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Statement of the Problem

This study examined the sexist attitudes endorsed, and the knowledge pertaining to domestic violence and sexual assault that high school students possessed prior to, and post a four day educational program. This study sought to find out if students from a single sex school environment were more or less prone to endorsing sexism and victim blaming attitudes than students attending a coeducational school.

Sources of Data

Data from three different school locales was compared: an all male private school, an all female private school, and male students from a coed public school. Two different sources of data was collected and analyzed. A 25 question five-point Likert scale pre/post survey was used which posed a variety of statements concerning sexism, sexual assault and victim blaming. In addition a five question open ended
questionnaire was used which allowed students an opportunity to evaluate both the curricular content and the educator who delivered the program.

Conclusion Researched

The quantitative data was analyzed utilizing a t-test, computation of pre and post mean, and a comparison of percentages. The qualitative data was analyzed employing a thematic approach. The quantitative data did not reveal one male group consistently possessing a greater propensity of victim blaming or sexist attitudes than the other male group. Compared to the all female group, however, both male groups demonstrated exceptionally high levels of both victim blaming and sexist attitudes, both prior to the presentation and post, demonstrating a resistance to changing their beliefs pertaining to the topics. The qualitative did reveal several themes which does suggest a greater rejection of the program and the female educator came from the all male group.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

“She just hates men and is always going to defend women, no matter what,” John scoffed under his breath as he stomped out of the room. John wasn’t the first male student to label the educator a *man-hater* during the two year period she spent working as a domestic violence and sexual assault educator. In fact, it was quite common for her to encounter defensive attitudes from male students during her classroom discussions on how social constructions of masculinity contribute to domestic violence and sexual assault. However, at no other school was this comment communicated from students as frequently or with such intensity, as the all male high school.

The acceptance of traditional prescriptions of patriarchy was communicated again by students of an all male school during a discussion of economic equity. Domestic violence abusers often commandeer the family’s finances in an effort to create or increase the dependence of their victim (United States Department of Justice, n.d.). To discuss the norms of an equal marriage, the researcher posed to the class, “If the father works outside the home, and the mother stays home to take care of the children, should both partners have access to the finances?” The majority of students expressed that if the father was bringing the money in, then he should be able to decide what to do with it, they should not both have access to the family’s finances. One student stated, “He should at least have 60% of the decision making power in the relationship.” The researcher further probed the class attempting to encourage any
students that possessed opposing beliefs to speak up and confront their peers. However, much to the researcher’s surprise, not one student voiced dissent. Fascinated by the way the students from the all male school responded to the gender equity curriculum, the researcher began to wonder how differently students might respond. Depending on the school environment they are being educated in.

The next school the researcher was scheduled to visit was Northern Cal Middle school (pseudonym) [NCMS]. NCMS has an API statewide rank of 3 and 90% of the school’s students participate in the free or reduced-price lunch program. Again the researcher posed the same question of economic access in a marriage to all five classes that she visited during her presentation on domestic violence. She asked each of the five classes the question, “If a father works outside the home, and the mother stays home to take care of the children, should both partners have access to the household finances?” In each of the five classes, approximately 80% of the class voiced that both parents should have equal access, since both parents were contributing to the households, albeit in different ways. Several male students in each class even piped in to challenge the peers who voiced that the father should hold the financial authority.

The two schools that the researcher conducted this initial experiment with were starkly different. St Andrews, pseudonym for the school discussed in the prior paragraph, is a highly affluent, costly, private all males school, while NCMS is an economically disadvantaged, public, coeducation middle school. To examine if the single sex environment might have contributed to the difference in attitudes; similar schools would need to be compared.
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine student’s reactions and change in perceptions on topics of sexual assault and gender socialization, and to explore if there are greater levels of sexist attitudes (sexism is more prominent/sexism is endorsed by more students) held by students in a single sex school, compared to a coeducational school, and in an all female school compared to an all male school.

Statement of Problem

Single sex schools, by innate design, bypass much of the opportunity for sexist interaction (Lee, Marks, & Byrd, 1994). Without the opposite sex present in the classroom, the instructor is not in a position to potentially favor one sex, or subconsciously gear one sex towards specific skills, while encouraging different skills and abilities from the other sex. However, students that have regular interaction with the opposite sex will undoubtedly have more opportunity to learn from the other sex, and possibly by the nature of that interaction begin to understand that their opposite sex peer is more like themselves than different.

Many educational researchers have discussed what has been seen as a “male paradigm” in education. Historically, academics have regarded the male experience as normative, frequently ignoring girls and women as subjects for research. When women and girls have been included in printed curriculum materials their experience has been minimal and portrayed in stereotypical in a manner (Lee et al., 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; U’Ren, 1971). Although many researchers have noted that progress has indeed made since the inception of Title IX and focus on gender equity in
education, representation in texts is still far from equal (American Association of University Women [AAUW], 1992).

Therefore if students in a single sex school are exposed to the typical male centered learning, without the everyday interaction of the opposite sex, are they more likely to endorse sexism? Or will the students in a single sex classroom, where teachers are not positioned to favor one sex over another, be less apt to endorse gender stereotypes?

**Significance of Study**

The 1972 passage of Title IX outlawed discrimination on the basis of gender from all schools and educational programs that received federal funding (Lee et al., 1994). In the name of reducing legally sanctioned sexism, the legislation forced the closing of all public single sex classrooms, schools and universities.

In the early 1990s research began to surface claiming that although legislation had reduced much of the obvert sexism in the public education system, sexism nevertheless was still thriving in American public schools. Though the physical barriers to females receiving an education equal to their male peers had been lifted, the stereotypical beliefs of teachers and administrators in coeducational contexts were still providing female students with a subpar education (AAUW, 1998; Lee et al., 1994). Researchers found that female students were receiving less in-class attention, were asked less probing classes, and were being steered into stereotypically feminine skill sets (AAUW, 1998; Lee et al., 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 2003).
In 2006 Title IX was amended, acknowledging the vast research and growing support of single sex education (AAUW, 1994; U.S. Department of Education, 2006b). Public school districts currently are positioned to legally offer some single sex schools and single sex classes while accepting federal funds. Due to the amendment in Title IX and the research attesting to the benefits, single sex schools are currently growing rapidly in the U.S. both public and private. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2007), as of 2007, there were over five million students attending private secondary education.

With gaps in the research and many educators and parents turning towards single sex education it is crucial that more research is devoted to examine this school model and the potential for sexism to be fostered or reduced there. This study will contribute to a more complete understanding of the positive and negative effects of single sex education for boys and for girls, and bring to the surface gender stereotypes that may be fostered in those educational models. This research is vital in lieu of the push towards single sex education, and Title IX offering federal funding to public single sex schools.

**Methodology**

This study employed two sources of data; a pre and post gender and culture survey, and a student assessment of program open ended questionnaire (see Appendices A and B). Both qualitative and quantitative methods of collection were incorporated to strengthen the study’s validity. Due to the participants being a protected class (children), opt-out permission slips (see Appendix C) were left with the
teachers at each study site two weeks prior to the beginning of data collection. Participants from three different schools contexts were included; one all boys private school, one all girls private school, and one coed public school. From the coed school, though the female students were present in the classroom during the presentation, and filled out the survey and questionnaires, the data collected from the female students from the coed school was excluded from this study. The schools names have been excluded to protect participant confidentiality.

One the first day of the program, each class of students was given a brief introduction from the researcher and then was asked to complete the pre survey. The class then participated in four days of one hour-long classes which included discussion, lecture, and activities pertaining to gender socialization, domestic violence and sexual assault. On the fourth day of the class the students were then given the post survey. The researcher left the open ended questionnaires with the teachers to have their students fill out one week after the program had finished to allow time for the students to process the program, and to avoid any influence that might arise from the researcher being present.

**Limitations**

This study focused on three specific schools. Although it is likely that many private Catholic schools have similar fundamentals, it cannot be generalized that what researcher will find in this study to be true for all schools or even all private schools. Additionally this research compared two single sex private schools to one public coed
school. Although it would have been ideal to compare schools that were all public or all private, access to such schools was not available.

As described by Millsap and Maydeu-Olivares (2009), participant predisposition to please the researcher and respond to the curriculum and the survey in a way which they assume that the researcher wants them to may have affected the results. Similarly, participants indignant of their participation or of the topics discussed, may have had the “screw you” effect, and attempted to sabotage the data by intentionally providing data that did not support what they believed the researcher’s hypothesis to be (Masling, 1966). The gender of the students and the researcher may have played a role in the participants’ predispositions. For instance, it is possible that the male students may have been compelled to answer questions or make comments during the class discussions with the simple intent of getting a rise out of the researcher, or discredit her. In this way, participant predispositions may have functioned as a limitation in this study.

Lastly, since the researcher was a guest in the classroom rather than the students’ everyday teacher, the students’ comfort may have been reduced, making the students less inclined to voice their actual perceptions and feelings on the topics presented. Lastly, limited time allotted to discuss such vast and sensitive topics may have had an effect on the results. If more time had been available, the researcher may have been able to build a more comfortable relationship with the students, increasing their likelihood to disclose perspectives and thoughts openly, and honestly.
Theoretical Basis of the Study

According to the theory of *symbolic interaction* (Anderson, 2005; Cresswell, 2002; Wood, 2009) people construct meaning and their understanding of the world and those in it by interaction with each other. It is through communication that “we learn who we are and what it means to be in our culture” (Wood, 2009, p. 53). Infants enter the world and are immediately exposed to constant labeling and messaging; first from their parents, then from others they interact with, telling the infant exactly who they are, what is acceptable and appropriate for them, and what kind of role they play in the world (Wood, 2009). The constant labels and messages thrown at young children through the basic interaction with them offer children a self image. Over time children begin to internalize much of the views being transmitted to them, reflect on the messages, and arrive at an understanding of who they in the world (Anderson, 2005; Wood, 2009).

According to *social learning theory* people develop a sense of self through their interaction with each other (Bandura, 1977). Through observing the behaviors, attitudes and outcomes of others; a child then learns what is expected and normal and models the learned behavior accordingly (Bandura, 1977). Children also learn gender roles by exposure to parents, peers, media, and teachers, who model and reinforce a patterned behavior for each gender group. Children then learn what is acceptable for their gender, and what is unacceptable, by the positive or negative feedback that they receive from others (Anderson, 2005; Wood, 2009). Thus “because children prefer rewards to punishments and neutral responses, they are likely to develop gendered
patterns of behavior that others approve” (Wood, 2009, p. 48). Social learning theory acknowledges that though each individual is indeed born with certain tendencies, ones exposure and interaction with role models and peers, and popular culture, “amplifies or tones down those inclinations” (Wood, 2009, p. 48). This process of imitation and reinforcement for gender appropriate behavior continues through each individual’s lifetime (Anderson 2005; Wood, 2009). In addition, research conducted by educational scholars and reformists such as John Dewey (1927), Jürgen Habermas (1971), and work is recent years by Diana Hess (2009), Nel Noddings (2005), and Sonia Nieto (1991) helped frame this research and is intertwined throughout the pages of this study.

**Definition of Relevant Terms**

For the purpose of this research, the following terms will be used;

*Double Standard*: a set of norms that is considered acceptable or expected for one group while not considered socially acceptable for another group (Henslin, 2007).

*Egalitarian*: The belief that all groups of people (gender included) are equally of value and deserving of equal rights and respect (*Cambridge Dictionary*, 2011).

*Femininity*: a category of social construction referring to the attitudes, behaviors, and interests that a culture has deemed appropriate for females (Henslin, 2007).

*Gender*: refers to socially constructed set of characteristics that defines masculinity and femininity (Anderson, 2005).
Gender Socialization: refers to the process of adopting what is considered socially appropriate for one's gender. Many sources contribute to one's process of gender socialization including; one's family, peers, media, and school (Wood, 2009).

Gendered Violence: refers to any type of violence (physical, verbal, sexual, etc) that is targeted at one gender, most commonly at women. This includes, but is not limited to, sexual assault, domestic violence, and sexual harassment (Anderson, 2005).

Hegemonic Masculinity: refers to the dominant and widely accepted version of manhood that exists within the spectrum of gender expression. The term acknowledges that multiple forms of gender and even multiple forms of masculinity do exist, yet it's hegemonic masculinity that subordinates all other forms of gender expression. Hegemonic masculinity is generally associated with heterosexuality, whiteness, toughness, physical strength, and social power (Beasley, 2008).

Masculinity: a category of social construction referring to the attitudes, behaviors, and interests that a culture has deemed appropriate for males (Henslin, 2007).

Patriarchy: refers to the social order of being governed by, and favoring men. In such a society those who hold general positions of power are male, while positions of subordination are generally female (Wood, 2009).

Rape Myths: refer to the false beliefs that discredit and blame victims for the violence committed against them while simultaneously justifying the perpetrators of that crime (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Examples of rape myth include: “It is
impossible to rape a willing woman,” “Women lie,” and “some categories of forced sex are not really rape” (Bourke, 2007, p. 23).

_Sex_: generally refers to the category male or female that is associated with ones reproductive genitalia (Anderson, 2005).

_Sexism_: prejudice and evaluation of people based on their sex. Generally referring to the belief that women are inferior and their subordinate status in society is just (Anderson, 2005).

_Sexual Violence_: is an umbrella term used to describe the various acts in sexual nature where one party has not provided informed consent to. This term includes, but is not limited to; rape (Katz, 2006).

_Single Sex School_: refers to a school that offers an educational program solely to either an entirely male or entirely female student body. The term Single Sex School is used intentionally rather than single gender recognizing that even in single sex schools there are likely to be students that possess different degrees of both masculine and feminine qualities (Mael, 1998).

_Title IX_: refers to legislation that was passed in 1972 that bans sex discrimination from all educational and co-curricular activities in schools that receive federal funding (Wood, 2009).

_Victim Blaming_: holding the victim of a crime responsible (partially or entirely) for the harm committed against him or her (Wood, 2009).
Organization of Thesis

The organization of this thesis is as follows: Chapter 2 consists of a review of all relevant literature on gender in education, single sex education, gender socialization, social contributors to gendered violence, and the social effects of sexism. Chapter 3 focuses on the methodology of the thesis and explains the treatment utilized in the study. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data. Lastly, chapter five draws conclusions from the data of this study and provides recommendations for further research.

Background of Researcher

Riana Pella earned her Bachelor of Arts degree in Women and Gender Studies, and Minor in Sociology, from California State University Long Beach in 2006. While in college she facilitated Women’s Studies courses; including Women in Contemporary Society as well as Women and their Bodies. While living in Long Beach she became certified as a rape crisis counselor and volunteered on a 24 hour hotline as well as a Sexual Assault Response Team, providing advocacy and support for victims of sexual assault at the hospital as they met with law enforcement and underwent forensic examinations. Living in Sacramento Riana began work with the organization WEAVE, inc. as a Teen Educator. For two years as an educator with WEAVE she presented curriculum on sexual assault and domestic violence to junior high and high school students, as well as information on family violence to elementary school students, in over 25 schools in Northern California. Her work as an educator,
coupled with numerous graduate courses in gender equity and education taken at Cal State University Sacramento, formed the rationale for this study.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The following literature discusses the role that different elements of society play in reducing or contributing to sexist belief systems. The first section covers the historical formation of formal education in the United States, including why single sex education was originally formed and then transitioned to coeducation. The second section describes the multitude of research that brought public attention to the gender inequality wracking public schools in the early nineties, which again turned attention onto the possible benefits of single sex education. The third section explores the single sex versus coeducation debate that arguments for and against offering single sex schools and classes through public education. The fourth section describes the process of gender socialization examining the role that parents, media, peers, and school play as agents of the process. The fifth section observes the social impacts of socialization in traditional gender roles, including the effect on; careers and pay, hate based violence, school shootings, domestic violence and sexual assault. The sixth section explores the importance of bringing controversy in the classroom, including how educational theorists propose instruction of such topics. The seventh section describes how students have responded to discussions on sexism and sexist material.

Gender and American Schools

Schooling segregated by sex was the original arrangement of structured education since its inception in the United States (Shah & Conchar, 2009). A formal education was denied to women entirely until the mid 1700s. Once women did finally
gain access to early instruction it was available only to girls whose families could pay for it and only offered by using the same classrooms as the boys before and after the boy’s day of instruction (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). By the early 1800s small towns unable to afford building two separate schools began to integrate coed instruction out of financial necessity. Resistance, however, was strong. Opponents of coeducation claimed that men and women employed different places in society and therefore needed entirely different educations. Proponents claimed that having girls in the classroom provided the refinement for the boy’s rough behavior, helping to “civilize” the boys (Gains & George, 1999; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Families who could afford an alternative education sent their daughters to female seminaries where they were taught “morals, mind, and manners” (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Although seminaries were designed around what females were purposed to need from an education, students were taught how to be proper mothers and housewives.

Seminaries eventually evolved into the training grounds for future teachers that staffed the proliferating public schools. Though Ohio’s Oberlin College first began accepting women in 1833, the majority of universities remained exclusively male up until the Civil War. In the 1870s the loss of college tuition from males going overseas finally forced most colleges to open up their doors to women (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Throughout the mid 1900s, although coeducation became increasingly mainstream, sexism by means of the resistance from male students, professors, and the school institutions at large remained widely commonplace (Sadker & Sadker, 1994).
Title IX

In 1972 congress passed legislation Title IX, illegalizing sexual discrimination in schools (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). The passing of Title IX closed doors to all publically funded single sex educational programs, with the small exception of physical education and sex education courses (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). The passage of Title IX has been viewed by many as a major historical milestone in the fight for attaining gender equity; improving many aspects of education for women (Riordan, 1990).

According to the United States Department of Education (1997), until the passage of Title IX, Virginia State law still prohibited women from enrolling in the University of Virginia’s college of Arts and Sciences, and only under court order in 1970 was the first woman admitted. According to the United States Department of Education, “In 1971, 18 percent of female high school graduates were completing at least four years of college compared to 27 percent of their male peers” (1997, para. 6). According to the United States Department of Education (2006b), because of Title IX such a discrepancy no longer exists. Because of Title IX, gender segregated schooling was once again reserved for the elite who chose private or independent education, sidelining much public discussion of single sex education for almost 20 years.

Gender Bias in Education

The American Association of University Women (AAUW) established in 1881, has taken a chief role in conducting wide scale research in areas of education and promoting equity for women and girls (AAUW, n.d.). The organization consists of
over 100,000 members, runs 1,000 branches, and has assisted in making major gender equity gains in public policy (AAUW, n.d.). In 1991 the AAUW conducted and publically released “Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America,” a nationwide poll of middle school and high school students which investigated the impact of gender on career aspirations, school experience, and interest in science and mathematics (AAUW, 1991). The study, which surveyed over 3,000 children from 12 different schools across the nation, was the first to connect the steep drop in self-esteem experienced by preteen and teenage girls with what they were experiencing in the classroom. The report explained that girls and boys begin their initial schooling with comparable skills. By the end of high school, however, most young women experience a “disproportionate loss of confidence in their academic abilities” (AAUW, 1991, p. 1). This study was the first of its kind to ignite widespread public discourse over concern for girls receiving a subpar education in the public system.

In 1992 the AAUW released a second report, *How Schools Shortchange Girls*, which publically declared, “Girls are not receiving the same quality, or even quantity, of education as their brothers” (AAUW, 1992, p. 1). The report, which was a compilation of over 1,300 published studies on girls in education, explained that the loss of academic interest in math and science, and drastic decline in personal agency and confidence girls experienced, was directly related to the reinforcement they received from their teachers, the textbooks, and the curriculum itself, all of which geared girls towards traditionally “feminine” skills. The study further explained that girls receive less attention from teachers (with the exception of comments towards
appearance), which is exacerbated further if the girl happens to be of a perceived minority ethnicity. The study’s analysis concluded that that entire public school context in hundreds of schools across America privileged male students (AAUW, 1992).

Of the various studies included in *How Schools Shortchange Girls* (AAUW, 1992) was research conducted by the researchers Myra and David Sadker. The two social scientists had spent 20 years studying American education, analyzing teacher and students behavior and observing classrooms. In 1994 the Sadkers synthesized their years of research in a book, *Failing at Fairness: How American’s schools Cheat Girls*. The book detailed that even though boys and girls receive an education in the shared classroom, they have polarized educational experiences. The Sadkers witnessed that starting in early grades females in the classrooms where often ignored by their teachers which continued throughout high school. The Sadkers assessed from their years of observation, that girls academic and social needs were consistently failed to be met by public schools.

