DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 965 HE 032 673

AUTHOR Grant, Carl A.; Kinsler, Kimberly; Morales-Nadal, Milgra; Tittle, Carol Kehr

TITLE Education. CUNY Panel: Rethinking the Disciplines. Women in the Curriculum Series.

INSTITUTION Towson Univ., Baltimore, MD. National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.

ISBN ISBN-1-885303-11-4

PUB DATE 1997-00-00

NOTE 73p.; For related documents in this series, see HE 032 663-689.

AVAILABLE FROM Towson University, 8000 York Road, Baltimore, MD 21252; Tel: 800-847-9922 (Toll Free); Fax: 410-830-3482; Web site: http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw ($10).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; College Instruction; *Education; *Educational Research; Ethnicity; Females; Feminism; *Feminist Criticism; Higher Education; Models; *Multicultural Education; Politics of Education; Race; Research Methodology; Sex Bias; Sex Fairness; *Teacher Education; Teaching Methods; Test Bias; Testing; Theories

IDENTIFIERS Gender Issues

ABSTRACT

This collection of four essays examines the ways in which education, as a discipline, currently reflects ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, social class, and sexual orientation. In "Teacher Education and Multicultural Education: Research, Students, and Teaching" Carl A. Grant notes that while a growing number of universities are offering multicultural education courses, the inclusion of multicultural education in the total teacher education program structure is met with resistance at both the student and faculty level. In "Taking Teachers' Blinders Off: A Short History of the Politics of Teacher Education," Kimberly Kinsler examines the evolution of teacher education and how it is influenced by the power politics of various interest groups. In "Education: Rethinking the Discipline for Race, Class, Gender, and Ethnicity," Milgra Morales-Nadal reviews changes in texts over the last several decades and the integration of new scholarship into the teacher education curriculum. In "Testing, Scholarship, and the Curriculum," Carol Kehr Tittle reviews the research on testing, test bias, and the effects of testing on teacher education. Each essay contains references. (MDM)

HE

EDUCATION

CUNY Panel:
Rethinking the Discipline

WOMEN in the CURRICULUM

Women in the Curriculum

EDUCATION

CUNY Panel:

Rethinking the Disciplines

Carl A. Grant
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Kimberly Kinsler
Hunter College, CUNY

Milga Morales-Nadal
Brooklyn College, CUNY

Carol Kehr Tittle
The Graduate School, CUNY

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
1997

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
8000 York Road
Baltimore, MD 21252
Phone: (410) 830-3944
Fax: (410) 830-3469
E-mail: ncctrw@towson.edu
http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw

The National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women is partially supported by grants from The Ford Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, whose support is gratefully acknowledged. The viewpoints expressed herein, however, do not necessarily reflect those of the funding agencies.

Printed on recycled paper by Uptown Press, Baltimore, MD

ISBN 1-885303-11-4

CONTENTS

PREFACE

In 1992 – 1994 the SEMINAR ON SCHOLARSHIP AND THE CURRICULUM: THE STUDY OF GENDER, RACE, ETHNICITY, AND CLASS, under the aegis of the **City University of New York Academy for the Humanities and the Sciences**, and generously funded by the Ford Foundation, undertook a series of meetings devoted to "Rethinking the Disciplines." The Academy Seminar had already spent four years examining ways in which the study of gender, race, ethnicity, and class has been slowly transforming the curriculum of the university. Panels had explored women's studies, ethnic studies, area studies, interdisciplinary studies, pedagogical issues, and teaching about such topics as AIDS. The Academy Seminar has involved faculty at CUNY who are members of the CUNY Academy, faculty, students, and administrators interested in these specific issues, and faculty who have themselves taken part in one of the several curriculum transformation projects within CUNY beginning in the 1980s.*

* Two curriculum projects, funded by the Muskawini Foundation, were introduced at Hunter College, in 1983 among those teaching introductory courses and in 1985 among faculty in the professional schools (Health Sciences, Nursing, and Social Work). Two more projects were undertaken with the sponsorship of the Center for the Study of Women and Society, with grants from the Ford Foundation, one for the Community Colleges and one to Integrate Materials on Women of Color into the Senior College curriculum. Four semester-long curriculum seminars for faculty involved in vocational education in the Community and Technical Education

It was timely, therefore, that in its fifth year the Academy Seminar should ask directly how much the introduction of this new scholarship, its theory and impact on the curriculum, had actually affected the pursuit of various disciplines in institutions of higher education. The seven areas targeted—Literature, History, Sociology, Biology, Psychology, Anthropology, and Education—represent scholarly arenas in which a great deal of "theory" has been produced, new journals have proliferated, and considerable activity has occurred under many aegises to identify, explicate, and disseminate the transformed perspectives thus formulated. There is now no lack of materials, no absence of theoretical frameworks, no question of the level of sophistication and argumentation, and no dearth of pedagogical analyses demonstrating the importance of these new methodological approaches, this new knowledge base.

For EDUCATION, each panelist was asked to consider these issues from a set of questions framed to bring forward what is happening from her/his perspective in the field. These questions probe the ways Education as an academic field currently reflects ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class: Have the ways the field is conceptualized undergone any radical changes? Are there any shifts in the ways theory and research are taught to graduate students in this field? Have there been changes in the way introductory textbooks explain the field? And if little major change is reflected in these areas, in the light of

colleges within CUNY, funded by the New York State Department of Education's Program for Sex Equity, took place from 1987 to 1991, and eight year-long Faculty Development Seminars, under the aegis of the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs, were offered from 1987 to 1995 for Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class. The CUNY Academy Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class has been in existence since 1988.

so much new scholarship, what has been the source of resistance to change in the practice of the field? Finally, we have sought to probe the ways new knowledge has affected teaching in the classroom. These papers are the answers to these questions by the panelists who discussed them March 21, 1994.

Dorothy O. Helly

Series Editor

March 21, 1994

EDUCATION

Teacher Education and Multicultural Education: Research, Students, and Teaching

Carl A. Grant

The purpose of this essay is to examine the presence of multicultural education, research and teaching and discuss how multicultural education influences the lives and careers of teacher education students. This essay will be guided by four sets of questions: (1) In what ways has teacher education been affected by the scholarship of the last two decades that has focused on gender, race/ethnicity, class and sexuality? (2) Have there been any shifts in the ways research is taught to graduate students in education? If so, what are they? (3) Are the questions in education presently raised the same questions that were raised two decades ago? If not, what have been the changes? Have any of the changes begun to show up in introductory textbooks in teacher education? What are some examples? (4) Have there been efforts to reconceptualize teacher education that have had a major impact on it as a whole? If so, what are they? If the change is minor, what is the nature of these minor changes? Why, in your opinion, have these changes remained marginal to the practice of the discipline?

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

Teacher Education and Multicultural Education

Multicultural education, an outgrowth of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, has been in existence for approximately twenty-four years. Many multicultural education scholars cite its influence on education starting in the early 1970s (Banks, 1993; Gollnick, 1992).

Since its conception, educators have vacillated in their recognition and acceptance of multicultural education. Teacher education organizations (Teacher Corps National Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)), the Reagan years, and demographic changes in the United States in the 1990s have all played a major role on the influence of multicultural education on teacher education.

During the mid 1970s, several teacher education organizations and associations (for example, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education—AACTE, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development—ASCD) established multicultural education committees. These committees had a modest influence on the way their organizations and some other teacher education programs responded to multicultural education. For example, multicultural committees influenced the annual conference programs of their organizations (e.g., including more people of color and women in the program), and multicultural committees prepared multicultural guideline statements that were circulated to organization memberships. To a lesser degree, these committees influenced the editors of organization journals to accept articles on diversity and/or publish a special journal issue on diversity.

From the late 1960s until the 1980s Teacher Corps probably did as much to put multicultural education on the U.S. education agenda as any institution or organization. A federally mandated program to prepare teachers to teach low-income and minority students in urban and rural areas, Teacher Corps required multicultural education as one of its key training strands.

NCATE Multicultural Standards, developed in 1979, significantly contributed to the awareness and importance of multicultural education in teacher education programs. Teacher education programs want (need) NCATE approval to be recognized as having a quality program.

During the 1980s, especially during the Reagan years, progress toward including multicultural education was severely retarded. The major educational reform effort of the 1980s, inspired by the National Commission on Excellence in Education report *A Nation At Risk* (1983), ignored multicultural education and marginalized equity. The report emphasized a return to the basics, with special attention to science and mathematics. Also during the 1980s education associations placed less emphasis on multicultural education, and their multicultural committees became less active. Although journal publications of multicultural education articles continued, it was at a reduced pace.

Additionally, teacher educators began to waver in their developing commitment to multicultural education. Attention to gender, race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality was a part of teacher education programs, but code words, for example, "at-risk," "single-parent home," "latch-key students," "Chapter 1 students," began to dominate the discussions of diversity. Classroom teachers argued that

they did not have time to do multicultural education *and* the basics. They also argued that they could not find quality multicultural materials. Teacher educators implemented multicultural education when it pleased them. Academic freedom allowed them to teach as they wished. Consequently, teacher education students included multicultural education in their assignments, practicum, and student teaching only when they knew it was an expectation of their professor (Grant, 1985; Grant & Koskela, 1986). These developments led some K-12 teachers and teacher educators to conclude that multicultural education had had its run (Grant & Grant, 1985, 1986).

During the late 1980s as population demographics (e.g., the increasing number of students of color) became common knowledge for all educators, multicultural education began a steady and strong resurgence. By the early 1990s multicultural education exploded in both the popular and academic press, and within the educational community. Since its explosion, a strong awareness of multicultural education in teacher education programs has developed. Nevertheless, many teacher educators are still hesitant to affirm it. When it is implemented, a watered-down model is usually chosen, a model that deals more with tolerance and human relations than one that deals with issues of inequalities, pluralism, social action, and empowerment for people of color, women, poor people and gays and lesbians (Haberman & Post, 1990; Sleeter, 1992).

In summary, multicultural education has had some impact on teacher preparation. However, the power struggle over whose knowledge and how teachers should be prepared to work in all schools is just beginning. Similarly, awareness, acceptance, and affirmation of multicultural education throughout the colleges of education are just beginning.

Multicultural Education and Research

Multicultural education and research can be discussed under two themes. The first is the growth and acceptance of qualitative research, and the second is the need to integrate the effects of the interaction of race, class, and gender into educational research studies.

Over the last two decades there has been an addition to the type of research methodology used in graduate schools of education. Now, qualitative research methodology is much more accepted and is growing in popularity. The number of graduate research courses that include or focus on anthropological and qualitative research methods has increased. Also, most graduate students use qualitative research methods for their master theses and doctoral dissertation (Gage, 1989).

