

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

The Medium Is the Message
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL LEARNING
ABOUT SEX-ROLES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

Elizabeth Peterson

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of
Master of Education

Department of Educational Foundations

Winnipeg, Manitoba

September, 1979

The Medium Is the Message
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL LEARNING
ABOUT SEX-ROLES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

BY

ELIZABETH LOUISE PETERSON

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1979

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	i
Abstract	ii
CHAPTER ONE: THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE STUDY	11
CHAPTER THREE: THE ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH	28
A. Description of the Setting.	29
B. Selecting the Teachers.	31
C. Observer's Qualifications	36
D. Observation	36
E. Key-Informant Interviewing.	38
F. Units of Observational Data	39
G. Recording Methods	40
H. Techniques of Analysis.	41
CHAPTER FOUR: TEACHER'S SEX-ROLE IDEOLOGY	46
A. Teacher T	49
B. Teacher M	64
C. Teacher A	75
CHAPTER FIVE: INTERPRETATION.	91
A. Power	92
B. Kinesics.	97
C. Sexuality	99
D. Teacher T	101
E. Teacher A	110
F. Teacher M	114
G. Summary	121
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION	130
APPENDICES	140
A. Part I - What Are Females Like?	141
B. Part II - Dilemmas.	142
C. Part III - Occupations.	145
D. Appendix D - What Do <u>You</u> Think?	146
E. Appendix E - Education Questionnaire.	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY	155

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Appreciation is expressed for the advice and assistance given by Dr. T. Morrison, Chairperson of the Thesis committee and Dr. Emily Nett outside advisor and friend.

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance provided throughout the planning, observing, writing and editing stages of this thesis given by her colleagues and friends of Winnipeg School Division #1.

Special thanks to Barry Peterson for support and photography.

Lest we take ourselves too seriously, the writer wishes to dedicate her research with the following:



Ms./September, 1979

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the role a teacher's ideology plays in the process of cultural learning in secondary school classrooms. It is assumed that the learning which occurs within school classrooms is more than just the overt, cognitive lessons of the curriculum; the "hidden curriculum" is being learned as well, often without the awareness of those it most affects--teachers and students. Learning "appropriate masculine and feminine behaviours"--learning about sex/gender roles--is the kind of learning significant to this study.

Through a questionnaire and interview selection procedure, three teachers are identified as holding different sex-role ideologies, along a continuum from traditional to androgynous. An ethnography, consisting of observations over a two-month period, is detailed and experiences occurring in the classrooms of the three teachers who volunteer to participate in the study are shown.

What emerges from the participant observation period are no overt sex differences in attitude toward or treatment of males and females in any class, but rather three very distinct mechanisms by which cultural learning, especially sex-role learning, occurs. These mechanisms--power, kinesics and sexuality--are defined

and then compared and contrasted as they affect the cultural learning in each of the three teacher's classes.

In conclusion, it can be said that ethnographic methodology is very useful for studying the culture of classrooms, provided that the ethnographer is aware of the problems which are possible when this technique is used within traditional institutions such as schools. Through this ethnography it is clear that a teacher's ideology, especially sex-role ideology, does have an effect upon the cultural learning which occurs in the classroom, and that students are being taught significant lessons in covert, unobtrusive ways. The way a teacher uses power, kinesics and sexuality is related to her belief system and allows her to play the role of teacher in ways which exemplify her idea of appropriate classroom behaviour.

Finally, although only three mechanisms of cultural learning are identified, the importance of understanding how learning occurs in schools is brought to the fore. Most significantly, the role the teacher plays in influencing learning and educational change is emphasized. It is hoped that future studies will uncover more mechanisms of cultural learning while at the same time recognizing the important role the teacher plays in any process of cultural learning in schools.

CHAPTER ONE
THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

CHAPTER ONE

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Feminism and the women's movement have aroused the interest and attention of many people throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Educators from pre-school to university are increasingly more concerned about the issues of sexism in schools, and much needed studies, especially in the areas of bias in textbooks and curriculum change, have begun to emerge. In addition to textbooks and curricula, however, people also play a large role in the educational process, and educators are beginning to investigate the part of teachers in changing that educational system. Florence Howe writes:

. . .the teacher is the single most powerful influence on children's school lives--more important, I believe, than textbooks or other curricular materials. When teachers 'change,' so does everything in their classrooms.

Howe is making a plea for non-sexist teacher training, but her statements are significant even taken in another light.

If a teacher is the "single most powerful influence" or even one of the most powerful influences

on students;² then that teacher's ideology, in particular sex-role ideology, will also affect the students in his or her classes. Studies to date, although they have been useful in the areas for which they were written (e.g., sex bias in textbooks, sex stereotyping in career counselling, male dominance at universities), do not investigate the impact of the ideology of the classroom teacher--the one closest to the students--upon the students and what they learn in school.

The fact that few researchers have studied any aspects of a teacher's belief system and its effects on students would be of little consequence if both teachers and students were robot-like automatons subject only to teaching and learning "the curriculum"; i.e., the subject lessons of English, mathematics, geography and the like. However, this is not the case. Phillip Jackson in his pioneering work, Life in Classrooms³ and others such as Spindler and Silberman⁴ have shown that the "hidden curriculum"--the repetitious and continual "incidental learning" which students in schools experience in contact with one another, with the teacher, with the rituals and rules of the school and with the subtle meanings in textbooks (the unwritten agenda of activities) often has much more impact on the learning which takes place within the culture of the classroom. For example, Jackson cites the case of

how children "learn" what makes a teacher angry:

. . .every school child quickly learns what makes teachers angry. He learns that in most classrooms the behaviour that triggers the teacher's ire has little to do with wrong answers or other indicators of scholastic failure. Rather, it is violations of institutional expectations that really get under the teacher's skin. Typically, when a student is scolded by the teacher it is not because he has failed to spell a word correctly or to grasp the intricacies of long division. He is scolded, more than likely, for coming into the room late, or for making too much noise, or for not listening to directions, or for pushing while in line. Occasionally, teachers do become publicly vexed by their students' academic shortcomings, but to really send them off on a tirade of invective, the young student soon discovers, nothing works better than a partially suppressed giggle during arithmetic period.⁵

It is through this "hidden curriculum" or system of "cultural learning" that values and attitudes based on a teacher's ideology will manifest themselves. A teacher may be using a non-sexist textbook, but if the students receive different treatment simply because of their gender, then the elimination of sexism from all other components of the educational process would be tokenism.

The central purpose of this study, then, is to investigate the impact of a teacher's sex-role ideology on the processes of cultural learning. The purpose may be further delimited by the positing of two research questions: (1) What are the processes of cultural learning that occur in classrooms at the secondary school level? (2) What relationship, if any,

does a teacher's ideology, especially sex-role ideology, have with these processes of cultural learning?

It should also be noted that this research takes the form of an exploratory case study. It explores, in several classrooms, the observed interaction between students and their teachers who differ in sex-role ideology.

Any number of methods are available to determine a teacher's ideology, including sex-role orientations and gender role preferences. The works in this area by Rosencrantz et. al.,⁶ Bem,⁷ and Brogan and Kutner⁸ are of particular significance here. The difficulty arises when one attempts to investigate cultural learning. For this study it was imperative that the research be based on actual classroom interaction between teachers and students. To carry out investigations of classrooms and schools, educational researchers have recently turned to a tool of the anthropologist--ethnography--or naturalistic observation. Although many sociologists such as Erving Goffman, William Whyte, Herbert Gans and Robert and Helen Lynd have undertaken "field" or "qualitative" research, Phillip Jackson was among the first educators to examine the activities of everyday living with one's own environment to discover new ways of interpreting how individuals relate to one another. Jackson points out:

Only as we remember that each classroom minute is one of millions of similar minutes experienced by millions of persons and by each person millions of times, are we led to look closely at the details of the events before us. Considered singly, many aspects of classroom life look trivial. And, in a sense, they are. It is only when their cumulative occurrence is considered that the realization of their full importance begins to emerge. Thus, in addition to looking at the dominant features of instructional interchanges and the overall design of the curriculum we must not fail to ponder, as we watch, the significance of things that come and go in a twinkling--things like a student's yawn or a teacher's frown. Such transitory events may contain more information about classroom life than might appear at first glance.⁹

However, the difficulty in studying what Birenbaum and Sagarin have labeled "the familiar" lies precisely in that "taken-for-granted familiarity." They write:

The most difficult things to study scientifically are the familiar, the stuff out of which our everyday experiences are constituted. These taken-for-granted occurrences and relationships are elusive and slippery things, providing no vantage point, no 'strategic research site,' no outside perspective or scaffolding on which to stand. Notice how uncomfortable people get when they are asked to focus on something they normally do routinely and unself-consciously, such as walking down the street. Indeed, people usually take their own routine actions and the actions of others for granted. . . .¹⁰

Aside from Jackson's advocacy, however, ethnography is still a relatively new method of research in education. Few studies have compared the relative merits of ethnographic versus statistical methodology in the area of educational research. As Minuchin, Biber, Shapiro and Zimiles in their own ethnographic analysis of two schools state:

School environments are often described and in many ways, but almost never systematically and comprehensively or with an eye toward determining their psychological impact on children. Moreover, since most procedures for the psychological study of children have been shaped by the needs of clinical diagnosis and laboratory experiments, the psychological assessment of the effects of complex, enduring environments upon the pattern of functioning in children is seldom undertaken.¹¹

Yet those who have chosen ethnography as their methodological framework such as Smith and Geoffrey,¹² Leacock,¹³ Minuchin et. al.,¹⁴ Joffee,¹⁵ Lightfoot,¹⁶ Tikunoff et. al.,¹⁷ and Tindall,¹⁸ would seem to agree that detailed, accurate field notes collected in one setting, over time, can yield much more valid and useful information than any number of statistical instruments used in isolation from the day-to-day events of the culture.

In a perceptive article entitled "An Ethnography of Classrooms," Philip E. D. Robinson concurs:

The call in this essay is for an understanding of classrooms as they are to the children, teachers and parents for whom they are a very pressing reality. This understanding is not tapped by a questionnaire, elicited by an hour's interview or captured on a sociometric chart, but may be reached through the persistent observation and shared analysis of the 'events' as they happen. This is not to say that the questionnaire, interview schedule or sociometric test have no uses; they have, but should be supplementary to observation. Observation is not a simple journey armed with the most sophisticated tape recorder, or even video tape, into the back of the nation's classrooms. There is a danger in fact that this 'journey' could become 'educational research,' with the proliferation of as many 'glib' findings as are 'discovered' by the ubiquitous questionnaire.¹⁹

Given the problem, then, of observing cultural learning and the impact of a teacher's sex-role ideology on that cultural learning, the method most useful to this study is ethnography. The following chapters will be devoted to an explanation of the ethnography which was derived from observation of selected classrooms of an urban secondary school.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER ONE

¹Florence Howe, "The Teacher and the Women's Movement," in Nancy Frazier and Myra Sadker, Sexism in School and Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), p. xiv.

²See also Marcia Guttentag and Helen Bray, Undoing Sex Stereotypes (New York: McGraw Hill, 1976) and Elizabeth Fennema, "Women and Girls in the Public Schools: Defeat or Liberation?" in Joan I. Roberts, Beyond Intellectual Sexism: A New Woman, A New Reality, (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1976).

³Philip W. Jackson, Life in Classrooms (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968).

⁴George D. Spindler, "The Transmission of American Culture," Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963).

⁵Philip Jackson, Op. cit., p. 22.

⁶R. Rosenthal and L. Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968).

⁷Sandra Bem, "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 42, (1974): 155-162.

⁸Donna Brogan and Nancy G. Kutner, "Measuring Sex-Role Orientation: A Normative Approach," Journal of Marriage and the Family (February, 1976): 31-39.

⁹Philip Jackson, Op. cit., p. 177.

¹⁰Arnold Birehbaum and Edward Sagarin (eds.), People in Places - The Sociology of the Familiar (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1973), p. 3.

¹¹Patricia Minuchin et al., The Psychological Impact of School Experience (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969), p. 31.

¹²Louis M. Smith and William Geoffrey, The Complexities of An Urban Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968).

¹³Eleanor Leacock, Teaching and Learning in City Schools (New York: Basic Books, 1969).

¹⁴Patricia Minuchin, Op. cit., p. 40.

¹⁵Carole Joffee, "Sex Role Socialization and the Nursery School: As the Twig Is Bent," Journal of Marriage and the Family 53 (1971): 467-75.

¹⁶Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot, "Politics and Reasoning: Through the Eyes of Teachers and Children," Harvard Educational Review 43 (1973): 197-244.

¹⁷William J. Tikunoff, David C. Berliner and Ray C. Rist, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study--An Ethnographic Study of the Forty Classrooms of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study Known Sample (San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975).

¹⁸Allan E. Tindall, "Ethnography and the Hidden Curriculum in Sport," Behavioral and Social Science Teacher 2 (1975): 5-27.

¹⁹Philip E. D. Robinson, "An Ethnography of Classrooms," in John Eggleston (ed.), Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1974), p. 263.

CHAPTER TWO
CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE STUDY

CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE STUDY

Lightfoot analyzed the political ideology of classroom teachers. She was able to conclude that "the political and social ideologies of teachers are inextricably intertwined with their educational philosophies" and that

one evidence of the teacher's political and educational philosophy is the way he or she structures the environment to encourage or discourage cognitive reasoning and elaborate thinking on the part of children.¹

Another aspect of a teacher's ideology is the component of sex-role which, like political ideology, may also be expected to be intertwined with educational philosophy.

Ideology, based on Krech, Crutchfield, Ballachey² and Mannheim is defined as:

. . . a belief, doctrine or affirmative which, even if it is in contradiction to scientific or otherwise established fact, continues to be propagated for the sake of its supposed political or social utility. . . . Once established, the ideology of a group or community serves to regulate the behavior of its members.³

Erik Erikson defines the concept as:

. . . a coherent body of shared images, ideas, and ideals which, whether based on a formulated dogma,

an implicit Weltanschauung, a highly structured world image, a political creed, or, indeed, a scientific creed (especially if applied to man), or a 'way of life,' provides for the participants a coherent, if systematically simplified, over-all orientation in space and time, in means and ends.⁴

English and English define ideology as:

. . .the complex system of idea, beliefs, and attitudes that constitutes for an individual or a group, a total (or at least very extensive) philosophy or world view.⁵

In all of these definitions, ideology seems to be synonymous with beliefs and ideas. Although English and English point out that ideology may be individualistic or group-oriented, they and Erikson state that the end result is a "world view" or "over-all orientation in space and time." Krech et. al., and Mannheim, emphasize the irrationality sometimes caused by maintenance of an ideology when they explain that despite contradictory evidence, an ideology will continue to be held because of its "supposed utility." Whereas the English and English as well as the Erikson definitions view ideology as what it provides for its proponents, Krech et. al., and Mannheim point out the use an established group ideology can be in terms of social control and behaviour regulation. The latter is significant when one looks at sex-role ideology and its communication within schools.

A person's overall framework, derived from an ideology, of course, is a composite of doctrines, some

of which may compliment one another, others which may conflict. The political ideology one subscribes to, for example, may be in conflict with the religious ideology, or educational ideology. Likewise, a sex-role ideology is also part of the total framework of the individual. Often it is not possible to differentiate between actions or ideas which are functions of a specific ideology; often, too, one's beliefs about an issue, according to the political ideology will be contradicted by beliefs governed by another ideological belief. In other words, varying categories of beliefs and ideals make up one's personal framework, and it is this belief system which causes that individual to hold certain values and attitudes and to act in certain ways.

Since sex-role ideology is so significant to this study, it is important to define the concept of sex-role ideology.⁶ For purposes of this study, sex-role ideology refers to that system of beliefs, attitudes and values about the role expectations, behavioural orientations and personality attributes ascribed to an individual on the basis of his or her gender. Sex-role ideology provides an individual with a perceptual orientation about males and females, masculinity and femininity. Sex-role ideology, like any other ideology, though, is not unidimensional. Rather, sex-role ideology here is viewed as a set of beliefs along a continuum

with traditional orientations at one extreme, androgynous perspectives at the other end, and a mixed set of beliefs about what constitutes correct roles for men and women somewhere inbetween the two extremes. The concepts of "traditional," "mixed," and "androgynous" sex-role ideologies need elaboration. The concept of traditional relates to maintenance of convention. With regard to sex roles, one who holds a traditional ideology would see males and females as having very distinct occupational and behavioural roles based purely on biological differences. This person would use historical precedent as a rationale for the traditional ideology and would be resistant to blurring or changing the role definitions which perpetuate stereotypic "masculinity" and "femininity."

A person who subscribes to an androgynous sex-role ideology, on the other hand, would view males and females as individuals who are what they are because of individual personality and other factors, not because of biological sex. Androgyny, from the Greek andro, meaning male and gyne, meaning female, refers to a blend of what are traditionally viewed as male or female characteristics, values and attitudes. Proponents of the concept of androgyny include Rossi,⁷ Kaplan,⁸ Bem,⁹ and Kaplan and Bean.¹⁰ Thus the person who holds an androgynous sex-role ideology, in attempting to look for positive characteristics of both sexes, would see role

differentiation as important in order to permit individuals to manifest beneficial human qualities which are called for in particular situations. In other words, one who holds an androgynous sex-role ideology would see no need for divisions of labour, attitudes or values based on sex. The person with the androgynous sex-role ideology, however, would believe that people and situations should dictate the attitudes one holds and the behaviours one exhibits. People are more important than either men or women in the views of the advocates of androgynous behaviour.

In the middle, or somewhere between traditional and androgynous lies the sex-role ideology which has been termed "mixed." The person who perceives the world through a mixed sex-role ideology (probably because of the awareness of issues generated by the womens' movement and related occurrences) would hold some of the beliefs of both traditional and androgynous sex-role ideologies. On the one hand, the socialization process has been effective so that this kind of person has lived by the traditional norms set by society and governing both men and women, but on the other hand, is one who, perhaps intellectually, can see the benefits to individuals and to society as a whole that androgyny offers. Often the person holding a mixed sex-role ideology will be ambivalent about the issues of sex roles and society,

and often, too, his or her expressed attitudes and subsequent behaviour will be inconsistent. Ambivalence is one of the key characteristics of the mixed sex-role ideology.

