TOO SMART FOR EDUCATION? ASSESSING EDUCATOR’S GENDER EQUITY TRAINING AND AWARENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Ashley Marie Olivieri
B.A., University of California, Berkeley, 2007

THESIS

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

EDUCATION
(Behavioral Sciences/Gender Equity Studies)

at

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

SPRING
2011
TOO SMART FOR EDUCATION? ASSESSING EDUCATOR’S GENDER EQUITY TRAINING AND AWARENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A Thesis

by

Ashley Marie Olivieri

Approved by:

_____________________________________________, Committee Chair
Sherrie Carinci, Ed.D.

_____________________________________________, Second Reader
Frank Lilly, Ph.D.

_____________________________________________
Date
Student:  Ashley Marie Olivieri

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the University format manual, and that this thesis is suitable for shelving in the Library and credit is to be awarded for the thesis.

Rita M. Johnson, Ed.D, Department Chair  Date

Department of Teacher Education
Abstract

of

TOO SMART FOR EDUCATION? ASSESSING EDUCATOR’S GENDER EQUITY TRAINING AND AWARENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Ashley Marie Olivieri

Statement of the Problem

Using survey research methods, the researcher sought current data about the amount and quality of training that higher education instructors obtain, and a further understanding of the training that higher education faculty receive in gender equity. This study focuses on the following questions: What do college and university educators in California learn about addressing issues of gender equity in the college classroom? To what extent are California university educators trained in gender equitable teaching approaches? Relevant to gender equity training, to what extent are California university educators trained about sexual harassment awareness? What are educators’ opinions about the type and amount of preparation they have received to teach?
Sources of Data

Two hundred and fifty educators from 11 California community colleges, California State University campuses, private California colleges, and Universities of California participated in this study. Convenience sampling was employed to obtain participants for survey research methods. The survey was designed to elicit both quantitative and qualitative data from participants, in order to provide different vantage points for the research questions. The quantitative questions provided data to conduct statistical analysis. The open-ended questions provided qualitative data, including themes within educators’ opinions.

Conclusions Reached

The results indicated that educators receive minimal training in gender fair teaching approaches. Specifically, out of 250 participants, 165 educators did not possess any training in gender fair teaching approaches. Only 34% of educators in this study had obtained training in equitable teaching approaches, and only 24.6% felt they were effectively trained. More than half of the educators lacked training in gender fair teaching approaches, multicultural awareness, and working with special needs students. As a group, educators teaching subject content related to engineering had the lowest amount of gender equity training, averaging 36 minutes. Educators in social science also had significantly low amounts of training in gender fair teaching approaches, with an average of 1.06 hours. The results of this study indicate a positive association between the amount of training in gender fair teaching approaches
departments’ receive and the percentage of women working as educators in the
department, with a correlation coefficient of 0.833.

The laws of California require that educators receive certain amounts of sexual
harassment training; however, this study suggests that educators receive far less
training than mandates require. The sample of educators in this study are largely non-
compliant, or do not remember having attained mandated amounts of sexual
harassment training. Of 250 participants, 88 educators reported having zero hours of
sexual harassment training.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

As a student, I often wondered why university-teaching strategies varied so greatly. Noticeably, some faculty used a variety of pedagogical methods to encourage and engage their students, with most classes introducing new tactics to learn information. However, other educators clung to the podium lecturing at students with the occasional PowerPoint presentation, unless it was time for a midterm or final exam.

In the United States, educators in grades K-12 receive preparation in the form of a teacher’s credential or license to become prepared to enlighten our children before teaching in the public classroom. Although college educators have advanced degrees in the disciplines they instruct, according to Golland (1995), “College teachers have rarely been trained to teach” (p. 308). This research venture questions the teacher preparation of university and college educators, focusing particularly on training in gender equity and gender equitable teaching approaches.

Research regarding the welfare of male and female students suggests that gender equitable teaching is beneficial to all students. Gender Gaps: Where Schools Still Fail Our Children (1998), produced by The American Association of University Women (AAUW), states, “Equity is the key to excellence in education” (p. 8). However, male and female students taking the same college classes, on the same college campus, have vastly different experiences. The different behaviors exhibited to students by college educators based on gender produce diverse effects (Sax, 2008).
Curiously, although college women’s grades are generally better than those of male students, women suffer from relatively low academic confidence compared to male students. While the confidence gap is present before entering the college environment, it increases throughout the college experience (Sax, 2008).

Educators who teach in public schools, grades K–12 in California, are required to obtain certification from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Teachers must earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential to teach in an elementary school, a Single Subject Teaching Credential to teach in a high school, or an Education Specialist Instruction Credential to teach special education students (CTC, 2010). California law, “Program Standard 5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum for All Children,” mandates that all K–12th grade teachers are required to complete preservice training in educational equity. Each applicant is to “systematically examine his/her stated and implied beliefs, attitudes, and expectations related to gender and to apply pedagogical practices that create gender-fair learning environments” (CTC, 2001, p. 7). However, Carinci’s (2002) study of three selected California teacher credential programs found that multiple subject post-credential students had received instruction on gender equity issues for an average of 50 minutes, and the single-subject students had an average of 1 hour and 55 minutes.

Most higher education institutions do not require preservice training in educational equity, including curriculum approaches, types of assessment, and conscious interaction patterns. Most educators have nominal, if any, training in instructional methods (Sandler, Silverberg, & Hall, 1996). Sandler et al. (1996) report,
“Even among those who have some training, most have learned little or nothing of pedagogical strategies that address gender, race, ethnicity, class, age, sexual orientation, and disability. Many faculty are thus not as well prepared as they could be” (p. 5). Furthermore, teacher education programs continue to endorse patriarchal ideologies and exclude feminist research (Robertson, 1989).

**Purpose of the Study or Significance of the Study**

For the purpose of this study, the terms college and university are used interchangeably, though their denotations and connotations are typically not intertwined. However, for fluidity in reading, these terms will be substituted freely for each other without prejudice.

An equitable classroom is a community of collaborative learners who are able to freely express their voice. Faculty should be aware of their students’ educational needs and conscious of gender bias, actively working to prevent it by implementing gender equitable teaching approaches. Educators need to be mindful of subtle gender bias including what students they ask questions of, how they ask and follow-up on questions, whether behaviors are responded to equally negatively or positively regardless of gender, and seemingly innocuous interactions such as complimenting a student’s appearance. Formal and informal curriculum should include both genders and both genders’ perspective (Streitmatter, 1993). To promote participation from all students and to encourage all students to engage their voice in class, educators should employ quick-writes, working in pairs, and small-group work. Educators can also call
on specific students who usually do not participate if it is “clear they know the answer” (Massin, 1992, p. 31).

One goal of this study is to recognize the amount of training that higher education faculty obtain in gender equity before entering the college classroom to begin instruction, or that they have acquired during their experience as an educator. Further, the researcher aims to understand whether college educators are aware of incorporating gender fair teaching approaches in their class instruction. If college educators are not acquiring training or classes in gender fair teaching practices, then students are often not receiving an equal educational experience.

This study examines the total hours and minutes of training faculty receive in gender equitable teaching approaches and also analyzes the existing awareness college educator’s possess about gender bias in the classroom. According to Carinci (2007), recent studies indicate “that nominal training is being offered to Kindergarten through college educators on gender equitable teaching approaches and most instructors are not aware nor have the training on the importance of gender inclusion methodologies and its impact on the learner” (p. 64). The amount and quality of training college educators receive affects the classroom setting and the learning experience of students (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004). Studies have found that even gender studies, a discipline that focuses on promoting equality, is unable to eliminate aspects of patriarchy and hierarchy from the classroom (Gardner, Dean, & McKaig, 1989). As such, without training in gender equitable teaching practices, it will prove even more difficult to provide equity and eliminate patriarchy in courses from disciplines such as chemistry,
business, engineering, and French. Educators’ lack of training in and awareness of gender equitable teaching may contribute to problems such as patriarchal classrooms and inequitable classroom incidents for male and female students (Brown & Silber, 2000).

Examining the amount of training on gender equitable teaching approaches faculty possess is imperative because colleges and educators continue to endorse classroom techniques, curricula and behaviors that put some students at a disadvantage (Campbell & Sanders, 1997; Jacobs, 1996; Sandler et al., 1996). This study provides a glimpse at the current extent of gender equity training for educators in higher education. If colleges are to be the pillars of equality, then every student should have an equal advantage and experience in the classroom environment, not just equal access. College educators need to be educated on approaches that foster equity and fairness in the classroom.

**Statement of the Problem**

Research in gender discrimination at the university level has revealed trends that mirror the gender bias of classrooms in grades K–12. However, some forms of bias exist exclusively in college classrooms (Allen & Niss, 1990). Women college students miss a substantial amount of educators’ attention. By grade 12, female students have obtained 1800 fewer hours of instructional interaction time from educators than their male colleagues (Kahle & Meece, 1994). One study suggests “that women [college] students receive even less attention from professors of either sex than they received from their teachers in elementary and secondary schools” (Allen & Niss,
1990, p. 608). Educators are also more likely to accept the initial responses of women in the college classroom, and less likely to ask probing, higher-level questions “than they were at lower academic levels” (Allen & Niss, 1990, p. 608). Horgan (1995) suggests that failing to receive feedback from educators can contribute to insecurity. Inequitable classroom dynamics, such as gendered behavior ideals and positive reinforcement for compliance, enforce social norms from grade school through higher education that negatively affect female academic confidence. This insecurity can lead to silenced femininity and contributes to “indirect speaking styles,” which can derail the success of women in school and in the workplace (Simmons, 2009, p. 101).

This study attends to the following questions: How many hours of training do college faculty receive in gender fair teaching approaches? Are college faculty effectively trained on gender equity concerns in the classroom? What type of training do college faculty wish they had received to prepare for teaching in a college classroom? This study ascertains current data about the amount and quality of gender equity training that higher education instructors obtain. The goal of the research is to understand the sum of training that higher education teachers attain in gender fair teaching practices and to understand if college educators are aware of, and prepared to encounter, gender bias in the classroom (Allen & Niss, 1990; Brooks, 1982; Campbell & Sanders, 1997; Jacobs, 1996; Sandler et al., 1996; Sax, 2008).

**Methodology**

Survey research methods were employed to obtain participants. Two hundred and fifty college and university educators from several California community colleges,
California State University campuses, private California colleges, and University of California colleges participated in this study. To gather data on the amount of andragogical training of college educators, surveys were disseminated through convenience, cluster, and snowball sampling methods. The questionnaire used in this study provided both quantitative and qualitative data about the amount of training educators had obtained, and their feelings about their professional preparation and effectiveness. To recognize some of the trends in the data, demographic information that subjects provided was also analyzed.

Quantitative data “assumes clear cause and effect relationships can be established while scrutinizing human behaviour. It also takes the stance that “facts can be substantiated only if they have been tested scientifically, or recounted by a large number of people” (Basit, 2010, p. 15). Qualitative data “describes events, perceptions, and views scientifically, thus illuminating social phenomena. The purpose of this kind of data of inquiry is to achieve depth rather than breadth” (Basit, 2010, p. 16). Employing both quantitative and qualitative methodologies provides an extensiveness to the data collected that one methodology alone could not convey or report.

Each participant received a consent form accompanied with a survey. The survey consisted of 18 short-answer questions and four open-ended questions. Participants were asked to provide information regarding their ethnicity and sex, and information regarding their professional training. The majority of participants mailed their forms and responses in a provided self-addressed and stamped envelope.
Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. The relatively small population of this study is not necessarily a true representation of all college educators in California. While a larger sample would have been beneficial for statistical significance, many colleges approached would not allow their faculty to participate in the study or grant the researcher permission to distribute surveys in a cluster sampling method. Time restrictions did not permit the researcher to compile a larger snowball sample, which might have yielded a greater sample size. In addition, it is possible that some subjects did not have a clear understanding of the questions because the researcher was not readily available, other than by email, to answer questions. Therefore, there is a limitation of the participants’ bias and interpretation of terminology.

Theoretical Basis for the Study

While various ideologies are relevant to the examination of equity issues, feminist theory, feminist pedagogy, Amazonian feminism, connected learning, and social role theory all have intertwining roots in philosophies of equity within education. Collectively, these theoretical frameworks developed the basis of the study, analysis of the data, and the conclusions drawn.

Feminist Theory

Gender equity in higher education embraces the diverse voices and experiences of students. While there are many modes of feminist theory, “Feminist theory in general questions the inherently authoritarian nature of patriarchy,” and as an ideology that confronts the oppressive nature of patriarchy, the philosophies of feminist theory
provide a framework in which to analyze complex issues of gender bias that arise in the higher education classroom (Caywood & Overwood, 1987, p. xii). For this study, liberal feminist discourse influenced the analysis because it “seeks to free women from oppressive gender roles, particularly those which often excuse or justify assigning women a lesser place in academic, economic, political and social arenas” and aims to recognize and eliminate obstacles that hamper women’s success (Carinci & Lindquist Wong, 2009, p. 526; MacDonald, 2002). Women continue to subsist in higher education, despite the systemically hegemonic and patriarchal structures within the classrooms and environments of colleges and universities. Aspects of feminist theory intend to release the ties of institutional sexism specifically in higher education.

**Amazonian Feminism**

A component within radical feminism, Amazonian feminism builds on fundamental questions of how society constructs power based on gender that are raised by feminist theorists.

Amazonian feminism vigorously rejects the idea that certain characteristics are inherently masculine (or feminine), and upholds and explores a vision of heroic womanhood by focusing on the images of the female heroes as expressed in fiction, art, and literature, in the physiques and feats of female warriors and athletes, and in sexual values and practices. (Ward, 2007, p. 107) Introducing diverse models to students through curriculum allows girls and women to see a multitude of female figures that they can form their behavior after, not just the images of women that society is saturated with. “Taking the time to connect current
realities with ancient traditions is often essential to building confidence among students that they are...part of a long intellectual and cultural heritage” (Ward, 2007, p. 106). Connected learning requires formal curriculum that allows students to identify and relate with diverse models within the material. Teaching and implementing connected learning and tenets of Amazonian feminism in preservice education can help college educators combat gender bias in the classroom.

**Feminist Pedagogy/Andragogy**

The term andragogy should be used when discussing adult learners; however, to incorporate the theories and ideas needed to fully develop the research topic, the term pedagogy has often been employed.

Feminist pedagogy, like feminist research, associates and resonates with contemporary theories of ideology critique, most notably critical, postmodern and poststructuralist orientations to inquiry. As such, a definition of feminist pedagogy is antithetical to the theoretical and practical ground from which it emerges. However, several features can be articulated that distinguish it from other ways of describing and teaching and learning environments. (Lathrop & Connolly, 2000, p. 61)

Evolving from feminist social practice, feminist pedagogy is angled “toward social transformation, consciousness-raising, and social activism that is the translation of thought into action” (Cohee et al., 1998; Ward, 2007, p. 104). Feminist pedagogy attempts to confront hegemonic power dynamics that are persistent within the higher education learning environment. Educators “must critically engage in dialogue and
reflection not only about what we teach but also about how we teach” (Crabtree, Sapp, 
& Licona, 2009, p. 2). Feminist pedagogy strives to break away from the molded form 
of the traditional classroom, offering “alternatives through [its] challenging of 
mastery, voice, positionality, and authority” (Lathrop & Connolly, 2000, p. 61; Maher 
& Tetreault, 1994). Teaching practices consistent with feminist andragogy challenge 
power structures in a variety of ways, including the following: they encourage 
dialectic thought and voice; they have classroom layouts that promote democracy 
among students and the teacher; and they have gender equitable curriculum that is 
taught in gender-neutral ways that counter typical teaching methods, such as varying 
the methods of instruction and assessment.

