

# Gender Studies and Teacher Education: A Proposal

Allen T. Pearson  
Patricia T. Rooke  
university of alberta

Although gender studies have become a central concern in Canadian universities through women's studies programs or programs in feminist theory, they have not influenced courses and programs in faculties of education to the extent they should. We propose the "mainstreaming" of gender studies and argue that courses and programs should be reconceived and reconstructed to incorporate the findings and approaches developed in feminist and women's studies. We talk of "gender studies" because, unlike "women's studies," we are not advocating a separatist strategy and do not propose a particular theoretical framework, as may be suggested by "feminist" theory. We justify mainstreaming gender studies in teacher education programs because they can contribute to the general education of teacher candidates and can help develop the attitudes, knowledge, and skills central to the practice of teaching.

Bien que les études axées sur la notion de sexe soient devenues une préoccupation majeure dans les universités canadiennes par le biais des programmes d'études sur les femmes ou sur les théories féministes, ces études n'ont pas influencé les cours et les programmes dans les facultés des sciences de l'éducation autant qu'elles auraient dû. Les auteurs proposent l'intégration des études sur le sexe et soutiennent que les cours et les programmes devraient être repensés et restructurés afin d'incorporer les conclusions et les approches issues des études féministes et sur les femmes. Les auteurs parlent d'"études sur le sexe" parce que, contrairement à ce qui en est pour les "études sur les femmes," ils ne prônent pas une stratégie séparatiste et ne proposent pas un cadre théorique particulier, comme le suggère peut-être la théorie "féministe." Ils justifient l'intégration des études sur le sexe dans les programmes de formation des maîtres en affirmant qu'elles peuvent contribuer à la formation générale des étudiants-maîtres et aider au développement d'attitudes, de connaissances et de compétences essentielles à la pratique de l'enseignement.

In the broadest context of that word, teaching is a political act; some person is choosing, for whatever reasons, to teach a set of values, ideas, assumptions, and pieces of information, and in so doing, to omit other values, ideas, assumptions, and pieces of information.

— Florence Howe, *Myths of Co-Education* (1984)

In 1990/91, the Department of Educational Foundations at the University of Alberta faced the a number of retirements and asked whether it should seek new

positions to carry on as in the past or use the opportunity to establish new directions.<sup>1</sup> We recognized that we could, perhaps, achieve both. The traditional stress on the disciplined study of education through history, philosophy, sociology, and anthropology could be strengthened by focusing staffing efforts in an area that would add a new direction to the department's concerns; gender studies provides just such an area. Scholarship in gender studies, with its bases in the department's traditional disciplines, would enhance the disciplined study of education. Some of the most promising and exciting work in the foundational fields, as well as some that may lead to dead ends, is being done in the area of gender studies. As well, a focus on gender studies is appropriate at this time in Canadian society. Events in society, some horrific and other ludicrous, have demonstrated the necessity for universities and faculties of education to take seriously the concerns raised by gender studies.

Our thinking raised issues far beyond our department. We believe that gender studies can teach us much about teacher education, and it is those lessons we pursue here. We begin by defending our decision to talk of "gender studies," rather than "women's studies" or "feminist studies." Next we explain how gender studies can be integrated into "traditional" academic courses and approaches. Finally, we justify an integrated approach to gender studies, or the mainstreaming of gender studies in teacher preparation programs, because it enhances and illuminates what teacher education programs ought to be trying to achieve.

#### MAINSTREAMING "GENDER"

Our initial approach to the departmental council about mainstreaming the compulsory core courses was motivated less by ideological and philosophical concerns (although we were committed to the idea of integration for reasons both pedagogical and philosophical) than by a sense of urgency. This sense of urgency was intensified by a growing unease that departmental offerings had remained unchanged for a number of years, and that the department had to take a new direction to be relevant in a milieu increasingly unresponsive to foundational subjects and exposition of the humanities in a professional faculty. We argued pragmatically that mainstreaming core and especially compulsory courses would reinvigorate the department and sustain its leadership in teacher education and in research and scholarship in the foundational fields.