No matter which sex-role ideology a person subscribes to, perhaps not all of that person's attitudes or behaviours will reflect an ideal type. For example, the person holding a mixed sex-role ideology could be androgynous in what he or she thinks about the characteristics, responsibilities and role prescriptions of other men or women, but very traditional in how he or she views him- or herself in an identical situation. In other words, it would probably be the rare individual who is totally androgynous or totally traditional.¹¹

If one is to observe teachers and students in schools, one needs to understand school culture. The classic anthropological definition of the concept of "culture" is that of E. B. Tylor who defined it as:

. . . that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.¹²

Other anthropologists and sociologists, depending upon which school of thought they advocate, have developed and modified Tylor's conception. For example, Kluckhohn has defined the concept as:

. . .the total life way of a people, the social legacy the individual acquires from his group. Or. . .as that part of the environment that is the creation of man.¹³

More recently, Nisbet has said:

A nuclear weapon, a high-rise office building, a pattern of family life, religion, friendship, morality, language, life style generally, as well as each of the prescribed ways we interact with others, is a part of culture. Beliefs, codes of law, systems of philosophy, esthetic, moral, and utilitarian values, all of these as well as the sundry machines, gadgets, and physical structures we find in all human societies are culture. Behind each is a way of thought or behaviour that has been learned.¹⁴

Talcott Parsons, however, was able to point out the consistency within all the definitions when he wrote:

. . .first, . . .culture is transmitted, it constitutes a heritage or a social tradition; secondly, . . .it is learned, it is not a manifestation, in particular content, of man's genetic constitution; and third, . . .it is shared.¹⁵

In other words, culture is the total way of life of people in a society.¹⁶

Within the dominant culture, the institutionalized sub-groups themselves have particular cultures which members of that society learn. For example, Taba describes the culture of the school as:

. . .the patterns of acceptance and rejection, the methods of gaining status and leadership, the ways of using authority and allocating belonging, the ideas about individuality and conformity, about what constitutes success and worth expressed in the formal and informal rules of conduct.¹⁷

Not only is there a school culture, but there is also a classroom culture. Stenhouse makes the point that

in a class, a teacher can generate common understandings which link pupils together on the basis of common experiences, and this provides a subculture with shared values, information, techniques, interpretations and meanings. He adds that this classroom culture is a "selective reflection" of the culture of the society as a whole.¹⁸

Just as schools reflect the culture of the dominant group, classrooms, too, to a greater or lesser degree, reflect the culture of the school. In describing a typical "factory" school,¹⁹ Grannis writes:

Students in a factory school classroom are generally found working on identical material at a uniform pace. Identical grading standards are presumed to be applied to all the students, though in practice there are great discrepancies in their application to different students, or in their application to different performances by one and the same student on various occasions. Much of the work is assign and recite, and the pattern of dialogue is often rote teaching. Students in the factory school do not get to see the teacher 'do things' that matter to the teacher himself, except teach, nor do they see the teacher working on his own questions.

At any given time it is expected either that the students already know what they are to do, or that they can pick it up with a little telling, or that they do not know--the distinctions are never quite clear--but that, in any case, it is the teacher's job to demand the doing of the children and to reward or punish according to the outcome. Thus the students in the factory school learn to think in terms of a crude standardization of products, effort, and reward, and at the same time to expect a certain arbitrariness of the standards by which their work is to be done and judged. They learn to expect the failure of many individuals to meet these standards. Finally, they learn the necessity of repetition, or, eventually, out-and-out withdrawal from the production line when individuals fail to meet the standards that have been laid down for them.²⁰

Thus classrooms and schools teach the essential and common modes of societal behaviours since the survival and maintenance of our kind of society depends on this process of cultural learning. Although, in some cases, particular types of behaviour will vary greatly, all cultures must have some common categories of behaviour which are essential for its continuation. How these behaviours are learned is the process of "cultural learning."

Within the culture of the school and classroom, students are learning many things. "Learning" may be defined as "the process of mentally retaining complex experiences by imposing structural patterns (concepts) upon them which results in adaptive changes in behaviour."²¹

Boocock sees learning as:

. . . a cognitive change leading to a measurable increase in knowledge or skills. A student who can perform some academic task which he could not perform at all or as well at some earlier point in time is assumed to have learned something.²²

Thus learning is the reconceptualization of experience, and the formal curriculum through which learning is said to be taking place consists of particular subjects, class schedules, lesson plans and perhaps behavioural objectives.

The lessons of the official curriculum, however, are not the only lessons students learn. In fact, the informal, "incidental learning" (the rituals and rules

of the school, the subtle meanings in textbooks and in interactions between teachers and students, the unwritten agenda of activities) which occurs within the culture of any school may have more impact upon students than any cognitive learning they acquire. The cultural learning which occurs through the formal and informal structure of the school is significant for this study.

Understanding the process of cultural learning, however, is no simple matter. As Hall points out, the anthropological problems in merely trying to understand culture are vast. As Hall states:

Until recently no one had defined any basic units of culture. There was no generally agreed upon underlying theory of culture--no way of being specific. . . . /Kroeber and Kluckhohn/ state that no constant elemental units of culture have as yet been satisfactorily established.²³

In fact, Hall goes on to say that although the concept of culture was first defined in print in 1877 by Tylor, "after all these years it still lacks the rigorous specificity which characterizes many less revolutionary and useful ideas."²⁴

Culture may be difficult to define, but the processes by which cultural learning occur are even more nebulous. For example, Kimball states that "to seek out its [cultural learning] particulars, one must specify who teaches what to whom, how, where, and under what circumstances."²⁵ Stenhouse points out that in

educational groups two components of culture are learned.

On the one hand, predominantly social understandings--morals, manners and attitudes to life--may be inculcated. . . . This is a subtle process, a matter of nuances and tones. On the other hand, education may transmit the understandings which are implied in curricula. . . . The first may be said to depend primarily on the influence of persons, the second to depend primarily on the influence of symbols--in books or on blackboards.²⁶

Thus the culture of the school or classroom may be learned directly, through rules, regulations or well-defined roles and behaviours; it is also learned more covertly. Analysis of this covert learning became popular in the late 1960s and early 1970s with the disciples of "free schools" and the concept of "deschooling society." The term "hidden curriculum" was used to explain all the negative aspects of schooling in the United States. For example, Charles Silberman wrote:

What educators must realize, moreover, is that how they teach and how they act may be more important than what they teach. The way we do things, that is to say, shapes values more directly and more effectively than the way we talk about them. . . . children are taught a host of lessons about values, ethics, morality, character, and conduct every day of the week, less by the content of the curriculum than by the way schools are organized, the way teachers and parents behave, the way they talk to children and to each other, the kinds of behaviour they approve or reward and the kinds they disapprove or punish. These lessons are far more powerful than the verbalizations that accompany them and that they frequently controvert.²⁷

Ivan Illich, in books like Deschooling Society, wrote about the hidden curriculum of schools which created power elites and taught students "that economically

viable knowledge is the result of professional teaching and that social entitlements depend on the rank achieved in a bureaucratic process."²⁸

Others like James Herndon and Herbert Kohl have written about the hidden curriculum in ghetto schools and the lessons poor, black children learn about how to survive in school. Charles Silberman, however, makes the point that "the defects and failures of the slum schools are but an exaggerated version of what's wrong with all schools."²⁹

In fact, John Holt, author of many books on aspects of the hidden curriculum, makes the point that schools do not teach students to think at all. Rather, they teach docility, passivity, conformity and lack of trust. As Holt sees it:

For children, the central business of school is not learning, whatever this vague word means; it is getting those daily tasks done, or at least out of the way, with a minimum of effort and unpleasantness. Each task is an end in itself.³⁰

Thus cultural learning takes place both overtly and covertly within the culture of the school, and the cultural learning most important to this study is the learning of sex roles.

The focus of this research, then, is in what way do males and females, through the process of cultural learning in schools acquire different kinds of behaviours, abide by different norms, and have different

expectations? Furthermore, do students learn that the culture of the classroom teaches that rewards, privileges and punishments vary according to one's gender?

This research will attempt to uncover those mechanisms of cultural learning operating within schools. For example, what happens during this process of cultural learning? What interactions contribute to or impede cultural learning? Few studies have attempted to investigate how this learning takes place, and so, for this reason, the research in this study is highly exploratory.

The hypothesis is that there is a relationship between a teacher's ideology (including his or her sex-role ideology) as reflected in his or her attitudes and values, in the context of the culture of the classroom, and the cultural learning which occurs in this classroom. The mechanisms through which this interaction occurs are of import here.

In summary, the broad focus of this research is on cultural learning within schools. The more specific focus is on the mechanisms through which this cultural learning takes place within the context of selected classrooms in one secondary school in Winnipeg. The following chapters will describe the research methodology, report on the findings, and draw hypotheses from the research regarding cultural learning of sex roles in schools.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER TWO

¹Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot, "Politics and Reasoning: Through the Eyes of Teachers and Children," Harvard Educational Review 43 (1973): 241.

²David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield and Egerton L. Ballachey, Individual in Society; A Textbook of Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), Chapter 11.

³K. Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), Chapter 2.

⁴Erik Erikson, Identity: Youth and Crisis (New York: Norton, 1963), pp. 189-190.

⁵Horace B. English and Ava C. English, A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1958), p. 250.

⁶There has been a great deal of confusion in both scholarly and popular discussions concerning the meaning of the concepts "sex" and "gender." Sex refers to the biological aspects of a person, such as the chromosomal, hormonal, anatomical and physiological structure. It is an ascribed status in that a person is assigned to one sex or the other at birth. Gender refers to psychological, social and cultural components. Unlike sex, it is an achieved status. People learn what behaviours and attitudes they should have according to their label of male or female. When a male is acting in culturally condoned gender--appropriate ways, he is viewed as masculine, and when a female is acting in gender--appropriate ways, she is seen as feminine. However, since the term "sex role" is the more common expression, it appears most often in this study.

⁷Alice Rossi, "Sex Equality: The Beginning of Ideology," The Humanist 29 (1969): 3-16.

⁸Alexandra G. Kaplan, "Androgyny As a Model of Mental Health for Women: From Theory to Therapy," in Alexandra G. Kaplan and Joan P. Bean (eds.) Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes--Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976).

⁹Sandra L. Bem, "Probing the Promise of Androgyny," in Alexandra G. Kaplan and Joan P. Bean (eds.) Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes--Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976).

¹⁰Alexandra G. Kaplan and Joan P. Bean (eds.) Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes--Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976).

¹¹Mason and Bumpass collected data in late 1970 based on a United States' national probability sample of ever-married women under the age of 45 about women's sex-role attitudes. The purpose of the study was to understand whether women's sex-role attitudes in 1970 had some kind of ideological basis. They found that the sex-role attitudes of these women appear not to be fully organized into a unidimensional ideology but partly organized according to a core ideology which causes them to be more traditional regarding the basic division of labour between men and women and more egalitarian regarding women's rights in the labour-market, ie, equal pay laws, and end to job discrimination. See Karen O. Mason and Larry L. Bumpass, "U.S. Women's Sex-Role Ideology, 1970," American Journal of Sociology 80 (1975): 1212-1319.

¹²E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture, 1st ed. (Boston: Estes and Lauriat, 1874), Vol. I, Chapter I.

¹³Clyde Kluckhohn, Mirror for Man (Greenwich, Connecticut: McGraw-Hill, 1944), p. 24.

¹⁴Robert A. Nisbet, "The Social Bond," in A. J. King and W. W. Coulthard, A Social View of Man - Canadian Perspectives (Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), p. 41

¹⁵Talcott Parsons, The Social System (London: Tavistock Publications, 1952), p. 15.

¹⁶The scope of this research does not permit investigation of dominant versus minority cultures in Canada. Although it is assumed that the various minority cultures and subcultures affect students, teachers and schools, it is in the context of the dominant culture that the research was undertaken.

¹⁷Hilda Taba, School Culture: Studies of Participation and Leadership (Washington: American Council on Education, 1955), p. vi. preface.

¹⁸Lawrence Stenhouse, Culture and Education (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1967), pp. 67-68.

¹⁹"Factory" school is the term used by Grannis to describe what he calls "the most prevalent type" of elementary and secondary schools in the United States (and by extension, Canada) today. These schools are products of the industrialization of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and their primary purpose then was to induct immigrant and rural youth into the working-class life of the times and for initiating some youth into the ways of American middle-class life. See Joseph C. Grannis, "The School As a Model of Society," in Norman Adler and Charles Harrington, The Learning of Political Behavior, (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1970).

²⁰Ibid., p. 140-141.

²¹K. T. Collins, et al., Key Words in Education (London: Longman, 1973), p. 125.

²²Sarane S. Boocock, An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972), p. 12.

²³Edward T. Hall, Silent Language, 1st ed., (New York: Doubleday, 1959), p. 25.

²⁴Ibid., p. 20.

²⁵Solon T. Kimball, Culture and the Educative Process: An Anthropological Perspective (New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press, 1974).

²⁶Lawrence Stenhouse, Op. cit., p. 56.

²⁷Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom--The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 36.

²⁸Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 22.

²⁹Charles Silberman, Op. cit., p. 51.

³⁰John Holt, How Children Fail (New York: Delta, 1964), p. 23.

CHAPTER THREE
THE ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

CHAPTER THREE

THE ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

The dominant mode of inquiry used in this study was ethnography, the term first used by anthropologists to study other cultures. In explaining the ethnographic method, Tikunoff, Berliner and Rist wrote:

Essentially it/ethnography/differs from the traditional methods employed by educational researchers in that, rather than focusing solely on quantitative evidence derived from a 'psycho-statistical model,' it utilizes trained observers to gather qualitative data by direct observation of human activity in an ongoing, naturalistic fashion. . . .

Unlike most research methodologies drawn from experimental psychology, ethnographic research seeks to develop hypotheses, rather than test them. While the ethnographer usually enters a field situation with some tentative assumptions/expectations/ to help him organize his observations, he does not take with him hypotheses to be verified or disproved. Instead, hypotheses are formulated after the data collected from observation have been analyzed. The ethnographer's hypotheses are thus observed, recorded data.

It was through ethnography that Smith and Geoffrey,² Minuchin, Biber, Shapiro and Zimiles,³ and more recently Lightfoot,⁴ were able to offer new perspectives on the education of teachers and students alike.

For purposes of this study, it was felt that through an intensive participant observation period

combined with key informant interviewing, the data gained would be beneficial in analyzing the mechanisms of cultural learning. As Lofland writes:

. . . statistical portrayals must always be 'interpreted,' 'grounded,' and given human meaning in the context of qualitative--direct face-to-face knowing. . . . the bedrock of human understanding is face-to-face contact. Statistical sociology serves to amplify and to check on the representativeness, frequency, and correlation of the knowing that is founded on that bedrock. Quantitative studies serve primarily to firm up and modify knowledge first gained in a fundamentally qualitative fashion.⁵

Relating this report to the essentials on ethnography described by Tikunoff et. al., the assumptions or expectations formulated prior to the participant observation period appear at the end of Chapter Two. Chapter Three will include a discussion of the setting in which the investigation took place, the qualifications of the observer, and the nature of the data gathering process. The findings of the observation will appear in Chapter Four. Finally, the formulation of hypotheses will come in Chapter Five, with a conclusion in Chapter Six.

Description of the Setting

The observation was carried out from April 6 to May 31, 1977, at a senior high school in Winnipeg, Manitoba. This school, located at the intersection of a quiet, tree-lined residential street and a busy thoroughfare, dates back to about 65 years ago, and since

its inception, has earned the reputation as one of the city's best preparatory schools for institutions of post secondary education. Throughout the periods of educational reform, this high school has maintained its reputation of being a school where students gained a solid, rigorous background in all academic subjects so that they might be fully prepared to succeed in further educational endeavors.

The school, of course, is not the only institution which advocated these traditional values. The family unit remains a strong influence on the students who attend this school, and families in this community place high value on education and citizenship. Thus, in most families, scholarship is praised, and children are taught to persevere in school in order to succeed later in life.

The neighbourhood surrounding this high school could be considered upper-middle class. Many of the heads of households are professional people such as medical doctors, dentists, lawyers and businessmen and businesswomen with university educations, often at the post-graduate level.

The composite of all these factors adds up to produce high school students with traditional values not only regarding the necessity of academic success in school but regarding respect for adults, personal

pride and ambition and above all, the desire to uphold the traditions of both family and school.

This high school is definitely the cornerstone of the educational institutions in this area of the school division. The other high school in the area was only established less than 20 years ago and seemed always to be trying to compete with this one, its "older sibling." There are four "feeder" junior high schools in the area from which students are drawn for the high school in this study. With the school division's open-door policy, students from any of the four junior high school could attend either of the two senior high schools. Proximity to a particular senior high school undoubtedly influences students' decisions about which high school they will attend. However, many students interviewed during this study expressed the view that this high school gives them a "better education" than they could receive at any other school.

Selecting the Teachers

The observation for the ethnography required the selection of teachers and classrooms. The first step in this process was to develop a three-part instrument which would be used to select the teacher participants. Several areas of attitudes and beliefs about sex-role ideology were deemed appropriate as the basis on which

to construct the instruments. These were the following: sex-linked characteristics, preferred behaviours and boundaries of occupational role. The first of the three-part instrument was a Likert-type scale which required respondents to check off their own beliefs about what women, in general, were like (see Appendix A). This scale was intended to measure personality attributes included in sex-role stereotypes. The second part consisted of three dilemmas for which the respondents had to give their opinions about what the central character faced with a dilemma should do (see Appendix B). The dilemmas served the purpose of allowing the respondent to write and talk about sex-role expectations. The dilemmas also revealed the respondents' own values since most people project themselves onto characters in dilemmas.

Finally, the third part of the selection instrument was another one-page questionnaire which asked the respondents to check off, along a continuum of "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," their position regarding occupations women should/should not hold. In other words, the questionnaire revealed the behavioural orientations, especially with regard to occupations, believed to be sex-appropriate (see Appendix C).

The three-part instrument was pre-tested on selected but mixed-sex classes at the University of

Manitoba's Faculty of Education, a mixed-sex class at another Winnipeg high school, and random women who were interested in the research. Changes and modifications in the instrument were then made.

Given the nature of the study and time involved in intensive observation, it would not have been possible to observe the classrooms of very many teachers. There needed to be some means of narrowing the field of potential participants. With this in mind, it was decided that three female senior high school teachers would be sought, representing each sex-role ideology.⁶ Female teachers (as opposed to only male teachers or teachers of both sexes) were chosen in order to control one variable and with the idea that female high school teachers serve as role models for adolescent girls. The latter seemed important since issues of sex-role conflict have been mainly focussed on the female role up to now.

Once these three female teachers had completed the instrument, it was scored. Part I, the questionnaire on personality attributes of women was subjectively analyzed through a comparison of the questionnaires of the three respondents and the follow-up interview which shed light on the respondents' reasoning.

For example, a cursory glance at Teacher A's responses to Part I of the instrument showed that she

chose not to complete the items. (In an interview later, she explained that she did not complete the items because there were no attributes which she felt all women in general had.) Teacher M checked the highest number of neutral positions on the Likert scale (position three) as well as checking that women were "always or almost always" (position five) familial. However, Teacher M did not agree with the traditionally-ascribed female attributes such as "passive," "emotional," "introverted"; Teacher T did agree with the traditional attributes of females, giving "most of the time" (position four) ratings to attributes such as "passive," "emotional," and "familial" and "not often" (position two) ratings to attributes such as "ambitious," "assertive," "independent" and so forth.

In scoring Part II, the dilemmas which measured role expectations, the researcher looked at the answers and searched out the reasoning behind each answer through the follow-up interview. In each case, the answers to the dilemmas were often sketchy but served to point out the consistency of the sex-role ideology first suspected after analysis of Part I. Furthermore, the follow-up interview served to "round out" the explanation given in each dilemma and to pose similar situations in which analogies could be drawn or inconsistencies in reasoning detected. The dilemmas and the analysis of the structure

of the teacher's reasoning gave an indication that these three teachers in fact did hold quite different sex-role ideologies.

The final item in the instrument, Part III-- a modified Likert scale designed to measure behavioural orientation with regard to occupation--was most difficult to score. Often the responses were inconsistent, which may have been caused by misunderstanding of the statements. For example, within an otherwise very traditional set of responses, one teacher answered "disagree" to the statement, "Certain occupations should only be filled by women." The reasons for this seemingly inconsistent statement could vary. For example, it could be an inconsistency within this teacher's ideology or a misinterpretation of the statement. Furthermore, it could show that there is an increasing acceptance of occupational choice on the part of certain individuals regardless of sex, i.e., there is a separating out of occupation from the sex-role complex. Only through the follow-up interview was the researcher able to get clarification of many inconsistencies such as the above and to be satisfied that in fact the sample did represent as much as possible androgynous, mixed and traditional sex-role ideologies. One cannot underestimate use of the structured interview for analyzing complex responses to research instruments.

