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Sexism and heterosexism, or homophobia, are two potentially sensitive and controversial issues that affect the field of art education. Since they are current issues, sexism and heterosexism manifest in students’ every day lived experiences. The study aimed to reveal Ohio secondary art teachers’ attitudes about sexism and heterosexism.

Through a literature review, the study explored the link between sexism and heterosexism, sexism’s role in the written and hidden curriculums, as well as heterosexism’s role in the written and hidden curriculums. The quantitative method of survey was used to gauge Ohio secondary art teachers’ attitudes about how sexism and heterosexism affect their curriculums. The qualitative method of interviewing was also utilized in order to understand how these two issues relate to the art classroom in a more holistic way. It was concluded that teacher education programs must address these two issues in order to prepare pre-service teachers to facilitate dialogues, as well as sensitively handle sexist and heterosexist incidents in the school community.

Furthermore, it was found that additional resources are needed, as well as in-depth ethnographic studies to better understand how sexism and heterosexism affects education.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Overview

Desai (2003) states that art educators need to “question what, how, and to whom we teach art in schools because it can no longer claim to be neutral” (p. 152). It is in this spirit that this study aimed to reveal Ohio secondary art teachers’ attitudes on sexism and heterosexism, or homophobia. Educators need to reconstruct the written curriculum and expose inequalities within the hidden curriculum in order to battle sexism and heterosexism. This paper will investigate how to battle said inequalities within the context of art education. The overall research question used to guide this study is: *What are secondary art teachers’ attitudes about the issues of sexism and heterosexism within their written and hidden curriculums?*

Purpose

Through the presentation of a literature review I will frame these issues as timely, relevant to the field of art education, and claim that heterosexism and sexism hinders all students’ learning and development. Furthermore, based on data collected through the research methods of survey and interview, I will synthesize a sample of practicing art teachers’ understandings of how sexism and heterosexism affect their teaching. Through these methods of data collection I hope to shed light on the current climate as felt by art teachers, and to also provide suggestions to eradicate said forces within their written curriculums, teaching practices, and within the larger school community. It is assumed that by methods of self-reflection, most art teachers can improve their teaching practices
in order to embrace a style that is fairer to their learners regardless of sexual orientation or gender. It is my conviction that religious and personal beliefs aside, educators owe it to every one of their students to provide a safe environment conducive to learning.

Justification

Two groups that have historically suffered due to mainstream society’s inflexible gender categories are women; and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) individuals. According to Murphy (2006), homophobia and sexism are linked for two reasons: sexism and homophobia uphold inequality in society by valuing traditional gender roles as the norm, and both understand masculinity and femininity to be unequal and polar opposite notions. Sadker and Sadker (1994) explain that different expectations based on gender impacts a young girl’s self-esteem, can foster an attitude of learned helplessness, and perpetuates the internalization of sexist beliefs as normative. Murphy (2006) notes that homophobia’s goal is to punish those outside of their societal-deemed “appropriate” gender category through discrimination, stereotyping, and sometimes even through psychological or physical abuse. Due to these factors, Stanley (2007) states LGBTQ youth are at greater risk for depression, substance abuse, sexual promiscuity and disease, and even self-inflicted harm or suicide. It is for these reasons that we must not ignore the oppression of women and LGBTQ individuals.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions will be used:

- Rosenberg and Thurber (2007) define sexism as stereotyping that leads to a negative evaluation or bias based on someone’s sex. These stereotypes can affect
teacher expectations based on if their student is male or female, and limits the educational possibilities for both boy and girl students.

- There is a distinction between sex and gender. Rosenberg and Thurber (2007) explain that **sex** is a biological concept determined by the sex chromosomes of the individual. In contrast, **gender** is a social construct, and refers to the traits that are associated with being male or female. For the purpose of this study, I have decided to use the term gender over the term sex. Gender is a more fluid idea, and it is my wish to embrace the nuisances that accompany the term.

- Lampela (2001) explains that **homophobia**, an unreasoned fear or apathy directed at homosexuals, creates a hostile school environment. Check (2000) notes that due to internalized and projected homophobia in art education, secrecy and hiding often become a part of a homosexual teacher’s individual and group identity. Due to this built-in secrecy clause, it is convenient for society to not address these teachers’ identities, histories, or bring up issues in art education that affect them (Check, 2000). Heteronormativity results in **heterosexism**, which is an attitude and bias towards heterosexuality.

- Stanley (2007) defines **heteronormativity** as the pervasive presumption that all individuals share a heterosexual culture and lifestyle. This attitude informs the written curriculum and succeeds in further marginalizing and alienating LGBTQ teachers and students.

- Desai (2003) explains that **queer theory** is “committed to challenging the dominant institution of heterosexuality, thereby opening a discursive space that
primarily focuses on sexuality and desire” (p. 149). As a researcher, I recognize that I possess a lens that is heavily influenced by Queer Theory, and therefore my study, the conclusions I draw, and the way I construct my thesis will be influenced by this theory.

- Addison (2007) discusses the method of queering the curriculum as a means to battle homophobia. Queering the curriculum would call attention to how relationships of sexuality, power, gender, and concepts of normal versus deviant interplay to create a school-wide heteronormative attitude.

- **Written Curriculum** is defined as knowledge that is explicitly communicated as observed from teaching materials. Manifestations within the art classroom include lesson plans, art history visuals, classroom aesthetic and decoration, and studio projects and models (Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007).

- **Hidden Curriculum** is defined as knowledge that is implicitly communicated as observed from teachers’ attitudes or behaviors (Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007). Attitudes are a state of mind or a feeling, or a disposition, expressed when the individual communicates his or her ideas.

Assumptions and Limitations

Based on my own experiences I have found that these two issues, particularly heterosexism, are potentially controversial to discuss in the classroom. Several studies have concluded that homosexuality is a difficult subject for teachers, administrators, students, and the community to address because it is rooted in dominant religious values (Addison, 2007; Chung, 2007; Kaufmann, 2006). In her National Art Education
Association survey, which sampled practicing educators about their inclusion of lesbian and gay artists in their art history curriculum, Lampela (2001) concludes that many art teachers are aware of homosexual artists. However, many do not communicate this aspect of the artist’s identity to students due to internalized issues of homophobia even if this information would help to inform fully the context, and often the meaning, of the artwork. It was her conclusion that additional research towards more equitable teaching materials and practices is needed (Lampela, 2001). Hence, a key assumption is that homophobia and sexism are controversial issues causing teachers various levels of discomfort in the classroom. It can be assumed that these feelings are limiting teacher ability and/or willingness to discuss said issues.

This chapter has introduced the research topic, the research question, the methods of survey and interview, and the idea that sexism and heterosexism are linked. A justification for the importance of this study was provided, explaining that societal, inflexible gender categories leads to the oppression of women and LGBTQ individuals. Definitions of key terms were provided, as well as basic assumptions and limitations. Chapter two will explore related literature with a focus on art education. This chapter will include an in-depth discussion of the link between sexism and heterosexism, sexism and the written and hidden curriculums, and heterosexism and the written and hidden curriculums.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Overview

This chapter will present literature and research on how to battle said inequalities within the context of schooling. Particular attention will be paid to the possibilities art education could play in this revision and reconsideration process. Personal commentary and narratives will preamble each of the sections in an attempt to provide a deeper understanding of the relationships that link sexism, homophobia, and education. By interweaving my personal narratives with research regarding the politicized sphere that is the educational institution, I hope to further emphasize the connection between homophobia and sexism by utilizing this critical method sometimes practiced by both Feminists and Queer Theorists.

Sexism and Heterosexism as Linked

Individuals concerned with equality need to examine marginalized groups and their relations to each other in order to have any chance at understanding the complexity of their perspectives. Women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) individuals are two groups that have been negatively affected by mainstream society’s rigid gender rules. Based on my own experiences as an art educator and student, I have come to believe that occurrences of both sexism and homophobia in the classroom, when allowed to proceed unchecked, contribute to maintaining traditional gender stereotypes as being natural.
Murphy (2006) explains that sexism and homophobia are linked because both value traditional gender roles as the norm and both understand masculinity and femininity to be unequal and opposite notions. According to mainstream society, an individual’s biological sex predetermines the gender roles he or she should embrace, including his or her choice of sexual partner (Murphy, 2006). Rosenberg and Thurber (2007) explain that these strictly defined societal categories are limiting, which makes participation and belonging difficult for those who do not embody traditional gender roles. This deviation from ideological gender norms results in a homophobic attitude towards the one deemed abnormal by societal standards. The goal of homophobia is to punish those outside of their societal-deemed “appropriate” gender category through discrimination, stereotyping, and sometimes even through psychological or physical abuse (Murphy, 2006). Bullying, while present to some degree in almost every student’s life, is particularly worse and more frequent for LGBTQ youth (Kaufmann, 2006; Rutter & Leech, 2006; Stanley, 2007). Impose all of the above factors onto a confused and alienated LGBTQ youth, it is no surprise that they are at greater risk for depression, substance abuse, sexual promiscuity and disease, and even self-inflicted harm or suicide (Stanley, 2007).

Homophobia can be thought of as a form of sexism. The pervasive stereotype of gay men is that they abandon their masculinity to embrace a feminine role, which is viewed by society as the role with lesser status. Discriminatory members of society find it hard to understand why a male with a higher societal status provided to him by biology would willingly align himself with the “weaker sex.” Lesbians are doubly persecuted by
facing prejudice not only for being homosexual, but also for being women (Murphy, 2006). Dempsey and Fawley (1988) explain the connection of lesbians and sexism throughout the past: “Throughout a history of the women’s movement that has been traced back to Elizabethan times, a rise in the demand for women’s rights has always been accompanied by an increase of virulent and violent attacks on lesbians” (as cited in Murphy, 2006, p. 218). Lesbians are particularly threatening to heterosexual values because they have rejected the notion of the need to align themselves with a man in order to gain economic and sexual freedom, a luxury traditionally only reserved for men (Murphy, 2006).

In developing an inclusive teaching pedagogy it is critical to achieve an understanding of how sexist and homophobic attitudes perpetuate discrimination and stereotyping. If this link is not consciously acknowledged and reflected upon by both teacher and the larger school community, then it will be harder to change sexist and homophobic attitudes. Murphy (2006) argues that if the two are not acknowledged as being interrelated, traditional gender norms will continue to stay rigid, creating the conditions that foster homophobia.

In order to consider each in depth, the following two sections will separately explore sexism and homophobia’s role in the classroom’s written and hidden curriculums. Each section will include suggestions art education can implement in order to eradicate these two detrimental forces.

Sexism in Schools

_During student teaching experiences, I started to uncover my biases as a teacher. I attribute this self-awareness to what I believe to be a vital component of any successful_
teacher - the act of self-reflection. My self-reflection took the form of journaling at the end of the school day. As a self-proclaimed Feminist, I have always tried to treat my students equally. However, by rereading my journal entries I noticed that I treated my male students differently. Much to my horror I started to see patterns in how my biases were communicated via my own internalized, hidden curriculum. In regards to the middle school level I realized that I actually preferred teaching the girls rather than the boys. I found the girls more receptive to the knowledge I was trying to convey, and preferred their non-confrontational and pleasant classroom attitudes to my sometimes disruptive boys. Having to write this was even difficult for me, for I realize that I was not fully practicing the equitable teaching practices that I so believe in.

By recognizing this flaw within my teaching past I can understand more completely the importance of gender issues and sexism in schools as a complex issue encompassing teacher, students, school community, and society. Without conscious attempts made on the teacher’s part it is easy to live out one’s internalized biases learnt through a lifetime of experiences. Gender equity must not only be taught by balancing the artists that we showcase or the history that we analyze, but also how we treat our students on a daily basis (Personal reflection, February, 2009).

Rosenberg and Thurber (2007) define gender as a social construct incorporating the characteristics associated with being male or female, whereas sex is biological and refers to an individual’s sex chromosomes. Within both society and classroom boys and girls are treated differently, which limits the possibilities for both and prohibits each from fully embracing masculine and feminine traits, affecting their individual identity formation (Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Sexism and the Written Curriculum

Sadker and Sadker (1994) note that the curriculum often does not include equal representation of female and male figures, leaving students to fill in the gaps of their history and internalize a distorted and stereotyped view. Traditionally, the curriculum has echoed society’s skewed notion that feminine traits and women deserve less status and recognition than masculine traits and men (Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).
Congdon (1996) notes that Feminist historians have identified many considered art masterpieces as being sexist. The making, learning about, and experiencing of art teaches both the individual and the culture about who they are, thus examples of sexism shape how gender is perceived and constructed (Congdon, 1996). Historically, women’s art has differed from men’s because of the different expectations and experiences that are unique to each gender (Congdon, 1996; Nochlin, 1988). Nochlin (1988) further explains that there have been no great women artists in Western art history because the social climate did not permit women to be deemed as artistic geniuses. Women have historically been shoehorned into the category of either craft or a bottom tier in the hierarchy of Fine Art (Congdon, 1996; Nochlin, 1988).

It is human nature to accept how things are as being natural, so romanticized stories of white, male geniuses perpetuate the artist stereotype and the societal belief that artists are born, not made. This view does not take into consideration social or institutional factors, such as women historically not having access to a nude model until the end of the 19th century (Nochlin, 1988). By reinterpreting history from a Feminist perspective, complex relationships of power begin to become evident.

By refiguring the curriculum from a Feminist perspective students can become more aware of how complex relationships of power, gender, and institutions factor into how sexism has been internalized by society (Nochlin, 1988). Rosenberg and Thurber (2007) state that by providing histories and visiting women artist in the classroom, students learn about obstacles, constructs, and biases associated with gender identity. In a society whose visual culture is saturated with images of women, it is important to give
equal voice to both genders so that students are not persuaded to believe that women serve only as objects, instead of producers, of art and culture. By exploring sexist artworks and issues of gender in the classroom, students will also see how stereotypes can be constructed and perpetuated (Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007). This awareness is a critical step in achieving gender equity.

Keifer-Boyd (2003) sets forth a feminist pedagogical model that seeks to help students recognize gendered stereotypes within their own interpretations of artworks. A ranking activity where students are shown artworks is proposed so that students can see how they assign gender to visual images, and then also how they place value on these then gendered images. It is thought that by explicitly analyzing ways of seeing, students will be able to break apart and conceptualize the complex processes involved when cultures assign values, rooted in gender, to visuals (Keifer-Boyd, 2003).

*Sexism and the Hidden Curriculum*

Sadker and Sadker (1994) explain that through the hidden curriculum different personality traits are taught and reinforced for each sex. For example, through subtleties in teacher’s and societal attitudes, girls are taught to withhold opinions and defer to boys (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). This can have a very real impact on a young girl’s self-esteem and foster an attitude of learned helplessness. These personality traits being taught are a reflection of society-learned and reinforced gender norms, and will continue to be taught until this inequality is consciously noted and attempts towards change are made (Garber, 2003; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).
Rosenberg and Thurber (2007) provide numerous ways for art teachers to examine the hidden curriculum and exorcise sexism. Teachers must first challenge their own biases and knowledge about gender through a process of self-reflection and research. After personal biases are confronted, teachers can research strategies to implement that will compliment their teaching style. Also, teachers need to develop and enforce with their students a language that is more considered and less sexist, including expelling sweeping phrases like “you guys” from one’s vocabulary, which serves to reinforce the masculine as the norm. Furthermore, modeling sensitivity and having the courage to confront controversial subjects and stereotypes inherent in visual examples of sexism furthers not only a sense of gender equality within the classroom, but also a rapport that exudes respect for one’s students (Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007).

Within a feminist lens, Garber (2003) proposes incorporating into art education the four themes of mastery, authority, voice, and positionality from feminist pedagogy. Whereas mastery has traditionally meant a canonical or expert grasp of teacher championed knowledge, in a feminist pedagogy mastery is gained from students seeking information either on their own or through a more collaborative learning process. Authority has been gained in the past from the institution so it is inherently hierarchal and has traditionally been recognized more in male than female teachers. Authority from a feminist pedagogical stance seeks to delegate an appropriate amount of authority from teacher to pupil so that students become more empowered in his or her own learning. Voice is the connection and valuing of student experiences within curriculum, and positionality is the acknowledgement that one’s personal experiences colors how he or
she understands and views the world (Garber, 2003). Garber’s work serves as a role model for rethinking the art curriculum and considering diversity issues.

Heterosexism in Schools

As a young child I recall first being attracted to women. In fourth grade I remember playing with Barbies, abandoning Ken dolls sometimes in order to pair two female figures, with their long hair and fashionable clothes, together. They would go on elaborate dates that would often times include a weekend getaway to an exotic destination. There they would stretch out next to a pretend ocean in their tiny bathing suits, toasting each other with miniscule cups. I limited this exploration of gender and romantic relationships to solitary play, never bringing it up around my peers. Since I had no role models or examples at the time to refer to, I internalized the heteronormative ideology that this was abnormal.

During high school I had a couple of honest, long-term relationships with boys. Even though I felt accepted by my peers, family, and elders because I aligned myself with heterosexuality, there was still a part of me that felt confused and depressed. I knew that I was bisexual, yet felt that it was simply a part of myself that I would have to hide and deny to those publicly. Having romantic relationships with boys made hiding easy, because everyone assumed I was straight.

The notion of heteronormativity has since become intriguing to myself in terms of both my own identity and the role I believe education should serve in an equitable democracy. Since I have personally felt in my own past an internalized sense of shame and the detrimental effects of a pervasive heteronormative attitude, it is my most sincere belief that this battle needs to be fought in the realm of education in hopes to achieve any sense of acceptance for those who do not quite “fit” by society’s standards (Personal reflection, February, 2009).

