

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Gender Curriculum and California Community College Students: A Study of How Non-Elective Gender Curriculum Impacts Community College Students

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/95h7p3t5>

Author

Smith, Jennifer Anne

Publication Date

2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Gender Curriculum and California Community College Students:

A Study of How Non-Elective Gender Curriculum Impacts Community College Students

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Jennifer Anne Smith

2018

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Gender Curriculum and California Community College Students:

A Study of How Non-Elective Gender Curriculum Impacts Community College Students

by

Jennifer Anne Smith

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2018

Professor Mark Kevin Eagan, Chair

There is a need to focus on adding more gender studies into mainstream coursework for many reasons. Schools in the United States, unlike some other leading global powers, are not doing enough to combat gender stereotyping, sexism, and gender disparity. Incorporating gender studies into required coursework could potentially do much to combat the sexism and gender disparity inherent in the current American educational system as well as in the American workforce and American politics. Additionally, gender studies within mainstream or required coursework might have the potential to increase student success, engagement, and activism on campus. To date, the bulk of studies about the impact of feminism and or gender studies instruction have been conducted with students who have elected into Women and Gender Studies

(WGS) or feminism courses, not students who encounter gender components as part of their standard curriculum. This study adds some understanding of this under researched area.

Accordingly, this mixed methods study sought to measure the impact of non-elective gender studies components in required classes for community college students to understand if exposure to such coursework results in changed perceptions about gender related concepts, including feminism, sexism, and gender roles and norms. The study consisted of a survey of several hundred students and document analysis of student reflections. The findings of this study were that students seemed as likely to change or not change their attitudes in a class that included a gender component as in a class that did not include a gender component. A point of interest however is the students in the gender component courses regularly had higher Pre-and Post-scale scores than students in the non-gender component courses, even though the rate of change was consistent between groups. Why this is the case is as yet undetermined, though it might be, in part, a self-selection effect or due to imperfections of this study.

The dissertation of Jennifer Anne Smith is approved.

Kathryn M. Anderson

Linda J. Sax

Juliet A. Williams

Mark Kevin Eagan, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2018

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
VITA	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
Definition of Terms	2
Problem Background	3
Statement of the Problem	5
Problem Significance	6
Existing Interventions	8
Diversity and Multiculturalism Inclusion Requirements	8
Gender instruction.....	8
Study Design	9
Researcher Assumptions	10
Research Questions (RQs)	10
Hypotheses	11
Overview of Approach	12
Statement of Purpose	14
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Current State in America of Prejudice and Discrimination	16
The Persistence of Sexism – a Feminist Understanding of the Power and Role of Education	21
Higher Education’s Responsibility to Promote Change	26
The Particular Role of Community Colleges in Serving Diversity	28
Why Gender Coursework?	29
Gender Coursework and Students’ Attitudes Toward and Perceptions of Sexism/Gender Discrimination, Feminism, and Gender Roles and Norms	33
Current Research on Mainstreaming WGS.....	34
Factors that Impact Student Receptiveness to Instruction	35
Campus Environmental Factors that Impact Receptiveness	36
Course & Classroom Factors that Impact Receptiveness	37
Faculty Factors that Impact Receptiveness	38
Student Factors that Impact Receptiveness.....	39
And, Of Course, There Is Post-Feminism.....	41
Conclusion	43
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS	45
Research Design and Rationale	46
Strategies of Inquiry	48
A Note About The Faculty Participants	53
A Closer Look At The Gender Component Courses	60
Data Collection Methods	62
Data Analysis Methods	66
Analytical Process for Survey Data	66
Analysis of Pre/Post Longitudinal Student Data Set:	67
Analytical Process for Reflection Data	71
Ethical Considerations	74
Trustworthiness and Validity	76
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS	78
Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination	79
Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism	89

Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Gender Roles and Norms.....	101
Student “Change”.....	112
The Gender Effect	113
Gender Class Gaps	114
Conclusion.....	118
CHAPTER FIVE	120
Discussion of Findings.....	120
So, Why No Impact?.....	122
Additional Points of Interest	127
What About A Negative Impact?.....	127
What About the “Gender Component” Really Matters?.....	130
Is Gender Already Mainstream?	130
Limitations	132
Opportunities for Further Study	133
Implications for Policy Makers	135
Final Thoughts	136
Appendix A: Timeline.....	138
Appendix B: IRB Approval.....	139
Appendix C: Recruitment Email.....	141
Appendix D: Student Recruitment Script	142
Appendix E: Student Consent Form	143
Appendix F: Pre-Survey – All Students.....	145
Appendix G: Post- Survey - For With Gender Component Classes	155
Appendix H: Post- Survey – For Without Gender Component Classes	169
Appendix I: Reflection Prompt.....	183
Appendix J: Follow Up Faculty Survey	184
Appendix K: Faculty Participant Bios.....	187
Appendix L: Course Catalog Descriptions of English Course Types	191
Appendix M: Descriptive Statistics Re Construct – Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination	193
Appendix N: Descriptive Statistics Re Construct – Attitudes and Perceptions Re Feminism	198
Appendix O: Descriptive Statistics Re Construct – Attitudes and Perceptions Re Gender Roles and Norms	201
References:.....	213

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	12
Overview of Courses Included in Study	12
Table 3.1	50
Overview of Participating Community Colleges	50
Table 3.2	51
Overview of Courses Participating in Study by Campus.....	51
Table 3.3	53
Overview of Instructor Participants Gender, Age, and Ethnicity	53
Table 3.4	58
Overview of Relevant Student Participants' Demographics	58
Table 3.5	61
Timeline of Gender Instruction and Survey Administration	61
Table 3.6	68
Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination Sum Score Scale Composition	68
Table 3.7.	69
Attitudes/Perceptions Re Feminism Sum Score Scale Composition	69
Table 3.8.	70
Attitudes/Perceptions Re Gender Roles and Norms Sum Score Scale Composition	70
Table 4.1	79
One Sample Statistics of Sexism Awareness Sum Scores	79
Table 4.2	80
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores by Gender/Non-Gender Class.....	80
Table 4.3	80
Between and Within Group Differences in Sexism Sum Scores	80
Table 4.4	82
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Post-Linear Regression Models.....	82
Table 4.5	89
One Sample Statistics of Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores	89
Table 4.6	89
Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores by Gender/Non-Gender Class	89
Table 4.7	90
Between and Within Group Differences in Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores	90