The three teachers were asked to complete two additional questionnaires after the observation was completed. The first of these was the Sex-Role Orientation Scale, a Likert-scale questionnaire adapted from Brogan and Kutner⁷ (see Appendix D). The second was another Likert-scale item used to sample the teachers' educational philosophy (see Appendix E).

Observer's Qualifications

One of the most important features of the ethnographic method is its use of trained observers. Ethnographers spend much time learning the art of participant observation, the problems and pitfalls of observation in the natural environment. The researcher, in this case, having been a secondary school teacher for the past nine years, was familiar with school structure, curriculum, and organization.

In addition, the researcher spent time reading about the methods of the anthropologist and the techniques of doing field research. Furthermore, the researcher had thoroughly researched the literature on sex roles and interaction prior to beginning the ethnography.

Observation

A schedule was to be set up for observing selected classes of each of the three teachers. It was not

possible to observe every class of each teacher within the two-month observation period. To begin, the teachers were asked to select one section of their subject for observation on a daily basis for one and one-half months. Thus the teacher whose sex-role ideology was categorized as androgynous (Teacher A) was observed teaching a foreign language class; the mixed ideology teacher (Teacher M) was observed teaching a business education class; the traditional ideology teacher (Teacher T) was observed teaching a foreign language class.

Concurrently with the one and one-half month observation of selected sections, observation of interaction within the school was carried out. All students as well as the students in these three classes were observed in their day-to-day interactions both inside and outside classrooms, in the library, lunchroom and outside the school building. Furthermore, these three teachers were observed informally interacting with students and colleagues. Approximately half-way into the observation period, a discussion was held with Teachers A and M regarding the observation and some of the findings. These discussions shed more light on the values and personalities of these two teachers.⁸

After the initial one and one-half months of observation, the schedule was changed to permit obser-

vation of each class the three teachers taught. Thus it was possible to observe the teachers with other students and in other settings. Each of the three teachers, then, was observed for approximately seven to ten additional forty-minute class periods.

Key-Informant Interviewing

Key-informant interviewing also played a part in this ethnography. Several students unknown to the researcher and randomly selected were asked questions about sex-role distinctions at this high school. Furthermore, after the one and one-half month observation of the selected sections, students from several of these sections volunteered to be interviewed about sex-role distinctions in the school.

In addition, one teacher observed in this study acted as a key informant after all observation had been completed. Since this teacher understood and was involved in issues regarding women and sex roles, she was able to give this researcher insights into the school and its students as well as to explain school procedure or events occurring prior to the observation which may have affected the things observed and definitely aided in the analysis of cultural learning and sex-role ideology.

Units of Observational Data

Since it was felt that the observation should be free from as many pre-conceived notions about classroom interaction as possible, the observer had no categories prior to the start of the observation; all recording would be anecdotal. It was hoped that significant patterns of behaviour would emerge and thus it would be possible to compare and contrast the three classrooms on the basis of the mechanisms by which cultural learning occurs in each classroom according to the mechanisms which are actually observed and not those which one thinks will exist.⁹

Many classroom observational studies in the past have made use of the interaction analysis techniques developed by Flanders.¹⁰ Flanders' scheme was designed to measure the relative amounts of teacher and student participation and the quality of the teacher's behaviour (e.g., domineering vs. encouraging) during an observational period. Flanders' instrument consisted of ten categories of communication behaviour; seven were for "teacher talk" (e.g., "praises," "accepts feelings," "lecturing," "giving directions" and so forth) whereas two were for "student talk" and one for pauses, silence or simultaneous talk by two or more people. Observers who use Flanders' scale write down at three-second intervals the category which best describes the communication which occurred in that interval. Thus the data

generated by Flanders' interaction analysis consists of an enumeration which represents the sequence of events observed.

Flanders' system was judged inappropriate for this study since his instrument necessitates close observance of relatively few of the many occurrences going on in a classroom and since it does not include non-verbal behaviour or consideration of the nuances of interaction such as facial expressions and inflection. Furthermore, if one were to use Flanders' scheme, one would not have time to make anecdotal notes of the type which could give substance and meaning to the talking by both teacher and students.

Recording Methods

Since the emphasis in ethnography is on accurate, complete field notes, it was important to record interactions systematically. To facilitate the notetaking, outline notes were recorded during each class period as the observer sat at the back of the classrooms. Since it may have been threatening to teachers and students if the observer were seen writing copiously throughout the period, much time was spent listening and making "mental notes" with only the bare essentials written down during class. These field notes were then elaborated upon, noting significant non-verbal interactions, inflection and so on, immediately after the observation

period. Exception to this rule was made when the observer wished to record an important interaction or statement verbatim. Then the observer did try to get a word-for-word transcript. After the observation, it was also necessary to make notations in the field notes about time or facial expressions--the significant occurrences which are so often quickly forgotten.

At the end of each day's observation of all three classes, it became imperative to compare and contrast field notes taken in each classroom. In this way, similarities and differences could be noted for further observation. This way, too, patterns of behaviour which emerged could be closely monitored. These patterns would later provide the data on which the three classrooms could be compared.

Techniques of Analysis

The technique to be used for analysis of the data by categories is that of comparison and contrast. Chapter Four--Teachers' Sex-Role Ideology--will give anecdotal information which this researcher observed over time in every class of Teachers T, M, and A. The information gathered should give a complete picture of what classroom life was like for the students in these classrooms. All significant observations have been recorded and explained in detail. After the anecdotal information has been presented, Chapter Five--

Interpretation--will analyze the observational material according to the categories of power, kinesics and sexuality. In other words, the classroom interactions of all three teachers will be looked at to gain a better understanding of the mechanisms of cultural learning through the interactions based on the concepts of power, kinesics and sexuality. These three concepts were selected after the observation since no preconceptions about the possible mechanisms to be found were hypothesized. Furthermore, these are the mechanisms which seemed to be most prominently displayed (or, in some cases, deliberately denied or hidden) in each of these three teachers' classrooms. In the following chapters, then, patterns of behaviour which emerged in the three classrooms will be analyzed as they reflect upon the teacher's ideological stance and the on-going process of cultural learning in the classrooms.



FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER THREE

¹William J. Tikunoff, David C. Berliner and Ray C. Rist, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study--An Ethnographic Study of the Forty Classrooms of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study Known Sample (San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975), p. vi-vii.

²Louis M. Smith and William Geoffrey, The Complexities of An Urban Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968).

³Patricia Minuchin et al., The Psychological Impact of School Experience (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969).

⁴Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot, "Politics and Reasoning: Through the Eyes of Teachers and Children," Harvard Educational Review 43 (1973): 197-244.

⁵John Lofland, Analyzing Social Settings--A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1979), p. 6.

⁶The process of selection of these three subjects was as follows: The instrument was administered to all female teachers in a suburban Winnipeg senior high school. After these instruments were completed and analyzed, it was found that the range of opinion was not large enough to provide an adequate comparison. However, a teacher whom this researcher met at a meeting at the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, was interested in the study and volunteered to complete the instrument and participate in any observation study. On the chance that there might be two other teachers in the same school who would hold sex-role ideologies sufficiently diverse from this teacher's and who at the same time would permit observation of their classes, this first volunteer was asked to suggest names of any female teachers in her school who would meet the above criteria. Fortunately, this teacher was able to name two other teachers--one whom she thought held a sex-role ideology very different from her own and another whom she thought might agree to classroom observation but about whose sex-role ideology she knew nothing. Also, these three teachers had classes of grade ten and eleven students, so that the age range of students to be observed would at least be close.

⁷Donna Brogan and Nancy G. Kutner, "Measuring Sex-Role Orientation: A Normative Approach," Journal of Marriage and the Family, (February, 1976): 3-39.

⁸An interim interview with Teacher T was discussed but not realized because of time pressure and commitments placed on this teacher by her mid-term marriage and the extra duties she carried as a result of substitutes during her honeymoon absence and her other educational commitments.)

⁹Although the observer was looking for all the observable mechanisms by which cultural learning takes place, the emphasis for this study was on the mechanisms by which cultural learning about sex roles occurs.

¹⁰Ned A. Flanders, "Teacher Influence Pupil Attitudes and Achievements," U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Monograph, No. 12, (1960).

CHAPTER FOUR
TEACHERS' SEX-ROLE IDEOLOGY

CHAPTER FOUR

TEACHERS' SEX-ROLE IDEOLOGY

Before a detailed discussion of the observation is undertaken, a profile of the ideological positions of the three teachers is in order.

Teacher T, whom it was determined held a traditional sex-role ideology also seemed to hold a traditional educational ideology. Her classroom was orderly, and she assumed that the students were there to learn a second language. The best way to accomplish this seemed to be through a serious approach to cognitive learning with little time for the affective domain. From the time class began (often before the bell), until the final bell, the teacher taught--almost like an actress before a captive audience. She had the knowledge. The students were there to learn, and it was her responsibility to teach them.

Although there were no overt references, either verbal or non-verbal, to aspects of sex roles, there was a feeling, seemingly understood by all, that females and males acted in certain typical but very different ways and that the teacher's femininity was

an underlying factor in her teaching style and attitude toward education.

Teacher M, the teacher who held a mixed sex-role ideology, also seemed to hold a mixed educational ideology. Upon first glance at her classroom, one might think this teacher held a very "liberal" educational ideology for there was much freedom of movement, little teacher direction, and a very relaxed atmosphere. Although this teacher no doubt subscribes to some of the tenets of open education,¹ she also held traditional beliefs about how children best learn. Ambivalence was evident both in this teacher's sex-role ideology and her educational ideology. Rather than run an authoritarian classroom, Teacher M allowed her students freer rein, but she did not seem to have a well-developed rationale for doing so--in fact, most often it seemed that when students got out of hand, lack of authority was a pragmatic solution to the problem; the students would settle down sooner or later. This teacher had been affected by both the ideas on change in sex roles and education, but she had not yet determined where her ideological position would eventually come to lie.

Teacher A, the teacher who held an androgynous sex-role ideology, would not, upon initial observation, appear to hold an "open," "humanistic," or "liberal"

educational ideology. The appearance of her classroom and her teaching techniques were very traditional and not unlike those of Teacher T. Furthermore, her responses to the educational philosophy questionnaire indicated that her sex-role ideology and her educational ideology might have caused some conflict. Her educational ideology seemed to disallow individual or developmental differences whereas her sex-role ideology seemed to condone them. A possible explanation for this inconsistency, however, might have been the fact that Teacher A was a new teacher on the staff of a very conservative, traditional school and, in fact, she reported in later interviews that had the circumstances been different, she would not have taught the way she was teaching. Judging from her responses to the educational philosophy questionnaire, however, one must wonder whether her changes would have merely been changes in method or technique rather than being differences in how she perceived the psychology of learning. For example, given more freedom, would Teacher A have altered the methods she used or merely the content?

Educational ideology aside, the behaviour based upon Teacher A's sex-role ideology remained consistent throughout the observation. In fact, Teacher A came very close to being the classic androgynous teacher-- a feat not easily accomplished within the confines of a culture which often accedes, consciously or unconsciously, to the tenets of sexism.

To give a fuller picture of these three classrooms, the following impressions are offered:

Teacher T

Silence, order and authority were the most obvious features of Teacher T's classroom. When one entered the classroom, one saw six straight rows of six desks per row, a teacher's desk in the front of the student desks, and chalkboards forming an "L" along the front and one side wall. There were aisles between the six rows but none at the back of the classroom. The bulletin boards were well covered, usually with travel posters from European countries and with school notices. A small chalkboard at the back of the room which was not used by Teacher T for instruction had written upon it the rules pertaining to class times for the information of all students. Despite the fact that it was already spring of the year, Teacher T chose to keep the rules written for all to see. No student could be unsure of class times since Teacher T's instructions were that classes would begin at certain times and that students should be in their seats five minutes prior to the start of class.

The element of time was important in this classroom. Class time always seemed at a premium to Teacher T. Although she seemed never to be aware of

the actual time on the clock, she conveyed the impression that there never was enough time to accomplish all that had to be done. Unlike some teachers who begin to settle classes and do the routine tasks such as attendance after the bell signalling the start of class has rung, Teacher T did all these things prior to the start of class and as the students were entering the room so that she began to speak in the foreign language--the signal that class had begun--the moment the bell sounded. As sometimes was the case, if there were no official bell to begin the classes, this teacher would often start whenever most students were seated, even if the clock did not indicate the starting time, and regardless of the fact that many students were still finding their way to class. Of course, some students would take all day to get from one class to the next if there were no set times for classes to begin, but the fact that there were often only four minutes between classes and long distances from one class to the next made this teacher's stress on getting to class "on time" difficult for some students. The punishment for tardiness was a verbal one to the student in front of the class. Teacher T would say, "If you can't come on time, don't come at all." Since the student who came late had to walk in front of the teacher to his or her seat, the embarrassment of being denounced in front of

one's peers was ever more severe since the tardy student could not hide in the safety of his or her seat.

The ending of class, too, was at the discretion of Teacher T. If there were a bell and she were not finished teaching, she continued and the class waited. She never finished early. If she were finished lecturing before the legitimate end of class, students would be required to begin their homework assignments or the class would take up another task to wait out the period. Never once were students allowed to leave the class when their work was done.

Teacher T also controlled the use of time in this class. It was she who decided when the class had spent enough time doing a grammar exercise or reading prose passages--the students had no say in the use of time. They were there for 40 or 80 minutes, and their job was not to participate in any decision making, but to use the time to learn. Because Teacher T was so entertaining a teacher, students, in general, never seemed bored or uninterested in the classes whether they had to sit still for a single or double period. Part of this may be attributable to the fast-moving pace the teacher set and the fact that to grasp all that was being said in the foreign language required intense concentration on the part of the students.

Nevertheless, the students who seemed to understand the class conducted entirely in that foreign language, seemed to pay very close attention. Thus not only was there no student control over the way time was used in Teacher T's class, neither was there much awareness of time by most students. Perhaps they were too busy listening to watch the clock.

Another point to be made regarding Teacher T's use of class time was the fact that since she always assigned exercises for homework, class time was spent correcting these exercises orally. Thus students were required to do the work first on their own time and class time was spent on learning through corrections. Students were rarely given class time to do the exercises they would discuss the next day. Finally, it should be noted here that the class time was always devoted to the subject matter, never to anything which did not fit into the course curriculum. Time was divided into grammar time, vocabulary building time, reading time and so forth, but never was there any free time.

What becomes clear was that Teacher T's emphasis was on subject-matter instruction and cognitive learning. Although Teacher T's educational ideology as expressed in questionnaire form would appear to have been heavily influenced by the theories of "open" education, in practice,

her teaching style was authoritarian. All of the lessons were teacher-directed and often consisted of grammar lectures for a good part of the period. In this way, Teacher T explained several points of grammar and asked for student responses to "fill-in-the-blank" items she would write on the chalkboard. To answer, students for the most part, would simply raise their hands, and then Teacher T would call on an individual. In neither situation did there appear to be any sex-differentiated pattern in Teacher T's choice of students to answer her questions. Whether they raised their hands or spoke aloud, Teacher T seemed to recognize both males and females equally.²

Even in her small class of another foreign language, Teacher T ran a teacher-centred classroom. On the day when this class was up at her desk viewing her wedding pictures, when Teacher T was ready to begin class, all the students took their seats in the straight rows of desks. Teacher T then reverted to her performer role and lectured to these few students just the same as she did when there were three times as many students in a class.

Of course, the atmosphere in Teacher T's class was geared for subject-matter learning, but it seemed to be characterized by a constant degree of tension. Partly, this was caused by the pace which Teacher T set for the class.

She would explain a grammar point, write a phrase or sentence on the chalkboard and then turn to call on someone to fill in the right word. All this happened in minutes, and it seemed that if she had to call on a student to answer she merely called on the first person (or hand) she saw. There was no time to think about whom she was calling on; the lesson was progressing.

Tension on the students' part was evident even before class. Students entered the room, usually individually and always quietly. After sitting down, sometimes two students would engage in conversation, but it was always quiet and brief. Never was there any sign of silliness, excitement or anxiety. Often students who arrived early would open their notebooks, presumably to review the upcoming lesson. The business at hand was the subject lesson, and nothing else took precedence. Even during the time of student council elections in classes where Teacher T had several of the contestants, the atmosphere remained subject-oriented and low key.

Teacher T's class moved at a relentless pace. There was a lesson to be taught and learned, and this was the reason everyone was there. This pace seemed to prevent any discipline problems from emerging. Teacher T's students seemed to be too busy to think about causing a commotion. If ever they did, a non-verbal

cue from the teacher, such as a frown, seemed to be enough to bring the student back to the subject at hand.

One subject-matter technique which Teacher T used also served as a disciplinary technique for those students who did not know their work. Because of the fast pace of each lesson, if a student were called upon to give an answer and he or she did not know the answer, Teacher T would do one of three things--immediately call upon another student, give the answer herself, or ask the class to recite the answer together. In any case, students who did not have an answer ready, regardless of whether they knew it or needed help in arriving at it, did not get the time. What they got was a negative message about their own competencies.³

Teacher T's rapport with her students centred around her subject, and her students accepted this relationship. There was, however, one exception to this. Teacher T had one small class in another foreign language--almost a seminar-sized group. Teacher T seemed to have a closer relationship with these students than with any of her other classes. She talked with them at her desk prior to class and laughed and smiled much more while teaching them. When this observation was taking place, Teacher T, prior to one class, showed this group photographs of her recent wedding which several of these students had attended.⁴

Teacher T's role as teacher and authority also allowed her to determine and control space and movement within her classroom. The territories of teacher and student were carefully established in her classroom. Although there were no visible divisions of space such as platforms or dividers, the students "learned" that the teacher utilized the area surrounding her desk and in front of both chalkboards but well in front of the six rows of student desks, down which aisles she rarely ventured. Her territory included the doorway which gave entrance and exit to the room--a process over which she had ultimate control. No student could enter or exit without passing through her territory, and indeed, this territoriality gave her some of her authority. As an example, Teacher T chose when to begin and end each class, thus if a student were late to class or wished to leave the room before the teacher decided the class were over, the student would have to pass through her territory and be subjected to verbal interaction with Teacher T. The verbal exchanges observed on these occasions were forceful enough "lessons" so that few students even chose to enter the teacher's territory to gain access to or exit from the class.

Upon certain occasions, Teacher T did invite students into the territory surrounding her desk, but this was to ask a question of the teacher when the others

were working silently, or to hand in a completed assignment or test. In all cases, the students understood when it was appropriate to walk up to Teacher T's desk, and they did this very infrequently.

Teacher T, on the other hand, never left her territory for that of the students', i.e., the area of classroom containing six rows of student desks, six desks to each row. Neither when she was teaching or even monitoring the writing of a test did Teacher T ever walk among the desks of the students. This territoriality was especially significant if one sees the performance-like nature of Teacher T's classroom methodology. It seemed that this Teacher was always "centre stage" or somewhere in front of her pupils, with the distance between teacher and student always maintained.