The use of qualitative research methods allows educators (teachers, graduate students, professors) to interview and observe K-12 students, thereby giving them an opportunity to examine how education and social inequalities affect the life chance of students. Gage (1989, 6) states:

> Teachers became much more involved in research on teaching, but no longer as mere objects of study or recipients of the finding of technically oriented experts. Teachers realized that their ways of asking questions, giving children opportunities to recite, and conducting reading-group sessions, for example, had often been alien to their pupils' familial and community culture and their pupils' expectations and understanding of how to behave and think.

Although qualitative research had some influences on attention to diversity, very little attention has been given

the importance of the integration of race, class and gender in conducting research. Grant and Sleeter (1986) examined four leading educational journals (*American Educational Research Journal, Harvard Educational Review, Review of Educational Research, and Teachers College Record*) to identify research studies that integrated these three important variables. They reviewed seventy-one articles. Thirty focused primarily on race, fifteen on social class, and eighteen on gender; five articles focused equally on two of these, and three focused on all three (Grant & Sleeter, 1986, 197). The importance of the race, class, and gender integration Bossard (1994, 5) argues, is that it produces a more powerful explanation of inequalities, social changes, and structural changes. Similarly, La Pointe (1994, 114) states:

> [T]hroughout the (sociology) literature there exists a broad range of underlying assumptions about the categories (groups) and their interrelations. For some, ethnicity was viewed as a cultural phenomenon unrelated to political, economic, or structural considerations (cf. Glazer & Moynihan, 1975). But for others, ethnicity and race were viewed as relationships, rather than as simply cultural practices, that were mutually affected by class and gender considerations. Ethnicity and race affect a group's opportunities within society and they affect assessments of group identity; that is, their definitions of themselves as group members.

La Pointe (1993), writing as a graduate student in sociology in an article titled "Integrating, Gender, Race Class and Ethnicity into Graduate Studies," continues with a statement that I believe is important for graduate students in education:

> As graduate students we can make an effort to build the sociology we will inherit. [A]n inclusive framework

for knowledge involves critical analysis and theoretical and methodological reconstruction. Inquiry of this kind should be extended to all of the substantive areas within sociology for a true process of integration or inclusion to take place. This means avoiding sexist language as well as being sensitive to racial and ethnic diversity and social class background.

Finally, research texts pay very little attention to multicultural issues. A review of five educational research textbooks, randomly selected from a university library shelf where research textbooks with current copyright dates (1989, 1992, 1993, 1993 and 1994) are found, reveals that one had a limited discussion of race and gender, and one referred to gender in some of the examples it provided. The other three research textbooks include no reference to multicultural issues (race, class, and gender). *Research and Multicultural Education* (1994), a book edited by this author, is one, if not the only educational research book on the market prepared to address both research and multicultural education.

Static Questions or Socially Reconstructed Questions and Multicultural Education

Many questions raised in teacher education two decades ago are still haunting teacher educators today: "How to work with schools"; "How to integrate theory and practice in teaching"; "How to make certain prospective teachers are grounded in the humanities and sciences and teaching procedures and methods"; "How to teach prospective teachers to teach students, who are racially, culturally, and linguistically different."

The collaboration between universities and schools seems to have improved. Collaboration, I believe, is taking place because recent reform reports, beginning with *A Nation At Risk* (1983) have challenged the worth of teacher education programs to prepare successfully teachers to work with urban and more challenging students. Similarly, public schools are being criticized because students' academic achievement levels are poor, especially in comparison to many other technologically advanced societies.

How to "go" from theory to practice still remains elusive, as many teacher education students continually question the wisdom of method courses, and believe that the most valuable part of their preparation program is student teaching (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Many universities require education students to have a major or a certain number of courses completed in the humanities or sciences before they complete their preparation program and receive certification. Some universities (e.g., the Wisconsin University System) require all students to complete six hours of ethnic studies' courses.

Teacher education groups (e.g., the Holmes Group) have been organized to examine teacher education and recommend changes. The Holmes Group made several recommendations for teacher education programs, including a fifth-year program that would lead to certification and a masters degree.

Introductory education textbooks have changed somewhat. However, attention to race, class, and gender issues are still limited. Issues of race, class, and gender are at best an add-on once a topic or concept has been presented and discussed.

Teacher Education and Restructuring

There have been some concerted efforts (e.g., the Holmes Group and Teacher Corps) to cause major changes in teacher education. These attempts achieved only moderate success.

In the 1980s, the Holmes Group (as noted above) attempted to change the preparation of teachers. The Holmes Group recommended that teachers receive a four-year liberal arts or science degree, and complete their teacher certification with a fifth-year Master of Arts degree. More than 100 of the country's leading teacher education institutions attended the first Holmes Group Conference in Washington, D.C. in 1986. During that meeting, regional Holmes groups organized and began to develop an action agenda "to enhance the quality of schooling." For several years, the Holmes Group received national attention and had a prominent voice in teacher education policy and practices. The Holmes Group publications of *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), and *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990) generated a good deal of discussion within the educational community, especially at the dean and university administrator level.

Interest in the Holmes Group seems to have waned in recent years, probably for several reasons. Many teacher education programs are already unofficially five years because of state mandated courses; for example, in recent years reading and nonwestern history courses have been added to certification requirements. A fifth year for certification would make an unofficial five-and-one-half or a six-year program. Also, since the severe economic downturn of the 1980s, many students have to work to pay for their college expenses. This sometimes increases the time they spend at college. Related to this problem is the fact that the

low starting salary of teachers is not competitive with many other professions, especially in relation to the extra time spent earning a degree. The Holmes Group generally ignored the historically black colleges and students of color, especially in the organization's early years (Gordon, 1986; Grant & Gillette, 1987; Grant, 1990). This neglect raised serious concerns about the purpose of the organization and its plans to prepare teachers to work in classrooms that were undergoing rapid demographic changes.

There are several reasons why the Teacher Corps was discontinued, thereby interrupting its attempts to prepare teachers for poor and minority students. The shortage of federal dollars was a major barrier to the continuation of Teacher Corps. An adequate or oversupply of teachers brought about a shift in program goals from a preservice to staff development. In-service teachers were less willing to be taught to teach poor and minority students, since many believed that they were already doing it.

There have been individuals like Madeline Hunter and her model of classroom supervision that had some small influence on teacher education programs. During the decade of the 1980s, some school systems used the Hunter Model of supervision to conduct classroom evaluations. Consequently, some school systems want teacher education programs to train prospective teachers in this model. Hunter's model was criticized because there was only limited research data to support its usefulness and/or effectiveness. As critiques of the Hunter model increased, money to support its implementation became scarce.

Conclusion

There is a greater awareness of multicultural education throughout many universities, including the teacher

education programs. A growing number of universities are offering multicultural education courses at both the undergraduate and graduate level. However, the inclusion of multicultural education in the *total* program structure often is met with resistance at both the student and faculty level; and according to Gollnick (1992), professional education programs that do focus on multicultural education do so in a limited manner.

Similarly, the meaning most often given to multicultural education is that of "tolerance" and "getting along." Few teacher education programs practice an approach to multicultural education that seeks to confront issues of social justice, examines privileges, seeks an understanding of who controls power and knowledge, affirms cultural pluralism, appreciates different voices and perspectives and promotes the recognition of the importance of both the group and the individual.

References

Banks, J. (1993). Multicultural education: historical development, dimensions, and practice. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of research in education.*

Bossard, C. (1994). Why do we avoid class in this sig? Why do we fail to integrate two or more topics across race, class, and gender in our papers? *Critical Examination of Race, Ethnicity, Class, and Gender in Education 9*(1), 3–7.

Gage, N. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath. *Educational Researcher 18*(7), 4–10.

Gollnick, D. (1992). Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher education. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Research & multicultural education.* London: Falmer Press.

Grant C. & Gillette, M. (1987). The Holmes report and minorities in education. *Social Education 51*, 517–21.

Grant, C. & Grant, G. (1985). Staff development and education that is multicultural. *British Journal of In-Service Education 12*(1), 6–18.

Grant, C. & Grant, G. (1986). Increasing the educational opportunities of black students by training teachers in multicultural curriculum development. *The Western Journal of Black Studies 10*(1), 29–33.

Grant, C. (1990). Barriers and facilitator to equity in the Holmes group. *Theory into Practice 29*(1), 50–54.

Grant, C. & Sleeter, C. (1986). Race, class, and gender. *Education research: An argument for an integrative analysis.*

Guyton, E. & McIntyre, J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teacher education.* New York: Macmillian.

Haberman, M. & Post, L. (1990). Cooperating teachers' perceptions of the goals of multicultural education. *Action in Teacher Education 12*(3), 31–35.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, Mich.: Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, Mich.: Holmes Group.

LaPointe, E. (1994). Integrating gender, race, class and ethnicity into our research and into graduate studies. *Race, Sex and Class 1*(2), 112–16.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Review of Educational Research 56(2), 195–211.

Sleeter, C. E. (1988). *Keepers of the American dream.* London: Palmer Press.

Taking Teachers' Blinders Off: A Short History of the Politics of Teacher Education

Kimberly Kinsler

Most individuals think of teaching as an apolitical, even neutral profession. Even teachers, themselves, pursue the profession because they either "like working with children" or want to do something "meaningful." This phenomenon is curious, as I believe teaching is one of the most political professions an individual can have. For teachers in their routine tasks not only serve as the dominant society's agents, instilling and rewarding male, middle-class, European-American traits and values in students from other cultures, but function as the system's initial "sifters and winnowers" in the process of ethnic, class, and gender stratification. How do teachers come to perform these tasks in apparent ignorance of their political significance? Why have efforts to reform these aspects of the school been so resistant to change? I believe the answers to these questions lie in the very nature of public schooling and teacher training.

Among the basic functions of the school are: the transmission of societally needed skills and knowledge; the sorting and optimal development of human potential; and the integration of youth into occupational and other adult roles necessary for the perpetuation of society. Essential to these tasks is the determination of what information is necessary for societal perpetuation and what criteria are to be used to sort and to develop human potential. These are political acts revealing the power relationships existing in a society. For the very ability of one group of individuals to develop a curriculum for a school system containing mem-

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

bers of other groups, grants it the power to sanction and to exalt its own knowledge base and, by default, to marginalize and disenfranchise that of others. The ability to set standards that will determine the educational tracks of others allows the school system to posit as criteria for optimal placement traits held primarily, if not exclusively, by its own group members, and by implication, dooms the fate of others to perpetual second-class citizenship.