Studies on the lack of gender equity in public coeducation multiplied throughout the 1990s. Many parents and researchers once again began to focus on the strengths that single sex education might afford girls. In 2004, with mounting support for single sex education and snowballing criticism of public coed schooling, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings announced the Department of Education was planning to reduce the prohibitions Title IX placed on single sex public education (Kasic, 2008).
Single Sex Verses Coeducation Debate

With escalating evidence of the supposed benefits for single sex education and support, in 2006 Title IX was amended, allowing public school districts new flexibility for providing public single-sex classes and schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2006b). The amendment stipulates that public non-vocational single sex schools may be formed for one sex, as long as there is a “substantially equal” school available to students of the other sex. Non-vocational single sex charter schools are exempt from this requirement (Kasic, 2008). Public schools may offer single-sex classes, as long as they are available to students as merely an option, rather than compulsory (Kasic, 2008). Within one year of the amendment to Title IX, 97 single-sex public schools emerged in the US, as well as 295 public schools that began offering single-sex classes (Billger, 2009).

Pro Single Sex Public Education

Some in favor of single sex education site essentialist arguments for reasons that boys and girls would both benefit from single the sex arrangement (Kasic, 2008). According to the National Association for Single Sex Public Schooling extensive research in the last 20 years has found substantial biologically-programmed sex differences in the ways that children learn (Sax, 2006). Sax (2006) explains that because boys and girls brains develop differently, there is strong justification for educating them separately, allowing for different learning styles and techniques that suit each gender best. According to Kathy Piechura-Couture, a professor at the
Institute for Educational Reform, among the various innate differences found between boys and girls are dissimilarities in hearing abilities. Piechura-Couture explains that because girls have different hearing abilities, teachers in a single sex classroom are better positioned to cater to their differences (Meyer, 2008).

High academic achievement, and positive academic attitudes and aspirations are frequently cited as benefits to girls of single sex schools (Billger, 2009; Kasic, 2008). Studies have found that some all female schools are intentionally working to combat sexism by providing the students a female centered learning environment, one that fosters non stereotypically feminine qualities such as learning to be assertive and ask questions (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Research has claimed that girls who have received a single sex education show greater comfort speaking up in class, are more involved in their physical education classes and attest to an all around more positive educational experience, compared to their coed peers (Billger, 2009; Kasic, 2008).

Advocates of single sex schools and single sex classes highlight the potential gender segregation has to gear girls towards disciplines that may have been stereotyped as masculine such as math and science (Haag, 2002; Lee, 2002). In her longitudinal study, examining a sample of eight grders interviewed first in 1988, then again in 1990,1992, 1994, and in 2000, Billger (2009) concluded, “single-sex institutions do lead to less gender segregation in college majors” (p. 402). However, according to Mael’s (1998) literature review of research examining the coeducation verses single sex argument, “virtually no research has focused on the conditions for increasing male participation in female-stereotypic disciplines” (p. 117). Similarly,
advocates have also made the claim that claims that the single sex environment reduces female students’ endorsement of stereotypical gender roles in both family and professional life (Lee & Marks, 1992; Riordan, 1990). According to Lee and Marks (1992), research has shown that, “more positive gender socialization may occur for students in single-sex schools, where the environments are less conditioned by stereotypical patterns and expectations” (p. 226). However, the same argument is not made for boys. No research was found that claimed boys on single sex schools or classes are less prone to endorse sexism, or more likely to possess egalitarian beliefs.

Other advocates claim that boys need a masculine environment since typically public coeducation favors a feminine learning style. Advocates claim that boys are naturally more rambunctious and therefore need more active learning that does not penalize their inclination to behave in a boisterous rowdy manner (Martino & Frank, 2006).

**Anti Single Sex Public Education**

Even in the wake of mounting evidence for the potential benefits single sex schools posed for girls, stark opposition to amending Title IX was voiced by women’s groups. Advocates of coeducation emphasize that single sex education has traditionally supported social inequity between the sexes. Many of those who fought for Title IX education considered coeducation to possess the potential to be the great equalizer (AAUW, 2009). The AAUW (2004) expressed apprehension claiming that any amendment to Title IX which reduced restrictions on public coeducation programs “would weaken the very law that brought about the massive achievements women and
The National Organization of Women ([NOW], 1995), voiced great concern that analogous to “separate but equal” in the case of Brown Versus the Board of Education, it was impractical to expect that girls would have equal opportunities in education if separated from boys. NOW emphasized, “female-dominated programs consistently receive fewer resources than male-dominated programs” (NOW, 1995, para. 10). Therefore, it was unrealistic to expect re-segregation of the sexes would promote gender equity in education (NOW, 1995).

Opponents to amending Title IX generally do not claim that coeducation in itself is superior; rather the common argument voiced is that single sex education is not any better (Herr & Arms, 2004). Opponents explain that for every argument in favor of single sex education there is a counterargument, and there is research against it (Billger, 2009; Lee & Marks 1990). According to Shah and Conchar (2009), “research is inconsistent in its assessment of whether single-sex education is ‘better’ than co-education for girls or boys or both” (p. 197). Single sex opponents assert that without clear overwhelming evidence in support of single sex education it is unwise to direct federal funding to single sex schooling and lax Title IX regulations simply because there are problems with current public education. Rather than remove legislation that protects a population, the AAUW (1998) advises more resources be placed in improving public coeducation, so that everyone can benefit.

Opponents of amending Title IX have also pointed out that there are numerous holes in the present available research. For instance, the bulk of available studies on
comparing single sex education and coeducation focus on the benefits and drawbacks such contexts offer females (Mael, 1998). Far less is available on the benefits and drawbacks for male students. According to Billger (2009), one important issue in the debate that often goes overlooked is examining “whether such school segregation is beneficial for both genders, both in terms of academics and acculturation” (p. 393).

When students do graduate single sex schools with high grades or test scores it cannot be assumed that they have also been afforded the same tools and social skills that students socialized in a coeducational environment have had (Billger, 2009). Some studies have found that all male schools, rather than combating sexism, may actually have a worsening effect by constructing a hyper masculine environment (Martino & Frank, 2006; Pattman, Frosh, & Phoenix, 2005, Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

According to Martino and Frank (2006) the all male school environment possesses a particular capacity to strengthen a heterosexual hypermasculine belief system within its students. Their study acknowledges that different constructions of masculinities are endorsed and therefore promoted not across the board of all single sex schools, but rather are individual to each particular school site. However, Martino and Frank explain, “there appear to be certain ‘manifestations’ of hegemonic masculinity which appear to emerge across specific localized school contexts” (p. 18). In their book, *Failing at Fairness*, Sadker and Sadker (1994) sought to find out if single sex schools are expanding the possibility for both genders growth, or are compounding old stereotypes. To examine the single sex context and the social conditioning the environment has on its students Sadker and Sadker observed and
interviewed students and teachers from single sex female schools, male schools, and student from single sex schools that took cross registration classes. Cross registration took place when a student from an all male, or all female school was offered registration in a class at the opposite sex school. Sadker and Sadker observed that in the all male school a certain kind of hazing, showmanship and “trying to establish where they are in the pack,” was commonplace classroom interaction (p. 244). During an interview with a teacher from the same school Sadker and Sadker posed the question, “Do you think the all-male environment is good for these boys?” (p. 247). The educator responded:

Not really. Maybe during junior high school. Otherwise, I don’t. I think interaction with girls is healthy. Girls today are testing every frontier of their psyche, but these boys are being left out and left behind. They’re lost in the past, and someone needs to bring them out. (Sadker & Sadker, 1994, p. 427)

The concern that the all male environment may be regressive to student social development is also reflected in a study conducted by Lee et al. (1994). The team of researchers observed and compared seven all boys, seven all girls, and seven coeducation schools. The team found various forms of sexism permeated each different school context. However, they found the greatest level of sexism appeared in the single sex male schools where the “male paradigm” of education seemed particularly prevalent. The teachers were particularly aggressive and demanding. In certain classes at the all male school, the lectures of male teachers occasionally even made references to females as sex objects. One teacher at the all boys’ school even
referred to his students as “studs” (Lee et al, 1994, p. 106). Lee et al. (1994) concluded that while each school really should be examined individually, the all boys’ schools consistently showed the highest level and most overt forms of sexism compared to the other two school contexts.

In addition to conflicting research over whether there are indeed benefits for both genders of single sex education, opponents have criticized comparisons being made of public coed schools with private single sex schools. Private schools have the luxury of being selective with admissions, which frequently involves a selective entrance process that filters many academically challenged individuals from entering private single sex schools altogether (Billger, 2009 Haag, 2002). Additionally single sex schools typically offer more advanced placement courses, smaller class size, extracurricular activities, and have the luxury of demanding regular parental involvement (Kasic, 2008). Because of the various benefits afforded by private single sex schools it is difficult to draw any sound conclusions from comparing the two school contexts (Billger, 2009; Haag, 2002; Kasic, 2008).

**Gender Socialization**

Social scientist and feminists alike generally agree one is not born masculine nor feminine, rather one *becomes* engendered through the process of gender socialization (Anderson, 2005; Henslin, 2007; Lorber, 2009; Wood, 2009). Gender, according to Wood (2009), is “a social, symbolic construction that expresses the meaning a society confers on biological sex” (p. 320). Much like language, gender is fluid, varying across cultures, within societies, and continues to change throughout
time (Wood, 2009). Gender socialization teaches individuals customs and ideologies about what is normal, acceptable, and valued in a given society (Henslin, 2007). Many difference sources contribute to ones acquisition of his/her gender. Logically, the sources that individuals have the most exposure to, and the ones that individuals greatly value the most, are going to have the most profound effect on their understanding of gender and how they fit into that role. Four major agents of gender socialization include; family, media, school and peers (Berns, 2009).

Parents as Agents of Socialization

Gender socialization, the process through which individuals learn socially accepted gender roles, begins at infancy (Anderson, 2005; Berns, 2009; Henslin, 2007; Wood, 2009). The family serves as a child’s “introduction to society” (Berns, 2009, p. 47). The family is a primary agent of the socialization process because of the complete and around the clock control the family has during a child’s earliest year of life.

Most parents are eager to learn the sex of an infant; often once learned, this knowledge dictates the ways parents perceive and exude gender appropriate behavior from a baby (Rubin, Provenzano, & Luria, 1974). In a classic study examining the ways parents observe and react to newborns, Rubin et al. (1974), found that even in just hours after birth, parents will describe seemingly similar infants in gender stereotypic ways. Although infants in the study where similar in size, weight, and activity level, parents described their female infants as softer, less strong, and more delicate, than the male infants who were described as strong, active, and large in size (Rubin et al., 1974).
Messages from parents conditioning their children into gender appropriate behavior continue throughout childhood. In a study observing parents walking with their young children in the city zoo, Mitchel, Obradovich, Herring, Tromborg, and Burns (1992) found that both fathers and mothers were more likely to permit their male children to demonstrate more exploration and independence by allowing them to wander off further by themselves. Though likely subconsciously, parents disallowing their daughters the same level of sovereignty as their brothers, teaches both boys and girls that girls are less capable, and more in need of physical protection.

Parents not only contribute to their child’s gender socialization by means of direct interaction. Parents also condition their children into gender roles by the toys, clothing, and bedroom decorations they select for, or discourage their children from having. Parents also teach their children about what they deem as gender appropriate by the chores they assign them, and the various extracurricular activities and supports they encourage or discourage them to participate in (Owen Blakemore, Berenbaum, & Liben, 2009).

By means of gender socialization parents unknowingly contribute to their children’s endorsement of stereotypic gender roles. By parents’ subtle yet perpetual comments and behaviors that encourage girls into passive, docile, domestic femininity and boys into aggressive insensitive, emotionally stifled masculinity, parents help construct a foundation of restriction and inequality for their children (Anderson, 2005; Henslin, 2007).
Media as an Agent of Socialization

The family has the greatest influence in a child’s life during early childhood; however media, another agent of socialization that children are often exposed to early in life, may eventually challenge a family’s control over a child’s perception of normalcy and value (Berns, 2009). Media consist of far more than television; the broad category encompasses advertisements (which can be found from the sides of cereal boxes to buses), video games, books, internet, cartoons, magazines, radio, and movies. American teenagers spend close to 50% of their time while awake (when not in school) engaging in some form of media (Brown, Steele, & Walsh-Childers, 2002). According to Campbell, Martin, & Fabos (2009), the media industry is so engulfing; more than $266 billion is spent annually on advertising alone. And although many dismiss media as simply entertainment that has little effect on the population at wide, media researchers generally agree constant exposure has a profound effect on viewers (Anderson, 2005; Campbell et al., 2009; Levin & Kilbourne, 2009; Wood, 2009).

In her pioneering study, Becker (2004) went to Fiji to examine if television could really have any effect on a target population. Becker selected Fiji as a site for study since the set of islands had only been introduced to television three years prior. The study consisted of interviews with 30 Fijian school teenage girls post social introduction to television. The Fijians cultural idealized body type had long been one of curves due to the society’s’ standard high calorie diet which citizens placed no clear effort on reducing body size through diet or exercise. However, between 1995 (when television was introduced) and 1998, Becker found there to be “an increase in
disordered eating attitudes and behaviors” (p. 539). According to Becker participants overtly “indicated a desire to emulate television characters; for some individuals, this appeared to be related to the perception that career goals could be enhanced by this route” (p. 539). Comments from the participants conveyed that television indeed had a powerful affect on their perception of what was beautiful, acceptable, and how to be successful.

According to Levin and Kilbourne (2009), in addition to advertisers selling products, they sell consumers a seductive set of values, norms, and perceptions of love, success, sex and gender. Ads, along with the rest of mass media, exploit differences between gender appropriate behaviors, and sexualize them. Men are unremittingly displayed as dominant and aggressive while women portrayed as subordinate and obedient (Cortese, 2008; Wood, 2009).

According to a study conducted by Lanis and Covell (1995), male participants that were exposed to advertisements portraying women as sexual objects displayed an increased endorsement of gender stereotypes, rape myth beliefs, and showed an greater acceptance of interpersonal violence (primarily against women). Their study concluded that print media has a powerful influence with consumers on male sexual attitudes and beliefs (Lanis & Covell, 1995).

A content analysis of popular media conducted in 2000 (Popcorn & Marigold) concluded that men actually prefer sexist media. They found that women and men are portrayed in gender stereotypic roles in most films and television programs selected by young males. To examine the effects of popular television programs targeting male
audiences, Scharrer (2004), conducted a study of 93 male college students. The students were shown a variety of television programs including those promoting hypermasculinity, defined as “extreme male gender role that may promote aggression” (p. 354). Scharrer (2004) found that after viewing patriarchal and misogynistic content, the participants increased their acceptance of hypermasculine beliefs, and acceptance of violence as a “manly” way to deal with problems and stress.

The growing video game industry is yet another area of media shown to portray hypermasculinity and increasing sexist representations of gender (Dill & Thill, 2007). According to PricewaterhouseCoopers [PWC] research, they project video games will continue to be the fastest growing segment of entertainment media through 2013, with worldwide spending to be over $31.6 billion as of 2006. By 2011, the gaming market is estimated to be worth nearly $50 billion, growing approximately 9% each year. According to PWC, roughly half of Americans between ages of 12 and 55 play video games (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2008). According to Roberts and Foehr (2004), 53% of children age two to seven and 83% of 8 to 18 year olds play video games. The majority of those who do play video games and those who spend the most time playing them are male. Boys outnumber girls as consumers of video games in every age group with the sharpest difference in the 11 to 14 year olds, where 61% of boys are regular gamers compared to 24% of girls (Roberts & Foehr, 2004).

According to Dill and Thill (2007), because of the great and growing popularity of video games, “it is important to understand them as an agent of socialization” (p. 861). Video games, much like other mainstream popular media,
regularly depict gender in stereotypical ways. Women are frequently underrepresented as characters in video games. When women are placed in roles in video games they are frequently depicted with over exaggerated sexual features, or sexual objects existing for the sexual gratification of the male characters or even for the sexual gratification of the video game players. Women are also frequently depicted as the targets of violence, which is often sexualized (Beasley & Collins-Stanley, 2002; Dill & Thill, 2007; Scharrer, 2004). For example, the extremely popular game *Grand Theft Auto*, includes female characters in the game as prostitutes available for a player to pick up, have sex with, beat to death, then allow the player to take the funds back from (Thomas, 2008). In a different version of Grand Theft Auto, a character named “Candy Sux,” yells back “I like it rough,” when struck by a male character (Dill & Thill, 2007).

Male characters, on the other end of the spectrum polarized by video games, are habitually depicted with exaggerated muscles who embrace aggression and violence (Beasley & Collins-Stanley, 2002; Dill & Thill, 2007; Scharrer, 2004). According to Thomas (2008), video games are, “yet another area of media entertainment that celebrates violent misogyny.” Consumers of video games, along with other sexist and degrading media often maintain that media is simply entertainment; and therefore does not contribute to the actual occurrence of violence (Dill & Thill, 2007). However, research examining the effects of media has refuted this claim. Brenick, Henning, Killen, O’Connor, and Collins (2007), for instance, found high frequency video game players, especially males, were “more likely to
condone negative stereotypic images, [and] to be less critical of negative images” (p. 412). Additionally, Brenick et al. reported “repeated exposure to negative stereotypic content potentially reinforces attitudes that could lead to discriminatory and prejudicial attitudes” (p. 412). Additionally, Brenick et al. found females were more likely than males to view violence in video games negatively and possess the belief that violent video games have the capacity to negatively affect the players’ attitudes and behavior. The study concluded that excessive use of violent video games may increase the players’ acceptance in aggression (Brenick et al., 2007).

According to Anderson and Dill (2000), every time an individual plays a violent video game they are rehearsing “aggressive scripts that teach and reinforce vigilance for enemies … positive attitudes toward use of violence, and beliefs that violent solutions are effective and appropriate” (p. 774). Furthermore, they concluded that repeated exposure to graphic violence will likely be desensitizing. The result, Anderson and Dill conclude, is the “creation and automatization of these aggression-related knowledge structures and the desensitization effects change the individual's personality” (p. 774). Video games therefore not only play an important role in youth culture but additionally in the development of their beliefs about gender and violence.

Along with video games, pornography is another area of media important to explore for its contribution to one's gender socialization, particularly for young men. Pornography, as defined by Catharine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin, “is a form of discrimination on the basis of sex…the sexually explicit subordination of women, graphically depicted, whether in pictures or in words” (Colombo, 1994, p. 44).
Regardless of level of debate surrounding how accessible legal pornography should be, according to Funk (1993), “there are more pornography shops in this country than McDonald’s. Pornography brings in more money than the music and movie industries combined” (p. 50). Because of its proliferation and ease of access, according to Flood (2009), young boys are regularly intentionally and unintentionally exposed to pornographic material. The content of pornography routinely depicts an extreme imbalance of power between men and women, and sexualizes it.

In pornography, men are perpetually shown as dominant and aggressive, maintaining control of their female partners. Women conversely are depicted in pornography as sexual objects submitting to any desires of their male partners, even at the cost of performing a degrading act or being subjected to physical pain. According to Lanis and Covell (1995):

> By viewing women as exclusively sexual beings whose purpose is to sexually arouse and gratify men, a power differential is created in which women are generally subordinate. This power hierarchy may facilitate the perceptions of women as appropriate targets for sexually aggressive behaviors. (p. 647)

Even more so than is the norm in video games, in pornography women are habitually portrayed as enjoying being the brunt of male violence and abuse (Jensen, 2007). According to Flood (2009), exposure to such material, “helps sustain young people’s adherence to sexist and unhealthy notions of sex and relationships” (p. 384). Flood further explains, “Particularly for boys and young men, the use of pornography may exacerbate violence-supportive social norms,” and even increases their likelihood of
perpetrating assault (p. 384). In an experimental study conducted by Allen, Emmer, Gebhardt, and Giery (1995), viewers of both nonviolent and violent pornography demonstrated a strengthening in their attitudes of sexual aggression, and attitudes in support of sexual assault and rape myth acceptance.

**Peers as Agents of Socialization**

Though media can be a seductive and powerful agent of socialization, it is not necessarily more influential than a child’s peers (Anderson, 2005). According to Wood (2009), because it is imperative for children to be accepted by their peers during childhood, fitting in at school becomes the cornerstone of esteem (p. 198). This motivates children to go to great lengths to gain approval from their friends. Once a child forms and regularly interacts with a peer group, children exert heavy influence and control over one another’s attitudes, particularly pertaining to the adherence to gender roles (Reay, 2001). Children ominously pressure other children to espouse conventional gender roles and behaviors (Blackmore, Berenbaum, & Liben, 2009). Research shows that higher level of acceptance with their peers when they conform to gender stereotypes (Reay, 2001).

