure job security for mothers and wage replacement for several months as well. In addition, securing fathers' rights and benefits—and encouraging their usage—is essential for the establishment of a dual-earner/dual-carer society. The Nordic countries stand out among other Western nations for their commitment to encouraging fathers to take up their benefits. These countries have established what are known as “daddy-quotas” in which leave periods not taken by the father are not transferable to the mother. Instead, if the father does not use his leave, it is lost to the family. Such policies help establish a cultural norm where paternity leave is encouraged.

In the United States, in contrast, while the FMLA grants some new parents the right to *unpaid* leave—usually up to 12 weeks per year—paid leave is much more limited. The lack of paid leave deprives parents of caregiving time, strains families’ finances, and exacerbates gender inequality. Fewer than half of employed women and the great majority of employed men have no paid leave rights at all, forcing many to either leave employment following childbirth or adoption or return to work after only a short break. In the United States, the absence of paid leave leads to the result that nearly 80 percent of employees fail to take advantage of their FMLA-provided leave when needed due to their inability to afford unpaid leave. As it stands, the FMLA contributes to gender inequality despite the fact that men and women have exactly the same rights under the law. The gender earnings gap results in couples being more likely to decide that the mother should take the leave (and forgo her pay) since her income is likely to be the lower one. Like the mother who works part time, those who take unpaid family leaves often incur a “mommy tax” and may face a lifetime of economic penalties for their decision. In many European countries, gender inequalities in employment and care are ameliorated by family leave provisions that provide leave rights and benefits for both mothers and fathers. While family leave varies substantially across countries, the common denominator for many countries other than the United States is wage replacement, whether partial or full.

Beyond family leave provisions, a dual-earner/dual-carer society requires some overall adjustments in working time regulations. Throughout Europe, for instance, the standard workweek has been shortened for a variety of reasons, often related to helping employees meet their family’s caregiving needs. In the United States, the standard workweek has not been reduced in over six decades, and average annual work hours have actually risen in recent years, hindering American families’ abilities to provide adequate child care. While in the United States the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) of 1938 set the standard workweek at 40 hours, it is notable for what is *not* addressed. The FLSA does not prohibit mandatory overtime; its regulations do not apply to salaried professionals, nor does it mandate maximum weekly work hours as labor laws in many European countries do. Additionally, the FLSA provides no protections for part-time workers (other than the minimum wage), or annual vacation rights, or extra compensation for individuals working nonstandard shifts—all of which are provided in most other Western nations. A growing share of the United States labor force, primarily salaried professionals, is exempt from overtime requirements as well. Thus, many employees in the United States receive inadequate protections under the FLSA.

In contrast, throughout the rest of the Western world, numerous working time policies have been established to help families—for example, by decreasing weekly work hours (usually to the range of 35 to 39 hours), by making high-quality part-time work available, and, finally, by ensuring levels of vacation time that allow parents to spend substantial periods of time with their families. France, for instance, has reduced its workweek to 35 hours, in part, to support families. Additionally, the law applies to virtually all workers, including many salaried executives who would be exempt from FLSA—and it is enforced. While workers in the United States have no rights to vacation time, European countries offer generous vacation time to workers, generally starting at a minimum of four weeks per year. This can, of course, be used by families to provide care for their children during the summer break from school.

A dual-earner/dual-carer society also must necessarily take into consideration school schedules, particularly the length of the school day versus the length of the average workday, and the care needs of older children during summers and other school holidays. In order to avoid having millions of unsupervised children due to such incompatible schedules, more flexible working arrangements and extended family leave arrangements could be solutions to the current incompatibility between the work schedules of most parents and the school schedules of their children. Throughout the rest of the Western world, various solutions have been crafted to address this dilemma such as longer school years, longer school days, and flexible working arrangements. Although changes in school calendars are much discussed in the United States, this discussion usually focuses on how best to improve student achievements. Little attention has been given to the ways in which such changes might help parents solve some of their work-family conflicts or affect the recruitment of men and women into teaching.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE POLICIES

In addition to time for caregiving, parents need safe, high-quality, and affordable alternatives to direct parental care. The largely private child-care system in the United States is widely regarded as a system in crisis. In part, the crisis results from the high cost of nonparental child care. These costs average about 9 percent of family earnings per month, roughly equal to or higher than tuition at public colleges in most states. In addition to cost concerns, however, there are quality concerns involved with privatized child-care solutions. In the United States, child care is regulated primarily for health and safety issues. There is little regulation of caregiver qualifications or wages outside of public early education programs. Ironically, although child-care costs are prohibitive for many families, child-care professionals, overwhelmingly women, are among the most poorly paid of all workers in the United States and most lack employment benefits. One result, clearly, is the impoverishment of many women who work as child-care professionals. A second is compromises in child-care quality. Women who work as child-care providers have generally low educational levels, little or no specialized training in the field, and very high rates of turnover. Given that adult-child interactions are the primary factor in child-care quality, it is not surprising that the overall quality of care provided by these workers is mediocre, on average, and poor in many settings. It is America's most vulnerable children, those from impoverished or otherwise disadvantaged families, who suffer the greatest consequences from poor-quality care, low-income families who bear the heaviest cost burden for purchasing private care, and women who pay the "gender penalty" for working in the largely female, poorly paid child-care workforce.

Early childhood education and care in a number of other industrialized countries resolves many of these problems and inequalities by ensuring access to affordable, high-quality care for children. Care is provided for all children above the age of three in most of the countries in Western Europe, with government assuming 80 to 100 percent of costs. In several, public child care is also widely available for children under three. These national governments also set standards for program quality and the education and compensation of child-care and early education professionals. Early childhood educators in other industrialized countries are typically highly educated and earn wages that are at or even above the average for other workers. As a result, care is widely available to families, regardless of income; overall quality is high; and women are not impoverished by their commitment to caregiving and early education professions.

For the United States to support dual-earner/dual-carer arrangements, transforming child care from a market-based to a largely public system is essential. Most fundamentally, access to care must be an entitlement and a much larger share of the costs of providing high-quality care must be assumed by government. The government currently pays an estimated one-third or less of these costs; the remainder are paid out-of-pocket by parents or through the "donated" labor of other family members who care for children without compensation. A more equitable distribution of 80 percent of costs to government and 20 percent to parents, the average in many European countries, would ensure access to care for all families, equalize labor market opportunities for men and women, and reduce the gender inequalities that result from low wages for child-care professionals. In addition to sharing the costs, the government has a critical responsibility to set and enforce standards for program quality, professional qualifications, and compensation.

In their call for an expansion of public child care and early education options, Gornick and Meyers (2003, 2004, 2005) differ from many feminists who advocate for extensive reliance on substitute care in order to reduce gender inequalities by freeing women to work as much as men. The dual-earner/dual-carer perspective emphasizes the role of child care as a mechanism to support employment opportunities for both mothers and fathers and to enhance child development. It also emphasizes the importance of parental care, by both mothers and fathers, and particularly for very young children.

The benefits of this combination of policies could be substantial for children who would have both time with their parents and high-quality care outside the home. These benefits are documented in a growing body of research that links high-quality child care to children's cognitive development and school readiness, a particularly crucial measure from an educator's perspective. Children from low-income and otherwise disadvantaged homes appear to show the most benefit from high-quality child care and suffer the most from poor-quality care. The disproportionate impact on low-income children has particularly important implications in the United States, where working families are far more likely to be poor or near-poor than are those in other Western countries. As of 2000, almost 20 percent of children in the United States were living in families classified as officially poor and as many as 40 percent to be in "near-poor" families that have incomes below 200 percent of the official poverty line.

PROSPECTS FOR WORK-FAMILY POLICIES IN THE UNITED STATES

There are many obstacles to the adoption of work-family policies in the United States and even more obstacles to implementation of the entire package of work-family policies proposed by Gornick and Meyers (2003, 2004, 2005). A primary obstacle is cost or the perception of what the cost of such policies might be. In the rest of the Western world, most of these policies are funded through payroll taxes and/or general revenues. In the Western nations that provide the most generous benefits, such as Denmark and Finland, expenditures on family leave and early childhood care and education programs constitute less than 2 percent of Gross Domestic Product. The United States currently spends about one-tenth that amount, but it seems unlikely that even this minuscule amount will be increased unless there is considerable demand, mobilized and communicated to government. Private dilemmas for American families will need to be translated into political demands.

Hewlett, Rankin, and West (2002) make a similar argument calling for "taking parenting public" and the necessity of building a new social movement composed of parents. They argue that a cultural shift is necessary, primarily a transformation in attitudes that gives a higher priority to parenting and places it on the public agenda. While Americans continue to embrace market solutions to their work-family dilemmas, the current failure of those privatized solutions may well present an opportunity for conversations about engaging more government support for parenting modeled after our Western counterparts.

It seems likely that women will embrace both the effort to take parenting public and the vision of the dual-earner/dual-carer society to a greater extent than men. Many women are already trying to combine earning and caring, and they are likely to welcome policies that would help them to stay connected with the labor market while still bearing and rearing children. It is less certain whether men will welcome the opportunity to take paternity leaves, even well-paid ones, so that they can play a more active role in parenting. Despite the availability of various programs in other countries that offer leaves to fathers, men's take-up of these benefits remains well below that of women everywhere. Employer resistance, workers' perceptions of employer resistance, and the continuing gender wage gap all contribute to fathers' lower take-up. Despite the fact that such public programs and expanded workplace supports exist and enable couples to choose more egalitarian parenting and work arrangements, low take-up of these benefits by fathers is telling. Thus, there is still some obvious resistance to gender equality throughout the Western world when it comes to work and family obligations. Beyond that, however, there is the added push toward gender parity in that, as family issues become politicized, they move out of the marginalized "women's domain." Family issues can begin to garner attention in the public sphere and, particularly, on political agendas.

When it comes to government-funded child care, Americans may be able to look to their own country for some inspiration. Since the United States was historically the world leader in its extension of public education to all children, one way to develop support for government-regulated and financed child-care programs might be to present them as simply an extension of existing school systems. Many school districts already provide some preschool education, although most avoid providing care for children under the age of three. Also, a child-care system tied to public schools runs the risk of extending to younger children the inequities in funding and quality for which the American locally based school system has become infamous. A better model might be a federal program like Head Start that has a demonstrated record of success and could be extended to children of all socioeconomic backgrounds and of even younger ages.

To move toward a national child-care system and other policies that support earner-carer families will require major changes in the role of the American government. Many parents in the United States are struggling with enormous problems as they try to meet the responsibilities of involved parenting and allocate work and care in ways that are fair and economically feasible. But, they are also being told by the media and some governmental officials that these are problems of their own making and, therefore, they are personally responsible for solving them. People need a broader perspective from which to assess what many regard as their personal problems or shortcomings. Educators can help people develop this broader perspective by providing valuable information about the widespread nature of these problems, the already existing policies and programs in other countries that can help to alleviate them, and alternatives to American competitive individualism such as the dual-earner/dual-carer society in which governmental policies are truly designed to help families and promote gender equality.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Crompton, R. (Ed.). (1999). *Restructuring gender relations and employment: The decline of the male breadwinner.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Gornick, J., & Meyers, M.K. (2003). *Families that work: Policies for reconciling parenthood and employment.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gornick, J., & Meyers, M.K. (2004). Welfare regimes in relation to paid work and care. In J. Zollinger Giele & E. Holst (Eds.), *Changing life patterns in Western industrial society* (pp. 45–67). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Science Press.

Gornick, J., & Meyers, M.K. (2005). Supporting a dual-earner/dual-career society. In J. Heymann & C. Beem (Eds.). *Unfinished work: Building equality and democracy in an era of working families* (pp. 371–408). New York: New Press.