Rutter and Leech (2006) note that homosexuality may not be as uncommon as heteronormativity leads one to believe, estimating that up to 15 percent of high school students have questioned their sexual orientation. Furthermore, it is noted that gay and lesbian youth are starting to come out at an earlier age than ever before.

Several studies have concluded that homosexuality is a difficult subject for teachers, administrators, students, and the community to address because it is rooted in dominant religious values (Addison, 2007; Chung, 2007; Kaufmann, 2006). However, just because homosexual issues are controversial and sometimes difficult to discuss does
not mean they should be ignored. Stanley (2007) proposes an adoption of an Equal Rights Agenda within schools that addresses LGBTQ issues as a way to increase understanding and foster compassion in regards to these marginalized groups. Addison (2007) calls for art educators to band together and counter homophobia by queering the curriculum by analyzing both the written and hidden curriculums through a queer lens. Queering the curriculum would call attention to how the relationships of sexuality, power, gender, and conceptions of normal versus deviant interplay to create a school-wide heteronormative attitude (Addison, 2007). Stanley defines heteronormative as the pervasive presumption that all individuals share a heterosexual culture and lifestyle (2007). This attitude succeeds in further marginalizing LGBTQ individuals, which can have dire effects on students. Personal biases and religious beliefs aside, teachers have both a moral and professional responsibility to challenge environments that are harmful to their students.

*Heterosexism and the Written Curriculum*

Desai (2003) explains that art is socially constructed, thus art can only be understood and fully appreciated by considering such constructs. Lampela (2005) states that lesson plans that consider contemporary social and cultural issues make learning more relevant to both teacher and student. Addressing homophobia and LGBTQ artists and artworks is a good way to understand how marginalized people relate to society and explore themes of identity (Desai, 2003; Lampela, 2005). Stanley (2007) further explains that utilizing examples of LGBTQ artists and culture offers several benefits to students. LGBTQ artists often offer an outsider, or marginalized, perspective that can broaden the ways students view their world and the people that inhabit it. Furthermore, LGBTQ
artists may offer an irony that critiques the norm, and an alternative way of interpreting art history that is proximal to a Feminist reading (Stanley, 2007). The inclusion of LGBTQ artists within the curriculum is beneficial because it embraces diversity and offers additional opportunities to reach a greater variety of students through personal connections to art (Addison, 2007; Chung, 2007; Desai, 2003; Kaufmann, 2006; Lampela, 2005; Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007; Stanley, 2007).

Several authors advocate using contemporary media as a teaching tool within the art education classroom to aid in deconstructing LGBTQ identity within society (Addison, 2007; Chung, 2007; Desai, 2003; and Stanley, 2007). Stanley notes that analyzing media can be an opportunity to deconstruct pervasive mores and stereotypes (2007). Chung elaborates on this notion, stating that since it is so pervasive media serves as the dominant source through which children learn about social issues, including homosexuality (2007). Personally as an educator concerned with implementing an Equal Rights Agenda in the classroom, this idea presents real problems. Since media is out to turn a profit, gay stereotypes are often perpetuated because that is what sells. These stereotypes are referred to as mediatypes, which are oversimplified and inaccurate representations manipulated by media producers in order to create a portrayal of a group’s values and behaviors (Chung, 2007). If schools do not discuss LGBTQ issues then students are left only with the information mined from media, and thus run the risk of developing false assumptions and prejudicial attitudes towards LGBTQ people (Addison, 2007; Chung, 2007). Since popular media is rooted in the students’ everyday lives and is already incorporating LGBTQ issues, using media in the classroom is an
appropriate means to start a dialogue that can be monitored and guided by a sensitive, informed adult.

Identity is a popular theme to explore in the art classroom (Addison, 2007; Lampela, 2005; Stanley, 2007). Addison (2007) advocates for teaching self-portraiture in a way that addresses the Post Modern idea that nothing is created in a vacuum. Identity and self-portraiture can be taught in a way that addresses the history of portraiture in western art along with incorporating contemporary images from media sources, such as advertisements. Advertisements are created to sell individuals a sense of identity by purchasing their product, and students can benefit from analyzing these images critically in a way that considers ideas of consumerism, the media, and how these factors affect the makeup of their own identity (Addison, 2007; Stanley, 2007). Lampela (2005) promotes exploring at the secondary level LGBTQ artists who have addressed their sexual identity in their work, and prompting students to consider artists’ influences, interpretations of work based on knowing if an artist is homosexual, and what impact on society the piece could have. By providing students with guiding questions and providing an opportunity for their own identity exploration, students are helped to reflect on LGBTQ art and culture in order to safely mine a marginalized identity and compare it to their own. This lesson would hopefully foster a sense of understanding and empathy with a group of people that students may experience mixed and complicated feelings towards.

*Heterosexism and the Hidden Curriculum*

Rosenberg and Thurber’s argument for sensitivity of language can be applied to considering homophobia as well (2007). If a teacher does not address sweeping phrases
such as “that’s so gay,” then they are communicating the idea that using terms that refer to a group of people in a derogatory fashion is acceptable. Kaufmann (2006) explains that language and discourses shape identity. Since their stories will shape how their students perceive the world, teachers need to become more self-aware and analyze the narratives they tell in a way that is more sensitive to the hidden meanings communicated.

The belief that identity is fluid and subject to change due to environmental factors counters the more popularized belief that identity is fixed and unchangeable. A belief that identity is fixed promotes ideas of othering and restating heteronormative values, whereas believing that identity is fluid coincides with critically examining social constructs and expectations (Addison, 2007). LGBTQ identities are described as being particularly complicated to deal with in school (Nicholas, 2007). Due to a society’s internalized heteronormativity, others perceive lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer individuals’ identities as quintessentially queer above all other factors, which is not the same for heterosexual individuals (Addison, 2007). As a teacher it is important to acknowledge these differing views of identity, and treat students in a way that is respectful towards what stage in their identity development they may be in. This notion also coincides with teaching identity themed lessons in a gender and LGBTQ sensitive way within the written curriculum, as previously discussed.

Serving as a trusted adult students can turn to if they have questions is a vital role for a teacher. In order for this to happen there needs to be more reference materials for adequately dealing with these concerns available to teachers, who often feel uncomfortable or unsupported when dealing with potentially controversial issues like
homosexuality. Teachers must band together to request these resources in order to further develop their written curriculum and reconsider their hidden curriculums in ways that are LGBTQ sensitive (Lampela, 2005; Stanley, 2007).

Conclusion

I have discussed and supplied research over the issues of sexism and heterosexism, or homophobia, and their relationship to the classroom. Both heterosexism and sexism are rooted in societal beliefs and are reinforced through attitudes and institutions. A crucial step to exorcise these elements from doing further harm to students is to have the courage, as teachers, to confront said issues. With media being as pervasive as it is, students run the risk of having a large portion of their education about gender norms and LGBTQ individuals come from mediatypes. I believe that we owe it to our students to model true equity and understanding by starting dialogues incorporating issues young people are grappling with. If we as teachers do not carve out the classroom as a safe place for our youth to ask tough questions then we abandon them to an often times sexist and homophobic society. The following chapter will discuss the methodology and procedures of this study. Role of researcher, the participants, quantitative and qualitative instrumentation, generalization and transferability, validity, limitations, and processes for data analysis will be addressed.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Methodology and Methods

This study aimed to reveal Ohio art teachers’ attitudes on sexism and heterosexism. This research is a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Fraenkel and Wallen (2007) explain that the benefits of taking a mixed methods approach is that by utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods the researcher is able to provide a more complete understanding of the research question than if just one methodology was used alone. Creswell (2003) states that mixed methods research is relatively new and there is a growing interest in mixed methods studies and procedures. Creswell names C.S. Reichardt and S.E. Rallis’s *The Qualitative-Quantitative Debate: New Perspectives* (1994) as the earliest entire text about mixed methods research. Reasons for mixing methods of research could be to confirm or compare data across methods, to not be limited as a researcher to a quantitative versus qualitative debate, and to embrace what the researcher finds worthwhile in both approaches. The challenges of mixed methods research is that the researcher needs to be familiar with both methodologies, be prepared for extensive data collection, and be able to invest a large amount of time to analyze the data (Creswell, 2003).

The quantitative method implemented is a survey, and the qualitative method used is Seidman’s Three-Interview Method (1998). The adoption of a qualitative methodology describes my willingness to embrace emergent codes and themes that will appear through the interview data, which will be used to enrich the data gleaned from the surveys.
Fraenkel and Wallen define qualitative research as studies that seek to “investigate the quality of relationships, activities, situations or materials” and that there is an attempt at holistic description, or “describing in detail what goes on in a particular activity or situation rather than comparing the effects of a particular treatment… or in describing the attitudes or behaviors of people” (2007, p. 422). The “particular activity or situation” that I will be attempting to describe in a holistic way is how secondary art teachers address the complex issues of sexism and heterosexism, or homophobia, in their classrooms. Furthermore, in order to better defend my reasons for mixing methodologies I will cite Fraenkel and Wallen here: “Generally, in a descriptive survey…. researchers are not so much concerned with why the observed distribution exists as with what the distribution is” (2007, p. 391). It is important for my research study to define what secondary art teachers’ attitudes regarding sexism and heterosexism are, so the method of descriptive survey fits this study. These two methods help to inform me, so I can then examine and interpret what can be done from a critical standpoint to foster more equitable teaching practices in chapter four.

This research implements a cross-sectional survey since data was collected at one time only (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2007). Since surveys are a way to collect information in which to describe a population, this method is appropriate for my study because I am attempting to gauge teachers’ attitudes over the two issues of sexism and heterosexism. Hence, I am looking at a particular population, or target population, as practicing, certified, secondary art teachers in Ohio.
Gathering participants’ perspectives is crucial towards understanding the classroom picture in a more holistic way through the qualitative method of interviewing (Creswell, 2007). Personal narratives, including stories, motives, reasons, goals, and ideals, will be valued as important data in informing a holistic view of Ohio art teachers’ attitudes regarding sexism and heterosexism.

Apple (2000) explains that critical researchers are concerned with how their topic relates to issues of power, justice, and oppression. In order to further clarify what I define as “critical” I will cite Apple here: “…critical work needs to be done in an ‘organic’ way. It needs to be connected to and participate in those progressive social movements and groups that continue to challenge the multiple relations of exploitation and domination that exist” (2000, p. 7). This idea is crucial to my study in two ways. First, as a self-identified qualitative researcher and interviewer I am interested in the emergent aspect of data collection and looking at the data collected through teacher interviews and surveys in a holistic way (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2007). Second, since my question addresses the social constructs of sexism and heterosexism, I will need to analyze contextual aspects, such as power, to better understand these two constructs’ roles in the classroom (Apple, 2000). The statistical data gained from the surveys is important for providing the skeleton of my study, but it is the interview data, or putting these issues into four specific, lived contexts, that I believe add substance to my study. Since I am interested in a narrative, qualitative authoring style, I will incorporate my own conclusions conversationally as they occur (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). These narratives have already been introduced in chapter two in the form of italicized, personal reflections. Italics were used so that the
reader will understand it is the researcher’s voice and experiences being communicated in order to tie together, from one point of view, the data collected from the survey and the narratives from the interviews. The conversational conclusions provided hereafter will not be italicized.

Role of Researcher

Creswell (2003) explains that a mixed methods research study tends to be either more quantitative or qualitative. This being said, due to my interest in a narrative authoring style and my willingness to embrace emergent themes, this study tends to be more qualitative in tone. The qualitative researcher makes an interpretation of the data, filtering the data through his or her personal lens. My lens is heavily affected by feminist and queer theories, as well as my socially-constructed body of knowledge gained from my personal and professional lived experiences. Creswell uses the term reflexivity to describe a researcher’s highly introspective approach and recognition that his or her personal values and biases affect his or her research. Additionally, the qualitative researcher’s thinking is not linear, but cycles from data collection, to analysis, to the drawing of conclusions, and back (Creswell, 2003).

Fraenkel and Wallen (2007) stress the role of researcher interpretation in regards to qualitative research. The qualitative methodology is important to me because it allows for a more narrative authoring style, and offers for myself as a researcher, as well as the author, the opportunity to frame these issues in a way that transcends numeral data to become a real world teacher’s lived experience. These narratives gleaned offer an emotional insight from the teacher’s perspective that may not usually be discussed in our
field, yet as emotive creatures narratives represent a crucial component to increased understanding (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

One of my interviewees was a close friend of mine from college, which immediately raises concerns of researcher bias. While these concerns are valid, I will attempt to make the study as ethical as possible. The participant and I hold a unique relationship; we both went through Kent State University’s art education program together, so we have similar concerns regarding equity in the classroom. I view the aspect of sharing a similar pre-service preparation to be a strength of this study because it will further potential for understanding. I have also attempted a certain level of impartiality by endeavoring as much objectivity as possible. Fraenkel and Wallen agree that true objectivity is impossible to achieve, but by engaging in in-depth interviews to more fully understand a participant’s point of view, minimizing bias is attempted (2007).

Participants

Confidentiality for all interview and survey participants was stressed. For interviewees it was stated in the consent form that a pseudonym will be assigned, and also that during the interview process interviewees should not provide any identifiable information regarding other individuals (Appendix A). For survey participants I have explained in the emailed cover letter (Appendix B) that anonymity will be maintained since there are no answers on the questionnaire that will indicate their identity aside from three basic background questions which inquire to their age, sex, and current employment.
In order to find survey participants, I conducted a systematic sampling of high schools listed by the Ohio Educational Directory (2005) provided by Kent State University’s library. From this list of 753 Ohio high schools I chose every fifth high school on the list, researched the schools online, and found a total of 205 art teachers’ email addresses. The link for the survey and a cover letter was emailed to the 205 art teachers on March 19, 2009, and they were asked to complete it by April 17, 2009.

The other portion of data collection was a more qualitative, in-depth interviewing process with four art educators at the secondary level. Since I am familiar with all of the teachers, the sample is purposive since I had made initial contact and all were willing to discuss the issues of sexism and homophobia at length. Participants were chosen in order to form a sample that is gender balanced and diverse in length of career. The first participant is a first-year, female teaching art in an urban setting I’ll refer to as Stephanie. The second art teacher, Andrew, is also in his first-year of teaching but is located in a more rural school setting. The third and fourth participants both teach at the same suburban school; Hannah (female) is mid-career, and Rick (male) is towards the end of his teaching career.

Instrumentation

Quantitative

The first procedure is survey. Data collection was at one time, not over a span, so the method is defined as a cross-sectional survey. Since surveys are a way to collect information in which to better describe a population, this method is appropriate for my study because I am attempting to gauge teachers’ attitudes over the two issues of sexism
and homophobia. Hence, I am looking at a target population defined as practicing secondary art teachers in Ohio. Based on a survey I designed, questions were available to participants through the popular survey website provider www.freeonlinesurvey.com (a hard copy is provided in Appendix C). Based on my personal experience, and the experience of those that I have talked to, an email with a link to an online survey yields a better response rate than a traditional mailed survey. Implementing an online survey was also relatively inexpensive and I was able to accomplish the task on my own so did not need to elicit any additional assistance. The survey was made available March 19, 2009 and concluded April 17, 2009.

Fraenkel and Wallen (2007) state that when possible, ready-made instruments should be used in order to maintain validity and reliability. For the survey portion of data collection I have modeled my questions after Lampela’s questionnaire (2001). Since Lampela (2001) focused on surveying art teachers’ understandings of homosexual artists and whether they used this information in their curriculum, her questionnaire in some respects parallels my research topic. However, she limits her unit of analysis to focusing on gay, lesbian, and bisexual artists; I have thus broadened some of her questions to embrace questions concerning transgender and queer peoples, as well as the role of sexism. The survey was pretested by administrating a hard copy to a group of graduate level art educators on February 17, 2009. The questionnaire was then edited based on their suggestions in order to improve question clarity and overall design.

The instrument is an online survey composed of thirty-five questions. The first twenty questions of the survey align within the five constructs (a) attitudes and beliefs
concerning art curriculum, (b) attitudes about importance of artists, (c) beliefs about teacher preparation program(s), (d) attitudes about student preparedness, and (e) resource interest. The two domains of gender and sexual orientation are used to assess each of the five constructs (Table 1).
Table 1

5 x 2 Constructs by Domain Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Domain Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes and Beliefs Concerning Art Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion fits in the art classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security due to classroom discussions.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes about Importance of Artists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for students to learn about artists.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists can serve as positive role models for students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion is important to understand artists working within the last 20 years.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion is important to understand artists working prior to the year 1990.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about the sexual orientation of artists is important to understanding their work.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If information about the sexual orientation of artists were made available I would use it in my classroom.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs about Teacher Preparation Program(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for including discussions in the art classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for handling instances in the classroom and school community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes about Student Preparedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can understand and identify examples.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can handle examples in a sensitive way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom fairer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first ten questions measure sexism utilizing an incremental, Likert-type scale, where the value of 1 (agree strongly) implies that the participant is not sexist and the value of 5 (disagree strongly) indicates a high level of sexism. There are fifteen questions that measure heterosexism. Ten of the questions measure heterosexism utilizing an incremental, Likert-type scale, where the value of one (agree strongly) implies that the participant is not homophobic and the value of five (disagree strongly) indicates a high level of homophobia. There are five questions that rank the participant’s comfort level with mentioning to his or her students if an artist was gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, or self-identified as queer. One open-ended question asks if the participant believes there is a connection between sexism and homophobia and to then explain. The last six questions of the survey allow the participant to describe his or her background in order to provide demographic and descriptive context.

