

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 932

HE 025 862

AUTHOR Korn, Jessica
 TITLE The Feminist Challenge to Pedagogy in Higher Education.
 PUB DATE Dec 91
 NOTE 26p.
 PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Design; Departments; Economic Factors; Females; *Feminism; *Higher Education; *Instruction; Males; Sex Differences; Social Change; Social History; Teaching Methods; Womens Studies
 IDENTIFIERS Feminist Criticism; *Feminist Pedagogy; *Feminist Scholarship

ABSTRACT

This essay makes an argument for bringing a feminist perspective to pedagogy in higher education. The paper opens by reviewing the history of gender roles, relations, and perceptions in society before the industrial revolution. Subsequent sections describe women's participation in academia and develop a description of feminist pedagogy. Feminist pedagogy would raise the issue of the missing or invisible voice of women throughout higher education and seeks to bring solutions to recognizing, valuing, and teaching the female perspective and contribution in all disciplines. In explicating this view the essay discusses feminist philosophy, and presents a critique of the traditional academic disciplines from a feminist perspective. Such critiques suggest that current approaches deny expression to and negate the creative works of the non-powerful, are taught chronologically, assume hierarchical approaches, and are founded on competition. Another section describes what is involved in forming a non-gender biased curriculum. A discussion of the underlying values of feminist pedagogy covers the basis for teaching methods. The essay concludes by proposing a study to investigate the influence of change in pedagogy on attitudes about the female voice and its place in the curriculum of higher education. Sixteen references are included. (JB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED 349 932

The Feminist Challenge to Pedagogy In Higher Education

Jessica Korn
December 4, 1991
Education 410A
Professor A. Astin
Professor A. Cohen
Term Paper

AE 025 P62

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jessica Korn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



By examining the art or profession of teaching and instruction, which is known as pedagogy, in Higher Education from the Feminist perspective, the necessity of adding women's voice to the pedagogy of Higher Education becomes crucially clear. Although in the 1980's women gained almost absolute access to the institutions of Higher Education (Solomon, 1985, page 208), women are still struggling for equality in Higher Education in the early 1990's. Access does not necessarily equate to equality. To achieve equality, the women's perspective in the disciplines of Higher Education must no longer be marginalized or ignored, but rather recognized, valued, and taught right along side the perspective of men in the disciplines.

Background: The Importance of Defining Women as "Other"¹

Because the Feminist Perspective discusses women as "other," it is important to explain how women became relegated to that status and the attitudes that Feminism attempts to change within society. "Woman as other" was a concept created by the 1940's existentialist, Simone De Beauvoir, and has become a governing concept of the Feminist Perspective (Andersen, 1988). It is necessary to see how women have been marginalized historically by American society to see how Higher Education in the United States has replicated this restriction of the female voice and experience. Women have historically been relegated into the status of "other" and therefore secondary citizens not due the actual characteristics of their gender, but rather due to the view that women are inferior to men because of their gender and are thus deserving of subordination. By first examining the subordination of the female value system and experience in the larger society, a reference point is provided for discussion of the microcosm of Higher Education and the way it replicates the societal pattern of the subordination of women and the female experience in order to maintain the white male dominance.

Pre-industrial America was strongly family based: the family was the basic unit of production. The family and its work and production were central to the economic society. No division between private and public spheres or woman and man's spheres existed. Regardless of gender, the entire family helped in order to survive. The family worked not to sell products, but rather to create the

¹This section has been based on two References: Nancy Cott's Root of Bitterness and Ellen Carol DuBois and Vicki L. Ruiz's Unequal Sisters. Rather than having several citations throughout this section, it seemed to footnote the two references for the entire section. The books are fully cited in the bibliography.

things they needed for their own use. Each member of the family had multi-tasked obligations and skills. Although the women of the family did the cooking, housekeeping, the production of cloth and clothes, the bearing and rearing of children, there was some cross over to the duties and tasks the men of the family usually performed. Differences between men and women's roles within the family order were due to the nature of the work that was done by that family member. Women's work was just as valuable as the male contribution. Yet, the family was male and father dominated, just like the larger society. All roles within the family were shaped by duties and obligations to those above them. Subordination marked all relations within the family; however, sons eventually outgrew their subordination to their fathers because they became dominators of their own families. Wives and daughters were always subordinate to the men of their families. The economically productive, patriarchal family was transformed by industrialization, as was society and the roles and perceptions of women and men.

Industrialization in the early decades of the Nineteenth Century resulted in the rise of factories, wage labor, and the production of goods for markets, and therefore, the American economy was transformed into a cash-based economy. As a result of this fundamental change in the economy, men and women's roles became associated with where their work was located. Men did work outside of the home, while women became the sole manager of the home and the private family. Women's work within the home, at this point in American history and for the first time in American history, became invisible because it was hidden in the private sphere and added nothing to the economic status of the family. This created the myth that women's work within the home really is not work and that women were, therefore, incapable of any activities outside the home. Differences between men and women's work now became represented by the overall societal prescriptions of the characters of men and women. Differences between men and women's work evolved into representing the perceived and limiting differences between the characteristics of men and women. The public sphere was the man's sphere, while women were relegated to the private sphere of the home. This national mythology about the essence of femaleness, which evolved out of the partitioning of public and private spheres, characterized and dominated the thinking of the rest of the 19th century and for a good part of the

twentieth century. Women's roles became idealized and romanticized, as well as limiting and prescriptive.