As it is the teacher's responsibility to perform these tasks, in their professional training they must acquire certain knowledge. They must learn what content is legitimate for transmission and what is illegitimate; what attitudes, learning styles, speech, and behavior patterns are appropriate to reward and what are inappropriate and, therefore, to be punished or ignored. Teachers must discover psychological and sociological theories to account for existing stereotypes and group differences. This training can either sensitize them to the political significance of their role in group stratification and the perpetuation of stereotypes or anesthetize them to the nature of their acts. It can either help them to develop a personal philosophy that rejects discriminatory institutional practices or equip them with rationales to defend and techniques to facilitate these ends.

The history of public and professional awareness and efforts to influence the school and teacher preparation in these matters have been cyclic, characterized by periods of self-serving inattention, liberal quixotism, and disappointing regressions. It is this narrow history of teacher education that this essay seeks to outline as a means to contextualize my own thoughts as a teacher trainer. This essay is divided into two sections: the first is an historical outline, while the second section offers comments on the response of the field to change.

An Abbreviated History of Pluralistic Struggles and Teacher Preparation

The 1800s: System Startup

Mass public education began in the 1800s. While public schools were widely believed to be benevolently established to educate the masses, from the onset they were used as a means to control and subordinate the working class, racial minorities, and women. To the system's founders, the school was initially a vehicle for indoctrinating working-class Irish immigrants to the ethics of Anglo-Protestant industrial society. Katz (1971, 31) quoting Barnard, a member of the "educational revival" of the mid 1800s states:

> As might be expected from their image of the urban poor, school reformers held that "the primary object" in removing the child from the influence of the parent to the influence of the school was "not so much . . . intellectual culture, as the regulation of the feelings and dispositions, the extirpation of vicious propensities, the preoccupation of the wilderness of the young heart with the seeds and germs of moral beauty, habitual practice of cleanliness, delicacy, refinement, good temper, gentleness, kindness, justice and truth."

After the emancipation of 1865, African-Americans were admitted to the public schools although, both in the North and in the South, their schooling remained largely separate from and inferior to that of other societal groups. During this period, women were demanding a greater political voice, and in an effort to maintain their nurturant and subordinate status, the system's founding fathers directed the more adventurous and humanitarian women into teach-

ing in the common (elementary) school. As instructors at this level were primarily regarded as "school keepers," this inferior work position carried little professional status and did not require higher education. Borrowman (1965, 22) writes:

> The normal school recruited a class of students who had limited opportunities for advanced education elsewhere or for achievement in other professions than teaching. Such opportunities were especially meager in the case of girls.

As might be imagined, teacher preparation was minimal, and discussions about it focused mainly on the curriculum and institutional control. Until the mid-1800s, most teacher training was in-service, and when preservice was provided—in normal schools and high schools—instruction could vary from six weeks to two years. The limited education of common school teachers was defended by major educators such as Horace Mann, who as late as 1866 forbade Massachusetts normal schools from offering secondary-school subjects. In these schools, issues of race and class were almost exclusively discussed in the context of the Protestant ethic. However, by the late 1800s, educators increasingly sought the inclusion of more rigorous liberal arts courses and the development of a science of education (Borrowman, 1965). What is more, with the increasing tendency to group students by grade, educators questioned whether training programs should continue to prepare teachers for the one-room schoolhouse or whether they should now be segmented into primary school teachers, secondary school teachers, and school administrators. Consistent with these trends, control of teacher training began to shift from the normal school to colleges and universities, which were better equipped to deliver these forms of instruction (Tyack & Tobin, 1994).

The 1900s to the 1940s: Segmentation and Rationalization

In the early 1900s, the debate continued over the nature and quality of teacher training. With the increasing shift in control of these programs to colleges and universities, the curriculum grew more demanding, consisting of instruction in the liberal arts (i.e., the classics, English grammar, composition, and logic); mental, moral and natural philosophy (i.e., the modern sciences, the social sciences and the humanities); and pedagogy, or education (i.e., the study of human development, the learning process and human educational institutions) (Borrowman, 1965; Hutchins, 1936). Still, these programs were severely criticized for the lack of uniformity among institutions which had no single model or vision for optimal teacher training, and on the poor general quality of instruction. One study, for example, found 636 different curricula distributed over thirty-one colleges, while another study of accredited institutions with programs in education published thirty years later related a plethora of ills (Rugg, 1933; Koerner, 1963). Koerner stated that there was little correspondence between teacher training programs and performance on the part of graduates; the field lacked a corpus of knowledge and techniques of sufficient scope and power to warrant its being given full academic status; the caliber of both educational faculty and students at many institutions was of inferior intellectual quality; course work was often repetitious, "puerile," and dull; and the "centripetal nature of authority in Education" often prevented many program improvements. Despite these findings little was done, for with limited resources, teacher certification institutions were under considerable pressure to produce large numbers of teachers to meet the ever expanding enrollment of the public schools (Hall & Jones, 1976).

In the midst of these discussions, the public schools became increasingly segregated and segmented. While some integrated schools existed in the North, the schools in the South were segregated and those servicing African-Americans were woefully neglected by both the states and local boards. Moreover, as students were increasingly segmented into age-related grades, the number of promotional failures rose. These "overage" holdovers, who tended to be poor, from the South and/or racial minorities, created logistical problems for this system. As a "scientific" means to sort out these and other low achieving students and to package students into ostensibly homogeneous "ability" groups, IQ tests were introduced to the system (Tyack & Tobin, 1994).

Teacher education reflected and supported these practices. In the North, some professional training programs admitted African-Americans; however, most Black educators were trained in Black colleges in the South. So severe was the shortage of African-American teachers for schools servicing predominantly African-American students that W. E. B. Du Bois wrote:

> There are always periods of educational evolution when it is deemed quite proper for pupils in the fourth reader to teach those in the third. But such a method, wasteful and ineffective at all times, is peculiarly dangerous when ignorance is widespread and when there are few homes and public institutions to supplement the work of the schools. It is therefore of crying necessity among Negroes that the heads of their educational system—the teachers in the normal schools, the heads of high schools, the principals of public systems, should be unusually well trained men [sic]; men trained not simply in common-school branches, not simply in the technique of school management and normal meth-

> ods, but trained beyond this, broadly and carefully, into the meaning of the age whose civilization it is their peculiar duty to interpret to the youth of a new race, to the minds of untrained people (1903).

What is more, dominant biological and psychological theories allegedly accounting for individual and group differences justified extant stratifications. At the time, race theory and genetic deficit theory were heavily favored as explanations. Consonant with these views, both society's and the school's stratification patterns were said to be the natural consequence of a genetically determined factor of intelligence variously possessed by different cultural and racial groups and assessed by IQ tests. Although alternate theories of class stratification existed, they were primarily Marxist, quite unpopular, and not likely to be part of the teacher training curriculum. Thus, until just before the 1950s, there was little formal opposition to the racist and classist practices existing in the schools and presented in the education literature.

The 1950s to the 1980s: Turmoil and Reform

In the mid 1900s a turning point was reached as a number of factors, both national and international, converged to thrust the politics of public education and teacher preparation into the national spotlight. In 1957, the Russians launched Sputnik, setting off a national debate on the ability of the schools and its teachers to educate youths adequately in mathematics and science. A series of court cases over access and equity in public education resulted, in 1954, in *Brown versus Board of Education*, the Supreme Court decision stating that separate was not equal and that the practice of segregating students by race was a violation of the law. The ensuing civil rights movement

further criticized the schools for their failure to change the plight of society's disadvantaged populations, while student activists critical of the war in Vietnam asserted that the role of the schools is to prepare youths to serve society and not big business. Into this fray leapt scholarship contradicting genetic deficit theory, thus challenging the objectivity of the school's sorting practices. This new view, cultural deficit theory, asserted that marginalized groups' poor school and test performance were the result of a cultural impoverishment in their home environments. These deficits were not immutable but could be made up through hard work in the schools and in compensatory education programs. The final blow to the system came from the economy, when in the midst of a severe economic downturn, the public demanded greater accountability on the part of teachers.

In response, federal and state governments, as well as national education organizations rose to address these problems as no time previously. The National Science Foundation was charged with improving the quality of science and mathematics curricula, and the United States Office of Education (OE), which had previously tinkered around the edges of the system (e.g., creating new types of classrooms and courses), called for sweeping changes in teacher training. In 1968, the OE funded the establishment of several imaginative national projects intended to change the quality of teacher training and the education of disadvantaged youths. The grandest of these programs were the Teacher Corps and the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) program. The goals of the Teacher Corp and the TTT were similar, that is, to strengthen the education of children in schools having concentrations of low income families; to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their teacher preparation programs; and to improve the training and retraining of educational personnel. The TTT program

sought to achieve these goals by developing innovative education programs offering courses in instructional methodology; having teacher candidates take courses in minority education; and as a means of sensitizing teacher trainees and education faculty to the realities of teaching the disadvantaged, asking both to immerse themselves in an extensive clinical, or "field" experience, especially in inner-city public schools. The decision making process was also to be extended to all individuals involved in the education of the elementary school child, including parents and the community, and minorities were aggressively recruited for entry into the teaching profession. States mandated competency-based teacher education. The American Association of College Teachers of Education (AACTE) supported these efforts with the publication of two critically significant works: *Teachers for the Real World* (Smith et al., 1969) and *No One Model American* (AACTE 1972). The first was a treatise on teaching disadvantaged youth that stressed clinical training and greater representation of ethnic minorities and the poor in the teaching ranks, while the second affirmed cultural diversity as a valuable resource and asserted that major educational institutions should strive to preserve and enhance pluralism. This latter piece became pivotal in early calls for multicultural education in the public schools, in teacher education programs, and in liberal arts curricula. Together, these events coalesced to create a unique era in public education marked by a flurry of humanitarian efforts to improve the education of disadvantaged students and heighten teachers' awareness of the political nature of their role (Grant, 1993; Provus, 1969).

While well-intended, well-funded and goal-directed, these programs were, unfortunately, relatively short-lived. During its first year, fifty-eight colleges and universities in twenty-four states participated in the TTT program alone, but by its close in 1973, only twenty-two projects were in

existence. Provus (1975) attributes the TTT's demise to several factors: the Nixon administration's premature demand for program results from the fledgling projects; an increasing loss of program direction; university faculties' regressive tendencies to teach as they had always done, even in the public school setting; and the failure of the public schools to provide sustained support and an organizational climate for the new methods. Early efforts at multicultural education were similarly compromised by the lack of an instructional cadre with an understanding of the philosophy and meaning of cultural pluralism and by academic ethnocentrism and elitism that denied status to research in the field (Grant, 1993). As federal funding for these programs was progressively withdrawn by successive Republican administrations, public education and teacher training succumbed to the gravitational pull of the status quo.