**Qualitative**

The interviews were modeled after Seidman’s Three-Interview Method (1998) and the questions were composed by the researcher. Each of the four interviews ranged from thirty minutes to an hour, consisted mainly of open-ended questions, and was split conceptually into three components. The first section was a reconstruction of the participant’s life experience in relation to the topic. The second section addressed how they deal with issues of sexism and homophobia throughout their daily life in the classroom. The final component provided an opportunity to reflect on the previous two sections, and to make meaning out of their experiences (Seidman, 1998). The questions used to guide the interview were as follows:
First Phase

• Why did you decide to become a teacher and how did you plan on addressing difficult or controversial issues in your classroom?

• Reflecting on your own K-12 education, reconstruct a story where you dealt with sexism.

• Reflecting on your own K-12 education, reconstruct a story where you dealt with homophobia.

• Without sharing the identity of the person, tell me about a teacher/administrator/student who dealt with a sexist incident in the school setting. How was this handled?

• Without sharing the identity of the person, tell me about a teacher/administrator/student who dealt with a homophobic incident in the school setting. How was this handled?

• How did your pre-service teaching program address these two issues?

Second Phase

• How has your thinking about sexism influenced your teaching?

• How has your thinking about homophobia influenced your teaching?

• Reconstruct a situation where you had to deal with an example of sexism in your classroom.

• Do you actively engage your students in dialogue concerning sexism? Please give an example.
• Do you actively engage your students in dialogue concerning homophobia? Please give an example.

• Do you discuss artists or artworks that have addressed issues of sexism? If you have, please give an example of a lesson/activity you have used to discuss this issue.

• Do you discuss artists or artworks that have addressed issues of homophobia? If you have, please give an example of a lesson/activity you have used to discuss this issue.

Third Phase

• Would you be willing to (further) include lessons that address issues of sexism or homophobia into your curriculum?

• Could your pre-service teaching program have better prepared you for dealing with issues of sexism? How so?

• Could your pre-service teaching program have better prepared you for dealing with issues of homophobia? How so?

• What systems need to be implemented in schools to foster gender equity and tolerance?

• What resources need to be made available to foster gender equity and tolerance?

• What would an ideal teaching environment be to you, and why?
During the four interviews my role as researcher was to operate as the key instrument for data collection (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2007). I analyzed interviewees’ experiences inductively in order to better understand the relationships that emerged between their stories. During the interview I had a list of interview questions to refer to and adhered to Seidman’s Three-Interview Method (1998). Due to the nature of Seidman’s qualitative interviewing method, I allowed the interview to proceed in a more tangential way if a valid opportunity presented itself. This method is crucial because I believe that constructing narratives is important in order for the interviewees to make sense of their experiences. Furthermore, the role of narrative is important to my own understanding as a researcher, and informs my analysis of interview data (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Interview transcripts were coded using the five survey constructs (a) attitudes and beliefs concerning art curriculum, (b) attitudes about importance of artists, (c) beliefs about teacher preparation program(s), (d) attitudes about student preparedness, and (e) resource interest. Additional constructs emerged while coding the transcripts. These interview constructs are humor, reflection, and background and community.

Generalization and Transferability

In chapter four, generalizations are made based on survey data collected. Based on the sample, the data is only generalized to practicing, secondary art teachers in Ohio.

In regards to transferability, it is my goal as a researcher to provide enough information in this study to add to the ongoing understanding of how issues of sexism and heterosexism are being addressed in the art education classroom. By presenting a
literature review to support the claim that these issues need to be dealt with in art education because of their impact on students, and by then presenting data to better understand how art teachers are dealing with these issues, our field can more fully understand the importance of addressing these issues and understand how these issues are being addressed by Ohio art educators. Additionally, by offering conclusions and future research implications, this study may inform others in how to address these sometimes-difficult issues. However, based on low numbers in certain populations (e.g. nine male teachers compared to thirty-nine female teachers) some transferability is limited.

Validity

For the survey, content validity was controlled for by administering a hard copy of questions to art education graduate students on February 17, 2009. Question clarity was the main topic of discussion, and questions were then edited based on the group’s suggestions. Construct validity was controlled for by establishing five constructs across the two domains of gender and sexual orientation, and then composing questions that fit into those five constructs. Consistency in data analysis for SPSS Version 15.0 was controlled for since two people, my advisor and myself, typed in the data. Frequencies were then run in order to ensure there were no anomalies or numbers missing.

Creswell (2003) notes that qualitative validity differs from quantitative validity because a qualitative researcher’s goal is to present the data in rich, descriptive writing, so that the reader can identify with the results. Interview validity was attempted by clarifying researcher bias and comparing the four interviews for shared themes and patterns.
Limitations

The initial proposal for this research was for an ethnographic study, so I feel as
the researcher that this method would have yielded richer results. Creswell (2003) notes
that a sometimes considered weakness of a mixed methods approach is that the researcher
is spreading herself thin by not giving 100% of her attention to one methodology. While I
believe that both contributed significantly to this study and were overall assets, I often
felt torn between the two methodologies.

Consistency in administering the survey could not be controlled for because it was
an online survey with no researcher contact with participants. Additionally, the survey
instrument’s measure of internal consistency across domains was seven out of ten (Table
1). Fraenkel and Wallen (2007) indicate that the disadvantages of emailed surveys is that
there is no opportunity to encourage participant response or to offer assistance if the
participant has any questions, which can produce low response rates. Fraenkel and
Wallen admit that nonresponse for mail surveys can be anywhere between 10 to 90
percent (2007). While I acknowledged that there would be some level of nonresponse, I
took measures to lower nonresponse by pretesting the questions on a group of graduate
level art educators on February 17, 2009. I then edited my questions based on their
suggestions to improve clarity. Even though the instrument was modeled after another’s
study, the final survey was designed by me and a certain level of variance is to be
expected since it is my first attempt at designing a survey.
Data Analysis

Since my survey sample is a randomized population of Ohio art educators, Fraenkel and Wallen (2007) explain that there is a greater chance of inferring that the data collected is representative of this population. The total size of the sample is listed, the percentage of returns, and the percentage breakdown of answer choice for each item. From here, I looked for similarities and differences between art educators, and inferred these findings back to the population of Ohio secondary art teachers.

The statistical analysis computer program utilized to analyze my data is SPSS Version 15.0. To start, constructs for the survey are organized into curricular attitudes concerning sexism, female artists in history, teacher preparation, teachers’ attitudes about how their students understand sexism, and resource interest. Secondly, the results for the heterosexism portion of the survey are presented, organized by the constructs of curricular attitudes concerning heterosexism, LGBTQ artists, teacher preparation, teacher’s attitudes about how their students understand heterosexism, and resource interest. The third section compares sexism and heterosexism and is organized by the constructs curricular attitudes towards discussions involving sexism and homophobia, female and LGBTQ artists, teacher preparation, teacher’s attitudes about how prepared their students are to handle sexist and heterosexist cases sensitively, and resource interest.

Creswell (2003) indicates that statistical programs, such as SPSS Version 15.0, are popular because the researcher can compare items within the survey instrument across constructs and domains. Fraenkel & Wallen (2007) state that correlational research, which is still a part of descriptive statistics, seeks to describe relationships that exist. In
chapter IV, by analyzing relationships within the survey data I was able to make implications that might be generalized to Ohio secondary art educators. In SPSS Version 15.0 I ran an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to see if any relationships existed between survey constructs and participants’ length of teaching career, gender, and region. In addition, significant correlations within survey data were found and will be described in chapter four.

From the interview data, codes were established by seeking out commonalities, and the overlapping of themes within participants’ stories were noted. From the codes that emerged I developed a color-coding system so that the data was manageable. Emergent codes are discussed, analyzed, and interpreted in the following chapter. In summary, I am using a mixed methodology of both quantitative and qualitative methods. The methods I will be using are survey and Seidman’s Three-Interview series method (1998). My survey sample is a generalization of Ohio’s population of art teachers, and my interview sample is purposive.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: QUANTITATIVE

Overview

This chapter presents the results found through the quantitative method of survey. This chapter is organized into three sections. In each section results are reported, followed by a discussion that includes analysis and interpretation of the data, as well as suggestions for the field of art education and the implications this research suggests.

First, descriptive statistics gleaned from the survey instrument are presented. Second, relationships between survey constructs and participants’ length of teaching career, gender, and region were analyzed. The third section reports significant correlations within the survey data, and what this means for art education.

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Results

Results for the sexism portion of the survey are listed first. The constructs described are overall attitudes concerning sexism, female artists in history, teacher preparation, and teachers’ attitudes about how their students understand sexism.

Secondly, the results for the heterosexism portion of the survey are presented, organized by the constructs of overall attitudes concerning heterosexism, LGBTQ artists, teacher preparation, and teacher’s attitudes about how their students understand heterosexism.

The third section compares sexism and heterosexism and is organized by the constructs overall attitudes towards discussions involving sexism and homophobia, female and LGBTQ artists, teacher preparation, teacher’s attitudes about how prepared their students are to handle sexist and heterosexist cases sensitively, and resource interest.
This section provides the descriptive statistics regarding Ohio high school art teachers’ attitudes regarding sexism and homophobia. Only valid percents are given. Of the 250 emailed surveys, 56 Ohio high school art teachers completed the online survey, with eight participants not answering all items. The majority of respondents were female (81.6%), which parallels national trends of gender in art teachers. The respondents’ length of careers ranged from one to over 30 years. Of the respondents, 14.3% indicated that they had taught art for 1 to 5 years, 20.4% had taught from 6 to 10 years, 26.5% had been teaching from 11 to 20 years, 20.4% had taught for 21 to 30 years, and 18.4% indicated that they had been teaching for over 30 years. Another 32.7% of respondents indicated that that they taught in the North East region, 22.4% named the North West as their region, 18.4% stated that they taught in the South West region, 16.3% selected Central Ohio, and 10.2% indicated that they taught in the South East region. Participants were supplied with a text box and asked to indicate their sexual orientation. Of the 49 total responses to this question, 42 indicated that they were heterosexual, one indicated that he or she was bisexual, one chose to leave the text box empty, and five chose to reply with a variation of ‘I am unwilling to answer.’

*Results and Discussions for Sexism Portion of Survey*

The survey indicated that 69.1% of Ohio high school art teachers agreed the art classroom is an appropriate arena for discussing sexism. Slightly more (77.7%) agreed that it is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their classroom more gender fair.
## Table 2

**Attitudes and Beliefs toward Sexism in the Art Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.13 (.96)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their classroom more gender fair.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.98 (1.01)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism.*
Figure 1. Respondents’ percentage of agreement with survey items measuring attitudes and beliefs toward sexism in the art curriculum.
These results might indicate that Ohio art teachers generally measure low in sexism. While not all of them are convinced that the art classroom is the appropriate arena for discussing the issue of sexism, they are willing to entertain the possibility if appropriate resources were provided.

Based on the survey, it could be generalized that a large majority of Ohio high school art teachers feel that it is important for their students to learn about women artists (96.4%) and that women artists can serve as positive role models (98.2%). In regards to sexism’s role in art history, 61.8% felt that a discussion about sexism is important to understand the work of contemporary female artists, and 76.3% thought a discussion about sexism is important to understand female artists working prior to the year 1990. These results can generalize that this sample measures low on sexism and believes that women artists and their histories have a valid place in Ohio high school art curriculums.
Table 3

*Attitudes and Beliefs about the Importance of Women Artists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important for my students to learn about women artists.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.47 (.57)</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women artists can serve as positive role models for the students I teach.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.42 (.53)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.25 (1.05)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.00 (.92)</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism.*
Figure 2. Respondents’ percentage of agreement with survey items measuring attitudes and beliefs about the importance of women artists.
While Ohio art teachers think that it is important to include women artists within the curriculum, less view the discussion of sexism as being a necessary asset towards understanding these women artists. However, by not including a discussion about sexism while discussing women artists poses a problem. Feminist art scholars recognize that women have historically been shoehorned into the category of either craft or a bottom tier in the hierarchy of Fine Art (Congdon, 1996; Nochlin, 1988). When these complex social factors are left unstated, students may be unable to recognize the reasons why there are a fewer number of women artists studied than males (Nochlin, 1988). Thus, students run the risk of assuming that women have simply not made as many, or as great of, contributions to culture (Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). It is for these reasons that if an effective conversation regarding women artists is to take place, sexism is a construct that must be addressed in order for students to understand more fully their history. Art criticism activities, such as Keifer-Boyd’s activity to expose and analyze gendered stereotypes in images (2007), are helpful to accomplishing this task.

It might be generalized that Ohio art teachers feel unprepared by their teacher education program(s) to both discuss sexism in the classroom (62.9%) and properly handle instances of sexism in the classroom and school community (61.1%). Only 24.1% of teachers surveyed felt prepared to discuss sexism, and 25.9% felt prepared to handle sexist situations.
Table 4

**Beliefs about Preparedness to Discuss Sexism due to Teacher Education Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for discussing sexism in the classroom.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.46 (1.16)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for properly handling instances of sexism in the classroom and school community.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.48 (1.02)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism.
Figure 3. Percentage breakdown of respondents’ beliefs about level of preparedness to discuss sexism due to teacher education programs.
From these results it could be concluded that teacher education programs need to more effectively address issues of sexism and how they relate to the art classroom and school community. When I have talked with practicing teachers both established and new to the field, none of them have felt fully prepared by their formal education to properly discuss sexism or handle sexist incidents. Role-playing scenarios, obtaining lesson plans, and knowing how to utilize resources could possibly aid in teacher comfort levels in dealing with issues of sexism in classroom discussions and within the school community.

When asked if the respondents thought that their students could identify examples of sexism, 44.4% thought that students could, 20.4% stated that students could not, and 35.2% were uncertain. Additionally, when respondents were asked if their students were prepared to handle examples of sexism in a sensitive way, 29.6% thought their students were prepared, 31.5% thought they were not, and 38.9% were uncertain.
Table 5

Beliefs about Student Preparation with Sexism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my students understand and can identify examples of sexism.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.72 (.83)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my students are prepared to handle examples of sexism in a sensitive way.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.00 (.89)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism.
Figure 4. Percentage breakdown of respondents’ beliefs about student preparation with sexism.
If teachers themselves are unprepared to sensitively handle sexist situations or lead discussions on sexism, then how can they effectively model or instruct their students on the same? Teacher preparation programs in Ohio might benefit their art education undergraduates if they provided ways to help their future students identify sexism and handle sexist incidents. Self-reflection is important to teachers, and if art teachers understand the reflection process then they can aid their students in the same (Addison, 2007).

Results and Discussions for Heterosexism Portion of the Survey

When asked if a discussion about homophobia could fit into the art classroom, 52.9% agreed that the art classroom was an appropriate place to discuss homophobia and 26.4% were uncertain. Additionally, 53.8% of Ohio high school art teachers surveyed thought that it was important for schools to make resources available to teachers in order to make their classroom more LGBTQ fair, 25% were uncertain, and 21.2% disagreed. It might be generalized that Ohio high school art teachers do not fear for job security due to homophobia because 75% indicated that they are not afraid to lose their job by mentioning if an artist is either lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer.
### Table 6

**Attitudes and Beliefs toward Heterosexism in the Art Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.55 (1.18)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their classroom more LGBTQ fair.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.56 (1.12)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am fearful that I will lose my job if I mention to students in my classroom that particular artists are either lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.08 (1.00)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less heterosexism.
Figure 5. Percentage breakdown of respondents’ beliefs toward heterosexism in the art curriculum.
Of the art teachers surveyed, 20.7% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that a discussion about homophobia does not fit into the art classroom. About 80% of art teachers then, if not fully convinced, might be willing to believe that a discussion about homophobia fits into the art classroom. Since a majority of Ohio secondary art teachers indicated that they do not fear for their job due to discussing homophobia, it might be generalized that those who disagree a discussion about homophobia fits in the classroom are doing so for reasons due to perhaps morality, discomfort, or other personal reasons. It is common thought among education professionals that ignorance about a subject breeds discomfort. Thus, it might be possible to predict that if practicing art teachers view a successful example of the issue of homophobia being discussed in the classroom, are then explained the theory behind including discussions about contemporary issues in the classroom, and are provided with resources, more art teachers might find the art classroom an appropriate arena to discuss the issue of homophobia.

It could be generalized that Ohio high school art teachers measure moderately on heterosexism. Of the sample, 41.5% agreed that it was important for their students to learn about LGBTQ artists, 28.3% disagreed, and 30.2% were unsure. A higher number of respondents indicated that LGBTQ artists could serve as positive role models to their students (62.3%). Additionally, 43.4% did not think that a discussion about the sexual orientation of artists as being important to the understanding of his or her work. Respondents to the survey were almost evenly split when asked if they would use resources about LGBTQ artists in their classroom if they were provided. In agreement was 33.9% of respondents, 30.2% indicated they would not, and 35.8% were unsure.
Table 7

*Attitudes and Beliefs about the Importance of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) Artists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56)</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important for my students to learn about LGBTQ artists.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.77 (1.13)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models for the students I teach.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.30 (.93)</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about the sexual orientation of artists is important to understand their art.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.23 (1.03)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If information about LGBTQ artists were made available to me I would use the information in my classes.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.96 (1.05)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less heterosexism.
Figure 6. Respondents’ percentage of agreement with survey items measuring attitudes and beliefs about the importance of LGBTQ artists.
From this sample of data, it might be said that Ohio art teachers are not very heterosexual in general because most agreed that LGBTQ artists could serve as positive role models (62.3%), or were at least uncertain (28.3%). While they may not be heterosexual in this sense, when it comes to their professional lives Ohio high school art teachers answered with a higher degree of heterosexism with their overall reluctance towards the inclusion of resources about LGBTQ artists if provided.