Exuding with White, Middle Class values, the common ideology of this era proscribed the notion that the essence of femaleness and the female experience and was expressed through the Cult of True Womanhood. Briefly, the basic tenant of True Womanhood and woman's sphere includes the idea that housework was noble because it gave dignity to the woman because it allowed her to express her managerial skills of the private sphere, which were perceived as similar to the skill her husband used in the public sphere. This allowed her husband not to be anxious about his home and to concentrate on his work outside of the home. The home under the auspices of the woman was transformed into the moral center of the family. The home revitalized the man for the outside world. Men received solace and reward at home; therefore, the home nourished the husband's reserve to continue working, which not only supported the family, but also supported the nation because it helped the economy to grow and thus strengthen the nation. Moreover, women were supposed to be the moral and social instructors of the children. The prescribed notions of the roles of men and women were taught by the mother, even if she herself did not believe them. Boys were supposed to be taught to be like their fathers: diligent, hard working, and decent. Girls were socialized to be like their mothers: domestic, submissive, pure and pious. Women were supposed to be passionless because, according to the doctrines of the Cult of True Womanhood, women had to remain morally pure because they instilled morals into their children. The notions of woman's sphere created the idea that all women were the same, having no differences in their status or their skin color. Moreover, it created the reified notion that all women had sisterly connection because they experienced the same woman's sphere.

This entire ideology that dominated American society for so long was one of celebration of women. Yet, it becomes important to understand that this governing doctrine of American society hid the true experience of women and their voices. This ideal notion was not a reflection of reality, rather it was an ideological distortion of reality. The values of The Cult of True Womanhood did not include women of color or the working class because they were not seen as "women;" this ideal limited the notion and definition of who a woman was and what she could do. Further, women lost a great deal of autonomy over themselves and their lives because they were dependent on the husband due to the fact

they had no income due to the relegation to the private sphere. Because women were ideally elevated to the moral keeper of the home and children, it was falsely believed that women were morally superior to men, when in reality women were subjugated to men.

From their exclusion from the larger, public society, restrictive and prescriptive views of women permeated the society; therefore, society became even more strongly male dominated, or patriarchal, with a sexist ideology. The society was not only patriarchal, with a sexist ideology, the society was also based on middle class ideas: society expected all women to eventually marry and be supported by a man. This assumption did not recognize that poor and immigrant women could not count on a man for support, nor did it account for the fact that most women wanted to be their own person, not an adjunct of their husband and families. Women were expected to remain in the same sphere despite societal changes. It should be noted that women were occasionally allowed to step out of their prescriptive status in the private sphere with the permission of the overall society: women sometimes worked before they were married to supplement a families income; or women were even allowed to attend schools, usually that were all female, until they found a husband in order to ready them for their role of homemakers and wives. By limiting the definition of who is a woman, limiting their activities, as well as limiting their movement within society, women became seen as "other," which was reinforced and enforced by the notions of True Womanhood.

Several factors led women out of the private sphere into the male dominated public sphere, which includes Higher Education. The passage of women into Higher Education is intimately tied to economic and social forces in the twentieth century in the United States that reshaped life and attitudes, as well as the overall society. Women broke through the private sphere into the public sphere, especially Higher Education, because of several key events: The Suffrage Movement and the politicalization of women, declining birth rates due to the advent and acceptance of birth control, The Depression, World War II, The Civil Rights Movement which in turn led to The Second Wave of Feminism, and the advent and acceptance of more reliable birth control. Women's time and bodies became their own which enabled them to enter the public sphere in larger numbers, and therefore, began to change societal prescriptions on women.

Women as Outsiders in Academia:

By understanding how the larger society views women, it is easier to understand how and why academia also relegates women to secondary status. Again, it is worth mentioning that just because women have mostly gained full access to the institutions of Higher Education, women have yet to gain equality. Although women may constitute almost half of the population of students in Higher Education (Aisalam, 1990, page 33), women are underrepresented as faculty, are less likely to be tenured and therefore, are concentrated at the lower ranks within academia and are concentrated at the lower ranks below their male counterparts (Andersen, 1988, page 37). It is therefore entirely possible, as the Feminists argue, that female students and faculty find their values and perspectives at odds with the dominant values and experiences taught and perpetuated within Higher Education. Women, both as student and as faculty, encounter isolation within academic life, which leads to a feeling of being different and excluded.

Women become outsiders within Higher Education for two reasons: firstly, women's status at the academic institutions is less than the status of males; and secondly, women are estranged from the dominant world view surrounding them in academic life. This relegation to the status of "other" occurs at both points of entry for females into the academic life. It occurs when the female is a student, even though female students constitute almost half of the population within Higher Education. It also occurs when the female is a faculty member because she is in the minority. Because women are not recognized as equals, and because women are in effect removed from a situation they are involved in, women are deliberately distanced from, and have themselves distanced themselves, from the overall academic culture of White Male domination in all areas of academia. Because women are relegated to the status of "other", their perspective eschews the perspective that white males are at the center of everything. Rather, as with the perspective of any other group that is considered "other," the female perspective is unique because it goes beyond the dominant ideas of the ruling class of the society, the White Males. The Feminist critique of pedagogy within Higher Education magnifies the very disturbing fact that white, male domination is continuing within the microcosm of Higher Education, as well as the the society at large.