The 1980s to the Present: An Ambivalent Regression

From the 1980s to the present, two somewhat contradictory trends emerged in the politics of education. On the one hand, with the rapid economic growth of the 1980s, public interest turned to the economic, political, and military health of the nation, spurring the rise of a conservative agenda in education. On the other hand, the liberal politics of the 1960s and 1970s encouraged progressive educators to continue their demands for multicultural education and greater decision making on the part of teachers and parents. In 1983, the President's National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation At Risk*, the first in a series of highly critical reports on schooling in the United States, and in 1985, the Heritage Foundation (a conservative think tank) produced *A New Agenda for Education*. These reports asserted that the country's decline in international economic competitive-

ness was due to a deterioration in the quality of education and to the system's substitution of "federal agendas" (such as affirmative action) for legitimate goals (such as quality teaching and academic standards). The solutions variously recommended by these reports included federal and local control of the schools through a focus on fundamental skills, more frequent assessment of student progress, stricter standards for student promotion and graduation, tying school funding to students' test scores, linking teacher pay to performance assessments, increased parental choice among public schools, the confirmation of English unequivocally as the nation's one and only language, and the repeal of the Women's Educational Equity Act. Opposing this trend, liberal educators and scholars recommended that greater control over decision making in the schools be shared with teachers and parents and that calls for student excellence be shifted from middle- and upper-class students to minority and urban students, who were largely ignored by these reports (Dougherty & Hammack, 1990; Gordon, 1988). Scholarship in education supported liberal notions, increasingly rejecting the position that findings characteristic of any one cultural group be used as standards against which others are judged. These researchers further contended that disparities in academic performance between groups are not deficits but rather neutral differences that exist among groups, resulting in an unfortunate mismatch between the attitudes, behavior, and knowledge valued by the school and those possessed by culturally diverse students (Jordan & Tharp, 1979).

Similarly contradictory debates ensued over teacher training. Recognizing the critical role of teachers in successfully implementing any educational reform, both groups renewed calls for changes in teacher education programs. The Holmes Group (1986) and the Heritage Foundation (1985) recommended practices reminiscent of the

early 1900s, that is, the elimination of departments of education, the creation of standards for entry into the profession, the strengthening of teachers' backgrounds in the liberal arts, and lessening the time devoted to instruction in educational methodology. The Holmes Group also recommended more extensive preservice, or student teaching experiences, and greater empowerment of teachers through new levels of autonomy and more cooperative relationships with administrators. Liberal-minded reformers further demanded that diverse cultural views be presented as valid alternate interpretations in the mainstream teacher training curriculum and that various groups' culturally-based learning styles, speech and behavior patterns serve as the starting point in their instruction (Grant, 1993).

Faced with declining enrollments and tax revolts, an almost schizophrenic response ensued from federal, state and local education agencies. The federal government established a commission to set "nonbinding" national academic standards for public schools; some states mandated increased use of proficiency tests for both students and new teachers, raised academic requirements for high school graduation, and required more integrated or expanded curriculum in multicultural education, both in the schools and in teacher training programs. Local districts, meanwhile, experimented with the "de-tracking" of minorities and other groups disproportionately placed in special education, "school-based management," and ceding control of some schools to private educational firms (Fiske, 1984; Dougherty & Hammack, 1990).

Not surprisingly, efforts by teacher preparation programs to respond to these contradictory trends have been inconsistent. Hampered by the continued lack of a unified model for optimally training teachers and the failure of states to provide adequate guidelines on how new requirements should be met, individual colleges and schools of

education have responded as they have seen fit. For example, to facilitate students taking more liberal arts courses, some universities have eliminated undergraduate teacher preparation or decreased the maximum number of credits required in education. In addition, large differences continue to exist between colleges in the nature of preservice field experiences and in the degree to which teachers are given instruction in diversity studies. Teacher educators may or may not attempt to incorporate the new scholarship into their courses. What is more, educational texts, which always lag behind the literature and vary widely in the degree and format, may still present cultural deficit theories or only fleetingly mention "difference" models and recent gender research on education. Only in the last five years have some educational psychology texts mentioned the cultural biases inherent in both the school system and in teachers, and the effects these have on student performance. Too often embedded in chapters on special education or individual differences, these references are at the mercy of education faculty to determine the amount of emphasis given to these topics and how the data are interpreted. As a result, even in the 1990s, teachers may exit teacher preparation programs with little more than a stereotypical notion of the plight of the disadvantaged and of their role in maintaining extant stratifications.

Remarks on Egalitarian Efforts in Teacher Education

The school and teacher training do not exist separate from other aspects of the society. As is clear from the above brief history, the state of egalitarian efforts in both these arenas has often reflected the conditions of the larger society on the issues of race, class, and gender. When con-

servative sectors are dominant, efforts are made to keep teachers blind to the transformative power of the school, and by implication, the power of teachers to effect upward mobility for disenfranchised populations. Conversely, when more progressive elements have the stage, efforts are made to strip off these blinders, to reveal the vested interests in the school's stratification practices and to remedy past injustices.

The translation of societal struggles into school reform and changes in education programs is not automatic, however. Teachers again play a pivotal role. Whether change is mandated by the state or advocated by new theory, it is teachers who must convert these directives into daily classroom practice. Despite the many changes in educational rhetoric and the insistent claims of new squads of reformers, each with solutions ready, actual practices in the classrooms may not have changed markedly. Behind the classroom door teachers can sabotage the best-laid plans of systems analysts if they disagree with them, or can unwittingly derail a reform if they are not helped to understand it (Tyack, Kirst & Hansot, 1980, 553).

As long as the school remains one of society's most significant institutions that is still influenced by the power politics of interest groups, waves of both progressive and conservative reform will continue to buffet the system. Teachers must not become confused nor despondent amid the continuing storms, retreating to familiar practices for comfort and security as they wait for "this too to pass." Rather they must become informed consumers and proactive agents of school change, actively implementing just reforms and opposing those that are not.

It is in this context that a philosophy of education is crucial. It can provide a set of orienting principles with which to approach proposed reform and educational theories,

a knowledge base with which to penetrate the motives and intent of these changes, and the inner strength to publicly accept or refute these proposals. Consequently, the task of schools of education and of teacher trainers must be to help new teachers develop such a philosophy. These programs and individuals must not only seek to provide teachers with a broad and egalitarian knowledge base, but empower them to act upon their convictions. Part of this process is in knowing the political significance of their role and understanding that failure to act is often to support the status quo. Toward this end, I as a teacher educator, attempt to transmit some basic principles:

1. Eschew ethnic, class, and gender stereotypes wherever they exist. Seek rather to understand each individual and those societal factors that would make human beings less than they can be.

2. Resist the forces of inertia and the hollow tendency to do things as they always have been done. Tradition may be neither right nor just.

3. Uncover the hidden agendas underlying each reform and theory. Ask which groups are most served by these changes and which are harmed or neglected. On this basis determine whether these values are consistent with the good of the greatest number of people.

4. Become an agent of change in your school and in the lives of your students. Actively work to implement and institutionalize positive reforms and to resist or defeat those that are not.

5. Place the children first. The bottom line of all efforts must be to right the system's previous injustices to attain the optimal development of all. Those most harmed must be most helped.

References

Borrowman, M. (1965). *Teacher education in America.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cusher, K., McClelland, A., & Safford, P. (1992). *Human diversity in education: An integrative approach.* New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Dougherty, K. & Hammack, F. (1990). *Education and society: A reader.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). The training of Negroes for social power. *Outlook 75*, 409–12.

Fiske, E. B. (1984, September 9). Concern over schools spurs extensive efforts at reform. *The New York Times.*

Gordon, B. M. (1988). Implicit assumption of the Holmes and Carnegie reports: A view from an African-American perspective. *The Journal of Negro Education 57*, 141–58.

Grant, C. A. (1993). The multicultural preparation of US teachers: Some hard truths. In G. Verma (Ed.), *The inequality of teacher education.* London, England: The Falmer Press.

Hall, G. E., & Jones, H. L. (1976). *Competency-based education: A process for the improvement of education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Herbst, J. (1989). Teacher preparation in the nineteenth century. In D. Warren (Ed.), *American teachers: Histories of a profession at work.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Hutchins, R. (1936, rpt 1962). *The higher learning in America.* New Haven. CT: Yale University Press.

Jordan, C., & Tharp, R. G. (1979). Culture and education. In A. J. Marsella, R. G. Tharp, & T. J. Ciborowski (Eds.), *Perspectives on cross cultural psychology.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Katz, M. (1971). *Class, bureaucracy & schools: The illusion of educational change in America.* New York, NY: Praeger.

Koerner, J. (1963). *The miseducation of American teachers.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office ERIC ED 226 006.

Provus, M. (1975). *The grand experiment: The life and death of the TTT program as seen through the eyes of its evaluators.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Smith, O., Cohen, S., & Pearl, A. 1969. *Teachers for the real world.* The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

Tyack, D., & Tobin, W. (1994). The "grammar" of schooling: Why has it been so hard to change? *American Educational Research Journal 31*(3), 453–79.

Tyack, D., Kirst, M., & Hansot, E. (1985). Educational reform: Retrospect and prospect. In J. B. Ballantine (Ed.), *Schools and society: A reader in education and sociology.* Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Education: Rethinking the Discipline for Race, Class, Gender, and Ethnicity

Milgra Morales-Nadal

As a teacher-educator, I am aware of the responsibility I have before me in preparing professionals to teach in our urban public schools. As a Puerto Rican/Latina whose people's history has been virtually nonexistent in the public school curriculum, I wish to add my voice to those progressive educators critical of the so-called reforms in education over the last decade. As an activist-educator in the struggle for social and economic justice, I am wary of programs that attempt to contribute to the development of a society that will acknowledge, appreciate, and respect differences while people of color are not included in the development and application of the same. In this paper I attempt to briefly discuss some developments in education that have included aspects of the scholarship of race, class, gender, and ethnicity over the last two decades while suggesting that there are some explicit ways that more could be done to advance this work in our colleges and universities.

Changes in Texts

Over the last twenty or more years the research related to gender, ethnicity, race, and class has often been simply tacked onto foundations of education texts. This situation continues despite the many discussions that have taken place locally and nationally showing the need for education reform that addresses issues of diversity in the education curriculum.