Table 4.8	91
Feminism Sum Scores Post-Linear Regression Models	91
Table 4.9	98
Top Six Words Associated With Feminism.....	98
Table 4.10	99
Top Six Words Associated With Feminism by Gender Component	99
Table 4.11	100
Negative Words Associated With Feminism	100
Table 4.12	101
Negative Words Associated With Feminism by Gender Component	101
Table 4.13	101
One Sample Statistics of Gender Attitudes Sum Scores.....	101
Table 4.14	102
Gender Attitudes Sum Scores by Gender Class.....	102
Table 4.15	102
Between and Within Group Differences in Gender Attitudes Sum Scores	102
Table 4.16	104
Linear Regression Models of Gender Scores Post-	104
Table 4.17	116
Students' Reasons for Enrolling Into Surveyed Course	116
Table 4.18	117
Timeline of Gender Instruction and Survey Administration	117

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give thanks to my committee members for their support, commitment, generosity, patience, and insight. My thanks also go to my fellow cohort members (ELP 23!) who provided emotional and practical support throughout this long process, especially Heather Adams, Mary Ann Triest, Holly Hare, Lindsay Armstrong Vance, Callie Moreno, Marco Valenzuela, Merry McOlvin, and Kathy Her. My thanks to my friends who listened to me describe my dissertation and didn't let their eyes glaze over in boredom, especially to Margee Magee, who provided many a de-stressing hike and hoofed it to UCLA for the graduation ceremony, to Derek Ringold, who never complained when I covered the living room, numerous times, with file folders full of manila envelopes full of surveys and other notes and musings, and to Andrea Scarpino, who was often a touchstone of sanity in this whole process. My thanks to the faculty participants who both gave their time and their encouragement to my work, the English Department chairs and research department personnel who lent their support to the program, and to the three community colleges that agreed to be a part of this study.

This has been a lifelong endeavor in some ways, especially with a family that always encouraged and supported my academic career. My endless thanks go to my mother, Dr. Brenda Dixon-Smith, and my father, Edward Smith, for a lifetime of encouragement and support. Additional thanks to my mother who provided feedback and support through the process of data collection, analysis, and the drafting process, and who said I could call her any time and meant it. My thanks to my siblings, Heather, Ian, and Colleen for their love, support, patience, and hugs, and for being there when I needed to not think about this project at all. Finally, my thanks to Blue, the best one, and even Ducks, for being the two sweetest and prettiest in the world.

VITA

Education

- 2003 Bachelor of Arts (English)
Concordia University, Portland
Portland, Oregon
- 2006 Master of Arts (English)
Chapman University
Orange, California

Professional Experience

- 2000-2016 Project Coordinator
Robie & Matthai, PLC
Los Angeles, California
- 2006-2007 Development Coordinator
Red Hen Press
Los Angeles, California

Teaching Experience

- 2010-2018 Assistant Adjunct Professor of English
Los Angeles Valley College
Los Angeles, California
- 2012-2016 Puente Co-Director
Los Angeles Valley College
Los Angeles, California
- 2013-2018 English Instructor
Moorpark College
Moorpark, California

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Sexism and gender disparity in politics, the workforce, and educational leadership positions still exist in the United States. California, as the most populous and a significantly progressive state, is an ideal place to study the ways in which non-elective¹ gender coursework affects students. California Community Colleges (CCC) handle seventy percent of the state's student population (PPIC.org, 2018), and therefore, their curriculum choices have a wide impact on current and future students. While California Community Colleges have made a concerted effort to promulgate a more multiculturally diverse curriculum, there has not been the same push to include gender.

Several reasons underscore the need to focus on adding more gender studies into mainstream coursework. In education, politics, and many other fields of work, women are still subject to pay inequity, sexism, and inadequate representation, and such inequalities can be attributed to societal, media, and educational normalizing of sexism and gender disparity (Bomey, 2016; Pager & Shepherd, 2008; Son Holoien, 2013; Stamarski & Son Hing, 2015; U.S. Department of Labor, 2013 & 2016). Furthermore, while females account for more than half of students in almost all higher education institutions (NCES.ed.gov, 2017); continued sexism and gender inequities are not always adequately addressed by education institutions (Bian, Leslie, & Cimpian, 2017; Caplan & Ford, 2014; Herideen, 1998; Milkman, Akinola & Chugh, 2014).

¹ In this paper, mandatory, required and non-elective gender coursework are used interchangeably to indicate the gender unit included in the courses students are required to take in order to transfer, courses such as English 1, 2 and 3. This is opposed to courses that students take knowing they will discuss issues of gender, sexism, and or feminism, such as a women's studies course, even if that course was meant to fulfill a transfer requirement.

Including gender studies could also help address ever growing concerns surrounding toxic masculinity. Additionally, instructors receive numerous positive benefits from teaching feminism.

This mixed methods study sought to measure the impact of non-elective gender coursework on community college students; to date, most studies around the impact of gender instruction have utilized students who knowingly elected into these courses, rather than students who were required to study gender as part of required coursework. Specifically, I hoped to measure if and how exposure to gender coursework impacts students' perceptions and attitudes towards gender related concepts, specifically feminism, sexism/gender discrimination, and gender roles and norms. The larger goal of this study is to provide data to begin to petition for changes to CCC curriculum.

Definition of Terms

Feminism: In many parts of the country, not only have 'feminism' and 'feminist' become pejorative terms, many men and women believe gender inequality is no longer an issue (Markowitz, 2005; Shollen, 2015; Taylor & Stein; 2014, Webber, 2005). Feminism has different meanings to different groups. In its simplest definition, it is, "the belief that men and women should have equal rights and opportunities" (Merriam-Webster, 2016). Others extend that concept further and define feminism as "a movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression" (hooks, 2014). National polls indicate that 82% of Americans embrace this idea of equality between the sexes, yet only 20% consider themselves feminists (Swanson, 2013).