Feminist Pedagogy:

Any discussion on pedagogy must include analysis of disciplines, curriculum, methods, and the underlying values of the purpose of how something is taught and why it is taught. Feminist pedagogy analyzes the different disciplines within Higher Education, the curriculum, the methods used to teach the curriculum of the various subjects within the various disciplines, and the underlying values of the way the curriculum is taught. Feminist pedagogy raises the issue of the missing or invisible voice of women through out Higher Education and seeks to bring solutions to recognizing, valuing and teaching the female perspective and contribution in all disciplines. Yet, it should be noted that the term Feminist Pedagogy is something of a misnomer. Feminist pedagogy simply deals with the empowerment of the female perspective and contribution, known as the female voice, within academia. It could just as easily be labeled Women's Pedagogy, which takes away the negative connotations that the term Feminism sometimes carries with it. Yet, the struggle engaged in by women for women's equality is dubbed Feminism; therefore, when discussing the struggle for women's experiences to be a valid pedagogy, as well as a valid part of the curriculum of Higher Education, it should be called and is called Feminist Pedagogy. Now that access has been basically achieved, women now want their experiences, contributions and values to be taught with the same respect and validity as the male experiences, contributions, and values.

Feminist Philosophy:

The Feminist Philosophy essentially asserts men and women do have differences based on biological characteristics that are connected with the different reproductive capabilities. However, Feminists further claim that these physical differences do not make women any less capable than men in any task or on any level. Physical differences do not legitimate the perception of women as "other" in contemporary society. Women have similar inborn potentials, abilities, and desires as men, regardless of the realm in which they manifest themselves, whether it be physical, verbal, emotional, or metaphysical. Women do have the same concomitant ability for interpretation, decision making, and abstract thought. Women need not be limited to the domestic sphere because women can fully function in the public sphere and larger areas of the society (Andersen, 1988, page 338). Moreover, Feminists affirm that women should have more autonomy over their lives, to the extent that it is

possible for anyone. This brief summary of the Feminist perspective allows now for a fuller discussion of their critique of pedagogy in Higher Education and how women can become a valid part of it.

Borne out of the struggle to have women's experiences and perspectives taken seriously and presented as a valid part of Higher Education, Departments of Women's Studies emerged within Higher Education. Here, women could present what they viewed as valid material without interrupting what the men in power believed to be valid. Women's Studies programs are on the cutting edge of redefining the disciplines within Higher Education with their theories and methodologies. Within Women's Studies a new awareness about women in society, culture and history is being created. The heart of Women's Studies is based on the fundamental tenant that knowledge traditionally taught in Higher Education is partial, incomplete, and distorted because it has excluded females, and is centered around White Males. It is simply not enough to add women to existing knowledge and teachings, because those are based on male experiences and masculine values. The goal of Women's Studies engages in the process of redefining knowledge by making women's experiences a primary subject for knowledge through conceptualizing women as active agents in the creation of knowledge, including women's perspectives on knowledge, looking at gender as fundamental to the articulation of knowledge in the disciplines, and viewing women's and men's experiences in relation to the sex/gender system of teaching. Yet, Women's Studies is largely an invisible paradigm because the Male White power structure does not recognize it as worthy of being taught in mainstream curriculum. Women's Studies attempts to create truly coeducational teaching, curriculum, and disciplines (Andersen, 1987, page 38). However, it is separated into its own small departments where it remains placated, patronized and largely ignored. This hard-won advancement of a Women's Studies department is a triumph because Feminist goals and scholarship can be pursued, but still trivializes and marginalizes women further because they are isolated from the main of Higher Education.

Critique of the Disciplines from the Feminist Perspective:

By critiquing the various disciplines present in the institutions of Higher Education, Feminists explicitly illustrate how women's culture is invisible or trivialized and ignored because men's construction of reality and men's culture is taken and presented as truth. The Feminists Schuster and Van Dyne provide the fullest critique of the disciplines in their Women's Place in the Academy. According to

Schuster and Van Dyne, the Feminist Movement exposes these unexamined standards for teaching and the curriculum by showing their relation to ideology, power, and values of dominant groups, who in our culture are white and male. Traditionally the disciplines, and thus the curriculum, are completely entrenched with the unacknowledged ideology of the dominant culture (Schuster and Van Dyne, 1985). The Feminist critique across the disciplines illuminates that "what [is presented] as timeless... and representative, or objective [within the disciplines] is embedded within patriarchal assumptions about culture and society" (Andersen, 1987, page 53). Attempts at recentring knowledge from an inclusive and holistic perspective unmask the invisible paradigms that guide the curriculum and raises questions about the traditional disciplines that require the Feminists, as well as those within each field, to critically examine the various fields.

According to Schuster and Van Dyne, who provide a detailed overview of the disciplines as seen from the Feminist perspective in Women's Place in the Academy, the Feminists believe that The Arts and Humanities traditionally create and reinforce definitions of life that exclude the experiences of, deny expression to, and negate the creative works of the non-powerful, all the while The Arts and Humanities are claiming to include all the concerns of all humanity and the human experience as their subject matter. In The Arts and Humanities, the Feminists claim that women are excluded from literary and artistic canons on the grounds that their work does not meet the standards of excellence. However, Feminists assert that this is actually a cover for the real reason for female exclusion: women's work in these arenas are not valued where as men's contributions are valued. Therefore, by the exclusion of women, the canons are founded on principles embedded in masculine culture, even though the discipline asserts that it speaks to universal themes and transcends the particularities of sociocultural conditions such as race, class, and gender. Another problem Feminists find with the way The Arts and Humanities are taught, is that it is taught chronologically. Chronological presentation assumes competition as a part of creativity and suggest that hierarchical arrangements are inevitable in all organization of cultural reality. This directly opposes Feminist Philosophy. In the Humanities as well as the Arts, women appear only in text or a artistic objects: women's own voice is rarely heard as a primary source. This reveals a deep sex, class, and race bias in the teachings of The Arts and Humanities. The Feminists believe that by introducing women as subjects the curriculum is more than

expanded, it introduces gender relations as a primary category of experience, whether it be in History, the Arts, or in the overall Humanities. It should be noted that the Arts, both fine and performing, were introduced as specific disciplines for women for them to study as they began to enter Higher Education in significant numbers because it was perceived this is what women should learn rather than math, sciences, or engineering. However, once the Arts began to be taught, they were coopted by the White Male point of view.