Martin and Fabes (2001) conducted a six month longitudinal study examining the amount and the effects of same sex peer interaction by observing a group of preschool children. The researchers found that the more time both boys and girls spent within same sex peer groups, the more they partook in gender stereotypic play. The study concluded “the experiences children have with same-sex peers have later consequences for how they behave and interact. Time spent with same-sex peers sets
powerful forces in motion that affect children's subsequent development” (Martin & Fabes, 2001, p. 445). Children, therefore play an important role in the construction of gender and teaching their peers what is considered of value and appropriate.

In their British based study Pattman (2005), conducted 45 single sex and mixed group interviews, and 79 individual interviews in 12 London schools. During male group interviews, the researchers found it common for boys to describe girls in opposition to what they understood boys to be like. Boys were described as tough, strong and powerful; and girls, as weak, emotional and needy. Male students described that if boys demonstrated any characteristics not placed on the masculine side of the dichotomy, they would quickly be chastised as being gay. In the all male group interviews the boys put on the face of stereotypical masculinity, which seemed to encompass the act of publically belittling girls and the characteristics they assumed girls to embody. In the individual interviews, however, many of the male students expressed angst from the constant pressure to project the standardized masculinity.

In his book, Real Boys (1998), Dr. William Pollack describes that it is all too common for boys to police other boys by what he has coined the boycode. Dr. Pollack explains boys are cornered into gender straightjackets at an early age, and grow up understanding that if they do not strictly adhere to stereotypical masculinity (play sports, never cry or whine, never wear or play with anything considered even remotely feminine) then they are not being a “real” boy and therefore berated and labeled sissy, girl, or gay.
Washington (2009), describes the label, or even fear of being labeled anything not considered masculine, such as girly or gay, becomes so repressive for young males it terrorizes them into strict gender compliance. Washington explains that U.S. cultural obsession with the terms “gay” and “fag” is not simply about homophobia, but is also cultivated in a social contempt and derision of females and all considered feminine. Washington explains:

The most effective way to humiliate a boy is to accuse him of having feminine traits, which is what the “fag” embodies… It is tantamount to a boy or man being called a girl or a woman. In a patriarchal society rooted in the belief of male superiority and the exercise of male dominance, that is a demotion: a huge loss not only of status but humanity. Gay men are reviled because they are seen as gender traitors, relinquishing the rewards and undermining the universal rules of patriarchy no matter how masculine or sexist they may be. (para. 12)

Boys voicing misogyny, therefore, are demonstrating their masculinity and policing the boycode in each other.

Single sex peer cohorts found in coeducational schools are not the only social environments with the capacity for extreme gender regulation of and by its members. It is common for chiefly male groups such as athletics groups, gangs, military, and fraternities to support hypermasculine culture as well that demonizes any deviation from standardized gender roles (Boeringer, 1999; Rosen & Martin, 1998). Traditional notions of gender are founded on inequality, which attributes power and authority to
masculinity, and attributes devalued characteristics such as helplessness to and subordination to femininity. Since single sex male peer groups (such as military, fraternities, and gangs) are commonly constructed on the glorification of hypermasculinity they subsequently become breeding grounds for sexism (Henslin, 2007). When sexist messages are woven into the norms of an environment, both overt and covert, it cultivates an ambiance of insecurity and serves as a potent means of social control. In such an environment, those who do not endorse sexist values are frequently silenced from voicing dissent (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

In their books, Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) discuss numerous studies, including the results from the Canadian National Survey on Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships, which indicate the immense magnitude that male peer groups play in the construction of young male’s normative beliefs about gender and the treatment of girls and women. The degree to which an individual is influenced by the values of the groups to which they belong, is related to the individual’s investment in a group, the social power that the group holds, and the groups’ isolation from outside forces (Shwartz, & DeKeseredy, 1997). Peers, peer groups, and single sex peer groups, therefore, serve as powerful agents of gender socialization.

**Schools as Agents of Socialization**

As mentioned earlier peer influence at school can have powerful weight on students understanding of what is gender appropriate and for whom. Peers however, are not the only agents of socialization that exist in this context. The policies of each individual school, the curriculum that is taught there, and the personal beliefs of each
teacher, all encompass the school itself acting as an agent of socialization (Anderson, 2005; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Shwartz, & DeKeseredy, 1997). Lee, Marks, and Byrd (1994), state that, “classrooms where the process of schooling largely occurs, are primary sites for sexist socialization” (p. 92). The curriculum itself can contribute to an endorsement of stereotypical gender roles by presenting what has been called a “male centered paradigm,” which refers to the standard of representing males as the norm in curriculum and materials (Lee et al., 1994, p. 92). For example it is the standard for the male body to be represented when learning about anatomy. Males are represented as scientists, doctors, lawyers, and most other positions that encompass power, prestige, and wealth. Women and girls are often represented in a stereotypical manner as well, being reserved to the sidelines as mothers, wives, nurses, or playing other male supporting roles. Gender exclusive language, which is less common today than in the eighties, has yet to be eradicated from school curriculum and materials. Gender exclusive language includes usage of the generic “he,” and “mankind,” to discuss all humans (Anderson, 2005; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). The effects of such components in a student’s educational experience can harshly hinder children’s concept of what they are capable of, and what is expected of them.

In their monograph Meeting at the Crossroads, Brown and Gilligan (1993) interviewed 100 girls over the course of five years, which tracked the emotional and psychological maturation of the participants as they journeyed from childhood to womanhood. Brown and Gilligan noted many common trends that emerged from the interviews as the girls grew older and they began to adjust to their perception of
themselves in the world. Although girls seem to express themselves with ease throughout their early years; at onset of adolescence, as the young women are steered into stereotypical prescriptions of femininity, their aptitude to dictate their true thoughts and feelings and act upon them begins to fade. It is upon adolescence, Brown and Gilligan concluded, that girls begin to learn being socially desirable as a girl requires self silencing, compulsive niceness, and prioritizing the needs of others.

In their early teen years the girls in the study began to mimic the gendered lessons about niceness and compliance they had learned from others. Brown and Gilligan (1993) explain:

Voice-training by adults, especially ‘good women,’ undermines these girls experiences and reinforce images of female perfection by implying that ‘nice girls’ are always calm, controlled, quiet, they never cause a ruckus, are never noisy, bossy or aggressive, are not anxious and do not cause trouble, and also by implying that such girls exist and are desirable. (p. 61)

These lessons learned from adults about when to speak up and what is acceptable even permeate classroom discussion. Brown and Gilligan describe that Liza, for example, rather than to voice dissent in a classroom, which would likely be seen as socially undesirable she “chooses to silence her astute disruptive commentary. What she does in school is simply to voice ‘the teacher’s point of view’” (p. 173). To a teacher, Liza may seem like the perfect student.

The classroom itself becomes the stage for further lessons about what is considered permissible behavior for girls. In their book, Failing at Fairness Sadker
and Sadker (1994) explain that while boys are praised for yelling out answers in the classroom, girls are often reprimanded for this same behavior. Teachers habitually rewarding boys for the same behavior they punish girls for reinforces silence, obedience and submission from female students. Girls then may respond to this reinforcement with limiting their classroom participation. The minimal time and energy that is put into the female students is then often further rewarded by teachers in the form of good grades further reinforcing messages of female compliance (Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Children’s gender roles are strengthened by subtle comments from both teachers and from peers. Teachers making comments such as, “That’s not very appropriate for a little lady/man,” affirm masculine behavior for boys, and feminine behavior for girls (Wood, 2009, p. 50). For example, children learn that “it’s feminine to squeal or scream at the sight of mice or bugs, but boys who do are quickly labeled sissies” (Wood, 2009, p. 50). As Loutzenheiser (1996) explains:

We are all susceptible to these stereotypes and as educators rarely discuss honestly our own views of gender roles and sexuality. By assuming, and not reflecting upon, a type of normality based on what is accepted as male and female appropriate behaviors, schools and teachers often have difficulty dealing with students who do not fit gender roles. (p. 62)

Subtle commentary or non verbal cues from teachers contribute to the foundation of a child’s belief system about what is normal, acceptable, and right. Teachers and schools therefore sit in a powerful position to teach children that there are many valuable
variations in human qualities and characteristic, or conversely unknowingly reinforce a rigid dichotomy that attaches gender to human values.

Parents concerned with the sexism present in schools may elect to place their children in private education systems. However, the sovereignty that private schools boast as making them superior to the public system may actually act as counterproductive to teaching its students equity since private schools are bound to serve the clientele that monetarily supports their operation (Lee & Marks, 1992). In their study of why families opt for single sex education for their children, Lee and Marks (1992) found, most families that choose to place their children in single sex schools do so less for “opportunity –structure” reasons, and more for a desire to have their children in a school environment that supports traditionalism. Since the families that place their children in single sex schools are typically of the socially affluent and elite, this is the same population that at large endorses traditional and stereotypical views of gender. The private schools, therefore, are at least to some degree obligated to teach such principles to the students, in order to create a market that draws the families in as customers. Such findings suggest sexism may be more common in the single sex rather than coeducational setting.

Impact of Gender Socialization

Careers and Pay

Traditional constructions of masculinity and femininity are far from consisting of qualities of equal social value. Endorsement in stereotypical gender roles is so far reaching that assumptions and expectations about gender pervade cultural, political,
legal, and economic domains. Seguino (2007) explains, “Because such domains structure access to and [have] control over resources, they also reproduce, strengthen, and legitimate unequal gender systems” (p. 1). Consequently the effects of gender socialization have a psychological, social, and monetary dimension. Socialization reproduces beliefs, attitudes and expectations about what is normal and acceptable for men and women, while promoting attitudes and behaviors that socially devalue women and anything considered feminine and legitimizing male power and control. Human qualities are polarized into a dichotomous system that labels certain qualities masculine and opposite qualities feminine. Men are socially encouraged to embody “masculine” characteristics while being discouraged from displaying qualities on the other side of the socially assembled dichotomy. The process of socialization, consisting of both subtle and overt messages about gender, is so powerful and systematic that members of society often defend the current system of inequality as it being a product of “nature” rather than a social construction designed to benefit males (Seguino, 2007).

Girls that only see representations of females as nurses, and teachers, while seeing representations of males as scientists and astronauts may conclude girls are simply not as good in such high paying prestigious occupations. Teachers who endorse such ideology will likely (subconsciously or not) steer their students into fields that they believe are gender appropriate. Boys that voice interest in subjects not considered to be masculine, may be discouraged from exploring the field by the teachers or by peers that believe that the field if interest is not appropriate for a boy (Anderson, 2005;
Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Wood, 2009). Socialization affects the courses teens choose to take in school, once they are in a grade level where choice is available. Girls are significantly more likely to select social science courses such as, health courses, foreign language, the arts and humanities. Boys conversely are more likely to select courses in math and science. According to Anderson (2005), students “who report liking math and science have higher self-esteem and have higher career aspirations” (p. 42). Such patterns do not stop at high school.

The patterns of kids clustering into gender “appropriate” disciplines in school have a weighty effect on the gender segregation of the labor market when they become active members of society. According to Razumnikova (2005), the 1960s icon of professionalism that includes rationality, logical decision making, competence, is still associated with masculinity, even today. Razumnikova’s study of 200 first year students at a technical university revealed:

- stereotypical conceptions of male dominance still persist not only in specialties such as military service or construction work but also in agriculture, politics, economics, engineering, and even programming. This latter circumstance is extremely instructive, inasmuch as programming is perceived to be a “masculine” profession even by the female students who are majoring in that specialty. The only specialty that was selected as being “feminine” by a very large margin was home economics. (p. 23)

As one might logically assume such widely held beliefs do have an effect on what men and women make monetarily.
According to Dey and Hill (2007), just one year after women graduate from college, fulltime working women earn just 80% of their male peers. Ten years after college graduation, however, the pay gap grows and women earn only 69% as their male colleagues. Dey and Hill explain, the selection of the major one chooses does contribute in part to the pay discrepancy. Female students that choose teaching are logically going to make less money than doctors. However, Dey and Hill explain, this is only part of the picture:

As early as one year after graduation, a pay gap is found between women and men who had the same college major. In education, a female-dominated major, women earn 95 percent as much as their male colleagues earn. In biological sciences, a mixed-gender major, women earn only 75 percent as much as men earn. Likewise in mathematics—a male-dominated major—women earn only 76 percent as much as men earn. (p. 2)

The report concludes that it is not simply enough for female students to choose a male dominated profession to avoid the pay gap. When women make less than men for comparable work, women have fewer resources available to support themselves. Women are more likely than men to head single parent households, often with little (if any) financial support from the fathers of the children. This disparity becomes further exemplified once women enter retirement.

**Hate Based Violence and School Shootings**

The same assumptions about gender norms that affect occupation and pay in adulthood have can have gruesome affects on young children. Since masculinity is tied
up with the belief that men are inherently powerful, emotionless, and in control, children attempting to embrace such characteristics have been shown to have extremely dysfunctional outcomes. Children sanctioning the ideology that any boy that does embody stereotypical masculinity is deserving of social torment led the suicide of 11 year old Carl Joseph-Walker in 2009. The 11 year old Massachusetts boy faced the daily ridicule of being branded with names such as “gay,” “girlie” and “fag” and was regularly threatened with violence. While his mother attempted to address the escalating issue with the school, she came home to find Carl hung himself with an extension cord in their home (Washington, 2009).

Carl never identified himself as gay. The students in his school picked on him because he did not clearly fit into their understanding of masculinity, earning Carl ostracism and ridicule. The act of chastising itself is an expression of hypermasculinity. The bullies acted out in a stereotypical masculine fashion; behaved aggressively, controlling, and found no problem threatening their peer with violence (Washington, 2009).

Larry King, a 15 year old openly gay student at E. O. Green Junior High School in Oxnard, California, used to go to school wearing makeup. Larry began to identify as gay in third grade. Although he had several friends that were girls, he was called names and harassed by many boys in school. Larry was seemingly comfortable with his sexuality, though many of his classmates openly detested it. Larry began to make it known that he had a crush on one of his classmates, Brandon McInerney. On Valentine’s Day, in front of Brandon’s friends, Larry asked Brandon out. Brandon’s
friends, amused by the demonstration began to tease their friend saying that the two of them would make “gay babies” together. Students who witnessed the spectacle described Brandon expressing extreme mortification. On February 12, 2008, Brandon brought a gun to school and fired two shots directly at Larry’s head. Larry died two days later from severe brain injuries (Setoodeh, 2008, p. 1).

In addition to hegemonic masculinity lending its hand to hate crimes, school shootings are yet another product of gender based violence. Since the perpetrators of school shootings are overwhelmingly male, it is important to examine what such incidents say about masculinity (Katz & Jhally, 1999; Mills, 2001). In his documentary Tough Guise, Katz and Jhally (1999) explain:

It is imperative that we take our focus off of the pathological male as the perpetrator of violence and put it on the “normal,” average-looking guys. We also need to confront the fact that most violence is perpetrated by boys and men and figure out how, given this unavoidable fact, we might change our definitions of manhood to begin dealing seriously with the heart of the problem. (p. 19)

According to the press surrounding the Columbine shooting, the killers were students that viewed themselves as fatalities of a “jock culture” from which they were involuntarily sidelined. The perpetrators did not fit into the masculine ideal of athletics and muscular toughness. Yet the shooters were able to use guns as the “great equalizer” (Katz & Jhally, 1999, p. 19). Weapons, Katz and Jhally (2009) explain, allowed the students “an immediate ability to actualize their revenge fantasy in a
violent, physical way, and finally gain a grotesque form of respect” (p. 19). Although
the students sacrificed their freedom for it, they were able to publically re-exert
hegemonic masculinity.

**Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence**

The majority of violent crimes in the United States are committed by men
according to the Bureau of Justice; over 85%. In 1998 women committed only 14% of
violent criminal offenses (U.S. Department of Justice, 2003). Of cases of sexual
violence, the number grows to 90%-99% that are perpetrated by men. Whether the
victims are female or male, men are overwhelmingly the perpetrators of sexual crimes
(Katz, 2006). When examining such statistics one may conclude that men are simply
innately more prone to violent behavior. Feminist scholars, however, have repeatedly
refuted this claim (Bourke, 2007; Katz, 2006; Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002;
assault women; most abusive behavior is learned. If it is learned, it is also taught, and
one key area it is learned is popular culture” (p. 129). Wood (2009) explains that
although for many years testosterone was blamed for violent aggression, current
research suggests any connection between hormone and behavior is an indirect one.
Both genders show aggressive tendencies in their early years before their gender
expectations become clear to them, suggesting that if biology does play any role at all,
it is an indirect role, mediated by social factors (Wood, 2009). According to Katz
(2006), numerous studies have found that while most men that tend to be more
emotionally constricted than nonaggressive men, and are often angry and hostile
commit rape “towards women, most of them are psychologically ‘normal’” (p. 151). If biology was to blame for human violent behavior, Katz explains, there would be very little variation between levels of violence across cultures and throughout history.

Cross cultural studies which have focused on rates of violence have found that sexual assault rates widely vary along features of each social structure. Even controlling for issues of underreporting reporting, and varying definitions of rape, some societies have an especially low occurrence or sexual violence, while others have an extremely high one. In a study examining 156 different societies, Sanday (1981) found, societies who demonstrated extremely low rates of sexual violence shared commonalities such as low rates of social violence, high levels of economic power for women, and possessed community wide egalitarian values. Conversely, Sanday found, in the societies prone to sexual violence, genders were more socially segregated, women possessed less social value and power, and the society had all around higher levels of “interpersonal violence” (p. 10). In the Gusii society, which Sanday categorized as “rape prone,” it was normal standard for sex to cause women pain. Sanday explains:

When a bride is unable to walk after her wedding night, the groom is considered by his friends to be a ‘real’ man and he is able to boast of his exploits, particularly if he has been able to make her cry. (p. 10)

In the Gusii society, as is many others, masculinity is strongly associated with power, control, and the use of female objectification to assert masculine domination. Similar studies, such as one conducted by Reiss (1986), found that societies with a higher
endorsement of hegemonic masculinity and wider agreement of the inferiority of women, show to have higher rates of sexual violence. According to Katz (1999, 2006), the United States shares many of the commonalities found in other rape-prone societies. United States, according to Alison and Wrightsman (1993):

Has the highest incidence rate of rape of any industrialized country. Even when we take into account the inaccuracy of underreported attacks (a problem in all countries), we find that the rate in the United Sates is 15 times higher than that of England. (p. 9)

Hypermasculinity is not the only aspect of gender socialization that high rates of gendered violence can be attributed to. Wood (2009) explains the “qualities that men are urged to exemplify (aggression, dominance, sexuality and strength)…are identical to those linked to abuse of women” (p. 292). Ironically, the very qualities that “women are encouraged to develop (beauty, sexiness, passivity, and powerlessness) in order to meet cultural ideals of femininity contribute to their victimization” (Wood, 2009, p. 292). By means of the process of gender socialization, boys are conditioned into normalizing physical control and violence, while girls are conditioned to be susceptible to victimization.

In additional to sexual assault, domestic violence is another form of gendered violence currently growing in the United States that is at least in part a product of gender socialization. Research suggests, “Male dominance and female submission, which are rooted in traditional gendered beliefs, create an unequal balance of power between genders, which can lead to aversive behavior” (Ulloa, Jaycox, Skinner, &
In their study which examined teenagers’ cultural orientation, endorsement of traditional gender roles, and perceptions of dating violence, Ulloa et al. (2009) found that boys were more likely than girls to possess attitudes accepting of violence and abuse. Their study also found no correlation between English language media use and gender role egalitarianism, suggesting popular media does not promote or glamorize egalitarian values. In their study, Lichter and McCloskey (2004) defined three beliefs associated with dating violence: “(a) Traditional gender-role beliefs about family roles and work; (b) traditional gendered attitudes about dating relationships, and (c) attitudes endorsing the use of physical force by a man against a female dating partner” (p. 344). Their study found that in youth possessing traditional gender roles attitudes showed strong correlation with “higher levels of dating violence perpetration and victimization, and acceptance of interpersonal violence was associated with perpetration” (p. 352). Research such as the work by Uolla et al. and Lichter and McCloskey, reinforce the body of research that explains that gendered crimes of violence are not a product of biology, but rather a product of a culture that dictates principles of gender inequality. Cultural beliefs about gender and gender stereotypes play a central role in setting the stage for such crimes of power to flourish (Ullo et al., 2009).