It might be generalized that Ohio high school art teachers do not feel that their teacher education program prepared them for the issue of homophobia and how it relates to the art classroom. Of art teachers surveyed, 76.9% felt that their teacher education program(s) did not prepare them for discussing homophobia in the classroom, and 65.4% felt that their program(s) did not prepare them for handling instances of homophobia.
Table 8

*Beliefs about Preparedness to Discuss Heterosexism due to Teacher Education Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56)</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for discussing homophobia in the classroom.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.94 (1.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for properly handling instances of homophobia in the classroom and school community.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.67 (1.06)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less heterosexism.
Figure 7. Respondents’ percentage of disagreement with survey items measuring beliefs about preparedness to discuss heterosexism due to teacher education programs.
When compared with Ohio high school art teachers’ attitudes towards their teacher education program(s) preparation for the issues of sexism, teachers felt even less prepared to handle issues of heterosexism, or homophobia. From these results it could be concluded that teacher education programs need to more effectively address issues of heterosexism and how they relate to the art classroom and school community. When I have talked with practicing teachers both established and newer to the field, none of them have felt fully prepared by their formal education to properly discuss homophobia or handle homophobic incidents. As with implications for handling sexism, role-playing scenarios, obtaining lesson plans, and knowing how to utilize resources could possibly aid in teacher comfort levels in dealing with the issue of heterosexism.

When questioned about their students, 44.2% of respondents indicated that they did not think their students were prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way, and 36.5% were uncertain.
Table 9

**Beliefs about Student Preparation with Heterosexism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my students are prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.35 (.96)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less heterosexism.
Figure 8. Percentage breakdown of respondents’ beliefs about student preparation with heterosexism.
With only 19.2% of teachers surveyed believing that their students are prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way, it could be generalized that there is too large a portion of Ohio high school students who are unprepared to adequately navigate LGBTQ tolerance. This could be due to the fact that homosexual teachers and students are sometimes pressured by heteronormativity to keep their sexual orientation hidden (Check, 2000). Art teachers can help to counter this unseen presence of a marginalized group by including LGBTQ artists in the curriculum. The inclusion and positioning of LGBTQ artists within the curriculum is beneficial because it embraces diversity and offers additional opportunities to reach a greater variety of students through personal connections to art (Addison, 2007; Chung, 2007; Desai, 2003; Kaufmann, 2006; Lampela, 2005; Rosenberg & Thurber, 2007; Stanley, 2007).

Five questions on the instrument asked participants to rate their comfort level mentioning if an artist was gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, or self-identified as queer. Of participants surveyed, 58.8% indicated they would be comfortable mentioning that an artist is gay, with 27.5% indicating they would be neutral or uncertain, and 13.7% indicating they would feel uncomfortable. A slightly lower amount (56.9%) indicated they would be comfortable mentioning that an artist is a lesbian, 27.5% indicated they would be neutral or uncertain, and 15.7% indicated they would feel uncomfortable. The percentages were the same for mentioning to students if an artist is either bisexual or transgender, with 47.1% feeling comfortable, 37.3% feeling neutral or uncertain, and 15.7% feeling uncomfortable. Also, 31.4% of participants indicated they would be comfortable mentioning that an artist is self-identified as queer, 31.4% indicated they
would be uncomfortable, and slightly more (37.3%) indicated that they would be either neutral or uncertain.

Participants might feel uncomfortable mentioning the sexual orientation of an artist for many reasons, from their own comfort levels with the topic to what type of demographic they teach in. I chose to specifically look at the LGBTQ subgroups. For example, while 58.8% of teachers surveyed would feel comfortable mentioning that an artist is gay, that number shrank to 31.4% when asked if they would feel comfortable mentioning that an artist is self-identified as queer. It could be generalized that even art teachers, of which 62.3% thought LGBTQ artists could serve as positive role models for their students, still measure higher on heterosexism when asked about LGBTQ subgroups. This might imply that more research is needed which directly addresses the unique issues associated with lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgender and queer individuals, in order to increase understanding.

One open-ended question asked if the participant believed there is a connection between sexism and homophobia. Of the respondents, 46.4% indicated that there was a connection, 23.2% left the text box blank or refused to give a definite answer, 16.1% indicated that there was not a connection, and 14.3% answered “maybe” or that they were unsure. Since the question was open-ended, there was a variety of explanations given. The majority of the breakdown, 32.1%, left the text box blank or did not provide an explanation. Of the sample, 19.6% indicated that there was a link due to prejudice, fear, or close-mindedness. Additionally, 16.1% indicated there was a fixation on people’s differences, and 12.5% indicated that it should not be an issue and that art teachers should
instead focus solely on art. Smaller variations also existed, namely 5.4% indicated both sexism and heterosexism as being rooted in existing cultural power structures, 5.4% indicated that they are learned from one’s environment, 5.4% indicated that there is a difference because homophobia is a more sensitive issue then sexism, 1.8% indicated that sexism is more apparent due to biology whereas one’s sexuality can be hidden, and 1.8% indicated that the difference is dependent on one’s experiences.

Written responses for those participants who agreed that there was a connection between sexism and homophobia often paralleled ideas found within the literature review described in chapter two. However, some participants utilized this question as an opportunity to share personal stories on the subject. The following are some examples:

- They are both areas of prejudice and subjects that students, based on conversations I have overheard, would possibly be uncomfortable with. This would be due to religious beliefs, background or general misconceptions.

- I think people who discriminate against women will also discriminate against homosexuals as well. There is much ignorance about these issues and it usually starts at the home of students.

- My students seem to be more sensitive regarding homophobic issues than gender issues - the young women I see still accept outdated information about their roles in society - their need for a boyfriend - at all costs.

- I am in a very sexist community. I have maintained my maiden name even though I am married to a fellow teacher for the last 20 years. Students just
think this is wrong. I should change my name to his. Plus I know some fellow staff members who are gay but keep their long term relationships very private and virtually undisclosed to the community so that their jobs are not in jeopardy. Students often make horrible general statements concerning these people’s sexual orientation and insinuate that this makes them a bad teacher.

- Ignorance about sexual orientations in the very small town setting I teach in seems to be passed down from parents to child creating a fear and hate. I have many male art students tell me that because they love art and want to pursue a career in the art field that their parents, friends and other family have teased and inquired about their sexual orientation. Those same students have very negative reactions, even using derogatory remarks about gays themselves, even when I believe their own sexuality is uncertain to them. They seem to be labeled already. One boy even said he is lifting weights to prepare for any advances from gay students because he will kick their ass if "they" come near him. I have a father this past year who is angry with his son for not going out for football (he is a football hall of famer type) because his son loves art and music. His dad sees art and music as a female pursuit, not a male. The damage this father does is sickening. He calls his son names that imply he is gay. This young man has changed drastically in the last 3 years. He is withdrawing from school and even his art. I have dialogued with him but he is out of reach. I have
another student who is the only openly bisexual student I have ever had. He was in many of my art classes as well as his girlfriend of over a year. He has been sexually harassed to the point of not being able to come to school at times. He has also sought out mental counseling. One day 2 years ago, our guidance counselor had an open gay college professor come in and talk to seniors about sexuality in college. Parents fired back accusing her of trying to turn kids gay. She feared for her job!

The complex variety of responses gained from this question reflects the idea that these two issues, especially heterosexism, are controversial topics of discussion. Since they are controversial, I feel that it is even more important for such issues to be discussed in a mediated forum, such as public education, that frames the issues in a constructive manner. If students are to learn about the connections between sexism, heterosexism, and how each affects their own lives, then potential for tolerance and understanding is increased.

From survey data it might be generalized that some Ohio secondary art teachers are willing to implement a gender and LGBTQ sensitive curriculum which discusses these two issues, yet the opponents towards this movement are vocal, and often passionate. Some participants utilized the survey’s text boxes to add additional information they thought was important to communicate with the researcher over this subject. Such written responses are as follows:

- The point you’re missing is how the artwork impacted the viewer, community, and period. It's not about the artist’s sexuality. Donatello's
David is prime example about his artwork and viewpoint, none of my students blink when I said he was gay.

- I teach Art, not the artist’s sexual preference. WE discuss the style, period and techniques. Not if the artist is queer! !!!!!!!!!!!!!

- I feel that this is none of your business!!!! BUT - I have been married for 30 years. I also have many friends that YOU would call queer. But they are people not queers!!!!! I think that this survey is sad!! With things like this - no wonder society has problems with judging people. Does it matter to you if an Artist is Black????? What would make the difference, Black or Gay?? Or better yet - both!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

- I believe that art is art. I would not bring up a person's sexual orientation in the discussion of their art. Not because of being uncomfortable with the topic but because I don't say that this person made this piece of art because they are a heterosexual. We look at the art. It should speak for itself.

- I believe sex preference and religion are personal choices that need not be discussed.

- I'm a Christian. Those life styles are wrong, but God is a forgiving God if only you seek his wisdom.

- Go ye therefore and populate the world. God made Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve! Repent if you need too. There may not be much time left!
While composing this survey I intentionally wanted to provide participants opportunities to openly discuss these topics, so the inclusion of open-ended questions was important. Based on my own understandings of this subject matter, I was not surprised to have these types of responses included. However, the majority of responses to this survey was very positive and expressed a degree of progressiveness. This could generalize that Ohio secondary art teachers are overall very tolerant, thoughtful, and open-minded, which bodes well for the further inclusion of the issues of sexism and heterosexism within the art curriculum.

Comparisons

Based on the survey, it could be generalized that there is an overall acceptance towards including discussions on both sexism and heterosexism within the art classroom, with 69.1% believing discussions about sexism fits in the art classroom, 52.9% believing discussions about heterosexism belong, and 26.4% indicating that they are uncertain if a discussion about heterosexism belongs in the art classroom. However, as described in the previous section, the written responses for those who disagreed with discussing homophobia showed much more animosity.
Table 10

*Attitudes and Beliefs toward Sexism and Heterosexism in the Art Curriculum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56)</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.13 (.96)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.55 (1.18)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism and heterosexism.
Figure 9. Percentage breakdown of respondents’ beliefs toward discussing sexism and heterosexism in the art classroom.
Based on respondents from the survey, it could be generalized that Ohio high school art teachers measure very low on sexism, with 96.4% thinking it is important for students to learn about women artists and 98.8% thinking women artists could serve as positive role models. In contrast, it could be generalized that Ohio high school art teachers measure higher on heterosexism then they do sexism. Only 41.5% agreed that it was important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists even though only about half (52.9%) thought a discussion about homophobia fits into the art classroom. Additionally, 62.3% agreed that LGBTQ artists could serve as positive role models, a 36.5% difference when asked if women artist could serve as positive role models.
Table 11

*Attitudes and Beliefs about the Importance of Women and LGBTQ Artists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important for my students to learn about women artists.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.47 (.57)</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women artists can serve as positive role models for the students I teach.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.42 (.53)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for my students to learn about lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) artists.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.77 (1.13)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models for the students I teach.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.30 (.93)</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.55 (1.18)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism and heterosexism.
Figure 10. Respondents’ percentage of agreement with survey items measuring attitudes and beliefs about the importance of women and LGBTQ artists.
It might be generalized that Ohio art teachers feel unprepared by their teacher education program(s) to both discuss sexism in the classroom (62.9%) and properly handle instances of sexism in the classroom and school community (61.1%). Only 24.1% of teachers surveyed felt prepared to discuss sexism, and 25.9% felt prepared to handle sexist situations.

While those surveyed indicated low attitudes for teacher preparedness for sexism, respondents’ attitudes towards their preparedness for dealing with the topic of heterosexism was markedly lower. Of them, 76.9% felt that their teacher education program(s) did not prepare them for discussing homophobia in the classroom, and 65.4% felt that their program(s) did not prepare them for handling instances of homophobia.
Table 12

Beliefs about Preparedness to Discuss Sexism and Heterosexism due to Teacher Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for discussing sexism in the classroom.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.46 (1.16)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for properly handling instances of sexism in the classroom and school community.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.48 (1.02)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for discussing homophobia in the classroom.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.94 (1.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teacher education program(s) prepared me for properly handling instances of homophobia in the classroom and school community.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.67 (1.06)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism and heterosexism.
Figure 11. Respondents’ percentage of disagreement with survey items measuring attitudes and beliefs about preparedness to discuss sexism and heterosexism due to teacher education programs.
Based on respondents’ attitudes, it might be generalized that Ohio art teachers do not feel prepared by teacher education programs to discuss sexism or homophobia, nor handle sexist or homophobic situations in their classroom and the school community. Since the two issues of sexism and heterosexism exist and occasionally manifest themselves within schools, teacher education programs who do not prepare pre-service teachers for these two issues do them a great disservice.

When asked about their students, 44.2% of respondents felt that their students are not prepared to handle examples of homophobia in sensitive ways, 19.2% felt students were prepared, and about a third (36.5%) were unsure. In contrast, sexism shows a more equal split between the three choices, revealing 31.5% of respondents thought their students were unprepared to handle sexist incidents, 29.6% felt that students were prepared, and 38.9% were uncertain. While comparing teacher attitudes, it is interesting to note that a greater number (11.5%) felt strongly that his or her students were unprepared to handle homophobic examples, whereas only a very small portion (1.9%) felt that his or her students were unprepared to handle sexist incidents.
Table 13

Beliefs about Student Preparation for Handling S sensitively Sexist and Heterosexist Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=56) n</th>
<th>Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my students are prepared to handle examples of sexism in a sensitive way.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.00 (.89)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my students are prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.35 (.96)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism and heterosexism.
Figure 12. Percentage breakdown of respondents’ beliefs about student preparation for handling sensitively sexist and heterosexist incidents.
In order to develop into well-rounded, operative adults, students must learn how to sensitively navigate potentially controversial issues and uncomfortable situations. Instances of sexism and heterosexism are going to manifest within students’ lives. Based on respondent’s feedback, Ohio art teachers do not feel, overall, that their high school students are prepared to handle sexist and homophobic instances in sensitive ways. As art educators, we have the ability to open and facilitate dialogues over these two issues through the medium of visual art. Art teachers can play an important role in helping to shape students into empathetic and tolerant individuals, even if they are presented with a situation that may contradict the values they have learned through their home life.

It could be generalized that a majority of Ohio high school art teachers think it is important to make resources available in order to make the classroom more gender equitable (77.7%), yet less (53.8%) thought schools should make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair. This drop in percentage implies to me the even greater need for schools to supply and mandate LGBTQ fair resources.
Table 14

*Resource Interest for Sexism and Heterosexism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(N=56) Mean (Standard deviation)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their classroom more gender fair.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.98 (1.01)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their classroom more LGBTQ fair.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.56 (1.12)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Lower number indicates less sexism and heterosexism.
Figure 13. Percentage breakdown of respondents’ beliefs about resource interest for sexism and heterosexism.
It might be generalized, based on respondent’s feedback, that there is some desire for gender- and LGBTQ-fair resources to be supplied for by schools. Ideally, the classroom should be a safe space where any and every student feels free to learn and to contribute his or her own unique voice. This ideal classroom can only be achieved if the teacher composes his or her classroom in a way that is conducive with the comfort for each child, regardless of their gender or sexual orientation. In order to achieve this, the teacher must seek out resources so that they can become more educated and can thus remove the blinders of heteronormativity (Rutter & Leech, 2006).

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

In SPSS Version 15.0, I ran an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to see if any relationships existed between survey constructs and participants’ region in which they teach, gender, and length of teaching career.

There were no statistically significant findings when comparing survey constructs to participants’ region.

There was one statistically significant relationship found in gender, and that was within the item measuring fear of job security due to discussing homophobia in the classroom. It could be generalized that male teachers feel less threatened compared to female teachers (p<.043), although both genders scored low and therefore did not harbor much fear for job security.

In regards to length of teaching career, the survey participants were asked to indicate if they have been teaching 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, 21-30 years, or over 30 years. Statistically significant relationships were found between the 1-5 years
group and the survey item that asked if a discussion over sexism is important to understand the work of women artists working within the last twenty years (p<.011), as well as the survey item that asked if a discussion about sexism is important to understand the work of women artists working prior to the year 1990 (p<.024). The 1-5 years group measured lower on sexism compared to the other age groups. It might be generalized that art teachers who have just entered the field after completing teacher preparation programs feel that a discussion about sexism is important when discussing women artists. These results might advocate for art teachers, after they are more established in their teaching careers, to revisit university-directed art history classes that discuss ways to incorporate discussions on sexism into the instruction of the artworks. Alternatively, more established art teachers might also research texts that discuss the history of women artists and the role societal factors, such as sexism, had in the development of art history curriculums.

Correlations

There are a greater number of positive than negative correlations. Based on this data, the attitudes and beliefs of Ohio high school art teachers concerning sexism tend to parallel heterosexism (see Appendix D for complete table of survey correlations).