As mentioned above, there was little movement from students' space to teacher's space, and none by the teacher into the students' space, but there was movement within at least the teacher's space. For example, Teacher T moved freely and frequently about her area, especially as she wrote on the chalkboard or used gesture and movement to pantomime a word or phrase. Facial expression, gesture and inflection were such fortes of Teacher T that even to the observer, untrained in the subject matter, she was immensely

entertaining. Indeed, the pace of her lessons and the concomitant movement made one wonder how she continued to teach from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. daily.

In contrast to the movement by the teacher within her own area, there was little movement by any student in their area. For the most part, students sat in their desks from the moment they arrived in the classroom until the teacher dismissed them. There were no opportunities for student movement--no chances for them to rise from their seats to write on the chalkboard or to get another textbook, or even to take a "seventh-inning stretch" during the periods. Perhaps the fact that the entire class was conducted by Teacher T in a foreign language forced the students to concentrate at all times on what was being said lest they not understand. However, what was significant was that the students had learned to sublimate, for an extended period of time, their need to move about so that there was little movement, even among those friends who sat behind one another in Teacher T's class.

Since her classroom was run in such a teacher-centred way, Teacher T was also able to control the verbal interactions which occurred during classes. Teacher T initiated most of the verbal interaction, and its purpose was to teach the subject matter or occasionally to discipline a tardy student. Most of the talking

consisted of cognitive explanations of the subject by the teacher or content-related inquiries directed by Teacher T to the students. Rarely would Teacher T ever speak to students about something other than the subject matter.

When Teacher T lectured to the class, the students expressed no verbalizations. In fact, there was little real interaction except when a student would answer a question or read a passage from the text. Those students who were not answering remained silent, and their posture would seem to indicate that they were paying attention to the lesson. Those who did answer, said their answer and nothing more. They gave no indication of non-verbal behaviour of any kind except the attending behaviours which all students exhibited.

Teacher T engaged in two kinds of non-verbal interactions. The first, negative facial gestures such as frowns or lifting one's eyebrows perhaps in disdain, were accorded students who answered incorrectly or who were in some way misbehaving--not paying attention, having forgotten a book and so forth. In these instances there was no indication of any reaction on the part of students. If they recited an incorrect answer, they did not have a chance to explain or correct themselves, and if they were being reprimanded, they did not dare. Much of the time they seemed immobilized by Teacher T's authority.

The second non-verbal behaviour, smiling, unlike the first, seemed not to be directed at or caused by students but seemed much more internal, personal to Teacher T as though she very much enjoyed what she was doing and was pleased at her "performance." Again, the students seemed to have no specific reaction. They still paid attention and listened. This one-sided display caused the observer to wonder to what extent Teacher T was, in fact, interacting with her students at all.

Student-initiated interaction with Teacher T was related solely to questions of content and during any class period there were few questions asked. When asked a question, Teacher T answered, but there was little other comment.

Interaction between or among students, too, was minimal and obviously clandestine. Some students would occasionally talk briefly to each other, but they usually stopped this on their own to pay attention to the lesson or when Teacher T gave them a non-verbal cue (usually a frown) to stop misbehaving. Never did this observer hear Teacher T verbally discipline a student who had been talking to another student. Teacher T never had to.

Still, Teacher T's students seemed to have respect for her knowledge and accepted her role as

teacher and authority. Those who were academically superior seemed to enjoy the challenges she presented, but one got the feeling that the academically weaker students were not encouraged to approach Teacher T for help or encouragement. They certainly were never asked if they understood or if they needed extra help, and they would probably lack the self-confidence to ask Teacher T for it.

Although overall Teacher T treated both male and female students equally, there were several incidents observed which seemed to contain differences based on gender. For example, in a class containing nine males and sixteen females, Teacher T continually forgot the names of females but never males. As well, in oral reading of plays, Teacher T never mixed genders, i.e., females always were assigned women's parts to read and males were always assigned men's parts. Additionally, as has been pointed out previously, she did call on slightly more boys than girls relative to their representation in the classroom.

Teacher T also seemed to single out males to joke with more than females. The quality of these jocular interactions were different. In one instance, with a male student who had been absent when worksheets were distributed, Teacher T asked the male jokingly if he had taken a vacation, since he did not have any

of the sheets. The boy replied something inaudible to the observer, but Teacher T smiled and laughed. There was no sign of annoyance on Teacher T's part, and she seemed to take it quite in stride.

In another instance where Teacher T joked, this time with a female student, the situation was a monologue by the teacher and perhaps at the expense of the girl's feelings. As it happened, one girl in Teacher T's class was running as a vice-presidential candidate in the upcoming student council election. At a point during one period, the following sequence of activities took place without warning:

Teacher T saw a flurry of paper drop to the floor between where she was standing and where the vice-presidential candidate was sitting. Teacher T quickly scooped up the paper, glanced at it cursorily and ripped it up, laughingly explaining to the observer, "We are having student council elections next week, and (name) is running for vice-president, and I just ripped up her election speech!" There was no reaction from any student, and so it was impossible to know whether Teacher T was joking or serious (as it later turned out, it was not the speech), but the effect upon the observer was disbelief and the effect upon the students seemed nil. The class continued. The point of the joke was lost, but the difference in Teacher T's use of humour with one male and one female in these instances was noted.⁵

Out of a class of 25 students, only one student ever talked back to Teacher T, and that student was a bright, intense male who sat at the back of a middle row. The incident involved a verbal exchange with this boy who had forgotten his book and not done the homework assignment--"two strikes" as it were, already. In reply to his stating the above, Teacher T said, "I think I'll forget to give you a mark at two-thirty." (Report cards were being distributed at that time.) Instead of letting the subject drop, however, the boy added in an irritated tone, "It doesn't happen very often." Although he was correct, that might still have been taken as "talking back" by many teachers, and could have been the beginning of a "show-down" between teacher and student. Teacher T, however, smiling and laughing said, "I think I'll start keeping track of all those times," and the situation ended with the teacher having the final word. However, one could not help but wonder why in the course of a two-month period and with almost twice as many female as male students in this class, no females ever had as potentially volatile an interchange with Teacher T as this male did.

In all, Teacher T was able to establish and maintain her control over all students in her class so that she could teach the cognitive skills necessary for success in this foreign language. There is no doubt

that if memorization, repetition and drill lead to proficiency in foreign language learning, Teacher T's students would score high marks.

Teacher M

Teacher M's classes were generally held in a basement room which was longer than it was wide. It too resembled a conventional classroom with six rows of eight student desks per row, chalkboards running the length of the front wall and one side wall, and a teacher's desk at the front. In this case, though, a long science lab table replaced the usual teacher desk, and it was on a raised platform, presumably for science demonstrations.

The phenomenon which any observer would first notice in Teacher M's class would be her voice level which was well above her normal speaking voice level. One might, at first, be startled by this, but after one observed the student interaction in Teacher M's class, one would quickly realize that this was the way Teacher M was heard above the constant noise in the classroom. Rather than wait for silence, Teacher M talked above the noise, whether she was explaining a concept, giving instructions or disciplining students.

The second most obvious point to be observed in Teacher M's class was that the talking rarely ceased and usually was being done by a handful of the same

students. Approximately five male students sought constant attention either from Teacher M or their other classmates; the other students talked freely but rarely had to be disciplined. Thus Teacher M spent most of her time disciplining these five and talked above the other general chatter.

Time was not something of overwhelming concern to Teacher M except in the sense that there seemed to be too much of it. One of Teacher M's most effective ways of disciplining her oft undisciplined students was to promise that they could leave early if they settled down to get their work done.

After the bell which signalled the beginning of class, Teacher M took attendance and informed the class of that period's activity--usually individual worksheets or correction of the previous period's worksheets. The rest of the time was spent on that activity, and often when the students finished the work assigned, they were free to leave. Teacher M was not overly concerned with accomplishing a set amount of work in each period. Thus the tasks assumed central importance and time was secondary.

Time, to the students of Teacher M, was viewed as how little of it they had to spend in class, for each period a few of the most troublesome students would ask, "Can we leave now?" after ten minutes into

the class period. Whenever the worksheets were long enough to take a whole period, though, students in Teacher M's class seemed unaware of the time.

Much of the subject-matter activity in Teacher M's class consisted of students' individual work on stencilled worksheets, teacher led, oral correction of these sheets and written tests. Once during the observation period, Teacher M attempted to conduct a class discussion, but gave up after the discussion turned into a verbal free-for-all. Also once during the observation period, Teacher M invited a speaker to the class. Teacher M commented to the speaker that the class was much better behaved for him than they ever were for her, and she was quite correct. They listened fairly attentively and asked questions. Perhaps this was because of the novelty of an outsider speaking to them and perhaps because his talk was interesting. Nevertheless, Teacher M only had to react non-verbally to one misbehaving student for that period.

When the class did go over their worksheets and Teacher M called upon various students for answers, she was very fair. She asked all students for at least one answer, took the time to hear the answer fully and to correct the student if he or she were wrong. Teacher M was trying, but the noise level never subsided, and one got the feeling that Teacher M, because she was

unclear about how to discipline her class, was not as effective a subject-matter specialist as she might have been to an attentive class.⁶

Because of the lack of effective discipline in Teacher M's class, the atmosphere often seemed chaotic with the noisiest students often dominating the interaction and the quiet students receiving little attention from anyone.⁷

There was emphasis on cognitive skills such as reading, writing and memorizing in this class, but there seemed to be little attention to the affective side except by default. The talkative students were certainly free to express their feelings, but they so often did so in negative ways that it almost appeared pure license. On the other hand, these students were not being taught to respect the feelings of others but rather to satisfy their own needs and desires.

Obviously, the problem of how "tough" or lenient one should be without becoming tyrannical was one with which Teacher M was still struggling, and it was reflected in her disciplinary techniques. Teacher M operated more on positive than negative reinforcement, but it had little long-term effect, and positively no observable transfer. Since the noise and unruly behaviour on the part of a few students began as soon as the class did, Teacher M was always on the defensive.

She spent most of every period trying to curb the outbursts or disruptions of these boys. Sometimes Teacher M would punish the misbehaving students by keeping them after class, but most of the time she tried to discipline them through a reward--"Settle down and you may leave when your work is done." Often she would allow anyone to leave the classroom for the remainder of the period just as soon as his or her worksheets were completed. Sometimes this would give them ten or fifteen minutes more free time. Of course, this did not work either; the boisterous students were subdued but not silenced, and the next day it would begin again.

Students also took the liberty of moving about the room interacting with other classmates when they were supposed to be completing their worksheets on an individual basis. Teacher M spent a great deal of time telling various boys to sit down, and they would, eventually, to do five more minutes of work only to be speaking to someone else at that time. These students learned well that Teacher M would tolerate their behaviour.⁸

Regardless of the reasons, most students seemed to get along very well with Teacher M. As Teacher M told this observer at one point during the observation, "They're not bad boys," and one certainly sensed that Teacher M really meant that statement about her

predominantly-male class. (There were five females and twenty-two males in this class.) She seemed to like the students and they, in turn, liked her.

Students were never afraid to speak out in this class, and although this must have been tension-producing for Teacher M, it surely did not produce any tension for the students who were always taking advantage of this situation. One sensed that Teacher M did everything possible to treat all her students fairly, to encourage them, and to be nice to them. Of course, students often do not understand the fine line between appropriate behaviour and "taking liberties," and so Teacher M was sometimes mistreated by the very students to whom she was the kindest. Kindness, however, was often mistaken for leniency.

An interesting dynamic in Teacher M's class was the use of space and movement within that space. Like Teacher T, Teacher M too had established territories within her classroom. The teacher's territory consisted of the front of the room with the raised platform and long table which this teacher sometimes referred to as "my throne." The students' territory was that area of the classroom containing the six rows of student desks. Teacher M as well, often used the space at the front of the room as her teaching position. However, unlike Teacher T, Teacher M was unable to maintain the exclusiveness of each territory. Although she seemed to disapprove

of students who entered her territory, she was unable to stop them from doing so. For example, although she did not tell students they could not walk up to her table on the platform, whenever students did so and sat on her chair as she was attending to other students, she would make various remarks (often "(name), get off my throne," or "Sit down, (name)."). The students, however, were quick to learn that these admonitions were not serious, and so they would return to their own territory after awhile, only to repeat the move into the teacher's space at another time.

If the students in Teacher M's class wished to ask her a question, they could do it in one of two ways. Either they could go up to her at the front of the room and speak to her (often this meant they had the attention of their classmates--a prime achievement for many of these students), or they could raise their hands or call out loud to her whereupon she would go to their desks. In this way, Teacher M entered the students' space as freely as they entered hers.

Unlike Teacher T, Teacher M did not move about frequently within her own territory. Most of her movement was among the students as she frequently walked up and down the rows, often answering the relentless flow of questions from her students. She was indeed, at their mercy in terms of the attention she paid to them.

Students, too, were allowed much freedom of movement within their own territory whether this meant movement from one desk to another or movement when one student rose to walk over to speak to another. Emphasis here, though, should be on pragmatism. It became apparent to the observer that Teacher M did not condone this frequent movement by students but rather she was ineffective in curbing it, and it seemed pragmatic to turn her attention away from it and toward the multitude of other pressing demands this class made upon her.

Since her classroom was so informal, there were many opportunities for interaction among the teacher and her students. Sometimes Teacher M would initiate interaction with one or more students; sometimes the interaction would come from the students. Most of the verbal interaction which Teacher M initiated was to ask a student to answer a question on one of the worksheets they were discussing or to discipline a student. If the class were discussing answers to questions on the worksheets, the teacher usually stood at the front of the class, near a student desk and called upon students from that position.

Students' responses to Teacher M's inquiries were varied. Sometimes students in a serious way would attempt to answer the question Teacher M asked; sometimes they were so busy talking amongst themselves that they

did not hear her speak to them. Sometimes the student called upon would hesitate in answering, and then several other students would offer answers or other comments which in no way pertained to the lesson. Teacher M's reaction to this mayhem was to cue into the right answer, no matter who gave it or to give it herself and to stress that answer by raising her voice even louder. Rather than insist on silence or answers by those students who were called upon, Teacher M ignored this uncalled-for behaviour and put emphasis on getting through the worksheets. She seemed to feel that someone must be listening, and since these worksheets would form the basis for the next test, it was her duty to see that the students got the correct answers in class. She also seemed to relinquish any responsibility for making all students record the correct answers although she tried to remind them often that they should be writing these things down.

At the same time as the class was discussing the worksheets, Teacher M would also verbally discipline students. Generally, the students would react by being silent or doing their work for a few moments, but this did not last long. Occasionally students who were being disciplined totally ignored Teacher M. These students simply kept up their actions while Teacher M chose to continue with the lesson. Most students

ignored the interaction which occurred between Teacher M and any students she was disciplining.

If Teacher M were helping students who were supposed to be working individually on seatwork, she would often exchange verbal comments with students at their desks. These exchanges were often accompanied by non-verbal actions on the part of Teacher M as well. These non-verbal messages were facial expressions, gesturing for a student to be quiet or turn around in his or her seat, or sometimes bending over a student's desk to assist in answering a question.

Students' reaction to these actions by Teacher M were similar to the interactions described above. Some students would discuss the question at their desks, others would simply stare at Teacher M and still others seemed to want to get Teacher M to their side of the room so that when she left their desks her back was to them and thus they could misbehave without her ever seeing them. None of Teacher M's non-verbal disciplinary behaviours worked as well as the "personal touch." Most often if Teacher M walked over to the desk of a misbehaving student and put his pen in his hand or turned his torso around to face front, he would stop misbehaving. However, these students would not react the same way if she had verbally told them to work or to turn around in their seats.

Interaction which students initiated was equally as frequent as that initiated by Teacher M. Whether it was directed at the teacher or other students, student verbal behaviour was always uncontrolled, often unnecessary and usually designed to get attention. Most of the time Teacher M reacted to this behaviour by verbally or non-verbally suggesting her disapproval, but none of these behaviours were effective in controlling the disruptive behaviour.

Considering the disproportionate number of males and females in Teacher M's class, it was difficult to distinguish gender-differences in Teacher M's treatment of students. There were certainly differences in the way she treated the boys and the girls, but similarly there were differences among the behaviours accorded each of the five girls, based presumably, upon personality factors. Nevertheless, Teacher M was forced to pay more attention to the boys since they outnumbered the girls and since all the problem students were boys. Yet when Teacher M spoke to males versus females, there were observable differences. The boys seemed to understand less and so Teacher M was often at their desks longer than when she was explaining something to a girl. Furthermore, three of the girls hardly ever asked any questions.

Then, too the personal space zone⁹ between Teacher M was less for males than for females. In fact,

in a typing class, Teacher M would often reach around a male to show him how to type a word, but she was never observed doing this with females.

One other interesting observation was that Teacher M seemed reluctant to discipline two males in the class, both of whom appeared older than the others in the class but who were probably no older than at least a few others. When the first boy in question flirted with an attractive female student whom he sat next to and thus prevented either of them from working, Teacher M spoke to both boy and girl, but when it came time to take action, Teacher M chose to move the seat of the girl and not the boy. The second boy seemed to be very undisciplined and often talked back to Teacher M. For some reason, she seemed to tolerate his remarks more than those of any other student, and he treated her rather like a contemporary.

Thus Teacher M's class contrasted sharply with Teacher T's class in terms of class composition, teacher behaviour, degree of formality and classroom setting. Teacher M's classroom certainly offered much to be observed.

Teacher A

Fairness and recognition of students as people seemed to characterize the classroom of Teacher A. Whereas

Teacher T was concerned with cognition and Teacher M with discipline, Teacher A seemed personally concerned with her students. In so doing, she seemed able to pay adherence to teaching the subject-matter but at the same time seemed continually aware of the students' needs and her own needs as people interacting in the close environment of the classroom.

The atmosphere created by Teacher A was serious and at the same time friendly. The students seemed to know and accept the rules; they were serious during the class time and outgoing and often loud during their free time each period.

As mentioned above, Teacher A seemed to worry about teaching the kinds of things and with the same emphasis that colleagues in her department were, thereby necessitating conducting her classes in ways she herself might not choose. Thus when one male student in particular voiced the criticism that "We never take anything interesting," it appeared that Teacher A could see his point. She felt, however, under sufficient pressure that she did not feel she could alter the course in this, her first year, at the school. Thus, if Teacher A had had her way, one sensed that the atmosphere for a larger part of the period would have been more relaxed and informal.

After an initial observation, the categories of space and movement in Teacher A's class seemed to yield some of the same findings as in the classes of Teachers T and M. The teacher's territory was that in front of the six rows of student desks which had six desks per row; the students' territory consisted of that area housing the student desks. Teacher A's territory, however, included the first student desk in row three which was not occupied by a student. It was by sitting upon the top of this student desk that Teacher A often taught. This position made the boundaries of teacher versus student space somewhat less distinct and brought Teacher A much closer to those being taught than did any of the teaching positions used by either Teachers T or M. Yet Teacher A never taught from the back of the classroom or from amongst the students who were seated in their desks.

Like Teacher T as well, Teacher A, by the position of her desk at the centre front of the room and her choice of teaching from somewhere in front of the students, was able to control the movement of students to and from the classroom door which was adjacent to her desk. Similarly, the students in Teacher A's class had "learned" that if they entered the class after it had begun, they were subject to comment by Teacher A who was always in a position to see who walked through the door just as the person did so.