Brown and Gilligan (1993), witnessed regression of the female participants in their study, as they grew from assertive children possessing a strong self identity during childhood to submissive obedient young women when they reached adolescence. Brown and Gilligan explained the girls once fully expressive in their
early years eventually became self-contained and ceaselessly concerned with pleasing others. Lessons girls internalize about female compliance have fearsome implications when considering how the effect of such coaching can present itself in future relational and sexual interactions. Girls who systematically received messages to be nice at all time learn to relentlessly surrender. If children have internalized an obligation to always put others wants, needs and desires first, then their resistance to potentially abusive situations, and even recognize them as such, can be significantly diminished. When girls find themselves in situations where they feel uncomfortable they may once again keep their own needs mute for fear of hurting the other person’s feelings, or making them angry. Furthermore, in the event that abuse of some sort does occur, the girls may again practice self silencing for fear of making too many waves, or getting the perpetrator in trouble.

Not only does the social endorsement of hyper masculinity and female passivity contribute to the construction of a “rape culture,” commonly accepted myths contribute to the occurrence of sexual violence (in direct and indirect ways) as well. Rape myths are myths which minimize perceived injury and/or blame victims of gendered violence for their own victimization (Bourke, 2007). Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald (1999) identified seven different rape myths popularly accepted. Such myths include; “she asked for it,” “it wasn’t really rape,” “he didn’t mean to,” “she wanted it,” “she lied,” “rape is a trivial event,” and “rape is a deviant event” (Payne et al., p. 4). The prevalence of rape myths are imbedded in popular media. Studies show vast populations of both men and women endorse these myths. According to Burt
(1980), research shows that endorsement of rape myths is strongly connected to “distrust on the opposite sex,” to a general acceptance of violence, and an endorsement in sexist values.

McMahon conducted a 2010 study of 2,338 incoming undergraduates in a northeastern university on their acceptance of rape myths. McMahon found males reported a higher acceptance of rape myths, as did those pledging the Greek system (fraternities and sororities), athletes, those who claimed to know not anyone that had been sexually assaulted, and those who reported having no previous gender violence education. Additionally McMahon found, the students who reported a greater endorsement in rape myths also reported they would be less likely to intervene or assist a victim in the chance they found out a sexual assault was occurring. Certainly not every man and woman who adheres to traditional gender roles or possesses rape supportive attitudes is going to go out and rape or beat their spouse. The hazard, however, with such ideology being so widely accepted, is that individuals will continue to create an environment that makes it difficult for victims to come forward, to be believed during jury trials, to prosecute abusers, and to even recognize abuse as criminal behavior when it occurs. A society that yields citizens that sanction rape supportive attitudes will also produce lawyers, judges, doctors, politicians, and decisions makers who lack empathy or understanding of sexual violence (Katz, 2006).

**Teaching Controversy**

Considering the systematic conditioning of gender socialization, the omnipresent endorsement of hypermasculinity and passive femininity, and frequency
of sexual violence, schools seem like a logical forum to address these issues. The AAUW (1992) describes gender socialization, domestic violence and sexual assault as “evaded curriculum” for schools rarely, if ever, touch on the topics which deeply affect many students lives. Other topics evaded in schools are issues relating to “functioning bodies, the expression and value of feelings, and the dynamics of power” (AAUW, 1992, p. 75). The AAUW explains that in an effort to avoid controversy with parents, many schools will go to great lengths to avoid the topics. When the topics cannot be avoided because of state standards, most districts will provide “facts devoid of references to the complex personal and moral dilemmas they face…” (p. 75). Without allowing students a forum to discuss life issues that they may be faced with (eating disorders, body image issues, racism, sexism) students are denied the opportunity to gain resilience when confronted with such problems.

Noddings (2005) proposes that rather than schools being rigidly organized around traditional disciplines as they currently do, schools would better serve students and society by being organized around issues that are pertinent to student’s lives, such as human problems. Noddings describes that typically when American educational system is confronted with a social problem, such as drugs, it responds by adding a single class, or even just a short course. However, Noddings explains, simply adding one cut and dry piece of curriculum cannot adequately address enduring problems faced by youth. Simply adding a class segment on domestic violence, sexual assault, cannot be expected to adequately address the social systems of power that deeply rooted sexual assault and domestic violence in American society. If students are
provided with content late in their schooling that introduces egalitarian values and requests students to deconstruct sexism which they have already eternalized, many students will likely be resistant to such information.

Noddings (2005) advocates that rather than putting social problems and issues students are faced with on the sidelines of education, policy makers and educators must be place real life issues front and center of schooling. Values such as empathy, critical thought, and individual inclinations towards cruelty and violence that contribute to social injustice should play a central role in educating youth. Noddings explains:

I am not talking about abstract learning that can dissipate immediately in a crisis. I am talking about an understanding of self and other that recognizes with a heavy heart that we are all vulnerable to error and evil. I am concerned with reducing the tendency to project evil onto others not only to exteriorize and destroy it, but also to deny its presence in ourselves. (p. 54)

In teaching students to examine their own ability to cause others pain Noddings (2005) describe simply teaching students about injustice is insufficient. She explains that to effectively combat social ills such as oppression, students must be given tools to critically examine power and inequality present in society and deconstruct it. Noddings explains, achieving such a goal cannot be accomplished in one unit, or even one course, but rather teaching students to critically think and resist oppression must be a part of education from the kindergarten through university learning.
Similarly in her discussion of teaching multicultural education Nieto (1991) describes, “Ethics and the distribution of power, status, and rewards are basic societal concerns” that education must address (p. 314). Nieto explains that children must be taught from kindergarten through college how to critically think, reflect, and question all aspects of life, including education itself. It is these tools that education can equip students with that begin to breakdown hierarchies and begin to combat social injustice. It is also these skills that will allow students to actively rather than passively, engage with the detrimental media messages that they are bombarded with, and which they so passively absorb (Nieto, 1991).

Early social theorists such as Dewey (1927) and Habermas (1971) describe that if the goal of education is to prepare students to be active in the democratic process as adults, schools should mirror democracy allowing students to take part in the construction of knowledge and be encouraged to share their thoughts and experiences, instrumentally developing the skills of democratic citizens. The classroom must be reconstructed to incorporate the private sphere with the public sphere, and create a forum for critical inquiry, discussion, and debate. Because classrooms shy away from controversy in most forms, when controversial topics are introduced to students, often there is discomfort (Dewey, 1927; Habernas, 1971). Hess (2009) explains, “There is an intrinsic and crucial connection between the discussion of controversial political issues, especially among people with disparate views, and the health of democracy” (p. 12). Hess explains that not only does discussion about controversial topics allow students to earnestly hear an opposing side, but it forces them to reflect on their own
value system, in order to explain their side. Allowing students open and honest discussion on controversial issues increases political tolerance, empathy, cultural understanding, and provides students the tools necessary to build a better society.

**Student Reaction to Sexism Material**

In their study teaching children to confront peers sexist commentary, Lamb, Bigler, Liben, and Green (2009) pre and post tested 153 five to ten year olds during a unit on sexism. The study was designed to teach the children to confront the harmful comment themselves, since research has pointed to the momentous influence peers have on each other’s attitudes and behaviors. The study found that both before and after the treatment, the girls demonstrated “significantly higher levels of egalitarian beliefs” (Lamb et al., 2009, p. 378), which they noted was consistent with the findings of previous research. Though the boys did show improvement from the treatment, the boys still did not compare to possessing comparable levels of egalitarianism. Lamb et al. did qualify these findings by noting that the educators in the children’s anti-sexism program were female. Using female educators may have served as a limitation, since “prior research suggests that male educators are more effective than female educators at reducing gender-typing among boys” (Lamb et al., 2009, p. 378). The researchers stated that any environment that encourages harsh conformity to gender roles, “including gender segregation and endorsement of stereotypic beliefs” is prone to producing prejudice and dysfunction (Lamb et al., 2009, p. 372).

Similar to the Lamb et al. (2009) study finding that elementary school girls are less inclined to endorse sexism than elementary school boys, Lanis and Covell (1995)
found the same to be true of college students. To test the degree of the effect advertising has on consumers’ endorsement of sexism and rape myth acceptance, Lanis and Covell examined a group of 90 undergraduate college students; 45 male and 45 female. The students were randomly assigned to one of three image conditions depicting women progressively, neutrally, or in an objectified manner. Lanis and Covell found when exposed to stereotypic imagery, males showed greater endorsement of sex role stereotypes and rape myths, and additionally show a greater acceptance of interpersonal violence, particularly against women. Female participants in the study, however, were found to have an opposite reaction when exposed to the same sexist imagery. Lanis and Covell explain:

It appears that the images used in the experimental conditions may have brought to the attention of the female subjects, the issues of sexual exploitation of women in the media, and perhaps the social alternatives available to women in the media, thus decreasing their tolerance for rape-supportive beliefs. (p. 646)

Lanis and Covell concluded that for the female participant, examining the contrasting representations of women advertisements, actually brought their attention to the sexual exploitation of females and the “social alternatives available to women, thus decreasing their tolerance for rape supportive beliefs” (p. 646). According to Turpin (2008), when of an oppressed class learns about “unjust stratifications of power” their personal experience is legitimized” (p. 141). Turpin explains, “learning how their individual experience fits into structural narratives can lead from a sense
individualized dysfunction and shame to a new sense of solidarity and empowerment” (p. 141). Therefore it should not be surprising that when female participants examined progressive verses oppressive representations of media, they were able to relate to the harm such representations have on their own lives. Lanis and Covell, however, found there to be no change in male participant’s attitudes after exposure to the progressive representations of women.

While students from a marginalized group may be validated and empowered by learning about structural inequality, the opposite effect has been found to be true of groups who align themselves with the dominant group. Turpin (2008) explains “When students who benefit from structures of power learn about the origins and costs of their privilege to other social groups, their experience and the way they have been taught to name it can be delegitimized” (p. 141). When students that associate themselves with a dominant group learn about oppression, it is not uncommon for them to react with resistance, sadness and anger (Turpin, 2008). Freire (1987) defines dominant group as the “non-poor” of society. Freire explains the non-poor are not always particularly motivated to change or give up their position of power. Freire elucidates:

…People among the non-poor do not customarily want to be transformed or to give up the privileges which they have enjoyed, and they’re not ready to accept or engage in a kind of education which involves giving up those privileges. (p. 142)

Therefore when male students are taught about sexist material, it should not be surprising that they are often resistant to acknowledge the material as oppressive. Boys
receive unceasing messages from parents, peers, and media that associates masculinity with social power and value, while conversely devaluing femininity and disassociating it with power. Boys turn on a videogame, the radio, movies, television programs, flip through magazines, or stumble upon pornography; all of which overwhelming portray females as sexual objects deserving and enjoying male control. While in school boys are taught in schools systems that still utilize a male paradigm of education; students hear history about male heroes, see pictures of the male skeletal system when learning about science, and read about doctors, scientists and astronauts who are primarily male.

Hess (2009) explains that controversial conversations in the classroom are essentially the practice of democracy. Hess describes democratic conversation has the most profound effect when diversity is available. Hess describes that in an “echo chamber” little can be learned since beliefs go unchallenged. She explains, “Most schools contain gender, religious, ethnic, and some degree of racial diversity” (p. 6). It is the multiplicity in a controlled environment, Hess explains, with a forum for open and honest discussion that can force student to open their minds and consider the values and belief systems of their peers; therefore challenging the ignorance that props up oppression (Hess, 2009).

Since boys and girls are socialized differently they bring into the classroom different perspectives on privilege and oppression. Studies show students have a heavy hand in socializing and influencing each other (Pattman et al., 2005). Research shows that females are more apt to recognize the oppressive harmful nature of sexist belief
systems, and are therefore better positioned to help those who do not, relate to the material (Katz, 2006). Just as students’ research has found that students who have never met a rape victim had a difficult time having empathy for survivors, and were more likely to endorse rape myths, boys who have minimal interaction with girls, may have a more difficult time rejecting stereotypic belief systems.

In the Pattman et al. (2005). British study, during the coed interviews the researchers observed female students regularly spoke up to challenge their male peers to reflect on the contradictions voiced about gender. In seven out of nine of the mixed gender interviews, the girls even took it upon themselves to act as group facilitators and, allowing all sides of the arguments, even the ones they personally disagreed with, to be spoke (Pattman et al., 2005). Additionally, the female students, “blurred gender boundaries and related to the boys as people with similar interests concerns and as potential friends” (Pattman et al., 2005, p. 560). In the mixed interviews rather than the boys expressing themselves in opposition, they were able to self reflect critically, and relate to the female participants. According to the Pattman et al., in the coed interviews, the female students created an environment for boys to feel comfortable enough to enact non-traditional masculinity.

According to symbolic interaction theory, people construct meaning by the interactions they have with other people (Anderson, 2005). And according to social learning theory, people develop their identity and their expectations of others through their interaction with each other (Bandura, 1977). If interaction to the opposite sex is limited, males have less interaction with female peers, and therefore it is reasonable to
conclude they will have less opportunity to develop an egalitarian belief system. It is consequently reasonable to assume that boys from a single sex environment will be more resistant to recognizing the harms of sexist socialization.

**Conclusion**

Single sex schooling was instituted because early policy makers believed that because women and men occupied different social spheres; they needed to develop different skills. Women’s early formal education involved learning how to behave like a lady and to be a good mother and wife. In the early seventies the fight for sexual equality finally legalized discrimination in schools with the passage of Title IX. Title IX closed all public single sex schools and classes, temporarily quieting debates surrounding single sex schooling. In the early nineties numerous studies surfaced proclaiming vast gender inequality existed in public school coeducation. Educational scholars, parents, and teachers again turned to the benefits of single sex education might offer students. Though evidence is inconclusive whether single sex education or coeducation is superior, Title IX was amended to allow federal funds to be channeled into single sex schools and programs under specific stipulations.

Gender socialization, the process through which boys and girls learn what it means to male and female in American society begins at birth. Children are exposed to messages from cartoons, the toys that they are given to play with, even the clothing they are dressed in. This process involved many different agents that influence ones construction of gender. The four primary agents of gender socialization are; parents, media, peers, and school. The consequence of dividing human qualities into a binary
and attaching a gender to specific ones, polarizes what characteristics are socially acceptable for whom to express. Girls become socialized into domestic passivity while boys learn behaving aggressive and exerting physical power is how a boy shows others he is a “man.” Qualities that are deemed “masculine” are attributed with being valued and respected while qualities that are defined as “feminine” are then socially devalued and trivialized. The result of this socially endorsed sexist ideology comes in the form of lower pay for women, even in parallel careers with comparable education and experience. Another consequence of rigid endorsement into traditional gender roles is hate based violence, school shootings, and sexual assault and domestic violence.

According to educational scholars and theorists the most effective way to combat prejudice and oppression is to place such education in the heart of curriculum from kindergarten through college. Students must be pushed to critically examine the knowledge and belief systems that they unquestioningly endorse. Research shows that girls, prior and post sexist education, are more likely to endorse egalitarian belief systems than are boys. Because peers and school environment prove to be significant agents of gender socialization, boys from a coeducational school are likely to have a more equalitarian belief system and are less likely to be resistant to gender socialization curriculum than are boys from a single sex school.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

After spending two years presenting domestic violence and sexual assault curriculum to high school students, the researcher of this study began to notice that students at the single sex private schools responded to the presented curriculum in a drastically different manner than students from the typical coeducational public school. This study examined the attitudes of students attending different school locations, focusing on determining if students in the single sex private school environment possess a greater propensity to reject or endorse gender stereotypes. Based on the available research, combined with her previous firsthand experience, the researcher has hypothesized that students attending all boys private schools are more likely to endorse gender stereotypes than students from the all girls’ school, and both sexes from the coeducation school. The following chapter provides the reader with a detailed description of the sample population and selection process, the instruments used for the measurement of the variables, the methodology and procedures used.

Research Data and Design

This study incorporated both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative researchers generally agree that relying on more than one source of data allows the researcher a more complete picture of the target and improves the validity of the research. (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006; McMillan & Wergin, 2006; Shank, 2002). The two different sources of data that were used in this study included: a pre-post
survey, and open ended questionnaires. According to Babbie (2010) pre/post testing is simplest of the experimental designs:

Subjects are measured in terms of a dependent variable (pretested), exposed to a stimulus representing an independent variable, and then premeasured in terms of the dependent variable (post tested). Differences are noted between the first and the last measurements on the dependent variable are then attributed to the independent variable. (p. 234)

The pre/post survey used in this study was designed to examine the attitudes and beliefs that students hold pertaining to gender roles, domestic violence and sexual assault. The format of the pre/post employed a Likert scale; a design utilized to determine the relative intensity of beliefs a participant held on each particular question (Babbie, 2010).

Babbie (2010) has criticized surveys as “superficial” with limited validity since the researcher is not present during the delivery. To maximize the validity of survey use, the researcher in this study was present to personally describe the rules and to distribute and collect them. Additionally, having the researcher present ensured a uniform method of instruction and distribution. As suggested by Gay et al. (2006) to increase the comfort and honesty of the student responses the classes were assured that the pre/post test would remain confidential; no one other than the researcher would have access to the tests. To further provide participant ease, as recommended by Creswell (2002), students were asked to use their student identification numbers as survey identifiers.
As recommended by Gay et al. (2006) to test for comprehension and deficiencies the pre/post was distributed to a pilot study of 150 college students prior to their use in this study. The college students were instructed to examine the test from the perspective of high school students paying particular attention to the language use and question construction. The test group was asked to make note of any issues they found that might problematic and was asked to provide comments and feedback on the back of the test. Many students provided thoughtful suggestions, flagged potential issues; the pre/post was amended to take the feedback into consideration.

The second method of data collection used in this study was an open-ended questionnaire. According to Gay et al. (2006) questionnaires are advantageous for their capacity to collect large amounts of data quickly. As suggested by Gay et al. to increase the honesty and comfort of participant responses, students were instructed not to include their names and assured of their anonymity. As the questionnaires were distributed the researcher also reminded the students that their honesty was desired and that the goal of the study was to find out exactly what students think about the topic, and the program, not to obtain specific answers.

Although Shank (2002) has explained, it is impossible to do any sort of qualitative research without getting involved and affecting the data at some level, the researcher took particular steps to maximize validity. As explained by Gay et al. (2006) “observer bias” occurs when the researcher “does not observe objectively and accurately” because of her own “individual background, set of experiences, and perspectives, thus effecting “not only what and how she observes but also her personal
reflections and interpretation” (p. 423). To minimize the potential observation bias, as suggested by Gay et al., the researcher utilized multiple sources of data collection.

Observer Effect, as explained by Gay et al. (2006) happens when the population “being observed behave atypically simply because they are being observed, thus producing invalid observations” (p. 424). As suggested by Gay et al. to combat the potential for observer effect, the researcher attempted to be as nonthreatening as possible, redundantly reminding the student that the goal of the research is to find out what students think rather than looking for specific right or wrong answers. Additionally the researcher attempted to increase the comfort of the students in the setting in part by starting the program with ice breakers and group work that allowed the students to find similar beliefs, hopefully increasing their comfort in voicing those opinions and beliefs. The researcher also attempted to increase student comfort by using language and examples which related specifically to youth culture.

**Research Questions**

Are there higher levels of sexist attitudes (sexism is more prominent/sexism is endorsed by more students) held by students in a single sex school, compared to a coeducational school, and in an all female school compared to an all male school?

**Research Instruments**

An opt-out informed consent form was used. Anecdotal notes were taken during class discussions to make note of the negative nonverbal feedback from the students. Detailed notes were taken directly after each class was finished, either in written form or by use of a personal recording device.
A pre/post test (Gender and Culture Survey/GCS) was compiled from three measures of sexism (the Attitudes Toward Women Scale/ATWS, the Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale/SATWS, the Modern Sexism Scale/MSS, and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory/ASI). The ATWS has been the “most widely used scale of gender-roles attitudes” (McHugh & Frieze, 1997, p. 6) and was developed to evaluate people’s attitudes and beliefs about the roles, responsibilities, and rights of women. The SATWS consists of seven different components of sexism (McHugh & Frieze, 1997). According to McHugh and Frieze (1997) the scale is highly comprehensive and “has high internal consistency reliability” (p. 9). Both the MSS and the ASI were designed to measure hostile and benevolent feelings towards both women and men (McHugh & Frieze, 1997).

Although research may suggest that using one preexisting uniform scale may be beneficial in allowing other researchers to compare the data with other studies, (enabling an examination of results across different samples, culture and over time) (McHugh & Frieze, 1997, p. 3), the researcher chose to select specific questions from each scale, and combine them. This method was chosen due to dated questions that did not adequately address the current social climate (McHugh & Frieze, 1997), and due to the researchers’ specific focus of gender attitudes and the victimization of females. Subsequently, questions were chosen from each scale that were applicable to this interest, and new questions were developed to adequately cover the scope. The test utilized a five point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A power point presentation was also developed and presented. Pictures of current popular
culture icons, lyrics from popular songs, news paper stories, and video clips were shown. Lastly, a seven question, one page, open ended questionnaire was used to survey the students’ thoughts on the four day program by the educator who provided the presentations.