Issues of gender, ethnicity, race, and class have often been addressed under the general headings of *Multicultural and Bilingual Classrooms*. Related content in these areas has also been included in isolated chapters of books for the preparation of teachers at the elementary school level. An example is the fifth chapter in Richard Arends, *Learning to Teach* (3rd ed., 1994), where there is a discussion related to race, class, and ethnicity. More often than not, however, the texts available to us for use in foundations of education courses (the history of education, its philosophical underpinnings, and social issues related to teaching and the educational system) have included the scholarship of diversity as "add-ons." The interweaving or natural integration of this scholarship is not evident in most of the texts that I have reviewed for use in my own classes.

Becoming a Teacher (2nd ed., 1992) by Parkay and Stanford offers the stories of people of color who are educators, boxed in profiles at the beginning of many chapters. A profile of Jaime Escalante, the mathematics teacher featured in the movie *Stand and Deliver*, is among those included. Specific attention to legal, social, and cultural issues affecting people of color and others viewed as "minorities" is not included within a chapter until chapter fourteen, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity." Here issues related to Asian Americans, "linguistically challenged" students (who, by the way, are really children for whom English is a second language), the physically challenged, and women are grouped together. It is possible to assign chapters out of sequence for students to read and discuss, and we often do, but, the notion of integration of this material throughout the text continues to be an issue.

Other books, such as Joel Spring's *The American School 1642–1990*, focus on the history of education and begin to reflect a more comprehensive picture of educational issues related to class and gender and, to a certain

extent, race. Spring, in the last edition of this text, reviews aspects of the role of white and African-American women in education and the development of schools in a chapter titled "Organizing the American School: The Nineteenth-Century Schoolmarm." When graduate students, most of whom are classroom teachers in elementary or middle schools, read this chapter, they are amazed at how little the educational system has changed since the late nineteenth century. Anglo men, for example, are still at the top in administrative positions, as superintendents and school principals. The class perspective reflected in Spring's writings helps to clarify for students why, for example, children are often referred to as products and why the structure of many older school buildings seems to be modeled after factories. This becomes clear in his chapter on "Education and Human Capital," which gives us a class perspective vis à vis the development of schools in the United States.

In another text, *School and Society: Educational Practice, Social Expression* by Tozer, Viola and Senese, published in 1993, in a chapter on "Schooling and Social Inequality: Race, Gender, and Class," we again see a determined attempt to focus on these issues. There are also three chapters that focus separately on the American Indians, gender, and schooling and social inequality from the perspective of Booker T. Washington. This text and many others attempt to be comprehensive and inclusive, but they are somewhat reductionist in their attempt to address all the relevant issues and, usually, quite expensive. As a result, I have observed that many education professors require students to read the original works of authors studied in the foundations courses. In this way, students are exposed directly to educational thinkers like John Dewey, Maria Montessori, and Paolo Freire.

In my graduate foundations of education class, I also assign books that can be used to compare historical events and issues that reflect a socioeconomic analysis, books often not included in education textbooks. For example, I include Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities* (1992) because it is a powerful statement dramatizing for young teachers the overarching class issues affecting them and the children they teach in public schools.

The publication of major documents on updating the curriculum in New York City and New York State in recent years has also given us real examples of how a curriculum may be transformed to include content and perspectives related to gender and people of color. These guides and curricula, such as the *Children of the Curriculum* (New York City Board of Education), *One Nation, Many Peoples* (New York State Department of Education), and the *Ibero-American Curriculum* (New York State Department of Education) are attempts by educational policy makers and practitioners to address the issues of representation and diversity. The availability of these documents has enabled some of us to share with our students the current thinking of scholars and ideas for implementation in the classroom. The response of some members of communities of color who do not feel included in the process has shown their desire for involvement in the discussion and debates around these issues.

Theory into Practice: Integrating the New Scholarship

Every semester, as I prepare to teach foundations of education and communication arts, several issues come to mind. Will the syllabus I submit to students and follow during the semester create in them a need for change? How do

I prepare a course that both provides a knowledge base and allows students to contribute their ideas in the construction of it? How do I include problem-posing, problem-solving, and social action as part of my curriculum? Lastly, should I try to infuse the concept of multiple perspectives, and how can I do it?

Clearly, there are, in and out of my discipline, some colleagues who do not share these concerns or give mixed messages about some of these issues. There are education professors interested in methods and techniques that student teachers or new teachers can use to survive in classrooms, and others that integrate few techniques and pedagogical strategies in their courses. Students have at times expressed confusion about what they are being asked to do and as a result may resist learning. There are also colleagues who express the opinion that the kind of expectation you have of students has no real impact on how they will respond to teaching/learning situations. The students who are meant to be "part of the club" will eventually succeed, and the others can teach elementary school. These professors are not going to change their syllabi very much since they place the burden of learning and the responsibility for knowing on the student alone.

Others support the introduction of issues about diversity in the curriculum, but suggest that these must come from the students and that the "teacher" should not raise them if the students do not. This position is of particular concern because in a diverse but segregated city, where some students have only rarely experienced relating in a positive way to others of different backgrounds, this may not be an alternative.

As I look back at how our discipline has changed over the last twenty years, I fear that much has yet to be done. As a student in my first education course twenty-five

years ago, I asked myself, "Why am I here?" "What am I learning? "Why can't class be held in the quad where the demonstrations are?" As an assistant professor of education, I ask myself very similar questions. I used to share these musings with other students, however, and that was acceptable. Today, however, these questions may prove uncomfortable to some of my colleagues, especially those who feel that they have done everything possible to adapt to the diversities in question.

What may be lacking are explicit discussions in our classrooms that will give our students both the perspectives and skills necessary for change. Here lies one possible reason for why we are still only attempting to integrate the new scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class throughout our curriculum. Proposals for an education that is multicultural and socially reconstructionist have not yet had a corresponding genuine response by educators affirming the need for curriculum change and, even more, the need for structural change.

I need not review with you the issues raised in *A Nation at Risk* or other calls to arms by governmental task forces. It is not that the call for reform has been completely top down. Voices from our neighborhood communities have been making themselves heard for a long time. Concern for high dropout rates, lack of performance on standardized and nonstandardized tests, lack of achievement in subject areas (including science and social studies) manifests itself in a call to validate and bring into the classroom the social and cultural background of our children.

Those in decision-making positions, however, whether in government and politics or in some curriculum committees of schools and colleges, may not be genuinely convinced that these changes need to occur. Earlier reform movements have accommodated certain ideas but either

glossed over, denied or whitewashed others. In cooperative learning, for example, cooperation among young people as a basic goal has been faulted for not allowing for individual genius to perform; or, the concept of empowerment concept has been coopted and reformed into narratives of narcissism that focus on the individual; or cultural diversity is viewed from a "Eurocentric" prism, one that says, "I don't know if we should include X," not, "how can we include X?"

It is interesting that figures as widely diverse as E. D. Hirsch, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., and leaders of fundamentalist religious organizations, have taken the call for reform and have reconstructed an education that works for them and in their interests. Their proposals center on a fixed western-focused knowledge base, the notion that one must assimilate to a dominant culture and social structure as a matter of course, and a determined adherence to a single set of prescribed values. Curriculum reformers continue to attempt to negotiate with the elements of entrenched systems: schools, administrators, community councils and conservative-minded parent associations, but at times they give in without addressing educational equity or equality of outcomes. In this exchange, in my experience, equity often takes a back seat to "excellence." In part, this occurs when reformers buy into the resolution of educationally-based problems from the perspective of ensuring we develop "human capital" and not human beings. Robenstein (1992, 79), in his discussion of what he refers to as the failure of educational reform, makes this point: "We do not need 'better educated workers for the future' nearly as much as we need human beings educated for social-political-economic empowerment."

What is overlooked is that education continues to be presented, and perceived, as the great equalizer. Yet as teachers in my graduate class concluded after a debate on

the topic, "Education cannot make a person who is perceived as unequal 'equal.'" As teachers, they suggested that society has to take responsibility for what the school has not done. This brings us to a second point: There are many children in our schools who express a disturbing point of view regarding education: "We have no freedom—my mother wants to tell me how to dress—I don't listen. We come to school and we are told what to do. When I get my driver's license—I am out of here" (a fifth grader in an inner-city elementary school). For them, education offers no rewards. When both children and teachers are included in the discussion, however, they are very specific about what makes us better people and what makes education work. They talk about having round tables in the cafeteria, rather than having long, prison-style educational fare. They talk about secure bike racks, and about dumping all guns into the ocean. These ideas get lost in the quagmire of rules, regulations, and procedures.

The "Compact for Learning" proposed by the Regents of State of New York, on the other hand, while it suggests progressive ideas and innovative, new possibilities for inclusion appears abstract and it is difficult to imagine its application. "Top down-bottom up," the Regents say. Proposals for changes come "up" from the local communities and formulations of policy will go "down." The mechanisms for this type of empowerment are not yet in place, and some educators fear that the local ownership it offers concerning education may not work for most of the poor and people of color in this state. Local school boards in many communities of color have few or no members from those communities. In Queens, increasingly a community of Asian Americans and the district which set itself most squarely against the "Children of the Rainbow" curriculum, there is only one member of the school board who is Asian American and, more important, an advocate for change.

Conclusion

While the scenario presented thus far concerning change occurring in education as a result of the scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class shows some movement for inclusion, I am mindful that it may stay at the level of an intellectual exercise. We need to present a clear vision of the changes we are proposing, and we need to involve representatives of the communities that have been traditionally overlooked. That you can't "do" multicultural change in the curriculum without a diversity of voices and accents being represented should, by now, be obvious to all. As a Puerto Rican/Latina I am compelled to involve myself in "rethinking" of the curriculum. In my Foundations of Education course at the graduate level, I select texts that express a diversity of viewpoints my students have probably not been exposed to in school. They read *Savage Inequalities* by Jonathan Kozol, accompanied by selected passages from *The American School: 1642–1990* by Joel Spring. Some relate to the inequalities that Kozol addresses in a very direct way. Others, who are recent immigrants, often question how this unequal distribution of funding to schools could happen in America. What they learn is reflected in their projects. They are asked to prepare, in groups, a presentation of a moment in the history of education they have found interesting. This leads them to research and to begin to debunk the myths. Included here is an article on the "schoolmarm" and "pedagogical harems" as discussed in the Spring text. This presentation is followed by group projects in which they are expected to study carefully and reflect on what is going on in the schools today, and to present some of the best approaches they have found while critically reviewing what they see as not so. They are expected to integrate some ideas from

John Dewey and Paolo Freire after they have read *The Child and the Curriculum* and *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Their last activity is to plan a school for the future. They present, from their perspective, what they think schools could be like. The focus is multicultural and allows them to debate their own ideas about how to put into practice what we have talked about in theory. We have thought of inviting local politicians interested in educational issues to hear their ideas, and to question their feasibility. To complement these readings, we select and show videos from all sources—including *Sixty Minutes* and Public Broadcasting System (PBS) specials focusing on the pedagogy of pedagogy, including more problem-solving, training methods, collaborative projects, journals, narratives, integrated studies, inquiry and discovery-based approaches and holistic philosophies of language learning. The research with students includes ethnographies, projects, curriculum units, classroom research, generative themes and a focus on process. While the focus is on the foundations of education, the students take back to their public school classrooms knowledge and approaches that they can use in their own curriculum planning. This is a step in the direction of becoming more explicit in the classroom and providing clarity regarding the changes we are proposing.