As in The Arts and Humanities, the exclusion of women from The Social Sciences leads to a distortion and ignorance of their experience in society and culture. The Social Sciences claim to give accurate accounts of social reality. However, the exclusion of the female experience and perspective has produced concepts and theories that are gender-biased because they are not based on universality but rather the notions of White Males. Feminists assert that the core concepts within The Social Sciences are gender-biased. For example, the assumed split between public and private spheres is reproduced in Social Science concepts that tend to be grounded in public experience while ignoring private experience, where women have traditionally been exiled, and the ignoring of relations between public and private spheres. This explicitly illustrates how women are excluded from the content of the discipline and how the core concepts of The Social sciences have been arranged around men and created by men. This world view does not reflect the reality of women existing. Another problem within The Social Sciences the Feminists cite is the fact that the discipline tries to establish itself as a science, which generates hierarchical methodologies in which the knower is seen as the expert in the lives of others and produces research methodologies that deny the social relations existing between researchers and those they study. Feminists want to revise The Social Sciences by using interpretive methods because they are reflexive about the circumstances in which knowledge is produced and sees researchers as situated in the action of their research. They also believe that scientific distance and rationality are masculine values and has made the exclusion of women possible. The texts of the discipline reflect that it is male centered; for example women are not shown as being involved in the history of psychology at all and they were (Schuster and Van Dyne, 1985).

Although claiming academic neutrality, The Natural and Physical Sciences have the closest relations with political and economic structures, according to the Feminists. Feminists closely examine

the fields of Science and Technology because they assert the worlds of science, capitalism and patriarchy are closely woven together. As an example of science meeting patriarchy, in science things are broken down into kingdoms and orders, which are not intrinsic to the nature of the organisms, but have evolved out of masculine values of hierarchy and patrilineage (Andersen, 1987, page 62). Schuster and Van Dyne scathingly review this discipline especially because the teaching techniques and the texts are essentially male dominated. Women are entering these fields as a matter of equity, however, female contributions are ignored. Feminists assert that a connection between science and gender/sex could provide a system that brings in the female contributions and experience to the Sciences. A more cooperative and pluralistic view could be instilled instead of a competitive, hierarchical and patriarchal view.

The Feminist critique of the disciplines illuminate common themes that are problems within all the fields. Feminists emphasize that the knowledge of each field is socially constructed based on the White Male experience. Female's voices and experiences are invisible, or if they are presented at all, it is on the fringe. Underlying values of the disciplines are essentially male: competition, hierarchy, and a patriarchal world vision. All of this is reinforced by teaching techniques, course content and the texts that are used. These themes are exactly what Feminists are trying to change by changing the pedagogy in Higher Education, which includes a change in the curriculum and a change in the technique.

Building a Non-Gender-Biased Curriculum:

Typically Women's Studies programs and scholarship have not fully made its way into the main curriculum of colleges and universities. Without programs designed to bring this new scholarship into the whole curriculum, most students, male as well as female, will continue to be untouched by the female voice and therefore will be unprepared to understand the world (Andersen, 1987, page 42). The curriculum that is now strongly entrenched in Higher Education claims validity, but is based on the experience, values, and activities of a dominant few. Women's Studies programs in Higher Education are a starting point for changing the curriculum, but the scholarship, theories, and perspectives it produces need to be extended to the general curriculum of every discipline within Higher Education.

There have been various movements across Higher Education to somehow bring the female voice to the overall curriculum. Projects designed to change the curriculum in order to bring the scholarship on women into the whole curriculum have been variously labeled "mainstreaming," "integrating Women's Studies into the curriculum," and "gender-balancing the curriculum." These labels attached to the attempts to bring women's perspective into the main are all problematic because they imply that curriculum change through Women's Studies follow a simple prescription for attachment, when in fact Women's Studies can not just merely be assimilated into or co-opted by the dominant culture.

"Mainstreaming" trivializes women by implying that women have been out of, and are only now entering, the mainstream. This term implies that there is only one mainstream, and by entering it women will be indistinguishable from men. It makes reconstructive work of curriculum change seem like a fast and easy process. This approach does not recognize that Women's Studies builds its understanding on the assumption that there are diverse, pluralistic, and tolerant perspectives of men's and women's experiences and all of those must be addressed. The overall problem with "Mainstreaming" is that it attempts to placate the female perspective by co-opting it. It does not seek to change the overall system of values or perspectives, which is based on White Male values and experiences. The problem with the "Integration" approach is similar to the problem with the "Mainstreaming" approach. "Integration" implies that Women's Studies can be assimilated into the dominant curriculum, when in fact Women's Studies scholarship already demonstrates that women can not be just included in a curriculum that is structured, organized, and conceived through the experience of men. Another problem Andersen cites with this problem is that it may lead to the diluting of the principal goals of Women's Studies. The risk is that women will be recognized, but not valued, and therefore further trivialized.