**Participants**

Participants from three high schools in Northern California were used in this study; one all boys private school, one all girls private school, and male students from one coed public school. The names of the schools have excluded protect participant confidentiality. Data from 231 surveys and 237 questionnaires was included in this study. Ideally, to study sexism in a single sex school compared to that in a coeducational school, this study would have examined two single sex and one public coed schools. However, since single sex public schools were not available in the area, the researcher focused on three schools with comparable heterogeneous composition; with similar socioeconomic statuses, ethnic makeup, and academic achievement.

Table 1

*Participants by School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Locale</th>
<th>9th Grade</th>
<th>10th Grade</th>
<th>11th Grade</th>
<th>12th Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Male Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed Male Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Female Students</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Male School

The all male school selected is private catholic college preparatory school. Seventy percent of the school’s student body is white. The school has 14 different advanced placement courses available for its students. Tuition costs students’ families approximately $12,000 annually and 22% of the students receive some form of financial aid. Nearly 100% of the schools graduates go directly into college (information gathered from the schools website excluded to maintain confidentiality).

All Female School

The all female school selected is private catholic college preparatory school. Seventy percent of the schools study body is white. The school has 13 different advanced placement courses available for its students. Tuition costs students’ families approximately $11,000 annually. No financial aid information was available for this location. Eighty five percent of the schools graduates go directly into a four year college (information gathered from the schools website excluded to maintain confidentiality).

Coed School

The coed school selected was chosen due to its similar heavy academic focus, and its similar socioeconomic demographic as the two private schools. Since this school is a public school, analogous data to the other two schools was not available. Seventy two percent of the schools’ student population is white and 13% participate in the free or reduced price lunch program. Less than 2% of the schools population are English language learners. The school is rated with just below an 800 on the Academic
Performance Index (API), and has been awarded the prestigious “Blue Ribbon” award for bringing their API up above 800 in recent years. The coed schools’ district spends approximately $10,500 per pupil expenditure annually. The coed school is located in an affluent part of the city where the median housing value is $360,000, and approximately 75% of those living in the schools zip code are home owners. To provide a frame of reference another school in the same district, located in a different part of the city, has a median housing value of $164,000 (Great Schools Inc.).

Setting

The grades of the students surveyed varied from freshmen to seniors. The grade level varied from each school location; the classes surveyed in the all male school were all 10th grade theology classes, while the classes surveyed at both the all female and coed school were health classes consisting of mixed grade level students. The variation was due simply to availability. The classes themselves were selected due to the researcher’s access.

Procedure

The opt-out informed consent was sent to the teachers, or curriculum instructor, of each school two weeks prior to the start of the program. The consent letter provided a brief introduction to the researcher, explained the parameters of the study and the voluntary nature of the program.

The students were provided the pre test on the first day program after the researcher provided a brief introduction to herself and the program. The students were instructed to choose the option that best suited their own personal beliefs; and if they
were did not have an opinion on a question they were asked to select neutral rather than leaving any questions blank. The researcher reminded the students to be as honest as possible, and reminded them that their answers were confidential. The survey took students approximately seven minutes to complete. The students then participated in four days of one-hour in length class lessons which consisted of lecture and discussion on gender socialization, domestic violence, sexual assault, and social contributors such as mainstream media. The researcher incorporated PowerPoint presentations, video clips, activities and discussions (see Appendices E, F, G, and H) into the program. Students were provided the post survey on the fourth day of the program at the end of the period. The researcher provided the teachers the questionnaire to distribute to the students in the week following the program. The questionnaire took students approximately 10 minutes to complete.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the researcher strategically organized this study’s methodology maximize validity. The researcher incorporated two different sources of data collection, and framed both methods of collection with suggestions from authorities in data and design research. Additionally, the researcher pretested the study’s instruments to catch errors and ensure comprehension from a wide population. Lastly, the researcher of this study took particular care selecting the participant schools of similar demographic makeup, with comparable socioeconomic status, with analogous focus on academics.
Chapter 4

FINDINGS

This study examined survey data from 231 high school students: 115 students from an all male school, 46 male students from a coed school, and 70 students from an all female school. The goal of this study was to explore if students from one particular school context are more prone to endorsing sexist or egalitarian beliefs than from another context. Additionally, this study was designed to measure whether one school site was more resistant to changing options/beliefs pertaining to sexism after being provided with a four day program that consisted of lecture, videos, activates and class discussion on gender socialization, domestic violence and sexual assault, compared to the other two schools in the study. In order to accomplish the research objectives, three sources of information were incorporated; a 25 question pre and post Likert scale survey, a five question open ended questionnaire, and first hand observations conducted by the researcher.

**Qualitative Results**

The Likert scale survey was designed to measure if and what sexist beliefs, victim blaming attitudes, and knowledge pertaining to sexual assault that students possessed prior to, and immediately after, a four day educational program on gender socialization, sexual assault, and domestic violence. A T-Value, and pre mean, post mean, and in mean has been included to examine students’ knowledge and to measure the change by comparing pre and post test scores. For this study, statistical significance was a determined by a T-Value of three or above.
Sexist Verses Egalitarian Beliefs Data

Questions 4, 7, 16, and 17 were included on the survey to assess the percentage of the students in each school locale that endorse sexist ideology. Questions 6 and 10 were designed to assess the percentage of students that agree with overt egalitarian statements. Question 23 is neither a sexist or egalitarian statement; however, it was included to assess students’ awareness of sexism in society. Though the topic of sexism was discussed only generally, it was hoped that bringing attention to the socialized nature of gender would increase endorsement of egalitarian beliefs, and decrease endorsement of sexist ones. Sexism was also discussed in the context of how inequality in society promotes violence (see Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>School Group</th>
<th>Pre Mean</th>
<th>Post Mean</th>
<th>Change in Mean</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.261</td>
<td>3.339</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.28744</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>4.314</td>
<td>4.486</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.05716</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.073742</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.438</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0.061548</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>3.374</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.754663</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.479</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>4.186</td>
<td>4.443</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.007031</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>School Group</td>
<td>Pre Mean</td>
<td>Post Mean</td>
<td>Change in Mean</td>
<td>T-Score</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td>T-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>2.539</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>2.458</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.522</td>
<td>3.435</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>4.471</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>2.409</td>
<td>2.530</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>3.686</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>2.678</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td>-0.452</td>
<td>9.36E-06</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>4.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>-0.514</td>
<td>2.04E-06</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question # 4: Men make better political leaders than women do.** Pre presentation, 19% of the all male group, 25% of the coed male group, and 3% of the female group reported endorsement of the statement, "Men make better political leaders than women do" (see Appendix D, Graph 1). Thirty eight percent of the male group, 29% of the coed male group, and 82% of the female group reported disagreement with the sexist statement.
Post presentation, 16% of the all male group, 19% of the coed male group, and 3% of the female group reported agreement with the notion that men are better fit for politics than women. Forty five percent of the all male group, 50% of the male coed group, and 87% of the female group reported disagreement with the sexist statement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 1). Though none of the groups showed a statistically significant change, the group with the highest degree of change was the all female group (T-Value 1.91). The group with the lowest degree of change was the coed male group (T-Value 0.50).

**Question # 6: When making decisions, women handle pressure just as well as men.** Pre presentation, 49% of the all male group, 23% of the male coed group, and 61% of the female group reported agreement with the statement, “When making decisions, women handle pressure just as well as men” (see Appendix D, Graph 2). Twenty six percent of the all male group, 44% of the male coed group, and 9% of the female group reported disagreement with the egalitarian statement.

Post presentation, 60% of the all male group, 37% of the male coed group, and 9% of the female group reported that agreed that, women can handle pressure just as well as men when making decisions. Twenty one percent of the all male group, 40% of the male coed group, and 9% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 2). The group demonstrating the greatest positive movement was the all girls group (T-Value 1.88). The male group demonstrating the least positive movement was the male coed group (T-Value 1.51). Interestingly, both boys groups showed a small degree of negative movement.
Question # 7: In a healthy family structure, a husband earns more money than his wife. Pre presentation, 16% of the all male group, 12% of the male coed group, and 6% of the female group reported endorsement in the statement, “In a healthy family structure, a husband earns more money than his wife.” Forty four percent of the all male group, 48% of the male coed group, and 81% of the female group reported disagreement with the sexist statement (see Appendix D, Graph 3). Post presentation, 15% of the all male group, 21% of the male coed group, and 0% of the female group reported endorsement in the sexist belief that man should be the family’s breadwinner. Forty seven percent of the all male group, 38% of the male coed group, and 91% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation statement (see Appendix D, Graph 3). The group to demonstrate the greatest positive change was the all girls group (T-Value 2.73). The male group demonstrating the least positive movement was the male coed group (T-Value 0.12). The coed male population demonstrated considerable negative movement. While the all male group began with the greatest percentage of endorsement in the sexist statement pre presentation and demonstrated only a minute drop in endorsement with the statement post, the coed demonstrated a 9% increase in endorsement with the sexist statement post presentation, resulting in the greatest percentage of endorsement post.

Question # 10: If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework. Pre presentation, 51% of the all male group, 53% of the male coed group, and 82% of the female group agreed that, “If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework.” Nineteen
percent of the all male group, 13% of the male coed group, and 3% of the female group reported agreeing with the sexist statement (see Appendix D, Graph 4).

Post presentation, 56% of the all male group, 61% of the male coed group, and 76% of the female group reported agreeing that both adults in a relationship should contribute equally to household chores. Sixteen percent of the all male group, 15% of the male coed group, and 3% of the female group reported agreement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 4). Though no group showed significant movement post presentation the all female group did show the most movement (T-Value 0.68). The group to demonstrate the least movement was the all male group (T-Value 0.32). However, all three groups, girls included, did show some negative movement for this question.

**Question # 16: In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in making household decisions.** Pre presentation, 11% of the all male group, 12% of the male coed group, and 1% of the female group reported endorsement of the statement, “In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in making household decisions.” Fifty three percent of the all male group, 58% of the male coed group, and 95% of the female group reported disagreement with the sexist statement (Appendix D, Graph 5).

Post presentation, both male groups demonstrated a 17% agreement in the ideology that the male of the household should possess the greatest household authority. Again 1% of the female group reported agreement with the statement. Fifty two percent of the all male group, 50% of the male coed group, and 95% of the female
group reported disagreement post presentation. The post presentation results represent a 5% increase in acceptance of the sexist statement for the coed male group, and a 6% increase for the male group (see Appendix D, Graph 5). None of the groups showed statistically significant movement. The all female group showed the greatest movement (T-Value 1.182), while the all male group demonstrated the least (T-Value 1.019).

**Question # 17: Men are naturally more dominant and powerful than women.** Pre presentation, 67% of the all male group, 65% of the male coed group, and 36% of the female group reported endorsement of the statement, “Men are naturally more dominant and powerful than women.” Fifteen percent of the all male group, 18% of the male coed group, and 48% of the female group reported rejection of the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 6).

Post presentation, 58% of the all male group, 53% of the male coed group, and 24% of the female group reported agreement in the belief that dominance and power is a natural product of maleness. Twenty one percent of the all male group, 21% of the male coed group, and 61% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 6). The group that demonstrated the greatest degree of positive change was the all female group (T-Value 2.25). The group demonstrating the least amount of positive change was the male coed group (T-Value 0.92), noticeably lower than the all male group (T-Value 1.33).

**Question # 23: The media regularly depicts women as inferior, less competent, or less valuable than men.** Pre presentation, 50% of the all male group,
33% of the male coed group, and 73% of the female group reported agreement with the statement, “The media regularly depicts women as inferior, less competent, or less valuable than men.” Twenty one percent of the all male group, 17% of the male coed group, and 11% of the female group reported disagreement with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 7).

Post presentation, 70% of the all male group, 65% of the male coed group, and 86% of the female group reported agreeing that media portrays women in a sexist manner. Eleven percent of the all male group, 19% of the male coed group, and 2% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 7). All three groups showed statistically significant movement. The group to show the greatest movement was the all female group (T-Value 4.959), followed by the all male group (T-Value 4.534). The male coed group demonstrated the least movement (3.403).

Sexist Verses Egalitarian Beliefs Conclusion

Questions 4, 7, 16, and 17 were sexist statements aimed at attaining the least percentage of agreement, equating an egalitarian attitude. The pre, which represents the summation of all of the values divided by the number pre presentation, signifies where the bulk of the group answered the question. While the coed male group demonstrated the lowest pre mean in question four, the all male group demonstrated the lowest pre mean for questions seven, 16, and 17. Therefore, the all male group went into the program with the highest endorsement of sexist attitudes for three out of four sexist statements. Questions six and 10 were egalitarian statements aimed at
attaining the greatest percentage of agreement. The all male group demonstrated the
greatest pre mean, out of all three groups, for both questions six and 10, representing
the greatest rejection of egalitarian ideology. Question 23 was included to assess
students’ recognition of the sexism that they are assumingly regularly exposed to by
media. The coed male group demonstrated the lowest pre mean for question 23,
representing the greatest oblivion of media sexism.

The all male group demonstrated the lowest post mean for victim blaming
questions, 4, 16, and 17, and the coed group for question four; representing the
students left the presentation with a high endorsement of sexist beliefs. For the
egalitarian statements, the all male group again demonstrated the greatest post mean,
representative of the greatest rejection of egalitarianism. For question 23, the media
awareness statement, the coed male group again answered with the highest post mean.
The change in mean is representative of the groups’ willingness to change beliefs after
being introduced to information. A positive change in mean for the negative
statements (4, 7, 16 & 17) indicates that the post mean score was higher than
the pre mean score, equating the population disagreed more with the statement post
presentation. Of the two male populations, the greater change for the negative sexist
statements was demonstrated by the all male group for questions 7, 16, and 17. The
coed male group demonstrated the greater change in mean for question number four.
For the positively phrased statements (6, 10 & 23), the coed male group demonstrated
a greater change in mean for questions six and 10. For question 23, the all male
demonstrated a greater positive change in mean.
The all female group was the only group to demonstrate consistency in the way they answered the questions both pre and post the presentation. For the negatively phrased questions (4, 7, 16 & 17), the all female group demonstrated the greatest pre mean for all four questions, indicating the greatest disagreement with the sexist statements prior to the presentation. The all female group also demonstrated the lowest pre mean for all three positively phrased questions (6, 10 & 23), again indicating the greatest agreement with the egalitarian statements and their awareness of sexism in the media. Even with the all female group beginning the program with such a large rejection of sexism and victim blaming, the all female group still managed to show the greatest positive change, out of all three groups, for questions six, 7, 17, and 23. The female group demonstrated a great willingness to change their attitudes, after being introduced to the curriculum.

**Sexual Assault and Victim Blaming Data**

Questions 15 and 22 were included to assess whether students possessed basic misconceptions pertaining to sexual assault. Question 15 addresses the misconception that sexual assault is a crime that only plagues women and misconception that when a man is sexually assaulted, it is because he is wimpy of even gay. Question 22 addresses the misconception that the majority of rapes occur by the hands of a stranger; as is frequently portrayed by the media.

Questions 8, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25 were included to assess the percentage of the students who endorsed victim blaming attitudes and assess how malleable the beliefs are once discussed in a classroom setting. Four categories of
victim blaming myths, borrowed from the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1994) were used to assess students’ belief system pertaining to sexual assault. Category one, “She asked for it,” relies on the belief that a victim provokes the assault (McMahon, 2010, p. 6). Questions 14, 21 and question 25 were classified as “she asked for it,” victim blaming ideology. The second victim blaming category, “It wasn’t really rape,” reflects a belief that only a narrow definition; one where a rapist uses force and the victim vigorously attempts to kick and fight, is valid rape (McMahon, 2010, p. 6). Questions 8 and 20 invoke “It wasn’t really rape” ideology (McMahon, 2010, p. 6). The third victim blaming category, “The victim lied” relies on the perception that victims “make it up” either to get attention or get back at someone (McMahon, 2010). Question 9 reflects “The victim lied” ideology. Lastly, category four, “He didn’t mean to,” reflects the perception that the rapist accidentally committed the rape, either due to uncontrollable desires for sex, or intoxication (McMahon, 2010, p. 6). Questions 19 and 24 reflect “He didn’t mean to,” ideology (McMahon, 2010, p. 6) (see Table 3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>School Group</th>
<th>Pre Mean</th>
<th>Post Mean</th>
<th>Change in Mean</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any woman in good physical shape can successfully resist a rapist if she really tried.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.626</td>
<td>3.626</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.396</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>3.743</td>
<td>4.014</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>A large percentage of women who report rape do so to get attention or to get back at a guy.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.661</td>
<td>3.817</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>3.604</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>If a girl gets drunk at a party, flirts with a guy, passes out and is sexually assaulted, she is somewhat responsible for the sexual assault.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>3.165</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.021</td>
<td>3.354</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>4.029</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Any man can be a victim of a sexual assault.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>1.791</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>The reason most rapists commit rape is sex.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>8.0E-11</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>6.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>4.443</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>7.44E-06</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>If a rape victim does not resist the attack, it isn’t really rape.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.670</td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.03928</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>4.443</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>7.44E-06</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>When women go out wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are asking for sex.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.226</td>
<td>3.635</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>3.46E-05</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>4.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>3.521</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>1.23E-06</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.191</td>
<td>3.730</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>8.29E-05</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>4.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>3.938</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>3.843</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>1.01E-05</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>School Group</td>
<td>Pre Mean</td>
<td>Post Mean</td>
<td>Change in Mean</td>
<td>T-Score</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td>T-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sex offenders usually commit sexual crimes because they are under the influence of alcohol.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>3.635</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.0113</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.292</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>4.186</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>4.19E-14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If a guy pays for a date he deserves something in return.</td>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>3.765</td>
<td>3.739</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.7341</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed Boys</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question # 8: Any woman in good physical shape can successfully resist a rapist if she really tried.** Prior to the presentation, 13% of the all male population, 31% of the coed male population, and 15% of the female population agreed that, “Any woman in good physical shape can successfully resist a rapist if she really tried.” Interestingly, the male boys group answered the victim blaming statement with a lower percentage of agreement than the all female group. Sixty two percent of the all male group, 52% of the coed male and 67% of the female group stated they disagreed with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 8).

Post presentation, 20% of the all male group, 27% of the coed male group and 12% of the female group demonstrated endorsement of the statement. Sixty two percent of the all male group, 50% of the coed group, and 76% of the female group reported post presentation that they disagreed with the concept that a victim of a sexual assault could resist the a rape if they actually tried to (see Appendix D, Graph 8). Additionally, though none of the groups showed statistically significant change, the group with the highest degree of change was the all female group (T-Value 2.20). The group with the lowest degree of change was the all male group (T-Value: 0.00).
Question # 9: A large percentage of women who report rape do so to get attention or to get back at a guy. Prior to the presentation, 12% of the all male group, 15% of the coed male group, and 4% of the female group reported agreeing that, “A large percentage of women who report rape do so to get attention or to get back at a guy.” Sixty percent of the all male group, 50% of the coed male group and 71% of the female group reported that they disagreed with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 9).

Post presentation, 12% of the all male group, 21% of the coed male group, and 2% of the female group responded that they agreed with the statement. The coed male group remained the dominant population to endorse the concept that rape is frequently falsely reported, showing a 9% greater agreement than the all male school. The male coed group also showed a 6% increase of students who reported that they agree that women report rape for attention or retaliation. Interestingly, though zero students selected “strongly agree” prior to the presentation, 6% selected “strongly agree” post presentation. Post presentation, 69% of the all male group, 58% of the coed male group and 87% of the female group reported rejecting the victim blaming statement (see Appendix D, Graph 9). The only group to demonstrate statistically significant movement was the all female group (T-Value 3.72). The group that demonstrated the least degree of change was the coed male group (T-Value: 0.136).

Question # 14: If a girl gets drunk at a party, flirts with a guy, passes out and is sexually assaulted, she is somewhat responsible for the sexual assault. Prior to the presentation, 41% of the all male group, 46% of the coed male group, and 8%
of the female group reported agreeing that, “If a girl gets drunk at a party, flirts with a
guy, passes out and is sexually assaulted, she is somewhat responsible for the sexual
assault.” Additionally, 31% of the all male group, 42% of the coed male group, and
8% of the female group reported disagreeing with the statement (see Appendix D,
Graph 10).