The students' space in Teacher A's class, like that in the rooms of Teachers T and M, was that area which contained the student desks and which faced the front of the room and the teacher's desk. At certain times, however, individual students and the teacher traded spaces, but this occurred when their roles were reversed as well. For example, at one point during the observation, individual students were to recite a poem to the class, thereby teaching the class. For this exercise, each student had a turn at standing in the teacher's territory, reciting to the class, while the teacher took a student's desk somewhere at the back of the classroom. It was interesting to note, however, that when this reversal occurred, the student did not assume the authority of the teacher, i.e., he or she did not have any command over the attention of other students nor did any of them imitate, in any way, the performance of a teacher. Teacher A, on the other hand, chose a seat at the very back of the classroom, making it seem as though to take any other seat would not give her the control over the students who remained seated. Thus she maintained that part of her teacher role which gave her the authority to discipline students while at the same time playing the role of listener or receiver of the information which the student was reciting.

Like in Teacher M's class, however, there was movement by both teacher and students into one another's territory. For Teacher A, this movement was most evident when the students were doing silent seatwork or writing a test, and its purpose was to answer questions individuals might have had to ask or to hand out test papers.

Students moved into the teacher's space during these same quiet times, most often to hand in a test paper or to ask a question so they would not disturb the work of the others. Unlike Teacher M, however, Teacher A did not seem to regard this student movement as a negative phenomenon. In fact, it seemed perfectly natural, and Teacher A did not have to tell students to return to their seats. Whereas in the class of Teacher M the student movement seemed purposeless or designed to get the attention of both the teacher and other students, student movement in the class of Teacher A seemed brief, purposeful and undisturbing to the others.

One final comment on student movement within their own space in the class of Teacher A is necessary. During the free time Teacher A allowed within the eighty-minute periods, students moved freely amongst themselves and the voluntary sex segregation of the group became most apparent. During these few minutes, students were free to do whatever they wanted short of leaving the

room or causing trouble. At this time, of course, there was much activity and movement and in some cases leaping over desks to reach the desk of a friend. At this time, four of the female students moved together and six of the male students moved together, each forming a small group away from the other sex. The females usually sat in desks whereas the males usually stood near a window or sat on top of nearby student desks. Movement was always uncontrolled by Teacher A who generally stayed in her own territory during these breaks. Sometimes, but not often, a student or two would speak to Teacher A during a break, but most of the time students used these minutes to get away from the business of school.

Teacher A seemed the most aware of time in her teaching. She, more than any of the others, kept a watchful eye on the clock. Partly this was caused by her anxiety at finishing the coursework which was set down by others in her department and the school, which left little time to do anything other than the traditional areas of French grammar, vocabulary and reading. Teacher A set the pace of the class, which could be described as continuous activity but which was much more low-key than the frenzy which seemed to characterize the style of Teacher T. Teacher A began the class at the bell and continued until the end of class, never dismissing the students early.

Students in Teacher A's class seemed aware of time mostly during the long, eighty-minute periods. Their attention was centred on the teacher, but, in an eighty-minute period when it neared the half-way mark into the period, the students became restless and much more aware of time. They began to make comments such as "Break, break. Aren't we going to have a break?" Of course, Teacher A always made allowances for a break, but the students often complained that the time was not long enough. Nevertheless, when the specified free time was over, Teacher A had no trouble getting the students to return to their desks.

This built-in component of free time went a long way in making the class atmosphere as pleasing as it was and aiding the rapport between teacher and students. Obviously, Teacher A recognized that a few minutes free time were necessary for a kind of rejuvenation of the minds and bodies of both the students and herself. Thus the students seemed to feel that they had some control over part of the way they spent their class time, even if they could not participate in any significant way in other aspects of class decision-making.

Teacher A established very good rapport with her students, and part of the way she did this was to reward them when they have correct answers or otherwise did a good job. She seemed to take the time to be positive with all students.

Most importantly, Teacher A seemed to sense the temper of the time and place and was able to make the most of this kind of educational experience for all involved. She was responsive to the needs of her students as individuals and likewise to her own needs as well.

One of the ways Teacher A maintained this rapport was that she did not restrict the interaction exclusively to the study of a foreign language. Since Teacher A supervised a school club, students would often talk with her about this. She also talked with them about their part-time jobs. Most importantly, she made students aware of the boundaries of their student role so that they knew their punishments and their rewards. Students seemed comfortable in this knowledge.

Teacher A's most effective disciplinary technique was silence. Whenever she became silent, the class stopped, and the person misbehaving would usually desist.

Sometimes, of course, the silence was not enough, and then Teacher A would speak firmly to the student who was misbehaving, but she never engaged in "put-downs" or raised her voice. The student was often asked if he or she wanted to leave the room, and, of course, the answer was always a quiet "no."¹⁰

Because of the atmosphere which Teacher A created in her classroom, students seemed to feel at ease and thus were not inhibited from interacting with Teacher A and with each other. Unlike in Teacher M's class,

however, the interaction was not chaotic and uncontrolled but rather informal and friendly enough so as not to be threatening to any member of the class.

As far as teaching time went, most of the teacher-initiated actions of Teacher A dealt with the content of the lesson, but often it would be interspersed with other, more personal and less subject-oriented queries. The key seemed to be Teacher A's ability to relate to her students as people and to keep a perspective on what was happening. Unlike Teacher T who was preoccupied with the lesson and Teacher M who was preoccupied with discipline, Teacher A seemed fortunate enough to find the proper blend of elements to create a calm environment where interactions were plentiful.

If Teacher A engaged a student in interaction about subject matter, the student would either answer directly, say he or she did not know the answer or remain silent. If Teacher A sensed that the student did not know the answer or was unsure, she would guide that student to the answer by a series of sub-questions, or if she sensed the student would find this embarrassing, she would call on another student. Nevertheless, students were not rushed and got a fair opportunity to attempt an answer. They also seemed sure that they would not be embarrassed by an incorrect answer, and their replies were louder than the replies were of students in Teacher T's foreign language class.

The exception to this rule came when Teacher A used calling upon a student for an answer as a disciplinary technique. If a student were not paying attention, she would often call upon that student for an answer, and if he or she did not know the answer, the silence maintained by Teacher A would probably be enough to make the student pay attention the next time. Everyone in the class knew, however, that the student was being punished for not having paid attention, not for not knowing the correct answer.

Teacher A's most effective non-verbal interactions were frowns or gestures with her arm to indicate her disapproval of mischievous behaviour on the part of one or more students. It, too, was generally very effective in prohibiting these students from continuing their misbehaviour, and thus the lesson was not disrupted for those who were paying attention.

There was some degree of student interaction during class times. Sometimes two girls would exchange non-verbal messages across the room, and several boys would mutter things to each other during the course of the lesson. Sometimes Teacher A noticed these interactions; at other times she seemed unaware of them. If, however, these interactions were interrupting the lesson, she would make the students stop. What was significant was that the students felt sufficiently at ease and

tension-free to interact, even in sometimes silly ways. They were comfortable with the learning environment, but they also knew the limits of Teacher A.

Since Teacher A was able to treat each student as an individual, she was able to transcend sex roles and eliminate consideration of them from her classroom. Intentionally, Teacher A with her awareness of the women's movement and related issues, was successful in eliminating the need for any consideration of gender differences. Students were called upon in equal numbers, with a slight bias in favour of females.¹¹ Quite noticeable, too, was the fact that when students were reading mens' and womens' parts in a play, Teacher A distributed the parts without regard to gender matching; both girls and boys read mens' and womens' parts, and no students seemed to find this distribution inappropriate or awkward.

In all other areas, Teacher A treated students as individuals, not as males and females. There seemed to be recognition and acceptance of this equally by everyone concerned.

The area seemingly most inconsistent with Teacher A's androgynous outlook seemed to be teaching style. One might expect that her classroom would be less teacher-centred or certainly open to small group learning and methods other than those directed by the teacher. In

fact, however, in teaching style, Teacher A appeared very traditional, teacher-directed and controlling. Although her manner was not authoritarian, there seemed little room for any kind of student decision-making, and in fact, little consultation on the part of the students at all. The only time Teacher A seemed to do something about the affective domain was when she considered that students could not concentrate or, for that matter, sit for eighty minutes without a break. Even though she thought about the subject-matter techniques she was using, she did nothing to change the system which was putting her in the position of having to teach specific things in a specific way. One suspected that she was too busy to give much thought to how to effect change.

There may be more to this inconsistency than first meets the eye, however. It may be an indication that Teacher A's sex-role ideology and educational ideology are not as close a match as they appeared to be in the cases of Teachers T and M. Her sex-role ideology was extremely unconventional whereas her attitude toward learning, at least as manifested in her teaching style, was very conventional. If one's attitude is that students learn best under the direct tutelage of an instructor, then one will be unwilling to make use of even as uncontroversial method as grouping for instructional purposes. Teacher A seemed unwilling to experiment with

any other modes of instruction and thus did not really seem to believe in individualization of learning to the extent that she believed in individuals as people and not as gender-differentiated beings.

Perhaps Teacher A's classroom was very conventional in an academic sense; it certainly was extremely open in the sense of cultural learning about equality of the sexes. For the latter, Teacher A must surely be seen as a rare teacher in our educational system.

In order to analyze this data, the categories of power, kinesics and sexuality will be explained in Chapter Five. Furthermore, the data from each classroom will then be analyzed according to these three concepts.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER FOUR

¹The term "open education" has been used by educators, especially in the 1970s to indicate education which is more flexible, child-centered and tolerant of differences than the traditional education of the past. Open education influences educational theory, philosophy, methods and practices. It carried very definite positive connotations in the educational literature of the early 1970s.

²On two random days of frequency counting, Teacher T called on three boys and three girls on one day and seven girls and five boys on another. In actual fact, this was not an example of equality, because the ratio of the class was almost two females for one male. Thus, if she were totally unaffected by pupil gender, we would expect her to call on four girls and two boys and, in the second instance, on eight girls and four boys. The point here is that at a cursory glance, one would think the teacher were showing no discrimination based on gender, and in the quick-paced environment of a lesson, the teacher, too, probably thought she was being non-discriminatory regarding gender in her control of class participation.

³It was also interesting to note that when students did answer in the foreign language, they did so almost inaudibly. Perhaps they were self-conscious about their pronunciation; perhaps they were worried about being embarrassed.

⁴For a more detailed explanation of the role that marriage played in Teacher T's life, see Chapter Five.

⁵Care must be taken in these observances of sex differences to attempt to ascertain whether, in fact, these are sex differences and not personality differences. If a pattern of behaviour toward one sex or the other had emerged, then it would be easier to say that they were definitely gender-linked behaviours. Even more lengthy participant observation in these classes would have been necessary to confirm with certainty that differences in jokes, for example, are the result of sex-role discrimination. Presently, one can only describe the situations where gender differences seemed to occur.

⁶The problems in this class are not solely attributable to Teacher M by any means. Any system of education which puts twenty non-academic boys into general business classes sets up environments where learning about insurance and consumer protection is not the primary interest.

⁷Unfortunately, the students who sought and received the most attention were not the ones having trouble passing the course; the quiet ones were receiving failing marks.

⁸Part of this lack of disciplining by Teacher M was surely caused by the presence of the observer. This problem will be discussed in Chapter Six.

⁹Sommer defines "personal space zone" as "the area surrounding a person's body into which intruders may not come." See Robert Sommer, "Studies in Personal Space," Sociometry 22 (1959): 247-260.

¹⁰Once during a period in Teacher A's class, this question backfired. A usually quiet, very well-behaved male student was acting up and Teacher A asked him if he wanted to leave the class. As it turned out, the boy misunderstood Teacher A's question and answered in the affirmative. Teacher A replied, "Well then, get out," much to the boy's astonishment. When he realized what had happened, he tried to explain why he had replied "yes." Teacher A, in often what would be a situation where face-saving would be a teacher's priority, simply said, "Take the next question," and the class continued.

¹¹During three different observations, Teacher A called on girls eight times and boys seven, girls thirty-seven times and boys thirty, girls twenty-seven times and boys nineteen. This class consisted of an equal number of males and females.

CHAPTER FIVE
INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER FIVE

INTERPRETATION

Although prior to the observation it was expected that there would be definite overt differences in the attitude, expectation and treatment of students based on gender in each of the three classes, this was not the case. The observation yielded little overt differential treatment based on sex even in the classroom of the teacher who held a traditional sex-role ideology. Perhaps certain situational factors in the classrooms of Teachers T and M disallowed any gender-based differences, but the fact is that very few obvious differences regarding any dimensions of sex-role were observed in the classes of Teachers T, M, and A.¹

What did emerge during the observation were certain mechanisms through which cultural learning of sex-roles occurred. Although no preconceived notions about the connection between ideology and each of the mechanisms was postulated, because of what has been previously noted in this study about the three sex-role ideologies, it is possible to make some statements about the nature of

each mechanism in light of traditional and androgynous sex-role ideologies. The mixed ideology lies somewhere inbetween these two, and its most significant feature is the ambivalence which its proponents exhibit.

The interactionist concepts by which one can analyze these mechanisms of cultural learning would seem to be power, kinesics and sexuality. Definitions of each of these terms will follow.

Power

According to Martin, power having been debated by many theorists, is like love, "a word used continually in everyday speech, understood intuitively, and defined rarely."² Yet, Martin points out that the most influential definition of the concept is that of Max Weber:

Power is the probability that one action [sic] within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests.³

Stated simply, power is the ability to have others do one's bidding, even against one's will.

Certain power tactics are available to those who legitimately exercise power. In this study, the use of reward and punishment, decision-making privileges, control of space, definition of the value of time, and establishing an order of activities were all observable manifestations of the authority of the teacher or her

legitimate power. For example, depending upon the exercise of the rights associated with her position, a teacher will be able to control and manipulate students' behaviour, the content of the lessons, the sequencing of activities, and the use of both time and space in the classroom.

For the students, then, the teacher has authority, which means they must do her bidding. They are aware further, however, that she is not the final authority. She bows to the will of at least the principal of the school, whose authority is greater than hers. Her own authority depends on the support of the principal, and her own adherence to the school regulations.

Authority is not the only basis for control in the classroom. Another type of power tactic involves less formal methods than the reliance on the rights and privileges of one's status in the organization. No one who attempts to control others can rely solely on the power legitimately vested in the position they fill. For some purposes influence is more effective in controlling others. This is particularly the case in small groups, such as a classroom. With this type of power it is the personal qualities of the teacher which count, not her teacher position. Tactics are more likely to include the many ways one can make one's self acceptable to students, such as making friends with them and winning their loyalty and admiration.

A teacher who holds a traditional sex-role ideology might have more difficulty with power as authority than someone less conventional. Since the traditional ideology emphasizes the feminine traits of non-competitiveness, nurturance, interpersonal skills and passivity, the more masculine activities of directing others and using power tactics may not be what she is used to doing. Rather than allowing herself to be controlled, the teacher must now find herself in the opposite situation--being the controller--and she may find this new role uncomfortable and confusing.

To relieve her anxiety, the teacher subscribing to a traditional sex-role ideology might fall back on the more accepted feminine ways of influencing others. Rather than ordering, making decisions, punishing, and generally exercising power directly, she may rely more on pleasing, helping, and gaining the personal acceptance of her students by making herself attractive and likeable.

The literature on sex differences in interaction between females and males confirms these assumptions. For example, Crandall⁴ and Garai and Scheinfeld⁵ found that relationships were more important for females than for males, and others noted that when females are motivated to high achievement it is not their desire to master an area of learning so much as it is their desire to please

others and to become socially accepted. If teachers with traditional sex-role ideologies are trying to please others and become accepted, it may be difficult for them to use their power in the classroom. They would not be used to insisting on behaviour which they felt was appropriate and using their power to make that insistence firm.

Several studies have shown that females adopt an anticompetitive norm and form coalitions along the lines of least resistance. According to their sex-role stereotypes, females in these situations will be more concerned about interpersonal relations, whereas males will be concerned with external rewards, e.g., winning and power. The research of Bond and Vinacke,⁶ Uesugi and Vinacke,⁷ and Shaw⁸ sheds light on coalition formation.

Others such as Strodbeck and Man,⁹ Strodbeck, James and Hawkins,¹⁰ Bennett and Cohen,¹¹ and Gouran¹² have found that females are more inclined to reward communication, express warmth, helpfulness and affiliation. Bardwick and Douvan¹³ found that women exemplify the traits of dependence, passivity, fragility, low pain tolerance, non-aggression, non-competitiveness, inner orientation, interpersonal orientation, empathy, sensitivity, intuitiveness, yieldingness, inability to risk, emotional liability and supportiveness.

All of these studies seem to point to the fact that "feminine" females, socialized into a traditional

sex role, value interpersonal relations and become skilled in developing them. Furthermore, these females would be very anxious to relate well to others, and this would seem to have a direct bearing on the use to which these women put any power they may acquire.

To the teacher with an androgynous ideology, the exercise of power, either as authority or as influence, should present no problems. The androgynous teacher probably will not see control as antithetical to her nature as the traditional teacher might. According to the androgynous view, females and males are both active and passive, nurturant and aggressive, competitive and non-achieving depending on the requirements of the situation in which they find themselves. The ideal is for persons, regardless of sex, to respond appropriately by selecting from the wide range of human emotions and behaviours, not rigidly or stereotypically. Thus, if decision-making was left up to the teacher, she would not see this as a conflict for her as a woman.

Because androgyny means flexibility, with androgynous individuals capable of behaving in integrative feminine and masculine ways and who are assertive and yielding, independent and dependent, expressive and instrumental, the androgynous personality would use power based on the appropriateness of the time, place and situation. It is the flexibility of traits and

judgement in how and when to use them that is significant in the androgynous personality. Androgyny would allow a person to use legitimate power or to choose not to use it to cope with changing situations in alternative ways. The process is dynamic and allows for maximum integration of the best or most pragmatic of masculine and feminine characteristics.

To the androgynous teacher it would be as easy to use influence as the more formal power tactics. Androgyny stems from a humanistic philosophy which includes the love and respect of self and others as the basis of interaction, a recognition of both dependency and interdependency as human needs, and a stress on responsible involvements as essential for self-development. The teacher with this framework would naturally be emotionally involved in her students' learning; she would interact with them personally, but directly and not in a manipulative manner.

Kinesics

"Kinesics" as defined by Birdwhistell is a systematic study of how human beings communicate through bodily movement and gesture. It is a "learned form of communication, which is patterned within a culture. . . ." ¹⁴ Furthermore, meaning is communicated through body motion, posture, facial expression and voice.

Much of kinesics is, of course, common sense. A certain posture conveys tension, flexing one's hands may be an indication of anger, or one's downcast head may indicate sadness. Some gestures, too, have clear and obvious meanings--head nodding for agreement, a hitchhiker's upraised thumb when seeking a ride.

However, it would be a mistake to see a one-to-one correlation between a body movement and a meaning. This would suggest that each movement could be assigned a word or phrase and that each time that movement came up, the label could be applied. It is not nearly so simple. Normal behaviour often involves movement of various body parts simultaneously. Which movement does one interpret? What if the person is behaving in such a way that one gets mixed or contradictory nonverbal messages?¹⁵ Thus, in order to interpret non-verbal communication, one must again analyze its context--the situation in which the communication occurs.

Bateson emphasizes that if one really wants to know what is going on in communicative behaviour, one needs to know the context of that communication because the context determines the meaning. Looking at the roles people play in interaction, the setting, the entire culture allows people to place kinesics in its proper context.

Therefore, kinesics in the classroom would be another mechanism through which one might observe the

on-going process of cultural learning. The non-verbal ways in which teachers communicate with students and vice-versa are important.