"Mainstreaming" is the term commonly used in women's studies to describe the basic notion we advocate. Because this term is ambiguous in faculties of education and school systems, it would be useful to have a synonym. Fortunately, mainstreaming has embraced mutually inclusive terminology in the literature, including: integration, balancing, transforming (the curriculum), and reclaiming (female experience). We shall use "integration" and "balancing" interchangeably because these suggest the complete education of men and women in the redesigning of curriculum and course content, which in turn suggests a redefinition of

what constitutes knowledge and in what forms such knowledge ought to be transmitted. Mainstreaming is both epistemological and pedagogical; it is very much the “stuff” of foundations disciplines.

Moreover, if integration and balancing are worthwhile goals for the department as it looks toward the next decade, indeed the next century, then a core of appointments would be desirable although not necessary to motivate and facilitate innovative approaches to courses, especially undergraduate compulsory courses. It is crucial, however, that we use the most pragmatic and useful descriptions for such a core of persons. Are they to be in “women’s studies” or “feminist studies”? In this case there is much in a name. We prefer “gender studies” because this latter term embraces aspects of the first two: gender cannot be studied without relation to “women’s studies,” and gender studies is the offspring of feminist discourse itself.

Mainstreaming, integration, balancing—the lively debate of the last decade has used concepts, theories, new analytical approaches, sources, and methodologies, and a range of empirical studies that have emerged from the new corpus of scholarship inspired by feminism and articulated through women’s studies. Nevertheless, integration and balancing do not have the same purpose as women’s studies programs. Some academic feminists are philosophically opposed to mainstreaming; others see it as premature. Women’s studies programs are rooted in separatist strategies. Although it is legitimate to have separate women’s courses, it is also appropriate to mainstream core courses. Mainstreaming, though not assimilationist (which implies a loss of identity and scholarly integrity), appropriates women’s studies by incorporating the corpus of scholarship women’s studies has created into those core courses feminist theory can reconceptualize.

The description “feminist studies,” too, might present a difficulty, as feminist studies have a particular ideological dimension. One can use the gender studies approach and construct new content without necessarily grounding it in a particular feminist theory, although this would have been impossible without the feminist discourse. A gender studies approach thereby allows individual department members to hold a variety of perspectives.

Gender—the social construction of sexed bodies in relation to each other—is a cognitive, social, and epistemological category, and an analytical tool providing a conceptual bridge to past and present relationships between men and women. It encompasses class, ethnicity, race, and any other social category we customarily deal with. It has multicultural and global implications, as it asks how men (often a white dominant social class) have defined, created, and perpetuated prevailing power relations and structures which have shaped and continue to shape educational experiences and processes. Gender as a category of analysis seeks to understand how men and women’s experiences are linked, in an inclusive vision of human dynamics based on notions of difference and diversity, not generalization and sameness. In this respect ethics and philosophy are as crucial

as history or sociology. Classrooms have agendas, both explicit and hidden, in which culture reproduces itself through the reproduction of gendered knowledge. In short, as all foundations people know, the discourse of scholarship and knowledge can be a language of power. Gender analysis highlights power relations while intersecting with other categories of social meaning.

#### TRANSFORMING PEDAGOGICAL INQUIRY

A multidisciplinary core of scholars could facilitate the transformation of a whole department by providing departmental workshops, seminars, and discussions, and distributing bibliographic materials in their respective disciplines. Mainstreaming is a journey from male-defined to gender-balanced education. It does not abandon centuries of scholarship, but rather asks of this scholarship different questions, reinvigorating it and creating new bodies of knowledge in the process.

In short, mainstreaming both past experience and present knowledge leaves familiar landscapes in place but uncovers distortions of past practice and ongoing assumptions while radically changing our understanding of how such landmarks were formed and why. It revisits the old foundations question of “what knowledge is of most worth” by revising what is assumed to be innate and natural; what is necessary and why; what is possible and not; and how to assess opportunity and access for different social categories. The major foundations disciplines have equal stakes in reformulating and answering such questions; fields of study more recently included under the foundations umbrella (global, adult, international, and intercultural education) have no less a stake.

We have already noted that the arguments for mainstreaming, and the intellectual climate of debate surrounding it, are, we believe, the very “stuff” of foundations disciplines. We have, moreover, been encouraged by the numerous examples—regrettably more in the United States than in Canada—of mainstreaming the humanities and liberal arts. Some of these have met with resistance from various quarters, but they provide us with models to adopt, modify, or adapt to our own situations.