Hewlett, S.A., Rankin, N., & West, C. (2002). *Taking parenting public: The case for a new social movement.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kathleen J. Fitzgerald

Janet C. Gornick

Marcia K. Meyers

Name Index

AAAS (American Association for the Advancement of Science), 252
AAHS (Association of Administrators of Human Sciences), 272
AAUP (American Association of University Professors), 157, 159, 525, 683–84
AAUW (American Association of University Women), 210, 220, 342, 572, 586, 794–98
AAWCC (American Association for Women in Community Colleges), 159
ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics), 118
ACA (American Counseling Association), 563
ACE (American Council on Education), 157, 639, 686
ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union), 220
Acker, Sandra, 628–30, 633
ACM (Association for Computing Machinery), 348
Adams, Abigail, 335
Adams, Natalie G., 485–87
Addams, Jane, 237
Adelphean Society, 510
Adkins, Lisa, 31
Adorno, Theodor, 726
Advisory Committee on Sexism and Social Justice, 332
AEA (American Economic Association), 123–24
AERA (American Educational Research Association), 109, 123
Agans, Lindsay J., 637, 641
AHEA (American Home Economics Association), 270–73
Ahmad, Yvette, 584
AHSA (African Heritage Studies Association), 260
AIAW (Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women), 811
AICF (American Indian College Fund), 228–29, 232
AIHEC (American Indian Higher Education Consortium), 228–29, 233
Ajzen, Icek, 398
Alabama State College for Negroes, 802
Alabama State University, 802
Albright, Madeleine, 237
Aldridge, Delores, 260
Alexander, Margaret Walker, 175
Allen, Katherine R., 629
Allen, Susan L., 524
Alloway, Nola, 720
Alpha Delta Pi, 510
Alpha Epsilon Phi, 510
Alpha Kappa Alpha, 173, 510
Alpha Kappa Delta Pi, 511
Alpha Pi Omega, 511
Alromi, Naif H., 204
AMA (American Medical Association), 275
American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, 795
American Council on Human Rights, 514
American Counseling Association, 563
American University, 221
Amherst College, 236
AMSA (American Men's Studies Association), 299–300
AMSTAT (American Statistical Association), 123
Anderson, Diane D., 460
Anderson, Ronald E., 350
Anthony, Susan B., 187
APA (American Psychological Association), 123, 299
Apple, Rima, 273
APS (Association for Psychological Science), 123

Aristotle, 364
Arnot, Madeleine, 31–33, 37, 742, 763, 766
ASA (American Sociological Association), 123
Asante, Molefi, 258
ASCA (American School Counselor Association), 564–65
ASHA (American School Health Association), 275, 278
Ashenden, D.J., 607
Ashraf, Javed, 687–88
Astell, Mary, 39
Astin, Helen S., 419
Avery, Patricia G., 336
Avorn, J., 252
Ayers, Ed, 285

Bacchi, Carol, 728
Bacolod, Marigee P., 666
Bailey, Lucy E., 106, 115
Baker, David P., 202, 206, 408–9, 414
Baker, Ella, 257
Baldwin, James, 554
Balka, Ellen, 167
Balliet, Barbara J., 505–6
Bank, Barbara J., 154, 522, 608, 611
Banks, James A., 289
Barber, Bonnie L., 480, 522
Barber Scotia College, 171
Barbezat, Debra, 625, 687–89, 690
Barickman, Richard B., 798
Barnard College, 186, 189–90, 236, 239, 510
Barthes, Roland, 56
Bass, Martha A., 280
Bassett, Rachel Hile, 707
Baudrillard, Jean, 56
Bay-Cheng, Laina Y., 278
Bayh, Birch, 809
BCTF (British Columbia Teachers' Federation), 753
Bean, Beth W., 400
Bean, John P., 398, 400
Becker, Joanne R., 288–90
Becker, Penny E., 704
Becker, William E., 689
Beecher, Catharine, 209, 238, 269–70
Belenky, Mary F., 288–89
Bell, Diane, 43
Bell, Roseann P., 260
Bell-Scott, Patricia, 177, 260
Bennett College, 172–74, 176–78, 236
Benschop, Yvonne W.M., 204
Berger, Peter L., 94
Bernard-Powers, Jane, 332, 338
Bethune, Mary McLeod, 176, 257, 335
Bettis, Pamela J., 485–87
Beutel, Ann M., 636
Bird, Elizabeth, 349
BJS (United States Bureau of Justice), 144
Blackmore, Jill, 769
Blair-Loy, Mary, 656
Blaisure, Karen R., 629
Blase, Joseph J., 703
Bleach, Kevan, 720
BLS (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics), 118, 348, 684
Bluefield State University, 174
Blum, John, 283
Bly, Robert, 298
Boaler, Jo, 287–89, 291, 293
Bob Jones University, 805
Bojar, Karen, 505, 507
Boserup, Ester, 772
Boulanger, Nadia, 312
Bourdieu, Pierre, 23–27, 31, 87–88, 90–92, 556, 628
Bowles, Samuel, 32
Boy Scouts of America, 296
BRAC (Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee), 774–75
Bradley, Karen, 451
Bradley, S., 160
Brannon, Robert, 299
Bravo, Patricia R., 772
Braxton, John M., 398
Brice, Richard A., 703
Bristol University, 124
British Open University, 165–66
Britzman, Deborah P., 343
Brod, Harry, 299
Brody, Celeste M., 215
Brophy, Jere E., 573
Brown, Jane D., 278
Brown, Marjorie M., 271–72, 274
Brown University, 185–87, 189, 417, 640, 812
Brown, William B., 593
Browne, Rollo, 720
Bryn Mawr College, 236, 417
Bryne, Kelli Z., 524
Buck, Gary, 334
Buck, Pearl S., 237
Buckley, James, 806
Buddin, Richard, 787
Bunch, Charlotte, 51–52
Bundy, Penny, 355
Bureau of Indian Affairs, 228

Burge, Stephanie Woodham, 387
Burkam, David T., 451
Burr, Vivien, 93
Burton, Leone, 290
Bush, Barbara, 237
Bush Foundation, 229
Bush, George H.W., 693
Bush, George W., 98, 103, 229, 359, 813
Bush, Vannevar, 9
Butler, Judith, 36, 44, 56, 58, 67, 96, 352, 551, 553, 743
Butler University, 511
Buttery, Thomas J., 339
Byrd, Tina, 211

Cade, Toni, 260
CAFSC (Council of Administrators of Family and Consumer Sciences), 271
Cahn, Susan K, 487
California State University, 815
Cambridge University, 188, 190
Cammarota, Julio, 788
Canadian Athabasca University, 165, 169
Cantu, Norma, 813
Carli, Linda L., 670
Carnegie, Andrew, 175
Carnegie Commission, 686
Carson, Rachel, 237
Carter, Jimmy E., Jr., 228
Carter, Linda K., 667
Caruso, Mary, 758
CB (United States Census Bureau), 118, 144, 755
CCCS (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies), 95
CCSS (California Council for Social Studies), 332
CEHR (Commission for Equality and Human Rights), 741
Center for Civic Education, 336
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 587
Central Connecticut State College, 804
CESSDA (Council of European Social Sciences Data Archives), 119
Chabbott, Colett, 202
Chafetz, Janet S., 694, 697
Chapman, Jennifer, 354
Charles, Maria, 451
Chen, Wenhong, 346
Cheney University, 171
Chesney-Lind, Meda, 596
Chi Upsilon Sigma, 511
Chiang, Kuang-Hsu, 630–31
Chicago, Judy, 358
Chief, Maria Tall, 335
Cinamon, Rachel G., 703, 706
Citadel, The, 191, 195, 199, 805
Civil Rights Project, 584
Claesson, Margareta A., 703
Claremont Colleges Consortium, 236
Claremont University, 236
Clark Atlanta University, 174
Clarke, Edward H., 150
Clements, Karen, 587
Clifford, Geraldine J., 340
Clinchy, Blythe M., 288–89
Clinton, Hillary Rodham, 237
Clinton, William J., 229, 693, 813
CMEC (Council of Ministers of Education Canada), 751
Coakley, Jay, 499
Coalition for Black Development in Home Economics, 271
Cole, Johnetta B., 177–78
Coleman, James S., 87–92, 477, 481, 607
Coll, Cynthia G., 73
College Board, 334
College of St. Benedict, 192
College of William and Mary, 185, 492
Colley, Helen, 629
Collins, Patricia Hill, 16, 20, 77, 171, 260
Columbia University, 150, 156, 185–90, 285, 417
Combahee River Collective, 16
Commission on Opportunity in Athletics, 813
Community College Research Center (Teachers College, Columbia University), 156
Comstock, Dana L., 78
Connell, Robert W., 129, 299, 587, 607, 678
Cook, Judith A., 108
Cookman College, 176
Cooper, Anna Julia, 257
Corcoran, Sean P., 666
Cordi, Sarah, 276
Cornell University, 187, 369, 373
Correll, Shelley J., 386
Corson, David, 26
Cortez, Nancy, 260
Coulter, Rebecca Priegert, 754
Cox, Peter J., 441
CPST (Commission of Professionals in Science and Technology), 250
CRE (Commission for Racial Equality), 740–41

Creswell, John W., 157
Crompton, Rosemary, 823
Crosnoe, Robert, 573
Crouter, Ann C., 703
CTF (Canadian Teacher's Federation), 751
Curry, David, 592
Cusick, Philip A., 519–20
Cuyjet, Michael J., 519, 521

Daly, Liza, 444
Daly, Mary, 42, 44
Dartmouth College, 185, 187
Datnow, Amanda, 788–89, 791, 792
David, Deborah S., 299
David, Miriam E., 182, 739, 742, 745, 746
Davie, Sharon L., 523, 526–27
Davies, Bronwyn, 58–61
Davis, Julia, 279
Davis, LaShonda, 585, 588
Davis, Laurel R., 486
Deem, Rosemary, 640
Deep Springs College, 191
de Genlis, Comptesse, 351
de Gouges, Olympe, 39
Deitz, Mary G., 33
DeJoy, Sharon B., 277
Delaware State University, 174
Delta Phi Epsilon, 510
Delta Sigma Theta, 173, 510, 514
DePauw University, 510
Derricotte, Juliette, 176
Derrida, Jacque, 36, 56, 735
DEST (Department of Education, Science, and Training, Australia), 118
de Varona, Donna, 813
Dewey, John, 140, 142
Dewey, Melvil, 270
DfES (Department for Education and Skills, United Kingdom), 119
Diamond, Diane, 200
Diamond, John, 787
Dillabough, Jo-Anne, 33, 38, 763
Dillard University, 172
Dimmler, Miriam Hernandez, 547
Dine College (Navajo Community College), 228, 232
Dine, Inc., 228
DOD (United States Department of Defense), 195
DOE (United States Department of Education), 84, 118, 137, 152, 157, 218, 220, 345, 465, 653, 657, 694, 712, 755–57, 759, 788, 806–7, 810–11, 813, 819–20
DOL (United States Department of Labor), 348
Dolloff, Lori-Anne, 309, 312
Douglass College, 189, 236, 240
Dowsett, Gary W., 607
Drago, Robert, 703
DRC (Disability Rights Commission), 741
DTI (United Kingdom Department of Trade and Industry), 741
Dubberley, W., 129
Dublin, Tom, 285
DuBois, William E.B., 19, 257
Ducrest, Stéphanie Félicité, 351
Duke, Nell K., 445
Duke University, 191, 637
Dunbar, Michele D., 489
Durkheim, Emile, 33, 397
Dutro, Elizabeth, 446
Dworkin, Anthony G., 624, 691–94, 697, 699
Dworkin, Roselind J., 694, 697

Eagly, Alice H., 670
Eason, Becky, 242
Easton, Peter, 775
Eaton, Shevawn, 398
Ebdon, Rosamund, 775
Eccles, Jacquelynne S., 480, 522
Eckert, Penelope, 519
Edelman, Marian Wright, 237
Eder, Donna, 486, 606
Edgeworth, Maria, 351
Education Development Center, 818
Ehrmann, Joe, 501
Elder, Glen H., Jr., 573
Eliot, Charles W., 151, 154
Ellerbeck, Kathryn, 758
Ellsworth, Randolph A., 445
Elmira Female College, 238
Enke, Janet, 488, 490
Ennis, Catherine D., 324
EOC (Equal Opportunities Commission), 740
Ephron, Nora, 237
Epps, Edgar G., 173
Epstein, Debbie, 599
Estler, Suzanne E., 639
ETR Associates, 277
Eu, March Fong, 335
EU (European Union), 119, 741, 768
European Commission, 119
Eurydice, 119
Evans, Kate, 343
Evans, William N., 666

Faith, Karlene, 163
Faludi, Susan, 820
Farkas, George, 611
Faulkner, Shannon, 191
Feminist Majority Foundation, 220
Fennema, Elizabeth, 287, 437
Ferraro, Geraldine, 237
Feuerverger, Grace, 628
Fine, Michelle, 554
Fineran, Susan, 796
Finkel, Susan K., 705
Firestone, Shulamith, 42
First Plenary Council of Baltimore, 210
Fischman, Gustavo E., 343
Fishbein, Martin, 398
Fisher, Alice M., 280
Fisher, Berenice M., 715, 738
Fisk University, 172–73, 176
Fitzgerald, Kathleen J., 830
Fitzgerald, Louise, F., 794–96
Flannery, Kathleen A., 444
Fletcher, Helen, 355
Fletcher, Richard, 720
Fonow, Mary M., 108
Forgasz, Helen J., 441
Foster, Andrea L., 250
Foster, Peter, 127
Foucault, Michel, 9, 36, 44, 56–57, 59, 66–67, 94, 628, 735
Foudy, Julie, 814
Francis, Becky, 61
Fraser, Nancy, 32, 48
Frederickson, Mary E., 286
Freebody, Peter, 390
Freedman, Janet, 526
Freedmen's Bureau, 171
Freeman, Joreen, 371
Freire, Paulo, 428, 733
French Catholic Church, 210
Freud, Sigmund, 296
Freudenberger, Herbert J., 691
Friedan, Betty, 237, 371
Frye, John, 158