Social Role Theory

Social role theory explains gender role differences and gender behaviors as 
results of society’s structural organizations, such as family and community 
development (Dulin, 2008). Social role theory also posits that differences in expected 
and accepted behavior based on sex are a result of sex-differentiated divisions in labor 
(Eagly, 1987). Social role theory has been tested as a theoretical basis on a variety of 
issues, and “most of the research upholds the theory’s premise that, in certain social 
situations, males and females act according to the social norms that originate from a 
division of labor at work and in the home” (Dulin, 2008, p. 109). Society’s general 
trend to embrace and fit gender roles significantly contributes to gendered behavior 
(Eagly, 1987). In the education system, women and men are likely to pursue certain 
majors in specific departments as a result of social role theory because students see
these pathways as viable, social normative pathways. In contrast, being one of few
women in a department could cause those few women to develop feelings that they do
not belong in such a masculine environment.

**Silenced Femininity and Voice**

Throughout *Meeting at the Crossroads* (1992), Brown and Gilligan explore
how girls lose their desire and confidence to express what they know to be their true
voice. The seminal study shares the interviews and stories of nearly 100 girls, whose
ages range between seven and eighteen and who attend the Laurel School for Girls, in
Cleveland, Ohio. Brown and Gilligan demonstrate through their study that young girls
are able to directly express their feelings, thoughts, and opinions. However, during the
course of adolescence, girls lose their ability to publicly share their thoughts,
confidently convey their emotions, and make public their true voice.

Exposing their own voices through their interviews, the young women from
Brown and Gilligan’s significant study (1992) reveal “the process by which, over
time, they begin to replace their voices with the foreign voice-overs of adults, their
feelings and desires with others’ wants and expectations” (p. 87). Expectations and
portrayals of women role models provided to young women in key facets of our
culture, including the American education system, encourages idealized beliefs of
femininity that silence the female voice.

The revelations from the interviews in *Meeting at the Crossroads* (Brown &
Gilligan, 1992), exemplify the gender-specific interaction problems in the education
system. Even at the age of eight, outspoken Lauren, “knowing from experience that
speaking up will surely mean that she will ‘get in trouble and have the teacher yell at me,’ Lauren, in effect, silences herself—And the teacher, like her mother…rewards Lauren’s silence, calls it good behavior” (Brown & Gilligan, 1992, p. 74). The gender specific ideals that educators and role models display through behaviors are influential in reinforcing stereotypical gender ideals, and silencing the female voice.

In “The Curse of the Good Girl” (2009), Simmons discusses how many young women silence their true feelings and voices in order to be socially accepted. Dana, a sixteen-year-old high school student “became silent or fake: in her words, ‘empty’” (Simmons, 2009, p. 22). Simmons describes Dana’s experiences as a lesson in emotional disconnection. She “learned to identify the voice in her head urging her to dissociate from her feelings. It helped her to see the voice as a ‘Good Girl voice,’ telling her what she should feel” (Simmons, 2009, p. 22). Gendered behavior ideals and positive reinforcement for compliance enforce social norms. This reproduces silenced femininity and contributes to women’s and girl’s “indirect speaking styles,” which can derail their success in school and the workplace (Simmons, 2009, p. 101). “If your delivery fails to instill the trust and confidence of your peers, all the right answers in the world will get you only so far” (Simmons, 2009, p. 101).

An educational experience where the silenced feminine voice is the social norm persists throughout higher education. While students begin school with equal levels of confidence and self-esteem, 12 years later when they graduate from high school women possess half of the confidence and self-esteem of men (AAUW, 1990; 1992). In “Gender and Silence” (1995), Gallos states that the majority of women
Brown and Gilligan (1992) state that women and women educators need to “bring themselves into their teaching and be in genuine relationships with girls” and with women students, which would involve “changing their practice as teachers and thus changing education” (p. 231). To encourage greater self-esteem and confidence from all students, and promote students to reveal their true opinions and voices, techniques to tackle gender bias, such as connected learning, need to be addressed in teacher education programs.

**Definition of Terms**

*Andragogy:* The science and art of teaching and assisting learning in adults (Knowles, 1973).

*Connected learning:* A way of learning that is based on “personal experience rather than the pronouncements of authorities” (Belenky, Clinchy, Golberger, & Tarule, 1997, pp. 112-113). In order to understand the theories of others, connected learners aim to understand the events that have caused a “person to form the idea” (Belenky et al., 1997, p. 113).

*Feminism:*

Encompasses ideas about the importance of women and women’s experiences, histories of social movements seeking gender equality, a philosophy of humanism that works as a lens for understanding the entire human condition...
(not just that of women), and a critical analytical method that interrogates the relationships among gender, sex/uality, race, class, the environment, and power, often using misogyny as an organizing principle to explain inequalities and injustices in these realms. (Crabtree et al., 2009, p. 1)

**Feminist pedagogy**: Educational practices that build on the fundamental ideologies of feminism with an attempt to analyze and deconstruct hegemonic classroom dynamics and gender biased classroom hierarchy (Crabtree et al., 2009, p. 1).

**Gender**: Not biologically determined, gender is a social construct of normative behavior for the sexes (Sanders, 2003, p. 26).

Gender practices, discourses, beliefs and institutions do not exist detached from power relations or in an historical vacuum; what is designated under the category of gender or what is considered a gender issue is not a straightforward reflection of the social, racial, religious, ethnic and economic conditions of men and women; instead, gender is constructed within these conditions. (Stromquist & Fischman, 2009, p. 468)

**Gender equitable teaching practices**: Teaching practice that “fosters the individual voice in the classroom, investing students with confidence in their own authority” (Caywood & Overwood, 1987, p. xi). Methodologies include presenting gender equitable curriculum in gender-neutral ways with the intention of countering typical teaching strategies, by means including varying the methods of instruction and assessment.
Gender roles: Social roles and normative behaviors that society assigns and internalizes as being male or female (Evans & Diekman, 2009).

Hegemony: A cultural process, as opposed to a structure, that allows ruling groups to maintain their power through force and consent. This process produces and reproduces ways people think about society that enables agreeing to social relations as they are. Hegemony is not simply ideological domination; it is a cultural method that creates and replicates the desires that society wants us to covet. Hegemony secures an ideology and internalizes the drive on the part of society to keep individuals in their places. It is constantly functioning, employing both compulsion and consent (Gramsci, 1971).

Hierarchy: Any system of people or things ranked one above another. “Hierarchy is based on patriarchy, patriarchy doesn’t work anywhere anymore” (Steinem, 1993, para. 2). Patriarchy protects the social structure that values men more than women (Gordon, 1996).

Ideology: “Ideologies are the frameworks of thinking and calculation about the world – the ‘ideas’ that people use to figure out how the social world works, what their place is in it, and what they ought to do” (Hall, 1985, p. 97). Ideology entails the rules that people use to figure out the world. Once the rules have been engrained, people know how to operate in that society. Therefore, ways of seeing and thinking are so engrained people do not really think about them (Hall, 1985). As a framework of thinking, ideology is not just a set of beliefs, it is the whole construction and the action that reinforces those beliefs.
Pedagogy: The science and art of teaching and assisting learning in children
(Crabtree et al., 2009, p. 1).

Sex: Biologically determined “distinctions between women and men”
(Sanders, 2003; Stromquist & Fischman, 2009, p. 463).

Organization of the Remainder of Thesis

The organization of this thesis follows the guidelines established in the Graduate Student Handbook through the College of Education, Teacher Education program and contains five chapters. Chapter 1 incorporates the following: the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, methodology used to carry out the study, limitations of the study, theoretical basis of the study, definition of terms, organization of the thesis and background of the researcher. Chapter 2 consists of a review of relevant literature on the topic of gender and higher education, including a brief history of women as both educators and students at colleges. Chapter 3 concentrates on the methodology of the thesis and details the design process and the procedures employed in the study. Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the quantitative and the qualitative data. Chapter 5 consists of the conclusions drawn from the study, as they relate to the proposed research questions and relevant literature, followed by the proposed recommendations for further study. Following Chapter 5 are the Appendices and a complete list of references utilized in this study.
Background of the Researcher

Ashley Marie Olivieri earned her Bachelor of Arts degree in Mass Communications from the University of California, Berkeley in 2007. During the first semester at UC Berkeley, Ms. Olivieri discovered her interest in gender studies, and reveled in the opportunity to explore this passion throughout her coursework. Working as a journalist with the Bay Area Alternative Press allowed Ms. Olivieri to tell stories of the underrepresented, and strengthened her conviction to study causes such as gender equity and education.

The Masters of Arts in Education, Behavioral Sciences and Gender Equity Studies in the Teacher Education program at California State University, Sacramento has allowed Ms. Olivieri to develop a deep understanding of the relationship between gender bias, and the college environment and classroom. Under the guidance of her mentor, Dr. Sherrie Thuss Carinci, Ms. Olivieri has been able to teach classes revolving around issues of gender discrimination in the American education system at California State University, Sacramento, as well as present at conferences on issues such as sexual harassment and bullying in the grade K–12 and college environments. Ms. Olivieri envisions working to facilitate gender equity in the higher education environment as a life-long commitment, interest, and pursuit.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Gender inequities persist in American higher education (AAUW, 1992; Moore, Piper, & Schaefer, 1993). The socialization of gender in schools throughout the United States perpetuates stereotypical ideals of gender, femininity, and masculinity, which are taught and reinforced throughout students’ educational experience (Brinkman & Rickard, 2009). College administrators, and most significantly, college faculty, distribute differential treatment to students based on gender, which creates an inequitable school environment (Fox, 1989). The amount and quality of gender equity training college educators receive affects the classroom environment and the learning experience of students (Coffey & Gibbs, 2000). Many college instructors and professors lack training or preservice teaching instruction (Golland, 1995). College educators need to be masters of their course and subject content, however they are not required to know how to teach. Further, of educators who do receive training, few receive training in gender equity studies or gender fair teaching approaches, or have the educational background to incorporate student centered curriculum and assessment approaches (Campbell & Sanders, 1997). The importance of gender equity needs to be addressed in teacher education programs because an inequitable school environment hinders academic achievement (AAUW, 1999).

This review of the literature consists of five sections. The first part is a survey of the role of women’s history in American higher education. The second piece is an analysis of the gender inequitable environment of American classrooms and how the
educational atmosphere has hampered the possibilities for and level of engagement for some students. The third portion is an examination of the preparation that college faculty receive before entering the classroom and interacting with students. The fourth segment includes information regarding remedies to gender inequities in the college classroom, such as the connected learning model, and feminist classroom dynamics. The final piece explores the type of faculty development that is available for college educators and the extent to which gender is considered or included within this training.

**Historical Perspective on the Practices and Politics of Gender and Education**

The position of women in higher education has evolved from its origin. Since the infancy of the United States, women’s education has been considered less significant, and served a different purpose, than men’s education. Though moving towards a more equitable stance in relation to men, women are still not represented as equals within the education system.

**Colonial Era and Revolutionary War (1607–1783)**

During the colonial era, women were excluded from higher education. Since formal education was not available to most women, the education that many women received “was simply an apprenticeship in the home” that focused on domestic duties, as opposed to liberal arts or character development (Fox, 1989, p. 218). Despite the fact that the Puritans encouraged women to be literate, “its purpose was to enable them to study the scriptures under the appropriate male guidance, not to think for themselves” (Conway, 1974, p. 2).
In 1636, Harvard College in the Massachusetts Bay Colony commenced higher education in the United States (Nidiffer, 2002). Harvard College intended to prepare young men for work within the church and within the colonial government (Nidiffer, 2002). The colonial government did not allow women to acquire formal jobs anywhere, much less within the government; therefore, women were not allowed to obtain training at the university (Fox, 1989). The eight other colonial colleges that opened during this time followed the prototype of education created by Harvard College and set the standard for excluding women (Nidiffer, 2002).

Similarly, in 1746 Benjamin Franklin’s *Reflections on Courtship and Marriage* further legitimized and popularized inequitable ideas about the purpose of women’s education (Conway, 1974). Franklin believed that the purpose of educating women was to enhance attributes believed to be necessary for being a wife and mother (Conway, 1974). “Since marriage and reproduction were her natural destiny… women should be educated to use their rational powers in the role of wife and mother” (Conway, 1974, pp. 2-3). Declaring that women’s educational purpose was to be fulfilled as a wife and mother naturalized the inequities in education between men and women, thus institutionalizing inequities within the education system.

**New Nation (1783–1860)**

During the Revolutionary War, the country depended on every citizen to combat British tyranny. Women were needed and able to take on new jobs without violating gender norms in the public and private spheres: “They managed farms, became politically involved, assembled munitions” and became active in political
organizations, such as the Daughters of Liberty (Small, 1998, para. 8). With this change in socially accepted gender roles, “the Revolution brought on a wholesale reversal of colonial antipathy for sending girls to school” (Rury, 1986, p. 4).

However, after the Revolutionary War, the united spirit that had existed did not persuade white, wealthy men to share their freedoms when creating the laws and policies of the United States government. In a letter dated March 31, 1776, Abigail Adams encouraged her husband, who was to be the second President of the United States, and the Continental Congress, to “remember the ladies” when framing the new government (Butterfield, Friedlaender, & Kline, 1976, p. 121). However, the Continental Congress did not include equal rights for women in the Declaration of Independence. As with Adams and Franklin, Thomas Jefferson considered the education of women a means to serve and appease their future husbands, and asserted, “a plan for female education has never been a subject of systematic contemplation with me” (Padover, 1956, p. 256). Jefferson also believed that women should not discuss politics, and therefore did not need to vote.

The belief in “Republican Motherhood,” the idea that mothers needed to prepare their children to become model future citizens, changed perceptions regarding women’s education (Kerber, 2000). The ability for a woman to educate her sons was what society considered the principle reason for educating women. As such, women needed a modest amount of education (Rury, 1986). Some research suggests, “It might be more accurate to say there was a prevailing ideal of republican womanhood, of which motherhood was only one piece” (Nash, 1997, pp. 174-175).
In the early 19th century, women’s education shifted substantially. During this time, “new cultural forces” produced “the first generation of women educators” within the United States (Conway, 1974, p. 5). The first women undergraduates were also introduced to higher education during this period at single-sex seminaries (Nidiffer, 2002). One force that created opportunities for women in education was the emergence of “numerous nonagricultural jobs for men” (Nidiffer, 2002, p. 5). With fewer men working on farms, came fewer women and children working on farms. Less farm work allowed women to have more time to pursue education. A subsequent force that created opportunities for women in education was the Second Great Awakening in Protestantism, which “spurred literacy rates because many Protestant sects wanted all children to have at least the ability to read the Bible” (Nidiffer, 2002, p. 5). These events expanded women’s access to education during the 1800s.