Post presentation, 34% of the all male group, 33% of the coed male group, and
7% of the female group reported agreement with the notion that a victim bears some
responsibility for a sexual assault if he/she makes him/herself particularly vulnerable.
Post presentation 45% of the all male group, 50% of the coed male, and 81% of the
female group reported rejection of the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 10). Though
none of the groups showed statistically significant change to question 14, the group
with the highest degree of change was demonstrated by the all female group (T-Value
2.86). The all female group may have demonstrated small movement due to high
percentage that reported disagreement with the statement in the pre test. Interestingly,
the percentage of the female group that agreed with the statement also increased
slightly. The group with the lowest degree of change was the all male group (T-Value:
1.68), though not significantly lower than the coed male group (T-Value: 1.78).

**Question # 15: Any man can be a victim of a sexual assault.** Prior
presentation, 82% of the all male group, 73% of the male coed group, and 90% of the
female group reported agreeing with the statement, “Any man can be a victim of a
sexual assault. Eight percent of the all male group, 10% of the male coed group, and
3% of the female group reported disagreement with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 11).

Post presentation, 91% of the all male group, 82% of the male coed group, and 96% of the female group reported agreeing that sexual assault is not just a crime that plagues women. Six percent of both male groups and 3% of the all female group reported disagreeing with the statement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 11). The group to show the most movement was the all female group (T-Value 4.224). The male coed group showed the least movement (T-Value 1.552), notably lower than the all male group (T-Value 2.985).

**Question # 19: The reason most rapists commit rape is for sex.** Prior to presentation, 40% of the all male group, 59% of the male coed group, and 34% of the female group reported agreement with the statement, “The reason most rapists commit rape is for sex.” Thirty four percent of the all male group, 23% of the male coed group, and 45% of the female group reported disagreement with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 12).

Post presentation, 14% of the all male group, 14% of the male coed group, and 4% of the female group reported agreeing that rape is motivated by sex. Seventy six percent of the all male group, 69% of the male coed group, and 93% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 12). All three groups demonstrated statistically significant change. The group with the greatest change was the all female group (T-Value 6.827), followed by the all male group (T-
Value 6.827). Though not considerably smaller than the all male T-Value, the coed male group demonstrated the smallest degree of change (T-Value 6.082.)

**Question # 20: If a rape victim does not resist the attack, it isn’t really rape.** Prior to the presentation, 18% of the all male group, 19% of the coed male group, and 18% of the female group reported that they agreed, “If a rape victim does not resist the attack, it isn’t really rape.” Fifty one percent of the all male group, 52% of the coed group, and 82% of the female group reported that they disagreed with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 13).

Post presentation all three schools again answered agreement to the notion that rape only occurs if there is a violent struggle, in very close percentages. Eleven percent of the all male group, 10% of the coed group, and 8% of the female group reported agreeing with victim blaming statement (see Appendix D, Graph 13). All three schools demonstrated a significant drop their agreement with the victim blaming statement. Additionally, 74% of the all male group, 82% of the coed male group, and 89% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation. The comparison of pre and post test for question 20 revealed statistically significant movement for the female group (4.65 T-Value), and the coed male group (3.06 T-Value) though not for all male group (2.07 T-Value).

**Question # 21: When women go out wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are asking for sex.** Prior to the presentation, 25% of the all male group, 27% of the coed male group, and 14% of the all female group reported agreement with the statement, “When women go out wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are asking
for sex.” Forty seven percent of the all male group, 50% of the coed male group, and 69% of the female group reported disagreement with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 14).

Post presentation, 13% of the all male group, 16% of the coed male group, and 4% of the female group reported agreement in the notion that girls increase their vulnerability to sexual assault by inviting sexual attention. Sixty one percent of the all male group, 57% of the coed male group, and 90% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 14). Though the all female group did demonstrate the most significant movement (T-Value 5.07), the all male group demonstrated statistically significant movement as well (T-Value 4.22). The group that demonstrated the least degree of movement was the coed male group (T-Value 1.43).

**Question # 22: Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers.** Pre presentation, 26% of the all male group, 42% of the male coed group, and 7% of the female group reported agreement that, “Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers.” Thirty seven percent of the all male group, 29% of the male coed group, and 68% of the female group reported disagreement with the statement (see Appendix D, Graph 15).

Post presentation, 16% of the all male group, 8% of the male coed group, and 2% of the female group reported disagreeing that the majority of sexual assault perpetrators and strangers to the victim. Seventy three percent of the all male group, 79% of the male coed group, and 95% of the female group reported disagreement post
presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 15). All three groups demonstrated statistically significant change. The greatest change came from the all coed male group (T-Value 5.744) followed girls group (T-Value 4.584). The all male group, though showed the least change, still presented statistical significance (T-Value 4.004).

Question # 24: Sex offenders usually commit sexual crimes because they are under the influence of alcohol. Though question 24, “Sex offenders usually commit sexual crimes because they are under the influence of alcohol,” does not directly place blame on victims of sexual assault, the question was designed to gage justification for a sexual assault when alcohol is involved. Such ideology is frequently used to rationalize and minimize a perpetrators’ assault (Katz, 2006).

Prior to the presentation, 15% of the all male group, 19% of the coed male group, and 28% of the female group reported agreeing with the statement. Forty four percent of the all male group, 41% of the coed male group, and 32% of the female group reported disagreement with the statement. Interestingly prior to the presentation, 13% more of the all female group, than the all male group, agreed that sexual assault is a crime motivated by alcohol usage (see Appendix D, Graph 16).

Post presentation, 13% of the all male group, 6% of the coed male group, and 4% of the female group reported agreement with the notion that sexual assault is at least in part motivated by alcohol use. Sixty six percent of the all male group, 63% of the coed male group, and 84% of the female group reported disagreement post presentation (see Appendix D, Graph 16). The group to show the largest degree of change was the all female group (T-Value: 8.42). The all female response to this
question represented the greatest movement out of all three groups; and also showed
the greatest degree of movement of all the questions on the survey. Interestingly,
neither male group showed a statistically significantly change. The group to show the
least degree of change was the coed male group (T-Value: 2.44).

**Question # 25: If a guy pays for a date he deserves something in return.**

Prior to presentation, 9% of the all male group, 15% of the coed male group, and 4%
of the female group reported agreeing, “If a guy pays for a date he deserves something
in return.” Seventy two percent of the all male group, 60% of the coed male group,
and 87% of the female group reported disagreement with the victim blaming
statement (see Appendix D, Graph 17).

The statement in question 25 implies females are obligated to perform a sexual
activity for a male, if the male pays for the date. Post the presentation, 22% of the all
male group, 6% of the male coed group, and 0% of the female group reported
endorsement in the statement. 69% of the all male group, 65% of the coed male group,
and 95% of the all female group reported disagreement post presentation (see
Appendix D, Graph 17). The group that demonstrated statistically significant
movement was the all female group (T-Value 2.81). The group that demonstrated the
least degree of movement was the all male group (T-Value: 0.34).

**Victim Blaming Data Conclusion**

Of the seven victim blaming statements that were included on the survey, the
coed male group responded with the greatest percentage of endorsement to all of them
prior to the presentation. The male coed group showed to have the lowest pre mean of
the three groups in response to questions 8, 9, 24, and 25; reaffirming that the male coed group went into the program with high endorsement of victim blaming ideology. The male coed group remained the group with the lowest post mean for questions eight, 9, and 21; indicating the male coed group left the program with high endorsement the victim statements. The coed male group showed a higher change in mean than the all male group for questions 8, 14, 20, 24, and 25. For questions 14 and 25, the coed male groups’ change in mean was even higher than the all female group. The positive change in mean indicates there was a general decrease in acceptance of the victim blaming statements post presentation. The coed male group showed a larger T-Value than the all male group for questions 8, 14, 20 and 25; representing greater positive movement. The only question that the male coed group showed to have statistical significance for was question 20.

The all male group demonstrated the lowest pre mean only for question 21. The all male group demonstrated the lowest post mean for questions 14, 20, 24, and 25. The all male group demonstrated a higher degree of change than the coed male group for questions nine and 21; indicating a stronger decrease in victim blaming attitudes for these two questions. However, for questions eight, 14, 20, 24, and 25 the all male group showed the smallest change in mean; indicating the least positive change out of all three groups. For question 25, the change in mean resulted in a negative number; indicating the population answered the statement with greater disagreement, prior to the presentation.
The all female group was the only group to demonstrate consistent responses to the victim blaming questions. The female group showed the greatest mean in every statement with the exception of question 24; indicating the females went into the program with a high rejection of victim blaming attitudes. Post presentation, the all female group showed the greatest mean out of all three groups, for all seven victim blaming questions; indicating they left the program with high rejection of victim blaming attitudes. The all female group was also the only group to demonstrate consistent high positive movement. The all female group responded with the highest T-Value out of all three groups, for every question. The lowest T-Value the all female group demonstrated was a 2.202, for which the female group initially answered in 67% agreement, allowing little room for positive movement. The all female group also showed demonstrated having the highest positive change in mean, out of all three groups, for all of the victim blaming questions except questions 14 and 25.

**Opened-Ended Questionnaire Results**

The student assessment of program open ended questionnaire was designed to evaluate students’ perceptions of the four day program including what they felt they gained from the program, what they did not like about the program, and how they felt about the educator who presented the material. The questionnaire consisted of six different prompts intended to encourage students to reflect and evaluate the program and the educator. The six questions were as follows;

1. What did you like best about the program? Why?

2. What did you like least about the program? Why?
3. Did you find the presentations interesting/educational? Explain.

4. Did the educator treat the sessions seriously and the students with respect?

5. What are your educator’s presentational strengths?

6. If this educator presents again, what suggestions for you have for improvement?

Two hundred and thirty seven questionnaires were included in the study; 96 from the all boys school, 53 male students from the coed male population, and 88 students from the all female school. The 56 questionnaires filled out from the female students at the all coed school were not included in the study to allow a focus on the two male groups.

The questionnaire was analyzed using thematic approach. A grid was constructed from the reoccurring themes that emerged, and then tallies were taken. The questionnaires were examined as a whole, rather than the individual questions. If a student mentioned that they felt the presenter was sexist in question one, this would be grouped together with another student that mentioned that the educator was sexist in response to question two. Additionally, if a student mentioned the same comment in two different questions, it was only counted once. Examining the questionnaires as a whole rather than comparing individual question responses, allowed the researcher to gather a more accurate picture of the proportion of students that possessed a particular opinion of the project. Noteworthy themes that emerged from the questionnaire included; the topic of sexism and media, the concept of power and authority,
presentation bias, generating or diminishing an environment of free expression, liking or disliking the educators’ personality, and the topic of victim blaming (see Table 4).

Table 4

Assessment of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Program</th>
<th>All Male (96 questionnaires)</th>
<th>Coed Male (53 questionnaires)</th>
<th>All Female (88 questionnaires)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexism in media (Liked)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism in media (Disliked)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected opinions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not feel opinion was respected</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias/One sided</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist/Derogatory towards men</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked focus of victim blaming content</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like focus of victim blaming content</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked the educators attitude</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous/Entertaining</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice/Friendly/ Great attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to relate to</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like the educators attitude</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude/Mean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to “lighten up”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fun/entertaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessed strength/ Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack control of classroom</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sexism and media segment of the program was found to be a very popular topic at the all female school. Twenty two, out of the 88 students at the all female school, reported on the questionnaires that they greatly enjoyed the media portion of the presentation. A sophomore student explained, “The part of the program that I liked the best was the final segment when we looked at the attitudes towards females displayed by media. I liked this best because it really supported everything we had been talking about, using modern examples.” Several students at the all female school described that they felt that they greatly benefited from learning about sexism in media. A sophomore explained, “I liked the part when we analyzed the lyrics to popular songs- it really revealed a lot about how subtle things can influence a lot of people.” One senior described that her favorite part of the program was, “When we were shown the song lyrics and advertisements and how they affected us. The contrast of advertisements from the mid 20th century compared to today was highly effective.” Students at the all female school not only mentioned that they liked learning about sexism in media because they found it interesting, but several students also mentioned that they appreciated that the program gave them an opportunity to critically examine and discuss popular culture.

A sophomore at the all female school explained, “I liked the last day when we looked at lyrics and media photos because it caused me to really look at my surroundings.” Another student described, “I found the advertisement information really interesting and I learned a lot of stuff about the hidden meanings of song and
ads that I see and hear every day.” In addition to the 22 students from the all female school that mentioned they enjoyed the sexism in media segment, two students at the school mentioned they did not entirely enjoy the sexism in media curriculum. A freshman female described, “I felt like it was it was good to know what songs are saying and the bad messages, but it seemed like you were bashing on them too much. Some people enjoy the music.” One student also described that she felt that discussion did explain how much of popular media has an oppressive tone to it, however she did not appreciate that there was not much discussion of what one could do to combat the media sexism.

Four out of the 53 male coed students indicated on their questionnaires that they enjoyed the media segment of the program. One freshman explained, “I liked the parts where we learned about sexism in lyrics. It was interesting.” A sophomore described in that what he liked best was, “That dove and Axe are owned by the same company, and Axe is like panty drop and Dove is nice and casual.” Another sophomore described simply what he liked was, “The pictures and the song references.” The fourth student that reported liking the media segment reported that what he liked best was, “The ad of the butts on the doors to the terminal.” It is unclear if the student was indicating that he simply found that particular ad entertaining, or if the student was attempting to be patronizing by indicating that the only part of the program he found enjoyable was the image of the partially naked woman’s buttocks.

In addition to the four students that commented appreciating some aspect of the media and sexism discussion, three students from the male coed group mentioned
that they did not like that segment of the presentation. One junior described what he
did not like was, “the photos because it made women look cheap and expendable.” A
sophomore explained that what he did not like was, “when she talked about songs.”
The last mention of the media and sexism material was a comment in response to a
short class discussion on “Bitch Skateboards.” Bitch Skateboards is skate brand that
targets male consumers. The company’s icon is a male stick figure holding a gun
against the head of a female stick figure. The student referenced this discussion in the
“additional comments” section of the questionnaire. The junior explained, “I figured
out why I felt the “Bitch skateboard” wasn’t really meant to degrade women. The
name of the company is making fun of another company; ‘Girl Skateboard.’ The
derogatory word for girl is bitch. Therefore, it is degrading the other skateboard brand,
not meant to degrade women.” No other students from the coed male group made
comments in regards to the media segment.

Interestingly, from the all male school questionnaire, only one student out of
96 referenced the media and sexism content of the program on the questionnaire
positively. The one student wrote that what he liked best was, “learning about
domestic violence and media.” In addition to the single student that indicated he
enjoyed the media segment, three students from the school indicated that they did not
appreciate that part of the program. On sophomore explained, “I didn’t like that we
kind of put down rap music. Not all rappers have the intention to put down women.”
Another student wrote in the additional comments section, “The media stuff was all
just her opinion. She should keep facts and opinion separate.” The last mention of the
media segment was from a student that described what he liked least was, “The portion on the involvement of media. Some of the songs that she spoke of are subject to opinion by all.” The same student also responded in a different portion of the questionnaire that his suggestions for the educators improvement was, “Deleting the comments about ‘303.’ That song is subject to opinion, not fact.” The students’ comment was in reference to a short discussion of the song, “Don't Trust Me.”” The lyrics to the song sing, “Shush girl, shut your lips, Do the Helen Keller and talk with your hips. Don't trust a ho. Never trust a ho.” No other students from the male coed group made comments regarding the media segment.

**Respect**

A second notable theme that emerged from the questionnaire was the mention of the students feeling that educator was or was not respectful of students’ different opinions. In response to the question “Did the educator treat the students with respect?” 85 students out of 88 at the all female school responded “yes,” three students responded “yes and no,” and one student responded “no.” At the all male school 80 students out of the 96, responded “yes” they believed the educator treated the class with respect, 9 responded “yes and no” or “kind of,” nine responded “no” and two left the question blank. At the male coed school, 45 of the male students out of 53 responded “yes” they did feel the educator treated the students with respect, 8 students commented “yes and no” or “kind of” and 3 students responded “no,” she did not.

In addition to directly responding yes or no many students from all three locations commented on feeling comfortable or uncomfortable participating in the
classroom discussion, voicing their personal thoughts and feelings on the topics. The school with the greatest number of students that mentioned that they felt they educator was successful in constructing a forum for open expression was the all female school. Twenty five students at the all female school commented they enjoyed that that there was a large focus on hearing the opinions of the students, including 9 students that specifically mentioned that the educator did not force her opinions on anyone. One freshman female explained, “I liked the fact that she was nice and encouraged us to speak our opinions.” A similar sentiment was described by a sophomore who explained, “Yes, she gives everyone respect, regardless of their beliefs. She remained unbiased and although one could guess some of her viewpoints, she was not aggressive with them and never came right out and expressed her beliefs, making for a more peaceful environment. She was also very enthusiastic.” Another sophomore female reiterated the construction of an environment open to discussion, “She treated the sessions seriously and spoke without criticism to all the students – this was especially apparent when she called on students to hear their varying opinions. She never blatantly disagreed or discredited their thoughts.” A freshman explained, in response to the question, did the educator treat the students with respect, “Yes she did. Even if a student’s opinion differed from her own opinion, she would respect them for it.” However, not every student did feel comfortable voicing their opinion.

Five students from the all female school mentioned that they did not feel comfortable voicing their opinions on the subjects presented. One senior explained, “There wasn’t anything that I disliked. However, I felt like it was hard for me to
explain my opinion when I was the minority.” One freshman described that she felt the researcher, “Pressured us to think your way, like it was the only right way, even though it is just your opinion. I mostly agreed with your opinion though.” Another freshman reflected this same impression when she explained what she did not like about the program was, “Sometimes I would comment on a topic, but my comment wouldn’t seem as important as others. I felt like at times when I said something the educator would disregard it or just head nod. That was fine but when you would talk to other people and spend more time with them, it seemed like you were being selective and only listening to some people. This discouraged me from taking part in the conversation. Also, I felt like even though you didn’t want to tell us what to think, you were really pushing us to think your way.” No other comments were made from the all female group regarding an environment allowing or inhibiting genuine discussion.

The theme of the educator allowing an environment of respect was mentioned heavily from the all male school students. Ten students at the all male school mentioned that the educator made them feel comfortable asserting their opinions and felt their different perspectives were valued, including four students who mentioned that they appreciated that the structure of the program encouraged authentic discussion. One sophomore explained what he liked about the program was, “The activities because you could express yourself. She accepted all opinions.” Similarly, another sophomore commented that what he liked best about the program was the, “Seriousness of the subject and how the instructor increasingly asked for class participation.” One sophomore commented that he thought the educators
presentational strengths were that, “She created an atmosphere for freedom of expression.” One sophomore student also commented that one of the educator’s strengths was, “She had the presentation memorized. …Allowed for difference in opinion- Yes she let us talk about our own thoughts then told us facts.” Although many students at the male felt respected, many also did not.

Seven students from the all male school commented that they did not feel comfortable voicing their opinions on the subjected presented. One sophomore explained that although he agreed the educator treated the students with respect, “She just didn’t answer questions that she didn’t like.” Another sophomore explained that what he liked least about the program was, “Sometimes differences of opinion was somewhat looked down upon.” Of the seven that mentioned not all opinions where accepted by the educator, two students commented that they felt the educator attempted to force her opinions on the students. One sophomore explained that what he did not like was, “The person who came. She didn’t take into consideration what students said and forced what she believed on students.” This student described in the additional comments section that a suggestion for the educator was to provide less opinion in the presentation.

Seven students from the coed male group made comments on their questionnaires regarding feeling comfortable to honestly voice their opinions on the topics presented. In response to the question, “did the educator treat the students with respect,” a sophomore described, “Yes, she let people have their own opinions.” Another sophomore described, “I like how she let us tell her our thoughts and then
pointed out what makes them wrong.” A junior described what he liked about the program was, “The educator was cool. She treated us like equals, making it easier to talk to her. And she didn’t look at us judgmentally when we would ask weird questions, or when we would tell her we disagreed with her.” A senior explained, “She is very straight forward, and opens up the conversation to all sides of an argument. She doesn’t shy away from anything, so we got to have a really honest discussion.” Though seven students commented that they did like the open environment of the program, several students commented that they did not feel comfortable speaking their minds.