Correlations exist between the constructs of sexism in the art curriculum and the importance of women artists: Teachers believing a discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom to teachers believing it is important for students to learn about women artists (.594); teachers believing a discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years (.531); teachers believing a discussion about sexism fits in the
classroom to believing women artists can serve as positive role models for students (.399); teachers believing a discussion about sexism fits in the classroom to believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990 (.396); teachers believing a discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom to believing it is important for schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom more gender fair (.403); and finally, the importance for schools to make resources available for teachers to make the classrooms more gender fair to the importance of a discussion about sexism to understanding women artists working with the last 20 years (.388). There was not, however, a signification correlation when comparing resource importance to the importance of a discussion about sexism to understanding women artists working prior to the year 1990.

Statistically high correlations were found between teachers believing it is important for students to learn about women artists to teachers believing women artists can serve as positive role models for students (.795), and teachers believing that a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990 (.816). A slightly lower correlation exists between teachers believing that it is important for students to learn about women artists to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years (.470); teachers believing it is important for students to learn about women artists to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990 (.420); teachers
believing women artists can serve as positive role models for students to teachers believing that a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years (.398); and teachers believing women artists can serve as positive role models for students to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990 (.414).

Correlations were found between the constructs of sexism in the art curriculum and student preparedness with sexism: Teachers believing that students are able to understand and identify examples of sexism to teachers believing a discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom (.488), and teachers believing that students can understand and identify examples of sexism to teachers believing that students are prepared to handle examples of sexism in a sensitive way (.585).

Not surprisingly, a high correlation exists between the constructs of heterosexism in the art curriculum and the importance of artists: Teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom to teachers believing LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models for students (.700), and teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom to teachers attitudes toward implementing LGBTQ artist information made available (.708). Slightly lower correlations were found between teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom to teachers believing it is important for students to learn about women artists (.460); teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years (.528); teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art
classroom to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990 (.433). A correlation was found between teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom to teachers believing a discussion about sexism fits into the art classroom (.565); teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom to teachers believing it is important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists (.564); teachers believing a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom to teachers believing a discussion about the sexual orientation of artists is important to understand their art (.447).

In addition, correlations exist between teachers believing it is important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists to teachers believing it is important for students to learn about women artists (.431); teachers believing it is important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists to teachers believing women artists can serve as positive role models for students (.410); teachers believing it is important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists to teachers believing it is important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists working with the last 20 years (.445); and teachers believing it is important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists to the importance for schools to make resources available for teachers to make the classrooms more gender fair (.514).

Furthermore, correlations were found between teachers believing LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models for students to the importance for students to learn about LGBTQ artists (.773); teachers believing LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models for students to teachers believing it is important for students to learn about women artists (.483); teachers believing LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models
for students to teachers believing women artists can serve as positive role models for
students (.361), and teachers believing LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models
for students to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important to understand
women artists working with the last 20 years (.409).

Likewise, correlations exist between teachers believing a discussion about the
sexual orientation of artists is important to understand their art to teachers believing a
discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom (.369); teachers believing a discussion
about the sexual orientation of artists is important to understand their art to teachers
believing it is important for schools to make resources available to make the classroom
more gender fair (.366); teachers believing a discussion about the sexual orientation of
artists is important to understand their art to teachers believing it is important for students
to learn about LGBTQ artists (.536); and teachers believing a discussion about the sexual
orientation of artists is important to understand their art to teachers believing LGBTQ
artists can serve as positive role models (.408).

Moreover, a correlation exists between teachers attitudes toward implementing
LGBTQ artist information made available to teachers believing a discussion about sexism
fits in the art classroom (.525); teachers attitudes toward implementing LGBTQ artist
information made available to teachers believing it is important for students to learn
about women artists (.442); teachers attitudes toward implementing LGBTQ artist
information made available to teachers believing a discussion about sexism is important
to understand women artists working with the last 20 years (.409); teachers attitudes
toward implementing LGBTQ artist information made available to teachers believing it is
important for schools to make resources available to make the classroom more gender fair (.447). Slightly higher correlations exist between teachers attitudes toward implementing LGBTQ artist information made available to teachers believing it is important for students to learn about LGBTQ artists (.633); teachers attitudes toward implementing LGBTQ artist information made available to teachers believing LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models for students (.559); teachers attitudes toward implementing LGBTQ artist information made available to teachers believing a discussion about the sexual orientation of artists is important to understand their art (.556).

Of equal importance, there is a statistically high correlation between teacher education programs preparation for discussing sexism in the classroom to teacher education programs preparation for handling instances of sexism in the classroom and school community (.873). There is also a high correlation between teacher education programs preparation for discussing homophobia in the classroom to teacher education programs preparation for handling instances of homophobia in the classroom and school community (.781).

To continue, there is a correlation between the importance for schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to a discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom (.604); the importance for schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to a discussion about sexism fits into the art classroom (.436); and the importance for schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to the importance
for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their
classroom more gender fair (.608). Correlations were found between the importance for
schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to
the importance for students to learn about LGBTQ artists (.747); the importance for
schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to
LGBTQ artists serving as role models for students (.667); and the importance for schools
to make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to having
LGBTQ artist information made available to use in the classroom (.654). There are
slightly lower correlations between the importance for schools to make resources
available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to a discussion about the
sexual orientation of artists as important to understand their art (.420), and the importance
for schools to make resources available in order to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair
to belief that students can understand and identify examples of sexism (.355).

Also, correlations exist between teachers believing it is important for schools to
make resources available for teachers to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to
teachers believing it is important for students to learn about women artists (.394);
teachers believing it is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to
make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to teachers believing that a discussion about
sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years (.543);
and teachers believing it is important for schools to make resources available for teachers
to make the classroom more LGBTQ fair to teachers believing a discussion about sexism
is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990 (.509).
There is a high correlation when comparing the domains of sexism and heterosexism to the construct of participants’ preparedness due to his or her teacher education program: Between teacher education programs’ preparation for discussing sexism to their preparation for discussing homophobia (.619); teacher education programs’ preparation for discussing sexism to programs preparation for handling sexist incidents in the classroom (.631); teacher education programs’ preparation for handling homophobic incidents in the classroom to teacher education programs’ preparation for discussing sexism in the classroom (.576); and teacher education programs’ preparation for handling homophobic incidents in the classroom to teacher education programs’ preparation for handling sexist incidents in the classroom (.608).

Not surprisingly, correlations were found between teachers believing that students are prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way to teachers believing that students can identify and understand examples of sexism (.551), and teachers believing that students are prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way to teachers believing that students are prepared to handle examples of sexism in a sensitive way (.693). Additionally, there are correlations between fear of losing one’s job due to mentioning LGBTQ artists to teachers believing that students are prepared to handle examples of sexism in a sensitive way (.433); fear of losing one’s job due to mentioning LGBTQ artists to student preparedness to teacher education programs preparation for handling homophobic incidents in the classroom (.428); fear of losing one’s job due to mentioning LGBTQ artists to teachers believing that students are prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way (.435).
In conclusion, it is not surprising that many correlations exist between survey constructs. These correlations help to support the idea, presented in chapter two, that the issues of sexism and heterosexism are related and closely linked. If one is to be battled and eradicated within the written and hidden curriculums of art education, then the other construct must be addressed as well. A more equitable art classroom can only be achieved when the art teacher recognizes sexism and heterosexism correlate, reflect on his or her own experiences with the two constructs, and seek out resources to aid in refiguring the art curriculum to aid his or her students in understanding how sexism and heterosexism affect their lives.

Based on the surveys collected and my own conversations with practicing secondary art teachers, homosexuality is a topic that is going to be brought up by students. One only has to turn on the news to see the issue being discussed in regards to civil rights, such as marriage. Since heterosexism is a contemporary topic, utilizing the work of contemporary LGBTQ artists who discuss these issues in their artworks can help to facilitate a dialogue about LGBTQ issues in a more constructive manner than mere student gossip. Resources such as the magazine and website *Teaching Tolerance* offers a multitude of general education resources, such as lesson plans and activities, that help to address the issue of heterosexism with learners of all ages. The following chapter will elaborate on data gleaned from the survey, and will report and discuss teacher interviews. Teacher interviews will first be compared to the constructs used to organize the quantitative survey. Additionally, the three emergent codes of humor, reflection, and
background and community will be described. Implications for future research will conclude chapter five.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: QUALITATIVE

Overview

In this chapter, the results found through the qualitative method of interview are presented. This chapter is organized into three sections. The first section compares interview data to the five constructs utilized in the survey instrument, and the second section reports and analyzes emergent codes gleaned from the interviews. The final section explores implications for future research.

Interview Data and the Five Constructs

In addition to the survey, I interviewed four Ohio high school art teachers. The first participant is a first-year, female teaching art in an urban setting I’ll refer to as Stephanie. The second art teacher, Andrew, is also in his first-year of teaching but is located in a more rural school setting. The third and fourth participants both teach at the same suburban school; Hannah is mid-career, and Rick is towards the end of his teaching career. Their interview transcripts were analyzed and interpreted according to the same constructs used to compose the survey, and are explored in the following five sections.

Attitudes and Beliefs Concerning Art Curriculum

None of the art teachers interviewed expressed a fear of losing their job due to discussing sexist or heterosexist issues in the classroom. Andrew, who also coaches two sports aside from his art teaching duties, expressed a feeling of being overwhelmed his first year as a teacher. He attributes this feeling as being the main reason he has not used classroom discussions to explicitly address issues of sexism and heterosexism. Instead,
Andrew tries to establish his classroom as a safe space for students to feel comfortable. Similarly, Rick tries to model equity not through explicit classroom discussions, but through his actions. He states, “I don’t think I need to talk about it, because I think the way you behave is enough.” However, he explains that there have been instances where he has had to address the issue of sexism or heterosexism with a student on an individual basis. Hannah likewise does not explicitly address either issue in whole-class discussions. Stephanie explains that while her lessons are not directly about either issue, she does address sexism and homophobia with her students when she can. She explains, “It definitely takes some planning. It doesn’t happen by accident that we address the issues… the best learning happens with preparation.” Like the other three participants, Stephanie remarks that in regards to homophobia it is how she acts as a teacher where she tries to model equity and teach tolerance.

Noddings (2002) and Phillips (2003) both explain that modeling shows students caring in action, and perhaps is the most effective way to teach empathy. Phillips states that when students “see teachers not as people who give homework and tests, but [as] people who are genuinely concerned about the lives of the children in their classes,” empathy is fostered (2003, p. 47).

Modeling an attitude of acceptance and tolerance is important for an art teacher; however, I support the idea that issues of sexism and heterosexism should be explicitly addressed in the art curriculum. One way to do this is to incorporate contemporary media into the classroom. The media, such as movies, television shows, news reports, and so on, address issues of sexism and heterosexism and are seen by our students on a daily basis.
Oftentimes, media perpetuates stereotypes, or what Chung (2007) refers to as mediatypes. Art teaches can show examples of mediatypes to their students, and then use the classroom as a space to engage in the act of deconstruction. By slowing down and analyzing mediatypes, and thus stereotypes, with a critical eye, students will learn how to not just passively accept the information that they are bombarded with on a daily basis (Addison, 2007; Chung, 2007; Desai, 2003; and Stanley, 2007).

Attitudes about Importance of Artists

All four interview participants agreed that it is important as art teachers to include works about women artists, which parallels survey findings. Responses varied when discussing the inclusion of LGBTQ artists into the curriculum. Andrew, a first year teacher, says that he will touch on sexism and heterosexism when showing his students artwork that contains the issues, but “wouldn’t really go into any further details than that.” It is understandable for first year teachers to feel overwhelmed. However, if sexual orientation is a critical idea to the artist’s work, then it is contextually important and should be discussed. For example, Hannah and Rick both named artist Keith Haring as a homosexual artist that when shown in their classroom, has led students to discuss the artist’s sexual orientation. They both credit his pink triangles as starting these dialogues. When remembering a situation where a student asked if Haring was gay, Hannah responded to the student:

Yes he was gay. Does it make any difference to his artwork? No. He’s still well known, he’s still a very important artist. And we’re going to read about him. And
I don’t think that personal part of his life has anything to do with what we’re going to take away from this project.

Hannah had previously explained that if students ask about an artist’s sexuality she will give them an honest answer and will not “brush anything under the rug,” yet she does just that in her above response. Haring’s work does blatantly discuss homosexuality, and would serve as a very appropriate opportunity to start a dialogue about heterosexism.

Hanna expresses reluctance towards discussing homophobia with her class. She explains, “I just don’t want to get into a debate with them about it. I don’t think that… I don’t know. Maybe my classroom is the place, but I don’t want to do it.” Rick voices a similar response, explaining that it was the boys in his class who would more often than naught laugh about the artist’s sexual orientation. When such instances arose in his classroom while showing an LGBTQ artist, Rick’s response is a nonchalant “just knock it off. It’s stupid. You know, get a grip.” This reluctance and sidestepping of the issue only serves to help keep heteronormativity in place. If we as art teachers do not rise above the immature laughter of our students when these issues arise, then we only contribute to the uncomfortable atmosphere surrounding the issue of heterosexism.

In contrast, Stephanie explicitly addresses both issues of sexism and heterosexism through the artwork that she shows. She names contemporary artist Josiah McElheny as being the catalyst for a discussion about homophobia with a Ceramics class. Due to the fact that he talks “lightly,” she explains that the first time she showed a video of the artist talking about his work her students started shouting out homophobic slurs. Seizing an opportunity, Stephanie paused the video and engaged students in a discussion about
homophobia. Additionally, she describes a worksheet she has created that asks students to count the names of male and female artists in the school’s provided art history texts. In describing the worksheet, she states:

I tried to connect the sexism in the art history books to their lives so that it could be constructive, and make them more aware that exists. It [the worksheet] led into questions like, ‘What is sexism? And when have you witnessed sexism? What can you do to help prevent sexism?’ And so they were to answer those questions and then we discussed them as a class. And then in our discussion I remember them… they were blowing my mind with some of the stuff they were coming up with I didn’t know what to say. It stunned me.

By seizing and not shying away from opportunities to discuss sexism and heterosexism, art teachers will model for their students an attitude of maturity when dealing with sensitive and sometimes controversial issues. If the art teacher themselves are uncomfortable, then their attitude will only feed to the students’ reactions and work at maintaining the idea that homosexuality is something to be laughed at or brushed over.

Beliefs about Teacher Preparation Program(s)

When asked if their teacher education programs prepared them adequately to handle issues of sexism and heterosexism in the classroom, none of the participants felt fully prepared. Rick, who has been teaching the longest, simply stated “No! There wasn’t any of this.” He explained that his teacher education program focused on student behavior and classroom management. When asked how he had planned to discuss or handle difficult issues in the classroom, Rick said that “you grow on the job. That’s the
best I can tell you, you just grow. I mean do they really get anybody ready for those kinds of things? I don’t think so.” This lack of preparation for handling issues of sexism and heterosexism in the classroom might be attributed to the fact that teacher education programs were more conservative during the time when Rick graduated from college.

Hannah said that she remembered “coming out of college with this really rosy, beautiful idea of what it was going to be like to be a teacher” and that the “reality didn’t really hit until later.” Like Rick, Hannah’s teacher education program did not specifically address either sexism or homophobia, and she agrees that “yes, they could have better prepared me. But I don’t know how.”

Andrew felt that his teacher education program did a good job about preparing him to incorporate issues-based lesson plans that could discuss these issues. However, he felt that he would have benefited from a better explanation on how to handle issues of homophobia in the classroom and the role discipline plays with these sensitive issues.

The other first year teacher, Stephanie, expressed that “in undergrad there is just so much coming at you, and maybe it was just hard for me to retain.” Even with the overload of information, she felt that having come from a small town where she was unaware of anybody being homosexual, if she had not gone through the training regarding heterosexist issues during her teacher education program she “would have been completely unprepared.”

From these interviews, it is clear to see that there is a connection between a teacher education program that introduces the issues of sexism and heterosexism to pre-service art teachers, to art teachers in the field discussing these issues. Had Stephanie not
been introduced to the issues of sexism and heterosexism, and taught how to engage in discussions, she “would have been completely unprepared” based on her own conservative upbringing. It can be concluded that teacher preparation programs must address these two issues if they wish to aid in the shaping of equitable art teachers.

**Attitudes about Student Preparedness**

The two male teachers, Andrew and Rick, both expressed discomfort with their students and sexual situations. Rick explains that on numerous occasions while talking to female students who have worn revealing clothing to his class he has “worried where his eyes land.” Andrew explains that he has experienced flirtations and comments from female students, as well as from one gay male student. His reaction to these instances is to verbally warn the students that they are being “inappropriate” and that if they continue there will be consequences.

This discomfort with the topic of sexuality might be a contributing factor in the hesitation for secondary art teachers to broach the topic of sexism and heterosexism. I think that it is important, when bringing up these issues to a class, to state that discussing the gender or sexual orientation of an individual or artist does not mean that we are discussing the sexuality or sexual practices of that person. Sexual orientation is one of many components that make up a person’s identity, and if the artist’s sexual orientation affects his or her work, then it is a component that should be discussed. Congdon, Stewart, and White’s *Identity Wheel* (2002) can serve as a way to get students thinking about and deconstructing identity (Appendix E).

With her inner-city student population, Stephanie attributes a seemingly low
presence of sexism to her students seeing females in more dominant roles. The following
interview excerpt explains:

Stephanie: At my school in that community there are a lot of female leaders.
There’s not a lot of male guidance in their life. So they don’t see women as weak,
or I don’t think they do. I’m generalizing of course.