The creation of coeducational colleges began in 1837 with Oberlin College. Subsequently Antioch College opened in 1852, and both furthered the idea of a limited role for women in higher education (Nidiffer, 2002). The educational aspiration set forth by coeducational institutions was only “to train women for useful work so that they could function efficiently as the help-mates of the men” (Conway, 1974, p. 5). Practical work included doing the laundry of the male students at their respective college. In the United States, the education of women was not for the enrichment of women themselves, but for the enrichment and benefit of society, and especially, men.
Civil War (1861–1865)

The second half of the 19th century was marked by a “coeducation explosion” (Chenault, 2002, p. 22). The Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862 enacted important policy change within “coeducation by subsidizing the establishment of state colleges and universities” (Chenault, 2002, p. 22). Most significant was a considerable expansion of public higher education, which helped women gain admittance to colleges (Nidiffer, 2002). The Civil War also helped women gain admittance to college because male enrollment dropped during this time. The high demand for students’ tuition prompted more colleges to open enrollment to women students, which created new opportunities for women within higher education (Albisetti, 2000).

Reconstruction and Progressive Era (1865–1913)

After the Civil War, two important milestones changed the future of education for women in the United States. The first was “feminists’ increased confidence that important changes could be achieved” in social policies affecting women (O’Kelly & Carney, 1986, p. 140). When the Fifteenth Amendment passed and the social status of black men rose, women found invigorated hope that they too could overcome and change the discrimination that they faced (O’Kelly & Carney, 1986). During this time, “first-rate women’s colleges also opened” (Fox, 1989, p. 219), and finally provided an education “for the mind which was not derivative and did not assume a role for women scholars compensatory to that of male students” (Conway, 1974, p. 8). These achievements helped push the enrollment of women between 1870 and 1910 to “35
percent of all college students” (Nidiffer, 2002, p. 10). When opportunities for women in education emerged, women seized them.

**World War I, Depression, and World War II (1914–1945)**

Gains in higher education continued through the 1920s, but had diminished by the 1930s. During the 1920s, women continued to enroll not only as undergraduates but also as students in graduate and professional programs (Nidiffer, 2002). In less than a century, women’s position in higher education had changed from excluded, to nearly half of all students. “By the 1920s, a high point for women’s education, female students represented 47 percent of the student body in colleges and universities” (Nidiffer, 2002, p. 11). Following World War I, women’s colleges confronted obstacles in enrollment as they faced “public criticism” of their inherent “elitism” (Carter, 1986, p. 573). From the 1930s through the 1950s, “the percentage of women in higher education drop[ped] to a low of 30 percent” (Nidiffer, 2002, p. 11).

Moreover, women’s educational gains in liberal arts and character development diminished. Olsen (2000) found that throughout the 1930s and 1940s, the promotional materials of three select women’s colleges stressed academic topics, but with time, the colleges progressively promoted their institutions as training graduates to be good wives and mothers. “In the public rhetoric, childless women were often portrayed as unfit, selfish, or neurotic, and babies were frequently linked to patriotism” (Olsen, 2000, p. 429). The 1940s’ mainstream media furthered the idea that the role of a woman was to be a wife and mother, bombarding the American populace with critiques of women’s inability to balance a career and family life (Olsen, 2000).
The Modern Era (1945–Present)

The 1940s and 1950s have “been labeled the era of the feminine mystique. Partly as a result of the need to re-absorb many men into the labor market, women were encouraged to leave paid jobs and focus their energies at home” (Stewart & Ostrove, 1993, p. 479). President Roosevelt signed the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the G.I. Bill, a year before the end of World War II, enticing an additional seven million men to enter higher education institutions, which added additional financial strains to women’s colleges (Olsen, 2000). In Capitalist Industrial Society, O’Kelly and Carney (1986) explain the change in women’s educational aspirations,

[W]omen moved from overall educational attainments higher than men’s in 1940 to slightly less than men’s in the early sixties. Higher education was now often pursued by young women to enable them to find better husbands and to make them better wives and mothers. Career goals were often absent or secondary as motivations for college. (p. 150)

The tendency for women’s education to focus “first on service and utility to society and community, and later on vocational and life preparation” continued and shifted until the late 1960s and early 1970s (Fox, 1989, p. 220). During the first two thirds of the twentieth century, college was not a step towards a career or job; it was filler in life before marriage and family (Fox, 1989).

The political climate of the 1960s and 1970s “ushered in an era of changes in women’s role in work, society, and education” that have continued to have an impact
on the organization of higher education institutions (Fox, 1989, p. 220). During this
time of social change, including the civil rights and women’s movements, the
popularity of women’s colleges waned and coeducational colleges saw a boom in
enrollments. Coeducation became the norm, even at “very prestigious and previously
all-male institutions. As a result, the number of women’s colleges today has declined
to fewer than 75 institutions, down from the more than 200 institutions that were in
eexistence in 1960” (Nidiffer, 2002, pp. 11-12). This pattern has continued: “Today
more than 95 percent of female students attend coeducational institutions” (Chenault,
2002, p. 21). Not only has the number of single-sex colleges dropped, but they also
have relatively higher tuition, because they are private institutions. Furthermore, in the
1980s top-tier and Ivy League universities began to accept women (Sadker, 1999).
Coeducational facilities have become the standard for the majority of students.

Currently, women earn 57% of bachelor’s degrees. However, according to
Cotterill, Hughes, and Letherby (2006),

…mere presence hardly constitutes an adequate criterion. Rather, we need to
consider how being female continues to represents a challenge to the
prevailing, and continuing, sense of ownership of the various spatialities of
higher education, and how this space is invested with masculinity. (pp. 404-
405)

Moreover, women’s higher attendance rates can be mostly attributed to women 25 and
older outnumbering their male counterparts by a ratio of two-to-one. However, there is
not a significant discrepancy in the number of female and male students who enroll in
college directly after high school. Men continue to earn more Ph.D.’s and MD’s than women; men also outnumber women at Ivy League and top-tier universities (College gender gaps, 2010; Rivers & Barnett, 2006).

**The Current State of Gender Inequity in American Education**

Gender-specific patterns of behavior occur at all levels of education and contribute to “gender-role-socialization pressure as soon as children enter the educational system” (Lips, 1989, p. 202). Society’s constant acceptance, endorsement, and reaffirmation of gender normative behavior, “especially modeling, positive and negative sanctions,” causes gender roles to be socially reproduced (Chafetz, 1997, p. 114). In the article “From Denouncing Gender Inequities to Undoing Gender in Education: Practices and Programmes Toward Change in the Social Relations of Gender” (Stromquist & Fischman, 2009), gender role socialization is described as a continuous engagement:

As a socio-historical dynamic that affects and is affected by individual and social practices, some of them consciously and others unconsciously exercised, gender is always in the process of being done, performed and acted, and is thus present in the relationships between individuals of the same or different sexes, between individuals and society, and between individuals and institutionalized structures of power. (p. 466)

Eagly’s (1987) Social Role Theory supports the idea that society is socialized and gendered. Social Role Theory purports that “sex differences promote a view of social life as fundamentally gendered, given current social arrangements” (Eagly, 1987, p.
From infancy, children “are taught by parents, and later peers, schools, media, etc., ‘sex appropriate’ gender identities (said to be all but immutable by about age 3) and gender normative behaviors (which are presumably trans-situational and therefore applicable in all interactions)” (Chafetz, 1997, p. 114). Gender related socialization pressures include the differential treatment given to students by educators, based on gender.

The most notable distinction in educators’ treatment of students is that male students receive much more attention from educators than female students because of “the notion that males need to be called on more in order to keep them engaged” (Carinci, 2007, p. 69). Several studies, including Sadker (2002), have found that female students have fewer interactions with teachers and “are less likely [to] be called on by name, are asked fewer complex and abstract questions, receive less praise or constructive feedback, and are given less direction on how to do things for themselves” (Carinci, 2007, p. 66). Other behaviors contributing to sex discrimination within the classroom that are often identified by researchers, including Hall and Sandler (1982) and Allan and Madden (2006), include the following: calling on female students less than male students, “focusing more on a woman’s appearance rather than her accomplishments; paying more attention when men speak; viewing marriage and parental status differently for men and women; and attributing women’s achievements to something other than their abilities” (Allan & Madden, 2006, p. 686). The inequitable perceptions and interactions educators have of and with students create a school environment where female students are less involved and connected than male
students. Male and female students have dissimilar educational experiences because differential treatment is so pervasive in the American education system.

Gender-specific interactions and expectations in American education help reproduce and reinforce traditional gender roles and expectations. Maher and Rathbone (1986) compare the single standard of academic achievement boys are held to with the double standard for girls. Girls are “trained for and judged by an alternate set of standards, one that includes qualities of cooperation, nurturing, and sensitivity to others. These guarantee femininity but often at the price of success” (Maher & Rathbone, 1986, pp. 215-216). Teachers often tolerate and unconsciously encourage different behaviors, such as which student behaviors are acceptable during class discussions, based on gender, thus enforcing stereotypical ideals of masculinity and femininity. Teachers also respond “more to boys who act aggressive and to girls who act dependent” (Lips, 1989, p. 203). Teachers who give attention to boys who are aggressive and girls who act dependent reinforce stereotypical gender roles; men are rewarded “for active, assertive, curious behavior,” and women are rewarded “for appreciative, dependable, and considerate behavior” (Sadker & Zittleman, 2006, p. 272). While it may be convenient in the classroom setting to have girls with characteristics that are complementary to most other personality types, girls should not have their personalities pushed and forced into confined boxes. The gender-specific ideals that educators display through such behaviors are influential in reinforcing stereotypical gender ideals.
The inequitable environment of higher education institutions that results from the differential treatment of students by faculty hampers female academic confidence and voice. Educators’ interaction patterns reflect the historical roots of the American education system, in that teachers convey that the priorities of male students are favored over the priorities of female students (Schaefer, 1994). Fox (1989) discusses the “subtle and silent language” of gender bias in reference to higher education (p. 225). However, the behaviors examined occur at all levels of education. “Faculty promote and reinforce the invisibility of women students” through preferential treatment of male students (Fox, 1989, p. 225). “These practices convey messages about women’s status and value in the classroom….This, in turn, depresses women’s intellectual development, undermines their confidence, and dampens their aspirations both in and out of school” (Fox, 1989, p. 225). The lack of interaction and the specific types of interaction patterns that teachers have with female students, make certain “that children will learn that male concerns take priority” (Lips, 1989, p. 204). In contrast to the female educational experience, “the male student learns early on and what is often reinforced throughout years of classroom interactions is that by his sheer maleness, he has more rights and voice in the classroom” (Carinci, 2007, p. 72). Gender biased processes in the classroom create destructive classroom environments that deter the academic confidence, inclusion, and voice of female students.

Spender’s (1983) research supports how the male voice has been prioritized in American classrooms: “attempts to give girls equal attention as boys were given up by the teachers because the boys would not stand for it and rebelled” (Maher & Rathbone,
Male students rebelling because female students were receiving equal attention from their teacher, not more attention, exemplifies the sense of entitlement that male students have within the classroom. Male students recognize their own priority and importance in the classroom, which suggests how deeply the female students must sense their own relative unimportance in the classroom.

Gender biased processes in the classroom deter academic inclusion and the voice of female students. Girls are “expected to sacrifice their interests, their fair share of teacher attention, and their right to curriculum that awards their interests and talent on a parity with those of boys” (Benjamin & Irwin-DeVitis, 1998, p. 64). The discrepancy in treatment subtly conveys to students that academic success is a male-dominated territory (Jones, Evans, Byrd, & Campbell, 2000). In “Gender in the College Classroom: An Assessment of the ‘Chilly Climate’ for Women” (1990), Crawford and Macleod discuss college students’ perceptions of the classroom environment: “Males tend to feel they are more part of and more active in the classroom than females” (p. 114). These educational experiences enforce hegemonic and patriarchal ideals that “resurface at work where women are listened to less, promoted less and paid less” (Jones et al., 2000, p. 64). Gender biased behavior and differential treatment negatively affect female students’ confidence and feelings of aptitude (Jones & Dindia, 2004).

The Training of Educators at Top-Tier Universities and Colleges

Little research exists on the small amount of training that college educators actually receive to teach (Golland, 1995; Sandler et al., 1996). Additionally, it proves
difficult to find information regarding training that faculty receive on gender equity in the college classroom. “Though there is minimal research on the subject, it is this author’s opinion educators are not entering the adult education classroom prepared to teach using gender equitable teaching approaches” (Carinci, 2007, p. 7). Sandler et al. (1996) state that while “most faculty agree with the goals of gender equity, it is the rare professor, male or female,” who implements gender fair teaching approaches (p. 5).

“U.S. News & World Report” ranks Harvard University as the top college in the United States for 2011. Three of the 13 Master’s programs offered at Harvard require a teaching license and experience in the K–12 setting. However, the EdLD and Ed.D., which “prepare students to assume roles as university faculty members, senior-level educational leaders, policy makers, and researchers” (Harvard University, 2010), do not require prior teaching of courses, a teaching license, or a credential; therefore, there is little if any training or information provided to these educators on gender fair teaching approaches.

Princeton University places second in “U.S. News & World Report” (U.S. News & World Report, 2010), and does not offer a degree, or even classes, in education (Princeton University, 2010). Yale University is positioned third nationally, according to “U.S. News & World Report,” and offers a Master’s degree in Urban Education, which aims to train students to teach at the middle or high school level, and requires program candidates to “fulfill the Connecticut teaching certificate content
requirements” (Yale University, 2010). Yale does not offer a doctorate of education in any form.

Recognized at fourth place, Columbia University boasts an entire “Teachers College,” which offers 128 specialized Master’s and doctoral programs. In 1938, Columbia’s Department of Curriculum and Teaching “was the first department in the U.S. devoted to the scholarly study of problems of curriculum and teaching across all subjects and all levels of schooling, from early childhood through the education of teachers and supervisors” (Teachers College at Columbia University, 2010). Additionally, Columbia offers a Doctor of Education in the College Teaching of an Academic Subject degree, an EdDCT focusing on either math, art, music, or English, where students are required to have at least two years’ teaching experience or to complete a teaching internship course (Teachers College at Columbia University, 2010). However, there is no program or specialization designated for those interested in gender fair or equitable teaching.

Stanford University, tied for fifth exceptional school in the United States (U.S. News & World Report, 2010), does not require a credential or teaching experience to qualify for admittance to its Ph.D. or Master’s programs in education (Stanford University, 2011). University of Pennsylvania ties with Stanford University for being the fifth greatest institution in the United States (U.S. News & World Report, 2010). While the university offers eight Ph.D. programs in education, seven Ed.D. programs, and many Master’s programs within the field of education, applicants are not required to have a teaching credential, though certain programs expect most students to have
“teaching or relevant educational experiences in or outside of school settings”
(University of Pennsylvania, 2010).