Feminist theory: Feminist theory, in its various iterations, seeks to understand how systems of power around sex and gender were and are constructed. Many feminist theorists also seek to understand gender and gender roles. Feminist theory has been applied to history, literature, economics, art, psychology, philosophy and almost all 'systems' of thought, culture or

production. When education falls under the lens of feminist theories, several patterns become clear: 1) in many Western and Westernized societies, a male canon is still privileged; 2) focusing on and normalizing male stories, in particular White male stories, sends a message to other groups that they are “other”, and, arguably, less than their White male counterparts; and 3) schools are crucial to the formation of gender identity, both positively and negatively (Acker, 1987; Wood & Hilton, 2012). Under this feminist theoretical lens, it can be argued that sexist and limiting attitudes toward women, and women in leadership, are products of an educational system that reinforces androcentrism. This framework presumes education has a role in creating gender and gender discrimination and works toward recognizing and challenging sexism/gender discrimination both within the educational system and in larger contexts. This guiding principal motivated this study.

Gender Component/ Gender Coursework/Gender Curriculum/Gender Instruction:

Faculty participants in this study had differing interpretations of what a gender component looks like in their classrooms. For some teachers, this included a whole semester couched in a gender perspective. For others, gender was a part of the discussion in the analysis of some texts, such as *Fences*, *Hamilton*, *The Handmaid’s Tale*, and *Beloved*, although not a semester-wide focus of conversation. For some teachers, this was their first semester teaching a course with a gender focus; others have included gender as part of their coursework for many semesters now. Additionally, gender appeared to come up in discussion in some of the non-gender component courses, while other non-gender component teachers expressly avoided the subject.

Problem Background

On a national level, the educational, professional, and political worlds are still strongholds of sexism and gender stereotypes – the 2016 presidential race exemplified these

issues (Bongiorno, Bian, & David, 2014; Bush, 2016; Fingerhut, 2016). In many institutions, sexism goes unchallenged, both by men and women (Black Chen, 2015; DiCanio et al., 2016; Ely, Insead, & Kolb, 2011; Parker, 2015; Shollen, 2015). Moreover, many women and men who might identify with feminist ideologies still resist the label ‘feminist’ because they fear reprisal and or ostracization. The 2016 election, again, showcased this point; more than 3.5 million Hillary supporters were part of secret Facebook Hillary groups because they wanted a safe space to discuss their chosen candidate. Women are not equally represented in positions of power and leadership in the workforce, in education, or politics (Eagly, 2016). In fact, women in leadership positions still reflect less than a fifth of the total jobs (Eagly, 2016). In addition, while women attend and graduate from higher education institutions at greater rates than men, wage discrepancies continue (U.S. Department of Labor, 2013).

Moreover, there have been both anti-feminist movements and men’s rights movements in response to concerns that feminism causes discrimination against males. The men’s rights movement posits, amongst other claims, that because women have outstripped men in education and middle management jobs, there needs to be a movement back toward the focus on male students, that we have left our boys behind in trying to promote girls, and that men’s rights are being violated (Banet-Weiser & Miltner, 2015; Farrell, 2012; Genz & Brabon, 2018; Stolzer, 2008; Strapagiel, 2013). That the backlash has been aimed against feminism is perhaps not surprising. Studies have shown, however, that loss of ‘male’ jobs and the failing of ‘boys’ in schools is not related to feminism but rather to other economic, political and social factors (DiPrete & Buchman, 2013; Martino, 2008). Indeed, it is not *all* girls outpacing *all* boys, but certain types of girls that excel and certain types of boys that fall behind (DiPrete & Buchman, 2013; Martino, 2008). Girls’ success, in these cases, has been attributed to receiving an emphasis

from school, parents, and society, to study and work hard – boys are often not given that message, in particular boys of color, the boys most likely to fall behind and drop out (DiPrete & Buchman, 2013; Martino, 2008). However, dealing with issues of male students falling behind, as well as the potential problematic nature of gender roles and norms is also a concern of feminists. Feminist pedagogy and the ethic of care, as well as advocating for a more diverse and inclusive curriculum, is a central tenet of feminism activism (hooks, 2014; Herideen, 1998; Townsend & Twombly, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

Several generations have passed since the Women’s Movement, yet college curriculum and canon are still male centered (Banks, 2015), and courses that add women into the field of vision are few; in fact, elective women’s studies and gender studies courses often mark women, their work, and feminism as the “other” and as a dated issue (hooks, 1994; Markowitz, 2005; Webber, 2005). While many Critical-thinking courses have begun to stress the inclusion of multicultural texts with more classical works in order to better engage students, there is no mandated gender component inclusion for Critical-thinking courses; inclusion of a gender component could, arguably, do as much or even more to engage students (Crossley, 2010; Griffin & Hu, 2014; Markowitz, 2005; Morrison, Bourkea, & Kelley, 2005; Reingold & Baratz, 2009; Shollen, 2015). While California’s community colleges pay attention to issues of race and ethnicity, (more than ever now with equity programs) gender and sexism do not garner the same level of attention on campus, even with Title IX protections (CCCCO.edu, 2016). All institutions of higher education have an opportunity to embrace a feminist agenda of striving to build gender equality. Community colleges play a critical role for their particular student body and have a distinctive responsibility to their students: they should work to: “remedy rather than to reproduce

existing inequalities. They should be oriented to the needs of the large nontraditional student populations served. In terms of numbers alone, older women, re-entry women, and returning women form a particularly important segment of those populations” (Oromaner, 1998, p. 7). Community colleges, as broad access institutions and havens for diversity, could easily have in their mission statements, and in the required coursework, at least a minimal discussion of gender equality.

Critics of social-justice-minded individuals often characterize those individuals as bullies and argue that society has asked people to change too much and too fast (Originos, 2015). Feminists are experiencing a backlash from communities that perceive the goal of feminists to be to either take power away from men or, at the very least, villainize and vilify men and ‘complacent’ females (hooks, 1994; Originos, 2015). But feminist education’s goal is not to make women more powerful or more privileged than men, but to open up a dialogue about what gender means, where certain ideologies have come from, and how students can find their own voice and power in a society that frequently disenfranchises them (hooks, 2014). Arguably, the required study of gender could both combat this resistance and these misconceptions, as well as inculcate a culture norm of female leadership in both male and female students (Crossley, 2010; Markowitz, 2005; Shollen, 2015; Webber, 2005).