Interviewer: So they don’t see… because sexism’s role is to kind of undermine
female authority.

Stephanie: Right, right. I totally don’t see that. Because in most of my students’
lives the female is the head of the house. And the administration at my school is
female. Well, two-thirds of it.

The other female teacher, Hannah, has noticed her students acting out
stereotypical gender roles. The example she gives is of a female student who plays the
role of “damsel in distress” in order to get a group of boys who sits by her to “do things
for her.” Hannah explains that the girl, who is in honors classes, “acts dumb since the
boys will rush in and help her,” and that the “boy she gets the most help from is an LD
student, and she defers to him.” This example, of a girl being afraid or unwilling to show
her intelligence so instead defers to boys, is an example of learned helplessness. If the
girl, during her development into adulthood, continues to defer to boys and therefore
never stands on her own intellectually, the attitude of learned helplessness could become
embedded into her very identity (Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Most of the stories the teachers shared about their students were not about sexism,
but were about heterosexist issues. In addition, most of these stories shared were about
their male students. This fixation on male students might further support the idea that LGBTQ subgroups warrant further research. If more attention was paid to each subgroup, perhaps the term “homosexuality” would not automatically bring to mind gay males.

Rick, who has been teaching the longest, tries to explain why homosexuality in his male students is more visible than in his female students:

We’ve had to break some girls up, girl things going on. They’re not as… aggressive about it. And I don’t know if the boys are trying to make a point. Or maybe it seems because girls tend to be more, um, free about touching, going to the bathroom, all that kind of stuff. It just doesn’t seem as obvious. And I think the girls tend to be more discreet. Is that possible? That’s what I find.

As an adult leader in the school’s theatre group, Rick voiced a number of stories regarding homosexual students and issues. He recalls one incident:

Just recently at one of the cast parties they were doing a gay dare thing. These boys kissing. And I suppose it is their way of dealing with their worries, their fears… And I think in a way they’re sort of desensitizing themselves to it. So it’s very hard for high school boys in particular. I think they’re still very unsure of themselves. Not unsure as whether they’re gay or straight, just unsure of who they are, period. So… it takes some time for them to really figure things out.

Rick has seen acceptance for homosexual students grow within the last few years, and attributes this increase in overall student tolerance to an increase in awareness from news and media coverage. He names news coverage over the topic of gay marriage as an example.
Both Rick and Hannah, who work at the same suburban high school, think that a percentage of students still exhibit homophobic attitudes. Hannah finds that about twenty-five percent of her students are not as accepting as the majority, and that this percentage is mostly made up of her male students who feel pressured to prove their heterosexuality. She explains:

I would say that it’s not so much that they’re afraid of being gay, it’s that they have to prove their manliness. You know, in high school they’re coming of age and they’re figuring everything out. I think that some people go so far to show that they’re not gay, that they really kind of step on the kids that are. And it’s not because they’re necessarily opposed to it, they just want to make sure that everybody knows that about them.

Andrew discusses in length one openly homosexual male student of his. The student has been getting picked on in Andrew’s class as well as the school community, and “does things to get attention,” such as the “way he talks in a certain tone,” which gets him “made fun of even more.” When the student was absent one day, Andrew said that he addressed his class and told them “that’s it,” and explained that if he hears of any more incidents regarding the mistreatment of this student then he would write the offender up and send him or her down to the office.

The fact that this harassment was allowed to get to the point where Andrew felt exasperated is daunting. There should be a no tolerance policy mandated for this kind of treatment. Since schools do seem to have these policies already in place, it is up to the teachers themselves to stand more firmly when these instances arise, and to make it
absolutely clear that it will not be tolerated. For example, in Stephanie’s class, the terms “gay” and “fag” are coined “cuss words” and are not allowed in her class. Stephanie successfully transcends the hierarchal ruling of a teacher only saying “no, that’s it,” and leaving it at that. Instead, she levels with her students and explains why she feels that terminology is wrong. When her students asked her why they cannot use the terms in her class, she explained that she has a gay friend and that those terms, to her, are the equivalent of racial slurs. By sharing her own experiences, Stephanie shows her students that people they know, such as their art teacher, are directly affected by hurtful terms.

Even though this direct and honest approach with her students has been successful, Stephanie still expresses discomfort when discussing the use of these terms with students. She explains the complexities of discussing LGBTQ slurs with students:

It turns into a moral issue with my class because it [homosexuality] is wrong. So I don’t know how to battle that. Because I know where they are coming from because that is how I was raised. So it’s looking past I think… even if they don’t agree with it, it’s getting them to look past. And get over the homophobia.

Discussing heterosexism with students is not an easy task. However, just because it is not easy does not mean that it is unwarranted or not needed. Teachers must not just enforce the rules, but must also give a human face and experience to why we, as a collective educational community, feel heterosexism is wrong. By sharing experiences and being honest with students, it is my hope that empathy can be increased in students.

Resource Interest
All four interviewees express an interest in obtaining resources for practicing teachers to utilize in order to make the art classroom more gender and LGBTQ fair. Stephanie proposes the idea of implementing workshops where practicing teachers can meet to discuss these issues and how they are handling them as they arise in their classrooms. Within these workshops she states that “it would be nice to have someone facilitate the discussion, with data, and then have personal reflection time.” Likewise, Rick believes it is critical to have trained individuals within the teaching staff to be able to turn to as resources. He explains that he has utilized the expertise of guidance counselors on several occasions when dealing with sometimes sensitive issues like homosexual students, and that the guidance counselors have helped.

Andrew identifies a lack of preparedness as a first year teacher with how to handle sensitive issues, like homophobia, in the realm of discipline. He expressed an interest in classroom management and discipline tutorials provided to teachers by administrators. He hopes that if teachers knew how to concretely handle tough classroom situations and how they would be backed by administrators, it would cut down on teacher discomfort and may increase discussions over such subject matters.

Hannah thinks that teacher resources are important, but that “we can’t fix their home life.” She explains:

And that [their home life] is going to be the biggest teacher of this kind of stuff unfortunately. And I don’t see there’s any undoing that. And I think if more things were put in place it would be parenting classes, and things like that. And that’s really the way to attack it [sexism and heterosexism]. Because it doesn’t matter
what you do for eight hours a day, the sixteen hours a day that they spend at home is going to have more of a telling. And if that’s the environment they’re raised in and the belief system they’re brought up in, ultimately those are the people they have to answer to for the rest of their lives... And if you’re homosexual and you feel that deep inside of you but your family is against that, you’re going to do everything to fight against it I would imagine.

This statement transfers too much of the blame to the student’s home life. If teachers were to accept this way of thinking, then our whole profession would be futile. As an educational institution, it is our mission to teach our students ways of existing successfully in the world. It is our collective ideal to become a more tolerant, and hopefully even a more accepting, society. If students are not getting this type of education at home, then education within a public school setting that models empathy and understanding for all groups of people is needed that much more.

Emergent Codes Gleaned From Interview Data

In addition to the five constructs discussed in the previous section, alternative codes began to emerge due to in-depth, conversational interviewing processes. The codes are humor, reflection, and background and community.

**Humor**

In regards to discussing sexism, and especially heterosexism, the four interview participants all identified humor as a tool utilized in his or her classroom. Stephanie credits her relaxed rapport with students to being the reason she can many times address the sensitive issues of sexism and heterosexism. This rapport enables her and her students
to joke and laugh about potentially sensitive issues, such as their racial differences. Both Rick and Andrew use humor as a means to diffuse potentially uncomfortable situations. For example, when Rick was having a problem with two boys repeatedly “making out” in the back of the theatre, Rick told them that the school was “not the No-Tell-Motel” and to “knock it off.” Hannah has used humor with art history discussions. When a student asked why Michelangelo’s painted female figures’ breasts looked “ridiculous,” Hannah quipped that he “perhaps did not have personal knowledge of the equipment.” She explained that this comment “fed its way into a discussion about homophobia, and homosexuality and art,” and that it was a “great discussion because they were really interested in the subject matter.”

Jensen (2005) explains that stress has negative impacts on an individual’s brain, and detrimentally affects students and their learning. Humor can be used a way to combat stress. Johnston (1990) states that humor serves a human evolutionary purpose and is vital to survival. The phenomenon of laughter spans time and cultures, and exists as a vehicle for interpersonal communication. Furthermore, humor is credited to aid in “transcending our differences and highlighting our similarities” (Johnston, 1990, p. 257). Weisenberg, Tepper, and Schwarzwald (1995) name humor as a coping mechanism that allows the individual to deal with increased pain or stress. Laughter is said to release endorphins, distract the individual under stress, and serves to lower tension.

When dealing with sensitive issues that may cause the participant discomfort, humor is sometimes utilized as a coping mechanism (Johnston, 1990). Teenage sexuality is a sensitive and often taboo realm for teachers to navigate in the classroom. Rick put it
aptly when he commented that in today’s society, “everybody’s under a microscope,” especially teachers. This discomfort with something so basic as sexuality often causes unease in teachers and students, so humor serves an important psychological and sociological function of easing tension.

While humor serves an important function, it is my concern that it could potentially trivialize the issues of sexism and heterosexism, and could actually be used as a way to maintain heteronormativity. By trivializing something, like homosexuality or women, we take away its weight and power by comparing it to the norm in a way that makes it seem silly. While it is natural to want to laugh at uncomfortable topics, it is my hope that art teachers will take that instance of laughter, use it as a discussion catalyst, and engage students in a discussion that works towards deconstructing why we, as a society, find such issues humorous. This activity would aid students in critically analyzing heteronormativity and its role in culture.

**Reflection**

Personally, I hold the process of self-reflection as critical towards bettering oneself as a teacher. In regards to sexism and heterosexism, the four teacher participants interviewed also expressed the importance of reflection towards developing a more equitable teaching practice.

The female teachers were more explicit about the importance of the self-reflection process. Stephanie remarks that even though she tries to be equitable, “it’s hard because you don’t think about it. It really takes a lot of reflection, to have that fairness I think.” Likewise, Hannah explains that questioning oneself as a teacher is important to increase
how one understands these issues. While reflecting on a recent situation where she 
overheard a comment between students that could have been hurtful, she states:

I’d hate to make a big deal out of it, not knowing what it was and blow the whole 
situation out of proportion. But I don’t feel like I should do nothing. And that’s 
kind of where I fall on all this stuff. It’s just so hard to know what’s welcomed. 
And even if it’s welcomed, it’s still inappropriate because someone else could be 
hurt by it sitting across the room. But then do you hurt that kid more by making a 
huge spectacle out of the thing? And I just don’t feel like I’m socially delicate 
enough to handle everything appropriate all of the time.

Even though Rick and Andrew never explicitly stated that self-reflection is 
important to good teaching, both male participants modeled it during discussion. There 
were many instances of Rick saying one thing, pausing, and then arguing with and 
contradicting himself. I thought that this was a very honest, self-critical method, and I 
have repeatedly witnessed this process in other self-reflective teachers.

As a teacher, especially when dealing with potentially controversial and 
emotionally charged subject matter, it is important to question one’s own beliefs 
(Addison, 2007). Additionally, I feel that it is important to understand the issues of 
sexism and heterosexism from multiple perspectives in order to be more empathetic and 
sensitive to others’ points of view. By questioning oneself and never falling into the 
complacent sense of all-knowingness, art teachers can understand how the issues of 
sexism and heterosexism affect their own understanding, and incorporate these issues into
their curriculum in beneficial ways. Furthermore, teachers can then provide opportunities for their own students to engage in self reflection over these two issues.

**Background and Community**

Another area addressed, whether explicit or implicit, is background and how it informs our sense of community. I am defining background to incorporate the contextual factors that have made us who we are, such as childhood, home life, demographics, and lived experiences. Stephanie discusses community at length and in diverse ways. She compares her background as drastically different to her students’ backgrounds, and during the interview expressed frustration at belonging to, what she views as, a different community than her students. She identifies this difference as being a major impediment to connecting with her students. Even with this obstacle, Stephanie feels that she has successfully established rapport with her students so that they can discuss sensitive issues. She explains how she uses the idea of community to combat homophobia:

>We’ve maybe addressed homophobia less in our topics but it’s more of… a classroom community thing. It’s unacceptable to be racist or to be homophobic in the way that you’re, you know, talking. In our classroom community, that’s not acceptable.

Hannah also comments on the difference between her background to her students’ backgrounds:

>I just don’t want to get into this huge discussion. Partly because I don’t feel that it’s my place to talk about that stuff with them. Um, my background is different from their background. I don’t really want to have to deal with all of their feelings
on it. You know, in my mind I can see these kinds of things spiraling out of control really fast and becoming a huge fight, and a huge deal.

Andrew describes his background as being similar to the community he teaches in. He explains that while he was a student in high school, the term “gay” was used interchangeably with the term “stupid,” so he was not surprised when he encountered the same vernacular as a teacher. Rick explains that he spent much of his childhood in Catholic schools, and that his eventual switch to public schooling in high school was “liberating.” He also grew up in the area he teaches in, and expresses through his body language and mannerisms an ease and sense of surety with his school surroundings.

It is important to analyze and seek to understand how we make sense of the community we serve and the students we teach. By analyzing one’s background, teachers might be able to better understand themselves as persons and professionals in heightened ways, and more fully understand how these social contexts, such as background, informs our teaching (Desai, 2003). By being more self-aware and having experienced ourselves the process of analyzing our own backgrounds, we as art teachers can then assist students in the complex task of deconstructing their own lived experiences in order to better understand ourselves and our community. In order to get students to deconstruct their backgrounds and more fully understand the contributing factors that make up their identity, art teachers could utilize the identity wheel previously discussed (Appendix E).

Implications for Future Research

Apple (2000) claims social movements help to shape education. The definition for equality has shifted depending on the time period, from a focus on consumerism and
unrestricted economic activity, to a definition that aligns the term to the freedom of oppressed peoples (Apple, 2000). Freire (2000) claims that education is not neutral in the sense that education is always working towards a utopia by trying to implement ideals, morals, and principles. Similarly, Carspecken (1996) states that “highly value-driven researchers like we criticalists most often feel compelled to conduct research as a way of bettering the oppressed and downtrodden” (p.6). If these statements are held to be true, then the political climate of today, with its progressive and liberal slant, makes studies concerning equity for all social groups as timely.

It is important to critique the society that we live in, especially ideas that seem normative. Reality is, after all, not natural, but is socially constructed (Apple, 2000). Through the method of critique, we as an individual step out of the passive role of observer and become a full participant in the society we live in (Apple, 2000). It is paramount for educational researchers concerned with equity for all social groups to ask her- or himself the following three questions, which I have paraphrased from Apple (2000):

- What should education do?
- Who should benefit from education?
- How should education be controlled?

I propose that researchers concerned with the issues of sexism and heterosexism keep these three questions in mind. By continually thinking about the larger picture of education, who controls it, and who our audience is (i.e. the children who would benefit from an equitable education which addresses social issues) researchers can keep
perspective. It is important to recognize that educators and researchers are working towards a more rosy future, and the utopia which occupies our mind’s eye is composed of not only our ideals, but the time that we live in. Since sexism, especially heterosexism, is such a current topic, now is an appropriate time to engage in studies which address such a relevant issue of social justice.

How should researchers conduct studies who are concerned with understanding art education’s role in an equitable education? Based on the findings from my survey results and interviews, I feel that qualitative, in-depth ethnographies, conducted with a teacher who is known to be effectively battling sexism and heterosexism, is needed. An appropriate model to follow would be a critical ethnographic study, which takes into account social inequalities and aims to promote change (Carspecken, 1996). Bogdan and Biklen (2007) list five components such a study should possess. I have paraphrased them here:

- The researcher serves as the key instrument by immersing her- or himself in the classroom. Throughout his or her stay, the entire classroom will serve as data, and special attention to context will be noted.
- Careful attention will be paid to every explicit and implicit action. Data will be collected in the form of pictures, sketches, visual artifacts, and words.
- By valuing the roll of process, particular attention will be paid to how things occur in the classroom instead of just focusing on an end product.
- By keeping the research question broad, the researcher allows for
questions and themes to emerge. By going into the classroom without any hypotheses, a more accurate idea of what is taking place can be formed.

- Gathering participants’ perspectives is crucial towards understanding the classroom picture in a more holistic way. Personal stories, motives, reasons, goals, and values will be valued as important data.

Through the method of critical ethnography, the complex social constructs of sexism and heterosexism will be able to be more fully, and holistically, understood.

Based on survey participant’s and interviewee feedback, art teachers would benefit from having resources available to them. Lampela (2005) and Stanley (2007) explain that teachers often feel uncomfortable or unsupported when dealing with potentially controversial issues like homosexuality. Thus, there needs to be more reference materials for adequately dealing with these concerns available to teachers.

One of these resources is the personal knowledge gained from the teacher’s pre-service teacher preparation program. The interview participant who was the most comfortable discussing and handling examples of sexism and heterosexism had a teacher preparation program which discussed these two issues. The two more established interview participants did not have such a preparation and were markedly more uncomfortable with the subject matter. If such discussions are to be successfully incorporated into the art curriculum, pre-service teachers must be shown how to do so.