Gallagher, Kathleen, 355
Gamble, James, 176
Gamma Epsilon Pi, 511
Gamma Gamma Chi, 511
Gamma Rho Lambda, 511
Gandara, Patricia, 787
GAO (U.S. General Accounting Office), 811
Garber, Elizabeth, 362
Gaskell, Jane, 368
Gasman, Marybeth, 137, 178
Gee, Susan, 446
Geis, Gil, 591
GEMS (Gender Education Music Society), 312
General Presidency for Girls' Education in Saudi Arabia, 205
George Mason University, 804
Georgetown University, 186
Georgia Female College, 238
Gerbner, George, 278
Gergen, Mary, 96
German FernUniversität, 167
German, Tony, 776
Gerson, Kathleen, 654–55
Gibson, Margaret, 787
Giddings, Paula, 260
Gilbert, Pam, 720
Gilligan, Carol, 109–10, 215, 288
Ginsburg, Mark B., 341
Ginther, Donna K., 636, 689
Gintis, Herbert, 32
Glennie, Elizabeth, 484
GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network), 600–601
Goldberger, Nancy R., 288–89
Goldin, Claudia, 662
Goldstein, Harvey, 768
Goldstein, N., 599
Gomm, Roger, 127
Gonzalez, Jo-Beth, 355
Good, Thomas L., 573
Gordon, C. Wayne, 519
Gordon, Linda, 32
Gordon, Tuula O., 97–98
Gordon, Vivian, 260
Gornick, Janet C., 823–24, 828, 830
Gosetti, Penny P., 215
Goulden, Marc, 704
Government of South Africa, 316
Grady, Sharon, 354
Gramsci, Antonio, 11, 726
Grant, Barbara M., 628
Grant, Carl A., 303–5
Grant, Linda, 532–33, 576
Green, Edith, 809
Greene, Liberty, 279
Greenberg, Jack, 802
Griffin, Susan, 43
GRIME (Gender Research in Music Education), 309–12
Gross, Larry, 278
Grove City College, 805, 811

Gruber, James, 796
Gumport, Patricia J., 640
Gurin, Patricia, 173
Gurwitz, J.H., 252
Guthrie, James W., 340
Guy-Sheftall, Beverly, 16, 175, 178, 260, 262
Guyton, Edith, 339
Guzzetti, Barbara J., 430–32

Habermas, Jürgen, 271, 726
Hacking, Ian, 93, 98
Hagedorn, Linda S., 159
Hahn, Carole L., 332
Hall, Jacquelyn, 26, 285
Hall, Roberta M., 153
Hallinan, Maureen T., 404
Hamilton College, 189
Hammersley, Martyn, 105, 127–28, 129
Hammond, Janice, 692
Hampden-Sydney College, 191–92
Hampshire College, 236
Hampton University, 178
Hanmer, Trudy J., 215
Hanson, Mary Ellen, 485–87
Hansot, Elizabeth, 342, 402–3
Harding, Sandra, 729
Hare, Nathan, 258
Harper, William Rainey, 151–52, 157
Harris, Barbara, 173
Harris, Mike, 750
Hart, Phyllis J., 565
Hartsock, Nancy, 19
Harvard Medical School, 150
Harvard University, 151, 154, 185–88, 221, 417–18, 759
Harvey, William R., 178
Harwood, Valerie, 36
Haskell Indian Nations University, 231
Hattam, Robert, 392, 394
Haverford College, 236
Haworth, Karla, 812
Hayes, Kathy J., 689
Haywood, Chris, 205, 554, 682
Heasley, Robert, 301
Heathcote, Dorothy, 355
Heffernan, Kerrissa, 505–6
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 19
Helland, Patricia A., 419
Hellman, Lillian, 237
Helmich, Henny, 776
Helmke, Laura A., 630
Helms, Jesse, 811
Hepburn, Katharine, 237
Heritage Foundation, 820
Herzig, Abbe H., 289–91
HEW (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), 712, 810, 818
Hewitt, Nancy M., 387
Hewlett, Sylvia Ann, 829
HHS (United States Department of Health and Human Services), 587
Hill, Antwanette N., 691–93
Hill, Catherine, 795–96
Hillsdale College, 805
Hine, Darlene Clark, 260
Hobart College and William Smith College, 300
Hoff, Tina, 279
Hoffman, Nancy, 340
Holland, Janet, 97–98
Hood, Marguerite V., 312
Hood-Williams, John, 125
hooks, bell, 16, 77, 260
Horkheimer, Max, 726
Horney, Karen, 296
Horowitz, Arlene, 818
Horvat, Erin McNamara, 91, 92
Howard University, 172, 174–77, 510–11
Howe, Sondra W., 309, 312
Hubbard, Lea, 405, 788–89, 791, 792
Huber, Mary T., 159
Hudson-Weems, Clenora, 260, 262
Huerta, Dolores, 335
Huff, C. Ronald, 592
Hughes, James, 687–90
Hull, Gloria, 260
Human Rights Watch, 586
Humble, Áine, 629
Hunter College, 510
Hurley, Sharon, 260

ICDE (International Council for Distance Education), 163
ICPSR (Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research), 118
I.C. Sorosis, 510
IEA (International Association for Evaluation of Educational Achievement), 346, 411
IFDO (International Federation of Data Organizations for the Social Sciences), 119
Indiana University, 373
Ingels, Steven J., 479–80
International Monetary Fund, 52
Iota Alpha Pi, 510
Iowa State Agricultural College, 270
Iowa State University, 270

Irving, Tesha Sengupta, 293

Jackson, David, 720
Jackson, Philip, 531
Jackson State University, 175
Jackson, Sue, 446
Jacobi, Maryann, 565
Jacobs, Jerry A., 387, 559, 624, 653–55, 658, 706
Jacobson, Lenore, 544
Jaggar, Alison M., 52
James, Abigail N., 224
James, William, 96
Javits, Jacob, 195, 810
Jeffrey, Julie R., 283
Johannesen-Schmidt, Mary C., 670
John Birch Society, 275
Johns Hopkins University, 190, 417
Johnson, Lyndon B., 817
Johnson, Michael P., 629
Johnson, Mordecai, 177
Johnsrud, Linda K., 639
Johnston, Betty, 290
Jones, Alison, 59
Jones, Deborah P., 409
Jones, LaTasha, 406
Jordan, Judith V., 72
Jorgenson, Jane, 349
Judd, Karen, 52

Kahn, Shulamit, 636
Kaiser, Gabriele, 436–37
Kanter, Rosabeth M., 696
Kaplan, Alexander G., 72
Kaplan, Temma, 506
Kappa Alpha Theta, 510
Kappa Beta Phi, 511
Kappa Delta, 510
Kappa Delta Phi, 510
Kappa Kappa Gamma, 510
Kappa Omicron Phi, 271
Kappa Phi Gamma, 511
Karenga, Maulana, 258, 262
Karenga, Tiamoyo, 262
Kasper, Barbara, 523–24, 527–28
Katz, Jackson, 307
Kaufman, Alan S., 425
Kaufman, James C., 423
Kear, Dennis J., 445
Keathley, Rosanne S., 280
Keegan, Kerri, 532, 569
Keen, Sam, 298
Kelleher, David, 775
Keller, Sarah N., 278
Kellogg Foundation, 228–29
Kelly, Deirdre M., 143–45, 786
Kelly, Kimberly, 532–33, 576
Kentucky State University, 174
Kerber, Linda, 283
Kern, Kathi L., 283
Kessler, Suzanne J., 125, 607
Kimmel, Michael S., 299–300, 587
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 257
Kirk, David, 322
Kirkpatrick, Jeane, 237
Kirkup, Gil E., 166–67
Klein, Jeanne, 355
Klein, Renate, 43
Knowles, Gary, 179
Knowles, T., 211
Kohlberg, Lawrence, 80, 109
Koop, C. Everett, 276
Kostin, Irene, 334
Koyama, Jill, 787
Krawczyk, Nora, 768
Kristeva, Juliet, 56
Kruse, Anne-Mette, 791
Kubitschek, Warren N., 404
Kunkel, Charlotte A., 524, 528
Kurtz-Costes, Beth, 630

Laboratory School, 140, 142
Laden, Berta V., 159
Ladner, Joyce, 260
Lahelma, Elina, 97–98
Lamb, Roberta, 309, 312, 314
Lambda Sigma Gamma, 511
Lambda Theta Alpha, 511
Landholt, Patricia, 90
Lange, Cheryl M., 142
Langer, Susan, 353
LaPaglia, Nancy, 160
Lareau, Annette, 27, 91
Larkin, Ralph W., 519–20
Lather, Patti, 112–13
LeCompte, Margaret D., 691
Leder, Gilah C., 287, 441
Lee, Valerie E., 211–13, 451
Lemon, Amanda, 780
Leonard, Diana, 630–31
LePore, Paul C., 211
Lerner, Gerda, 335
Lesko, Nancy, 586
Leslie, Larry, 7–8
LeTendre, Gerald K., 202, 206
Letts, Will, 330

LeVasseur, Michal, 336
Levitas, Ruth, 744
Lewin, Kurt, 398
Lewis, Shelby, 260
Lichtenberger, Elizabeth O., 425
Liederman, Jacqueline, 444
Lin, Nan, 87–89, 91
Lincoln University (Missouri), 174
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania), 171
Lindenmeyer, Kriste, 285
Lindsay, Beverly, 341
Lintz, Angela, 405
Lively, Kit, 639–40
Livingstone College, 175
Lloyd, Margaret, 755, 760
Lois, Jennifer, 181
Longino, Helen E., 250
Longwood College, 510
Lorde, Audre, 16
Lorence, Jon, 693
Losen, Daniel J., 759
Loutzenheiser, Lisa W., 136, 142, 144, 146
Lovell, Terry, 26
Lowery, John Wesley, 807
Luce-Kapler, Rebecca L., 461
Lucey, Helen, 34, 96
Luckmann, Thomas, 94
Lukacs, Georg, 726
Lyon, Mary, 209, 238
Lyons, Nona P., 215
Lyotard, Jean-François, 56

Mac an Ghaill, Mairtin, 205, 551, 554, 679, 682
MacDonald, Madeleine, 32
Macgregor, Molly Murphy, 332
Mac Naughton, Glenda, 267
Madden, Margaret E., 624, 675
Maine, Margo, 74
Malcom, Shirley, 252
Malcolm X, 257
Mandel, Laurie, 598, 603
Margo, Robert A., 667
Marks, Helen M., 211
Marlow, Stacey, 179
Marshall, Thurgood, 802
Martin, Renée J., 308
Marx, Jeffrey, 501
Marx, Karl, 5, 11, 19, 724–26
Mary Sharp College, 238
Maslach, Christina, 691
Mason, Heather, 221
Mason, Mary Ann, 704
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 191
Mayberry, Maralee, 179, 183
Maynard, Trisha, 430–31
McCall, Leslie, 26
McDonald, Jack, 195
MCEETYA (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training, andYouth Affairs, Australia), 118
McIntosh, Peggy, 77
McIntyre, Charsee, 260
McKenna, Michael C., 445
McKenna, Wendy, 125
McLaughlin, John, 758, 761
McNay, Lois, 37
McRobbie, Angela, 31
Mead, George Herbert, 96
Mead, Margaret, 793
Measor, Lynda, 128
Megdal, Sharon B., 687–88
Mehan, Hugh, 405
Melody, June, 96
Mertens, Donna M., 758, 761, 762
Merton, Robert K., 9, 543
Messner, Michael A., 299–300, 587
Metcalfe, Amy Scott, 4, 13
Meyers, Marcia K., 823–24, 828, 830
MHSAA (Michigan High School Athletic Association), 814
Miami University, 526–27
Michigan State University, 640
Mickelson, Roslyn Arlin, 406
Middlebury College, 186
Miles, Philip, 766
Miles, Rebecca, 775
Millard, Elaine, 431, 446
Miller, Jean Baker, 71–72, 74, 76–77
Miller, Joshua, 183
Miller, Michael T., 157
Miller-Bernal, Leslie, 192
Mills, Martin, 681–82
Miner, Anne S., 639
Mink, Patsy, 818
Minns, Hilary, 431
Mississippi University for Women, 236, 240
MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), 191, 270, 637
Moen, Phyllis, 704
Mondale, Walter, 818
Monkman, Karen, 772, 775, 778
Monmouth College, 510
Morehouse College, 171–72, 177, 186, 191–92
Morgan, Michael, 278

Morgan, Rick, 334
Morrison, Toni, 17
Morrow, Virginia, 92
Moscato, Susan R., 215
Moser, Caroline O.N., 428, 771–72
Moss, Gemma, 431
Mount Holyoke College, 210, 236, 238, 340
Mount Holyoke Seminary, 238
Mounty, Judith, 762
Muller, Chandra, 611
Mulvey, Laura, 359
Mu Sigma Upsilon, 511

NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), 514, 802
NACWEP (National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs), 818
Nagel, Nancy G., 215
NAIS (National Association of Independent Schools), 210
NALFO (National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations), 511
Nananda, F.C., 252
Naples, Nancy, 505
Narayan, Uma, 49
NASDC (New American Schools Development Corporation), 693
Nash, Diane, 173
Nash, Gary B., 283
National Academy of Sciences, 108, 636–38
National Agency for Education (Sweden), 316
National Coalition for Black Development in Home Economics, 271
National Council of Administrators of Home Economics, 271
National Hockey League, 460
National Science Board, 253
National Underground Railroad Freedom Center, 285
National Women's Law Center, 220, 809, 812–14
Navajo Community College (Dine College), 227–28, 232
Naylor, Gloria, 17
NBCC (National Board for Certified Counselors), 563
NBFO (National Black Feminist Organization), 16
NCAA (National Collegiate Athletic Association), 811, 813–15
NCBS (National Council for Black Studies), 260
NCES (National Center for Education Statistics), 118–19, 121, 152, 157, 175, 211,396, 416–17, 419, 443, 635–38, 644, 653, 683, 686, 696, 718, 759
NCETS (National Centre for Education and Training Statistics, Australia), 118
NCGE (National Council for Geographic Education), 336
NCGS (National Coalition of Girls' Schools), 218
NCSS (National Council for the Social Studies), 331–33, 336
NEA (National Educational Association), 275, 519
Nelson, Donna J., 636
Network for Family Life Education, 279
Newcomb Center (Tulane University), 526–27
Newcomb College Center for Research on Women (Tulane University), 527
Newcomb Women's Center, 527
Newcomer, Mabel, 149
New York University, 510
NFHS (National Federation of State High School Associations), 487
NIC (North-American Interfraternity Conference), 494
Nicholson, Helen, 355
NILD (National Institute for Leadership Development), 159
Nixon, R.M., 809
NMGC (National Mulcultural Greek Council, Inc.), 511
NOMAS (National Organization of Men Against Sexism), 298
NORC (National Opinion Research Center), 118, 122, 418
Northwestern University, 352
Norwich University, 195
Norwich University Corps of Cadets, 195, 197, 199
NOW (National Organization for Women), 16, 220, 305, 504–5, 815
NPC (National Panhellenic Conference), 511–14
NPHC (National Panhellenic Council, Inc.), 511–14
NSB (National Science Board), 254
NSF (National Science Foundation), 251, 253, 470
NUL (National Urban League), 514
Nu Sigma Phi, 511
NWCA (National Wrestling Coaches Association), 813

NWHP (National Women's History Project), 332–34
NWLC (National Women's Law Center), 220, 809, 812–14
NWSA (National Women's Studies Association), 123, 372

Oakley, Ann, 743
Oaxaca, Ronald, 685–87
Oberlin College, 147, 185, 238, 418
O'Connor, Sandra Day, 805
OCR (Office for Civil Rights), 218, 538, 712, 759, 794, 797–99, 810–13, 815
OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 119, 347, 439, 718
OET (U.S. Department of Education Office of Technology), 345
Oglala Lakota College, 231–32
Ohio State University, 640
Olswang, Steven G., 705
Olweus, Dan, 584
Omicron Nu, 271
O'Neill, Keith B., 496
Orfield, Gary, 759
Ormerod, Alayne J., 796
Oxford University, 188, 190
Oyewumi, Oyeronke, 262

Pace, Glenellen, 215
Padilla, Felix, 594–95
Paechter, Carrie, 320
Paige, Roderick, 722, 813
Pajak, Edward F., 703
Paludi, Carmen, Jr., 796–99
Paludi, Michele A., 796–99, 800
Paolucci, Beatrice, 271–72, 274
Pardini, Priscilla, 275–77
Parker, Bettye J., 260
Parker, Judi, 526
Parker, Stephen, 486
Patterson, John, 802
Payne, Kevin J., 104, 124
Pelak, Cynthia Fabrizio, 812, 816
Pelosi, Nancy, 237
Pembroke College, 186, 189, 239
Penney, Dawn, 323, 326
Perrin, Karen, 277
Petchesky, Rosalind, 52
Peterson, Shelley Stagg, 458, 462
Pfeffer, Jeffrey, 8
Phi Beta Kappa, 492–93
Phi Mu, 510
Phillips Academy, 209
Philomathean Society, 510
Phi Upsilon Omicron, 511
Piaget, Jean, 80
Pi Beta Phi, 510
Pi Kappa Sigma, 510
Pines, Alaya, 692
Pipher, Mary, 352
Placier, Peggy, 344
Player, Willa, 176
Pleck, Joe, 587
Poggi, Biff, 501
Pollack, William S., 75, 352
Popoviciu, Liviu, 554, 682
Porche, Michelle V., 448, 587
Portes, Alejandro, 87–88, 90
Potter, Elizabeth, 252
Princeton University, 185, 187–89, 191, 640
Pritchard, Craig, 640
Proctor and Gamble, 176
Proweller, Amira, 215
PSAL (Public School Athletic League), 498
Pusser, Brian, 640
Putnam, Robert D., 87–92

Queer Nation, 63
Quinlivan, Kathleen, 682

Radcliffe College, 186, 236, 239
Raj, Anita, 587
Ramirez, Francisco O., 413
Randel, Judith, 776
Randolph, Antonia, 787
Rankin, Nancy, 823
Ransom, Michael R., 687–88
Rao, Aruna, 775
Rasmussen, Mary Lou, 36
Ray, Brian D., 179–80
Raywid, Mary A., 141–42
Reagan, Nancy, 237
Reagan, Ronald, 150
Reay, Diane, 27, 29, 31, 34
ReCAPP (Resource Center for Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention), 277
Redman, Peter, 551
Rees, C. Roger, 501
Renold, Emma, 599
Ressler, Paula, 354
Rhoades, Gary, 7–10
Rich, Adrienne, 43–44, 112
Rich, Yisreal, 703, 706
Richards, Ellen H. (Swallow), 270
Richards, Herbert, 224

Richter, Maurice N., Jr., 696
Riegle-Crumb, Catherine, 377, 455, 611
Riordan, Cornelius, 211–12, 574
Roberts, Cokie, 237
Roberts, Joanne, 619
Robeson, Wendy Wagner, 619
Robinson, Jean.C., 374
Robinson-Pant, Anna, 427, 429, 433
Rockefeller, John D., 175
Roddy, Bertha Maxwell, 260
Rodgers-Rose, LaFrances, 260
Rogers, Pat, 436–37
Roman Catholic Church, 150, 235
Romero, Mary, 630
Roosevelt, Theodore, 187
Rosenthal, Robert, 544
Rosenwald, Julius, 175
Rosser, Sue V., 247, 253–55, 256
Rosser, Vicki J., 639
Rossié, Ute, 167
Rousso, Harilyn, 760
Rowan, Leonie, 432
Royal Commission on Learning, 748
Royal Commission on the Status of Women, 747
Rushing, Andrea Benton, 260
Rutgers University, 185, 189, 236, 240
RWE (Research on Women and Education), 109

Sachs, Jeffrey, 767
Sadker, David, 545, 573, 820
Sadker, Myra, 545, 573, 820
Sagaria, Mary Ann Danowitz, 636–40, 641
Saha, Larry J., 691–93
Saint John's University, 300
Saint Mary's School, 210
Salancik, Gerald R., 8
Salisbury, Jonathan, 720
Salomone, Rosemary, 137, 224, 225
Sami, Nilofar, 547
Sandell, Renee, 362
San Diego State College, 369
San Diego State University, 369
Sandler, Bernice R., 153, 799
Sarah Lawrence University, 189
Saudi Arabian Ministry of Education, 204
Sawyer, Diane, 237
Schiebinger, Londa, 251
Schmuck, Patricia, 215
Schor, Juliet, 653–54
Schultz, Jennifer, 444
Schwab, Robert M., 666
Schwartz, Michelle, 758
Sciarra, Daniel T., 532, 569
Scieszka, Jon, 447
Scripps College, 236
Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, 65–66
Seeman, Melvin, 691
Seidman, Alan, 398
Seymour, Elaine, 387
Shakeshaft, Charol, 533, 540, 598
Shakib, Sohaila, 489
Salish Kootenai College, 231–32
Shanahan, James, 278
Shauman, Kimberlee A., 253, 387, 451
Shaywitz, Bennett A., 444
Shaywitz, Sally E., 573
Shelden, Randall G., 593, 596
Sherman, Cindy, 359
Sherman, Julia, 437
Shmurak, Carole B., 137, 213–14, 216
Siedentop, Daryl, 323–24
Sigma Gamma Rho, 511
Sigma Omicron Epsilon, 511
Sigma Omicron Pi, 511
Sigma Sigma Rho, 511
Sigma Sigma Sigma, 510
Signorielli, Nancy, 278
Sikula, John, 339
Silva, Elena, 795–96
Silverman, Jay G., 587
Simmons, Annette M., 336
Sinte Gleska College, 231
Sinte Gleska University, 231–32
Sizemore, Barbara, 260
Skeggs, Beverley, 26–28, 31
Skiba, Russ, 584
Sklar, Katharine, 285
Slaughter, Sheila, 4, 7–10, 13, 638
Sledz, Bridget, 532, 569
Sleeter, Christine E., 303–5
Slowe, Lucy Diggs, 176–77
Smerdon, Becky A., 451
Smillie, Ian, 776
Smith, Adam, 87, 724–25
Smith, Barbara, 16, 260
Smith College, 236
Smith, Dorothy E., 575
Smith, Michael W., 446
Smith, Peter K., 584
Smith, Richard, 167
Smithies, Chris, 112–13
Smith-Reid, Inez, 260
Smithsonian Institution, 285
Smyth, John, 389, 390, 392, 394

Solomon, Catherine R., 629
Sommers, Christine Hoff, 717
Sophie Newcomb College, 186, 189
South Carolina State University, 148
Spady, William, 397–99
Sparks, Dennis, 692
Special Interest Group on Gender Equity, 332
Spelke, Elizabeth S., 444
Spelman College, 16, 171–74, 177–78, 186, 192, 236, 526
Spencer, Renée, 587
Spender, Dale, 33
Spergel, Irving, 592–93
Spillane, James P., 787
Spring, Joel, 340, 519
Stambach, Amy, 182
Stanford University, 151
Stanton-Salazar, Ricardo, 88, 91
Statistics Canada, 118
Statistics Commission, United Kingdom, 119
Statistics Sweden, 316–17
Staurowsky, Ellen J., 811, 814
Stearns, Elizabeth, 484
Steele, Claude M., 546
Stein, Nan, 584–86, 588, 589
Stein, Wayne J., 137, 233
Steinem, Gloria, 237
Stephens College, 510
Stevens, Mitchell, 181–82
Stewart, Maria W., 17
Stiver, Irene P., 72, 76–77
St. John's College, 191–92
Stockard, Jean, 85
Stone Center, 72–73
Stone, Lucy, 820
Stonehill, Harriett M., 799
Strange, Charles Carney, 160
Street, Brian V., 427, 429
Stromquist, Nelly P., 428, 765, 770, 772
Sudarkasa, Niara, 260
Suggs, Welch, 809, 811, 813–14
Summers, Lawrence, 154
Surrey, Janet L., 72–73
Swarthmore College, 236
Syracuse University, 510

Talburt, Susan, 70
Taliban, 201
Talladega College, 173
Tallerico, Marilyn, 624, 651
Tannehill, Deborah, 323–24
Tarule, Jill M., 288–89
Teachers College, 156, 467
Teese, Richard, 391
Tembo, Chimbuko, 262
Terborg-Penn, Rosalyn, 260
Terrell, Melvin C., 519, 521
Texas Women's University, 236
Texas State University, 336
Theberge, Nancy, 489
Theta Nu Xi, 511
Theta Tau Epsilon, 510
Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, 210
Thomas, Scott L., 638
Thompson, Travis, 758
Thorne, Barrie, 609, 618
Tinto, Vincent, 397–98
Toenjes, Laurence A., 693
Tolman, Deborah L., 587
Tong, Rosemarie, 53
Toutkoushian, Robert K., 689
Town, Shane, 682
Townsend, Barbara K., 160, 162
Townsend, Merric Lee, 691–93
Tracy, Sharon K., 593
Trecker, Janice Law, 332, 335
Trenholm, George W., 802
Troupe, Quincy, 554
Troy Female Seminary, 340
Truth, Sojourner, 22, 335
Tse-tung, Mao, 733
TSSAA (Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Association), 814
Tulane University, 186, 189, 526–27
Twombly, Susan B., 160
Tyack, David, 342, 402–3

Ülkü-Steiner, Beril, 630
UN (United Nations), 52, 202, 410, 711, 757, 764–65, 767, 771, 773–74, 776
UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), 768
UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), 203, 410, 428, 443, 470, 765, 767–68, 771
UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 119, 203, 205
UNGEI (United Nations Girls' Education Initiative), 776
UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund), 410, 542, 767, 771
UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women), 768
Union College, 187
United Negro College Fund, 514
United States Supreme Court, 135–37, 150,