California Institute of Technology and Massachusetts Institute of Technology are also at a draw, both measured as the seventh finest universities in America (U.S. News & World Report, 2010). Neither college offers programs in education (California Institute of Technology, 2010; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010). Rounding out the top 11, Dartmouth University, Duke University, and the University of Chicago are all considered the ninth best schools in the United States (U.S. News & World Report, 2010). Dartmouth offers a teacher education program in education with the goal of training “future teachers and educational leaders with a deep understanding of educational research, a broad base of experience in classroom teaching, and a commitment to social justice” (Dartmouth University, 2008). Duke only offers a Master of Arts in Teaching Program, which intends to prepare to students to become exceptional high school teachers through coursework and a two-semester internship at a public high school. According to the description of curriculum, Duke’s M.A.T. program lacks courses that discuss issues of gender or equity (Duke University, 2010). While the University of Chicago does not offer a degree in education, the college sponsors the “Center for Teaching & Learning,” which provides an annual workshop on teaching in college and a “Certificate for Teaching in College” (University of Chicago, 2010). Without obtaining a certificate, it is doubtful that future educators who graduate from the University of Chicago receive training about gender equitable teaching approaches.
Although the aforementioned universities are considered the best in the nation, they largely lack training for future educators in educational equity and gender fair teaching approaches. Notably, Columbia University’s “Teachers College,” which offers 128 focused Master’s and doctoral programs in education, does not have a single one devoted to issues of equity or gender in the classroom at any grade level. These trends suggest that issues of equity in the classroom are not taken as a serious issue in many educational spheres. The connotation of equity being an illegitimate field causes many educators to be deficient in valuable classes or training pertaining to issues such as gender equitable teaching practices for either lack of availability or lack of belief.

**Gender Equity Training of College Educators**

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill offers a Master’s and Ph.D. in Education, “Culture, Curriculum, and Change,” that allows students to focus on the issues they are most passionate about, including issues involving gender (University of North Carolina, 2010). Indiana University, Bloomington offers a Ph.D. in the History of Education and “students are encouraged to complete supplementary coursework in programs and departments outside the School of Education, for example, in…Women’s History and Gender Studies” (Indiana University, 2011). Claremont Graduate University offers a Master’s in Applied Women’s Studies, where students can choose education as their concentration, and requires an internship in their chosen field (Claremont Graduate University, 2010). In contrast to the compromises offered at the previously named colleges, the University of Toronto features the Ontario Institute
for Studies in Education, where students focus on gender and feminist studies in Master’s and doctoral programs within departments including Adult Education, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, Sociology and Equity Studies, and Theory and Policy Studies (University of Toronto, 2010).

Certificate Programs

In 2008, the University Faculty Preparation Program opened at Oklahoma State University, allowing doctoral students to obtain a “Certificate in University Faculty Preparation” (Oklahoma State University, 2006). The department was created to train doctoral students for “jobs in the academy, in particular teaching. While doctoral students are typically prepared to conduct independent research, many, perhaps most, received little opportunity to familiarize themselves with educational theory or engage in supervised practical experience in teaching” (Oklahoma State University, 2006). Similarly, many colleges in California now offer certification programs to prepare faculty for teaching at the community college level, including CSU Fresno, CSU Sacramento, CSU Chico, and the Sierra Community College District.

The typical college educator does not possess special training specifically for teaching. While educators should be a master of their discipline, with a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science, Master’s degree, and possibly a specialized Ph.D., few receive, and very few are required to obtain, training in teaching methods. While some educators have had training in teaching, especially those in liberal studies and education departments, or those who have taught in grades K–12, most college
educators do not have teaching credentials. Educators who have received training in teaching methods are unlikely to have learned about gender equitable teaching approaches. In “Teaching our Teachers: Gender in the Foreground,” Brown and Silber (2000) describes a nationwide survey of education department faculty conducted by the Marymount Institute, entitled Educational Issues for Women and Girls. The survey found the following:

(1) of the fifty colleges represented, none offered a course in gender equity in its teacher education program; (2) more than 90 percent of faculty said gender equity was merely mentioned in their curricula; and (3) in some programs gender equity was the subject of a one-hour lecture during the semester. Faculty expressed the need to learn more about the psychology of women's and girls' development, strategies for creating a more gender fair environment in the classroom, and the transformation of curriculum material to include information about and perspectives of women and girls. (pp. 154-155)

Sexual Harassment Training

The college classroom and university environment is not equitable or conducive for learning when discrimination is part of the dynamic. Sexual harassment is related to issues of gender equitable classrooms because like inequitable classrooms, sexual harassment “corrodes the atmosphere for learning for all students. Girls and boys suffer in such an environment” (AAUW, 1999, p. 66). According to the AAUW, 18% of students state that faculty and staff often or occasionally sexually harass students (2005). Additionally, about 7% of sexually harassed students have been
harassed by a professor (AAUW, 2005). Students often try to “avoid the person who harasses them (38%) and stay away from particular buildings or places on campus (19%). Only a handful of students change colleges (3%), but about 6% think about transferring colleges” (AAUW, 2005, p. 28). Sexual harassment impacts the learning environment and educational experience for students offended.

Assembly Bill 1825 (Gov. Code § 12950.1) applies to educators at public and private universities in California. The law requires a two-hour training program to be provided (and completed) by January 1, 2006, and to be conducted every two years thereafter. In addition, the training must be provided to all new supervisors within six months of their appointment to a supervisory position (http://www.statetraining.ca.gov/files/GovtCode12950.pdf). The law clearly states that the ruling is only a baseline of minimum training, and “should not discourage or relieve any employer from providing for longer, more frequent, or more elaborate training….in order to meet its obligations to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent and correct harassment and discrimination” (California General Laws, 2004).

Table 1

*Minimum Hours Needed to be Compliant with the Law*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching 1 year or less</th>
<th>2 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anyone teaching for more than 5 years should have a minimum of 6 hours (Gov. Code § 12950.1).

In 2008, the Chair of the UC Berkeley Academic Senate reported concern regarding the low rate of faculty compliance in completing the Sexual Harassment Prevention education and training in regards to AB 1825 (UCB ASUC Minutes). As of the end of July 2009, the overall compliance rate was 86% (University of California, Berkeley, 2010).

**Changing Teacher Education and Classroom Dynamics Using Gender Fair Learning Environments**

Adequate information about gender bias needs taught to educators and future college faculty in order to increase the use of gender fair teaching approaches (AAUW, 1998). To encourage greater self-esteem in all students, techniques to tackle gender bias, such as connected learning, need to be addressed in teacher education programs. Zohar (2006) states that “the heart of connected knowing is understanding” (p. 1580). Connected learning requires formal curriculum that allows students to identify and relate with diverse models within the material. Diverse models allow young girls to see a multitude of female figures that they can form their behavior after, not just the images of women that society is already saturated with (Ward, 2007; Zohar, 2006). Gender equitable curriculum needs to be taught in gender-neutral ways that counter typical teaching methods. Studies suggest that varying the methods of instruction and teaching strategies is a component of gender fair teaching approaches (AAUW, 1992; Tracy & Lane, 1999; Wilbur, 1992). Practicing connected learning
encourages gender equity and greater learning in the classroom for male and female students. Teaching and implementing connected learning in preservice education can help future college educators combat gender bias in the classroom.

For educators who do receive training, how gender equity is presented is imperative. “Academics have a vital role to play in transforming the attitudes, beliefs and values of intending teachers during the period of preservice teacher education. How they present gender issues is, therefore, important” (Poole & Isaacs, 1993, p. 276). Educators in university and college classrooms also need to question existing power structures and incorporate new classroom relationships. In “The Gender Agenda in Teacher Education” (1993), Poole and Isaacs discuss the troubling findings of Gardner et al. (1989) on gender issues in higher education: “Even in women’s studies courses, patriarchal, hierarchical classroom dynamics impeded the development of empowering modes of thought and behaviour for women students” (p. 275). The findings that higher education courses, and even gender studies courses, are contributing to patriarchal classroom structures suggest that there is something amiss in the American educational system that needs to be addressed.

**Backlash Against Gender Equity**

In recent years, some contend that there is a “boy crisis” in the United States education system (Kafer, 2007). Many of the reports and media coverage of the “boy crisis” support that male students “are at a disadvantage in the many classrooms headed by female teachers, who are supposedly hostile to their sex” (Rivers & Barnett, 2006, B1). Ample media coverage has examined the position of male students in the
American education system, with statements such as, “At every level of education, [boys are] falling behind” from news magazines like Newsweek (Matthews, 2006, A1). In a similar refrain, Kafer (2007) reports that the “once proclaimed and now debunked” AAUW report, *How Schools Shortchange Girls* (1992), “can no longer conceal the facts about girls’ achievements and boys’ struggles: that girls equal or surpass boys on nearly every indicator of academic excellence, and too many boys are falling behind and not catching up” (p. 10). However, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, a federally funded report that tracks student achievement, boys are not struggling to achieve academically.

Over the past three decades, boys' test scores are mostly up…long-term trends in test scores and academic success argues that widespread reports of U.S. boys being in crisis are greatly overstated and that young males in school are in many ways doing better than ever. It concludes that much of the pessimism about young males seems to derive from inadequate research, sloppy analysis and discomfort with the fact that although the average boy is doing better, the average girl has gotten ahead of him. (Matthews, 2006, A1)

The research does not support claims that female educators are hostile to male students. Furthermore, even reports that are pessimistic about the educational achievement of male students concede that male students receive between two and eight times more attention from educators than do female students (Sommers, 2000).

Moreover, “the alarming statistics on which the notion of a crisis is based are…clear that if there is a crisis, it’s among inner-city and rural boys…When it
comes to academic achievement, race and class completely swamp gender” (Rivers & Barnett, 2006, B1). Male students who are poor and working-class are not as likely to graduate as their female counterparts are. Among black students, “for every 100 males who graduate, 139 females do” (Rivers & Barnett, 2006, B1). In contrast, “among whites in Boston public schools, for every 100 males who graduate, 104 females do” (Rivers & Barnett, 2006, B1). This discrepancy in graduation rates exemplifies that the “the predominant issues” that boys face “are race and class, not gender” (Matthews, 2006, A1). Further research needs to be completed in order to understand why boys of low socioeconomic status and minority groups are not succeeding in school at the same rate as the girls with whom they attend school, as well as why boys of higher socioeconomic status are not affected. Research does not support claims that male students as a whole are falling behind in academics and are disadvantaged in the classroom setting.

Historically, women and girls in the United States have obtained an education that lacked the excellence of that made available to men and boys. Curiously, now that women, in some areas, are achieving higher levels of academic success than men are, it is a national education crisis. Men continue to monopolize high-paying fields such as math, engineering, science, and IT (Pollitt, 2010). To earn a salary equivalent to that of a man with a high school diploma women must attain a college degree: “[That] women earn 20 to 30 percent less than men in nearly every occupation from salesclerk to surgeon is not a detail, and suggests that gender reversal is hardly around the corner, no matter how well girls do in school” (Pollitt, 2010, p. 10).
While in office, former First Lady Laura Bush led a three-year undefined campaign to help boys achieve more academically, especially in regards to reading ability, stating, “I feel like, in the United States, that we’ve sort of shifted our gaze away from boys for the last several decades, and that we’ve neglected boys” (Goodman, 2007, para. 11). The fervor surrounding the “boy crisis” suggests that women’s education in America has not strayed far from the original patriarchal conceptions, which place women as second-class citizens.

How ironic that the gender debate, once thought to be synonymous with females, now hinges on how well boys are doing in school. And in the end, reframing gender equity to include boys may prove to be a very positive development. (Sadker, 2002, p. 240)

In part, gender equity is beginning to make larger strides in education and receive recognition as a legitimate concern because of the perceived benefits for male students.

**Conclusion**

Evidence from various disciplines in education and within the humanities suggests that gender equitable classrooms benefit all students, although generally the American education system engages in practices that are not conducive for equitable experiences in education. Originally only intended to educate men, the United States higher education system does not deviate far from its foundation. Women adjusted to a college system that was not designed for their inclusion, which has contributed to systemic gender discrimination at the university level.
Institutional gender discrimination is engrained in the college classroom and environment. Every student with a four-year degree graduates as a “bachelor” of arts or a “bachelor” of science. This, and the vast array of other examples, reflects the culture of universities, which still embrace masculine culture and patriarchy. Men and women may not even see barriers because they are entrenched within our ideologies. As a society, we may not see how some people benefit in the university system simply because of their gender; the opportunities that gender presents or prevents may go unnoticed by many, or may be attributed incorrectly to other factors. Gender discrimination in the college classroom cannot be remedied without having a discourse about gender equity in the classroom on a national level.

This review contributes to research that questions and analyzes patriarchal classroom dynamics through the lens of feminist theory and feminist andragogy. Data provided also emphasize the importance that social role theory plays in influencing humans’ gendered behavior in society. Specifically, in the college environment gender norms are well established and persistent, even though women outnumber men on many college campuses.
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METHODOLOGY

The principle of this study was to examine college educators’ training on gender differences in the classroom and gender equitable teaching practices. The purpose was also to understand educators’ perceptions and awareness of gender bias in both the college environment and the classroom setting. Two hundred and fifty college educators from Northern California, including San Francisco and surrounding areas, and Central California functioned as participants in the study. Each participant was given a survey containing both short-answer and open-ended questions regarding their demographic background information, teaching experience, and the amount of training that they had received in a variety of areas within education.

Study Design and Data Collection

This study employed quantitative and qualitative research. Quantitative research is often praised for being objective in nature. Quantitative research “asks specific, narrow questions” of participants (Creswell, 2008, p. 46). Ideally, the numerical data acquired is manipulated to form descriptive statistics that measure “social reality” and often produce generalizable results (Basit, 2010, p. 16). However, “researchers using solely quantitative methods should not be deluded into thinking that their methods give the only ‘scientific’ answer,” although historically this has been the typical belief (Douglas, 2003, p. 89). Currently, educational research disputes whether quantitative or qualitative research methodology is the purest form of scientific research (Niaz, 2009).
Based on the premise that perception and experience shift an individual’s reality, qualitative methodology focuses “on the subjective views of research participants,” and facilitates “the researcher to explain social reality as it is perceived and created by the research participants themselves” (Basit, 2010, p. 16). In contrast to the specificity of quantitative research questions, qualitative research asks participants open-ended and comprehensive questions. Researchers examine interview responses “for themes; and [conduct] the inquiry in a subjective, biased manner” (Creswell, 2008, p. 46). Though the qualitative method lacks the ability to be generalizable, the information it can provide through textual analysis discovers a “particular aspect of social reality” that is unmatched by quantitative analysis in its ability to complete a rich and thorough examination (Basit, 2010, p. 16).

The research questions of this study were explored using a survey (Analysis of College Educator's Training/ACET) that was largely based on Carinci’s (2002) “Sample of Post Credentialing Survey (SPCS).” A validity panel of qualified experts deemed Carinci’s SPCS to be credible and found “that the areas listed on the survey are included in the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Standards for preservice teachers” (Carinci, 2002, p. 52).

**Research Questions**

The following questions were explored:

1. What do college and university educators in California learn about addressing issues of gender equity in the college classroom?
2. To what extent are California university educators trained in gender equitable teaching approaches?

3. Relevant to gender equity training, to what extent are California university educators trained about sexual harassment awareness?

4. Are most educators in compliance with AB1825 (receiving at least two hours of sexual harassment training within six months of being hired, and at least two hours every other year thereafter)?