Different departments and faculties at other universities have been involved in what might be described loosely as the “integration movement,” especially in the United States. At a major research institution, the University of Maryland at College Park, implementation of a comprehensive plan to improve undergraduate women’s educational experiences has been underway since 1985.<sup>2</sup> Prototypes of this experiment can be traced to the early 1980s at numerous universities and colleges, some even to the 1970s. Smith, Wellesley, and Wheaton colleges, state universities including Arizona, California State at Hayward, Georgia, Maine, Montana, and North Dakota, and such religious colleges as Guildford and St. Mary’s can be counted among these. The Feminist Press, the Great Lakes College Association, and a consortium of liberal arts colleges have set “mainstreaming” as a major goal.<sup>3</sup> A powerful group, the Organization of American Histori-

ans, has endorsed the publication of bibliographies and teaching manuals to demonstrate the possibilities and importance of integrating the new feminist scholarship and women's history into mainstream history in the classroom and in history texts.<sup>4</sup> In 1990 the *Women's Studies Quarterly* published a whole issue on the topic. Summer institutes have encouraged each participant, chosen through competition, to transform a course to take back to his or her university and department for approval and implementation. In short, across the United States conferences, faculty development projects, seminars, and workshops have been organized to demonstrate strategies that facilitate mainstreaming.

Integration and balancing do not mean merely "add women and stir," nor do they mean squeezing the "facts" into existing materials and modes of instruction. In "Trying Transformations," Aitken et al. note that mainstreaming is not a formula or a "how to" for making classroom materials fit otherwise unaltered courses, but offers opportunities for faculty development and provides a legitimate arena in which to address and diffuse gender politics in academe.<sup>5</sup> Its purpose is to alter such materials and modes. If exclusion has led to sexism and discrimination, and arranged our perceptual and conceptual worlds by developing limited and androcentric knowledge, then inclusion shifts the central thrust of inquiry and creates other categories of signification by redefining what is important. It represents a dramatic rethinking of choices, transforming a multitude of areas in which we already work, such as the study of classrooms, teaching and learning, professionalization, achievement, equal opportunity, family, socialization, ethics, social justice, equity, epistemology, and many others.

Although integration does not mean adding a new unit to present course content, this would certainly be better than nothing. Single unit inclusion often consists of a single (guest) lecture on a relevant topic of interest, for instance, "women" or "Natives." Such lectures do not alter the direction of the instructional approach or instructional intent. They do not compel the instructor to redefine the parameters of the course content or the intellectual experience. They do little to expand theoretical understandings.

Integration is, moreover, a major component of equity demands. With regard to women and minorities, equity is too often interpreted in its most narrow sense, that of hiring practices and salary differentials (although these are not insignificant). Equity in fact seeks to eliminate imbalances perpetuated by sex role stereotyping and sex biases. There can be no more appropriate means to do this than through the example of the professoriate in a faculty of education and through course content and pedagogical methods.

All of the above coincide with observations by Concordia University's history department, which has committed itself to mainstreaming. Concordia sees this policy as synonymous with "the democratization of knowledge and learning." Quite apart from institutional obligations under the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* to facilitate a more equitably constituted gendered and multicultural work

force, and also apart from the legal and ethical necessity to eradicate discrimination, Concordia notes that “the imbalance produced by exclusion cannot be resolved only by quantitative changes in staff. Qualitative changes are also required.”<sup>6</sup>

Integration not only introduces a whole new body of scholarship (which is substantial), it also demands that we totally transform our pedagogy to incorporate it and the new assumptions it brings. This in turn represents an exercise in praxis — from theory to practice — something uniquely appropriate for foundations disciplines. Integration brings to a discipline various modes of inquiry, in an interdisciplinary approach.

To date the debate and strategies introduced have met resistance. Again, Aitken et al. astutely observe that the varieties of resistance reflect “in microcosm the power structure of the university itself” and have “served to reveal in stark detail the nature and depth of opposition to feminist scholarship.”<sup>7</sup> The debate over mainstreaming is far from neutral and is rarely conducted on the conventional grounds of objectivity related to the canons of a discipline. Instead, the debate provides “a theatre in which the gender policies of the academy operate(d) in a particularly dramatic and revealing fashion.”<sup>8</sup> Under these circumstances we were scarcely surprised to identify similar sites of resistance in the responses of some of our own department members during the debate surrounding our proposal, not the least being references to other inequalities. Such references raised issues about relative oppression, minimizing the significance of gender oppression although no one denied its reality.