191, 195, 218, 220, 223, 240, 585–86,588, 712, 780, 794, 801–5, 807, 811–14, 817
University of Amsterdam, 124
University of Birmingham, 95
University of California, 640
University of California, Berkeley, 637
University of California–Irving, 591
University of Chicago, 118, 122, 151, 157, 417
University of Iowa, 147, 148, 526
University of Massachusetts, 236
University of Michigan, 118, 124, 640, 804
University of Missouri, 803
University of North Carolina, 221, 260
University of Pennsylvania, 185, 187, 417, 640
University of Rochester, 187
University of Virginia, 189, 804
University of Wisconsin, 151, 804
Ursuline Academy, 210
U.S. Air Force, 195
U.S. Air Force Academy, 198–99
U.S. Army, 194–95
U.S. Coast Guard, 195
U.S. Marines, 195
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, 195
U.S. Naval Academy, 195, 199
U.S. Navy, 195
U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 591
U.S. Public Health Service, 275
USDA (United States Department of Agriculture), 693
USDLA (United States Distance Learning Association), 163

Valerio, Nina L., 280
Valiulis, Maryann, 317
Valley Forge Military College, 195
Valverde, Leonard A., 673
van de Water, Manon, 353, 356
Van Hise, Charles R., 151–52
Vassar College, 189, 236, 270
Vega, F., 307
Vigil, James Diego, 594–95
Villanueva, Irene, 405
Vincenti, Virginia, 246, 274
Virginia State Normal School, 510
Virginia State University, 148
Vitelli, Robert, 603
VMI (Virginia Military Institute), 137, 150, 191, 194–99, 218, 220, 223, 270, 805
Volk, Cindy S., 638
von Gandersheim, Hroswitha, 351
von Prümmer, Christine, 166–67, 170
Wabash College, 191–92
WAC (Women's Army Corps), 194
Walker, Alice, 17–18, 49
Walkerdine, Valerie, 96, 306
Wallace, Michelle, 16
Ward, Kelly, 160
Ward, Winifred, 352
Wardell, Mark, 703
Warren, John R., 211
Warrington, Molly, 740
Washington, Mary Helen, 260
Washington, Raymond, 593
Washington Square College, 510
Washington State University, 526
Weaver-Hightower, Marcus B., 718–19, 722
Webb, Sidney, 683
Weber, Max, 8, 725–26
Wechsler, David, 421, 423
WEEA Equity Resource Center, 820
WEEA Publishing Center, 818, 820
Weedon, Chris, 45
Wehmeyer, Michael L., 758
Weiner, Gaby, 742
Weingarten, Kathy, 73
Weininger, Elliot B., 27, 91
Weinstein, Rhona S., 547
Weis, Lois, 31, 390, 393
Weitzman, Lenore, 446
Wellesley College, 72, 151, 236
Wellman, Barry, 346
Wells, Amy E., 515
Wells, Ida B., 257
Wernersson, Inga, 766, 769
Wesleyan College, 187
Wesleyan Female College, 510
West, Cornel, 829
West Point, 196, 199
Wexler, Philip, 389–90
Wheeler, Barbara, 260
Wheeler, Evangeline A., 22
Whipple, Edward G., 496
Wilberforce University, 171
Wilhelm, Jeffrey D., 446
Willard, Emma, 209–10, 238
Williams, Barbara Morrow, 532, 561
Williams, Joan, 706
Williams, Tookie, 593
Willis, Paul, 129, 605–6
Willits, Billie S., 703
Wilson, Amy, 762
WIN (Women's International Network), 163

Winslow-Bowe, Sarah, 659
Winslow-Bowe, S. E., 624
Wiseman, Alexander W., 137, 204, 208, 414
Wolfe, John R., 160
Wolfe, Leslie R., 821
Wolf-Wendel, Lisa, 160, 242
Wollstonecraft, Mary, 39
Wolpe, Anne Marie, 95
Women's Center (Miami University), 526
Women's College Coalition, 240
Women's Research and Resource Center, 178, 526
Women's Resource and Action Center (University of Iowa), 526
Women's Resource Center (Washington State University), 526
Woodson, Carter G., 257
Woody, Thomas, 150
Wooffitt, Robin, 97
World Bank, 52, 119, 410, 712, 756, 766, 771, 776
Worley, Deborah, 515

Xavier University, 174, 178
Xie, Yu, 253, 387, 451

Yale University, 185, 187–91, 246, 417
YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association), 498
Young, Carlene, 260
Young, M.F.D., 95
Younger, Mike, 740

Zeta Mu Epsilon, 510
Zeta Phi Beta, 510
Zeta Tau Alpha, 510
Zimmer, Ron, 787

Subject Index

Numbers in **boldface** refer to the main entry on or overview of the subject.

Academic capitalism theory, 4, 5, **7–13**
Academic majors, **381–87**; choices at HCBUs, 174; choices at single-sex v. coeducational colleges, 224; consequences of, 397, 453, 727; curricular tracking and, 405; gender inequalities in, 153–54, 156, 341, 379; school counseling and, 568; in STEM, 249–50, 449–51, 452. *See also names of specific majors*
Academics: evaluation policies for, **723–29**; salaries of, 625, 637, 671, **683–90**, 696, 722. *See also* Faculty in higher education
Achievement. *See* Educational achievements
ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, USA), 756, 757
Administrators, higher education, 10, 638–640; at community colleges, 155, 157, 159, 161; leadership styles of, 670–75; at HBCUs, 176–78; at TCUs, 231–32; women, at men's colleges, 191, 241; women, at single-sex colleges, 154
Administrators, school. *See* Career patterns of; Salaries of
Advising and mentoring: for gender development, 298, 311, 449, 453, 576, 721, 748; of faculty and administrators, 176, 639, 640, 648, 672–73, 749; in graduate education, 289, 419, **627–33**, 635; by students, 269, 279. *See also* School counseling
Afrocentricity, 20, 258–59, 261, 721, 788
AIDS/HIV, 43, 276–78, 551, 680, 756; androcentric v. feminist research on, 112–14, 251
Alternative schools and educational settings, 136, **139–46**, 780–81, 782–84
Attrition: from colleges and universities, 228, 232, 379, **395–400**; from courses or academic majors, 289, 311, 312, 379, 428, 450–51; gender differences in, 84, 206, 296, 481, 532, 558, 718; race-ethnicity and social class effects on, 84, 90, 222, 228, 232, 404; from schools, 144, **389–94**, 479

Biological and physical sciences, **249–56**; career patterns in, 636, 656; gender (in) equities in, 378, 449–51; gender (in) equities, reasons for, 452–54; gendered pathways to, 379–80, 381, 382–84; research methods in, 223; heteronormativity and, 329; masculinity and, 246; in single-sex schools, 214
Biological clock, 631
Biological determinism: international data v., 377; psychological causality v., 446, 447; social causality v., 108, 222, 296, 409–10, 423, 438; social constructionism v., 64, 94, 391, 790. *See also* Biological sex differences; Essentialism
Biological sex differences, 79, 82, 221, 437, 444, 718; cultural interpretations of, 542; feminist theories and, 39, 40, 41, 48, 52, 63, 67; hidden curriculum and, 550; sports and, 487. *See also* Biological determinism; Essentialism
Black colleges. *See* HBCUs
Black common school, 135

Black feminism, 6, **15–22**, 40, 727, 733. *See also* Standpoint theories; Womanism

Black movements: feminist, 16; freedom, 247, 257, 261; liberation, 15; power, 549–50, 733. *See also* Black feminism; Black studies; Civil rights movement

Black studies, 246–47; **257–62**

Black women's studies, 17, 259–62. *See also* Women's and gender studies

"Boy Problem," 379, 714, **717–22**, 753, 788; "girl power" and, 144–46; history of, 140, 342

British Education Reform Act of 1988, 318, 711, 742

Brown v. Board of Education court decision, 136, 220, 487, 712, 805, 817

Capital, 6; cultural v. economic, 23, 24, 26, 28; economic, 4, 11, 34, 87, 90, 725; human, 87, 378, 379, 395, 410, 666; linguistic, 23; symbolic, 23, 24, 28. *See also* Cultural capital theories; Social capital theories

Capitalism, 8, 12, 16, 159, 270, 749; education as a tool of, 32–33; Marxist theory of, 19, 725

Career counseling and guidance, 345, 400, 524, 563, 564, 565–69, 629. *See also* Advising and mentoring; School counseling

Career impediments, 17, 575, 658, 674, 748, 796–98; for gang members, 596; in STEM, 154, 292, 436, 440, 450–51, 698, 787. *See also* Work-family conflict

Career opportunities: for literacy teachers, 430, 748; service learning and, 503–5

Career patterns of: children and adolescents in school, 92, 403, 405, 543, 545–46, 594; females vs. males, 109, 154, 165, 217, 287, 297, 348, 787; professionals in higher education, 416, 564, **635–41**, 671; school administrators and teachers, **643–51**; students in higher education, 311, 409, 496, 514, 542

Cheerleading. *See* Femininity; School sports

Civil Rights Act of 1964 (USA), 136, 684, 712, 756

Civil rights movement: in 1950s, 173, 271; in 1960s, 158, 173, 217, 549–50; subsequent influences on feminism, 16, 36, 41, 107, 733; on scholarship, 109; on teen pregnancy policy, 780. *See also* Black movements; Women's movements

Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (USA), 150, 712, 713

Coeducational colleges and universities, 135, 137, **147–54**, 158, 417; men's colleges, transformation from, 185, 187, 188–90; sororities at, 493, 509; student government at, 518; women administrators at, 518, 671; women's colleges v., 235–40. *See also* Community colleges; HBCUs; Military colleges and academies; TCUs

Coeducational schools, 518, 572, 574, 671, 714, 766, 788. *See also* Single-sex v. coeducational schools

College types: denominational, 148, 235, 239; independent, 239; Roman Catholic, 150–51, 186, 188, 189, 191, 235, 239; single-sex, 135, 136, 137, 147, 148, 149, 172. *See also* Coeducational colleges and universities; Men's colleges; Women's colleges

Community colleges, **155–62**, 269, 363, 396; tribally controlled, **227–33**

Cultural capital theories, 4, **23–29**, 87, 91; in analyses of school cultures, 392, 555–57, 558

Curricular tracking, 112, 136, 152, 204, **401–6,** 607; alternative schools as types of, 143

Curriculum: in alternative v. traditional schools, 140–43, 145–46; hidden, 56, 311, 358, **531–33**, 598, 600, 628 (*see also* Heterosexism and homophobia); gendered practices in, 60, 136, 137, 403; national, **315–20**; official, **245–47**; prepackaged, 10; queer(ing), **327–30**; theoretical framings for, 33, 64, 67–69, 81, 83 *See also names of specific school subjects*

Data sources on gender and education, **117–24**

Developmental disabilities. *See* Learning disabilities

Disabilities, students with: feminist teaching and, 734; gender equity and, 740, 741, 744, **755–62**, 819–20; legislation in Canada about, 781; sexual abuse and, 536. *See also* Learning disabilities

Distance education, 10, 12, 133, **163–70**

Early childhood education, **263–67**; WMD intelligence and, 150. *See also* Playgrounds and recreational activities

Eating disorders, 73, 191, 509, 756–57, 797

Education policies and gender, **711–15**. *See also* Gender equality policies; *names of specific policies*

Educational achievements: in international context, **407–14**; in official curriculum

377–80. *See also names of specific school subjects*
Educational research: feminist critiques of, **107–15**; frameworks for, 677, 680, 681; gender issues and, 101, **103–6**, 743, 745; representations of social class in, 553, 554. *See also* Gender research
EFA (Education for All): global policy, 202, 764–65, 768, 773, 774; world conference on, 202
Essentialism, 6, 47, 57, 129, 437, 784; social constructionism v., 64–65, 94. *See also* Biological determinism; Biological sex differences
Expectations, of teachers for boys and girls, **541–47**. *See also* Teacher-student interactions
Extracurriculum, **475–78**; "boy problem" and, 342; exclusion of pregnant and parenting students, 781–82; offerings at colleges, 173, 186, 194, 236; offerings at single-sex and coeducational schools, 224–25; theatre and visual arts in, 354, 358. *See also* Fraternities; School clubs; School sports; Service learning; Sororities; Women's centers