Three students from the coed male group commented on their questionnaires that they felt their opinions were not respected during the class sessions including one student who also commented that he felt the educator attempted to push her beliefs on the class. A senior male described that he liked least about the program was, “having to sit through it because you were trying to shove ideas into our heads.” The other two students commented not feeling comfortable voicing their opinions. One freshman explained, “She lectured like her information was all facts, though it was clearly just her opinion. And when we would tell her we disagreed, she would try to get people that disagreed to jump in and argue you over it.” No other students from the male coed group commented on feeling comfortable or uncomfortable voicing their thoughts during the program.
Bias

A third interesting theme that emerged from the questionnaire responses was bias of the material presented, or of the educator presenting it. The theme of bias was mentioned most frequently on the all male school questionnaires. Of the 96 all male school questionnaires, 21 students commented that they felt the educator was “biased,” “one sided,” or “sexist.” One sophomore described that was liked least was, “The statistics didn’t provide an accurate and fair information; they seemed influenced by bias.” Another sophomore reflected the same opinion in his comment describing that what he did liked least was, “I found the presentation to be too ‘one sided.’ I think that there were too many simplification of the matter.” Another sophomore described, “I felt like you were constantly favoring women’s right and were biased against men.” In addition to students mentioning bias, six students commented that they felt the educator was “sexist” or “derogatory towards men.” One sophomore explained in the suggestions for improvement section of the questionnaire, “Try to understand what guys think and try to be less sexist.” A sophomore described that what he liked least was, “I felt like the program was a little sexist towards guys and especially because (School #3) is an all boys school I thought it should have been toned down a little bit to accommodate us respectfully.” In addition to students commenting on bias and sexism, six students also mentioned that what they liked least about the program was that the educator was a feminist. In his description of what he did not like about the program, one sophomore explained, “The feminist points of view on sexuality.” Another student reflected the same opinion when he described that what he did not
like about the program was, “The speaker because she was a feminist- SEXIST!!!”

Two students even mentioned in their suggestions section that the educator should be less hateful to men.

At the coed school four male students made comments on their questionnaires that they found the program or educator to have “bias.” Though no male students at the coed school specifically mentioned the program to be “sexist” four students mentioned they found the program or educator to be anti-male. One junior explained what he didn’t like about the program was, “Most of the presentation by its creation was anti-male.” One junior male student described what he suggested for the educator was, “Don’t man bash.” Another junior reiterated this perception when he described that he also did not like that, “Most of the presentation, by fact of its creation, was anti-male.” In addition to students mentioning sexism, two students commented that what they did not like was the feminism present in the presentations. One junior responded that what he liked the least was, “Feminist (Sexist) - ☹️ whatever you call it.” One freshman male reflected this feeling in his comment that what he suggests for the educator is she presents again is to, “Not to be so feminist and hate on guys as much.” In the section asking students to describe the educators strengths one sophomore explained, “Her strengths are pointing out the flaws in men. Yes a feminist rally would be perfect.” Additionally, one student commented that he felt the program was “derogatory” towards men.

Sentiment about the program being sexist, biased, or one sided was reflected the least in the questionnaire comments at the all girls school. One student mentioned
that she did not like that, “The gender stereotyping was kind of biased.” Though no student at the all female school mentioned that they felt the educator was “sexist,” “feminist” or a “man hater” four students did comment that they felt there was not enough discussion of men as victims or of females as perpetrators. One freshman female described what she liked least was, “Talking about sexual assault and rape and how it all seemed to revolve around women. This happens to men too, but you did not talk about it very much.”

**Victim Blaming**

The theme of curriculum bias also presented itself in students’ comments regarding the discussion of victim blaming. Five students from the all male school commented that there was not enough blame placed on the victim, during the discussion of rape. One sophomore described that he what he didn’t like in the program was that, “It seemed a little biased at time. Especially among the faults of rape.” Another sophomore described a similar opinion in his statement “Some of the cases seemed to let the victim seem blameless although the victim is partially responsible.” One student commented that his suggestion for what the educator could improve upon was explaining “both sides; perpetrator and victim.” One sophomore explained that he did not like, “That we never talked about the girls at fault.” Similarly another sophomore reflected a similar opinion of the victim blaming segment in his comment, “She was very sexist and it showed in her hate towards men. Everything was the man’s fault and the girls were angels.” Comments regarding the *blame game* emerged from the all girls’ school as well, though only the only comments reflected
perceived bias in the way the content was presented. A 10th grade female at the all girls school explained, “I felt like the victim blaming section was a little biased. I believe that a girl who gets drunk and passes out is 100% accountable for her rape. However, I also believe that a rapist is 200% accountable. There is plenty of blame to go around.” The only other student from the all female school that described she disagreed with the focus of the blame game, also mentioned that she appreciated aspects of the victim blaming information. The sophomore explained, “Although I learned a lot more information about analyzing where fault lies in situations, which helped me open my eyes a little more, I am still convinced of my previous opinions.”

Zero students of the male coed group made comments in regards to disliking the egalitarian ideology of the victim blaming segment.

A handful of students at each school location commented that they appreciated the tone the program took and even that they appreciated that contrary to perceiving bias, the educator instructed that both sexes are both victims and perpetrators’ of the crimes. Two students at the all male school commented that they appreciated the content of the blame game. One junior at the all male school responded that what he liked about the program was, “The info presented gave me new insight about sexual assault. For example, the “victim blaming” discussion taught me that is it not the victims fault.” Another student at the all male school also explained, “I liked it. I really don’t like when the victim gets criticized.” Three male students from the coed school made similar comments about the victim blaming segment. A sophomore coed male commented, “Everything. It taught me that not all men are bad.” One junior
explained that what he liked best about the program was that he thought “It was interesting because both men and women can be victims of abuse.” Lastly, one male freshman from the coed school commented that he liked the program because, “It talked a lot about rape and how men get raped also.”

The all female school overwhelmingly had the majority of comments indicating that they enjoyed the focus of the victim blaming content. Nine all female students commented that they liked the blame game segment. One sophomore explained, “It made me realize a lot of things within my relationship and how I see victims of assault. It changed my views in a positive way.” A junior described what she liked about the program was, “I thought they were educational because it helped me to really stop and think about what’s okay and what’s not. It got me to think about which person is really at fault in a rape crime.” A freshman reflected a similar opinion in her comments, “I liked that she relates to teens and stresses that it is not the victim fault.” In addition to comments indicating they liked the victim blaming activities, two students at the all female school mentioned that they did not like the way some of their peers reacted to the curriculum. One senior explained, “I was kind of offended by some others comments, though none of the speakers, and how blind some people seem to be.” Another senior responded that what she did not like was, “the activity concerning the rape case at Folsom High. It’s hard to believe that anyone could support a rapist.” Lastly, one student commented on the intention of the educator to stress that very few men do commit sexual assault. A freshman explained, “She was
wonderful! And even though she’s a woman, she always made it clear that not all men are villains.”

**Attitude**

A fourth theme that emerged from the questionnaires was the topic of the educators attitude; either positively received or negatively received. Attitudinal characteristic were most frequently mentioned at the all female school. Out of the 88 questionnaires collection, 37 questionnaires from the all female school mentioned that what they liked about the program or what they thought was one of the educators “presentational strengths” was the attitude that she projected to the students. Out of the 37 students that mentioned attitude, five students’ mentioned that they enjoyed the “lively” of “enthusiastic” tone of the presentations. One ninth grade freshman explained that what she liked about the presentation was that the educators’, “Very bright personality and how the presenter talks to us not at us. This makes it pretty easy to pay attention.” Twenty one students out of the 37 that mentioned positive attitudinal characteristics indicated that what they enjoyed was the educators’ humor, found the educators personality to be fun or found the educators personality entertaining. Comments indicating they found the activities “fun” were not included in this category. One senior explained that what she liked about the program was that the educator “knows the topic and was successful in getting the class into it. She can also be funny while discussing serious issues which gets the class engaged.” Fifteen out of the 37 all female school students that commented positive attitudinal characteristic on
their questionnaire, described that they just found the educator to be “nice,” “friendly,” possessing “great attitude,” or simply having an enjoyable personality.

One freshman from the all female group explained that what she liked about the program was, “The speakers friendly and open attitude because it helped knowing it was okay to speak up.” Seven students from the all female group also mentioned that they enjoyed the casual tone that the educator approached students and material with. A freshman explained that what she thought was one of the presenters presentational strengths was that the educator, “was able to talk to us like we were having a conversation which made it feel more comfortable so we could participate and interact.” Additionally, 15 out of the 37 students commented that they felt the educator was easy to relate to. One senior that explained that she thought the educators presentation strength was, “She wasn’t disrespectful at all. Her strengths are that she makes us laugh and she is able to understand easily what people our age are going through. She doesn’t speak like she just memorized a speech.” Out of the 88 questionnaires submitted by the all female group, no students mentioned a negative attitudinal characteristic of the educator.

Attitudinal characteristics of the educator were also mentioned frequently in the coed male questionnaires. Out of the 53 questionnaires submitted, 18 male students mentioned positive attitudinal characteristics of the educator. Out of the 53 students that mentioned positive attitudinal characteristics, eight students mentioned that they enjoyed the educators’ humor, found the educators personality to be fun or found her personality entertaining. A freshman explained that what he liked about the
program was that, “She makes it funny and interesting.” One sophomore reflected the same sentiment when he explained that what he liked least about the program was, “Nothing really because it was entertaining.” Out of the 18 students that mentioned positive attitudinal characteristics, four students mentioned that they simply liked some aspects of the educator’s personality. A sophomore described, “She has good and persuasive speaking skills, and she is down to earth.” A junior reflected that what he felt was the educator’s presentational strength was that, “She didn’t let of the students bother her.” Lastly, one student out of the 18 that mentioned positive attitudinal characteristics of the educator, made a comment that indicated he appreciated an “easy to talk to” tone projected. The junior explained, “Yes she did treat us seriously and with respect. I felt very comfortable with her.” Out of the 18 students that mentioned positive attitudinal characteristics in their questionnaires, nine students indicated that they felt the educator to be easy to relate to. A sophomore student explained that the educator’s presentational strength was, “Connecting with students and adding humor.” Similarly, a junior explained that what he liked about the program was that “She was good at relating to our age group, and getting up class participation.” In addition to students mentioning positive attitudinal characteristics of the educator, several students mentioned negative attitudinal characteristics as well.

Out of the 53 questionnaires submitted by the coed male group, five students mentioned negative attitudinal characteristics of the educator. Of the students that mentioned that they did not enjoy the educator’s personality, four students comments indicated they perceived the educator as “rude” or “mean,” and one student
specifically indicated he did not like the presenter’s attitude. The senior explained in
the additional comments section, “I personally did not like her attitude because if you
had a different idea then she would like sick the entire class on you for it.” In addition
to the five students that commented disliking the educators’ attitude or personality,
one student specified that his suggestion for the educator was, “Not to take things so
seriously.” No other students from the male coed group made comments indicating the
educator should lighten up.

Students from the all male school made the fewest comments regarding the
educator’s personality, out of all three groups. Of the 96 questionnaires submitted
from the all male group, nine students mentioned positive altitudinal characteristics.
Of the nine students, one student mentioned that he liked the presenter’s enthusiastic
personality. One sophomore explained what he liked best about the program was, “I
liked that the educator was open to new ideas and different opinions. I liked her
bubbly attitude.” Five students from the all male school mentioned that they found the
educators personality “fun,” “humorous,” or “entertaining.” A sophomore explained
that he felt the educator’s presentational strength to be that she was, “Humorous and
serious. She was effective in guiding the group.” Another sophomore reflected similar
sentiment in his response to what he felt the educators presentational strength was, “I
believe that she is sociable and fun and fun to engage with.” Four students mentioned
what they liked about the program, or what they thought one of the educators
presentational strengths to be, was that the educator was “nice,” “kind” or processed a
positive attitude. One student indicated that they liked that they felt comfortable with
the educator. The sophomore explained, “I thought she was very inviting and easy to
talk to.” Out of the 96 questionnaires submitted by the all male school students, zero
students made a comment indicating they felt the educator to be easy to relate to.

In addition, students at the all male school, addressing positive attitudinal
caracteristics in their questionnaires, nine students out of the 96 questionnaires
mentioned negative attitudinal characteristics. One sophomore explained that he did
not like the educator because, “She was not fun or entertaining. She gave so much
info, to the point I wasn’t interested.” One sophomore similarly explained, “She was
rude and mean. I didn’t like her at all. What was the point of having her here
anyway?” Another sophomore explained, “This was totally lame. This is all stuff that
we all know. Her jokes weren’t funny. Her personality sucked too.” Of the nine
students mentioning negative attitudinal characteristics, six students indicated that
they felt the educator should “lighten up.” One sophomore explained his suggestion
for the educator is to, “Take our jokes less seriously, because I know that I usually
joke around to avoid awkward situations, like talking about rape.” Another sophomore
reflected similar sentiments in his suggestion for the educator, “Lighten up. Don’t be
afraid to joke around.” One sophomore explained, “Don’t take the students comments
too literally. Kids like to test their teachers.” Another sophomore simply put, “You
need to relax.”

Knowledge and Authority

A fifth noteworthy theme that emerged from the questionnaires was the
concept of perceived knowledge and authority. The school group that referenced the
knowledge and authority the most frequently was the all female group. Sixteen out of the 88 questionnaires submitted from the female group’ referenced knowledge or power as an aspect of the program they liked or as a presentational strength of the educator.

Eleven students commented that one of the educator’s presentational strengths was that she was “very knowledgeable” about the topics presented, or “knew what she was talking about.” One sophomore explained, “She is knowledgeable, a clear speaker, and obviously loved her job. Also, she is also very approachable.” A freshman explained, “Her strengths are talking about what she knows best, everything was well said. Yes, she guided us in good group interaction.” Another freshman explained the educator’s presentation strength was, “Yes she was very serious and knowledgeable about the subject matter. She taught with passion.” In addition to students commenting on knowledge, five students at the all female school referenced “strength” or “authority” when describing the educator. A ninth grader explained, “She was very strong. She used adjectives that grabbed our attention, spoke with inflection, and articulated her words. She knew a lot about her topics and could not have been any more prepared.” A junior reflected a similar impression, “She was very well-spoken and asserted herself with authority on the subject. She also connected easily with the students and was affable.” A freshman explained that the educator’s presentational strength was “her authoritative voice, and her sense of humor. It was effective because she did not bore us or scare us; she was friendly.” No students from
the all female school mentioned the educator possessed or lacked control of the classroom.

Though mentioned less frequently then the all female school, the all male school also mentioned the concept of knowledge and authority in their questionnaires. Seven questionnaires, out of 96 submitted, referenced that they what they believed was one of the educator's presentation strength, was that she was “well versed” or “knowledgeable” on the topic. One sophomore explained, “She was entertaining and very knowledgeable and prepared for class.” Another sophomore explained, “She knows thoroughly the subject and is confident. Similarly another sophomore stated, “She knows lots of facts.” Zero students from the all male group described the educator as an “authority.”

Out of the 53 male coed schools questionnaires, three students expressed that they perceived the educator to be knowledgeable. All three students mentioned knowledge in the presentational strength question on the questionnaire. One sophomore described, “She is knowledge, it was effective.” A junior explained, “She was well educated on the subject. Yeah, she brought up interesting topics.” Lastly, one senior described the educator as, “She is very interesting, not boring and very knowledgeable.” Zero students out of the coed male group described the educator as an “authority.”

The fifth and final notable theme from the questionnaire was the mention of power and control. Two students, out of the 53 coed male questionnaires, commented that the educator did possess strong classroom control. One junior explained, “She was
didn’t let students walk over her, she has strong voice, and has good classroom management skills.” A freshman explained, “She kept the conversation going, but would lead it back if we got off topic, or settle the class down when it got rowdy.”

One student at the all male school, out of the 96 surveys, mentioned that the educator had strong “class room control.” One sophomore explained that the educator was a, “Loud speaker,” who maintained “good control” of the classroom.

**Power and Control**

Not one student from either the all female group, or coed male group mentioned that the educator lacked class classroom control. However, sixteen students from the all male school mentioned that the educator lacked power or control. Eight of the students mentioned that they believed the educator lacked classroom control.

One sophomore explained, “She leads talks well, but can’t control them if they lead off topic. Nor was she very open to opposite views.” Another sophomore described his suggestions for improvement were to, “Try to control class.” “Try to control class.” Another suggestion from a sophomore was, “Be louder. Take control of the classroom.” In addition to the eight students that mentioned the educator lacked control; 10 other students mentioned that the educator lacked power. One sophomore explained in the presentational strengths section, “She knew many facts but she was somewhat timid and shied away from questions she didn’t like.” Another sophomore explained in the suggestions for improvement section, “To come across stronger and not so passive.” Another suggestion for improvement from a sophomore was, “Speak with more authority.” One student explained in the additional comments, “She didn’t
seem very confident.” And one sophomore commented in the educator’s presentational strengths section, “She explained the topic well but had a hard time controlling the students. She seemed powerless.” One student also commented that if the presenter were to present again, she should “not be so aggressive towards men.” No other students included comments regarding the educator having or lacking power and control in the classroom.

**Quantitative Conclusion**

While no consistent pattern emerged comparing the quantitative data between the two male groups, both groups did present a clear trend of possessing high levels of endorsing both sexist, and victim blaming ideology. Additionally, both male groups showed resistance to changing their attitudes after being presented with four day program on sexism, domestic violence and sexual assault. The female group showed significantly lower levels of sexist beliefs than the male groups, prior to the four day program. Additionally, the all female group showed significantly more movement, representing less resistance to altering sexist beliefs once provided information and a forum for discussion. The qualitative data, however, did point to a difference in the way the different male groups perceived the curriculum. The quantitative data does suggest that there was a greater rejection of the program in the all male group, compared to the coed male group.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was an examination of the sexist and victim blaming attitudes that high school students possess. This study compiled and analyzed data from 231 Likert Scale surveys; 115 from an all male school, 46 male students from a coed school, and 70 from an all female school. Data from 237 open-ended questionnaires from the three school locations was also utilized. The goal of this study was to investigate whether students from one particular school environment are more prone to endorsing sexist or egalitarian beliefs and perceptions then another school context. This study additionally proposed to measure whether one location (single sex or coed) was less apt to change their sexist attitudes and beliefs, then another school location. Students were given a 25 question pre test prior to the program, then provided with four days of one-hour-long classes, which included; discussion, activities, video, and lecture on gender socialization, domestic violence and sexual assault. On the last day of the program students were given a post test. Open ended questionnaires requesting students to reflect and assess the program were left with the students’ teachers to be distributed within one week of the final portion of the program.

Quantitative Data Conclusion

Sexist versus Egalitarian Beliefs

Though the data from the surveys did uncover slightly greater egalitarian responses from the male coed group prior to the presentation, and slightly higher T-Values from the all male group, the differences comparing the two male groups were
insignificant. The only consistent pattern presenting itself from the sexist and
egalitarian quantitative data was that the female group demonstrated significantly
higher percentages of egalitarian responses both pre presentation and post
presentation, for seven out of the seven victim blaming questions. The findings, that
females held more progressive attitudes both prior and post anti sexism programs, are
consistent with previous research (Lamb et al., 2009; Lanis & Covell, 1995).
Additionally, the female group showed the greatest movement for every question
except question 16. In question 16, 95% of the all female group disagreed with the
statement, leaving very little room for movement.

What is also clear from examining the quantitative sexist and egalitarian data is
that both male groups possess very high levels of sexism. Placing the focus on the
percentage of the students that either selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree” for the
sexist statements, and “agree” or “strongly agree” to the egalitarian statement, the
percentage that both male groups reported egalitarian beliefs was negligible. For
question four, “Men make better political leaders,” while 19% of the coed male
population and 25% of the all male population admitted to endorsing the blatant sexist
statement, another 43% of the all male group, and 46% of the male coed group
reported to be unsure of their position on the statement. By the students feeling unsure
of selecting “disagree,” they are still demonstrating sexism. Students selecting
“neutral” are communicating a lack of confidence that women are just as competent in
positions of power, as are men. Only 38% of the all male group and 29% of the coed
male group rejected the sexist statement. To further divide the numbers, only 10% of
the all male group, and 21% of the male coed group felt strongly that men do not make better political leaders than women.

In question six, “When making decisions, women handle pressure just as well as men,” more than one third of the all male group did not identify women as being as capable of handling pressure as men. Forty three percent of the group of 115 all male students equates to 44 students who indicated they did possess the belief that women are as capable of making decisions as men. For the all male group, 39% of the class either disagreed that women are as capable, or selected that they were unsure if they are capable. However, equally disturbing, 17% of the female group selected “neutral,” and 10% selected “disagree.” This data, although troubling, is also consistent with previous research that shows even young women learn to view women as being less capable and competent than men (Brown & Gilligan, 1993).