Feminist scholarship is based on the tenant that the exclusion of women has led to the distorted, partial, and false claims to truth based on the White Male perspective. "Gender-balancing" implies that all perspectives are equally accurate and significant, and are worthy of presentation. Feminists believe that not all perspectives are valid because they breed intolerance, such as perspectives that are racist, anti-Semitic, ethnocentric, class-biased, and sexist. Therefore, Feminists

do not accept that all perspectives are worthy of being presented. According to the Feminists Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli-Klein, it is unrealistic to seek a balanced curriculum when the world itself is unbalanced.

The overall problem with these approaches to curriculum change, is not purely semantic. Rather, the primary problem with these is that they continue to accept the dominant male view. Women's Studies attempts to shift the dominance away from males to the dominance of female and males. Feminists assert that curriculum change, by necessity, must maintain that what is wrong with the dominant curriculum cannot be fixed by simply addition, inclusion, or minor revision. The entire system must change by changing the perspective of who is powerful, valid, and significant. Merely having men study women as new objects of academic discourse does not necessarily represent a transformation in men's thinking or perspective to include women. Most of these attempts to change the curriculum have resulted in Women's Studies departments on campuses in order to placate the attempts to change curriculum. However, it is still not enough because women are isolated in their own department and not allowed to participate in the whole of Higher Education. It is analogous to the isolation women underwent in the private sphere of the home. Feminists view Women's Studies departments as starting points for expanded their scholarship throughout the disciplines, not an ending point.

Schuster and Van Dyne in their Women's Place in the Academy present a conceptual framework to transforming the overall curriculum. Their six-step phase theory to curriculum change helps to unveil hidden assumptions within the dominant curriculum and therefore helps to move towards a reconceptualization of knowledge that includes the female voice. It should be noted that other Feminists, such as Gerda Lerner and Peggy McIntosh, have similar theories that parallel the theory outlined by Schuster and Van Dyne, and they all have the same purpose to reconceptualize knowledge from a female and male perspective. The most important feature of Schuster and Van Dyne's theory is that it sees changing the curriculum as an evolution from recognizing the invisibility of women and identifying sexism in traditional knowledge, to searching for the missing women, then to conceptualizing women as a subordinated group, and finally, to studying women on their own terms (Schuster and Van Dyne, 1985, page 16). It is useful to catalogue the elements that would characterize a transformed course, according to Schuster and Van Dyne. A transformed course would be self-

conscious about methodology and use gender as a category of analysis, no matter what is on the syllabus, even if it is all males. A transformed course would present changed content in a changed context and be aware that all knowledge is historical and socially constructed, not immutable. A transformed course would develop an interdisciplinary perspective, to make visible the language of discourse, assumptions of a field, and analytical methods by contrast with other fields. Meaningful attention would be given to the intersection of race, class, gender, and the cultural differences within gender, as well as avoiding universalizing beyond data. The transformed course would study new subjects in their own terms, not merely as other, alien, non-normative, and non-Western, and attempt to encourage and create a true pluralism. Paradigms would be not merely adding on women figures or issues, they would instead incorporate analysis of gender, race and class by a thorough reorganization of available knowledge, which would include knowledge produced by women. The explicit content would include the learning process and the student's experiences, which would serve to reaffirm the transcendent goals of the course. Finally, a transformed course would recognize that, because culture reproduces itself in the classroom, the more conscious teachers and students are of this occurrence, the more likely they are to turn it to an advantage in teaching the transformed course.

Another useful outline to changing the curriculum is presented by Mary Kay Tetreault, in which she defines the phases of Feminist scholarship are male scholarship, compensatory scholarship, bifocal scholarship, feminist scholarship, and multifocal/relational scholarship. Her first phase, like Schuster and Van Dyne's, accepts the male experience as universal. In Phase 2 women are recognized as being missing, but continues to perceive men as the norm. The third phase, or the bifocal stage, defines human experience in dualist categories; the curriculum perceives men and women as generalized groups. This phase still emphasizes the oppression of women and their voice. Stage four, or Feminist Scholarship, use women's experience as the measure of significance rather than men's experience. Here, more attention is given to the contextual and the personal: sex and gender are seen within historical, cultural, and ideological contexts, and thinking becomes more interdisciplinary. The final stage is multifocal/relational scholarship, which seeks a holistic view in which the ways men and women relate to and complement each other is a continuum of human experience. This phase takes into full account of the experiences of race, class, ethnicity, and gender.

These two conceptual outlines can be used as measures for critiquing and redesigning the course content and the disciplines overall. It is also important to point out that these boundaries between phases are fluid and do not have to be linear as long as the end result is the reconceptualization of knowledge from an holistic and inclusive perspective, which takes into account gender as well as race and class. This way the curriculum, and the disciplines, no longer rest on the experiences and judgements of a few, namely the ones who hold the power: White Males (Andersen, 1987, page 52).

Yet the success of reconceptualizing knowledge from the perspective of both males and females, not just White Males, depends on several factors, not just a change in the value system and the acceptance by those in power. Of course a value shift is the most necessary factor because those in power perceive this change as a direct threat to their power and dominance, and are most reluctant to give up their power and dominance. However, other concrete steps must be taken at the same time. Schmitz, Dinnerstein and Mairs in their contribution to Women's Place in the Academy suggest several concrete factors to help change the curriculum (Schuster and Van Dyne, pages 116-129). A key group of committed individuals who will act as agents of change is needed. Administrative understanding and support is vital. Women's Studies expertise and resources are needed on campuses. Resources to support faculty development programs and activities are needed on campuses. There must be the impetus for reform or specific opportunity for faculty development of the new curriculum. A new reward mechanism for participating faculty must be instituted. A legitimate, non-isolated home base must be present on campuses for the projects in order to directly deal with the institutional power structure. Schuster and Van Dyne propose three models to illicit curriculum change on campuses. A top-down model begins with an administrative directive to make sweeping changes in the curriculum by integrating introductory courses in all departments or otherwise affecting a significant number of basic courses. A piggy-back model is that which interdisciplinary courses or programs already sanctioned within the institutional agenda are targeted by Women's Studies groups or by administrators as the best way to begin curriculum transformation and to reach a broad range of faculty, and therefore students. A bottom-up model or consortial model originates with the faculty expertise and student interest and seeks to highlight, connect, and maximize internal resources; retraining is accomplished

through collaboration among peers. Another option that Schuster and Van Dyne do not mention, because they are trying to reform the system from within, is the viable possibility of starting an entirely new institution centered around the Feminist ideals.²