Faculty in higher education. *See* Academics; Career patterns of: professionals in higher education; Workloads of
Family and consumer sciences, 246, **269–74**
Family friendly policies. *See* Work-family conflict, reconciliation policies
Federal Vocational Education Act of 1976 (USA), 274
Femininity: boys and, 553, 575; in cheerleading and women's sports, **485–90**, 497, 499; as cultural capital, 26, 28; curricular constructions of, 254, 275, 311, 321–24, 359, 446, 573; "good" students and, 532, 575; masculinity v., 5, 74, 266–67, 328; peer cultures and, 580, 599, 609; research on, 81; social constructions of, 93, 95, 97, 282, 284, 372, 575; social constructions in specific educational contexts, 195–96, 198, 222, 343; sororities and, 514; theoretical conceptualizations of, 43, 48, 296, 299, 328; traditional, and deviations from, 139, 144, 145, 306, 550–51, 682; White conceptualization of, 22, 559
Feminisms: ecofeminism, 43; lesbian, 16, 40, 43; Marxist and neo-Marxist, 31–33, 36, 727 (*see also* Reproduction theories, feminist versions); postcolonial, 44, 45; postmodern influences on, 342–43, 359, 506 (*see also* Postmodern and poststructural theories); socialist, 40, 41, 42, 159, 438, 727. *See also* Liberal feminism; Multicultural and global feminisms; Radical feminism
Feminization of: lower level campus administration, 636, 640; teaching, 430, **661–67**
FERPA (Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act, 1974, USA), 806–7
Fraternities, 475, 476, **491–96**, 509, 510, 512, 514; men's colleges and, 187, 190, 191, 192

Gang rape, 153
Gangs, 144, 579, 581, **591–96**. *See also* Peer group
Gender equality policies: in British schooling, **739–46**, 781; in Canadian schooling, **747–54**; international, 201, 202, 203, 205, 407–14, **763–70**; national curricula and, 315, 316–19. *See also* Education policies and gender
Gender equity: distance education and, 166–67; reproductive theories and, 32–34, 36; school choice and, 34, **787–92**; transformational approach to literacy and, 432–33
Gender legislation. *See* Gender equality policies; Legislation; *names of specific laws*
Gender research, 32, 35, 60, 96; data sources for, **117–24**; methodological problems in, **125–29**; music education and, 309–12
Gender schema, 81, 614–18
Gender segregation in: academic majors, 151, **381–87,** 450–51; colleges, 148, 149, 152; national school systems, 203, 205, 208, 318; occupations and vocational education, 363, 364, 381, 644, 645, 666; school administration, 643, 644, 649, 650, 791; schools, 135, 136, 791; student peer groups, 609. *See also* Single-sex v. coeducational schools
Gender studies. *See* Women's and gender studies
G.I. Bill, 188, 817
GLBT (gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transexuals). *See* LGBT students
Graduate and professional education, 150, 247, **415–19**, 713

HBCUs (historically Black colleges and

universities), 135, **171–78**, 186, 236, 271, 526; teacher training at, 340–41

Health and sex education, 113, 180, **275–80**, 298, 403

Heterosexism and homophobia in: Black civil rights movement, 16; hidden curriculum, **549–54**; peer group, 392, **597–603**; school curricula, 305; socialization of boys, 74; teaching, **677–82**

Hidden curriculum, 56, 311, 358, 366, 500; gender constructions in, **531–33**; heterosexism and homophobia in, **549–54**

History lessons about gender, **281–86**. *See also* Social studies

Home economics, 136, 152, 158, 217, 246, 297, 413. *See also* Family and consumer sciences

Home schooling, 133, **179–83**

Homophobia. *See* Heterosexism and homophobia

ICT (information and communication technology), 168, 345, 432

IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990, USA), 756, 757

Intelligence tests, **421–25**, 544

IT (information technology), 318, 345

Leadership styles of educators, 114, 624, 640, 646–47, **669–75**; at HBCUs, 175; in visual arts, 359, 360, 361; in women's studies, 371

Learning disabilities, gender differences in, 73–74, 221, 444, 718, 757–58. *See also* "Boy Problem"; Disabilities

Legislation regarding: affirmative action, 650; gender and educational equality, 39, 316, 318, 684–85; home economics, 273; home schooling, 179; mathematics performance of girls, 435, 436; pregnancy and parenting teens, 781; students' rights, 801, 805–6; students with disabilities, 755–57; TCUs, 229. *See also* Gender equality policies; *names of specific laws*

LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transexual) students: inclusive policies for, 67, 68, 600; mistreatment of, 586, 597; peer advocacy for, 475, 600–601; sororities for, 511; treatment by teachers, 602–3

Liberal feminism, 4, 5, 159, 182, 437, 748; "Boy Problem" and, 719–20; feminist reproduction theory and, 34; radical feminism and, **39–45**, 58, 159, 726–27

Literacy, 120–22, 379, **427–33**, 440, 789; goals of EFA, MDGs, and NGOs, 765, 774, 775. *See also* "Boy Problem"; Reading

Major fields/programs of study. *See* Academic majors

Masculinity: "boy problem" and, 719–22; cheerleading and, 485–86; crisis of (*see* "Boy Problem"); femininity v., 5, 74, 266–67, 328; gender oppression and, 306; hegemonic, 129, 185, 299–300, 497, 551, 553, 681; heterosexuality and, 551–52, 599; homophobia and teaching and, **677–82**; men's studies scholarship on, 299–300; national curricula and, 314; peer cultures and, 580, 599, 609; physical education and, 322–34; play and, 616; school sports and, 306, 445, **497–501**; sexual harassment and, 609; "tough guise" and, 307; violence and, 587

Mathematics: achievement measures of, 121, 122; advanced track placements in, 404; feminism and, 251; gender constructions in, **287–93**; instructors of, difficulty finding at TCUs, 231; interpretations of performance in, 127–28; masculinity and, 246, 317, 359; national curricula and, 314, 318; single-sex classes and performance in, 211–12, 214–15, 221, 437

Mathematics, gender differences in: interest in 211, 215; enrollment in, 136, 206, 247, 405; expected performance in, 408; majors and degree attainment in, 253, 381, 405, 450, 452; occupational careers in, 154, 384; performance in, 378, 408–10, **435–41**; senior faculty positions in, 404; TIMSS results, 206–7, 411–12

MDGs (Millenium Developmental Goals, U.N.), 764, 765, 768

Men's colleges and universities, **185–92**, 201, 296. *See also* Military colleges and academies

Men's studies, 247, **295–301**, 677

Mentors, 154, 311, 279, 289, 449, 453. *See also* Advising and mentoring

Military colleges and academies, 151, 189, 191, **193–200**. *See also* VMI (Virginia Military Institute) court case

Morrill Land Grant Act (USA): of 1862, 149, 238, 270, 273; of 1890, 149, 172, 270

Multicultural and global feminisms, 6, 40, 41, **47–53**, 344, 727

Multicultural education, 258, **303–8**, 342, 495, 789

Music, **309–14**; as cultural capital, 27, 87; gender differentiation within field of, 246; in home schooling, 181; school theatrical productions of, 352–53, 354; student participation in extracurricular forms of, 479, 480; teachers of, as sexual abusers, 536, 540; videos of, and the female body, 359

NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress), 334, 450, 718. *See also* Data sources on gender and education
National curricula, **315–20**
National school systems, **201–8**, 407
NCLB (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, USA), 693; devaluation of applied sciences, arts, social studies in, 274, 331, 359; gender and, 711; "high stakes testing" and, 103; research funding and, 111; school choice and, 315; school reform undermined by, 308; single-sex schooling and, 137, 218; teacher burnout and, 695–96; testing and quantitative analysis promoted by, 98
NGOs (nongovernmental organizations), 715, 769; impact on gendered education, **771–78**

Patriarchy, 77, 769; education institutions, entrenched in, 4, 5, 11, 12, 33, 39, 173, 175; female experience of schooling and, 391, 393; feminism and, 5, 18, 41, 42–45, 727; gender construction in, 5, 41; men, effects on, 298, 299; transformation of, 39; White, 261; women's groups, opposition to, 373, 775–76, 820
Pedagogy: Black feminist, 20–21; critical, 352, 360, 431; feminist, 114, 360, 361, 524, 629, 715, **731–38**; flexible, 142, 145; gender sex equity and, 750, 779, 784, 818, 820; queer, 63, 68–70, 328, 554; traditional, 142
Pedagogy in: "boy's problem," etiology of, 719, 720; mathematics, 291; multicultural education, 303, 306, 307, 308; music, 312, 313; physical education, 321, 324, 325, 326; teachers' education, 340; women's studies, 506
Peer group: bullying, harassment and violence in, 74, 113, 304, 500, **583–89**, 599; cultures and friendships in, 597, **605–11**; gender constructions in, 295, 296, 299, **579–81**; recreational activities on playgrounds, 615–18
Physical education, 274, 315, 316, **321–26**, 476. *See also* School sports
PIRLS (Program in International Reading Literacy Study), 121, 122
PISA (Program for International Student Assessment), 347–48, 438–40. *See also* Data sources on gender and education
Playgrounds and recreational activities, **613–19**
Policies. *See* Gender equality policies; *names of specific policies*
Positionality, 306–7, 627, 630, 735
Positivism, 111, 250; criticisms of, 271
Postmodern and poststructural theories, 5, 34, 35, 40, 41, **55–61**; in music education, 311; research knowledge and, 110
Pregnant and parenting teens, schooling of, 113, 114, 142, 143, 714, 744, **779–86**
Private schools. *See* School types
Problem boys and girls, management by teachers, **555–61**
Public schools. *See* School types

Queer: activism, 735; curriculum, **327–30**; meanings of, 327; studies, 247
Queer theory, 5, 40, 56, **63–70**, 327, 743; in men's studies, 299; in music education, 311; subjectivities in school and, 551, 552

Racial segregation, 135–36, 172, 712, 805, 817; gender segregation, differences from, 136
Radical feminism, 4, 5, 12, 727; liberal feminism and, **39–45**, 58, 437–38, 726–27; sisterhood in, 43, 45, 51
Reading, 278, 339, 359, 379, **443–48**, 721; curricular tracking in, 403; gender differences in, 128, 211, 221, 264, 379, 718; measures of, 121, 122, 695, 718; queer practices and, 328, 329; single-sex schooling and, 224. *See also* Literacy
Relational-cultural theory, 4, **71–78**
Reproduction. *See* Sexual reproduction; Social reproduction
Reproduction theories, 25, 27, 28; feminist versions of, 4, 5, **31–38**
Research. *See* Educational research; Gender research
Role learning. *See* Sex role socialization
Role models, 154, 311. *See also* Advising and mentoring; Mentors

Salaries of: academics, 625, 637, 657, **683–90**; reading teachers, 447; school administrators and teachers, 340–41, 343, 623, 644, 665–66, 722

School clubs: academic, arts, and service, **479–84**; drama, in all-male schools, 224. *See also* Student government

School counseling, 77, 219, 400, 524, **563–69**, 678, 789. *See also* Advising and mentoring

School sports: boys' and men's, 477–78, 479, 481, **497–501**, 617, 619; cheerleading, girls' and women's, **485–90**; gender equity policies and, 766, 807; history of, 186, 187, 190, 342; masculinity and, 299, 300, 306, 445, **497–501**; risky behavior and, 482; school theatre programs as alternative to, 186, 300, 354; Title IX and, **809–16**. *See also* Physical education

School types: Catholic, 209, 210, 211, 212, 215–16, 789; independent, 209–10, 211, 212, 213, 498; Islamic, 204–5; private, 137, **209–16**, 222, 223, 402; public, **217–25**; single-sex, 741–42. *See also* Single-sex v. coeducational schools

Science: academic capitalism and, 8, 9, 10, 12; attrition from higher education by women in, 397; Black women in, 174; feminist critiques of, 21–22, 43, 44, 111; interpretations of performance in, 127–28; masculinity and, 246, 297, 309, 359, 408, 543, 545–46, 573; measures of performance in, 121, 122; national curricula and, 315, 317, 318; patriarchal biases in, 250–51; underrepresentation of girls and women in, 379, 380, 696, 697, 713; valued above arts, 359. *See also* Biological and physical sciences

Science, gender differences in: access to, 524, 542; achievement, 206–7, 287, 378, 411–13, **449–55** (*see also* Single-sex v. coeducational schools); course enrollments, 136, 404, 550; degrees obtained, 84, 382–84, 386–87, 543, 636–37; encouragement received, 559, 568, 572; peer influences on, 611; teacher expectancies about, 544, 545. *See also* Biological and physical sciences

SDA (Sex Discrimination Act of 1975, UK), 711, 740

Second-wave feminism, 32, 55, 56, 105, 149, 713, 715, 743; men's studies and, 296, 297; single-sex education and, 217; sisterhood in, 513, 516; student government and, 518; women's studies and, 370–72

Self-socialization of gender, 613, 614–15, 618. *See also* Sex role socialization theory

Service learning and activism, 259, 336, **503–7**, 527

Sex education. *See* Health and sex education

Sexism, 48, 190, 299, 528; Black women's experiences of, 16, 20, 261; bullying as different from, 587; multicultural feminism and, 49; programs to reduce, 178, 191, 198; racism and, 305–6; relational-cultural theory and, 71, 77; religious roots of, 172–73; teachers and peer, 533, 573

Sexist practices in: mass media, 310; mathematics, 289; music education, 310; single-sex schools, 212, 220