Obviously, then, we are not speaking of superficial changes when we advocate a social reconstruction of knowledge which has devalued and continues to devalue most things related to women. This reconstruction constitutes more than making new objects of knowledge or inserting more information into existing bodies of knowledge.<sup>9</sup> It suggests a redefinition of knowledge itself, with women as agents and gender an analytical tool fundamental to its articulation. Under these conditions the reorganization of such knowledge — or mainstreaming — is not simply “about women,” maintaining as it does that gender as a system of social and relational organization is endemic to all societies and is not just a social role or a set of traits common to either sex.<sup>10</sup>

The term “integration” is, in fact, inadequate, for as Peggy McIntosh suggests, it implies being “integrated into the dominant curricula” rather than *transforming* curricula. “Mainstreaming” too is inadequate as a term, for it implies the existence of only one mainstream rather than “a diverse and plural stress on women’s and men’s experiences.”<sup>11</sup> If women enter the mainstream there remains a risk that they will so merge with it that they become indistinguishable from men.<sup>12</sup> The point is not to identify what knowledge gender studies promotes, but to be able to imagine that another kind of knowledge is possible — can evolve, or be created — even as knowledge has been transformed in the past. The medieval mentality of the Schoolmen is not the same as that of the Enlightenment thinkers,

any more than the mentalities of modernity coincide with those of the post-modernists. Feminists and other women do not have an impermeable idea of what this knowledge might be; only the hope that it *can* be, and that as a consequence the processes, products, and experiences of education for men and women will be affected profoundly. Mainstreaming calls us simultaneously to respect differences and to refute traditional views of differences between men and women based largely on hierarchical dichotomies, of “superior” and “inferior,” just as the traditional differences on grounds of race have placed white males in a dominant position over all other males.<sup>13</sup>

#### TEACHER EDUCATION

Although mainstreaming is quite widely found in the humanities and the liberal arts, we know of no cases where it has been applied to preservice professional teacher education. The justification for mainstreaming is different in this context than in those where it is more commonly found. In the humanities and liberal arts, subjects are not taught for their utilitarian ends; mainstreaming is defended on the ground that a mainstreamed history course is better history. In professional education, however, much of the concern is with the application of knowledge in later professional contexts, so the arguments for mainstreaming in professional education take quite a different turn. This view is put in its starkest terms by a comment of an engineering professor to the effect that if bridges don’t fall down there is no need to alter the engineering curriculum. We want to argue that mainstreamed gender studies do make a difference to the professional work of teachers.

Teacher education programs almost universally contain four components: general education, specialized knowledge, professional knowledge, and practice.<sup>14</sup> This seems to be a normative as well as descriptive claim: not only do teacher education programs contain these components, strong arguments can be produced to show that they should. After all, one is hard pressed to imagine a desirable teacher education program that does not give its students a strong, or at least reasonable, general education; that does not provide for in-depth study in the areas in which the person will teach; that does not provide for a study of both the professional abilities of a teacher and the nature of education as a professional activity; or that does not allow for the practice of professional skills. Given this,<sup>15</sup> our concern here is to show how gender studies contributes to these essential components of a teacher education program.

#### *General Education*

How does integrated gender studies in a teacher education program contribute to the intending teacher’s general knowledge? Of the four program components, the role of general knowledge is least clear. That teachers should learn the subjects

they are going to teach, learn how to teach those subjects, and have practice in teaching those subjects is obviously desirable. But why it is desirable for teachers to learn subjects they will not teach is less clear. We suggest two possible outcomes of general education that would contribute to making a person a better teacher: open-mindedness and sensitivity.

Open-mindedness is a trait central to what we ought to expect of teachers:

A person who is open-minded is disposed to revise or reject the position he holds if sound objections are brought against it, or, in the situation in which the person presently has no opinion on some issue, he is disposed to make up his mind in the light of available evidence and argument as objectively and impartially as possible.<sup>16</sup>

In light of this characterization we want to show that the integration of gender studies in teacher education helps bring about this end. Under this view, open-mindedness is a disposition, namely a disposition to reconsider. It allows that we are not always open-minded even though we may be for the most part; after all, we may have temporary lapses or failings. It also allows for degrees of open-mindedness. The disposition may be more strongly present in one person than in another. It further suggests that open-mindedness can be thwarted: "For example, there are numerous ways such as refusing to look at or listen to something, failing to consider a point, ignoring an opponent, etc., in which a person can indicate that he has a closed mind."<sup>17</sup>

Teaching need not be open-minded; indeed there are instances of teaching, such as teaching children the multiplication tables, where the issue of open-mindedness seems otiose. Where teaching is seen as a generalized activity aiming to educate students, to develop worthwhile knowledge and understanding, open-mindedness is much more important.