5. What are educators’ opinions about the type and amount of preparation they have received to teach?

6. Does the type of institution educators attended, top-tier universities contrasted with non-top-tier universities, make a difference in the type and amount of training they receive?

7. Do male educators and female educators obtain different amounts of training in gender equity and sexual harassment training?

**Research Instruments**

Questionnaires obtained the data for this study. Surveys allow researchers to gather a plethora of information about a population with “versatility, efficiency, and generalizability” (Schutt, 2006, p. 234). Babbie (1998) stresses the significance of surveys for use in research:

Survey research is probably the best method available to the social scientist interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to
observe directly. Surveys are also excellent vehicles for measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population. (p. 256)

This study’s self-administered survey included multiple-choice, short-answer, and open-ended questions. Each participant received a consent form along with a survey.

The survey consisted of 18 short-answer questions and four open-ended questions. Participants were asked to provide information regarding their ethnicity, sex, education, and professional training. Experiences and training in other areas of education, including classroom management techniques, sexual harassment, and working with special needs students were also included in this study, functioning as reference points for comparison with gender equity. Some of the participants completed surveys on-site, where they were distributed. If the participant was not able to complete the survey on-site, he or she was permitted to complete it at an alternative location. The participants who were unable to return surveys immediately mailed their forms and responses in a provided self-addressed and stamped envelope. In order to maintain the anonymity of the participants in the study, when analyzing the data and reaching findings, code numbers were used in place of the participants’ names.

Supplies used by the researcher for the packets of survey materials given to the participants included white copy paper, color-coding dots, white self-adhesive labels, United States postage stamps, white envelopes, and manila envelopes.

**Participants**

All 250 participants involved in the study were educators employed at colleges or universities in Northern California, San Francisco and the surrounding area, or
Central California (Table 2). Faculty from 11 college and university campuses in Northern California, San Francisco and the surrounding areas, and Central California participated in this study. The institutions included community and private colleges, as well as the University of California and California State Universities. The 11 colleges are located in 10 different California counties. The communities that surround each of these colleges vary (Table 3).

Table 2

*Numbers and Percentages of Participants’ College Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UC*: University of California  
*CSU*: California State University  
*Private*: Private College  
*CCC*: California Community College

_Urban_: Urban areas “consist of densely settled territory that contains 50,000 or more people, and an [urban cluster] contains at least 2,500 people but fewer than 50,000 people” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002).
Suburban: “A Census Block Group no more than 30 miles from urban areas or a Census Block Group with a density greater than or equal to 500 people per square mile and less than 2,000 people per square mile” (U.S. Department of Justice, 2008).

Rural: “A Census Block Group with a density less than 500 people per square mile” (U.S. Department of Justice, 2008; Table 3).

Table 3

Numbers and Percentiles of Participants’ School Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentile of Males at Location</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentile of Females at Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Survey Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study’s sample, male educators obtained doctorate degrees at higher percentages than did female educators (Figure 1).
Figure 1. Gender Differences in Educational Attainment.

The percentage of male educators in this study who attended top-tier universities was higher than the percentage of women who attended top-tier universities (Table 4).
Table 4

*Type of University Attended by Participants Relative to Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of University</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage of Male Degrees</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage of Female Degrees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top-Tier University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Top-Tier University</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of certifications include California Teaching Credentials, California Community College Teaching Credential (no longer offered), Learning Disabilities Specialist, and licensed psychologist (Table 5).

Table 5

*Number and Percentage of Certifications Obtained Relative to Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certifications</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men and women educators in this study tended to concentrate in different departments and subject matter (Figure 2, Figure 3).
Figure 2. Percentage of Women per Department.

Figure 3. Percentage of Men per Department.
Procedures

In order to begin the study, a department chair in a northern California State University agreed to have his or her department engage in the study. Acquired through snowball research methods, this contact commenced the research project. “Snowball sampling is often used because the population under investigation is ‘hidden’ either due to low numbers of potential participants or the sensitivity of the topic” (Browne, 2005, p. 47). College educators are just such a specific subgroup of the population, and hard to reach. Further, the topic of the questionnaire was also off-putting to some faculty, making the snowball method an appropriate research technique. Snowball sampling encompasses various techniques, “all of which have in common the strategy of locating members of the target population through the help of initial contacts” (Eland-Goossensen, Van De Goor, Vollemans, Hendriks, & Garretsen, 1997, p. 317).

College educators were also recruited to volunteer for the study at faculty meetings and presentations at one university through social networking.

The researcher also contacted 20 universities in order to obtain permission to visit their campuses and distribute surveys to in order to recruit samples of volunteers for the study. The researcher acquired permission to visit and distribute surveys at 11 campuses through convenience sampling methods. Similar sampling methods were employed at all campuses. For instance, convenience samples where a survey was distributed to every faculty member teaching at a particular university were conducted at a suburban, a rural, and an urban campus.
Some questionnaires were distributed in faculty mailboxes; others were handed out to the individual instructor in person. Ninety-nine percent of subjects mailed their surveys to the researcher. A total of 1,458 surveys were dispersed and 269 surveys were collected, for a total response rate of 18%. While this was an acceptable response rate, the three-page length of the questionnaire and open-ended answers likely contributed to the low rate of return (Shao, 1999). Two hundred and fifty out of 269 returned surveys were usable for the purposes of the study. Surveys that were not included lacked the needed information to conduct statistical analysis, or logistical information such as a signature on the provided consent page.

For the 250 usable surveys, both quantitative and qualitative analysis was conducted in a procedural fashion. Quantitative analysis consisted of various statistical techniques; many of the figures were calculated using LaTeX statistical software. This allowed the researcher to use the data as “an interrelated set of constructs (or variables) formed into propositions, or hypotheses, that specify the relationship among variables” (Creswell, 2009, p. 235). Qualitative data was examined for recurrent themes of participants’ experiences. “Coding is one of the significant steps taken during analysis to organize and make sense of textual data” (Basit, 2003, p. 143). Categorizing the qualitative data plays an imperative role in analysis (Basit, 2003).

For the findings sections of this study, top-tier universities were determined by three different qualifications. All universities had to be considered in the top 10% of the ranking system of US News & World Report at least once between the years of 1988 and 2010. The years 2001-2003 were omitted because the data was unavailable
to the researcher. Additionally, all universities had to be ranked in the top 10% of universities at least once based on research from the Center for Measuring University Performance. Furthermore, all colleges must have acceptance into the Association of American Universities, an association of 63 leading public and private research universities in the United States and Canada (aau.edu; Table 6).

Table 6

*List of Top-Tier Universities According to Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columbia University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan, Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Employing survey research methods incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data, the researcher aimed to understand the role that gender equitable teaching approaches plays in the training educators receive. The goal of this study was to focus on the amount of time devoted to issues of gender equity and sexual harassment, in regards to preparing college educators to create equitable classrooms where all students have an ability to thrive. The researcher’s intent was to gain awareness about educators’ perspectives on gender equitable classrooms, sexual harassment, and general aspects of andragogy.
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FINDINGS

This study examined 250 educators from 11 California community colleges, California State University campuses, private California colleges, and Universities of California and their experience with gender equitable teaching approaches. It explored the amount and quality of training that higher education instructors obtain, and sought a further understanding of the training that higher education faculty receive in gender equity. In order to ascertain this, data were obtained from surveys distributed to educators at colleges in Northern and Central California.

Research Questions

The following questions were explored:

1. What do college and university educators in California learn about addressing issues of gender equity in the college classroom?

2. To what extent are California university educators trained in gender equitable teaching approaches?

3. Relevant to gender equity training, to what extent are California university educators trained about sexual harassment awareness?

4. Are most educators in compliance with AB1825?

5. What are educators’ opinions about the type and amount of preparation they have received to teach?
6. Does the type of institution educators attended, top-tier universities contrasted with non-top-tier universities, make a difference in the type and amount of training they receive?

7. Do male educators and female educators obtain different amounts of training in gender equity and sexual harassment training?

Quantitative Results

Demographic Information of Educators

**Years teaching.** The review of the survey responses found there was a broad range of educational experience among participants. The median reflects that at least 50% of educators had at least 12.04 years of experience teaching at a college, and the sample had an average of 15.63 years as an educator in the university system. The least amount of time-spent teaching at a college by a participant in this study was one quarter of a year, and the most time was 58 and a quarter years. The first quartile had 6.3775 years of teaching at the college level. The third quartile had an average of 22 years of experience teaching at a college (Figure 4).
Highest degree obtained. While 134 participants in the sample were women, only 54 of those women had their Ph.D. In contrast, of the smaller sample size of 116 men, 72 men had obtained a Ph.D. In the sample, if a college educator is female she is less likely to have a Ph.D., whereas a male educator is more likely to have a Ph.D. Given that the educator is female, there is a 40% chance that she holds a Ph.D. Given that a teacher is male, there is a probability of 62% that he holds a Ph.D.

Gender compared to subject content. Certain disciplines had more male or female educators. The gender disparity within subject content can contribute to the vastly different experiences of male and female students taking the same college classes, on the same college campus (Sax, 2008). Notably, more women participated in this study than men, so the representation of each sex is not biased towards a higher
proportion of men. If the numbers of subject in department are at all biased, it would be a propensity for more women to be represented throughout all disciplines (Table 7).

Table 7

*Gender Analysis of Participants per Discipline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Breakdown in Departments</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gender analysis of participants in relation to schools of education.* Even though more women participated in this study than men, in this study’s sample women were less likely than men to graduate from a top-tier university (Table 8). Men were also much more likely to teach at a University of California (80%) than women (21%), as shown in Table 8.
Table 8

**Analysis of Universities Participants’ Attended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top-Tier Universities</th>
<th>Non-Top-Tier Universities</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females/Population</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender analysis of participants in relation to location of employing university.** Women returned more surveys than men, and therefore represented the majority of respondents, at urban and suburban schools. At urban schools, women returned 62.3% of all surveys, and women returned 54.8% of all surveys at suburban schools. However, women only represented 40.7% of the sample at rural schools (Table 9).

Table 9

**Educators’ Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average training of study participants.** Comparing the means between various types of training and preparation educators received indicates that college educators received the least amount of training in gender fair teaching approaches,
with a mean of 1.992 hours. The mean for sexual harassment training was the second lowest, at 3.413 hours. Curriculum and instruction methods had the highest amount of training, with a mean of 13.237 hours (Figure 5).
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**Figure 5.** Mean Hours of Training Educators Report Receiving.

**Average training of study participants relative to institution location.**

When examining the setting of the schools, the overall trends were consistent at suburban and rural schools. However, at urban schools, there was a slight increase in sexual harassment training, with a mean of 4.094 hours, and sexual harassment training ranked third lowest, above the mean amount of training in gender equitable
teaching approaches, and working with special needs students. Suburban schools had more training than both rural and urban colleges (Figure 6).

*Figure 6. Training of Educators Compared to Institution Location.*

**General training.** The data of the study support research that finds that college educators most often do not have training to teach (Golland, 1995). Twenty-six percent of college educators responded that they had no training in at least one area of andragogy.
In well-established aspects of andragogy, such as classroom management techniques, curriculum and instruction methods, and technology in the classroom, an average of 29.6% of educators lack any training. Conversely, in the areas of multicultural awareness, gender fair teaching approaches, and working with special needs students, an average of 51.8% of educators lack any training (Table 10).
Table 10

Educators Without Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Educators Without Training</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management Techniques</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Awareness</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction Methods</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Fair Teaching Approaches</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology in the Classroom</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Awareness</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Literacy Issues</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Special Needs Students</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training and gender. In each of the eight categories of teacher training included in the survey, this study’s sample demonstrates that women have a higher average number of hours of training compared to the average amount of training hours that men possess. The summation of the average across the different training types is 43.2 hours for men and 62.2 hours for women. Based on the sample, overall the average female educator receives 18.9 hours more training than does the average male educator. Furthermore, women are also received certificates, such as teaching credentials, at higher rates than men; 58% of women had obtained special certificates as opposed to 42% of men, as shown in Table 4 and Table 11.
Table 11

*Analysis of Gender and Training Hours*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Training</th>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management Techniques</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction Methods</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Fair Teaching Approaches</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology in the Classroom</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Literacy Issues</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Special Needs Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does Top-Tier University Education Influence the Amount and Type of Training?*

Non-top-tier universities had an average of 2.2 hours of training in gender equitable teaching approaches and top-tier universities had an average of .84 hours. Even though more women participated in this study than men, the study’s sample suggests that women are less likely than men to graduate from a top-tier university. However, the discrepancy in gender at each type of college was not enough to account for the difference in the average amount of training in gender equitable teaching approaches. The difference cannot be attributed to fewer women attending top-tier schools than men. Considering the difference in training between the samples of men and women, the discrepancy is more likely correlated to socialization processes. While
more females might seek out more gender training, in comparison, males receive only 36 minutes less (Figure 8).
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**Figure 8.** Mean Hours of Training Top-Tier University Graduates Receive Compared to Non-Top-Tier University Graduates.

**Table 12**

*Statistical Analysis Comparing Top-Tier University Graduates and Non-Top-Tier on the Amount of Gender Equitable Teaching Approaches Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Top-Tier</th>
<th>Top-Tier</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.010889146</td>
<td>213.7614779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Educators’ training according to subject content.** The amount of training that educators received in each of the eight categories contained in this study varied greatly. Educators teaching classes with subject content pertaining to business had an average summation of 62.2 hours of training in all eight categories, the greatest amount out of all six disciplines. A close second, educators in the arts had an average summation of 60.8 hours of training. Educators in the health science discipline had the third highest amount of training, with an average summation of 49.8 hours. Natural science had the fourth greatest amount of training among the six disciplines, an average summation of 34.4 hours. With the least amount of overall training, social science educators had an average summation of 28.9 hours and engineering educators had an average summation of 13.7 hours (Figure 9, Figure 10).
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*Figure 9. Mean Hours of Training Based on University Department (Business, Natural Science, Social Science).*
Specific examination of gender fair teaching approaches per discipline.

Educators teaching subject content related to business had the most training in gender fair teaching approaches, with an average amount of 2.21 hours. Educators teaching in the arts had the second highest amount of training in gender fair teaching approaches, with 2.17 hours. Natural science was third, with an average of 1.69 hours of training in gender fair teaching approaches. Educators teaching subject content related to health science was fourth of the six disciplines, with 1.36 hours of training. At 1.06 hours of training, social science was ranked fifth. Engineering had the lowest overall amount of training of all the disciplines, at only 36 minutes (.6 hours).
The social science department had significantly low levels of training in gender fair teaching approaches, with a t-score of .0365 from a t-test for unequal means and unequal variances, and a degree of freedom that is on the upper end of the spectrum at 144.15. The average amount of training hours for educators in the social science department was 1.1, compared to the average for non-social sciences, 1.6 hours.

While the degrees of freedom and the number of samples of engineering teachers might be on the lower end of the spectrum, the t-score of .0266 from a t-test for unequal means and unequal variances suggests that the data for gender equity training in engineering are statistically significant. The distribution of training in gender equitable teaching approaches for educators in engineering does not match the distribution for educators in the other disciplines. The engineering department receives significantly less training in a variety of areas, and notably in gender equitable teaching approaches. Engineering also has the least amount of women educators (Table 13).