Underlying Values of Feminist Pedagogy

One other aspect the Feminists critique while reviewing pedagogy is teaching methods. In most of the Feminist literature on pedagogy, the Feminists are concerned that the teaching methods are implicitly based on power relation, as are the curriculum and the disciplines. The passive, silent, note-taking student and the active, lecturing teacher creates competition among students and a hierarchy between the students and the teachers. This is directly opposed to the values the Feminists are trying to put forth through a change in the pedagogy of Higher Education. Feminists believe teaching should be cooperative, democratic, and collective, without one dominant person who is the teacher lording over a group of subordinates who are the students. A vital change for the Feminists in pedagogy would be changing the power dynamics in the classroom, and would also be reinforced by what is taught in the classroom.

The values that are the foundation of the Feminist challenge to traditional pedagogy in Higher Education parallel Alexander Astin's view of the true purpose, and the underlying values, of Higher Education. According to Astin, most institutions of Higher Education operate on two sets of values: "explicit" values are the formal or official statements of the college or university that are found printed in the college catalogue or mission statement; the "implicit" values are those that "actually drive the institution's policies" (Astin, 1991, page 4). Because college catalogues and mission statements provide an outright statement of the goals and values of the institution, it is easy to discern these overt goals, which "embraces the familiar triad of teaching, research, and [community] service" (Astin, 1991, page 5). Discerning the implicit goals and values is a much more difficult task because they are usually hidden and at odds with the explicit goals. Astin suggests that the best way to examine the implicit values of

²Several institutions that are centered around the Feminist ideal have been started and are discussed through the literature on Feminist Pedagogy, but are beyond the scope of this paper, and therefore not discussed.

Higher Education is by focusing on the issue of quality and excellence in academia (Astin, 1991, page 5).

By comparing the traditional views of excellence to Astin's alternative view of excellence, which is presented in many published works and speeches like "Competition or Cooperation? Teaching Teamwork as a Basic Skill," Assessment for Excellence and "The Unrealized Potential of American Higher Education," the implicit values and goals of Higher Education are isolated and shown how they oppose the explicit values.

The Resources View of Excellence asserts that excellence is based on having a multitude of resources, which include money, high-quality students and high-quality faculty. In other words, the more resources an institution possesses, the more excellent the institution. The Reputational View of Excellence advances the notion that the most excellent institutions enjoy the best reputations. Reputations are positioned on a reified prestige hierarchy or pecking order, with the most excellent, selective, and elite schools ranking at the top. These two dominant concepts of excellence are mutually reinforcing because "more resources enhances reputation, and a good reputation helps to bring in more resources" (Astin, 1987, page 14). Therefore, these assessment measures of excellence perpetuate the same rankings among the institutions in Higher Education. According to Astin, these traditional measures of quality and excellence reinforce and expose the underlying values within Higher Education. Competition, individuality, and materialism (Astin, 1987 and 1991) are the implicit values of Higher Education. These values are not only reinforced by Resources and Reputational views of excellence, but also by the curriculum (Astin, 1991, page 15) and the teaching methods (Astin, 1987). Although from a different focus of analysis, the Feminists have been able to deduce the same thing. The Feminists believe the hidden values of Higher Education are, as Astin asserts, competitive, individualistic, and materialistic due to the White Male power structure.

Astin asserts that these values directly oppose the primary purpose of Higher Education, which is explicitly expressed in mission statements: "the reputational and resources approaches to excellence are flawed because they do not directly address [the] explicit values, and in particular the education of the student" (Astin, 1991, page 6). Astin insightfully asserts that the traditional views of excellence miss the main point of Higher Education: the mission of Higher Education is to educate the student

and fully develop the student's abilities and talents (Astin, 1987, page 14). The Talent Development Approach to Excellence defines quality in terms of how an institution positively and effectively impacts the student's knowledge and development, which includes personal and mental growth. The focus of excellence shifts away from the overall institution and its status to the individual student and their growth. An excellent institution is committed to the goal of having students involved with their learning process and their peers and teachers, as well as having the institution committed to the growth of the students. In the article "Competition or Cooperation? Teaching Teamwork as a Basic Skill," Astin asserts that methods of teaching, course content, grading, testing, hiring policies all are laden with the competitive value system and must be reformed to be cooperative in nature instead. The underlying value of this approach is cooperation, as opposed to competition. The same themes are echoed in the Feminist challenge to pedagogy.