Sex role socialization, 94, 112, 296–97; hidden curriculum as source of, 550; liberal feminist emphasis on, 437; reading and, 444–45, 447; relational-cultural theory and, 72–76. *See also* Self-socialization of gender

Sex role socialization theory, 3, 4, 5, **79–85**, 265–66, 748; critiques of, 32–33, 56–57, 748–49

Sex role theory, 33, 57, 265, 551. *See also* Sex role socialization theory

Sexual harassment, 153, 599, 602–3, 609, 680; educator sexual misconduct and, **535–40**; HBCUs and, 177; men's colleges as context for, 190–91, 193, 196, 198–99; overreactions to, 557–58; policies regarding, 153, 158, 751, **793–800**, 805–6, 807; programmatic responses against, 198, 279, 316, 495, 525, 818; student attrition, as consequence of, 292, 453; teachers as observers of, 308, 575; Title IX and, 81, 812; underreporting of, 153. *See also* Peer group: bullying, harassment, and violence

Sexual reproduction: as choice in liberal feminism, 40, 41; as constraint on women, 727–28; gender constructions and, 109, 682; sex education and, 254, 276, 278; technology and, 50; vocational education and, 364; women with disabilities and feminist views of, 760

Single-sex v. coeducational schools: in international context, 204–5, 208, 437, 542; in private sector, 137, **209–16**; in public sector, 135, 136, 137, **217–25**, 403, 543, 552, 574; science achievement and, 211, 213, 214–15, 220, 229; school choice policies and, 714, 788–91

Social capital theories, 4, 23, 24, 28, **87–92**

Social constructionism, 5, **93–97**; men's studies and, 299; theoretical debates about, 48, 61, 250

Social constructions of: femininity in cheerleading, 489; gender in curricula, 330, 403; gender and whiteness in teacher education, 339, 343; knowledge in class-based studies, 550; masculinity and reading, 446; peer cultures, 605; selves in feminist pedagogy, 736; youth cultures, 607

Social movements. *See* Black movements; Civil rights movement; Women's movements

Social reproduction, 56, 714; of gender identities through physical education, 324, 326; of gendered inequalities by educational institutions, 56; of heterosexuality, 44. *See also* Reproduction theories

Social sciences: academic capitalism and, 9, 10, 12; Black feminism, challenges to, 21; Foucault's influence on, 56; funding policies effects on, 631; gender gap in, 381–85, 636; men's studies and, 297, 300; queer perspectives in, 329

Social studies, **331–38**, 354, 404. *See also* History lessons about gender

Sociobiology, 41. *See also* Biological sex differences

Sororities, 173, 475, 476, 493, 494, **509–15**

Standpoint theories: Black feminism and, 6, **15–22**

STDs (sexually transmitted diseases), education about, 277

STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) fields of study: attrition from, 450; chilly climate for women in, 453; gender differences in, 378–79, 381–82, 386, 450–51; teacher recruitment into, 697. *See also* Career impediments

Student government, **517–22**; student unions, compared to, 475–76

Students' rights policies, **801–7**

TCUs (tribally controlled colleges and universities), **227–33**

Teacher burnout, 181–82, 624, **691–99**

Teacher education, **339–44;** in drama and theatre, 352; FCS and, 274; gender gap in, 247, 721; NGOs and, 775; in physical education, 321, 325–26; shortcomings of, 308, 310–11

Teacher-student interactions, **571–76**

Teachers. *See* Career patterns of; Salaries of; Workloads of

Teachers unions, 112, 750, 751, 753, 764

Technology and computer science, **345–50**; academic majors of men and women in, 381, 383–84, 386–87; gender gaps in, 169, 246, 247, 249–50, 572, 630, 787

Theatre and drama, 114, 186, 246, **351–56**, 461

Theories, gendered, of education, **3–6**. *See also* Feminisms; *names of specific theories*

TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study), 207, 208, 411–12, 438–40, 451. *See also* Data sources on gender and education

Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972 (USA), 113, 149–50, 539, 711–13, 805–7; "boy problem" and, 722; people with disabilities and, 755–56; pregnant teens and, 780; school sports and, 190–91, 487, 490, 501, **809–16**; sexual misconduct and, 538, 583–84, 794, 799–800; single-sex schooling and, 136, 218, 220, 240, 788; WEEA and, 818–19

Tracking. *See* Curricular tracking

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 202

Visual arts, **357–62**; as cultural capital, 27, 87; devalued in academic capitalism, 12; devalued in NCLB, 274; drama and, 354; gender stereotypes concerning, 568, 617; in national curricula, 318; poststructuralism, influence on, 56; sex segregation in, 246. *See also* School clubs: academic, arts, and service

VMI (Virginia Military Institute) court case, 137, 150, 218, 220, 223, 805. *See also* Military colleges and academies

Vocational education, 246, 273–74, **363–68**; data on, 120–21; in national curricula, 315.

WEEA (Women's Educational Equity Act), **817–21**

Womanism, 18, 261–62

Women's and gender studies, 254, **369–74**; citizen education and, 336; community colleges and, 158, 160; curricular transformations encouraged by, 109, 246, 249–52, 255, 310, 335; Black, 259–61; distance education and, 169; feminist activism and, 247, 503–6; feminist influences on, 50–51; HBCUs and, 178; hiring of women faculty and, 191; pedagogy and, 254, 731, 732; secondary school level, 753; shortcomings in, 253; social

constructionism and, 94; women's centers and, 523–26; womanism and, 18
Women's centers, 3, 158, 160, **523–28**
Women's colleges and universities, 135, 148, 149, 173, **235–42**; faculty and administrators at, 11, 154, 177, 671; science and, 237, 252; sororities at, 512
Women's movements, 41, 190, 371–72, 742–43; Black sororities and, 173, 513–14; consequences of, 158, 192, 257, 296–97, 649, 780, 811; for liberation (*see* Second-wave feminism); for rights and suffrage, 148, 173, 282, 296, 335; third-wave feminism, 11; women's centers and, 524, 526; women's studies and, 252, 369
Work-family conflict, 149, 625, 727–28; distance education as response to, 164–65; of educators, 160, 655, 658, **701–7**, 727; penalties for, 175, 387; reconciliation policies, 160–61, 182, 705–6, **823–30**; women faculty as role models for resolution of, 630
Workloads of: faculty in higher education, 630, 631, 637, **653–59;** teachers, 184, 751, 752
World Conferences on Women, 52; 4th in Beijing, 52, 765, 776; NGO Forum at 3rd in Nairobi, 333
Writing, **457–62**

Youth. *See* Gangs; Peer group

About the Editors and Contributors

Barbara J. Bank is Professor Emerita of Sociology and of Women Studies at the University of Missouri–Columbia. She has been honored with a Fulbright Senior Scholar Award, visiting fellowships at the Australian National University, and three awards for outstanding teaching. Her scholarly presentations and publications, including *Contradictions in Women's Education: Traditionalism, Careerism, and Community at a Single-Sex College* (2003), reflect her interests in the areas of social psychology, gender studies, and the sociology of youth and education.

Sara Delamont is Reader in Sociology at Cardiff University, Wales, U.K. She was elected an Academician of the U.K. Academy of Social Sciences in 2000. In 1984, she was the first woman President of the British Educational Research Association, and she was also the first woman Dean of Social Sciences at Cardiff University. She is currently editing two journals, *Teaching and Teacher Education* and *Qualitative Research,* and her most recent single-authored book is *Feminist Sociology* (2003). Her ongoing research interests include an ethnography of how the Brazilian martial art capoeira is taught in the United Kingdom.

Catherine Marshall is Professor of Educational Administration and Policy at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Her gender studies focus on leadership and policy in education. She has also studied gender policy internationally. Her *Feminist Critical Policy Analysis* (1997) demands policy attention to a range of gender issues. Marshall also conducts research on state education politics and gender issues in education careers. She initiated the formation of Leadership for Social Justice, an international network for equity advocacy. Her books, *Reframing Educational Politics for Social Justice* (2005) and *Leadership for Social Justice* (2006), are used to shift the educational administration field away from managerial assumptions to equity advocacy leadership.

Sandra Acker is Professor in the Department of Sociology and Equity Studies, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto in Canada where she has recently served as Associate Dean (Social Sciences), School of Graduate Studies. She has worked in the United States, Britain, and Canada as a sociologist of education, with interests in gender and education, teachers' work, and higher education. Her current research is focused on university tenure practices, women academics in leadership positions, graduate student experiences, and transitions in teacher education institutions. She is the author of *Gendered Education* (1994) and *The Realities of Teachers' Work: Never a Dull Moment* (1999).

Lyndsay J. Agans is a doctoral student and research assistant in Higher Education at the University of Denver. Her scholarship focuses on organization and governance as it relates to change and reform for equality in higher education.

Debra Barbezat is Professor of Economics at Colby College in Waterville, Maine. She received her PhD from the University of Michigan with an emphasis on labor economics. Her research has focused specifically on academic labor markets including male-female pay gaps, the effects of collective bargaining, and the influence of seniority, job mobility, and salary structure on academic salaries.

Rachel Hile Bassett is Assistant Professor of English at Indiana University–Purdue University at Fort Wayne. Her research focuses on early modern English literature, and she is the editor of *Parenting and Professing: Balancing Family Work with an Academic Career* (2005).

Karen Bojar is Professor of English and Coordinator of Women's Studies at Community College of Philadelphia where she has taught for the past 30 years. She has published extensively on feminist pedagogy and the relationship between women's studies, service learning, and feminist activism. She has had a long history in grassroots feminist politics. Currently, she serves as President of Philadelphia NOW, chairs its Political Action Committee, and is on the board of the Pennsylvania NOW-PAC. She is also a board member of NARAL-PA Foundation.

Linda K. Carter is a graduate student in Economics at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee. Her research interests include the economic history of education in the United States and the use of innovative strategies to improve educational outcomes in less-developed countries. She is the author of *A Hard Day's Night: Evening Schools and Child Labor in Early 20th Century New Jersey,* a study of the factors determining attendance at night school among New Jersey child workers that is part of her dissertation.

Rebecca Priegert Coulter is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, Canada. She has published several articles and chapters on gender equity policies and practices in Canada and coedited *History Is Hers: Women Educators in Twentieth-Century Ontario* (2005). In recognition of her contributions to the education of girls and women, she won the 2005 Achievement Award from the Canadian Association for the Study of Women and Education.

Amanda Datnow is Associate Professor at the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California. Her research focuses on the politics and policies of school reform, with a particular focus on educators' professional lives and issues of equity. She is the author of *Integrating Educational Systems for Successful Reform in Diverse Contexts* (2006) and numerous other books and articles.

Miriam E. David is Professor of Policy Studies in Education and Associate Director for Higher Education of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme based at the Institute of Education, University of London, U.K. She has an international reputation for her research and scholarly publications on education, family, gender, and policy sociology.

Miriam Hernandez Dimmler is a PhD candidate in the Clinical Science Program at the University of California, Berkeley. Her research focuses on family socialization processes in ethnic minority and low-income families, school-based interventions for family, urban education, and minority mental health.

Anthony Gary Dworkin is Professor of Sociology at the University of Houston, Texas; cofounder of that university's Sociology of Education Research Group; and editor of *The New Inequality Series* at SUNY Press. Additionally, he serves on the council of Research Committee 04 (Sociology of Education) of the International Sociological Association. His publications include works on teacher burnout and student dropout behavior; minority-majority relations and racial and ethnic stereotyping; gender roles; the impact of accountability systems on student learning outcomes; and, most recently, accountability and high-stakes testing under No Child Left Behind. He is currently coediting *The International Handbook on Research on Teachers and Teaching.*

Janet Enke is Chair of the Social Science Department at Metropolitan State University in St. Paul, Minnesota. She has written on young women's experiences in high school varsity athletics and has been recognized four times for her excellence in teaching.

Berenice Malka Fisher is Professor Emerita of Educational Philosophy at New York University. Her articles and chapters address topics as diverse as women role models, the impact of disability on women's friendships, and feminism and political theater. Her book, *No Angel in the Classroom: Teaching Through Feminist Discourse,* won the 2002 Distinguished Publication Award of the Association for Women in Psychology. Her current interests include feminist education, political discourse, and the peaceful resolution of political conflict.

Kathleen J. Fitzgerald is Assistant Professor of Sociology at Columbia College in Columbia, Missouri. Her research and teaching interests include gender, race, education, family, and social policy.

Elizabeth Glennie is a Research Scientist at Duke University's Center for Child and Family Policy and Director of the North Carolina Education Research Data Center. Much of her research has focused on the American educational system with an emphasis on school engagement and educational achievement. In particular, she analyzes factors that influence student engagement with school and those affecting teacher job satisfaction and turnover rates.

Janet C. Gornick is Professor of Political Science and Sociology at The Graduate Center, City University of New York (CUNY), and Professor of Political Science at Baruch

College, also part of CUNY. She is also Director of the Luxembourg Income Study, a cross-national research institute and data archive located in Luxembourg. She has written extensively on work-family reconciliation policies in the industrialized countries and is coauthor of *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment* (2003).