Problem Significance

Women’s advancement in positions of power in education, industry and politics is advancing, but much too slowly. In recent years, some have argued that the gains have even stalled (Sandberg, 2013). California, although usually a progressive state, is seeing the same stall. In 2015, Governor Jerry Brown signed into law measures to decrease the wage gap between

genders in California (McGreevy & Megerian, 2015). It is still too soon to see the effects of that law, but similar iterations of such laws² hint that this law will not be entirely successful.

Additionally, many campuses do not endorse a feminist stance, which can undermine feminism, women's studies, and or gender studies when and if they are taught. The current CCC student population, who soon will be participating in California's workforce, is made up of predominately millennials and Gen Zs. These two groups can be resistant to discussions about gender, feminism, and sexism, or are reactionary and view feminism pejoratively in part because they believe the problem to be solved and in part because "feminism" is associated with White middle-class women (Banet-Weiser & Miltner, 2015; Crossley, 2010; Markowitz, 2005; Shollen, 2015; Webber, 2005). There also exists a Post-millennial feminism that rejects the feminist critique of current systems, seeing more value in embracing aspects of current canon and culture (McNeil, 2010). However, as worldviews, both rejecting feminism and Post-millennial feminism do not seem to advance female leadership; as previously mentioned, female gains in positions of power have stalled (Sandberg, 2013).

As of 2015, the United States ranked 31st in gender equitable countries (Hausmann, Tyson, & Zahidi, 2015). Outstripping the United States are the Scandinavian trio of Norway, Sweden, and Finland, many other European countries, and several African, Asian, and North American countries, and Bolivia in South America. Of these countries, many have either already incorporated units on feminism into their educational curriculum or have plans to do so. Sweden, one of the most gender equitable countries in the world, has an active model of mainstreaming

² The Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 made dents in gender wage discrepancies, but did not remedy them entirely (EEOC.gov, 2016; Eagly, 2016).

feminism, and has launched a program to give all 16-year-old students a copy of *We Should All Be Feminists* (Wagner, 2015). CCCs could adopt and adapt the work of more gender equitable nations. Without an emphasis on teaching and cultivating awareness of sexism and gender issues, it is unlikely an actual sea change regarding sexism and gender disparity in California, and in America, will occur any time soon.

Existing Interventions

Diversity and Multiculturalism Inclusion Requirements

To address issues of diversity and cultural sensitivity, most California Community Colleges have mandated the inclusion of multicultural works and perspectives into coursework, particularly in Critical-thinking courses (CCCCO, 2018). The colleges also offer many cultural courses such as Chicano Studies, African American Studies, and Jewish Studies. Exposure to diversity and multicultural courses increase student success because it makes students more engaged in the subject material, gives them a sense of connectivity to their classmates, their education, and the institution, and it gives them a sense of purpose and “college” identity (Harris & Harper, 2008; Hedges, 1997; Herideen, 1998; Wood & Hilton, 2012).

Gender instruction

Schools that ask their students to complete Diversity Courses generally offer some form of Women and Gender Studies (WGS) course. Within WGS courses, feminism is frequently discussed, although a WGS course does not equal a feminism course. Studying gender and feminism can improve campuses in several ways, including bringing significant and positive change to students’ attitudes toward sexism/gender discrimination, gender roles and norms, and feminism (Crossley, 2010; Griffin & Hu, 2014; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Manago, Spears Brown, & Leaper, 2009; Markowitz, 2005; Morrison, Bourkea, & Kelley, 2005; Reingold & Baratz, 2009;

Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Shollen, 2015; Taylor & Stein, 2014; Webber, 2005). Additionally, use of feminist theory and feminist pedagogy creates more inclusive learning communities (Herideen, 1998; Kezar, 1998). Like Freire's Critical Theory, and the many theories that have spawned from his work over the years, Feminist Pedagogy is concerned with what the student brings with them into the classroom, and creates validation and connection through that approach. An "ethic of care" within Feminist Pedagogy (Herideen, 1998; Wood & Hilton, 2012) leads to increased female student success rate and to female students feeling empowered and taking on more leadership roles (Herideen, 1998). Studies have shown that discussions of feminism, gender, and sexism are also freeing and empowering for male students (Harris & Harper, 2008; Flood, 2011; Wood & Hilton, 2012). There is also an impact on faculty; teachers become aware of options to the standard cannon, of differing perspectives, and engage with their students more (Hedges, 1997; Moore, 1998).

Study Design

The successes of courses that include gender studies and those that include multiculturalism inform the claim that incorporating gender studies into required curriculum would be beneficial to all students. However, the impact of gender studies coursework has been studied predominantly on those who elect to enroll in gender studies courses, not on those required to take such courses as part of their general electives. Many colleges offer some sort of "women" centered courses, such as women's history, women's literature, and women in the arts (CCCCO, 2018), but these are, by and large, elective courses only. WGS courses may have a "preaching to the choir" mootness since students self-select the courses (Crossley, 2010; Griffin & Hu, 2014; Markowitz, 2005; Shollen, 2015; Taylor & Stein, 2014; Titus, 2000; Webber, 2005). Thus, before any compelling arguments can be made for mandating gender studies into the

required curriculum, the effect of such curriculum needs to be studied on students who have not “elected” into the course, so to speak, but find it a part of their required course load.

Researcher Assumptions

The following assumptions undergirded this study:

- Students are either unaware of and or underestimate the level of sexism/gender discrimination in this country.
- CCCs, at the administrative level, do not advocate for Gender Studies.
- Students benefit from gender coursework.

Research Questions (RQs)

For these reasons, the following research questions guided my study:

1) Does incorporating gender into required coursework affect student perceptions of and reactions to gender, particularly concepts of sexism/gender discrimination?

2) Does incorporating gender into required coursework affect student perceptions of and reactions to gender, particularly concepts of feminism?

3) Does incorporating gender into required coursework affect student perceptions of and reactions to gender, particularly concepts of gender roles/gender norms?