Table 13

*Statistical Analysis Comparing the Discipline of Engineering to Non-Engineering Disciplines*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Hours of Gender Fair Teaching Approaches Training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Non-Engineering</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Engineering</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Score</td>
<td>0.0266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A correlation coefficient of .833 suggests a positive relationship between the mean hours of gender fair teaching approaches training and the percentage of women educators in each of the departments. The arts department had the highest percentage of women, 62%, and a mean of 2.2 hours of training in gender fair teaching approaches, and the engineering department had the lowest percentage of women, 18%, and a mean of .6 hours of training in gender fair teaching approaches (Figure 13).

Figure 11. Mean Hours of Training in Gender Fair Teaching Approaches Compared to the Percentage of Women per Discipline.
Gender training and the impact of career length. The review of the survey responses indicated that the median amount of experience teaching at a college was 12 years with a median of zero hours of training in gender fair teaching approaches. The most hours of training in gender fair teaching approaches was capped at 48 in order to maintain the legitimacy of the sample. Numbers beyond 48 in all categories of training were determined to corrupt the sample’s averages. The first quartile of respondents had an average of zero hours of training in gender equitable practices and 6.37 years of teaching at the college level. The third quartile of respondents had an average of one hour of training in gender fair teaching approaches and 22 years of experience teaching at the university level. The overall average of gender equity training was 1.922 hours (Table 14).

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Gender Training</th>
<th>Number of Years Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartile1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartile3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.992222222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph in Figure 12 visually portrays the amount of training in gender equitable teaching approaches educators in this study received; most educators,
regardless of the number of years teaching, had nominal, if any training. Specifically, out of 250 participants, 165 educators did not possess any training in gender fair teaching approaches.

Figure 12. Training in Gender Equitable Teaching Approaches Compared to Years Teaching at a University.
Mean Hours of Sexual Harassment Training

The sample mean of sexual harassment training for each bracket of teaching experience was significantly lower than the amount of hours mandated by law. Overall, 20% of educators teaching for five years or longer were compliant with California Assembly Bill 1825. Even with a larger sample, these figures would all have to be outliers in order to match the distribution of a graph of samples in compliance with California law. Six hours of sexual harassment training is a normal distribution for college teachers to have, and therefore the mean of the sample should also be around six. However, the sample mean minus the assumed mean (six), shows a difference of 2.04942 hours. This difference would not be significant if the variance was large or the sample size was small, but after dividing the difference by the sample standard deviation and number of trials, the sample’s z-score of -4.22024 shows that the distribution between an assumed mean of six hours per teacher and a sample of 250 that the two populations are different. Therefore, the sample shows that educators are largely non-compliant, or that educators do not remember having six hours of training.
The review of the survey responses showed that the median amount of experience teaching at a college was 12 years with a median of one hour of sexual harassment training. The least amount of sexual harassment training was zero, reported by 25% of participants, and the most was 48 hours. The third quartile of respondents had an average of three hours’ training in sexual harassment, and the overall average was 3.464 hours.
The graph in Figure 14 depicts each amount of training reported by educators in this study. Of 250 participants, 88 educators reported having zero hours of sexual harassment training.

*Figure 14. Sexual Harassment Awareness Training Compared to Years Teaching at a University.*
Qualitative Data

Participants were asked a series of open-ended questions on the questionnaire they were given. For this study, the researcher examined three of the four open-ended answers that participants provided. Question one was not used in this study because it did not provide relevant data.

**Question Number Two: Do You Feel You Are Effectively Trained on Gender and Gender Fair Teaching Approaches? If so, Explain the Content of the Training (Time, Method of Delivery) (Appendix A).**

Sixty participants, 24.6% of those who provided a response, answered that they had received some sort of training. Types of formal training most often cited were workshops, new faculty orientations and programs, and college courses.

- “Yes, I graduated from the [district] Faculty Diversity Internship Program which had a variety of seminars on learning how to work with diverse student populations. Gender, race, ethnicity, disability and other dimensions of diversity were all topics of discussion and learning” (M, M.A., 6 years teaching, Sociology).
- “Yes, coursework in critical gender theory” (F, M.A., 6 years teaching, English).
- “Yes, the community college internship I had (9 weeks of seminars) were pretty useful” (F, Ph.D., 9.5 years teaching, History).
- “Yes, gender and sexuality studies [were involved] in [acquiring my] literature and composition certificate. I teach core ideas of feminist theory as it applies to
education in all my classes” (F, M.A. 5 years teaching, English Composition and Literature).

Of the 24.6% of subjects who had received some sort of training, the degree to which they felt effectively trained varied.

- “I do indeed [feel effectively trained in gender fair teaching approaches]. I’ve taken courses in feminine history participation in at least 10 workshops and encounter programs as part of my public health training” (M, Ph.D., 36 years teaching, Linguistics and Anthropology).

- “Yes, [I am] part of a feminist teaching collective at another university and was a member of the sexual harassment training team” (F, RN, Ph.D., 23 years teaching, Public Health).

- “I was three units shy of a women’s studies minor. In graduate school, there was only a bit of gender fair teaching methods taught in the teaching classes I took” (M, M.A., 8 years teaching, English).

- “I only went to a 3 hour workshop on this topic. I don’t feel effectively trained in this area” (F, M.A., 14.5 years teaching, English as a Second Language).

Other participants who responded that they felt effectively trained could not recall aspects about the preparation they had received, or did not feel that gender training was imperative.

- “Yes, I don’t recall any specifics from those trainings. My approach in the classroom is to be fair/inclusive, so I start each semester with a student
questionnaire to individualize our lessons” (M, Ph.D., 7 years teaching, Geography, Fire Ecology, and Environmental Science).

- “I received training in guard. School and teaching workshops that have helped improve my skills. I don't remember much in regard to fair teaching” (M, M.A., MS, 10 years teaching, Physical Education, Health and Recreation).

- “I was introduced to the concept in my credentialing training/education. I do not see the need for further training on the topic” (M, M.A. 3 years teaching, Political Science).

One hundred and nineteen subjects, 48.8% of educators who gave an answer, stated that they did not have training or did not feel effectively trained in gender or gender fair teaching approaches, with the most common response being simply “no” and “none.” Other educators who did not have training were not aware of the concept or did not think that issues of gender equity played a part in their classrooms.

- “Never heard of it. Other than general differences/sensitivity between male and female students, especially in regards to criminal justice material” (M, Ph.D., 4 years teaching, Criminal Justice).

- “…no formal training. Not sure what gender fair refers to?” (M, Ph.D., 13 years teaching, Political Science).

- “Trained – No. Never had any challenges based on gender bias” (M, Ph.D., 35 years teaching, Philosophy).
- “I received no training whatsoever on this, but attended a women’s college and so [I] do not feel the need for a more gender based information” (F, MLA, 20 years teaching, Community and Rural Planning).

- “No, this has been a weak spot in my background that I am trying to strengthen” (F, M.A., 20 years teaching, English).

- “Probably not [effectively trained], I don't really understand what gender fair teaching means” (M, Ph.D., 7 years teaching, Mechanical Engineering).

An additional 8.2%, 20 subjects, stated that they either did not have training or did not feel effectively trained, but would welcome training on the topic of gender and gender fair teaching approaches.

- “I attended the ‘Safe Space’ training 3 hour workshop on LGBT sensitivity which was very helpful, however, I do not know more specifics other than to be aware & sensitive to gender issues. I could benefit from more training in gender fair teaching” (F, M.A., 10 years teaching, Reading and Learning Disabilities).

- “Yes on the subject of gender as a core part of identity. Gender as part of identity was part of the curriculum taught in communication and we were required to incorporate identity for content and class involvement in lesson plans. No on specific ‘gender fair’ teaching approaches” (F, M.A., 3 years teaching, Communication Studies).
- “I don’t feel I am trained in this area at all and would gladly welcome any instruction/awareness” (F, Ph.D., 21 years teaching, Foreign Language and Literature).

Seven subjects, 2.9% of educators sampled, stated that they were trained in gender studies or a related field, but not gender fair teaching practices.

- “I have not received any specific training…However, I do feel like my undergraduate work in Women’s Studies focused heavily on issues of race, class, and gender (and their interaction) and I believe this has been very helpful for me in the classroom” (F, MFA, 5 years teaching, Art Studio).

- “Gender = yes. Gender fair teaching practices = no” (M, Ph.D., 10.5 years teaching, Political Science and Criminal Justice).

Finally, 2.4% of participants did not respond to the question.

**Question Number Three: Have You Ever Received Training Regarding Sexual Harassment, Harassment, and/or the Effects of Bullying? If so, Explain the Content of the Training (Time, Method of Delivery) (Appendix A).**

One hundred and fifty-eight of the subjects, 63.2% of educators in this study, responded that they had received some sort of training in sexual harassment. Of those who responded they had been trained, participants’ interpretations, experience, and type of training varied.

- “Yes, to complete our hiring process for full time professors, we have to be trained using software that explains proper conduct” (M, M.A., 6 years teaching, Sociology).
“Yes, 1 hour [at a] new faculty orientation” (F, Ed.D., 20 years teaching, Teaching English as a Second Language).

“I went to a 1 hour seminar on sexual harassment when I was a graduate student at the University of Nebraska” (M, Ph.D., 11.5 years teaching, Physics).

“I am sick of this training, I have had it so often—twice online, several times in person, all with the same tired joke and exercises” (F, Ph.D., 43 years teaching, English).

“At the beginning of the job – on written form. Mostly focused toward myself as an employee not toward the student or classroom” (F, MS, 2 years teaching, Nutrition).

Seventy-three participants, 29.2%, stated they did not have training in sexual harassment awareness, with the most common answers being “no,” “none,” and “zero.”

“No training whatsoever” (F, Ph.D., 21 years teaching, Linguistic Theory).

“Not really. We need this” (F, Ph.D., 20 years teaching, Japanese Language and Literature).

Only 1.2% of the subjects expressed interest in more comprehensive sexual harassment training.

“Not as much as I’d like. But we were instructed to call university police at orientation and at [the university] there are campus resources to help” (F, Ph.D., 7 years teaching, Media Studies).
Finally, 3.6% of participants did not respond to question number three regarding sexual harassment training.

**Question Number Four: What Training do You Wish You Had Received to Prepare You for Teaching at the College Level? (Appendix A)**

The majority of respondents denoted that more andragogical training would be beneficial for either themselves or their peers. Of the responses, 36.7% indicated a desire for training in aspects related to classroom management techniques, as well as curriculum and instruction methods.

- “All the ones you asked about: how to manage a classroom effectively; multicultural training; harassment training. Also I would have liked training on how to write an effective syllabus, how to write effective exams, how to prepare effective assignments, how to deal with students who are disruptive, how to deal with students who cheat” (F, JD, Ph.D., 5 years teaching, Political Science).

- “I’d say that when I was in graduate school the pedagogy class I took was very good for the time (early 1980s). I think all college teachers should take a class like the one I took, but it should cover the areas you address here” (F, Ph.D., years teaching undisclosed, Media Studies).

Only 27% of respondents indicated that they did not need any additional training to be an educator. Of 237 subjects who provided a response to question
number four, 10% voiced concerns about their lack of training in identifying students’ learning disabilities and working with special needs students.

- “Definitely working with special needs students and knowing how/when to refer students with possible learning disabilities. Also… classroom management” (F, M.A., 14.5 years teaching, English).

- “I definitely need more tech training and more training on how to cope with students who have psychological issues. In the last two years I have had several students with compel[ling] psych[ological] concerns: bipolarize [sic], depression, etc…. maybe it is the stress of our current social economic conditions in part but, I wish I was better equipped to direct these students to the appropriate resources; I want to help them, but just redirecting them to the student health center seems ‘cold.’ Even some specialized training in calming anxieties would be nice” (F, M.A., 5 years teaching, Religious Studies and Humanities).

- “Most important—learning and mental disabilities. Students with all types of mild to serious mental disabilities come into my classes. Everything I use to help them, I have learned ‘on the fly’” (F, MS, 15 years teaching, Mathematics).

**General Themes**

Throughout all the open-ended questions there was a common theme of disbelief in the concept and effectiveness of training, mandated training, or education provided by another. Ten respondents out of 244 (4.1%) who answered question
number two regarding gender equitable teaching practices clearly described formal training to be fruitless and not the best way to learn.

- “We learn more from experience than training” (F, Ph.D., 4 years teaching, Communication Studies).

Responses tended to be stronger than the one above, with feedback expressing extreme distaste for training and resentment about mandated training.

- “This question assumes the need for training; however, I don’t feel the need to be ‘trained.’ An open-mind, consideration of others, awareness and experience build …awareness. An intelligent, well-educated person doesn’t need to be trained in order to be aware of gender issues. Especially as a lit. [literature] major, one delves into issues of sexism, gender identity, etc. Also, respect for one’s students addresses the issue of fairness” (F, Ph.D., 22 years teaching, English Composition and Literature).

- “…training from state representatives ineffective, this too is a forced and artificial method of [training]…I am skeptical that anything but an open mind and experience can achieve this. Any formal discussion I’ve seen was very badly done” (M, Ph.D., 33 years teaching, Language Arts and Literature)

Surprisingly, even educators who stated they lacked training or felt ineffectively trained asserted that formal training is feckless.

- “No, I do not feel like I am trained, however I also think any institutional training would be useless. You need people to consume the value” (M, M.A., 3.5 years teaching, Communications).
“I didn’t receive any formal training so I guess not but I don’t know what I would learn if I were trained” (M, Ph.D., 7 years teaching, Kinesiology).

Related to the theme of rejecting training and finding training ineffective, other participants indicated that they were “self-trained.” This was such a fundamental part of subjects’ responses that it was difficult to classify answers in this category with an exact percentage in order to avoid double-counting participants. Variations of this answer implied that educators had been self-trained through experience, though not always in the classroom.

“At home every day but would welcome more formal education” (M, DS, 4 years teaching, Physical Therapy and Kinesiology).

“No training but some common sense” (M, Ph.D., 39.5 years teaching, Public Health).

“I’m a female & feminist (3rd wave I think)” (F, MFA, 10 years teaching, Art).

There are very few mandates for university educators to obtain training for teaching. Specifically, educators are only required to receive two hours of sexual harassment awareness training every other year (AB 1825). However, some educators believe that any training, in andragogy or otherwise, is worthless.

Conclusion

After examining survey data from 11 colleges in Northern and Central California, this researcher verified that issues of gender, and specifically gender fair teaching practices, are often absent from the training college educators receive. The data from 250 survey responses denote that only 34% of college educators, 85
participants, had received training in gender equitable teaching approaches, with an average of almost two hours. Further, only 24.6%, 60 participants, responded that they felt effectively trained in gender fair teaching approaches. These findings echo similar studies regarding the limited training college educators receive on gender fair classrooms (Brown, 2000).

The findings from this study also determined that educators lack training about sexual harassment. Aside from gender equitable teaching practices, sexual harassment had the lowest mean hours of training, with an average amount of three hours and 25 minutes. Sixty-four percent of respondents had training. Almost the exact amount, 63.2%, felt that they were effectively trained in sexual harassment awareness. However, 80% of educators employed at a college or university for five years or longer were not compliant with California Assembly Bill 1825.