In response to question four, again a disturbingly large percentage of both male populations indicated that to some degree they agree that, “In a healthy family structure, a husband earns more money than his wife.” Only 55% of the all male group and 48% of the male coed group indicated that they believe masculinity does not have to equate with familial financial prominence. In question 16, “In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in making household decisions,” which is a blatant sexist statement, 11% of the male group, and 12% of the male coed group agreed that men should have primary authority in a relationship. Thirty six percent of the all male group, 29% of the coed male group, and 4% of the all female group selected “neutral.” Such findings are alarming when considering how these beliefs
may present themselves in teen romantic and sexual relationships. Both sexes have eternalized that an imbalance of power in a relationship is normal, and even preferred. Research has shown that such beliefs play an important role in enabling domestic violence and sexual assault (Ahrens & Rozee, 2007, p. 170; Ulloa et al., 2009).

**Victim Blaming Beliefs**

This study was conducted and analyzed from a feminist perspective endorsing the ideology that a rapist is 100% to blame for a sexual assault, regardless of the level of vulnerability of the victim. Because the study was framed using feminist ideology, the research focused on finding out what school context proved to have the highest endorsement of victim blaming ideology and assess what groups were the most resistant to changing their attitudes post discussion.

The male groups answered the victim blaming questions similarly to how they answered the sexism and egalitarian questions. Neither male group showed any significant or consistent greater agreement or disagreement with the statements than the other male group. The female group, however, did again responded to the statements with the highest rejection of victim blaming in six out of the seven questions pre presentation. Additionally, the all female group demonstrated the highest rejection of victim blaming attitudes in all seven victim blaming questions post presentation. The difference between the responses of the two male groups and the all female group was substantial. The all female group answered with a minimum of 10% higher disagreement in every question except one, and most questions showed 20% to 30% greater rejection of the victim blaming attitudes compared to the male groups.
Furthermore, the all female group showed the highest T-Value of the three school groups, on all seven victim blaming statements. The coed male group demonstrated statistical significance only on question 9, and the all male group only on question 21. The all female group, even with their high initial rejection of victim blaming, still demonstrated statistical significance on questions 9, 20, 21, and 24, and close to statistical significance on questions 14 and 25. Essentially, while the majority of the students in both male groups entered the program with either ambiguous or definitively endorsing victim blaming ideology, they were also quite resistant to lessening their victim blaming beliefs. However, the majority of the students in the all female group entered the intervention with low rates of victim blaming ideology and were willing to increase their rejection of the ideology. The victim blaming findings reflect previous research that has indicated that males are more inclined to endorse victim blaming ideology, and more resistant to changing those beliefs then are females (Lanis & Covell, 1995; McMahon, 2010).

**Qualitative Data Conclusion**

Seven categories emerged from the questionnaires; mention of the media and sexism segment, perception the educator respecting different opinions, perception of the educators’ attitude, bias and blame both of the curriculum and of the educator, perception of knowledge and authority of the educator, and the perception of power and control of the educator. The three different groups reportedly perceived the program and the educator quite differently from each other.
Media

The female group clearly liked the discussion of sexism in media. One quarter of the class referenced the media segment in positive terms. In the coed school, while four male students made positive references to the segment an additional three students commented their disapproval of the segment. At the all male school, on the other hand, one student mentioned liking the media content, while the other two references to the content were negative.

Much of popular media is misogynistic, repeatedly portraying women in positions of sexualized submission and objectification while portraying men in positions of power and dominance (Cortese, 2008, Dill & Thill, 2007; Thomas, 2008; Wood, 2009). Therefore, it was not surprising that the comments by female students indicated that the students felt empowered by the media segment. Additionally, research has shown that because males benefit from the power dynamics of sexist media, many actually even prefer media with sexist images and imagery (Popcorn & Marigold, 2000). As such, it was again unsurprising that several male students responded defensively.

What was surprising was that while one student out of 96 from the all male group made positive references to the media segment of the program, three students out of 53 from the coed male group indicated enjoying the media segment. Additionally the all male group had over twice the number of questionnaires then did the male coed group, yet had the same number of negative responses to the critical discussion on media. This may possibly have been a result of the females at the coed
school participating in the discussion and adding their reflection and support of what the educator was describing.

**Respect**

The perception of respect was another interesting difference in observation noted on the questionnaires. The all female students overwhelmingly felt their opinions respected by the educator. Twenty five students, out of 88 at the all female school, reported feeling respected, while five reported not feeling their opinion respected. However, only 10 students out of 96 from the all male school reported feeling respected by the educator, and seven out of 53 male students from the coed school reported similar sentiment. Additionally, seven out of 96 students from the all male group reported not feeling respected, while three out of 53 of the coed male group indicated feeling similarly. While the two male groups responded similarly, their comments indicating their perception of respect sharply contrasted with the all female responses. The difference in perception of respect may have simply been that the educator was voicing the dominant ideology in the female group, allowing the majority of the class to feel comfortable and easy engaged. However, among male students, who research has indicated are more prone to endorsing higher levels of sexism, there was a larger percent that disagreed with the educators’ message and therefore did not feel encouraged to speak their perspective (Lamb et al., 2009; Lanis & Covell, 1996).
Attitude, Bias & Victim Blaming

The four day program was designed with the goals of providing a critique of traditional gender roles, bringing forth awareness of sexism, and refocusing social blame and responsibility of domestic violence and sexual assault onto the aggressor of the crime and off of the victim. Because the egalitarian principles of the program very likely challenged students’ belief systems it was of little surprise to receive negative feedback. According to Sandler (1991), the mere introduction of content perceived as “women’s issues” may be viewed as superfluous and yield resistance in the form of students acting out in class, as well as students providing the instructor with negative teaching assessments (Sandler, 1991).

While a handful of male students from the coed group indicated that they disliked aspects of the program and/or the educator, overwhelmingly the negative feedback found in the questionnaires came from the all male group. The male group had the largest percentage of students reporting to perceive the educator as mean, biased, sexist, or a man hater.

Additionally, the all male group provided the least positive commentary in their questionnaires regarding both the educator and the content presented. While 18 coed male students out of 53 questionnaires submitted mentioned positive aspects of the program or educator, only 9 all male students, of the 96 questionnaires made similar positive commentary. The comparison of the positive commentary between the two male groups is particularly striking since the coed male group was half the size as the all male group.
In her analysis of teaching evaluations from various academic departments including history, political science, women’s studies, and ethnic studies, Hartung (1990) found that the negative commentary most often used to describe disapproval for the women’s studies and included frequent accusations that the instructor had “bias,” was “lacking objectivity,” or was “hating of men” (Hartung, 1990, p. 257). Hartung explains that instructors of history or political science are frequently criticized on teaching evaluations in terms of being boring or having poor teaching skills. However, in contrast, instructors of women’s studies frequently receive the same general critique, along with language, is that is phrased more as a personal attack, crude, or even a diagnosis of the instructor as a “frustrated woman,” or exhibiting “radicalism.” Though similar reproaches came from all three locations; comments such as “feminist” “bias” “man hater” “sexist” as well as comments indicating “she needs to lighten up,” were the most heavily expressed by the all male group.

Hartung (1990) explains that when students’ comments focus on qualities other than the instructors’ teaching competence, it sheds light on why students react so negatively to women’s studies content. According to Hartung, the negative descriptive comments that target the instructor indicate that students who negatively react to an instructor “may be reacting to a woman who has stepped out of her place” (p. 261). Therefore, students’ strong negative reaction to the educator may have in fact been simply a rejection of the egalitarian ideology the educator was advocating.

Comments indicative of a rejection of the egalitarian ideology emerged again in students’ reference to the victim blaming segment. And again the disapproval of the
curriculum came primarily from the all male group. Interestingly, though the terms “victim” and perpetrator” were routinely used to avoid assuming gender of the crimes, several students from the all male group became defensive of the role of the perpetrator and did assume gender.

In addition to the five students at the all male school that commented that it was unfair to place all the blame on the perpetrator of sexual assault, another two students from the male school also made comments indicating disapproval of the responsibility of obtaining consent. One sophomore from the all male school responded that he did not find the program interesting or educational, “because the program almost made people feel bad about any little things they do with a girl.” Another student from the same school location reiterated a similar sentiment in his comment that what he liked least about the program was, “The feminist points on sexuality.” Throughout the sexual assault segment of the program, the educator discussed egalitarian principles of sexual activity with a heavy focus on consent. Students were taught that both males and females may inadvertently push their partner into something unwanted by simply making the assumption that they know what their partner wants. To ensure a sexual act is consensual, students were told it is important to talk with their partners about what each person is comfortable with; paying attention to both verbal and nonverbal feedback from the conversation. Both students in the above comments indicate a disapproval of prioritizing finding out if their partner consents to a sexual act prior to engaging in it. Students who indicated that a having a
conversation to ensure consent is a daunting task, seemed to be communicating a rejection of egalitarian ideology.

Knowledge and Authority

The theme of knowledge and authority emerged as another interesting difference in perception from the different school contexts. The all female school had the largest portion mention that they perceived the educator as knowledgeable on the topics presented; equating twice the number students express the same perception as in the male groups. Additionally, of the 16 female students that mentioned the educator as a source of credible knowledge, five students specifically used adjectives that associated the educator as an authority or as a source of strength. While the two male groups had an equal number of students mention that they perceived the educator as an authority, the male coed group was half the size as the all male group, equating to twice the proportion of students at the male coed school who commented that they perceived the educator as a source of reliable knowledge.

Power and Control

The perception of the educator as possessing control marked a striking dissimilarity between the three groups. While zero students from the all female group and zero students from the male coed group mentioned the educator deficient of classroom control, 16 students from the all male school indicated that the educator lacked control of the classroom. Sandler (1991) explains that merely the teaching of feminist content which contradicts with a student’s belief system may diminish the students’ perception of the instructors’ competence. Such comments indicating a lack
of authority also mark a contradiction with the students in the same locale that commented that the educator should “relax,” and “be less aggressive.” While the differing messages may simply be a difference in perception, Hartung (1990), explains students’ messages indicative of a double bind may also be students demonstrating discomfort with a female defying the feminine stereotype or dismantling masculinity. Again, the commentary pertaining to the educator needing to be “less passive,” “take more control,” or “have more power” may in fact be a rejection of egalitarian ideology.

While the quantitative data did not indicate one male group possessed a greater endorsement of sexism or victim blaming ideology than the other, the quantitative data did reveal several differences in the students’ perception of both the program and of the educator. It may also be possible that because of the female students in the classroom, the male coed students were less inclined to perceive the educator as lacking control. The female students were generally openly receptive to the content presented, possibly increasing the perception of educators credibility. With a larger perception of the group seemingly perceiving the content as valid, the coed males may have been less incredulous than the all male group. Though a degree of the differences in the way the three different groups responded may simply be attributed to the difference in sample size and the in age of the three groups equating to difference in maturity level, a portion of the different ways the three groups perceived the same program is also likely also a product of the student’s socialization.
Limitations

Several limitations limit the findings of this study. Three different size groups were compared together. Data from the all male group consisted of 115 surveys and 96 questionnaires. Though data was collected from 95 surveys and 110 questionnaires from the coed school, because the goal of the study was to contrast the attitudes of males in a single sex school with males in a coed school, the surveys and questionnaires from the females at the coed school were sorted out and did not contribute to the statistical analysis. Only 46 surveys and 53 questionnaires were included from the males at the coed school. Data from the all female group included data from 70 surveys and 88 questionnaires. Therefore, the appreciably different sample size of each participant group was a limitation to this study. Additionally, while the all female school and the coed school consisted of students of each grade level, the all male school only consisted only of sophomore level students. The maturity difference of the different groups therefore may have skewed comparisons of the here groups also a affected the critical comparisons of this study.

While the researcher had intended to use students’ identification numbers on the pre and post surveys to increase the comfort and encourage honest responses, the two private schools did not have identification numbers assigned to students. Therefore, students were asked to write their initials on the surveys in order to be able to pass out their post surveys back at the end of the program. This decreased the sense of anonymity in the two private school locations may have reduced students’ honesty and threatened the validity of this study.
Recommendations for Further Study

While this study aimed to examine the attitudes of high school students from different school locales, the survey questions were framed only generally. Because high school students are a protected class, the questions were carefully phrased not to imply malicious behavior. Additionally, since the surveys were distributed in private schools, again the researcher was careful with the survey design and curriculum, to avoid any issues the schools might have with the study. However, had the survey been able to ask more behavioral questions, a deeper examination of sexist belief systems may have been achieved. Therefore, another avenue for further research would be to survey college freshman, posing demographic questions to allow focus again on students from single sex schools.

Additionally, while this study focused on comparing attitudes of male students from different school locales, had more time been available the researcher would have included the female students from the coed school. Including a comparison of the female students would again provide a more complete understanding of the effect a school setting might have on an individuals’ understanding of gender.

Lastly, while this study examined student’s currently attending private school, a further avenue of exploration could compare the attitudes and beliefs of adults who attended coed and single sex private school as teenagers. The focus on the study could examine if the sexist attitudes that seem to be rampant while in high school dissipate, or if the attitudes developed by high school are in fact a foundation for individuals’
lifelong perception of what is appropriate for what gender and who is appropriate to blame in the case of domestic violence and sexual assault.

**Conclusion of Study**

The quantitative data collected from this study did not indicate one male group as possessing a greater inclination to blame the victim of a domestic violence or sexual assault crime, nor a grater endorsement of sexist ideology compared to the other male group. Compared to the all female group, both the male coed group, and the all male group demonstrated a remarkably high endorsement of sexism and victim blaming. The quantitative data also revealed both male groups demonstrate resistance to changing their attitude on the topics presented after a four day program incorporating classroom discussion, activities, videos, and power point presentations. While the quantitative data did not show any significant difference between the two male groups, the qualitative data revealed that the all male group to have a notable greater rejection of both the program and the female educator, compared to the male coed and the all female group. Reason for such findings may be the result of the patriarchy present in the religious teachings of the all male private school. Since the all male school students were all sophomores, rather than mixed grades as were the other two groups, maturity level and life exposure may have played a role in their questionnaire responses. A pack mentality may have also influenced the perception of the program from the all male students. Since there were simply more males in the all male group, there was a great change that some males would have a negative reaction, influencing the perception of the rest of the group. Since females were present in the classroom
with the male coed group, the females may have helped the males relate to the educator and the program more. Lastly, by the limited exposure the all male students have to females, it may be more difficult for the male students to recognize females as a source of knowledge and power and authority.

**Final Thoughts**

Both the quantitative and qualitative data does suggest that by the time males reach high school, their values about the normalcy and legitimacy of inequality is already deeply ingrained in their beliefs systems. In light of such findings, it is this researchers’ opinion that sexism intervention needs to start at a much younger age than high school, and needs to be built into curriculum, rather than simply a four day program.

The saturation of engenderment starts at infancy. Children are bombarded with both verbal and non verbal messages that teach them what behaviors, activities, mannerisms, skills, and even emotions, are appropriate for whom and when. A plethora of sources contribute to the socialization process including four highly influential institutions; parents, media, peers, and schools, both in the classroom and in between classes. The consequence of gender socialization is the polarization of human qualities and emotions. Certain qualities are considered acceptable and expected of one gender, while demonizing the qualities if demonstrated by the other gender. The binary that is produced is not only restrictive; it supports a hierarchy that results in unequal financial access, social value and power, along with violence; including hate crimes and school shootings, domestic violence, and sexual assault. Considering the
systemic dynamic of socialization, and the far reaching devastating effects sexism reeks on a society, it is imperative to prioritize constructing education based on a foundation of egalitarian values. While statistical significance was not observed in every survey question, some positive movement overall was achieved in only a short four hour program. This study suggests that if administrators, parents, and teachers prioritized imbedding egalitarian ideology into curriculum, significant changes in social attitudes could be achieved.

As suggested by Noddings (2005) and Nieto (1991) curriculum needs to be reflective of human issues. Simply implementing one unit or course is insufficient in teaching students to look inward at the beliefs that we all possess. Dewey (1927), Habernas (1971), and Hess (2009) suggest students must be conditioned to critically think, reflect, and interact with their own belief systems to become healthy, active members of democracy. Again, this can be accomplished if the American educational system is constructed upon a foundation of equality, and students are provided a forum for the discussion and exploration of oppression. Only once a discussion of equality and oppression is normalized and can develop comfort with being able to consider how their position of privilege may be harmful to another, will a female educator be able to discuss sexism in a classroom of males, without being called a “Man hater.”
APPENDIX A

Pre and Post Gender and Culture Survey
### Pre/Post Survey
Gender and Culture Survey: An Examination of Opinions, Attitudes, and Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Violence is a learned behavior.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If a woman becomes physically abusive, it is acceptable for her partner to hit her back.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is possible for a petite woman to be physically abusive to a man.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Men make better political leaders than women do.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is acceptable for a woman to pay for the date.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When making decisions, women handle pressure just as well as men.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In a healthy family structure, a husband earns more money than his wife.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Any woman in good physical shape can successfully resist a rapist if she really tried.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A large percentage of women who report rape do so to get attention or to get back at a guy.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A prostitute can be raped.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Biologically men are more prone to violence than women.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If a woman gets in her partners face and her partner snaps and shoves her, the woman is somewhat responsible for the violence.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If a girl gets drunk at a party, flirts with a guy, passes out and is sexually assaulted, she is somewhat responsible for the sexual assault.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Any man can be a victim of a sexual assault.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in making household decisions.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Men are naturally more dominant and powerful than women.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Real men look for danger and face it head on.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The reason most rapists commit rape is for sex.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. If a rape victim does not resist the attack, it isn’t really rape.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. When women go out wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are asking for sex.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The media regularly depicts women as inferior, less competent, or less valuable than men.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Sex offenders usually commit sexual crimes because they are under the influence of alcohol.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If a guy pays for a date he deserves something in return.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Open-Ended Student Assessment of Program Questionnaire
Student Assessment of Program

School:   Grade         Male/ Female (Please circle)

1. What did you like best about the program? Why?

2. What did you like least about the program? Why?

3. Did you find the presentations interesting/educational? Explain?

4. Did the educator treat the sessions seriously and the students with respect?

5. What are your educator’s presentational strengths? Is she effective in guiding group interaction?

6. If this educator presents again, what suggestions do you have for improvement?

7. Please feel free to add any additional comments you may have (Please use the back if you need more space).
APPENDIX C

Opt Out Consent Form
Agreement to Participate

For several years ______ has invited domestic violence and sexual assault prevention curriculum into their classrooms. Riana Pella has been able conducted these workshops for over two years. Now, a Master's of Arts in Education student at California State University Sacramento, Ms. Pella will be examining the effectiveness of this curriculum on retaining information and changing attitudes.

The students participating in this study will be asked to complete a pre survey about their understanding of gender roles, dating violence, and sexual assault. The students will then be asked to participate in several class discussions, with a post survey to follow. When consolidating and analyzing the findings, the participants will remain anonymous.

The questions in the survey are similar to questions that have been a part of the domestic violence sexual assault curriculum that has been administered at Jesuit in the past. Student participation in this survey is entirely voluntary as is the class discussion.

This study will provide students with invaluable information about sexual assault, domestic violence, cultural contributors to the crimes, and reducing risks. It is hoped that the results of the study will be beneficial for designing effective domestic violence and sexual assault prevention curriculum for students.

The names of the participants will remain confidential. The students will fill out the surveys using their student ID in place of their names. Only group results for the project will be recorded.

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact Riana Pella at (530) 514-8972 or by e-mail at rp725@saclink.csus.edu.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary. Please check, sign and return this form if you DO NOT want your child to participate in the study.

☐ I DO NOT want my child to participate in the study.

__________________________________________   ______________
Signature of Parent/Guardian of Participant      Date
APPENDIX D

Gender and Culture Survey: Results
Question #4: Men make better political leaders than women do.

(Graph 1)

Question #6: When making decisions, women handle pressure just as well as men.

(Graph 2)
Question # 7: In a healthy family structure, a husband earns more money than his wife.

(Graph 3)

Question # 8: Any woman in good physical shape can successfully resist a rapist if she really tried.

(Graph 8)
Question # 9: A large percentage of women who report rape do so to get attention or to get back at a guy.

Question # 10: If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework.
Question # 14: If a girl gets drunk at a party, flirts with a guy, passes out and is sexually assaulted, she is somewhat responsible for the sexual assault.

Question # 15: Any man can be a victim of a sexual assault.
Question # 16: In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in making household decisions.

(Graph 5)

Question # 17: Men are naturally more dominant and powerful than women.

(Graph 6)
Question # 19: The reason most rapists commit rape is for sex.

(Graph 12)

Question # 20: If a rape victim does not resist the attack, it isn’t really rape.

(Graph 13)
Question # 21: When women go out wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are asking for sex.

Question # 22: Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers.
Question # 23: The media regularly depicts women as inferior, less competent, or less valuable than men.

(Graph 7)

Question # 24: Sex offenders usually commit sexual crimes because they are under the influence of alcohol.

(Graph 16)
Question # 25: If a guy pays for a date he deserves something in return.
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