Secondary inquiries for those three questions are:

- a. Are there patterns of student responsiveness to the gender coursework that seem to be related to students’ gender, race/ethnicity, age, or religious/cultural practices?
- b. Are there patterns of student responsiveness to the gender coursework that seem related to the faculty member’s age, race/ethnicity, or gender?

- c. Are there patterns of student responsiveness to the gender coursework that seem related to campus climate?

These research questions were intended to determine to what extent, if any, faculty-constructed, non-elective gender coursework has an effect on students' perceptions of and reactions to gender concepts, particularly sexism/gender discrimination, feminism, and gender roles and norms. The literature indicates that student demographics influence student attitudes toward feminism. The literature also indicates that students are more receptive to lessons from certain kinds of instructors and instruction methods. The literature also indicates that students' receptivity and engagement can be related to campus satisfaction. This study works to understand the variables impacting students' responses to non-elective gender coursework, including aspects about the instructor, characteristics of the unit, college satisfaction, and the students' pre-existing attitudes shaped by their culture, gender, race and so forth.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses guiding this study were as follows:

1. If students show any change in attitudes and perceptions toward sexism/gender discrimination, feminism, and or gender roles and norms, the students in the gender component courses will show more change than students in non-gender component courses.
2. The faculty members' age, race/ethnicity, and gender will have an impact on students' receptiveness (i.e. change) regarding the gender coursework.
3. Students' gender, age, ethnicity, and religious identity will have an impact on students' receptiveness (i.e. change) regarding the gender coursework.

4. Students' level of college satisfaction has an impact on students' receptiveness (i.e. change) regarding the gender coursework.

Overview of Approach

This mixed methods research design compared students with a gender component in their required Critical-thinking English course to students in Critical-thinking English courses without a gender component. Specifically, the study compared the two groups' attitudes toward, and perceptions of, sexism/gender discrimination, feminism, and gender roles and norms. As shown in Table 1.1 below, the study was conducted at three community colleges, with a total of 24 English Critical-thinking classes, in three different varieties of English class type³, with both gender and non-gender component courses.

Table 1.1

Overview of Courses Included in Study

	With gender coursework	Without gender coursework	Total
College #1 – Coastal College	English Critical-thinking Course type 1, 2	English Critical-thinking Course type 1, 2	7
College #2 – Sweet Valley	English Critical-thinking Course type 1, 2, 3	English Critical-thinking Course type 1, 2, 3	6
College #3 Canyon Glen	English Critical-thinking Course type 1, 2, 3	English Critical-thinking Course type 1, 2, 3	11
			24

³ CCCs offer three English classes that meet the transfer requirements for both UCs and CSUs. English 1 is the equivalent of a freshman level English composition course, and all students seeking transfer are required to take this course. After completing English 1, students take an additional Critical-Thinking Course. This can be English 2 or English 3, or another course that meets the schools' requirements. English 1 is a prerequisite for both English 2 and 3. Most students will take either English 2 or English 3, not both. English 2 explores critical thinking through literature, and English 3 explores critical thinking through argument.

Students were given Pre- and Post-surveys to record any changes in their reactions. Students who identified themselves on both the Pre- and Post-surveys were matched and constitute the Longitudinal Data Set used for the statistical analysis portion of this data analysis. Survey findings were also examined in light of instructor syllabi documents and with the analysis of student reflections completed by select students who completed the Post-survey. Some of these students were part of the Longitudinal Data Set and some were not.

I conducted this study at three California community colleges for several reasons. California is the most populous state in the nation, and it is also a majority-minority state (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). California also has more community colleges than any other state, and California Community Colleges handle over 60% the state's student population (Ma & Baum, 2016); therefore, CCC curriculum has a wide and large impact on the future leaders of America.

Community colleges tend to see more students coming from diverse backgrounds, students from lower socio-economic standing, students from historically marginalized or underrepresented communities, students of color, and nontraditional students; these are students that would be best served by an intervention of empowerment, which can be considered, under a feminist framework, gender studies instruction. Community colleges also have more academic freedom than K-12 schools system do, and arguably, even more than four-year institutions (Townsend & Twombly, 2012). Furthermore, CCCs have mission statements that express their commitment to diversity. Most current research has been conducted on students who elect into WGS courses as well as on students who attend four-year universities, so, the community college general student population is somewhat untested on this subject matter.

An effective place in which to address these research questions is within the community college Critical-thinking English courses. While there are multiple types of Critical-thinking courses offered at CCCS, Critical-thinking English courses are the most commonly taken to meet the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or IGETC or requirements, and the English courses are more likely to have feminism/gender studies texts or feminist theory already incorporated than communications or psychology courses. English Critical-thinking courses have the explicit purpose of helping students critically reflect on themselves and their surroundings. Additionally, such courses, often by requirement, include multicultural texts in the coursework. Finally, English Critical-thinking courses are required for all students seeking to transfer to a UC or Cal State campus (CCCCO.edu, 2018). Many English faculty members who lead these courses already include a gender component in the coursework. In this study, I included English Critical-thinking courses with a gender component as well as comparable units without a gender component. The gender component served as an “intervention,” and the course without a gender coursework served as a comparison “control” group. The benefit of this study is that it provides information on how gender coursework affects students who have not opted to study the subject but are just required by course to do so, which is, as previously mentioned, an understudied area.

The data was analyzed to see if exposure to non-elective gender coursework has an impact on students’ attitudes towards or perceptions of sexism/gender discrimination, feminism, and gender roles and norms, if there were demographically informed differences in responses to the gender curriculum, and if faculty factors affected student responsiveness.

Statement of Purpose

An overarching question of interest to me has been: Why haven’t gender studies already been included into community college curriculums? Feminism is perhaps a more “loaded”

concept than multiculturalism, but is gender? An understanding of where and how sexism and gender inequalities exist seems a natural part of both a Critical-thinking course and the community college mission. This study is a first step in examining the larger and more entrenched problem of sexism, anti-feminism, and gender disparity in our school system. I hope this study provides convincing arguments that community colleges can offer courses that not only challenge students' concepts of sexism, feminism, gender norms, roles, and gender disparity, but also empower students to take a stance against the long-standing and deep-seated sexism in this country.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In arguing the need for my study on how mainstreaming gender in community college curriculum impacts students, my literature review first focuses on the problem of discrimination in America, with a particular emphasis on sexism. I next explain how the problems of sexism and gender disparity, and the role education plays in sustaining and perpetuating these problems, can be understood through a feminist theoretical lens. I then explore the particular opportunity and responsibility higher education institutions in general, and community colleges specifically, have in countering sexism and all forms of discrimination. The next part of this chapter examines the evidence of the efficacy of women and gender studies and feminist instruction. Additionally, because a student's reception of diversity instruction, including feminism, is affected by multiple factors, I explore those factors in order to anticipate the possible effect they might have on my study. This section includes research on how characteristics of the student, instructor, class, and campus can influence a student's receptiveness to gender instruction. Finally, I reiterate the need for this study in light of the evidence and literature I have reviewed.