We may think of open-mindedness as characterizing a *way* of teaching or we may think of it as an aim of teaching. If we are right in thinking of open-mindedness as the appropriate attitude with respect to truth and as having intrinsic value, then we will hold not only that teachers will aim at developing this trait in their students, but will also aim at manifesting it in their work as teachers.<sup>18</sup>

Given this, we need to be on the alert not to prepare teachers in ways that may contribute to their not being open-minded. Open-mindedness in teachers can be thwarted, even if "closed-mindedness" is not produced, by limiting the knowledge a person acquires.<sup>19</sup> If one is exposed to a limited range of knowledge, one lacks the resources for reconsidering some positions. Open-mindedness is the disposition to see, examine, and weigh alternatives, to not lock on to a position without considering its alternatives. To the extent that we limit the alternatives available to people, we limit their ability to consider different positions. Integration of gender studies into general education provides people



with a broader cognitive perspective than if they experience only courses and programs that ignore women's experience and views. It will not guarantee greater open-mindedness; for various reasons, a person may participate in courses where gender studies are integrated without coming to see that this knowledge allows one to reconsider what has previously been learned. If teachers of such courses encourage and develop students' ability to raise questions about what has been taken for granted, there is an increased likelihood that students' views of the world will be challenged, possibly resulting in students thinking differently. There is thus an improved chance that students in such teacher education programs will be more open-minded. Hence, insofar as we value the trait of open-mindedness in teachers, the integration of gender studies in teacher education courses is instrumentally justified in these terms.

A second instrumental justification for the integration of gender studies into the general education component of teacher education programs is the contribution of gender studies to the teacher's sensitivity. We believe sensitivity, a character trait that has received little attention in discussions of teacher education, is crucially important for teachers, and therefore that which contributes to development of sensitivity is an important part of teacher education. We further believe that integrating gender studies into teacher education will increase this sensitivity. To make this case we must first say what we mean by sensitivity.

The sensitivity with which we are concerned is the teacher's sensitivity to students' needs and interests. At a minimum, a teacher should be aware of what students need at a given point in their education and what their interests are. From the point of view of motivating students to learn, one will have difficulty in teaching if one is unaware what is of interest to students and what is needed to help students move along. As well, a teacher must be able to diagnose what should be done in light of students' interests and needs. Sensitivity, in our sense, includes all this and also has a moral element: the teacher needs to be concerned about children so that their individuality may develop and flourish. In the broadest terms, a teacher is concerned to make the lives of students better, to provide knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will help children lead worthwhile and fulfilling lives. Given this general commitment, implicit in teaching, it follows that part of the moral domain of teaching is sensitivity in our sense. This is not a truth universally recognized. There are those who see education as concerned with the good of society, with preserving and transmitting to children a certain way of life, or who believe schools are there to ensure that students learn what is necessary for the economic well-being of society. We do not want to belittle the importance of either of these social goods, but we do want to maintain that over and above these is the concern for the good of the individual student. Once this concern is recognized, it is clear that sensitivity to students is an important character trait of teachers.<sup>20</sup>

Sensitivity can be learned through the integration of gender studies in teacher education programs, particularly in the general education component. Making

students aware of the full range of human experience increases their understanding of people's lives, an understanding important for sensitivity because for teachers to be disposed to care about the flourishing of their students requires that they are able to see the lives of their students in their totality—to see the forces that shape the development of their personalities, to understand the social conditions that influence their circumstances in life. Integration of gender studies can increase sensitivity not only on matters of gender, but also on matters of class, race, and ethnicity. Helping students to see how people are different and similar with respect to gender raises the question of what other kinds of perspectives are used to distinguish among people. Hence, insofar as sensitivity is a desirable trait of teachers it too instrumentally justifies the integration of gender studies into the general education component of teacher education programs.