While I have been critical of where we are, I must say Brooklyn College has begun to address these issues through its new Undergraduate Teacher Education Program, which is interdisciplinary and, though young in its development, has already generated a cohort of teachers who seek to change entrenched systems. We recognize, therefore, that while transformation may be a long way off, there is some light at the end of the tunnel.

Selected References

Arends, R. I. (1988). *Learning to Teach.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage Inequalities.* New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Parkay, F. W. & Stanford, B. H. (1992). *Becoming a Teacher.* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Robenstein, C. (1994). The illusion of educational reform: The educational system and at-risk students in F. Schultz (Ed.) *Multicultural Education 94/95.* Akron, OH: University of Akron.

Shultz, F. (Ed.) (1994). *Multicultural Education 94/95.* Akron, OH: University of Akron.

Spring, J. (1990). *The American School 1642–1990.* New York, NY: Longman.

Tozer, S. E., Violas, P. C., & Senese, G. (1993). *School and Society: Educational Practice as Social Expression.* New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Testing, Scholarship, and the Curriculum

Carol Kehr Tittle

Introduction

I have been asked to focus on "the testing phenomenon" as it relates to student placement and educational theory, and to consider what the graduate curriculum teaches students in education about this area. In this discussion I will use the terms testing, standardized tests, performance assessments, and authentic testing, as interchangeable terms. For our purposes here, similar concerns arise, whatever the specific form of the assessment. I will also focus on large-scale testing and assessment programs, rather than the informal tests and assessments used by individual teachers in classrooms. These large-scale programs may be called "high stakes" tests and assessments, as opposed to the "low stakes" assessments of the classroom. I am also concerned here primarily with research that examines test bias:

> [T]o say a test is biased is to charge that it is prejudiced or unfair to groups or individuals characterized as different from the majority of test takers. In this country these groups have included ethnic minorities, women, individuals whose first language is not English, and persons with handicapping conditions. Charges of test bias have been based on examination of the content and format of individual test items, group differences in average performance, and the use of tests . . .

As multiple choice testing has had increased use for teacher certification and licensure, there have been

> charges that these tests are biased against minority teachers . . . Test bias, from a broader, construct-oriented perspective, has been examined in studies of tests used in cross-cultural research and in earlier attempts to develop tests which are culture free or culture fair . . . No one now would claim that a test can be culture free or culture fair, nor is there consensus on a set of procedures which would establish that a test measures the same construct for groups with different social and cultural environments. . . . Thus the tensions between professional testing practices and public concerns that arise in court cases and legislation . . . have been fruitful. The result has been a series of studies since the early 1970s resulting in renewed attention to the theory underlying tests, the test development process, and a broader view of the validity evidence appropriate for the justification of tests used in educational settings . . . (Tittle, 1994).

Testing: American Culture, Industry, and Institutions

Before examining specifics of educational testing, three general points can be made and are important to understanding particular examples of gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status (SES), and testing:

1. The first general point is that testing as a phenomenon reflects particular aspects of American culture and societal, although not necessarily individual, understandings and beliefs about the way resources are (or should be) allocated. An example of the allocation of resources is the use of tests to distribute special educational services, such as for the physically handicapped. Another example is the allocation of general educational resources in admissions

to different types of postsecondary institutions and financial support in the pursuit of advanced degrees. Testing also reflects traces of "scientism" and the beliefs that science and technology can solve social and individual problems. Large-scale testing, the mandated (policy-related and legislative or regulatory) use of tests, and the testing industry are a reflection of those beliefs in the use of tests in a variety of contexts.

2. The second general point is that testing also has both industry and institutional characteristics. There are profit-making and not-for-profit companies who have strong interests in the continuation of testing, for example:

- testing organizations such as the American College Testing Program and the Educational Testing Service,
- publishers such as CTB/McGraw Hill, Psychological Corporation and American Guidance Services, and
- small contract-test developers (e.g., National Evaluation Systems).

While not of the size of other American industries, these companies are resistant to change. Some changes are only made after court cases, as in the New York case that successfully challenged the use of the SAT to award scholarships based on bias in the test and discrimination against women. These court cases also reveal differences in beliefs within the groups of educational researchers, research psychologists, professional psychologists, and educators about the origins of observed differences in performance on tests. Examples of these professional differences are found in court cases in California that examined the disproportional placement of minorities in special education classes (Mercer, 1973).

3. The third general point is that testing becomes an institution of the state, with accompanying bureaucracies. The institutional characteristics of testing are evident in the continuing use of every-pupil achievement testing in the vast majority of cities and states. For example, there are:

- state and citywide testing programs for achievement and competency, and
- at the federal level, twenty years of testing requirements for Chapter I (Title I) evaluation.

Most states and cities have testing and evaluation groups in their bureaucracies. Many of these state and city testing groups develop and maintain their own testing programs.

Scholarship in education and psychology as it relates to testing has been primarily concerned with the examination of tests and assessments in use, as described next. Scholarship has been less concerned with the industry and its institutional characteristics.

Tests and Assessments in the Context of Use

A recent review of sex-equity legislation in education and gender (Stromquist, 1993) provides categories that are examined for sex equity in education. These categories apply with equal force among all the groups with which this seminar is concerned: race, ethnic, SES and gender. The six categories are:

1. access to schooling
2. school textbooks
3. curriculum context

4. provision of pre- and in-service training to teachers
5. presence of women as administrators and professors in educational institutions, and
6. provision of incentives and supportive measures for girls to give equal access to all benefits offered by the school.

Many of these categories have parallels in the major uses of tests that have been examined for bias and fairness for the groups of concern here (Tittle, 1994). The categories that need expansion, from the testing perspective, are number 4, *teacher training*, to consider access to teacher training and testing, and number 5, to include *selection* of administrators in schools and superintendencies. All of the six categories are examined briefly for tests or the influences of tests on the groups of concern, along with several additional categories, on test use in evaluation, with special populations, and career counseling.

1. and 6. The use of tests to select and place students in postsecondary institutions and courses, and to award financial aid, including scholarships.

The research here examines differences in the SAT or ACT admissions testing scores of groups of students. These scores are also used for other purposes, such as placement in course sequences in mathematics or English, or for scholarship selection. The scholarship on gender differences has resulted in a successful court case against the SAT (for use in awarding scholarships in New York state), and resulted in a current case against the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, that uses the PSAT (*New York Times,* 1994). Both cases were brought by the American Civil Liberties Union. Unfortunately, the scholarship and even court cases do not stop this discriminatory use of

tests. The ACT math tests are used to choose scholarships for the National Academy for Science, Space and Technology (NASST) program. Seventy-five percent of scholarships, awarded solely based on the highest ACT math score, went to boys (*Fairtest Examiner,* 1993).

The evidence of the bias of the SAT against women is strong, particularly for the mathematics test. A study by Wainer and Steinberg (1992) used large data bases (47,000) of first-year college students who enrolled in and completed a mathematics course in their first semester. They examined the average SAT mathematics scores for men and women within five specific types of first-year math courses and at each academic grade (A, B, C, etc.) achieved in the two courses. They asked, "If two individuals of different sexes in the same kind of course get the same grade, what was the observed difference in their SAT scores?"

When women and men were matched on each of the five criterion grades achieved within each of the five courses (e.g., calculus) and their SAT scores examined, women's scores were about 33 points lower. Prediction of college grades using SAT and sex found larger sex effects (women's scores were underpredicted). The authors concluded, "There is evidence of differential validity by sex on the SAT-M; women score lower on average than men of comparable academic performance." These findings are critical, since the SAT-M weights heavily in selection, course placement, and scholarship awards in some universities.

Data for minorities are harder to examine, and in the U.S. there is a general trend toward overprediction of grades for minorities, using the ACT or SAT.

Attempts to explain differences in test scores for groups of concern and majority group test-takers fail to account fully for the variance in observed test scores.

2. and 3. The use of tests to provide instructional direction and accountability for teaching and learning, and curricula, as in citywide and state competency and achievement testing programs.

These are the two most frequently reported purposes of state testing programs (Barton & Coley, 1994). The Gender Equity in Education Act (as reported in the *New York Times*, 13 February 1994) cites gaps in achievement on the College Board Achievement tests: women scored higher than men, on average, in only three subjects—German, English composition, and literature. There were large differences (greater than 25 score points on group means) in physics, European history, chemistry, advanced and general math, and biology, among others.

Data on test score differences for women and minorities have shown some trends for the use of particular formats and test time limitations to account for some differences. Women tend to have somewhat higher scores when written essay examinations are used, as opposed to multiple choice examinations (Bolger & Kellaghan, 1990). The evidence is not as consistent for minorities. Nonetheless, the influence of test bias can and should be examined.

Test format and test content have effects on the curricula of teachers. One effect is in focusing on the format and specific test content, and the second effect is in deleting or reducing time spent on other content. While both influences are of concern for all students, they are of particular concern for women and minorities. As indicated by the CEEB achievement test data, and other research (e.g., Meece & Eccles, 1993), there are still many concerns with respect to gender, educational achievement in particular disciplines, achievement at the highest proficiency levels within disciplines, and segregation in courses and occupations. Further, results on tests of science and mathematics

may further reinforce stereotypes for these groups with respect to achievement in science and mathematics.

The work to date with performance or constructed response tests in mathematics and science does not show that group performance differences are reduced. Work is needed to examine whether these continuing differences are due to time limit effects, to selection of particular topics, or to other factors such as educational experiences and opportunity to learn. Research has shown that the areas of mathematics, science, and technology are subject to a variety of influences on the task performance and persistence of girls particularly (e.g., Kahle et al., 1993). Further, research on gender, SES, and schooling predicts a dismal future for working class young women, due to changes in the economy and needs for education and training (Flanagan, 1993).