Current State in America of Prejudice and Discrimination

The population of the United States is diverse in many ways. It is predicted that over the next 30 years, it will become more racially and ethnically diverse, with the population of Whites (at 61.6% currently in 2016) expected to be less than 50% in 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). As of 2010, 19% of the population was people with disabilities, veterans make up about seven percent of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017), and the number of people who identify with non-Christian religions increases every year (Pew Research, 2015). More than 13% of the population is living in poverty, while about just under 30% of the population is lower income,

about 50% middle income, 20% in upper-income, and .01% of the population makes five percent of the total income of the United States (Fry & Kochar, 2016; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

Despite this diversity, or perhaps in response to it, prejudice and discrimination are still major and insidious problems in America. Both critical race theorists and feminist theorists argue that systems, structures and institutions perpetuate discrimination in order to maintain power discrepancies in favor of those groups in control; often this means White, middle and upper class men (hooks 2014; Gillborn, 2005; Gumport, 2002; Pager & Shepherd, 2008; Townsend & Twombly, 1998). This can be seen in the fact that women and minority groups are not equally represented in educational, economical, and political spheres in the United States. In terms of education, Black and Latino male students have the lowest rates of degree completion across all school levels (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016), and, “Racial minorities and low-income students are underrepresented in college enrollment and graduation” (Son Holoien, 2013, p. 2). Students with disabilities and students of color face higher suspension, expulsion, and disciplinary rates than White and non-disabled students (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2014).

In terms of the economy, discrimination starts as early as the hiring process in the workplace and continues afterward (Pager & Shepherd, 2008). Asians and Whites have the lowest rates of unemployment and American Indians and Alaska Natives have the highest rates. Whites make up almost 80% of the labor force in America. Just over half (51%) of Asians and 40% of Whites had jobs in the highest paying sector of jobs, as compared to only 30% of Blacks and 22% of Hispanics. Among men and women, Asian men were the highest earning group, White males the second highest earning, Asian women the third highest, White women the fourth highest, then Black men and Hispanic men, then finally Black women and Hispanic women

coming in at the lowest wage ranks (U.S. Department of Labor, 2016). As for politics, the 115th Congress of the United States is considered the most diverse Congress yet, but still fewer than one in five members of congress are minorities; only six members of the Senate are minorities (Bialik & Krogstad, 2017).

Women, although not a minority group, also struggle for comparative representation in politics, in education, and in the workforce, and this is only further compounded by the intersection of gender and race/ethnicity. Women make up only 18% of Congress (Bialik & Krogstad, 2017). Although women graduate at higher rates from high school and college than men in general, women are underrepresented in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) majors (Son Holoien, 2013; Stamarski & Son Hing, 2015). On average, women earn 77 cents for every dollar that men earn (Berman, 2013; Bomey, 2016). This gap starts at the beginning of a woman's career. Between recent college graduates, men average 18 cents more than women in the same positions, and, "In their first year of work after graduating college, men make \$7,600 more than women on average" (Berman, 2013). Furthermore, discussion of salaries is often discouraged, suggesting that women have little opportunity to realize that they are making less than their male counterparts and hence cannot demand equal pay for equal work (Berman, 2013). Studies have also shown that women must work harder and negotiate more strategically than men to earn more money (Berman, 2013). In general, women populate more of the low-paid workforce; women make up two-thirds of part-time workers and 60% of minimum wage earners, and the number of women living in poverty is much higher than the number of men (Berman, 2013). Additionally, wage and job disparity increase for women of color (Berman, 2013; Bomey, 2016).

The disparity also worsens as the woman climbs the corporate ladder. While women make up more than half of service professions, women are dramatically underrepresented in STEM jobs and in the corporate culture (Jean, Payne & Thompson, 2015; Stamarski & Son Hing, 2015). Not only is it harder for women to obtain these high paying leadership positions, it is also harder for them to retain them (Heller & Stepp, 2011; Stamarski & Son Hing, 2015). In entry-level positions, the imbalance is already visible: women fill less than 50% of positions. By management level, women fill only 37% of the positions, and at the vice-president level, less than 30% of positions are filled by women (Bomey, 2016). Only four percent of S&P 500's Chief Executive Officers are women; less than 20% of big company Chief Financial Officers are women; over a third of public companies had no female senior officers; and as of 2010, women were less than seven percent of the top earning positions (Berman, 2013; Bomey, 2016). Furthermore, as with wages, the percentage of women of color in these positions is also less than White women (Bomey, 2016).

In addition to wage discrepancy and inadequate representation, women face both overt and unconscious stereotypes at work (Berman, 2013; Hideg & Ferris, 2016; Stamarski & Son Hing, 2015). Some of the stereotypes they face are that, as women, their first duty is to the home, or that women need less money than men, or that a woman's career is second to a man's, or that women do not "belong" in the workplace (Berman, 2013; Hideg & Ferris, 2016; Stamarski & Son Hing, 2015). Office cultures are often more tailored to men than to women (Berman, 2013); even air conditioning in office buildings is geared toward men (Kingma & van Marken Lichtenbelt, 2015). Women are also more likely to feel harassed or unsafe at work. "Of the 11,717 sexual harassment charges brought in 2010, 83 percent came from women" (Berman, 2013). It is even further disheartening that many of the policies created to deal with sexism and

gender inequality at work, such as employment equity policies, face much resistance, which further stalls progress (Hideg & Ferris, 2016).