Sexuality

Probably one of the most misunderstood concepts in the area of sex roles is the concept of sexuality. Routenbeek gives the historical perspective when he writes:

Up until a few decades ago sexuality was treated almost entirely as a clinical entity. This is not surprising, since many people thought of sexuality as something of an oddity, not to be discussed or even mentioned. Such nineteenth-century psychiatrists and sexologists as Krafft-Ebing, Hirshfeld and Moll saw sexuality in pretty much the same way and emphasized the disturbing aspects of sexuality by writing extensively about perversions, and this unfortunately then set the tone for the study of sexuality in that time.

Freud in his fundamental statement on human sexuality... taught us at least that sexuality is a driving force in all of us and although he, too, saw the development and place of sexuality very much through his clinical glasses, he brought the discussion and role of sexuality into a human, i.e., analytic situation.

It was left to the existential psychoanalysts and philosophers [Sartre, Jaspers, Ricoeur] to formulate at least the beginnings of a human philosophy of sexuality. They stressed that sexuality is very much part of our existence--here and now--that we cannot separate sexuality from our total world experience, that such a separation only can lead to a dehumanization of sexuality and that we should make every effort to integrate our sexuality into our existence and our mode of being.¹⁶

Sexuality might also be seen as the pattern of culturally comprehensible cues which are intended to provoke or elicit sexual interest or arousal, including

dress and adornment, body use and display, voice and tone, as well as gestures and signals. As Oakley writes, "'Sexuality' describes the whole area of personality related to sexual behaviour."¹⁷ She goes on to describe the stereotyped version of female sexuality:

The female's sexuality is supposed to lie in her receptiveness. . . it extends to the whole structure of feminine personality as dependent, passive, unaggressive and submissive. Female sexuality has been held to involve long arousal and slow satisfaction, inferior sex drive, . . . and romantic idealism rather than lustful reality.¹⁸

In one sense, being female according to the traditional sex-role ideology means at least subduing, if not denying one's sexuality. The virgin and the lady are models of asexuality. Other images have abounded, depicted in the lustier "earth mother" or the more powerful "witch" figures.¹⁹ The duplicity perceived in feminine nature has been variously dealt with in different cultural representations, but in recent times the solution has been to deny sexual interest to some kinds of women, such as wives and teachers, and to assign it to special categories of other women, such as public entertainers and prostitutes. The "proper" or respectable woman downplays, at least in the public sphere, her sex appeal; unless, of course, she is man-hunting, and then it must be used very subtly. Another exception is that even the "good woman" should present herself as a pleasing "object" for others to admire.²⁰ The line between provocative and pleasing is indeed a fine one.

According to the androgynous ideology, the sexuality of all individuals, male and female, adult and child, is acknowledged as ever-present. Awareness of sexual needs and responsibility in response and choice is emphasized. It is normal for females as well as males to take direct initiative and be active agents in interaction. Furthermore, sexuality is more than body chemistry and genital response. It is awareness and response to feelings, glances, tone, attitude and actions. Sexual attractiveness is intrinsic to personality, not merely a matter of display or exhibition. The most effective communication is direct, without resort to psychological games.²¹

The following is a discussion of the three mechanisms chosen to interpret the observed interaction in the classes of Teachers T, M, and A.

Teacher T

In Teacher T's class through each of these mechanisms, the students had opportunity to learn that the proper behaviour and attitudes of females existed along very traditional lines. Teacher T's educational and sex-role ideologies were very traditional, and the messages she conveyed to students about the proper role for females was consistent with this ideology. The image Teacher T presented was that of a woman who was extremely

self-confident in her ability to perform the female role (in our society) of teacher, one who displays herself as being feminine in appearance without being overtly sexual, and yet one who behaves somewhat coquetishly and beguilingly to males. This is certainly consistent with the behaviour and attitude of a female who operated within a conventional and traditional sex-role ideology.

She was socialized into a very traditional sex-role ideology, and during the observational period for this study, her life was pre-occupied by her upcoming marriage. Since her role in that marriage and the positive reinforcement she received from it dominated her existence, she did not need reinforcement of her behaviour in any other sphere of her life and so appeared extremely confident in the image she presented to others. This self-confidence permeated her teaching style, and was very evident in the way she controlled her classes. Probably the most notable mechanism of cultural learning which was observed in Teacher T's class was that of the use of power. Teacher T's classroom was entirely teacher-centred and quite authoritarian. Development of cognitive skills seemed most important to Teacher T, and this influenced the establishment and use of power within her classroom.

In Teacher T's class, the overriding concern of everyone was the subject matter. Students learned quickly, however, that the teacher held all the power. Decision-making about every matter, large or small, was in the hands of the teacher. Teacher T decided when students would change desks, what work would be discussed at what time and in what order, who would be called upon, and when students were to be tested for knowledge acquisition. As noted earlier, even the beginning and ending of class periods was left up to the discretion of Teacher T.

The mechanism of reward and punishment was one through which students in Teacher T's class learned about the culture of the classroom. Teacher T directed the learning and in this way, distributed rewards and punishment. However, neither rewards nor punishment in Teacher T's class were very overt. After any student would give a correct answer, Teacher T would always praise that student by saying, "good," or "well done," or some other word or phrase, but in order to keep the lesson moving, she was never lavish in her praise. Likewise, because of the pace of the lesson, Teacher T never dwelt upon a student's error. The punishment for an incorrect answer came not in verbal comments but rather by Teacher T ignoring the mistake and the student who made it. When a wrong answer was given, Teacher T

did not spend time explaining the error but rather had another student answer or answered it herself. Students in this class learned that they must not take up valuable class time by asking for an explanation of their error unless the pace of the class was slowed by Teacher T and there was time for questioning.

Rarely did any students in Teacher T's class break any rules or norms. No one spoke out loud at the wrong time; no one needed to be told to pay attention or any of the other usual activities in which some students always engage. They had learned the norms of proper classroom behaviour, and so Teacher T could spend all of the time teaching the subject matter.²² All the rules and mechanisms of control--all the legitimate power--were in the hands of Teacher T, and this was the most noticeable feature of Teacher T's classroom.

The control techniques used by Teacher T are very much reminiscent of those available to the mother in the patriarchal family household. That is, in a hierarchy of obedience required and privilege granted by virtue of one's position in the family, the mother is intermediate between the father and the children.²³ Her exercise of authority is mainly during the absence of the father from the family group, and it is buttressed by the last recourse which the father's power represents. She can call upon the father's authority

failing to effectively use her own, or when hers is called into question by a child. In the formal hierarchy, the mother is subservient to (and dependent upon) the father-husband, but superordinate to the children. In her relations as a subordinate with her husband, she needs to use influence; i.e., find ways of endearing herself to him in order to sometimes have her own way. Such strategies would be required with the children only if she were uncertain of the support from above. In the natural and close mother-child relationship, however, most mothers even in the authoritarian household structure, learn to rely on their bond of affection with their children as well as their authority as a basis for effective control. It is only sound practice also, since they can then rely on their children to form a coalition with them against the superior legitimate power of the father if necessary. Teacher T, like the traditional mother-wife who knows her place in the social structure, seems really not to require the approval or liking of her students on a more personal level. On the other hand, her effective use of formal control tactics establish a barrier between herself and her students which blocks intimacy or warmth of feeling in the relationship, which might prove gratifying to both parties and also provide the basis for effectively learning about interpersonal relations along with course

content. Teacher T seems to be somewhat rigid, or over-controlled.

There is no doubt that the kinesics of Teacher T reinforced and supplemented the control she maintained over her classes. Teacher T made extensive use of gestures and movement to illustrate something written on the chalkboard, or to hand out papers and so on, but she never stopped teaching as she did so, and thus she continued to control the pace of the class. The attention of the students could never be completely focussed on her movements, for she was always questioning, reciting or reading at the same time, and her students' concentration must have been split between her verbal language and her body language. An analysis of kinesics, though, would show that her movements were always traditionally feminine. Teacher T never sat upon a student desk or upon her own; her gestures always effected a certain gracefulness. She was entertaining, vivacious and charming, but at the same time distant from her students. She knew the boundaries of her role and the students learned theirs while at the same time learning the appropriate classroom behaviour for a female teacher.

There were suggestions in her behaviour that Teacher T paid more attention to male students even though she called upon male and female students for

answers in equal numbers. Yet any informal remarks she made seemed directed toward males, whereas she tended to ignore the females. Teacher T seemed to take more time with males who more often struggled with phrases. Females either seemed to know the answers right away or not at all; they did not pause to reflect upon an answer. Perhaps the females in Teacher T's class were brighter than the males, or perhaps they had no real incentive to try hard for an answer. Sex-role socialization may have taught Teacher T that a female "plays up to" males and so in a subtle way, Teacher T was reacting according to the traditional patterns of socialization when she paid more attention to the males or when she allowed a male student to get away with seemingly rude behaviour. Are students in Teacher T's class not learning in some very subtle ways that aggressive behaviour is more appropriate for males than for females, that they can expect their female peers to be quiet and well-behaved, or that in mixed-sex situations, females pay more attention to males than to people of the same sex as they?

In keeping with her body language is the entire realm of sexuality. Although it is not a subject readily investigated in schools and often a concept, the existence of which, is denied outright on the assumption that teachers, once they are certified, become asexual

(at least in the classroom), it is, nevertheless, a significant factor in cultural learning in classrooms.

Teacher T would most likely believe that sexuality had no place and, in fact, did not exist in her classroom. Indeed, her sexuality was so overridden by her authority role that only observation over time could yield some possible clues to how it was a factor in the cultural learning in her classroom. Teacher T's case is an extremely complicated one to analyze. Since her entire life revolved around her mid-term marriage, her thoughts, for the most part, seemed totally directed toward preparation for that event. School was a job, but the informal conversations she had with other colleagues centred on the wedding and prior events. As the wedding drew closer, Teacher T's appearance changed. She frequently wore a corsage on her lapel, obviously a gift from a bridal shower the evening or day before, and she began to appear without her eye glasses, apparently getting used to contact lenses for the event.

During the few weeks prior to her marriage, and which coincided with the beginning of the observational period, Teacher T dressed in a very stereotypic feminine manner. She almost always wore dresses or blouses and skirts, frequently those which gave her the appearance of a lovely woman but which never called attention to or emphasized her figure. Even when she wore pants, they

were part of pantsuits which, like the dresses, conveyed the image of a well-dressed woman who took the time to choose her clothes carefully to create that certain image.

By dressing in this way, Teacher T was de-emphasizing the physical part of her sexuality to her students and conveying the message that clothing was important for a female insofar as it created a total look, but not so that it called attention to any physical attributes. The image she transmitted by dressing in this proper feminine way for an about-to-be-married woman, plus the distance she maintained from her students further emphasized the aloofness which she established between herself and her students.

An interesting but unsubstantiated claim that may be valid in Teacher T's case is that her image seemed to change after her marriage. Although there may have been many reasons for the change, there was, nevertheless, a distinct difference in the clothing Teacher T wore after her marriage compared to that which she chose before the event. Afterward, she came to school in much more casual attire which highlighted her figure. Whether this was caused by a change in seasons, by the fact that many out-of-town relatives whom Teacher T would surely have wished to impress had returned home after the wedding, or in some way by a subtle change in her attitudes toward her own sexuality is not a question

which can be answered. Rather, it is reported here to point out how subtle and yet significant how a person feels about his or her sexuality is to the dynamics of a classroom. The distance, aloofness of manner and clothing of Teacher T, for the most part, emphasized her femininity and presented an image to her students that would be quite in line with the concept of a very traditional female sex role.

Teacher A

In Teacher A's class, the three mechanisms of cultural learning operated altogether differently than in the other two classes. To begin with, it was obvious that Teacher A held and used the power in her classes, but unlike Teacher T, Teacher A did not use her power in an authoritarian manner. Students in Teacher A's class were well aware that Teacher A represented authority and that her word was final, but Teacher A seemed very much more aware of the effects of that power on the interaction between herself and her students. She was able to gain their respect by being firm and sticking to a decision, but her decisions seemed to be made with an awareness of all the factors affecting that decision and the human needs which would be affected as well. For example, Teacher A would decide on the course of activities in each class period, but she planned them

with at least some consideration of the needs of both her students and herself, and she would not give in to the pressure of students who wanted the plan changed for inconsequential reasons. Her use of power in this way seemed well thought out and thus was a fair distribution of equality and authority. The flexibility incorporated in her androgyny would have allowed her the freedom to decide when and how to use her power in the best interests of individuals in this or any other, situation. Indirectly, then, students in Teacher A's class wielded some power in that their needs were taken into consideration by Teacher A.²⁴

In distributing rewards and punishment, Teacher A would also be teaching fairness. She, like the other two teachers, was quick to reward a student verbally for the correct answer, and she often expressed a real delight when a slower students gave a correct answer. Since Teacher A's behaviour was so very low key, this delight was not effusive, but her smile or inflection would convey approval to these students. Because of her feminist bias, Teacher A also rewarded a female student who expressed feminist ideas in a piece of written work.²⁵ However, her fairness only allowed her to make positive comments on the work, not to raise the grade artificially because the work fit her bias.

In this way, Teacher A was teaching that women are as important as men at the same time as she was rewarding intellectual achievement for those students who seemed interested. In no way did Teacher A ever make feminism or sex-role stereotyping an issue in her classes, but she was the only one of the three teachers observed who would point out the existence of stereotyped views of males and females to her students. Although this interaction was not observed, Teacher A told the observer that her students were used to sex-role stereotypes being pointed out to them. Thus students in Teacher A's classes were learning not to accept outright, the traditional roles for males and females, but at the same time, they were not alienated from the issues by the "preachings" of an over-zealous reformer.

Any punishment doled out by Teacher A was fair. In addition to her tactic of maintaining silence until a recalcitrant student stopped misbehaving and admonition through facial expressions, Teacher A punished both male and female students who were not paying attention by asking them several questions in a row. They soon had to pay attention. Thus the students learned that Teacher A could insist upon a certain kind of acceptable behaviour in the classroom not by embarrassing or ignoring them but by pressure upon them and by one-to-one interaction between herself and the student while the rest of the class waited for the lesson to continue.

Teacher A's kinesics reinforced her verbal behaviour which placed no emphasis on gender differences. Her gestures were carried out well within a small personal space zone, and her only repetitive body motion was facial expression, which usually evoked improved behaviour on the part of a misbehaving student. Stereotypically "unlady-like," she usually taught by sitting on a front student desk with her feet on the desk's seat and holding the text in one hand. She had only the other hand free to gesture, which she rarely did. Students would not really be conscious of Teacher A's body language except as she was trying to teach a foreign language. There were no other messages. Even when Teacher A walked among the rows of student desks, kinesics conveyed no message other than subject-matter instruction and Teacher A's students would not be faced with double binds.

A most notable and significant finding for this study was Teacher A's ability to appropriately neutralize sexuality as a factor operating in her classroom while she seemed to eliminate sex-role differences entirely. Teacher A seemed so at ease with her own sexuality and so comfortable relating to either males or females that it never was an issue. There were no "games" with the boys and there was no subtle messages to devalue the girls. At the same time, personalities were given free play.²⁶

The difference between Teacher T and Teacher A in this regard was extremely subtle but very important. Teacher T's overriding concern for teaching the subject matter acted as a foil and prohibited her from relating to her students as people, but when that concern was relaxed, she showed evidence of relating to males, in particular, in traditionally feminine ways. Teacher A, on the other hand, even though she too was very concerned with her subject, related to her students as individuals without any trace of seductiveness toward boys or indifference to girls. Students in Teacher A's class, therefore, would not feel that there was one appropriate sex role for male students and another for female students or that male and female students were treated in any way different from one another.

Teacher M

Whereas of all the mechanisms observed in the classrooms, the mechanism of power seemed most obvious and important in the classroom of both Teachers T and A, although in different ways, it was not the dominant feature of Teacher M's classroom. In fact, Teacher M's ambivalence about sex-role ideology probably was linked to her ambivalent or confused educational ideology.

Since several students in Teacher M's class dominated the classroom, one could say that power was

sometimes in the hands of these students and sometimes in the hands of Teacher M. This teacher, because of the norms of the school culture which gave ultimate authority in the classroom to the teacher, was able to have the final word. She could send a student from the room or keep a student after class as punishment for violating a classroom norm, but that was the ultimate use of power. Inbetween there were various forms of power, most of which seemed meaningless for the students who were misbehaving. For example, Teacher M often tried to exert power through the use of minor threats--"If you continue to arrive late, you will have to stay after class;" "If you do not settle down and do your work, you will not be allowed to leave early."²⁷ What students learned in these instances was three-fold. First, the misbehaving students learned that these threats were not serious since they were rarely carried out. Second, the passive students learned that the aggressive, attention-seeking students usually got the attention they were seeking. Third, all students learned that Teacher M never carried through in her use of power, perhaps because of her desire to seek approval as females have been conditioned to do.²⁸

The students in Teacher M's class who were disruptive also yielded a certain amount of power, and it seemed to the observer that they were testing Teacher

M, almost like small children with a permissive mother, to see how far they could extend that power. These students were able to demand and get immediate attention whenever they wished it simply by creating a disturbance or talking out-of-turn. Even if the attention they got was negative and in the form of verbal punishment, since the punishment held no meaning for them, in their eyes they must have felt successful in getting the attention they desired.

The most vocal students in Teacher M's class also shared in decision-making. Although Teacher M decided upon the class activities and their sequence, she often altered them if there were too many negative comments from the class about her decision. For example, if she had decided that the class would take a quiz at the end of the period or discuss their worksheets, she would announce this and if there were too many "outraged" students, she would bow to the pressure and yield her decision-making power. What happened, of course, was that the negative comments most often were loudest and strongest from the problem students, so Teacher M was, once again, transferring some of her power to the vocal minority, for they never represented the majority of the class.²⁹

The system of reward and punishment employed by Teacher M has already partially been discussed.

Whatever punishment she did try to exert was fairly ineffectual. Rewards, however, were another matter. Teacher M would make the usual comments to students who gave correct answers or who did exceptionally well on a test. However, she rewarded other behaviours of which she no doubt was unaware. For example, she inadvertently rewarded aggressive behaviour on the part of male students by meeting their attention needs. However, the times this observer was aware of female students acting aggressively, e.g., continuous talking, or kidding with a boy in a seat across the aisle, Teacher M's comments were effective in curbing the disturbing behaviour. Apparently the females who attempted to behave in a non-traditional way were quick to respond in a traditional way when an authority figure reprimanded them. They also apparently did not relish the negative attention Teacher M bestowed on them as the males did.

Unlike Teachers T and A, a large part of the effect Teacher M had upon her students was a direct result of her sexuality and the kinesics through which this sexuality was exhibited. Unlike Teacher T, whose sexuality was peripheral and a subtle influence upon cultural learning in the classroom, and Teacher A, whose sexuality was taken for granted, Teacher M had a much more physical presence and projected a rather alluring

image. One sensed that Teacher M, who was immaculately groomed and dressed in the latest high-fashion clothing, saw herself as sophisticated in style and manner and yet personable and very amiable. She had a captivating charm, and she knew the art of maximizing her finest features. The image she presented to her class was far from any stereotyped image of the "schoolmarm" of yesteryear. Particularly noticeable were Teacher M's clothes which were often soft or bright colours and had soft, flowing lines. Surely her students learned that to be female meant emphasizing one's best features in garments which were eye-catching and often sensual. Like Teacher T, Teacher M was exceedingly feminine, but Teacher M's femininity was more distinctly sexual.