Utilizing contemporary artists whose work deals with such issues is a good way to start a classroom dialogue. Additionally, such resources as the magazine *Teaching Tolerance*, which is free to anyone who requests it, is available. There is also a website tolerance.org
to accompany the magazine, and provides additional supplemental materials and activities. Two examples found on the site are an Anti-Bullying Quiz that could be included in a discussion over why sexism and heterosexism is harmful (Appendix F), and an informational sheet entitled *Ten Ways Homophobia Affects ‘Straight’ People* (Appendix G). In my own attempt to contribute to this request for practical resources to address these issues, I have included a lesson plan I created entitled *Reclaiming Myself: Exploring a Memory of a Stereotype*. Within this lesson, students can personally identify cases in their own lives where they have experienced the act of stereotyping, and introduces Feminist artists Ghada Amer and Lisa Yuskavage, as well as homosexual artist Felix Gonzalez-Torres (Appendix H).

**Conclusion**

One survey participant wrote: “There is a strong connection between any sort of discrimination, unfair grouping of people, and ill treatment of a person based solely on a pre-judged characteristic. The connection is that it is sickeningly wrong.” It was found through survey and interview data that even if Ohio secondary art teachers measure relatively low on the issues of sexism and heterosexism personally, they still may be reluctant to discuss issues based on their lack of preparedness, their perceived students’ lack of preparedness, and lack of resources. This study suggested what changes need to occur, as well as provided ways to overcome the factors that hold art teachers back from discussing sexism and heterosexism, and thus maintaining an equitable classroom and educational community.

*The completion of this thesis provides an appropriate opportunity for me, the researcher, to reflect. Through this research my own understandings, thoughts, and*
feelings regarding sexism and heterosexism have been challenged and considered. These two issues have also provided me with a number of sleepless nights and the consumption of endless cups of coffee.

Many times during this research process these issues, especially heterosexism, have just seemed too big to tackle. While it is comforting to find that many Ohio art teachers surveyed and interviewed did not feel that they personally harbored sexist or heterosexist feelings, it is sad to see that many are still not making these feelings known to their students. I absolutely believe that this reluctant attitude to discuss heterosexism is helping to keep heteronormativity in place. I cannot help but wonder that if I struggle with said issues, with all of my invested interest and research, then how can an art teacher, who may feel overwhelmed anyway, hope to adequately address sexism and heterosexism?

The research is there. The resources are there. The collective educational community, with our implementation of zero-tolerance policies for terms like ‘gay’ and ‘fag,’ clearly expresses that homophobia should not belong in schools. The oppression of any group of individuals has no place in an equitable society. I feel that in our society there are so few ‘truths’ out there, yet I still believe that the golden rule is applicable. Thus, art teachers must gauge their community in order to discover how far the boundaries of intolerance can be challenged, and then use their creativity and position within education to fight the good fight, no matter how controversial or daunting the mission may seem (Personal reflection, July, 2009).
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Interviewee Consent Form

AUDIO TAPE CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHER PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWEES

I agree to be audio taped
at_____location to be determined by interviewee and interviewer jointly_____

on____dates to be determined by interviewee and interviewer jointly________

_____________________________________________ ______________________
Signature      Date

I have been told that I have the right to hear the audio tapes before they are used.
I have decided that I:

_____want to hear the tapes _____do not want hear the tapes

Sign now below if you do not want to hear the tapes. If you want to hear the tapes, you will be asked
to sign after hearing them.

Allison Avery and other researchers approved by Kent State University may / may not use the tapes
made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

_____this research project _____teacher education _____presentation at professional meetings

_____________________________________________ ______________________
Signature                          Date

Address:
March 19, 2009

Dear Art Educator,

I am a researcher at Kent State University seeking to more fully understand art teachers’ attitudes regarding sexism and homophobia, and how these two concepts affect teaching. Your high school was randomly selected from the Ohio Educational Directory (2005) provided by Kent State University’s library. After randomly selecting from this list, I then went onto your school’s website to find your name and email address. At the conclusion of this email you will find a link to an online survey that I would like you to complete and submit by April 17, 2009. The survey should only take about 10 minutes to complete.

The survey link you are receiving has been emailed to a sample of Secondary, Ohio art teachers. Your voluntary participation in this study is extremely valuable and appreciated. All information gathered will be confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form. Information collected through these surveys will be used to help me complete my thesis addressing the research question How do art teachers address issues of sexism and homophobia in their written and hidden curriculums?

All surveys are identical, and there will be no follow-up to obtain further information from you. By submitting the online survey, you are indicating your willingness to participate in this research project. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Kent State University Institutional Review Board at (330) 672-2704. Additionally, if you have any questions about this research project you may contact me at (440) 655-1068 or my advisor, Linda Hoeptner-Poling, at (330) 672-7895.

Thank you for your help and your time.

Sincerely,

Allison Avery
Graduate Student, Art Education
School of Art
Kent State University
Box 5190
Kent, OH 44242
aavery@kent.edu
(440) 655 – 1068
Appendix C
Survey Hardcopy

Sexism and Homophobia in the Art Classroom

Your voluntary participation in this study is extremely valuable and appreciated. All information gathered will be confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form.

For questions 1 - 10:
Please indicate your choice by marking the circle your answer appears in.

1)  
1 Agree Strongly  2 Agree  3 Uncertain  4 Disagree  5 Disagree Strongly
It is important for my students to learn about women artists.
Women artists can serve as positive role models for the students I teach.
A discussion about sexism fits in the art classroom.

2)  
1 Agree Strongly  2 Agree  3 Uncertain  4 Disagree  5 Disagree Strongly
A discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working within the last 20 years.
A discussion about sexism is important to understand women artists working prior to the year 1990.

3)  
1 Agree Strongly  2 Agree  3 Uncertain  4 Disagree  5 Disagree Strongly
I feel that my teacher education programs prepared me for discussing sexism in the classroom.
I feel that my teacher education programs prepared me for properly handling instances of sexism in the classroom and school.
community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>I feel that my students understand and can identify examples of sexism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that my students are prepared to handle examples of sexism in a sensitive way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>It is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their classroom more gender fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is important for my students to learn about lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) artists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBTQ artists can serve as positive role models for the students I teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A discussion about homophobia fits in the art classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>A discussion about the sexual orientation of artists is important to understand their art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If information about LGBTQ artists were made available to me I would use the information in my classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel that my teacher education programs prepared me for discussing homophobia in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I feel that my teacher education programs prepared me for properly handling instances of homophobia in the classroom and school community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9) I feel that my students are prepared to handle examples of homophobia in a sensitive way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is important for schools to make resources available for teachers to utilize in order to make their classroom more LGBTQ fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10) I am fearful I will lose my job if I mention to students in my classroom that particular artists are either lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Agree Strongly</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For questions 11 - 15:
Please indicate how you would complete this sentence using the drop down menu.

11) I would feel ____________ mentioning to my students that an artist is gay.

- Comfortable
- Uncomfortable
- Neutral
- Uncertain

12) I would feel ____________ mentioning to my students that an artist is lesbian.

- Comfortable
- Uncomfortable
- Neutral
- Uncertain
13) I would feel ____________ mentioning to my students that an artist is bisexual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14) I would feel ____________ mentioning to my students that an artist is transgender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15) I would feel ____________ mentioning to my students that an artist is self-identified as queer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16) Do you believe that there is a connection between sexism and homophobia? Please explain in the space provided.

Background Information

Please indicate your choice by marking the circle your answer appears in.

17) What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18) Please indicate:

Female
Male

19a) Are you presently employed as an art teacher?

Yes
No

19b) If YES, how many years have you been employed as an art teacher?

1-5
6-10
11-20
21-30
Over 30

19c) If YES, which region best describes where you teach (may not coincide with OAEA’s Divisions and Regions:

North East
North West
Central
South East
South West

20) In the space provided, please indicate your sexual orientation.
## Appendix D

### Table of Survey Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learn women artists</th>
<th>Women artists as role models</th>
<th>Current women artists</th>
<th>Past women artists</th>
<th>Discussion about sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learn women artists</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women artists as role models</strong></td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current women artists</strong></td>
<td>.470**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past women artists</strong></td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.816**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion about sexism</strong></td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexism resources</strong></td>
<td>.306*</td>
<td>.291*</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.403**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher prep sexism discussion</strong></td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher prep sexism instances</strong></td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students identify sexism</strong></td>
<td>.324*</td>
<td>.312*</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.488**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students handle sexism</strong></td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.371**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learn LGBTQ artists</strong></td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ as role models</strong></td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.347*</td>
<td>.376**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual orientation of artists</strong></td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.348*</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>.369**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ artist resources</strong></td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.327*</td>
<td>.525**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion about heterosexism</strong></td>
<td>.460**</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.528*</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.565**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterosexism resources</strong></td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.509**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher prep heterosexism discussions</strong></td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher prep heterosexism instances</strong></td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students handle heterosexism</strong></td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job fear discussing heterosexism</strong></td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn women artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women artists as role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current women artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past women artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep sexism discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep sexism instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students identify sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students handle sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn LGBTQ artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ as role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation of artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ artist resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about heterosexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexism resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep heterosexism discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep heterosexism instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students handle heterosexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job fear discussing heterosexism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01
# Survey Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learn LGBTQ artists</th>
<th>LGBTQ as role models</th>
<th>Sexual orientation of artists</th>
<th>LGBTQ artist resources</th>
<th>Discussion about heterosexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn women artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women artists as role models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current women artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past women artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students identify sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students handle sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn LGBTQ artists</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ as role models</td>
<td>.773**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ artist resources</td>
<td>.633**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.700**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.708**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexism resources</td>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>.667**</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>.604**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexism</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students handle</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heterosexism resources</th>
<th>Teacher prep heterosexism discussions</th>
<th>Teacher prep heterosexism instances</th>
<th>Students handle heterosexism</th>
<th>Job fear discussing heterosexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn women artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women artists as role models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current women artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past women artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep sexism discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep sexism instances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students identify sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students handle sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn LGBTQ artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ as role models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation of artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ artist resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about heterosexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexism resources</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep heterosexism discussions</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher prep heterosexism instances</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.781**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students handle heterosexism</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.339*</td>
<td>.303*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job fear discussing heterosexism</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.311*</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01
Appendix E
Identity Mapping Wheel

MAPPING MY IDENTITY

Religious
Gender
Geography
Family
Health
Age
Economic
Political
Recreational
Aesthetic
Ethnic
Occupational
Appendix F
Teaching Tolerance’s Anti-Bullying Quiz

Handout 1: Anti-Bullying Quiz

BULLYING QUIZ ADAPTED FROM WWW.SAFELYOUTH.ORG

(Answer True or False)

1. Nearly one-third of American teens are involved in bullying.
   (True) (False)

2. Less than 10% of American teens admit to bullying others.
   (True) (False)

3. Students who are bullied in school are usually attentive students with good attendance.
   (True) (False)

4. Most students who bully are insecure.
   (True) (False)

5. Contrary to stereotypes, male bullies are not usually bigger and physically stronger than their peers
   (True) (False)

6. Students who witness bullying often refuse to remain friends with the victim and feel guilty for not reporting the incident.
   (True) (False)

7. Bullies have trouble making friends.
   (True) (False)

8. Bullies do poorly in school compared to others who do not bully.
   (True) (False)

9. Most bullies discontinue violent or aggressive behavior in adulthood.
   (True) (False)

10. If you are being bullied it’s best to handle it alone.
    (True) (False)
Answer Key to Handout I: Anti-Bullying Quiz

Bullying Quiz adapted from www.safeyouth.org

Key:

1. True: In a recent survey, 13% admit to bullying, 11% admit to being bullied, and 6% have been bullied and also bully others.

2. False: See above

3. False: Students targeted by bullies sometimes avoid school or have trouble concentrating. They can also develop personality disorders like depression and anxiety.

4. False: Studies show that most bullies have confidence and high self-esteem.

5. False: Male bullies are usually bigger and stronger than their victims.

6. True: Witnessing an act of bullying has negative consequences even if you are not directly involved.

7. False: Bullies seem to make friends easily, particularly with other students who are aggressive and may join them in bullying.

8. True: The problem behaviors associated with bullying include impulsiveness, disliking school and getting in trouble often.

9. False: 60% of bullies have at least one criminal conviction because the behavior carries over into adulthood.

10. False: Putting an end to bullying requires a commitment from everyone in a school, including teachers, custodians, students, administrators, cafeteria workers and crossing guards. You should seek adult intervention and try to stay among friends if you are being bullied.
Appendix G
Teaching Tolerance’s Ten Ways Homophobia Affects ‘Straight’ People

A guide to help straight students think about the cost of homophobia in their own lives.

1. Homophobia forces us to act "macho" if we are a man or "feminine" if we are a woman. This limits our individuality and self-expression.

2. Homophobia puts pressure on straight people to act aggressively and angrily towards LGBTQ people.

3. Homophobia makes it hard to be close friends with someone of the same sex.

4. Homophobia often strains family and community relationships.

5. Homophobia causes youth to become sexually active before they are ready in order to prove they are "normal." This can lead to an increase in unwanted pregnancies and STDs.

6. Homophobia prevents vital information on sex and sexuality to be taught in schools. Without this information, youth are putting themselves at a greater risk for HIV and other STDs.

7. Homophobia can be used to hurt a straight person if they "appear to be gay."

8. Homophobia makes it hard for straight people and LGBTQ people to be friends.

9. Homophobia along with racism, sexism, classism, etc. makes it hard to put an end to AIDS.

10. Homophobia makes it hard to appreciate true diversity and the unique traits that are not mainstream or "normal."


(http://www.tolerance.org/teach/activities/activity.jsp?ar=1020)
Appendix H
Lesson Plan Reclaiming Myself: Exploring a Memory of a Stereotype

**Note:** This lesson is one that I have designed and implemented, and provided as a guide for secondary art teachers. It was conducted with junior and senior students. Prerequisites for this lesson include knowledge about facial proportion, color theory, and application of paint and painting styles.

**Title of Lesson:** Reclaiming Myself: Exploring a Memory of a Stereotype  
**Grade level:** High School Art  
**Time of Class & Number of Days:** 50 minutes; 6 days

**Description of Learners & Appropriateness:** According to Rosenberg and Thurber (2007), “socialization is the lifelong process by which society defines what is expected of us as individuals.” Since socialization is a method that may not be addressed or explored within the context of the classroom yet affects the child’s development, such processes are important to explore. One of these important socialization processes is how we as individuals categorize those around us. This categorization can result in stereotypes and biases. Rosenberg and Thurber argue the value for this analysis, explaining that classroom populations are composed of diverse individuals that need to be given an equitable, safe learning environment (2007). Furthermore, the reinforcement of “tightly defined categorizations and labels,” and the refusal to address issues of stereotyping and bias “can diminish both the art and the learning experience for students” (Rosenberg and Thurber, 2007).

**Objectives**

**Aesthetics: Grade 12: 4.C.3**  
By completing worksheets and participating in a class debate, students will construct a defense for either Ghada Amer’s *Barbie Loves Ken, Ken Loves Barbie* (1995/2002) or Felix Gonzalez-Torres’ *Untitled (Perfect Lovers)* 1991 as being a meritable work of art.

**Art History: Grade 12: 1.D.4**  
By analyzing Lisa Yuskavage’s *Wrist Corsage* (1996), students will learn how artists internalize and comment upon cultural values, attitudes, and biases.

**Critical Inquiry: Grade 12: 3.C.2**  
By analyzing Felix Gonzalez-Torres’ *Untitled (Perfect Lovers)* 1991 and participating in a teacher-led discussion, students will learn how context and framing of objects in a gallery affect interpretations.

**Studio-Media: Grade 11: 2.A.1**  
By viewing artistic examples and my demo, students will learn about rendering and how to apply paint in an expressive way, either impasto, a smoother style, or utilize an underpainting, that shows an exaggerated, personal stereotype.

**Studio-Elements/Principles of Design: Grade 12: 2.A.1**  
By viewing my demo and drawing from models, students will learn correct facial proportions and how to depict the planes of the face two-dimensionally.
**Connections: Grade 12. 5.B.3**
By completing a worksheet, students will explore a memory where they were stereotyped and represent it in a finished painting.

**Studio – Conceptual: Grade 11.2.B.2**
By transferring their written memory of being stereotyped into a visual format through their sketches and later into a painting, students will learn how to reclaim a hurtful stereotype and explore biases in a safe way.

**Day One**

**Materials Needed**
- 5 large pieces of paper spread out and tacked to walls of room
- A marker for each student
- Worksheet *Memory of Experiencing a Bias* with questions
- Pencils for students
- 6”x6” laminated visuals of Lisa Yuskavage’s *Wrist Corsage* (1996)
- A dry erase marker for each student

**Objectives**

**Art History: Grade 12: 1.D.4**
By analyzing Lisa Yuskavage’s *Wrist Corsage* (1996), students will learn how artists internalize and comment upon cultural values, attitudes, and biases.

**Connections: Grade 12. 5.B.3**
By completing a worksheet, students will explore a memory where they were stereotyped and represent it in a finished painting.