The workplace is not the only place women experience sexism and stereotyping. Women also face sexism at school and in their daily activities and encounters. Rape, abuse, and sexual harassment remain a major problem for women and girls, and significantly more for women and girls than for men and boys (NSVRC.org, 2018). One theory behind why women in America continuously face such pervasive and detrimental sexism is Ambivalent Sexism Theory (Bush, 2016; Glick & Fiske, 1997; Hideg & Ferris, 2016). Ambivalent Sexism Theory categorizes sexism into two main forms: 1) hostile sexism, which manifests as men and women who consider women to be inferior, manipulative succubae, and 2) benevolent sexism, which manifests as men and women who put women on pedestals, and who have positive but patronizing views of women as well-meaning but weak. Hostile sexism is most often overt, loaded with negative stereotypes, and steeped in rigid traditional norms. Women who face hostile sexism in the workplace can expect negative reviews and little advancement. Benevolent sexism is most often subtle, laden with “positive” stereotypes, and formed out of gender notions, perhaps equally as traditional and rigid, that women, as sensitive caretakers, need protection and special treatment. Both types of sexism generally result in an understanding in both men and women that women are incompetent at handling challenging or important jobs. Furthermore, women are as likely to practice benevolent sexism as men are. This type of sexism often is not even seen as sexism, but as socially acceptable behavior. Because of this, benevolent sexism is also less likely to be recognized, fought against or complained about in social, political and workforce environments (Hideg & Ferris, 2016). The theory behind benevolent sexism may also explain why sexism has remained so prevalent and insidious.

As the data above show, Americans still have a long way to go before racism, sexism, and many other prejudices are eliminated. A further troubling fact is that many Americans have decided that prejudices and discrimination are no longer a problem in America. Although six out of ten Americans believe racism is still an issue, at least 30% of Americans believe we've achieved enough racial equality (Stepler, 2016). Just a little over half of Americans think sexism no longer creates obstacles for women, and 56% of men, as opposed to 34% of women, believe sexism is no longer a problem in America (Fingerhut, 2016). Perhaps these statistics are not surprising; after all, "Social psychology research tells us that everyone thinks they're not prejudiced, and everyone is wrong" (Bush, 2016). Another factor impacting people's understanding of their own discrimination habits is the sense that discrimination must be overt or openly hostile, as with hostile sexism; however, much of the discrimination marginalized groups face today are subtle, normalized, and often overlooked, and, at times, even considered benevolent (Glick, P. & Fiske, S. 1997; Hideg & Ferris, 2016; Jones et al., 2016; Pager & Shepherd, 2008). Some studies have also shown that it is the normalized and subtle discrimination that is more detrimental to the psychological and physical health of others (Hideg & Ferris, 2016; Jones et al., 2016). Normalized and subtle discrimination is also connected to the tendency to view out groups or the other negatively (Miller, 2008; Said, 1993). However, although the outlook might look bleak, it is not a hopeless situation; both long standing and current research and theories underscore my contention that mainstreaming of gender studies in the curriculum could help unresolved issues of sexism and gender disparity in the long run.

The Persistence of Sexism – a Feminist Understanding of the Power and Role of Education

In general, feminists are unified in the idea that sexism and gender inequality exist in the world and that sexism and gender inequality must be fought (Gumport, 2002; Harlan, 1998;

hooks, 2014; Townsend & Twombly; 1998). Many feminist groups also agree that education, in particular the structures of education, entrenched as they are, have perpetuated and will continue to perpetuate sexism and gender disparity if a change is not effected (Gumport, 2002; Harlan, 1998; Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985; Townsend & Twombly, 1998). Feminist-oriented reviews of the American educational systems reveal how school structures, including school personnel and school curriculum, reinforce sexist gender norms, gender stereotypes and male privilege. Debates persist as to the nature of gender, whether it is a learned, constructed or biological formation (Butler, 1990; Francis, 2006; Khan & Sultana, 2012; MacNaughton, 2006; Westdon & Zimmerman, 1987). Either way, many feminist theorists see schools as a key force behind how children come to conceive their gender identity (hooks, 1994; Khan & Sultana, 2012; MacNaughton, 2006; Minnich, 2016). Several feminist groups, including liberal feminists and feminist Post-structuralists, make the argument that gender is a social construct and that gender is learned socially (Alcoff, 1998; MacNaughton, 2006; St. Pierre, 2000; Westcon & Zimmer, 1984). Even feminist groups, such as cultural feminists, who see inherent differences, biological or other, in males and females, still agree that schooling has, for a very long time, ignored its female population, whether it is where they are learning, how they are learning, or what they are learning (Alcoff, 1988; St. Pierre, 2000). That gender norms are learned, and not solely biological, can explain, in part, why gender norms are not consistent from country to country, or from century to century. Moreover, if gender norms are created or learned in relationship to time, place, and culture, this can also point the way forward to change.

Several aspects of school structures, including school faculty and personnel, are also responsible for how gender norms, sexist or not, are learned and constructed. Indeed, research has shown that as early as six years old, girls already have gendered notions about intelligence

(Bian, Leslie, & Cimpian, 2017). Teachers often consider one way of teaching appropriate for boys and another way appropriate for girls (Skelton, 2006). For example, teachers are still more likely to encourage boys in science and math (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Sax, Riggers, & Eagan, 2013), yet evidence shows that there are essentially no differences in math and science aptitudes between male and females biologically (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Spelke, 2005). That a gender gap in STEM fields persists might indicate the shaping hand of teacher bias. On the other hand, girls are still more often encouraged toward passive exploits and to be caretakers (Paechter, 2006; Sax, Riggers, & Eagan, 2013). Schools tend to encourage positivity in girls and resistance to sports and activities and images considered masculine (Paechter, 2006). Teachers may also be more likely to spot and address underachievement in boys than in girls (Jones & Myhil, 2004; Skelton, 2006). Children also face forms of benevolent sexism; the “positive” perception, for example, that girls mature faster and are more sensible than boys, create its own sexist gender norms (Paechter, 2006).