### *Specialized Knowledge*

The specialized component of the teacher education program consists of courses prospective teachers take to provide themselves with the knowledge they need to teach in the school. It includes, for example, courses in mathematics that the future math teacher takes, history and sociology courses for the social studies teacher, and the broad range of courses that the future elementary teacher takes. These courses are typically done outside the professional program, in arts or science. The justification for integrating gender studies into these courses is the same as for the any course in the liberal arts: courses that have been integrated are quite simply better courses in that they present more complete pictures of the subject matter. There will of course be differences in the extent to which gender studies can be integrated into these subjects; for instance, history will allow for more integration than will mathematics.

### *Professional Knowledge*

The professional knowledge component introduces students to teaching and its theoretical underpinnings. Here one finds courses with such labels as educational psychology, administration, history, philosophy of education, sociology of education, policy studies, social foundations, curriculum, instruction, pedagogy, and methods of teaching. The arguments for integrating gender studies into the more theoretical parts of professional knowledge are similar to those for its integration into general education, but here the concern is for the understanding of education, schools, and teaching. This part of teacher education provides the student with a theoretical understanding of the profession. Teaching has been described as “women’s paid work”;<sup>21</sup> that is, traditionally women have been well represented, even overrepresented, in the teaching profession even at times when their representation in other professions has been negligible. Although women have dominated the ranks of the profession, their voice has not dominated theoretical

discussions of education. Integrating gender studies will bring their voice forward, resulting in a fuller understanding, or more complete picture, of education.

The relationship between the opening discussion of mainstreaming and the issue of voice is crucial. Mainstreaming content, it has been argued, has pedagogical implications for both teaching style and methodological approach. The female voice, articulating as it does "different ways of knowing," will influence the teaching of professional aspects of a wide range of teaching activities. The dynamics between the two—mainstreamed content and professional knowledge—will generate a wider epistemological framework. We do not know what this will look like. To "know" in this sense would contravene the concept of transformation itself, which suggests an on-going involvement, a laboratory, if you will, of experimentation, trial, and error. Neither is the ensuing debate predictable. We appreciate, for example, one reviewer's concerns that the discussion of sex differences (even a re-emphasis on women's voice) may reinforce these very differences, that it cannot be assured that faculty have more than commonsense views about sex differences, and that all areas of knowledge and teaching must be scrutinized constantly with the gender dimension in mind.<sup>22</sup>

Notwithstanding these concerns, this more complete picture of the theoretical bases of education and teaching encompasses many issues, among them the role of women in the administration of schools; possible psychological differences between males and females in the ways that people learn and develop; sex-role stereotyping; differential forms of education for girls in the past and differential opportunities for girls and boys in the present; and feminist approaches to moral education. These issues, representing some of the concerns identified to date in scholarship on women in education, ought to be part of a complete program in the development of professional knowledge.<sup>23</sup> The integration of gender studies also leads us to ask new questions. One area of concern is research on sex differences in education, which has led and continues to lead to the oppression of women. Another is the male standard that continues to inform curriculum development.<sup>24</sup> These raise serious questions for the study of education. No claim to knowledge can be considered beyond debate or question. But to deny legitimate and scholarly approaches a place in the debate is an equal mistake. Students in teacher education programs should become participants in the theoretical discussions that define and defend our profession. For them to become full participants, the full range of these debates must be an integral part of teacher preparation programs.

As well as adding to our understanding of the more theoretical parts of professional education, the study of women in education has added to our understanding of the methodology of teaching. Our knowledge about gender differences in the motivation for and selection of subjects can give us important information about how to treat subjects in schools. Teachers need to be aware of social structures that create such differences. More fundamentally, the development of a feminist pedagogy would need to be studied.<sup>25</sup> Approaches to teaching that rely

on personal experience and autobiography need to be integrated with our more traditional styles of teaching.

Two catchwords in current use in the professional preparation of teachers are “effectiveness” and “reflection.” Teacher educators want, at least for the present, teachers to be both effective in and reflective about their teaching. The integration of gender studies will contribute to both. Teachers who are aware of differences between females and males will be able to take these into account in their teaching; in so doing they will be more effective in their teaching than if they were to teach in ignorance of these differences. As well, teachers’ greater knowledge and understanding will enable them to be more reflective in their teaching. To reflect on one’s teaching requires that one has a knowledge background against which one can place present experience and from which one can begin to understand that experience. To expand the teacher’s understanding of the profession is one way to help the teacher become more reflective about practice.<sup>26</sup>