4. and 5. The use of tests to select teacher education students, to certify teachers, and to select school administrators such as principals and superintendents.

Several states have used standardized, multiple choice tests to select or certify teachers for licensure. These uses have been challenged in court when tests have been administered to teachers already on the job. The disparate results for majority and minority groups have led to the rejection of tests based on due process for already-employed teachers.

More recently, a variety of new assessment procedures are being developed to assess beginning teachers, experienced (expert) teachers, and administrators, including school superintendents. The issues of bias in observations and ratings of these performance assessments have been raised, but there have not yet been studies of these assessments in use. There are concerns, however, based on

the use of assessment centers in employment testing. Some findings in these employment settings suggest that the procedures also need to be examined for group differences and bias (Tittle, 1994).

Additional uses of tests that have been examined for bias:

- **to evaluate education programs for federal or state funding requirements**

  In this use of tests there are concerns about the appropriateness of test content for the students being assessed. Here, for standardized multiple-choice achievement tests, the majority of publishers have used both expert judgments and statistical analyses to detect biased items. Overall, however, if the tests are inappropriate due to extensive reading requirements or test formats, the statistical techniques will not identify such problems.

- **to place students into special classes, as for the mildly retarded**

  The use of educational and psychological tests in placing students into special classes has been the subject of controversy and court litigation. Two main issues are the overrepresentation of minorities in special education classes and charges of bias in tests that are often the basis of placement. The assessment process leading to classification and placement typically involves standardized tests. Assessments are most important for classifications of such categories as the mildly handicapped, learning disability, educable or mild mental retardation, and emotional disturbance/behavior disorders. More severe disabilities occur with lower frequency, standardized tests are less important in their

classification, and no significant disproportionality by race, social status, or gender exists with the more severe disabilities.

The studies of bias or fairness have been concerned with the adverse impact of the procedures, and that tests alone not be used for classification. Issues of language dominance are also critical.

- **to provide career guidance and counseling for students**

Issues of test bias in career counseling have centered on whether career interest inventories and aptitude batteries are biased against women and minorities. Interest inventories have changed since the 1970s and typically the same range of occupations is now provided for men and women. These inventories have no direct way, however, to counteract the gender stereotyping of activities, fields of study, and occupations that women and men hold.

There are severe problems with using the *Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery* (ASVAB) for classification and career counseling in high schools. The aptitude battery is made available to high schools at no cost by the Department of Defense. The test uses knowledge tests in several technical areas (electrical and mechanical) that severely limit the occupational areas that are recommended to young women.

Testing Knowledge and the Curriculum

A brief survey of texts suggests the following with respect to several areas discussed above. Review of several undergraduate, teacher education, educational psychology texts shows that most texts have a section on culture, com-

munity, and individual variety that examines SES, ethnicity, race, gender, and language. The section is separated from discussions of human development theories, learning theories, and teaching practice discussions. There is some discussion of issues of minorities in types of testing and alternative forms of testing; none on gender. An advanced text of readings does not include specific discussions on ethnicity, gender, and testing.

As for graduate studies, of three texts in evaluation, none discussed issues of test bias or item bias. However, issues of culture, race/ethnicity, gender, and SES are relevant to the design of evaluation procedures and assessment instruments.

In graduate studies in educational and psychological measurement, the two texts examined include types of tests and general reliability and validity issues. Both texts include sections on culture and testing, including cross-cultural testing issues, and statistical analyses of test bias. One text examines research on cultural and motivational issues on intellectual development, the cultural loading of ability tests, problems involved in comparisons of U.S. ethnic groups and the importance of SES matching. There are no discussions of problems of bias for gender.

As for test practice, it should be noted that major test publishers all use gender and ethnically judgmental and statistical bias reviews. SES is sometimes also included in content reviews, and urban/rural, north/south geographical, and language differences. With the move to open-response assessments (portfolios, writing about mathematical thinking), equity issues and research are beginning to be conducted. In science, for example, instructional research has shown that context or topics used may be differentially responded to by females and males. Such concerns become even greater when few assessment questions or samples are used.

Testing Knowledge and Research in Education

The research on testing and bias issues for different groups has resulted in other research that examines factors related to these observed group differences. The critical importance of SES has been known but not widely carried out in studies of group differences. In the 1980s and 1990s there has been an effort to develop models that use educational and psychological variables to account for group differences in performance. The work of Eccles and her colleagues (Eccles et al., 1985) has had an influence on such studies in the field of testing. Also, the work of cognitive and constructivist theories is having an impact on the test development work of researchers. How this will relate to equity issues remains to be seen.

In my own research, I have moved from studies of gender differences in testing to the development of an assessment tool for classroom use by mathematics teachers. This assessment uses variables identified in the work of gender researchers in mathematics, for example, Eccles and Fennema (Fennema & Sherman, 1976), among others. This work has also incorporated findings from the cognitive constructivist perspectives, on metacognition and self-regulation in classroom activity settings. The research has also resulted in expanding thinking about assessments in schools. In particular, it has led to further research to understand how both teachers and students think about and use assessment information.

References

Barton, P. E., & Coley, R. J. (1994). *Testing in America's schools.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Bolger, N., & Kellaghan, T. (1990). Method of measurement and gender differences in scholastic achievement. *Journal of Educational Measurement 27*, 165-74.

Eccles (Parsons), J., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., & Midgley, C. (1985). Self-perceptions, task perceptions, socializing influences, and the decision to enroll in mathematics. In S. G. Chipman, L. R. Brust, and D. M. Wilson (Ed.), *Women and mathematics: Balancing the equation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fairtest examiner. (1993). *Gender bias found in new federal scholarship program 7*(3), 5.

Fennema, E., & Sherman, J., (1976). Fennema-Sherman mathematics attitude scales. *JSAS catalog of selected documents in psychology,* 631.

Flanagan, C. (1993). Gender and social class: Intersecting issues in women's achievement. *Educational Psychologist, 284*, 357-78.

Kahle, J. B., Parker, L. H., Rennie, L. J., & Riley, D. (1993). Gender differences in science education: Building a model. *Educational Psychologist 284*, 379-404.

Meece, J. L., & Eccles, J. S. (1993). Introduction: Recent trends in research on gender and education. *Educational Psychologist 284*, 313-19.

Mercer, J. (1973). *Labeling the mentally retarded.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

New York Times. (1994, February 16). Merit scholarship program faces sex bias complaint.

Stromquist, N. P. (1993). Sex-equity legislation in education: The state as promoter of women's rights. *Review of Educational Research 634*, 379–407.

Tittle, C. K. (1994). Test bias. *International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies* (2nd ed.). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Wainer, H., and Steinberg, L. S. (1992). Sex differences in performance on the mathematics section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test: A bidirectional validity study. *Harvard Educational Review*.

Contributors

CARL A. GRANT is a Professor of Curriculum and Instruction and of Afro-American Studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He received a B.S. from Tennessee State University, an M.A. from Loyola University, Chicago, and a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He is a former teacher and administrator in the Chicago public schools. Prof. Grant has written or edited many books on multicultural education and teacher education, including *Bringing Teaching to Life, After the School Bell Rings,* and *Making Choices for Multicultural Education* (both with Christine Sleeter), *Preparing for Reflective Teaching, Community Participation in Education, Research and Multicultural Education,* and *In Praise of Diversity. After the School Bell Rings* was selected by the American Educational Studies Association Critics Choice Panel in 1987 as one of the most outstanding books in the area of educational studies. He has served as guest editor for the *Journal of Negro Education,* the *Journal of Research* and *Development in Education,* and the *Kappan* for issues on multicultural education, staff development, and school desegregation.

Prof. Grant has written numerous articles for journals; and his article (with Christine Sleeter), "Race, Class, and Gender and Abandoned Dreams," *Teachers College Record,* was selected as one of the top three articles by Educational Press Association of America for 1988. He

has received grants for research and training from the U.S. government and from foundations. Prof. Grant was a Fulbright Scholar in England 1982–83. In 1990, he served as Director of the Teach for America Summer Institute at the University of Southern California. In 1993, he was elected President of the National Association for Multicultural Education and received a Distinguished Scholar Award from the American Educational Research Association.

DOROTHY O. HELLY is Professor of History and Women's Studies at Hunter College and The Graduate School at the City University of New York. She has worked with CUNY curriculum transformation projects since 1983 and has co-facilitated the CUNY Faculty Development Seminar in Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class. She created the Seminar on Scholarship and Curriculum at the CUNY Academy of the Humanities and Sciences to provide a general forum for discussing these issues, and is a member of the advisory committee of the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women, located at Towson State University, Maryland. She is the author of *Livingstone's Legacy: Horace Waller and Victorian Mythmaking* (1987), coauthor of *Women's Realities, Women's Choices: An Introduction to Women's Studies* (1983, 1995), and coeditor of *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women's History* (1992). She has also written on "Doing History Today," in *Revolutions in Knowledge: Feminism in the Social Sciences* (1992), ed. S. R. Zalk and J. Gordon-Kelter, and (with H. Callaway) "Crusader for Empire: Flora Shaw/Lady Lugard," in *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (1992), ed. N. Chaudhuri and M. Strobel.

KIMBERLY KINSLER is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations at Hunter College in the City University of New York. She earned her undergraduate degrees at City College and her Ph.D. in Educational Psychology at the CUNY Graduate Center. She has published a dozen articles and book chapters, her work appearing in such journals as the *Journal of Educational Psychology, Educational Horizons*, and *Educational Considerations*. Her most recent work has centered on social history and collaborative learning, "at-risk" minority teens, and the contextualization of formal operations.

At Hunter College, Prof. Kinsler is the coordinator and principal advisor for the teacher training program in elementary education and has served as a consultant to the American Social History Project. As a consultant, she has also worked with Manpower Development Research Corp., the city of New Haven, Connecticut (as an adjunct faculty member at Yale University), the City University of New York Graduate Center, the Ford Foundation, and the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey. She has worked with the LaGuardia Community College Liberty Partnership Program, the Mayor's Commission on Black New Yorkers, and a number of pre-college assessment programs connected with the City University and the Board of Education of the City of New York.

Prof. Kinsler has received several faculty development and research awards from the City University and the National Science Foundation, and has presented her work throughout the country in a number of conference contexts, dealing with issues of learning in a mixed classroom, differential school performance, technology and urban education, the use of peer discourse groups, and the use of creative drama and student feedback groups.