Using survey research methods to collect data, this study was able to identify the amount of training college educators receive about gender fair teaching approaches and sexual harassment. The results lead the researcher to conclude that training on gender equity issues, and gender fair teaching approaches, including sexual harassment awareness, are types of training lacked by the educators participating in this study.
Chapter 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study examined the attitudes, awareness, and amount of training in gender equity and gender equitable teaching approaches of college educators in Northern California, San Francisco and the surrounding area, and Central California. Various types of college institutions in urban, suburban, and rural locations with varying demographics were investigated in this study. Minimal research has been conducted evaluating college educators’ training in gender equity and gender fair teaching approaches. This study sought to contribute to the body of knowledge regarding college educators’ training in gender fair teaching approaches and sexual harassment within the American higher education system. The inclusion of educators from all disciplines makes this inquiry unique. The researcher is unaware of any similar study that inquired about college educators’ training in gender equitable teaching and sexual harassment training, beyond educators within the discipline of education (Brown & Silber, 2000).

Discussion

Quantitative Data

Demographic information of educators. Of the 134 educators in the sample who were women, only 54 had a Ph.D. On the other hand, educators who were men were a smaller proportion of the study’s population, at 116 subjects, and 72 men had a Ph.D. This study supports previous findings that men are more likely to earn Ph.D.s
than are women; in the sample, women educators were 22% less likely to have a Ph.D. than male educators (College Gender Gaps, 2010; Rivers & Barnett, 2006). While this might not affect women educators’ teaching ability, it reflects and perpetuates socialization processes that engrain perceptions on the part of students that male educators are more likely to obtain the highest levels of education.

This study also supports research findings that women are less likely than men to graduate from a top-tier university (College Gender Gaps, 2010; Rivers & Barnett, 2006). These findings can have a negative impact on female students in higher education because there are fewer women and diverse examples of educators on which to model behaviors. Women and men internalize the roles that educators have in the college system as social norms, and in effect, this perpetuates gendered behavior (Dulin, 2008). In this study, women educators do not obtain the level of education that their male counterparts pursue, and they do not attend prestigious universities at the same level. These two trends may have a debilitating effect on these educators’ students because they can cause students to develop patriarchal attitudes and perceptions, even unconsciously, about gender roles and social-normative pathways.

**Educators’ training.** This thesis supports studies that suggest that college educators lack training in andragogy (Golland, 1995; Sandler et al., 1996). Twenty-six percent of educators lacked training in all eight aspects of andragogy discussed on the research instrument (Appendix A). It is unusual that most, if not all jobs and careers require some training, yet college educators are not required to have any knowledge about teaching, just about subject content. Teachers for grades Kindergarten through
12 are required by the state of California and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to attend a certified credentialing program to ensure that they are well-versed in pedagogy.

Educators in the university system are not taught how to effectively convey and communicate the knowledge they have in their discipline, although it is expected of them that they be able to do so. However, this expectation to be self-trained rarely exists in other aspects of American society. For instance, according to a case study of the coffee house chain “Starbucks,” the minimum amount of training time any barista in the study received was 24 hours, including workshops, in a two to four week period (Thompson & Gamble, 1999). California has a higher education system in which many educators have less training in teaching methods than the least amount of training a barista at Starbucks receives.

**Participants’ gender.** On average, in this study, female teachers receive 18.9 hours more training than the average male teacher does. In each of the eight categories of andragogy contained on the survey for this study, women had a higher average than men. Even in “Technology in the Classroom,” a category related to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines (STEM), where women are vastly underrepresented, and where it would be gender normative for men to have a higher amount of training, women had an average of 1.7 hours more training than men (Pollitt, 2010). Men continue to monopolize high-paying fields such as math, engineering, science, and IT (Pollitt, 2010). In categories that could be considered to require more nurturing qualities, which are commonly considered feminine, such as
“Working with Special Needs Students,” women averaged 4.5 more hours of training than male educators. This trend may be an extension and result of the praise that girls and women often receive from teachers for exhibiting sensitivity and nurturing characteristics (Maher & Rathbone, 1986).

The fact of women receiving more training than men may also reflect that much like female students, female educators feel less confident in the college environment than male educators do, and as a result, they engage in extracurricular training to increase their perceived abilities and confidence (Sax, 2008). Women’s additional training may also reflect that education has been considered a socially normative field for women to pursue, in part because of the implied need to be sensitive and nurturing. On the college campus women largely dominate education as a discipline, and therefore, women are more likely to receive andragogical training because they took education courses while in college. This trend may also reflect that women still only earn approximately 75% of what men earn in almost every occupation, even with higher levels of education (Pollitt, 2010; Steinem, 1993). Women may partake in extra training to maintain or advance their career, as well as stay competitive.

**Educators’ training in gender fair teaching approaches.** The overall value for mean gender training for the sample is 1.992 hours, which is much less than the 48 hours that research suggests would be needed to impact attitudes and help create gender fair learning environments (Carinci, 2007). One hundred and sixty-five out of 250 educators in this study did not have training in gender fair teaching approaches.
While the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) mandates that educators in public schools, grades K–12, earn documentation proving that they attended a certified credentialing program to be well-versed in pedagogy, including gender fair learning environments, this is not a requirement for university educators (CTC, 2010). In contrast, universities are only mandated to provide two hours of sexual harassment training for educators when hired and every other year following the initial training session (AB 1825).

This study has determined that most college educators have limited, if any, special training in teaching methods. Furthermore, it is uncommon for even education department faculty to have taken classes with gender equity in the curricula, or to have participated in some type of gender equity training or discussion (Brown, 2000). One longitudinal study suggests that just one college course focusing on the American education system, gender equity, and equitable teaching practices noticeably improves attitudes and awareness of gender bias in college students (Carinci, 2007). Amount and quality of gender equity training received by college educators affect the classroom environment and the learning experience of students (Coffey & Gibbs, 2000). Similarly, studies affirm that educators taught gender equitable teaching approaches are more aware of their own teaching methods and interactions with students, in regard to gender, and are more likely to implement gender fair teaching practices; however, most participants in this study have not been exposed to gender equity training (AAUW, 1998; Campbell & Sanders, 1997). Without gender equitable
teaching approaches being incorporated, students cannot achieve their full academic potential (AAUW, 1998).

**College faculty educated in top-tier versus non-top-tier universities.** The findings from this study suggest that participants from top-tier universities received significantly less training in all eight aspects of andragogy included within the survey than did participants educated at non-top-tier universities. Participants from non-top-tier universities had an average of 2.2 hours of training in gender equitable teaching approaches and participants from top-tier universities had an average of .84 hours. This is a difference of means that provides a statistically significant t-score from a t-test for unequal means and unequal variances of 0.01. On average, educators who graduated from top-tier universities received less than half of the hours of training in gender fair teaching approaches compared to educators who graduated from other universities.

Historically, the United States’ higher education environment and experience has been focused on the male experience, in terms of both function and curriculum (Conway, 1974; Nidiffer, 2002). While universities have made efforts to create equitable opportunities and learning environments for all students, gender inequities persist on college campuses and in college classrooms across the country (AAUW, 1992; Moore et al., 1993). The findings of this study reflect the masculine culture that persists at top-tier universities. Ivy League and top-tier universities only started admitting women in the 1980s (Sadker, 1999). Men also continue to dominate the number ratios at top universities in comparison to women (Education Week, 2010).
**Educators’ training relative to subject content.** High ratios of men and aspects of patriarchy are still found within certain university departments. Of the six departments fully analyzed in this study (the education department was omitted because there were not enough participants in the sample to make statistically significant claims), engineering ranked the lowest in gender equitable teaching approaches training, with a mean of .6 hours and a statistically significant t-score of .0266. Among all the participants’ departments, engineering also had the lowest percentage of women educators at 18%, 20% lower than the discipline that closely mirrored engineering’s findings, social science (Figure 11).

Educators in the social sciences also had a statistically significant (t-score .0365) low mean of training in gender fair teaching practices, measuring 1.1 hours. The findings from this study also indicate a positive association between departments’ quantity of gender fair teaching approaches training and the percentage of women educators, with a correlation coefficient of .833. Engineering and social sciences have the least amount of training, and according to the findings of this study, they also employ the least amount of women as educators. While it is clear that more females are entering the college teaching environment, there are still distinct disciplines pursued by each sex, suggesting socialization processes, such as social role theory, and a difference in academic confidence between men and women (Eagly, 1987; Pollitt, 2010).

**Relative to career length.** Educational equity has been gaining in popularity, and has been a topic of education research for over 35 years (AAUW, 1999).
However, the disparity in training between educators who have been teaching for many years and educators who are new to educating in the college environment is not noteworthy. There were 165 educators with zero hours of training in gender fair teaching approaches across the spectrum of career lengths. The length of time teaching at college level did not correlate to more or less training in gender fair teaching approaches.

**Sexual harassment training.** The mean for sexual harassment training was the second lowest of the eight types of educational training included on the survey, at 3.413 hours, even though 64% of educators report receiving training. These findings are quite troubling. Educators at public and private universities in California have mandated requirements for sexual harassment training. California Assembly Bill 1825 (Gov. Code § 12950.1) has required a two-hour sexual harassment awareness training program to be provided and conducted for college educators every two years, since January 1, 2006. However, according to this sample, only 20% of educators teaching at universities for five or more years were compliant with California Assembly Bill 1825. Educators who have been teaching less than a year had a mean of 12 minutes (.2 hour) of training, when the mandate is two hours. Similarly, educators teaching between 4 and 4.9 years had a mean of one hour of training, when the mandate is six hours. Sexual harassment training is not being provided even when mandated.
Qualitative Data

Question Number Two: Do you feel you are effectively trained on gender and gender fair teaching approaches? If so, explain the content of the training (time, method of delivery) (Appendix A). Of the 34% of educators who had obtained training in gender fair teaching practices, only 24.6%, 60 participants, indicated that they felt effectively trained, though many did not indicate why they felt effectively trained or cite components of equitable teaching practices. The following response is an exemplary example of the 244 educators who provided an answer to question number two:

- “Yes. I’ve taken gender seminars on how to make sure you are teaching gender equality and have done readings on how gender is sometimes not recognized in classrooms by teachers in equal ways. 1 semester long class and a few hours in a teaching seminar” (F, M.A., 1.5 years teaching, Communications).

Notably, another educator who had received much more training than the majority of the educators in the study did not feel that her preparation in gender fair teaching approaches was adequate. These statements (quoted below) suggest that she understands the importance of equity in education because she is familiar with the topic, yet feels eliminating gender bias from the classroom is not something that can be learned in a workshop or day-long seminar (AAUW, 1998).

- “No! I do not feel gender issues were covered well in my course work. In total, I have probably had 20 hours on gender issues in all of my education. Mostly lecture and discussing articles. I learned more about approaching gender issues
in a 3 credit under graduate course on communication. We spent probably 6 hours total” (F, M.A., 4 years teaching, Human Development and Family; Health Safety and Nutrition).

The statement reflects other responses from educators who had andragogical training. Several participants cited that courses in pedagogy/andragogy should be required for college educators, and that information about teaching is not provided in Master’s and Ph.D. programs.

The results of this study supports research findings that many educators are unaware of gender fair teaching practices and the beneficial affects for students (Carinci, 2007). Many of the educators responded that they did not have any training in gender fair teaching approaches, and were not aware of the concept. “Not sure what you're asking—I feel like I treat all genders the same. What is ‘gender fair’ teaching?” (F, M.A., 10 years teaching, Communication Studies). Others felt that they taught subject content where issues of gender equity are not a factor. “In the science classroom, this should not be particularly important” (F, Ph.D., 15 years teaching, Chemistry and Biochemistry). It is disappointing that some of these responses were in STEM fields, where women are vastly underrepresented (Pollitt, 2010).

One respondent who stated he dealt with students and his classroom autonomous of gender, admitted that maybe he does not recognize gender discrimination.

- “I try to deal with subject matter and lab activities that are independent of gender. Maybe I am too naive to recognize gender bias. One of my concerns is
that females are overwhelmingly the dominant gender in our classrooms. That is okay but I get concerned wondering where the young men of equivalent age are. I doubt they are all in the military or the [other college systems] or jail systems” (M, MS, 42 years teaching, Biology and Zoology).

This statement is multi-faceted, and reflective of the struggle to introduce educators to gender equity training. While he states that he does not let gender affect his classroom activities, in the next sentence he contradicts himself, and wonders if he is aware of different types of gender discrimination. He also demonstrates that he has a different perception of the male and female students in his classes, voicing apprehension about the amount of female students he teaches, and doubting that men are pursuing other avenues, such as other colleges, the military, and the jail systems. It is difficult to imagine that this educator interacts with his students equally when he sees male students as precious commodities in a sea of women students. Many of these educators are unaware that women receive markedly less interaction with professors, regardless of sex, than male students do, which contributes to women’s higher rates of insecurity, lack of academic confidence, and “indirect speaking styles” (Horgan, 1995; Kahle, 1994; Simmons, 2009, p. 101).

**Question Number Three: Have you ever received training regarding sexual harassment, harassment, and/or the effects of bullying? If so, explain the content of the training (time, method of delivery) (Appendix A).** AB 1825 requires educators in both public and private colleges in California to attend a two-hour training program within six months of being employed; subsequently a two-hour
training program must be conducted every two years. While most, 63%, of participants responded that they had received training in sexual harassment, both the short-answer and open-ended answers indicate that most, 80%, of educators in this study are not in compliance with Assembly Bill 1825. “In flex days at the community colleges, when I taught there, we had such workshops and once, when teaching at [a CSU in the Bay area], we had to take a computer on-line course that was very short” (M, M.A., 20 years teaching, Composition and Literature). Many educators stated or implied that the online program that colleges typically employ to distribute sexual harassment training is brief and meager. “[The university I am employed at] requires us to take an online ‘course’ every one or two years” (M, Ph.D., 30 years teaching, Structural Engineering).

Shockingly, other educators reported that they had only been given brochures, phone numbers for campus police, or a website for information. “[I have had] very little [training]. Read employee-training documents about definitions and procedures for sexual harassment. No training on bullying” (F, M.A., nine years teaching, Mathematics). AB 1825 has been in place for over five years, yet this study suggests that the higher education system in California is largely failing to meet a mandate that would help create more hospitable and equitable college environments. This failure causes students to attempt academic success in an environment that is not conducive for achievement (AAUW, 1999).

Question Number Four: What training do you wish you had received to prepare you for teaching at the college level? (Appendix A). Twenty-seven percent
of subjects did not want or feel the need for any type of training. However, most
respondents indicated that they would like more training and preparation for teaching
in the college classroom: “[I wish I had received] tons [more training]! Ph.D.
programs are about scholarship, there is no preparation I’ve had at all” (M, Ph.D., 25
years teaching, Jewish Studies). Numerous educators stated they wished they had
obtained training in “General educational pedagogy” (M, Ph.D., 30 years teaching,
Engineering, Operations Research, Computer Modeling). A common theme was
educators’ declaration that androgogical training should be taught in the college
curriculum: “The Ph.D. curriculum should include mandatory classes on how to teach
effectively” (M, Ph.D., 36 years teaching, Heat Transfer). Approximately 38% of
participants denoted that they would like more training in classroom management or
curriculum and instruction methods.