Teacher M's kinesics provided direct links with expressions of her sexuality and served to illuminate her mixed sex-role ideology. On the one hand, one senses that she had learned well the lesson of how females attract males and her personality carried strong traces of this sex-role learning. She had been well socialized into a traditional female sex role, and she had probably been extremely successful in reaping its "rewards" of male attention. However, since she held a mixed sex-role ideology, she was often at odds with this socialization and so she projected a conglomeration of attitudes and values and expressed them often in curious ways.

Teacher M unconsciously reacted to her male students as tradition demands women react to males--deferring to their demands, engaging in banter with them, and maintaining less of a personal space distance between herself and them. Her body language--gestures, inflection and the like--were very typically feminine, not forceful or assertive. She rarely wrote on the chalkboard and rarely gestured, but she moved about the room more than either Teachers T or A. When she walked amongst the students, she moved closer to them and so their attention needs were satisfied to an even greater extent.

In one particular instance of deference, Teacher M told one male student that he could not go to the door to talk to a friend of his, but he ignored her comment and did so anyway. When he returned to his seat, Teacher M did not reprimand him but instead reminded him that he had not closed the classroom door. Teacher M then said no more to him. She obviously was deferring to a male student who was older than the others in the class, a football player, and one with whom she had previously had no luck in making follow the class norms. Teacher M ignored his display of rudeness and misbehaviour. Perhaps she simply did not feel that punishment would serve any purpose, but the other students in the class may have learned that

aggressive, rude males are able to exert power over females regardless of the legitimate authority vested in the position occupied by the female, and simply by virtue of being male.

A very significant use of kinesics in Teacher M's class became apparent as students would ask her to come to their desks for help. In all observable cases, Teacher M maintained a greater personal space distance from female students than from male students. To help females, Teacher M would often give verbal instructions or show them how to perform a job by telling them what to do. With male students, Teacher M most often wrote on their notebooks for them, or reached across them to show them how to perform a task. Thus female students would learn that between females there is to be a greater distance maintained than between a female and male of any age. One wonders, however, what learning the males were acquiring in these interactions. To be sure, certain male students had a great deal of questions to ask when Teacher M was willing to answer them personally, and perhaps a form of the double bind was operating here--male students were being given conflicting messages. Thus the assignment of males and females to traditional statuses and involvement in the traditional pattern of sexual "games" was the learning which was most often reinforced in Teacher M's class.

Summary

Of course, the three mechanisms of cultural learning described in this study are not the only ones which could be identified as those mechanisms through which cultural learning in the classroom takes place; they were, however, the most obvious and probably most significant ones in the classrooms of these three teachers.

What can one deduce from these findings? Although it was expected that there would be overt discrimination or differences based on gender, especially as one moved more toward the traditional pole on the continuum of sex-role ideology, this was not observed. It is a tribute to all three teachers that there were few observable differences in any teacher's overt treatment of males and females in their classes. Yet perhaps it is not at the conscious level that discrimination is the most insidious.

What was expected and found was that ideology, especially sex-role ideology, affected the cultural learning which occurred in the classroom. In all three classes, the teachers' ideologies were associated with their classroom behaviour, their attitudes toward their role as teacher and the roles which their students should perform. Through observation of their use of power, kinesics and their expressions of sexuality, the researcher observed the processes of cultural learning from very traditional attitudes and values to

those which were much more human or androgynous, each corresponding to a teacher's expressed ideology on the three-part instrument given prior to the observational period.

It has been pointed out that the teachers' frameworks very definitely affected the cultural learning which occurred in their interactions with students, and, according to expectation, the teachers seemed unaware of the informal learning occurring in their classrooms. Perhaps Teacher A was most aware of the hidden curriculum of sex roles and sexuality in the classroom, and she certainly did the most to teach equality at the cognitive level and to make the issue of sex roles a non-issue in her classroom. Teachers T and M, however, seemed oblivious to the cultural learning about sex roles and to the role their own sexuality played in the process, and it was in these two classes that the cultural learning about sex roles was the most tradition-bound and most covert.

An unanticipated finding in this study revolves around the way that power, traditionally seen as a component of the masculine role, was used by Teachers T and M. Whereas Teacher M suffered conflict over her use of power in terms of class control and the system of reward and punishment, Teacher T seemed to have no problem playing the role of teacher³⁰ in a way which

might have caused a great deal of conflict with her expressed sex-role ideology. Since power and authority are a male's domain, it should have been most difficult for Teacher T to utilize that power in a domineering, forceful way. Instead, she may have resorted to manipulation, verbal aggression or defense-oriented behaviour within the class. Furthermore, Teacher T may have been able to use power in the masculine-delegated sense. Whether she was able to do this consistently and without any sense of conflict with her presumed feminine need for expressiveness and love is not known.

The fact that Teacher T was able to run her classroom with a great deal of power and authority and at the same time exhibit no observable conflict must be explained further by the way she had thoroughly compartmentalized her life so that outside the classroom, her traditional feminine role ideology permeated her life. Inside the classroom, however, she assumed an attitude of "liberal professionalism" which allowed her to ignore sex-role stereotypes and eliminate typically feminine behaviours in order to play the teacher role in the most effective way she knew. Certain of her femininity outside the classroom, she could adopt masculine strategies to accomplish the necessary tasks of teaching. Thus the traditional female, who in less well-defined circumstances might have been uncomfortable with many forms of power,

was able to use power very effectively when she buttressed herself with rules, norms and certainties which accompany the role, in this case the teacher role. Her effective use of legitimate power may only be possible in her role as deputy to a male higher in authority, like a principal, a father or a husband.

Such is not the case with Teacher M. Her mixed sex-role ideology did not provide her with a definite sense of unified, or even compartmentalized, self, and she often appeared confused about proper role behaviour. Thus her ambivalence about whether to use the legitimate power she acquires in her traditional teacher role or the power her femininity and sexuality often assures in other contexts, caused her to be less effective a teacher than Teacher T who holds a traditional sex-role ideology.

There seem to be various implications of these interpretations for those concerned with the education of adolescents. Some of these, as well as their limitations and drawbacks, will be discussed in Chapter Six.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER FIVE

¹The extremely fast pace of the lessons and the exclusively teacher-directed style in Teacher T's class certainly were factors in the absence of sex-role linked attitudes and behaviours. Teacher T seemed to treat males and females alike perhaps because she was so determined to keep up the pace of the lesson that she did not even seem aware of which students were males and which females. Her attention and sole effort were on transmitting subject matter to her students, and she was almost oblivious to any other dimension of life in the classroom.

In Teacher M's class, the uneven split of twenty-seven males and five females plus the fact that the males were the discipline problems seemed to preclude any valid conclusion about differential treatment based on gender by Teacher M. Had the class population been more evenly split, or had any of the females been discipline problems, different attitudes and behaviours toward males and females may have occurred in this classroom.

²Wilfred B. W. Martin, The Negotiated Order of the School (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976), p. 15.

³Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons (Chicago: Free Press, 1947), p. 152.

⁴Virginia C. Crandall, "Achievement Behavior in Young Children," Young Children 20 (1964): 77-90

⁵J. E. Garai and A. Scheinfeld, "Sex Differences in Mental and Behavioral Traits," Genetic Psychology Monographs 77 (1968): 169-299

⁶J. R. Bond and W. E. Vinacke, "Coalitions in Mixed-Sex Triads," Sociometry 24 (1961): 61-75.

⁷T. T. Uesugi and W. E. Vinacke, "Strategy in a Feminine Game," Sociometry 26 (1963): 75-88.

⁸Marvin E. Shaw, Group Dynamics--The Psychology of Small Group Behavior, 2nd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976).

⁹F. Strodbeck and R. Mann, "Sex Role Differentiation in Jury Deliberations," Sociometry 19 (1956): 3-11.

¹⁰F. Strodbeck, R. James, and C. Hawkins, "Social Status in Jury Deliberations," American Sociology Review, 22 (1957): 713-719.

¹¹E. Bennett and L. Cohen, "Men and Women: Personality Patterns and Contrasts," Genetic Psychology Monographs 59 (1959): 101-155.

¹²D. Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy," Speech Monographs 36 (1968): 387-391.

¹³J. Bardwick and E. Douvan, "Ambivalence: The Socialization of Women," in V. Gornick and B. Moran (eds.) Woman in Sexist Society (New York: Basic Books, 1971).

¹⁴Ray L. Birdwhistell, Kinesics and Context, Essays on Body Motion Communication (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971), p. xi.

¹⁵Bateson, Jackson, Haley and Weakland proposed a "double bind" theory of schizophrenia, according to which maladaptive responses of schizophrenics come about because they receive inconsistent communications. A double bind communication is defined as involving two or more inconsistent attitude messages which are assumed to elicit incompatible responses from the addressee. For example a mother asks her son to come over and kiss her while she implicitly communicates indifference for what he is requested to do. The child is left with the dilemma of responding to either message, knowing that responding to either one will elicit a rebuff. See G. Bateson, D. D. Jackson, J. Haley and J. H. Weakland, "Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia," Behavioral Sciences, 1 (1956): 251-64.

¹⁶Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek (ed.) Sexuality and Identity (New York: Delta Book, Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1970), p. 70.

¹⁷Ann Oakley, Sex, Gender and Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 99.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 100

¹⁹See Julia O'Faolin and Laura Martines (eds.) Not in God's Image: Women in History from the Greeks to the Victorians (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).

²⁰On "presentation of self" as an important activity in general, See Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (New York: Anchor, 1959).

²¹A way of communicating which is open direct, and honest and which reinforces the self-worth of both persons is termed leveling. A leveler's verbal responses are unified with body language. Being a leveler allows a person to live as a whole person, in touch with head, heart, feelings and body. See Virginia Satir, Peoplemaking (Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1972).

²²It would have been interesting to have observed Teacher T's classroom from the beginning of the year when she was teaching her classes the norms of the classroom culture. There were certain rules about the times of classes and the time when students had to be in their seats (prior to the bell) still written on the chalkboard in April and May. Presumably Teacher T established these rules early, and they were heavily sanctioned so that they were now followed absolutely.

²³Ernest W. Burgess, Harvey J. Locke, and Mary Margaret Thomes, The Family: From Traditional to Companionship, 4th ed. (Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1971), p. 8.

²⁴Students who lacked the maturity to see the dynamics of the situation often complained that Teacher A was too "tough" or that she worked them too hard. In years to come, however, it would be a rare adult who would not be able to see the wisdom and compassion with which Teacher A conducted her classes.

²⁵Since this information was obtained through a key-informant interview, the reaction of the student was impossible to assess. The informant only told the observer of the incident prior to handing back the written assignment to the girl.

²⁶In keeping with the notion of no pure types as expressed earlier in this paper, it is interesting to note that Teacher A did not appear to be totally androgynous. Since androgyny allows a person to amalgamate positive masculine and feminine traits, the androgynous teacher should use feminine traits as well as masculine ones. For example, in education, the characteristic of nurturance, a stereotypically feminine trait, would seem to be important, and yet Teacher A was never observed to be nurturant to any individuals. Thus, the idea of a pure androgynous teacher did not prove possible in this research.

²⁷In fact, leaving early was a reward, a kind of positive reinforcement for good behaviour but the results of this reinforcement were always short term. This would quiet the students for a few minutes and usually resulted in their becoming noisy again to ask if they could leave yet.

²⁸Teacher M did tell the observer about an incident prior to the observational period in which she had sent one male student to the principal's office. Apparently, he either became too overwhelming a behaviour problem, or he violated an important classroom norm. The information available is not clear. What is important to note, however, is the fact that Teacher M may have been exerting less power during the observation than she would have exerted had the observer not been present. Upon reflection, though, this seems less plausible since Teacher M's reserved manner and pleasant personality never wavered. She was always consistent in her kindness, and this observer feels sure that to be more severe or firm with students is not in Teacher M's makeup. Perhaps, too, in keeping with the female sex-role stereotype, Teacher M was, in some way, seeking approval of her conduct indirectly from her students. Since she felt it necessary to explain this prior incident to the observer, almost as an explanation of her current behaviour in not sending misbehaving students out of the room, perhaps she was seeking approval of her behaviour from the observer.

²⁹Martin's theory of negotiation in schools is particularly apt in Teacher M's class. Martin points out that in teacher-pupil interactions, the setting up of agendas is an important part of the interaction process, and that in all situations the agendas are, to some extent, negotiated. However, they are rarely negotiated with equal voice by pupils and teachers. Only in Teacher M's class, however, were students even consistently able to decide upon or alter the agenda. See Wilfred B. W. Martin, The Negotiated Order of the School (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1976).

³⁰Whereas in elementary school, the behaviours associated with the teacher role are more stereotypically feminine (almost an extension of the mother figure), in secondary school, the teacher role switches to more masculine behaviours. Self-reliance and knowledge acquisition on the students' part is stressed, and the students are often treated more sternly and with much less nurturance.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

A teacher's sex-role ideology falls somewhere between the two poles of an androgynous ideology and a traditional ideology and sex-role ideology may be determined by a three-part instrument consisting of questionnaires and dilemmas which investigate personality attributes, role expectations and behavioural orientations regarding the female sex role.

A person's ideology is such a strongly held system of beliefs that it comes with a teacher into the classroom. Using the methods of the ethnographer, an observation of the classrooms of three selected teachers showed that learning was occurring both covertly and overtly and that some of this learning was about gender. It was then determined that power, kinesics and sexuality in these three classrooms were the mechanisms through which most cultural learning about what is masculine and what is feminine was achieved. Teachers T, M and A were able to demonstrate the overlap and connection between how they felt about and used power,

how they communicated often-conflicting messages through the kinesic communication system, and how they felt about their own sexuality and its effects upon their students, all within the culture of the classroom.

The results of the ethnography show that female teachers with certain ideologies behave in certain ways, and in some way communicate very special cultural "information" through this process of cultural learning. For example, the teacher with a very traditional sex-role ideology behaved consistently within a traditionally feminine role outside the classroom. However, her rigidity carried over into her classroom behaviour insofar as she could assume a much more "masculine" posture when she placed herself in the teacher role. Her class was run with much more authority and control than one might have expected from a female who held such a traditional sex-role ideology. Nevertheless, her efforts to control absolutely her own sexuality, connected with her nevertheless feminine body movements, can be seen as consistent with her traditional sex-role orientation.

The mechanisms analyzed also served to point out the consistency between Teacher M's behaviour and a mixed sex-role ideology. Her sex-role ideology was characterized by ambivalence, and her uncertain use of power, the mixed messages about her sexuality, and the

varying forms her body motion took, likewise expressed this ambivalence. Observations of her classes seemed to show that she was torn by her traditional socialization and her intellectual understanding of male/female equality and thus often acted in conflicting ways.

The analysis of power, kinesics and sexuality in Teacher A's class also served to illuminate the androgynous ideology. Teacher A's power was used in a flexible way; kinesics did not get in the way of cognition, and sexual responses were appropriate to the classroom situation. Because of these factors, the roles of the sexes in the androgynous teacher's class were communicated as undifferentiated.

Thus there was an interaction between a teacher's sex-role ideology in the context of the culture of the classroom, and the cultural learning which occurs in the classroom. The mechanisms of power, kinesics and sexuality stood out as teacher behaviour in each of these three classrooms was observed. Furthermore, it was found that teachers were indeed unaware of the informal, cultural models which their classrooms served as, and that sex-role learning opportunities of a very subtle kind were being presented as the three teachers acted out their perceptions of female roles. Finally, it was also found that the teacher's sex-role ideology affected the employment of the mechanisms analyzed in this study.

This study has shown that an ethnography can describe the processes of cultural learning in classrooms and at the same time shed light on the mechanisms through which cultural learning occurs. It has also shown the differences in classrooms of three teachers who subscribe to different sex-role ideologies. Thus the process of observation within the natural setting of the school culture can offer much to the researcher who wishes to describe how learning occurs.

There is much to be cautious about, however, in carrying out ethnographies in schools. Although this research tool has tremendous potential for the analysis of a culture, it also has its drawbacks. A dispassionate role on the part of the observer must always be maintained. To be sure, each observer carries with him or her a set of values and beliefs which provide a window through which the culture will be viewed. This can affect the observation to varying degrees, depending upon the subjectivity to which the observer opens him or herself. The problem can become magnified if the observer is a participant observer as in the case of teachers who wish to assess their own classrooms or even the classrooms of colleagues in the same school. There is a case to be made here for use of an outside observer, but, of course, outside observers can never be as aware of the subtleties of interactions in which

they take no part. This is the reason that ethnographers must be trained in objective assessment and accurate, detailed field notation. If a participant observer records all the significant events and the processes through which each action goes, there is a better chance that the observation will be a more objective and accurate one.

At the other extreme, attempts have been made to make field observations more objective by quantifying the activities and movements observed. Flanders through his interaction analysis scales, Birdwhistell through his counting of eye movement, and Mehrabian with his scoring criteria and categories for observing and measuring nonverbal behaviour have attempted to systematize and objectify anthropological observation. Often the result of such counting and charting, however, is quantitative data about insignificant events. Even more unfortunately, the observer who is busily counting the number of times a teacher acts in a discriminating way because of gender differences, may miss highly significant interactions which may be occurring at the same time. The trained observer must be able to sort out and judge, often without any advance warning, what is significant to make note of, and what interactions may be noted only mentally. Only a camera can record every interaction, and then someone must view the film to find meanings in the interactions.

Another problem with ethnography in schools is the almost insurmountable problem of gaining the trust of those involved so that permission for the observation will be granted. Since anyone would be leary of being "watched" over a period of time with no chance of seeing how he or she is "doing," it should be no surprise that teachers are not generally willing to participate in ethnographic studies. It is the rare teacher who will agree to an unknown person attending his or her classes daily over a period of time. An untenable situation would be the one in which the principal insists that any of the teachers in his or her school participate in an ethnography.

Once permission has been granted, timetabling and maintenance of any kind of control, e.g., same grade, subject or time of day and so on, become the next problems to be solved in an ethnography in schools. Especially at the secondary school level, there exists such a wide variety of curricular choice for students that to control even one of the variables, if one is trying to observe several classrooms, is very difficult. The more control one attempts to get, the more "tight" things become. Thus the observer will have to juggle many situational factors in trying to set up the observation.

Of what value, then, is an ethnography which analyzes cultural learning of sex roles in secondary schools? In the first place, the study can be a starting point in first-hand analysis of the conditions under which learning occurs. Few studies have analyzed what is presented in schools about sex roles; fewer still have analyzed how sex-role learning occurs in the classrooms of our secondary schools.

Recognition of sex-role stereotyping and differential treatment based on gender has recently been given token attention, but the changes have been largely in the area of curriculum and materials. If, as this study points out, the teacher is one of the most powerful influences on students' cultural learning, then no amount of non-sexist textbooks and co-ed physical education programs will have as much impact upon students' sex-role learning as will the teacher's attitudes in the context of the classroom. Males and females may be allowed to take the same courses or even encouraged equally to pursue further education, but if males and females receive different messages about "proper" attitudes, values and behaviours from their teachers, then the latter's influence will have much more effect upon sex-role learning.

Since it has become more acceptable, indeed, often "vogue" to be in agreement with the more palatable tenets

of feminism, many female teachers today would see themselves as more "liberated" than "traditional" females. For example, the "equal pay for equal work" principle is one that is difficult to be against, especially if one is already in the labour force. Therefore, probably few teachers would blatantly discriminate against female students who violate some of the norms of the female role (e.g., female students whose clothing appears to be unisex would not be chastised to dress in a more lady-like fashion). Most teachers seem, at least consciously, to be working toward equality for females, but few have reached the other pole--androgyny. Thus many teachers are probably similar to Teacher M in this study, and inconsistency of action as well as ambivalence would characterize their attitudes, values and behaviours. This ambivalence could be a source of conflict and concern for many students.