MILGA MORALES-NADAL is Assistant Professor of Education at Brooklyn College at the City University of New York, and supervisor of the students in the department's Bilingual Teacher Education Program. Born in Puerto Rico, Prof. Morales-Nadal has undergraduate degrees from Queensborough Community College and Brooklyn College, an M.S. in Education from Brooklyn College, and a Ph.D. in Bilingual Education and Developmental Psychology from Yeshiva University. Her duties have included teaching, counseling, and administration involved with bilingual education.

Prof. Morales-Nadal has presented papers on her ongoing research, which has involved innovative approaches to inclusive education, multicultural education and the student, bilingual education in a multicultural context, the Latino community and Hispanic culture in New York City schools, the politics of language in the Puerto Rican Barrio, and cultural and linguistic factors in assessing students in English as a Second Language programs.

She received a three-year grant award under Title VII for a Bilingual Education Personnel Training Program, and has taken part in a research project with Defense for Children International on "The Marginalized Child." Other professional and community activities include working on the Latin American Heritage Project of the New York State Education Department's Curriculum Advisory Committee, review of the New York State Regents' position on Bilingual Education, and evaluation consultant for a Queens School District on its Bilingual and ESL programs.

CAROL KEHR TITTLE is Professor of Educational Psychology and Executive Officer of the Ph.D. Program in Educational Psychology at the Graduate School of

the City University of New York. She is also on the CUNY doctoral faculty for the Certificate Program in Women's Studies and a Professor of Education at Queens College at the City University. She has taught at the University of North Carolina, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Hunter College, and has been a Research Associate and Assistant Director with the Educational Testing Service in Washington, D.C., and the Associate Director of the Assessment and Research Centre in London.

Prof. Tittle earned her B.A. at the University of Colorado, her M.A. at Ohio State University, and her Ph.D. at the University of Chicago. She has a long list of publications, including *Career and Family: Sex Roles and Adolescent Life Plans; Returning Women in Higher Education: Defining Policy Issues; What to do About Sex Bias in Testing*; and *Sex-fair Interest Measurement: Research and Implications*. She has also written "Test Bias" for the *International Encyclopedia of Education* and "Gender Research and Education" for *American Psychologist*.

She has received grants from the Ford Foundation, the New York State Department of Education, the National Institute of Education, The City University of New York, and the Aaron Diamond Foundation to investigate issues of sex bias and testing, career decision-making, comprehensive assessments and mathematics, and development of a computer-based assessment to improve mathematics teaching and learning. She has been President of Division 15 (Educational Psychology) of the American Psychological Association, and President of the National Council on Measurement in Education.

Reader Comment

Rethinking the Disciplines: Education

Thank you for taking a few minutes to provide us with your response to this group of essays. If you have shared it with others, please feel free to copy this form and provide it to them.

Circle the appropriate number:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
• These essays informed me about the analysis of gender, race, and class in education	1	2	3	4	5
• These essays pointed out how theories, concepts, and methods have or have not changed	1	2	3	4	5
• Concepts and vocabulary were easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5
• The information in the main body of the essay was useful for course revision	1	2	3	4	5
• The references were very useful	1	2	3	4	5

How did you learn about this essay? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Publication notice
- ☐ Faculty workshop
- ☐ Conference presentation
- ☐ Internet listing
- ☐ Summer institute
- ☐ Other (what?_____)

What use did you make of the essay? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Read it for my own knowledge
- ☐ Used to revise a course
- ☐ Shared with colleagues
- ☐ Assigned as classroom reading

Please tell us something about your institution. Is it a:

- ☐ high school
- ☐ two-year college
- ☐ four-year college
- ☐ research university
- ☐ other (what?_____)

Also tell us something about yourself. Are you: (check all that apply)

- ☐ a faculty member (If so, what is your discipline of training? _____)
- ☐ a student (If so, what is your major? _____)
- ☐ an administrator
- ☐ other (what?_____)

How much formal academic training have you received in this discipline?

- ☐ none
- ☐ one or two courses as an undergraduate
- ☐ undergraduate major
- ☐ some graduate training
- ☐ master's degree training
- ☐ Ph.D. degree training

For additional comments, please write on the back of this card or attach additional pages.

Thanks!

Name:
Address:
City/State/Zip:
Phone:
Email:

TAPE HERE TAPE HERE

Comments: We would welcome additional comments. Please be specific. Write in the space below, or use additional pages if necessary. Thank you!

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 9560 BALTIMORE, MD.

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
Towson, MD 21252

Publications of the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

The following publications consist of directories, manuals, and essays covering the primary information needed by educators to transform the curriculum to incorporate the scholarship on women. The publications have been designed to be brief, user friendly, and cross referenced to each other. They can be purchased as a set or as individual titles. Tables of contents and sample passages are available on the National Center Web page: http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw/.

➢ ***Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.***

The *Directory* provides brief descriptions of 237 curriculum transformation projects or activities from 1973 to the present. It is intended to help educators review the amount and kinds of work that have been occurring in curriculum transformation on women and encourage them to consult project publications (see also *Catalog of Resources*) and to contact project directors for more information about projects of particular interest and relevance to their needs.

386 pages, 8½ X 11 hardcover, $30 individuals, $45 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-07-6

➢ ***Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources***

The *Catalog* lists materials developed by curriculum transformation projects and national organizations that are available either free or for sale. These include proposals, reports, bibliographies, workshop descriptions, reading lists, revised syllabi, classroom materials, participant essays, newsletters, and other products of curriculum transformation activities, especially from those projects listed in the *Directory*. These resources provide valuable information, models, and examples for educators leading and participating in curriculum transformation activities.

(Available fall 1997)

➢ ***Introductory Bibliography for Curriculum Transformation***

The *Introductory Bibliography* provides a list of references for beginning curriculum transformation on women, especially for those organizing projects and activities for faculty and teachers. It does not attempt to be comprehensive but rather to simplify the process of selection by offering an "introduction" that will lead you to other sources.

15 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $7, ISBN 1-885303-32-7

➢ ***Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation***

Planning Curriculum Transformation describes the major stages and components of curriculum transformation projects as they have developed since about 1980. Written by Elaine Hedges, whose long experience in women's studies and curriculum transformation projects informs this synthesis, *Getting Started* is designed to help faculty and administrators initiate, plan, and conduct faculty development and curriculum projects whose purpose is to incorporate the content and perspectives of women's studies and race/ethnic studies scholarship into their courses.

124 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-06-8

➢ ***Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation***

This manual gives clear, step-by-step instructions on how to use e-mail, find e-mail addresses, and access e-mail discussion lists relevant to curriculum transformation. It explains Telnet, FTP, Gopher, and the World Wide Web, and how to access and use them. It discusses online information about women on e-mail lists and World Wide Web sites. Written by Joan Korenman, who has accumulated much experience through running the Women's Studies e-mail list, this manual is a unique resource for identifying information for curriculum transformation on the Internet. Updates to this manual will be available on the World Wide Web at http://www.umbc.edu/wmst/updates.html .

130 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-08-4

➢ ***Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities***

This manual is intended to assist educators who lack experience in applying for grants but are frequently expected to secure their own funding for projects. The manual provides an overview of the process, basic information and models, and advice from others experienced in fund raising.

150 pages,6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-05-x

➢ ***Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation***

This manual outlines several designs which could be used when assessing the success of a project. *Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation* is written by Beth Vanfossen, whose background in the teaching of research methods as well as practical experience in conducting evaluation research informs the manual's advice. Evaluation is an increasingly important component of curriculum transformation work on which project directors and others often need assistance.

(Available fall 1997)

➢ ***Discipline Analysis Essays***

Under the general editorship of Elaine Hedges, the National Center has requested scholars in selected academic disciplines to write brief essays summarizing the impact of the new scholarship on women on their discipline. These essays identify and explain the issues to be confronted as faculty in these disciplines revise their courses to include the information and perspectives provided by this scholarship. The series is under continuous development, and titles will be added as they become available. See order form for essays currently available.

27 - 60 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $7 each

➢ ***CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines***

Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. For this seminar CUNY received the "Progress in Equity" award for 1997 from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

56 - 85 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $10 each

ORDER FORM 1-800-847-9922, 8:30-4:00 EST, M-F or Fax: 1-410-830-3482

National Center for Curriculum Tranformation Resources on Women
Towson University, Baltimore, MD 21252

SHIP TO:

Name_____

Institution_____

Address_____ *(no P.O. Boxes)*

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

Phone_____ Fax_____ E-mail_____

All orders must be prepaid **by charging the total to a credit card by phone, fax, or mail or by enclosing a check for the total amount with the order form. No purchase orders.**

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Visa ☐ Mastercard ☐ Discover

Account #_____ Exp. Date____/____

Signature_____

Printed Name_____

CUT HERE

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

Title	Quantity	Total Cost
Complete SET of all titles listed below at 10% discount $251 set (individuals); $292 set (institutions) + $20 shipping		$
• **Directory of Projects & Activities,** Hardcover: $30 (individual); $45 (institutions)		$
• **Introductory Bibliography,** Paper: $7		$
• **Getting Started,** Hardcover: $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Internet Resources on Women,** Hardcover: $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Funding for Projects & Activities,** Hardcover: $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Discipline Analysis Essays,** Paper: $7 each		$

___Anthropology ___Education ___Philosophy
___Art ___European History ___Political Science
___Biology ___Geography ___Psychology
___British Literature ___Health ___Sociology
___Composition ___Music ___U.S. History
___Economics

• **CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines,** Paper: $10 each		$

___Anthropology ___History ___Sociology
___Biology ___Literature
___Education ___Psychology

Subtotal	$
Sales Tax (MD residents add 5%)	$
Shipping/Handling (UPS, $4 first book, $1 ea. addl.)	$
TOTAL	$

Make checks payable to: **TU UNIVERSITY STORE**
Mail order to: **University Store, University Union Bldg, Towson University, 8000 York Rd., Baltimore, MD 21252**
Phone orders: **1-800-847-9922**

Printed in USA 1997

Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. This series received the 1997 "Progress in Equity" award from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

Publications available in WOMEN In the CURRICULUM series

- Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.
- Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources
- Introductory Bibliography: Basic References for Curriculum Transformation
- Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation Work
- Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation
- Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities
- Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation
- Essays on Selected Topics and Issues
- Discipline Analysis Essays:
  - Anthropology
  - Art
  - Biology
  - British Literature
  - Composition
  - Economics
  - Education
  - European History
  - Geography
  - Health
  - Music
  - Philosophy
  - Political Science
  - Psychology
  - Sociology
  - U.S. History
- CUNY Panels:
  Rethinking the Disciplines
  - Anthropology
  - Biology
  - Education
  - History
  - Literature
  - Psychology
  - Sociology

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University

ISBN 1-885303-11-4

73

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☐ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☑ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").