### *Practice*

We now turn to the final component of a teacher education program: practice. To begin, and to be very practical, one of the authors recently served as a faculty consultant for some student teachers doing their practicum in English and language arts at the junior high school level. One day, a student teacher had a very lively discussion with her class. The students were so interested in the topic that they volunteered all comments, and the student teacher did not call on students for their views. After the lesson, the faculty consultant asked the student teacher, “In that discussion, did you notice that not one female student said a word?” The student teacher had not noticed this; that someone always had something to say without her having to call on students was enough to suggest class discussion was going well. The student teacher and faculty consultant then had a discussion about how students at this age display assertiveness in differential ways, about the social expectations for “good boys” and “good girls,” about the ways girls and boys see themselves at this point in their lives. They also discussed whether teachers should reinforce this kind of position or whether they should try to encourage girls to participate in class discussion. The student teacher opted for the latter view.

We recognize there is nothing profound about this case. But this discussion would not have taken place if the faculty consultant had not had a little background knowledge in gender studies, since it was information from this area of knowledge that provoked the faculty consultant to pay attention to the gender of those participating in the class discussion. In this way gender studies was integrated into the student teaching component of the teacher education program. As the practice component is where the knowledge and skills obtained in the other

three components are put to use, if the integration of gender studies into the professional preparation of teachers is justified, it follows that it is important that gender studies be integrated into the teaching practice component.

#### CONCLUSION

We began with a quotation reminding us that teaching is a political act. Teaching teachers is of course no less a political act. The decision to mainstream gender studies in teacher education is a political act that we have here tried to defend. Our arguments have treated the issue in a broad political way, as an issue concerned with the good of society and its members. To show how mainstreaming gender studies contributes to teacher education is not just to make some points about the preparation of teachers, it is as well to ask us to think about the kinds of lives we want to lead and the kind of society we want to live in. Teachers in some, perhaps small, ways affect the attitudes of the young as they mature into members of society. Teacher educators, perhaps in even smaller ways, affect the attitudes that teachers bring to their classrooms. To advocate the mainstreaming of gender studies is therefore to make a commitment to a view of the world that is to be presented to children in schools. We believe our commitments are clear; we hope our arguments are persuasive.

#### NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> We thank the anonymous peer reviewers for comments that helped us improve this article.
- <sup>2</sup> This program is complemented by a similar plan for Afro-American undergraduates. See Evelyn Torton Beck, Sandra C. Green, Diana R. Jackson, and Betty Schmitz, "The Feminist Transformation of a University: A Case Study," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 18, nos. 1/2 (1990): 174–78.
- <sup>3</sup> We thank Ann Hall of the University of Alberta for her summary "Curriculum Transformation, Integration and/or Balancing," April 1988. The following include only some of the numerous case studies: Bonnie Spanier, Alexander Bloom, and Darlene Boroviak, eds., *Gender Integration Projects* (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1984); Jo Ann M. Fritzsche, ed., *Toward Excellence and Equity: The Scholarship on Women as a Catalyst for Change in the University* (Orono, Me.: University of Maine Press, 1985); Margaret L. Anderson, "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education," *Signs* 12, no. 2 (1987): 222–54; Betty Schmitz, Myra Dinerstein, and Nancy Muirs, "Initiating a Curriculum Integration Project: Lessons for the Campus and the Region," in *Women's Place in the Academy: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curricula*, ed. Marilyn Schuster and Susan Van Dyne (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld, 1985): 116–29; K. Merrill, "Wheaton College: Integrating the Study of Women Into the Liberal Arts," *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 10, no. 1 (1982): 24–25; M. Schuster and S. Van Dyne, "Placing Women and the Liberal Arts: Stages of Curriculum Transformation," *Harvard Educational Review* 54, no. 4 (1984): 413–28; and P. Brown, "Montana State University: Seeking Women's Equity Through Curriculum Revision," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1982): 25–26.
- <sup>4</sup> The "Restoring Women to History" series (1988; revised edition, 1990) consists of teaching packets and material for Western civilization and U.S. history courses.
- <sup>5</sup> Susan Hardy Aitken et al., "Trying Transformations: Curricula Integration and the Problem of Resistance," *Signs* 12, no. 2 (1987): 255–75.