Conclusions:

This is the same value system the Feminists are trying to achieve in Higher Education by doing exactly what Astin suggests: changing the curriculum and teaching methods. Astin, as well as the Feminists, believe that the curriculum are concrete manifestations of what the institution considers important, it is the reflection of the implicit values (Astin, 1991, page 15); therefore is a logical place to begin changing in order to produce the true purpose of Higher Education. Astin and the Feminists are working toward the same thing, but from two different directions: Astin is seeking change through the Talent Development Approach to Excellence, where as the Feminists are seeking change through a reconceptualization of knowledge through Women's Scholarship. Both advocate a change in pedagogy, specifically the curriculum and teaching methods, in order to achieve a system of Higher Education that "reflect[s] an awareness of contemporary social problems, a commitment to dealing constructively with such problems," (Astin, 1991, page 15), the incorporation of "others" in the teaching of the disciplines. The current teaching methods and current course content pay little attention to women as well as other values that would breed an acceptance of others; Astin believes values such as "honesty, social responsibility, self-understanding, tolerance, [and] empathy" (Astin, 1991, page 17) should be the core values of the institutions because it would not only impart knowledge to students, but would also help them to develop into good citizens. Feminists essentially

want the same thing because they want women, as well as other marginalized groups, to be tolerated, understood, and valued enough to have their perspectives and experiences taught right along with the male perspective and experience. If these were the governing values of Higher Education there would not be such a struggle to include women as a source of valid experience and knowledge. Although approaching it from two different tactics, Astin and the Feminists believe that the "materialistic" (Astin) or patriarchal (Feminists) world view employed in Higher Education, as well as the overall society, leads to intolerance, "religious fanaticism, prejudice, fear, envy, racism, ethnocentrism, and sexism (Astin, 1991, page 22). According to Astin, disciplines such as science and technology can not solve these problems, so it is time to "redress the balance" in the curriculum (Astin, 1991, page 22). This is concise way of summarizing what the Feminists assert. According to the Feminists, changing the pedagogy, especially curriculum and teaching techniques, to include women, must be through a reconceptualization of knowledge from a holistic and inclusive perspective with the underlying values of cooperation, tolerance, collective sharing, and non-prejudiced.

A Proposed Study:

In order to reinforce and validate the concepts of Feminist Pedagogy, it may be useful to attempt a study where their tenants about curriculum and teaching methods are used.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of change in pedagogy on attitudes about the female voice and its place in the curriculum of Higher Education. This would help to support the Feminist belief that by changing pedagogy, especially curriculum, the disciplines will change, as will the overall value system of the institutions within Higher Education. The study will achieve its primary purpose by comparing the impact of environmental characteristics on attitudes.

Hypothesis: The hypothesis guiding the study is that by manipulating the gender of the teacher, the the course content of the course, and the types of teaching methods, the attitudes of the students in the class will change to be more accepting and tolerant of others, specifically women. The study attempts to answer the question that if pedagogy is changed in accordance with Feminist suggestions, the values of the students will change to be more cooperative, tolerant and accepting.

Methods: At UCLA, almost every incoming freshman is required to take Freshman English Composition, which is labelled English 3. The only way a freshman may pass out of it is if that

individual scored a four or higher on the English Advanced Placement Exam in their senior year in high school. The freshman are not required to take the class their first year at the university, however it is highly recommended. Therefore, it is possible that in the English 3 classes, freshman, sophomores, juniors and seniors may be present. The objective of the course is to teach freshman how to write critically according to the specific requirements of the university. Each quarter about 45 sections are taught by different Teaching Assistants. Each Teaching Assistant chooses the materials the students are to use in the class. Moreover, the Teaching Assistant has the autonomy to conduct the class any way they choose: lecture style or having a student or a group of students conduct the class on a rotating basis. The only restriction is to make sure their students learn to compose critically. This is an ideal situation to test the hypothesis.

Sample: The sample would consist of all students taking the English 3 course in all the different sections for one full year. The total number would be an unknown until the data gathering was concluded. This should provide a diverse group of subjects. Both genders would be represented, as would most races and ethnicities. Moreover, this large of a sample could almost insure the fact that all levels of aptitude and socioeconomic status would be represented. Because students are free to choose their sections, there will be no randomization. Rather the study will be using intact groups of students.

Design: The overall design of the study is a Quasi Experimental Alternative Treatment Groups Pre-Test/Post-Test Factorial Design. It is a Quasi Experimental Design because there is no randomization of the subjects to the different groups, which does pose the possible threat of selection to both internal and external validity. But when conducting research outside of the laboratory, the researcher must adapt to the real world and the limitations it imposes on experiments.

Procedure: It should be noted here that this study must have the approval of the administration as well as the approval of the department and the teaching staff, which is Schuster and Van Dyne's top-down model. Before the quarters began the Teaching Assistants would be assigned to different sections of English 3. Among themselves, with the researchers permission, they would decide on the course content and the type of teaching method they would use. The course content would vary in three ways: the first type of content would be strictly male authors, the second type of course content

would be strictly female authors, and the final type of course content would be both male and female authors. The types of teaching methods would be divided into lecture, or a collective discussion group where the students taught the class each class meeting. For each different type of course content combined with each different type of teaching method, a male and a female Teaching Assistant would be teaching it in different sections. There will be more sections than different combination of the independent variable, therefore, each combination will have more than one section. This helps to provide checks between sections taught with the same combination of environmental factors. Because students will know that different sections are being taught with different teaching methods as well as different with different course content, the possible threat of diffusion of treatment to internal validity presents itself. However, it really is not a threat because it can be explained away by the Teaching Assistants reporting to their students that their method of teaching and the content was left up to the individual Teaching Assistant so long as they teach the students how to write critically.