Linda Grant is Professor of Sociology at the University of Georgia, Adjunct Professor in the Social Foundations of Education program, and an affiliated faculty member of the Institute for Women's Studies. She recently completed a term as deputy editor of the journal *Sociology of Education.* Her research focuses on equity and inequality in education and in medical and scientific careers.

Sandra Harding is Vice-Chancellor and President of James Cook University, Queensland, Australia. She is a sociologist whose key scholarly interests revolve around the sociology of work, organization, and inequality. Her current research is focused on the conditions for enterprise development and organization survey methodology. She has a keen professional interest in education policy and management.

Chris Haywood is Programme Director of Media, Communication, and Cultural Studies at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne in the United Kingdom. He has published widely in the area of sexuality, gender, and age and is coauthor of *Men and Masculinities* (2003) and *Gender, Culture and Society: Contemporary Femininities and Masculinities* (2006).

Lea Hubbard is Associate Professor in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego, California. Her work focuses on educational inequities, as they exist across ethnicity, class, and gender. Her latest book, *Reform as Learning: When School Reform Collided with Organizational Culture and Community Politics in San Diego* (2006), combines sociocultural theories of learning with organizational life and policy adaptation.

Jerry A. Jacobs is Merriam Term Professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania. He has served as editor of the *American Sociological Review* and President of the Eastern Sociological Society. His research has addressed a number of aspects of women's employment including authority, earnings, working conditions, part-time work, and entry into male-dominated occupations. He is coauthor of *The Time Divide* (2004). His research has been funded by the National Science Foundation, the Spencer Foundation, the Sloan Foundation, Atlantic Philanthropies, and the Macy Foundation. His current research projects include a study of women's entry into the medical profession, funded by the Macy Foundation, and a study of working time and work-family conflict among university faculty.

Kerri Keegan is a recent graduate of Hofstra University's School Counseling program in Hempstead, New York. She plans to obtain a position as a school counselor. Her research interest is in prevention programs for teenagers focused on self-injury and bullying.

Deirdre M. Kelly is Professor in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia. Her research interests include alternative girlhoods, critical feminist policy analysis of schooling, and teaching for social justice. She is the author of *Last*

Chance High: How Girls and Boys Drop In and Out of Alternative Schools (1993) and *Pregnant with Meaning: Teen Mothers and the Politics of Inclusive Schooling* (2000), which won a 2003 American Educational Studies Association Critic's Choice Award.

Kimberly Kelly is a doctoral candidate in sociology at the University of Georgia. Her research focuses on gender, women's activism, inequality, and interaction. She is currently studying grassroots abortion activism.

Charlotte A. Kunkel is Associate Professor of Sociology at Luther College in Decorah, Iowa. She specializes in gender studies and has taught widely in sociology and women's studies. She actively pursues research and scholarship that promotes equality for all. Her current interests include diversity education and women's transnational identities and immigration.

John Wesley Lowery is Associate Professor of Educational Studies in the College of Education at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater. He has written extensively on topics related to student affairs and higher education, particularly legal and legislative issues.

Mairtin Mac an Ghaill is Professor of Sociology at the University of Birmingham in the United Kingdom. His current research involves exploration of the figure of the male migrant among the Irish diaspora in England. He is the author of *The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and Schooling* (1994) and *Contemporary Racisms and Ethnicities* (1999).

Margaret E. Madden is Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs at the State University of New York at Potsdam. A social psychologist, she specializes in the psychology of gender and was President of the Society for the Psychology of Women (Division 35 of the American Psychological Association) in 2004. Recent publications focus on enhancing the representation of gender and ethnicity in the psychology curriculum and analyses of women's and gender issues in higher education administration.

Laurie Mandel is founder of The GET.A.VOICE™ Project (www.getavoice.net), an organization that proactively addresses name-calling and gender-based verbal violence in schools through awareness, empowerment, and leadership. She is an American Association of University Women fellow and is an educator at Murphy Junior High School, Three Village Schools, New York. In 2004, she was the recipient of the Myra Sadker Curriculum Award from American University for her work on gender issues at the middle school level.

Robert A. Margo is Professor of Economics and African-American Studies at Boston University in Massachusetts and a Research Associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research. A specialist in the economic history of the American economy, his books include *Race and Schooling in the South (1990), 1880–1950: An Economic History* (2000), and *Women's Work: American Schoolteachers, 1650–1920* (2001).

Donna M. Mertens is Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations and Research at Gallaudet University in Washington, DC. She writes extensively about the merger of the disability community and the transformative approach to research in such books as *Research and Evaluation Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods* (2005).

Marcia K. Meyers is Professor of Social Work and Public Affairs and Director of the West Coast Poverty Center at the University of Washington. She has published extensively on issues of poverty and social welfare policy in the United States and in a comparative context. She has coauthored *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment* (2003).

Karen Monkman is Associate Professor of Comparative Education, Social and Cultural Foundations of Education, and Educational Policy Studies at DePaul University in Chicago, Illinois. Her educational research relates to gender, immigration, nonformal education, and social change.

Judith Mounty is Director of the Center for American Sign Language Literacy at Gallaudet University in Washington, DC. She focuses her work in the area of psychological health in the deaf community and coedited *Assessment of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Adults: Critical Issues in Testing and Evaluation* (2005), which addresses measurement issues specific to the deaf population.

Keith B. O'Neill is a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration program at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. He has been active in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the Ohio Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and Sigma Pi fraternity.

Michele Paludi is President of Human Resources Management Solutions and Participating Full Professor of Management at Union Graduate College. She has published several texts on sexual harassment, including *Ivory Power: Sexual Harassment on Campus* (1990), which received the Myers Center Award for an Outstanding Book on Human Rights in the United States.

Cynthia Fabrizio Pelak is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Memphis in Tennessee. She has published articles on gender/race/class and sport in the United States and South Africa. She is currently working on a project examining the persistence of sexist naming practices of women's athletic teams at universities and colleges in the southern United States.

Liviu Popoviciu is Lecturer in Communication and Cultural Studies at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne in the United Kingdom. He has a particular interest in exploring the interconnections among globalization, nationalism, and subjectivity. He has recently completed his PhD dissertation entitled *Children and National Identity. How Children Conceptualise Identity: A Comparison of Case Studies from Romania and England.*

C. Roger Rees is Professor in the Department of Health Studies, Physical Education, and Human Performance Science at Adelphi University in Garden City, New York. He has written extensively on school sports, including *Lessons of the Locker Room: The Myth of School Sports* (1994). His research focuses on how to make interscholastic athletics a more positive influence on the lives of schoolchildren.

Joanne Roberts is a Research Scientist at the Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College in Massachusetts. She conducts research in the areas of quality of early care and education, child-care voucher use, and school readiness.

Wendy Wagner Robeson is a Research Scientist at the Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College in Massachusetts. Her research includes early care and education studies, school readiness, and the National Institute of Child Health and Development Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development.

Mary Ann Danowitz Sagaria is Professor of Higher Education at the University of Denver and a 2007 Fulbright Scholar at the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration. Her research focuses on leadership, academic careers, governance and administration, and gender and racial equality.

Nilofar Sami is a PhD student in the Clinical Science Program at the University of California, Berkeley. Her research focuses on risk and resilience in children and adolescents, especially from impoverished backgrounds including immigrants and refugees, and research-based community interventions that promote academic achievement and well-being.

Daniel Sciarra is Associate Professor of Counselor Education and Chairperson of the Department of Counseling, Rehabilitation, Special Education, and Research at Hofstra University in Hempstead, New York. He is both a licensed psychologist and a certified school counselor. His main research interests are in multicultural counseling and the role of the school counselor in the academic achievement of Latino students.

Charol Shakeshaft is Professor in the Department of Foundations, Leadership, and Policy Studies at Hofstra University where she teaches courses on gender, statistical analysis, evaluation methodology, and school safety. She is author of a Congressionally mandated study on educator sexual misconduct and is currently examining the ways in which states collect information on school violence, as well as the extent of sexual abuse of special education students.

Randall G. Shelden is Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of Nevada–Las Vegas. He is the author of several books and articles on the subject of crime and delinquency, including *Youth Gangs in American Society* (2004) and *Delinquency and Juvenile Justice in America* (2006). His Web site is www.sheldensays.com.

Bridget Sledz is a recent graduate of Hofstra University's School Counseling program in Hempstead, New York. She is currently working as an academic adviser at Polytechnic University in Brooklyn, New York. Her research interest is in factors affecting retention rates in higher education.

Elizabeth Stearns is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Research interests include sociology of education, interracial friendships, and inequality in the contemporary United States. Her recent research efforts have focused on the interplay of individual and school-level characteristics on students' probability of dropping out of high school and student engagement with formal education. She is a contributing author to *Race in the Schools: Perpetuating White Dominance?* (2003).

Nan Stein has been a Senior Research Scientist at the Center for Research on Women at Wellesley College since 1992 where she directs national research projects on sexual harassment, gender violence, teen dating violence, and bullying in schools. She has written several curricula for schools on these issues and has published dozens of articles in the popular press as well as in educational and legal journals. She has also served as an expert witness in lawsuits about sexual harassment and gender violence in schools.

Nelly P. Stromquist is Professor of Comparative and International Education in the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California. She is interested in issues of gender equity, state policy, and social change. Two of her most recent books are *Feminist Organizations and Social Transformation in Latin America* (2006) and *Education in a Globalized World: The Connectivity of Economic Power, Technology, and Knowledge* (2002). She is former President of the Comparative and International Education Society and a 2005–2006 Fulbright New Century Scholar.

Marilyn Tallerico is Professor of Education at Binghamton University in Binghamton, New York. Her research interests include gender and politics in public school educational leadership; women and the superintendency; promoting diversity, equity, and excellence in educational administration; and superintendent–school board relationships.

Robert Vitelli is Director of Development at Long Island Gay and Lesbian Youth where he has worked extensively with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender youth to develop the organization's Safe Schools Initiative into one of the largest and most comprehensive programs of its kind in the United States. He is also an instructor of human sexuality at Nassau Community College.

Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower is Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations and Research at the University of North Dakota. He was a Fulbright scholar to Australia who has written extensively on masculinity and the education of boys.

Rhona S. Weinstein is Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Berkeley. She has written extensively on the multilayered dynamics of academic expectations and self-fulfilling prophecies, with implications for school culture change. She is the author of *Reaching Higher: The Power of Expectations in Schooling* (2002), which won the American Educational Research Association Division K Book Award and the Virginia and Warren Stone Prize from Harvard University Press.

Amy E. Wells is Faculty Research Fellow and Associate Professor of Higher Education in the Department of Leadership and Counselor Education at the University of Mississippi in Oxford. She has written on the history and development of education in the South, Rockefeller philanthropy, and multicultural Greek organizations.

Edward G. Whipple is Vice-President for Student Affairs and Adjunct Associate Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. He has served in a variety of administrative roles in Greek life and student affairs and has published a number of articles on topics related to these areas. He has served in leadership positions at the national level with the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Association of Fraternity Advisors, and Phi Delta Theta International Fraternity.

Barbara Morrow Williams, JD, PhD, is an education organizational consultant living in Columbia, Missouri. She has authored articles on African American mothers and cultural capital and coauthored articles on school leadership. Her research and writing interests include women, aging in leadership roles, schools as organizations, and First and Fourth Amendment issues in organizations. She was a David L. Clark Seminar Scholar in 2005, and her dissertation case study of a female, African American superintendent was nominated for the Politics of Education Dissertation Award for 2006.

Amy Wilson is Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations and Research at Gallaudet University in Washington, DC. She is Director of the International Development for People with Disabilities Program.

Sarah Winslow-Bowe is Assistant Professor of Sociology at Clemson University in South Carolina. Her research interests focus on gender inequality, the intersections of work and family, and the life course. In addition to her publications on gender inequality and work-family issues in academia, she has written about trends in work-family conflict from the 1970s through the 1990s and the relationship between welfare reform and women's enrollment in postsecondary education. Her current research examines persistence and variation in wives' income advantage and its relationship to reported levels of marital conflict. This research has been supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and recognized by the Sociologists for Women in Society and the Family Sections of the American Sociological Association and the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

Leslie R. Wolfe is President of the Center for Women Policy Studies, a multiethnic feminist think tank in Washington, DC, founded in 1972. She was Director of the Women's Educational Equity Act Program in the U.S. Department of Education from 1979 to 1983; her previous federal government career began at the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, where she was Deputy Director of the Women's Rights Program. After leaving government service, Wolfe served as Director of the Project on Equal Education Rights of the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund before joining the Center for Women Policy Studies in 1988.

Deborah Worley is a doctoral student and graduate assistant in Higher Education in the Department of Leadership and Counselor Education at the University of Mississippi in Oxford. She has extensive experience in student affairs, including career services, experiential education, and student leadership development. Her research emphases include student assessment and learning outcomes for master's students.