- <sup>6</sup> We thank Rosemary Shade for sharing this proposal with our department. Also see M. McGowan, "A New Opportunity for Women's Studies: Inclusion in a Revised Core Curriculum," *Frontiers* 8, no. 3 (1986): 110–13, and P. McIntosh, "Warning: The New Scholarship on Women May Be Hazardous to Your Ego," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1982): 29–31.
- <sup>7</sup> Aitken et al., p. 258.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>9</sup> See Judith Waltzer, "New Knowledge or a New Discipline?" *Change* (1982): 21–23; and Betty Schmitz, "Current Status Report on Curriculum Integration Projects," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 10, no. 3 (1982), 16–17. For a Canadian perspective, see J. Gaskell, A. McLaren, and M. Novogrodsky, *Claiming an Education* (Toronto: Our Schools/Ourselves Education Foundation, 1989).
- <sup>10</sup> Two interesting explications of this issue are found in N. Glazer, "Questioning Eclectic Practice in Curriculum Change: A Marxist Perspective," *Signs* 12, no. 2 (1987): 293–304, and L. Kramer and G. T. Martin, Jr., "Mainstreaming Gender: Some Thoughts for the Non-Specialist," *Teaching Sociology* 16, no. 2 (1988): 133–40.
- <sup>11</sup> Peggy McIntosh, "A Note on Terminology," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1983): 29–30. The author comments on the terminological confusion as reflecting the profundity of the activity (of mainstreaming). See also Nan Koothane, "Our Mission Should Not Be Merely to 'Reclaim' a Legacy of Scholarship — We Must Expand on It," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 32 (2 April 1986): 88.
- <sup>12</sup> Sandra Coyner, "The Ideas of Mainstreaming: Women's Studies and the Disciplines," *Frontiers* 8 (1986): 87–95; C. Stimpson, "New Consciousness, Old Institutions: The Need for Reconciliation" (unpublished paper); and Leslie R. Wolfe, "O Brave New Curriculum: Feminism and the Future of the Liberal Arts," *Theory Into Practice* 25, no. 4 (1986): 284–89 all discuss these issues as part of their arguments.
- <sup>13</sup> See Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault, "The Journey from Male Defined to Gender Balanced Education," *Theory Into Practice* 25, no. 4 (1986): 227–34 and C. Lougee, "Women, History and the Humanities," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (1981): 4–7. For a careful discussion of the significance of "separate spheres" historically, both as trope and as an ideology, including how its assumptions have shaped scholarship and needs to be re-examined, see Linda Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Women's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," *Journal of American History* 75 (June 1988): 9–39.
- <sup>14</sup> Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Education of the Educating Professions* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977): 12–13.
- <sup>15</sup> For a defense see, for example, Allen T. Pearson, *The Teacher: Theory and Practice in Teacher Education* (New York: Routledge, 1989), Chapter 8.
- <sup>16</sup> William Hare, *Open-mindedness and Education* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979): 9.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 65. Emphasis in the original.
- <sup>19</sup> The discussion here bears some relation to Hare's point on unconscious bias as possible evidence of close-mindedness; cf. op. cit., pp. 79–80.
- <sup>20</sup> Although the particular character trait of sensitivity that we have identified is little discussed, it is closely related to a central theme in moral education and moral philosophy. See, for example, Nel Noddings, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984) and Debra Shogan, *Care and Moral Motivation* (Toronto: OISE Press, 1988).

- <sup>21</sup> Michael W. Apple and Susan Jungck, "'You Don't Have to be a Teacher to Teach This Unit': Teaching, Technology, and Gender in the Classroom," *American Educational Research Journal* 27, no. 2 (1990): 232.
- <sup>22</sup> An interesting variety of perspectives on this is found in Kathleen Weiler, *Women Teaching for Change: Gender, Class and Power* (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1988) and Frieda Forman et al., eds., *Feminism and Education: A Canadian Perspective* (Toronto: Centre for Women's Studies in Education, 1990).
- <sup>23</sup> For a position on gender studies in the professional component of teacher education, see Daniel P. Liston and Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Teacher Education and the Social Context of Schooling: Issues for Curriculum Development," *American Educational Research Journal* 27, no. 4 (1990): 630–36.
- <sup>24</sup> Nel Noddings, "Feminist Critiques in the Professions," in *Review of Research in Education* 16, C. Cazden, ed. (Washington, D.C.: AERA, 1990): 407–9.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 411.
- <sup>26</sup> See Pearson, *op. cit.*, pp. 144–46.

---

Allen T. Pearson and Patricia T. Rooke are in the Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2G5.