**Procedures**
- **Intro/Motivation.** (20 minutes total)
  - *Stereotypes Activity*
  - Categories are a natural way of organizing our thoughts, but they can lead to assumptions about groups of people that we perhaps don’t even know.
  - Whole-class brainstorm on board: Categories in school (geeks, jocks, emo-type).
  - Choose 5 that class agrees represent the school’s student population. Write a category on each large piece of paper tacked around room.
  - 8 minutes. Instruct students to grab a marker and write adjectives for each category.
  - 8 minutes. Regroup. *What assumptions did we arrive at? Do these assumptions apply to every individual in that group? Do you all hold the same assumptions about these groups, or why do each of your assumptions differ? (personal experiences/belonging to the groups) How do these assumptions affect yours or others behaviors towards these groups?*
  - Define *stereotype* as a class (assumptions about a group of people).
  - Define *bias* (judging others based on these assumptions and stereotypes).
- **Brainstorming for studio.** (10 minutes)
  - *Memory of Experiencing a Bias*
Pass out worksheet and pencils. Write silently – a personal experience you had where someone unfairly judged you based on age, ethnicity, gender, attire, how much money your family has, how you speak, etc. Consider while you are exploring your memory (on worksheet): How did you know you were being judged? What were the words/actions the other exhibited? Why do you think they were judging you? How did this make you feel?

◊ **Art History.** (15 minutes)

Pass out small, laminated visuals of Lisa Yuskavage’s *Wrist Corsage* (1996). After mining your own personal experience, I want you to take a look at this image. What “category” does the figures belong to? What assumptions can you draw? What do you think the girl in the photo’s stereotypes and biases she has to face are? What about the nude? Why do you think the artist emphasized this particular aspect of the nude’s body?

Share responses to the image.

Work into discussion during student’s responses – Lisa Yuskavage works with ideas of the female body and the role that it plays in today’s culture. She analyzes the **male gaze** (A term derived from feminist film theory, which asserts that men are able to exercise control over women by representing them [through the camera lens] as passive sexual objects of male desire. Also represented throughout the history of art.) and ideas of internalized and cultural **misogyny** (hatred or strong prejudice against women). By creating female forms with exaggerated attributes that are characteristic of desire, such as enlarged breasts and buttocks, the artist asks the viewer to reconsider the female nude’s role in art history and popular culture (Summers, 2007). These paintings that she does have received much criticism for continuing to depict women as objects of the gaze, but are also so beautifully rendered so do not appear vulgar (Harris, 2002).

◊ **Show model** (4 minutes)

We are going to work with all of these ideas in the creation of our next piece. Like Yuskavage, we are going to mine our story of being stereotyped and complete a self-portrait in a way that exaggerates the reason we were being stereotyped, yet reclaims the experience and sheds a positive light on the previous negative memory. I did this in my model. For my memory of being stereotyped, I reflected on a recent experience I had with my boyfriend while we were shopping at a Flea Market. I found this charming little carousel that did not work, and the man who was there to sell it saw me handing it, so came up to Kevin and I. Even though I was the one interested in it and was asking the questions, he still directed all of his response to Kevin, treating me as if I could not comprehend the intricate workings of this motorized carousel and could not fix it myself. This made me mad and frustrated that just because I am a woman he did not see me being as intelligent as my boyfriend. I created this self-portrait thinking about how that man viewed me – as a young, unintelligent girl who is intimidated and surprised at the intricate workings of motorized objects. I exaggerated the proportion of my eyes to better convey this feeling of wide-eyed innocence and exasperation. I also exaggerated my pose, recreating myself as a heroine in peril
in order to be a little humorous and take away some of the hurtfulness of being stereotyped.

◊ **Closure** (1 minute)
Take some time tonight and work on your *Memory of Experiencing a Bias*. If you’re uncomfortable with the one you wrote today, then think of one that you wouldn’t mind working with and rewrite your experience, thinking about the questions on the worksheet. Also begin to consider how you will show this stereotype in a self-portrait. We will explore this issue more tomorrow. I will be collecting your worksheets after you walk in the door, so complete them!!!

**Assessment and Assessment Procedures**

**Art History: Grade 12: 1.D.4**
I will be able to tell if a student understands how an artist can comment upon culture values, attitudes, and biases, if they write their observations on the Yuskavage visual and contribute at least once during class discussion.

**Connections: Grade 12. 5.B.3**
I will be able to tell if a student understands the meaning and effects of stereotyping and biases if they complete the worksheet provided and then transfer those ideas into their finished painting.

**Day Two**

**Materials Needed**
◊ Student’s completed worksheet *Memory of Experiencing a Bias*
◊ Ghada Amer’s *Barbie Loves Ken, Ken Loves Barbie* (1995/2002); posted
◊ Student’s sketchbooks to practice proportion
◊ Pencils
◊ Proportion Handout
◊ Timer to split up studio time

**Objectives**

**Studio-Elements/Principles of Design: Grade 12: 2.A.1**
By viewing my demo, referring to a handout, and drawing from models, students will learn correct facial proportions and how to depict the planes of the face two-dimensionally in a straight-on view, profile, and three-quarter view.

**Procedures**
◊ **Intro/Motivation.** (2 minutes)
Collect worksheets while students enter classroom. Today we are going to look at another artist who explores memory and stereotypes, and then practice correct facial proportion. This is so important to the success of your finished paintings, so these activities are not just time fillers artists!!! To stress the importance of these activities, I will collect your sketchbooks and give you points for sketching today – easy points, people.

◊ **Art History** (10 minutes)
Conduct class discussion over the work. *Like/dislike – why? Art/not art – why?* Work into discussion – Amer’s background of conflicting cultures (East vs. West), and the effect this has on her work. Amer was born in Cairo, Egypt, educated in Nice, France, and is working currently in New York City (Hutton, 2008). *(Discuss Islamic background, controversy according to religion, if subject is brought up.)* The material she chooses, thread, requires a great amount of care and time to be used as an expressive medium (Hutton, 2008). Within the tradition of art history, the use of this feminine material is meant to undermine the macho history of modernist painting, the other aesthetic that she utilizes through her brushstrokes and drips (Knoble, 2002). The long strands of embroidery threads make the text hard to read, which forces the viewer to actively seek out the text and contemplate the possible meaning (Finkelstein, 2007). She is questioning Western archetypes of Barbie and Ken. *Is she successful? What do you think of the medium she is using – is this appropriate for “fine art?”*

◊ **Demo** (7 minutes)
Alrighty, moving on. I am going to give a demo on proportion, pass out these handouts, and then we are going to take turns drawing each other’s portraits in order to practice correct facial proportion. During the time you are working I will come around and see how you’re doing. Also remember that I am collecting your sketchbooks so do your best! *Do demo large scale on board (guidelines of worksheet) on board, talking through my thinking processes as I sketch so students will receive better understanding.*

◊ **Studio** (30 minutes)
Pair up with someone near you and practice drawing each other’s portrait. The first artist will have 15 minutes, as will the second. Work on creating 3 sketches total, practicing profile, straight on, and three-quarter views. Refer back to your handout throughout your sketching to ensure success. Have fun, and don’t get too chatty!

◊ **Cleanup/Closure** (1 minute)
Please drop your sketchbooks off with me before you leave. I’ll finish reading your worksheets and I will stick them in your sketchbooks to return to you tomorrow. We’ll start on our paintings tomorrow.

**Assessment and Assessment Procedures**

*Studio-Elements/Principles of Design: Grade 12: 2.A.1*
I will be able to tell if a student is successful if they complete three sketches that show the correct proportions of the face in a straight-on view, profile, and three-quarter view, and then use one of these angles correctly in their own self-portrait.

**Day Three**

**Materials Needed**
- Pencils for sketching
- Mirrors for each student
- Student’s sketchbooks and worksheets to pass back; with my notes on the
Objectives
Studio – Conceptual: Grade 11.2.B.2
By transferring their written memory of bias into a visual format through their sketches and later into a painting, students will learn how to reclaim a hurtful stereotype in a safe way by exaggerating a characteristic in their self-portrait.

Procedures
◊ Intro/Motivation. (8 minutes)
   I was very impressed with your work yesterday. I want to show a few examples of the portraiture sketches, if that’s OK? *Hold up examples of a few students’ work. Try to do this throughout school year, using different students throughout.* Pass back sketchbooks with worksheets inside.

◊ Studio, part 1 (16 minutes)
   For the first part of today I want you to work on translating your written experience from your worksheet into the visual format. After two days, you should have some ideas already! As you will see, I made some notes and suggestions on the backs of your worksheets as well. I will come around and try to talk to all of you as you work through your ideas in your sketchbooks.

◊ Demo (8 minutes)
   Now we will break for the second half of class and you can transfer your small sketch to your painting surface. I will demo that really quick. *Demo taking a small sketch and quickly transferring it to a larger surface. Discuss composition, and looking at all elements at the same time to ensure proper proportion, instead of just focusing on one part. Sketch lightly, explaining the importance of capturing the large shapes of the composition and not focusing on the details, since they will get painted over.*

◊ Studio, part 2 (16 minutes)
   Alrighty, get to work. You should be sketching on your painting surface now. Make sure to talk to every student about their composition and what attribute they are going to emphasize.

◊ Closure/clean up (2 minutes)
   Before you come in tomorrow you MUST be ready to paint. As always, points will be docked if you’re not ready to put paint on your surface, i.e. get these sketches done by tomorrow.

Assessment and Assessment Procedures
Studio – Conceptual: Grade 11.2.B.2
I will be able to tell if a student understands the idea of reclaiming a hurtful experience if the student is able to verbalize their story and indicate how they represented their exaggerated stereotype in their self-portrait during studio time.

Day Four

Materials Needed
Objectives

*Studio-Media: Grade 11: 2.A.1*

By viewing artistic examples and my demo, students will learn about rendering and how to apply paint in an expressive way, either impasto, a smoother style, or utilize an underpainting, that shows an exaggerated, personal stereotype.

Procedures

- **Intro/Motivation.** (2 minutes)
  The next two days are going to be dedicated to studio, and then on the last day we are going to conclude our lesson with an activity. For the activity I want you to start thinking about what characteristics an object has to possess in order for it to be claimed as art.

- **Demo** (10 minutes)
  I want to give a painting demo now, so please gather around the front so that you all can see. As you can see in my model, I really tried to emphasize this exaggerated stereotype of mine in a way to draw more attention to it, but also to render it in a way that it is aesthetically pleasing to look at. I’m going to show you a few painting techniques to help you. **Demo impasto, building up the form with large strokes of paint. Reference Jenny Saville’s portraits (pass around.)**
  **Demo how to achieve a smoother surface, referencing Yuskavage’s Wrist Corsage and other portraits.** Every painter has their own way to paint – I’m just showing you two. But like I said, every artist has a different aesthetic and it’s up to you to find a method that best expresses your vision. If you’re trying to emphasize a rough, scraggly beard perhaps impasto would be your best method, and if you’re trying to call attention to the underside of an elongated neck, then maybe you want to work with a smoother style. Whatever style you choose, make sure you can justify it to me as I go around and discuss with you your works.
  I also want to show you the way that I personally paint – by utilizing an **underpainting.** I think that this method achieves depth and creates a really meaty painting that have a lot of weight to them! Plus, skin tones are not just brown or peach shades, there are a lot of colors within them. I like to lay down reds and
purples first, then brush over them with a color that’s more suited to the individual’s obvious skin tone, with the underpainting still peeking through (indicate towards images of my model in process, and demo while talking – laying down a sketch, then the underpainting of violets and reds, and last the final layer).

◊ **Studio** (33 minutes)
   OK, time to get to work. I will be around to give you points for having your painting surfaces ready to paint today. Gather your supplies and get to work. *Walk around and check off sketches. Discuss painting meanings with students and answer questions.*

◊ **Closure/Cleanup** (5 minutes)
   These are looking nice. One person from each table gather the paintings and set them on the drying racks; one gather the brushes and water cups and clean them; and the other go ahead and tidy up the table by throwing away the paper towels and wiping down your tables. Tomorrow we will finish these up! Remember to start thinking about what characteristics an object has to possess in order for you to deem it art.

**Assessment and Assessment Procedures**

**Studio-Media: Grade 11: 2.A.1**
I will be able to tell if a student is successful if they utilize one of the painting styles discussed, can verbalize what style they chose, and can give a reason why the style best shows their exaggerated, personal stereotype.

**Day Five**

**Materials Needed**

◊ Acrylic paints (A large variety of colors)
◊ Brushes (A large variety of sizes; 3-4 for each student)
◊ Water cups (One per student)
◊ Paper Towels
◊ Pencils for sketching
◊ Canvas pad for each student
◊ Mirrors for each student
◊ Students’ Sketches from the day before
◊ Materials table (with painting materials spread out upon for easy and quick choosing)

**Objectives**

**Studio-Media: Grade 11: 2.A.1 (cont.)**
By viewing artistic examples and my demo, students will learn about rendering and how to apply paint in an expressive way, either impasto, a smoother style, or utilize an underpainting, that shows an exaggerated, personal stereotype.

**Procedures**

◊ **Intro/Motivation**. (5 minutes)
Today is our last day of painting. I want you all to take a quick lap around the room and take a look at what your peers are doing so far. Take only five minutes, please, and then get back to work.

◊ **Demo**

*To be done individually if a student is having difficulties with one of the techniques of painting.*

◊ **Studio (40 minutes)**

*Students work for majority of period.*

◊ **Cleanup/Closure (5 minutes)**

One person from each table gather the paintings and set them on the drying racks; one gather the brushes and water cups and clean them; and the other go ahead and tidy up the table by throwing away the paper towels and wiping down your tables. Take a few minutes tonight to jot down what you consider art to be and why. *For example, can a coffee pot or a discarded water bottle be a work of art? What needs to happen for it to be considered a work of art? Is it even possible?* We’ll start off tomorrow with a whole-class critique of our paintings, so check with me if you have to check out painting materials in order to take them home to keep on working.

**Assessment and Assessment Procedures**

*Studio-Media: Grade 11: 2.A.1*

I will be able to tell if a student is successful if they utilize one of the painting styles discussed, can verbalize what style they chose, and can give a reason why the style best shows their exaggerated, personal stereotype.

**Day Six**

**Materials Needed**

◊ Finished Paintings (brought in by students)

◊ Felix Gonzalez-Torres, *Untitled (Perfect Lovers)* 1991

◊ *Clocks Vs. Footie Pajamas* Worksheets (Enough for half the class to get either Amer’s or Gonzalz-Torres’ worksheet)

**Objectives**

*Aesthetics: Grade 12: 4.C.3*

By completing worksheets and participating in a class debate, students will construct a defense for either Ghada Amer’s *Barbie Loves Ken, Ken Loves Barbie* (1995/2002) or Felix Gonzalez-Torres’ *Untitled (Perfect Lovers)* 1991 as being a meritable work of art.

*Critical Inquiry: Grade 12: 3.C.2*

By analyzing Felix Gonzalez-Torres’ *Untitled (Perfect Lovers)* 1991 and participating in a teacher-led discussion, students will learn how context and framing of objects in a gallery affect interpretations.

**Procedures**

◊ **Intro/Motivation/Critique.** (15 minutes)

  Please display your paintings at the front and let’s gather around to discuss our
ideas and methods. Try to get everyone to talk at least once. Ask – what was the stereotype that you faced? How did you reclaim this stereotype and render it in a more positive light? What painting style did you work with, impasto or smooth? Did your work change at all from when you did the worksheet the first day until today? What problems did you have, and how did you solve them?

◊ Critical Inquiry/Art History (15 minute)
8 minutes. While you all are still up here, I want to discuss this piece. Who thinks this is art? Who doesn’t? (by show of hands). This is Felix Gonzalz-Torres’ Untitled (Perfect Lovers) 1991. Knowing that someone named this, who now thinks it is a work of art? Why did your ideas change? What if it was in a museum, would it be more of a work of art then if it was displayed in an office like this? Why? Who decides what is art? (museum, you, the artist, art historians, art critics, society, politicians).

7 minutes. That was a great conversation. I hope your brainstorming last night and this discussion helped you define what you think art is, and why. Before we split into groups and participate in our activity today, I want to give some background information on this piece real quick. Untitled (Perfect Lovers), 1991, is a good summation of perhaps Gonzalez-Torres’ most haunting artistic statements. The two synchronized, “same-sex” clocks tic away, passing time until inevitably one of them stops before its partner. This simple, conceptual statement prompts the viewer to consider the darker aspects of relationships, such as loss and grief (Mosquera, 1996). Ho (2001) states that though not particularly obvious at first glance, Gonzalez-Torres’ works are directed towards one that is usually not addressed in the art world – a gay audience. In his pieces he blends the personal with the political, claiming that “to be political is to be alive” (Hooks, 1995). In his works Gonzalez-Torres elegantly draws beauty from the every day mundane, showing his viewer that beauty is present throughout his or her daily experiences (Hooks, 1995). This beauty is offered forth despite boundaries, male or female, gay or straight, communicating that everyone deserves the right to be touched by beauty, art, and their own, unique experiences (Hooks, 1995).

◊ Debate/Closure (20 minutes)
Pass out worksheets. Indicate that we are going to debate which object is more of a work of art - Ghada Amer’s Barbie Loves Ken, Ken Loves Barbie (1995/2002) or Felix Gonzalez-Torres’ Untitled (Perfect Lovers) 1991. 5 minutes. Split class in half, students fill out worksheet. 15 minutes. Class engages in debate over which object is more of a work of art then the other.

Assessment and Assessment Procedures
Aesthetics: Grade 12: 4.C.3
I will be able to tell if a student has considered what characteristics an object has to possess to be deemed a meritable work of art if they can complete the worksheet and participate at least once in the class debate.

Critical Inquiry: Grade 12: 3.C.2
I will be able to tell if a student understands the social factors, framing, and contexts that affect the interpretations of objects as art if they can participate in the class discussion about Felix Gonzalz-Torres’ *Untitled (Perfect Lovers)* 1991 twice.
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