As well as rewriting textbooks and striving for curricular changes, perhaps those concerned with non-sexist education should be concentrating upon teachers at all school levels. If the maxim that "more is caught than taught" is in any small way true, then cultural learning about sex roles is highly influenced by the manner in which a teacher plays her many roles.

Enlarging upon this premise, one could say that the teacher should become the pivotal point in any

educational change. If the teacher can influence the culture in the classroom to the extent that has been shown in this ethnography, then any educational change must focus upon the teacher. Too often, changes are made in buildings, curriculum and textbooks in order to reach particular goals, but the classroom teacher is left out of the planning stages. Then the teacher is asked to implement the changes and something goes awry. Could it not be that through certain mechanisms--such as the ones identified in this study--the teacher's belief system is transmitted, and the changes either succeed or fail? Therefore, the teacher has so influenced the knowledge map of the classroom that the educational change or innovation must be seen in the light of this culture. If one were to consider the role the teacher plays in influencing the learning which occurs in the classroom, one could see how any educational change would need the support or acquiescence of the classroom teacher.

Although our schools have begun to see male and female students as students first and feminine/masculine second, they cannot fully plan for non-sexist education if they do not understand how the teacher's ideology affects the cultural learning of the classroom. This study isolated only three mechanisms through which this cultural learning takes place. Hopefully subsequent

studies may isolate different mechanisms of cultural learning and then begin to see what kinds of correlations there are between various variables. Important to research further would also be the cause and effect relationships, if any, between a teacher's attitude or behaviour in any given situation and a student's attitude or behaviour. This study is a beginning; hopefully it will give some new direction and focus to research into sex-role learning in secondary schools.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Part I - WHAT ARE FEMALES LIKE?

Indicate on a scale from 1 ("never or almost never characteristic") to 5 ("always or almost always characteristic") how well you think each word(s) characterizes or describes women, in general.

introverted	<u>Never or almost never</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Always or almost always</u>
passive	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
leader	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
emotional	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
independent	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
virtuous	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
individualist	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
assertive	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
irrational	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
familial	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
ambitious	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

APPENDIX B

Part II - Below are three stories. Read each one carefully and then answer the questions asked. Please elaborate as fully as possible on the reasons for your answer.

Case A

Nora Chambers is a happily-married 25-year-old woman. Married to a department store sales manager and the mother of a healthy two-year-old son, she seems to her neighbours to be the model Canadian woman. And yet, Nora often feels anxious or depressed lately. More and more she has been thinking that she needs to get out of the house to do different things. Before the birth of her son, Nora worked as a receptionist in a medical office, and she has been thinking seriously about going back to work. The time away from home, Nora feels, might give her a whole new outlook on her marriage and family, and she thinks her son would benefit from the experiences he would get at the local daycare centre.

Nora knows, however, that raising the issue with her husband will mean another fight. Bill, her husband, feels his wife's place is at home raising their son, and he also believes that, with the cost of day care, transportation, clothing and lunch money, the added income wouldn't amount to very much at all. And yet Nora feels she is missing something by staying home all the time. What should Nora do? Why?

Case B

Marianne is a rather plain-looking but very bright 4th year student at the local university. Studies come easy to Marianne, but dates do not. Over the past year, most of her friends have become engaged or married, and this bothers Marianne. She has had a few dates over the past six months, but most of these men seemed intimidated by Marianne's intelligence.

A few weeks ago Marianne met a new man, Paul, to whom she has become very attracted. Paul seems very interested in the things Marianne is doing, and he is one of the first men to ask her out more than twice.

Marianne and Paul seemed to be getting along very well until Marianne realized that Paul occasionally showed evidence of being threatened by her. Because of this insecurity, Paul tries to outwit Marianne in small matters--games, puzzles, trivia contests. Although on some occasions Marianne finds she could have won, she finds herself allowing him to win more and more.

What should Marianne do? Why?

Case C

John and Sylvia Casey are two teachers, both in their early 30s, who have been married for five years. John is getting increasingly impatient to father children, but Sylvia enjoys her teaching job and doesn't want to give it up. Pressure from friends and relatives has added to the tension between them over the issue of raising a family. Sylvia loves John, but she is not sure she is suited to motherhood.

John and Sylvia have had many serious arguments over this issue. After one particularly lengthy argument, John told Sylvia that he wants a child or a divorce.

What should Sylvia do? Why?

APPENDIX C

Part III - OCCUPATIONS

This questionnaire asks for your views on the occupations you feel women should hold. Please place an "x" on one of the five spaces for each item. Then, for items 2-4, list the occupations and your reasons for each.

1. All occupations should be open to women.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

2. Certain occupations should only be filled by women.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

IF YOU AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE, NAME SOME OF THESE OCCUPATIONS:

Occupations	Reasons
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.

3. Certain occupations suit women better than men.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

IF YOU AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE, NAME SOME OF THESE OCCUPATIONS:

Occupations	Reasons
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.

4. There are certain occupations women should not hold.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

IF YOU AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE, NAME SOME OF THESE OCCUPATIONS:

Occupations	Reasons
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.

APPENDIX DWHAT DO YOU THINK?

The following are a series of statements we would like your opinion on. There are no "right" answers. Please check the space under each statement which best reflects your opinion on the statement. If you are not sure, check undecided.

1. It is more important for a wife to help her husband's career than to have a career herself.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

2. The idea of young girls participating in minor hockey competition is ridiculous.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

3. The relative amounts of time and energy devoted to a career on the one hand, and to home and family on the other hand, should be determined by one's personal desires and interests rather than by one's sex.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

4. It is more important for a woman to keep her figure and dress becomingly than it is for a man.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

5. The old saying that "a woman's place is in the home" is still basically true and should remain true.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

6. A woman should refrain from being too competitive with men and keep her peace rather than show a man he is wrong.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

7. A woman whose job involves contact with the public, e.g., salesperson or teacher, should not continue to work when she is noticeably pregnant.

<u>Strongly</u> Agree	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> Disagree
--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

8. The husband should take primary responsibility for major family decisions, such as the purchase of a home or car.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

9. In groups that have both male and female members, it is appropriate that top leadership positions be held by males.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

10. Unless it is economically necessary, married women who have school-aged children should not work outside the home.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

11. If there are two candidates for a job, one a man and the other a woman, and the woman is slightly better qualified, the job should nevertheless go to the man because he is likely to have a family to support.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

12. Marriage is a partnership in which the wife and husband should share the economic responsibility of supporting the family.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

13. A woman should not accept a career promotion if it would require her family to move and her husband to find another job.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

14. A married woman who chooses not to have children because she prefers to pursue her career should not feel guilty.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

15. Unless it is economically necessary, married women who have preschool-age children should not work outside the home.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

16. It is generally better to have a man at the head of a department composed of both men and women employees.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

17. A husband should not feel uncomfortable if his wife earns a larger salary than he does.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

18. It is all right for women to hold local political offices.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

19. A male student and a female student are equally qualified for a certain scholarship; it should be awarded to the male student on the grounds that he has greater "career potential."

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

20. The use of profane or obscene language by a woman is no more objectionable than the same usage by a man.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

21. It is certainly acceptable for boys, as well as girls, to play with dolls.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

22. Girls should primarily be counseled to enter "feminine" vocations such as nursing, public school teaching, library science, etc.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	-----------	----------	-------------------

23. Women should not feel inhibited about competing in any form of athletics.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

24. Parents should encourage just as much independence in their daughters as in their sons.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

25. Women should be able to compete with men for jobs that have traditionally belonged to men, such as telephone lineman.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

26. It is o.k. for a wife to retain her maiden name if she wants to.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

27. There is no reason why a woman should not be Prime Minister of Canada.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

28. Career education for boys should have higher priority with parents and teachers than career education for girls.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

29. Even though a wife works outside the home, the husband should be the main breadwinner and the wife should have the responsibility for running the household.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

30. In elementary school, girls should wear dresses rather than slacks or jeans to school.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

31. It is acceptable for a woman to become a member of the church clergy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

32. It is acceptable for women to hold important elected political offices in provincial and federal government.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

33. It is not a good idea for a husband to stay home and care for the children while his wife is employed full-time outside the home.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

34. The only reason girls need career education is that they may not marry or remain married.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

35. There is no particular reason why a man should always offer his seat to a woman who is standing on a crowded bus.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

36. Men should be able to compete with women for jobs that have traditionally belonged to women, such as telephone operator.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

APPENDIX E

May, 1977

Please place a check mark along each line which best represents your own feelings about each statement:

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>No Strong</u> <u>Feeling</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
1. Children are innately curious and will explore their environment without adult intervention.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Exploratory behaviour is self-perpetuating.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. The child will display natural exploratory behaviour if he is not threatened.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Students have both the competence and the right to make significant decisions concerning their own learning.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Students will be likely to learn if they are given considerable choice in the selection of the materials they wish to work with and in the choice of questions they wish to pursue with respect to those materials.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Given the opportunity, students will choose to engage in activities which will be of high interest to them.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Strong Feeling	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. If a student is fully involved in and is having fun with an activity, learning is taking place.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. When two or more students are interested in exploring the same problem or the same materials, they will often choose to collaborate in some way.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. When a student learns something which is important to him or her, he/she will wish to share it with others.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Students learn and develop intellectually not only at their own rate but in their own style.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Students pass through similar stages of intellectual development, each in his/her own way and at his/her own rate and in his/her own time.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. Intellectual growth and development take place through a sequence of concrete experiences followed by abstractions.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. Verbal abstractions should follow direct experience with objects and ideas, not precede them or substitute for them.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Strong Feeling	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
14. Errors are necessarily a part of the learning process; they are to be expected and even desired, for they contain information essential for further learning.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. Those qualities of a person's learning which can be carefully measured are not necessarily the most important.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. Objective measures of performance may have a negative effect upon learning.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. Learning is best assessed intuitively, by direct observation.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. The best way of evaluating the effect of the school experience on the child is to observe him or her over a long period of time.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
19. The quality of being is more important than the quality of knowing; knowledge is a means of education not its end. The final test of an education is what a person is, not what he or she knows.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. Knowledge is a function of one's personal integration of experience and therefore does not fall into neatly separate categories or "disciplines."	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Strong Feeling	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
--	-------------------	-------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

21. Little or no knowledge exists which it is essential for everyone to acquire.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

22. It is possible, even likely, that an individual may learn and possess knowledge of a phenomenon and yet be unable to display it publicly. Knowledge resides with the knower, not in its public expression.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Norman and Harrington, Charles. The Learning of Political Behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1970.
- Bardwick, J. and Douvan, E. "Ambivalence: The Socialization of Women," in Gornick, V. and Moran, B. (eds.) Woman in Sexist Society. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Bem, Sandra L. "Probing the Promise of Androgyny," in Kaplan, Alexandra G. and Bean, Joan (eds.) Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes--Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976.
- Bem, Sandra L. "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 42 (1974): 155-162.
- Bennett, E. and Cohen, L. "Men and Women: Personality Patterns and Contrasts." Genetic Psychology Monographs 59 (1959): 101-155.
- Birdwhistell, Ray L. Kinesics and Context, Essays on Body Motion Communication. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.
- Birenbaum, Arnold and Sagarin, Edward (eds.) People in Places - The Sociology of the Familiar. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1973.
- Bond, J. R. and Vinacke, W. E. "Coalitions in Mixed-Sex Triads." Sociometry 24 (1961): 61-75.
- Boocock, Sarane S. An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972.
- Brogan, Donna and Kutner, Nancy. "Measuring Sex-Role Orientation: A Normative Approach." Journal of Marriage and the Family (February, 1976): 31-39.
- Brophy, J. E. and Good, T. L. "Teacher's Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioural Data." Journal of Educational Psychology. 61 (1970):365-74.
- Broverman, I. K. "Sex-Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal." Journal of Social Issues 28(2) (1972): 59-78.

- Broverman, I. K. et al. "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Clinical Judgements of Mental Health." Journal of Consulting Psychology. 34 (1970): 1-7.
- Burgess, Ernest W.; Locke, Harvey J.; Thomes, Mary Margaret. The Family: From Traditional to Companionship. (4th ed.). Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold, Co., 1971.
- Collins, K. T.; Downes, L. W.; Griffiths, S. R.; Shaw, K. E. Key Words in Education. London: Longman, 1973.
- Crandall, Virginia C. "Achievement Behavior in Young Children." Young Children 20 (1964): 77-90.
- Davies, L. and Meighan, R. "A Review of Schooling and Sex Roles, With Particular Reference to the Experience of Girls in Secondary Schools." Educational Review. 27(3) (1975): 165-78.
- English, Horace B. and English, Ava C. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1958.
- Erikson, Erik. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton, 1963.
- Fennema, Elizabeth. "Women and Girls in the Public Schools: Defeat or Liberation?" in Roberts, Joan I. Beyond Intellectual Sexism: A New Woman, A New Reality. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1976.
- Flanders, Ned A. "Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievements." U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Monograph No. 12, 1960.
- Frazier, Nancy and Sadker, Myra. Sexism in School and Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Garai, J. E. and Scheinfeld, A. "Sex Differences in Mental and Behavioral Traits." Genetic Psychology Monographs. 77 (1968): 169-299.
- Garner, J. and Bing, M. "The Elusiveness of Pygmalion and Differences in Teacher-Pupil Contact." Interchange 4(1) (1973): 34-42.
- Garskof, M. H. Roles Women Play. California: Brooks-Cole, 1971.
- Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Anchor, 1959.

- Good, T. L.; Sikes, J. J.; Brophy, J. E. "Effects of Teacher Sex and Pupil Sex on Classroom Interaction." Journal of Educational Psychology 65(1) (1973): 74-87.
- Gouran, D. "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy." Speech Monographs 36 (1968): 387-91.
- Grannis, Joseph C. "The School As a Model of Society." in Adler, Norman and Harrington, Charles. The Learning of Political Behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1970.
- Guttentag, Marcia and Bray, Helen. Undoing Sex Stereotypes. New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.
- Hall, Edward T. Silent Language. New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Delta, 1964.
- Horner, M. S. "Femininity and Successful Achievement: A Basic Inconsistency." in Bardwick, J. M.; Douvan, E.; and Gutman, D. (eds.) Feminine Personality and Conflict. Belmont, California: Brooks Cole, 1970.
- Howe, Florence. "The Teacher and the Women's Movement." in Frazier, Nancy and Sadker, Myra. Sexism in School and Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Illich, Ivan. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Jackson, Philip W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Joffe, Carole. "Sex Role Socialization and the Nursery School: As the Twig is Bent." Journal of Marriage and the Family. 33(3) (1971): 467-75.
- Kaplan, Alexandra G. "Androgyny as a Model of Mental Health for Women: From Theory to Therapy." in Kaplan, Alexandra G. and Bean, Joan P. (eds.) Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes--Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976.
- Kaplan, Alexandra G. and Bean, Joan P. (eds.) Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes--Readings Toward a Psychology of Androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976.

- Kimball, Solon T. Culture and the Educative Process: An Anthropological Perspective. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press, 1974.
- Kirschner, B. F. "Introducing Students to Women's Place in Society." American Journal of Sociology 78(4) (1973): 1051-54.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. Mirror for Man. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, Inc., (McGraw-Hill), 1944.
- Krech, David; Crutchfield, Richard S.; and Ballachey, Egerton L. Individual in Society; a Textbook of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.
- Leacock, Eleanor. Teaching and Learning in City Schools. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Lightfoot, Sarah Lawrence. "Politics and Reasoning: Through the Eyes of Teachers and Children." Harvard Educational Review 43 (May, 1973): 197-244.
- Lofland, John. Analyzing Social Settings - A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.
- Maccoby, E. E. (ed.) The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Mannheim, K. Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Martin, R. "Student Sex Behaviour as Determinants of the Type and Frequency of Teacher-Student Contacts." School Psychologist 10(4) (1972): 339-47.
- Martin, Wilfred B. W. The Negotiated Order of the School. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada., 1976.
- Mason, Karen O. and Bumpass, Larry L. "U.S. Women's Sex-Role Ideology 1970." American Journal of Sociology 80 (March, 1975): 1212-19.
- Minuchin, Patricia et. al., The Psychological Impact of School Experience. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969.

- Mischel, W. "A Social Learning View of Sex Differences in Behavior." in Maccoby, E. E. (ed.) The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Money, J. and Ehrhardt, A. A. Man and Woman, Boy and Girl. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972.
- Nisbet, Robert A. "The Social Bond." in King, A. J. and Coulthard, W. W. A Social View of Man--Canadian Perspectives. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Oakley, Ann. Sex, Gender and Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- O'Faolin, Julia and Martines, Laura (eds.) Not in God's Image: Women in History from the Greeks to the Victorians. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. London: Tavistock Publications, 1952.
- Ricks, F. A. and Pyke, S. W. "Teacher Perceptions and Attitudes that Foster or Maintain Sex-Role Differences." Interchange 4 (1973): 26-33.
- Roberts, Joan I. Beyond Intellectual Sexism: A New Woman, A New Reality. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1976.
- Robinson, Philip E. D. "An Ethnography of Classrooms." in Eggleston, John (ed.) Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1974.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Rossi, Alice. "Sex Equality: The Beginning of Ideology." The Humanist 29 (1969): 3-16.
- Ruitenbeek, Hendrik M. (ed.) Sexuality and Identity. New York: Delta Book, Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1970.
- Satir, Virginia. Peoplemaking. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1972.

- Sears, P. and Feldman, D. H. "Teacher Interactions With Boys and Girls." in Stacey, J.; Beneaud, J.; and Daniels, J. (eds.) And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell, 1966.
- Shaw, Marvin E. Group Dynamics--The Psychology of Small Group Behavior (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.
- Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom--The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Silberman, Melvin L. The Experience of Schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.
- Smith, Louis M. and Geoffrey, William. The Complexities of An Urban Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Sommer, R. Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Spindler, George D. "The Transmission of American Culture." in Spindler, George D. Education and Culture--Anthropological Approaches. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Stacey, J.; Beneaud, S.; and Daniels, J. And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell, 1966.
- Stenhouse, Lawrence. Culture and Education. New York: Weybright and Talley, 1967.
- Strodtbeck, F.; James, R.; and Hawkins, C. "Social Status in Jury Deliberations." American Sociology Review 22 (1957): 713-19.
- Strodtbeck, F. and Mann, R. "Sex Role Differentiation in Jury Deliberations." Sociometry 19 (1956): 3-11.
- Taba, Hilda. School Culture (Studies of Participation and Leadership). Washington: American Council on Education, 1955.

- Tikunoff, William J; Berliner, David C.; and Rist, Ray C. Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study-- An Ethnographic Study of the Forty Classrooms of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study Known Sample. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975.
- Tindall, Allan E. "Ethnography and the Hidden Curriculum in Sport." Behavioral and Social Science Teacher. 2 (1975): 5-27.
- Tylor, Edward B. Primitive Culture (1st ed.) Boston: Estes and Lauriat, 1874.
- Uesugi, T. T. and Vinacke, W. E. "Strategy in a Feminine Game." Sociometry 26 (1963): 75-88.
- Wylie, R. C. "Children's Estimates of Their School-Work Ability As a Function of Sex, Race and Socioeconomic Level." Journal of Personality. 31 (1963): 203-24.