- “Some grad programs have courses designed for ‘best classroom practices,’
  etc. [that teach] how to compose syllabi, deal with difficult students, etc that I
  wish I had received. Much of what I learned was common-sense, self-taught,
or came from colleagues & other mentors, but there was little that was formal
or structured” (M, Ph.D., 12 years teaching, History).

It is noteworthy that nearly three quarters of all educators in this study recognized the
importance of learning effective teaching methodologies.
Findings to Mention

Differences in Training Relative to Type of University Location

While the researcher had not expected to find prominent differences in the amount of training at urban, suburban, and rural schools, surprisingly there was a significant difference between the three types of location. Participants from rural universities had notably low levels of training across seven of the eight categories of andragogy, with the exception being working with special needs students. Educators from rural colleges also had the least amount of training in gender fair teaching approaches. These data are important for college students looking for the most equitable experience in education they can obtain. Research supports that when educators acquire gender equity training students benefit academically (AAUW, 1994, 1998; Campbell & Sanders, 1997; Coffey & Gibbs, 2000). Consequently, students would thrive at colleges where educators had a high amount of training in gender fair teaching approaches.

Resistance

Resistance to ideas of training, and specifically training on gender fair teaching approaches, appears to be common strand throughout the entirety of this study. In response to “Question Number Two: Do you feel you are effectively trained on gender and gender fair teaching approaches? If so, explain the content of the training (time, method of delivery) (Appendix A)”, numerous participants responded “yes, self-trained” or that they did not need training. One collection of responses cited personal relationships, such as “My mother” (M, Ph.D., 48 years teaching, English and Creative
Writing), for their training or experience in gender fair teaching approaches. Another such example was: “Not necessarily, but experience with having children of my own” (F, M.A., 12 years teaching, French). These responses reflect the subjects’ lack of understanding of the topic of gender equity and gender fair teaching approaches. Some subjects were clear that they did not feel their lack of training was a problem. “No [I have not received training], but it does not seem to be a pressing issue among my students” (F, M.A., 5 years teaching, English). Responses like this suggest not only a level of ignorance about gender equity, but also a sense of disbelief about the legitimacy and value of gender fair training and the field of gender equity studies in education.

Several participants were much more direct about their disdain for training in gender fair teaching techniques and sexual harassment.

- “I haven’t received any training to prepare me for teaching college classes. A general overview, an expectation of what they wanted, some technology training would have been nice. The other training method[s] above (sexual harassment/multicultural/gender) would have probably been a waste of my time” (M, M.A., 3 years teaching, Political Science).

More unexpectedly, 4.1% of educators specifically responded to “Question Number Two: Do you feel you are effectively trained on gender and gender fair teaching approaches? If so, explain the content of the training (time, method of delivery) (Appendix A)”, that training in gender equitable teaching practices, or training in general is not a valuable resource.
“I’m dubious about the values of training on these types of issues. I should add that I consider myself extremely sensitive to matters of multicultural and gender diversity, and have never had a single complaint in any of my classes” (M, M.A., 10 years teaching, Religious Studies, Philosophy, Humanities).

A measure of equity in classrooms and gender fair teaching should not be based on whether an educator has received complaints related to gender discrimination or sexual harassment. This subject was not alone in using a lack of complaints as a rationalization for not having training, which seems to be a rather low standard for equity. In effect, these responses suggest the participants’ lack of belief of the seriousness of gender bias and legitimacy of academia related to gender equity because they believe they have been able to learn equitable andragogical techniques without any classes, seminars, workshops, or training of any kind.

Believing that one can learn all one needs to know about educational equity in the college classroom through one’s children is preposterous. Believing equity training is a waste of one’s time when one has not received any training is rather ignorant of equity issues in education. Furthermore, it discounts the field of gender studies and gender equity studies. Ph.D.s are granted in the field of Gender Studies and gender issues in the field of education. Brilliant researchers devote their entire professional lives to studying gender bias in the classroom. Yet, there is a sizable portion of educators in the American higher education system who believe gender awareness and handling gender inequities in the classroom are commonsense procedures and practice; or worse, they do not believe that these inequities exist.
Hostility

The topic of this study did not sit well with a portion of the educators and administrators whom the researcher encountered. The researcher did not anticipate encountering animosity regarding the subject content of this study and survey. The first appearance of hostility was the lack of cooperation from colleges’ administration to allow the researcher to conduct the study, even though protocols for approval were honored.

Some educators approached at the college campuses were also somewhat resentful of the research topic. Numerous educators, male and female, initially appeared willing to participate in the study, but then declined upon learning the general topic. Most striking was an exchange while distributing surveys to faculty in a mail and copy room. A male educator came into the room and checked his mail box. After opening the survey and reading it very briefly, he ripped it in half and threw it in the garbage with the rest of the mail he did not want. Subsequently, he walked out of the room and nodded at the researcher. This silent communication was noteworthy. During the distribution of surveys, some educators opened their survey while the researcher was still in the room distributing other surveys, and gave it to her so she could possibly reuse it for someone else. However, when this educator tore the survey in half, yet not any of the other declined mail, it was a form of backlash, and showed how he felt about the research topic.

Another form of aggression came from educators who participated in the study and who returned completed surveys with negative notes and comments criticizing the
researcher’s methods, advisors, and the basic premise of the research. In particular, one educator returned the completed survey with a typed seven-paragraph response entitled “Sensitivity for Teachers” (M, D.M.A, 38 years teaching, Music). Included in this reaction is a description of a patriarchal classroom in which the “teacher should be accorded a sign of respect just by virtue of the position.” He also states that the “golden rule” should suffice for “potential issues.” The response to the survey clearly states opinions that are discriminatory, patriarchal, hierarchal, sexist, and racist:

- “Women and minorities may feel they deserve preferential treatment by virtue of historical injustices regardless of their own personal behavior or attitude. To avoid confrontations, teachers are expected or required to take classes in sensitivity training where they are directed to be ‘politically correct’ for fear of offending someone…should education just enforce norms or challenge them?… Are African-Americans so disadvantaged that they need affirmative action just to compete? Is there some genetic disorder for which they need compensation?…Can we legislate fairness? And if we do, does that prepare students to live in the real world?…If students set aside time for real studying, memorizing and drilling, they will succeed in college regardless of other considerations-especially superficial ones like skin color or gender.”

Gender fair teaching practices benefit all students, not just women, and techniques employed do not include preferential treatment to female students (AAUW, 1999). Gender fair classrooms are not hierarchal because hierarchy is based on patriarchy (Steinem, 1993). As opposed to a hierarchal mode of teaching, where teachers lecture
from the front of the room, most likely at a podium, and students’ desks line up in
rows facing the lecturer, educators employ diverse methods of teaching in order to
create an environment conducive for connected knowing and connected learning
(Zohar, 2006). The goal of gender equitable school environments and classrooms is to
help all students feel included in the classroom and curriculum, feel comfortable
enough to speak in their authentic voices, and achieve more academically.

Conclusions

The findings from this study provided descriptive quantitative and rich
qualitative data, which enabled the researcher to come to several conclusions. Out of
eight categories of andragogy, surveys indicated that college and university educators
receive the least amount of training in gender fair teaching approaches, with only 34%
of the sample having obtained training, and a mean of 1.992 hours. Further, only
24.6% of educators felt that they were effectively trained in gender equitable teaching
approaches. Educators with training were largely a result of educators teaching classes
related to gender studies, or having taken gender studies courses during their college
careers.

Simply attending college as a student does not necessarily prepare a person for
the role of an educator. The lack of gender equitable training is contributing to
problems such as patriarchal classrooms and inequitable classroom experiences for
male and female students. Faculty should be aware of their students’ educational needs
and conscious of gender bias, actively working to prevent discrimination by
implementing gender equitable teaching approaches. Educators need to be mindful of
subtle gender bias including what students they ask questions to, how they ask and follow up on questions, whether behaviors are responded to equally negatively or positively regardless of gender, and seemingly innocuous interactions such as complimenting a student’s appearance (Allan & Madden, 2006). Without training in educational equity, it would be difficult to identify and reduce these behaviors. Similarly, the mandated training for sexual harassment is disregarded and educators without training or who are non-compliant with California Assembly Bill 1825 may face difficulties not only identifying their own improper behaviors, but also harassment among their students.

Preservice training should become a requirement to teach at the college level and the training needs to incorporate issues of race and ethnicity. The concerns Poole and Isaacs raise in “The Gender Agenda in Teacher Education” (1993), regarding the ability of preservice educators’ attitudes to influence teachers’ beliefs about gender, are also applicable to values about race and ethnicity. If preservice trainers are agents of change to enable the free flow of ideas and positive discourse so that future college teachers will hold more equitable ideas, this positive change should not be limited to values about gender alone. Brown and Gilligan (1992) state that women and women educators need be willing to share open dialogue with students and be willing to transform the college classroom dynamic. In “The Burden of Teaching Teachers: Memoirs of Race Discourse in Teacher Education” (2005), Williams and Evans-Winters discuss the importance of bringing “race talk back into the public forum of the teacher education classroom” (p. 202). Williams and Evans-Winters, both preservice
educators, found that when attempting to introduce issues of race and ethnicity, “students who benefit from systematic inequality…are often non-responsive and frequently resist the messenger, consequently, precipitately resisting the message” (p. 202).

Similarly, the systemic patriarchal inequality of the higher education system has been largely unchanged by the more than 35 years of research on the detrimental effects of gender inequity in classrooms and on school campuses (AAUW, 1999). Training needs to effectively convey ideas and theories about ethnicity, gender, and equity issues in ways that enable educators to engage in critical analysis, as opposed to meeting with resistance the ideas that are presented.

**Limitations**

One limitation of this study was the moderately small population, which is not necessarily an exact representation of all college educators in California. While more participants would have increased the statistical significance for some questions, numerous universities did not allow their faculty to participate in the study or grant the researcher permission to distribute surveys on-site. The reasons given for denying the researcher the ability to survey educators on a college campus were mostly vague or non-existent.

Two colleges asked for paperwork such as certification from the Institutional Review Board, the consent letter, and the survey; however, after several attempts to follow up for the needed approval, the researcher failed to receive any communications. Another college rejected the researcher’s application to perform
research after reviewing certification from the Institutional Review Board, an approved human subjects form, and approved thesis proposal, the consent letter of the survey, and the actual survey because it did not feel the research instrument was conducive for the research goals. One college requested minimal information, but was not able to approve the researcher’s request to conduct research for undisclosed reasons. Time restrictions did not permit the researcher to compile a larger snowball sample, which may have yielded a greater sample size.

The survey also posed limitations within the study. A survey cannot provide all the information about a research question. It is possible that some subjects did not have a clear understanding of the questions because the researcher was not readily available, other than by email or postal mail, to answer questions. Therefore, there is a limitation of the participants’ bias and interpretation of terminology within the survey.

Furthermore, employing short-answer questions, as opposed to a Likert scale, proved somewhat difficult because participants did not always follow the survey directions correctly. For instance, some participants wrote “many hours” as their response for the amount of training they had received in a particular category, even though the section asked for a response in hours and minutes, and provided an example. Other volunteers chose not to sign the consent form, or to answer only one question, and briefly at best. The length of the survey, 4 pages, may have been off-putting to some teachers who were requested to participate, although 10 pages is considered to be the maximum page length of questions that many volunteers are
willing to fill out (Schutt, 2006, p. 235). Furthermore, some teachers who were initially willing to take the survey declined after a brief summary of its contents.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The data obtained from this study indicated that there is a vast amount of research on gender equitable teaching practices, and the effects of failing to instill equitable practices in the college environment, that has yet to be conducted. The researcher would like to expand the geographic dimensions of this study. It would be beneficial to expand the sample with more institutions as well, as to include Southern California universities; this would allow trends to be reflective of the entire state of California. An analogous study would be exceedingly useful, executed at a nationwide level.

Additionally, there was a plethora of data acquired during this study. The researcher would like to focus on some of the other aspects of andragogy that were included on the questionnaire, including special needs students, technology in the classroom, and classroom management techniques. Another area that could be explored further is sexual harassment training of college educators. An in-depth, statewide study of university and college compliance with California Assembly Bill 1825 could be conducted to determine the status of educators’ sexual harassment training in higher education. California’s mandate determines sexual harassment to be an issue that needs research and training directives enforced.
APPENDIX

Analysis of College Educator's Training
Analysis of College Educator's Training

The following is a short survey that will provide background information on the participant and their professional training.

General Information:

What is your sex? Male__________     Female__________     Other__________

What is your ethnicity/nationality? ___________________________________________

What educational institutions have you attended? _______________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

What degrees have you obtained? ____________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

Do you possess any special certifications? Yes__________  No__________

If so, please specify:_______________________________________________________

Are you currently teaching? Yes__________ No__________

If so, for how long? Years? ________ Months__________

At what type of college do you teach? (Please circle one or more)

California Community College    California State University

University of California    California Private College

Other:______________________________________________________________

Subject/Content Area (s)

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________
Indicate to what extent you received any of the following training for teaching:

Please note the training in approximate **hour/minutes**. (example 1 hr. 10 min.) Give each question a response even if the answer is none.

Classroom Management Techniques ______________________________________

Multicultural Awareness _______________________________________________

Curriculum and Instruction Methods _____________________________________

Gender Fair Teaching Approaches ______________________________________

Technology in the Classroom ___________________________________________

Sexual Harassment Awareness _________________________________________

Language and Literacy Issues __________________________________________

Working with Students with Special Needs _______________________________

1. Do you feel you are effectively trained about and aware of multicultural concerns in the classroom? If so, explain the content of the training (time, method of delivery).

2. Do you feel you are effectively trained on gender and gender fair teaching approaches? If so, explain the content of the training (time, method of delivery).
3. Have you ever received training regarding sexual harassment, harassment, and/or the effects of bullying? If so, explain the content of the training (time, method of delivery).

4. What training do you wish you had received to prepare you for teaching at the college level?
CONSENT LETTER

Survey of Higher Education Teachers in California and Nevada

Informed Consent for Participation in a Research Study

My name is Ashley Olivieri and I am a graduate student of the Teachers
Education Master of Arts at California State University, Sacramento. You are being
asked to participate in a study that examines college teachers’ attitudes on equitable
teaching practices. Your participation involves filling out a questionnaire followed by
four open-ended questions that will require up to 15 minutes of your time.

Your participation is voluntary. You may quit at any time without
consequences. Although none of the questions were designed to cause you discomfort,
you may leave any of the questions unanswered if you are uncomfortable for any
reason. However, only completed questionnaires will be useful to me. Providing your
name is optional; your confidentiality is strictly protected.

The results of this research study will be available after May 28, 2011. If you
would like a copy of the results or have any questions, please contact Ashley Olivieri
at: ashley_marie@hotmail.com.

Thank you for your time and participation. Your signature below indicates that
you have read this page and agree to participate in the research.

_________________________________  __________________
Signature of Participant            Date

Please, return the survey to: Ashley Olivieri
P.O. Box 2490
Granite Bay, Ca 95746
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