Once the quarter begins, the students would be given a pre-test that is a survey about attitudes about women, this would be controlling for inputs that may affect the outcomes or the environments, as well as controlling for the possible threat of history to internal validity and the possible threat of characteristics of subjects to external validity. This survey would be administered to the students the first class meeting. It would be shrouded as an attitudinal survey about study habits and expectations of college in general; however, there would be specific questions about attitudes about women. For example, one question may ask how much time a student devotes to homework, or television watching, or reading, or sports and the next question may ask if the student learns better from male or female teachers and why. The first type of question would serve as a decoy, while the second type of question drives at the real purpose of the study. The survey would be administered by a trained assistant who poses themselves as a senior psychology student working on their senior research project, which is on students attitudes about study habits and expectations about college in general. This avoids the possible threat of testing to internal validity and the possible threat of experimenter effect to external validity. Then the quarter would proceed as normal, with the sections be taught along the guidelines already established. At the end of the quarter a similar survey would be administered, again under the same conditions, to see if the classroom environment changed the

attitudes of the students. The specific surveys to measure attitudes would be developed by the researchers.

At the end of the each quarter, each Teaching Assistant would be interviewed to see if they noticed a difference in the values of their students as well as their own values. The researchers will already know the Teaching Assistant's affinity towards technique and content because they will have been allowed to pick how they teach the course and what the content is with the consent of the researchers. The researchers will have to make sure that every combination is taught at least twice, given that at least 40 sections of English 3 are taught every quarter at UCLA (UCLA Course Catalogue, Fall 1991, Winter 1992).

Treatment of Data: To see if the different environments did impact and change the student's attitudes, correlations between the independent variables and the dependent variables should be calculated. To prove causation, multiple regression would then be performed. The model applied to the data analysis will be Alexander Astin's Input-Environment-Outcome Model of Assessment because that isolates the differences in environments that impact outcomes (Astin, 1991), which is the overall purpose of this proposed study.

Significance: The significance of this type of study is that if the hypothesis is proven correct, then the basic tenants of Feminist Pedagogy would be reinforced and validated. A study like this proposed study, if ever conducted, would also bring recognition to the Feminist challenge to traditional pedagogy within Higher Education because it would be conducted at a major research university. Moreover, a study of this nature would be providing a platform for Feminist scholarship, which is a holistic and inclusive perspective, to enter for the first time into the main of the disciplines of Higher Education. It would also help prove that the Feminist approach, as well as the Talent Development Approach to education, are more beneficial to students because they not only teach them non-biased knowledge, but also how to build a set of values that will allow them to respect and interact well with others.

Bibliography

Alsalam, Nabeel (editor)

- 1990 National Center For Education Statistics: The Condition of Education, 1990, Volume 2, Postsecondary Education. U.S Department Of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Andersen, Margaret L.

- 1988 Thinking About Women: Sociological Perspectives on Sex and Gender, second edition. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

- 1988 "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education" Pages 36-68 in Elizabeth Minnich, Jean O'Barr, and Rachel Rosenfeld (eds.) Reconstructing The Academy: Women's Education and Women's Studies. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Astin, Alexander W.

- 1987 "Competition or Cooperation? Teaching Teamwork as a Basic Skill." *Change*, Volume 19, Number 5 (September). Pages 12-19.

- 1991 Assessment For Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. New York: American Council on Education Macmillan Publishing Company.

- 1991 "The Unrealized Potential of American Higher Education." Louise McBee lecture delivered at the Institute of Higher Education, The University of Georgia, November 7, 1991.

Astin, Alexander W. and Lewis C. Solmon

- 1981 "Part Two: The Quality of Undergraduate Education - Are Reputational Ratings Needed to Measure Quality?" *Change*, Volume 13, Number 7 (October). Pages 14-19.

Bruner, Jerome S.

- 1963 The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
1966 Toward a Theory of Instruction. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

- Bunch, Charlotte and Sandra Pollack (editors)
1983 Learning Our Way: Essays in Feminist Education. New York:
The Crossing Press. Pages ix-xv, 248-260, 261-271.
- Cott, Nancy F. (editor)
1972 Root of Bitterness: Documents of The Social History of
American Women. Boston: Northeastern Press.
- DuBois, Ellen Carol and Vicki L. Ruiz (editors)
1990 Unequal Sisters: A Multi-Cultural Reader in U.S. Women's
History. New York: Routledge.
- Gabriel, Susan L. and Isaiah Smithson (editors)
1990 Gender In The Classroom: Power and Pedagogy. Chicago:
University of Illinois Press. Pages 1-27, 28-40, 41-59,
- Mayhew, Lewis B. and Patrick J. Ford
1971 Changing The Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
Publishers.
- Morris, William
1980 The New College Edition of the American Heritage Dictionary
of the English Language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Schuster, Marilyn R. and Susan R. Van Dyne (editors)
1985 Women's Place In The Academy: Transforming the Liberal
Arts Curriculum. New Jersey: Rowan and Allanheld
Publishers. Pages 3-12, 13-29, 48-61, 98-115, 116-129,
161-171, 221-231, 279-325.
- Solmon, Lewis C. and Alexander W. Astin
1981 "A New Study of Excellence in Undergraduate Education- Part
One: Departments without Distinguished Graduate Programs."
Change, Volume 13, Number 6 (September). Pages 22-28.
- Solomon, Barbara Miller
1985 In The Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and
Higher Education in America. New Haven: Yale University
Press.

University of California, Los Angeles
1991 Fall 1991 Course Catalogue
1992 Winter 1992 Course Catalogue

Walsh, Catherine E.

1991 Pedagogy and the Struggle for Voice: Issues of Language,
Power, and Schooling for Puerto Ricans. New York: Bergin
and Garvey Publishers.