Feminist Post-structuralists see gender as partially defined by its relationship to the other gender; for example, to be a girl is defined in part by not being a boy, and to be a boy is defined, in part, by not being a girl. Additionally, feminist Post-structuralists see gender identities that conform to tradition as being, initially at least, more pleasurable than newer constructs of gender. Challenging gender norms then is difficult, even at early ages before gender norms are entrenched. “To ask children to change from being sexist to being non-sexist is an intensely emotional request, because it requires children to ‘give up’ ways of being that are pleasurable” (MacNaughton, 2006, p. 130). Children who challenge gender norms generally do not feel safe and supported in their school environments (MacNaughton, 2006). Both boys and girls still often see math and science as ‘masculine’ subjects, and the attributes associated with those subjects,

such as competitiveness, are also seen as masculine. Girls who succeed in these fields are often likely to identify themselves as other or unfeminine (Paechter, 2006), and boys, particularly Black and Latino boys, often begin to equate studying, sitting still and schooling in general as feminine (Bukoski & Hatch, 2016; Harris & Harper, 2008). Furthermore, girls in school begin to feel pressure to balance their academics with their appearance (Sax, Riggers, & Eagan, 2013). These patterns that are instilled in elementary and secondary education are often reinforced or even exacerbated in higher education institutions (Caplan & Ford, 2014; Milkman, Akinola & Chugh, 2014).

Furthermore, a privileging of a male centric curriculum and canon (and White centric curriculum and canon), which endures through all levels of education, elementary to post-doctoral, also reinforces the established patterns of gender and male privilege (Andersen, 1985; Carter, 2007; Condis, 2016; Dyches Bissonnette & Glazier, 2016; Minnich, 2016; Webber, 2005). After all, “What is the impact of a curriculum that denies the culture—indeed, the very existence—of most of the world’s population?” (Andersen, 1985, p. 62). The notion that American or Western school curriculum is male privileged and White privileged is not new, as the quote above evinces (Andersen, 1985; Bérubé, 2008; Carter, 2007; Condis, 2016; Lauter, 1991; Said, 1993); as early as the 1970s, schools began to augment (and even occasionally alter) the texts used in early-childhood education in an effort to create gender-fair classrooms and “Girl Power” became the catch phrase of nineties educational reforms (Burke & Trumpy, 2016; MacNaughton, 2006). In some ways, these interventions seemed to work; as previously noted, women began to outpace men in high school graduation rates and college enrollment and completion rates (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Yet the success of women and girls has never secured an equal drop in sexism nor created a level of economic or political

power for women, and we are currently in a culture of post-feminism, which blames the individual for gender inequality, not the system (Bettis, Ferry, & Roe, 2016; Pomerantz & Raby, 2011). Furthermore,

Connected to this ‘new gender gap’ argument is postfeminist rhetoric touting gender equality in all arenas of social life. Post-feminism is the popular idea that girls and women no longer need – or want for – feminist politics (McRobbie 2004, 2009).

Gendered oppressions that once plagued the school, the workplace, the home, and the wider social world have evaporated, and we are now living in an age of equality, making feminism irrelevant. (Pomerantz & Raby, 2011, p. 549)

Other critics of the feminist movement point to the failing boy problem driven by the increased focus on promoting girls (Farrell, 2012; Pomerantz & Raby, 2011; Stolzer, 2008). However, the “boy problem” has been countered by evidence showing that it is generally lower income and Black and Latino male students who struggle, whereas middle and upper-class males and White and most Asian American males have continued to succeed at previous rates (Bukoski & Hatch, 2016; Harris & Harper, 2008; Martino, 2008).

Views that the educational system is discriminatory are also shared by critical theorists who argue that both a male and Eurocentric perspective is transferred to students both consciously and unconsciously through the lessons they are taught in school, and how and why those lessons are taught (Aragon & Brantmeier, 2009; Webber, 2005). Furthermore, the academy has never rejected this androcentricity and Eurocentricity. Both Ethnic Studies and Women and Gender Studies (WGS) have struggled to become mainstream curriculum within academia, repeatedly facing criticism for not being rigorous or academic enough, and for being too political. Arguably, even the way WGS or Ethnic Studies courses are added to the curriculum recreate

power systems, as the male and Eurocentric canon remains mainstream and required, and multicultural studies are elective (Carter, 2007). White men of a certain class have dictated the content and even the instruction of the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences, as well as how academic systems are run in Western societies overall (Condis, 2016; Gumpert, 2002; Smith, 1999; Webber, 2005). This cannot continue to be the case if we, as a society, really want to reach gender equality. As Townsend and Twombly (1998) argue:

Feminists believe that organizational change is central to improving the condition of women. Without change, women's social, political, and economic conditions will continue to be unequal to men's, and women will not have a significant voice in the power structures that drive society. Moreover, because traditionally organizations have been led and dominated by men (and community colleges are no exception), organizational change will not occur unless it is specifically planned and supported by organizational leaders. The kind of change that feminists envision is not mere tinkering but requires a paradigmatic shift, a breaking out of the mold of patriarchal thinking (p. 77).

Such a paradigm shift has been long in coming.

Higher Education's Responsibility to Promote Change

The American Association of Community Colleges' (AACC) mission statement starts with the quote: "In times of change, it is the learners who will inherit the earth, while the learned will find themselves beautifully equipped for a world that no longer exists." -- Eric Hoffer" (AACC.nche.edu, 2016), which implies that a change is in the wind. As much as institutions of higher education can be places that reinforce discriminatory practices, they can also be places that challenge and change systems of discrimination. In fact, in the face of ever-

growing diversity and continuing prejudices, higher education institutions have made creating safe, inclusive, and equitable and validating campuses a priority, although this is not an easy task (Parker et al., 2016). “As a consequence of the growing demographic of historically underrepresented groups (U.S. Census Bureau 2011), perhaps for the first time in history, we are at a critical crossroad—the success of diverse college students is tied to our collective social and economic success” (Hurtado, et al., 2012, p. 42).

In recent years, higher education institutions also have broadened their goals for students to include such personal development factors as fairness, open-mindedness, and egalitarian attitudes toward traditionally oppressed and or marginalized groups, and increased awareness of repressive, oppressive, discriminatory and unjust acts on campus (Malkin & Stake, 2004; Spoor & Lehmiller, 2014; Stake, 2006). Not only do higher education institutions have a responsibility to promote civic mindedness, egalitarian and social justice attitudes, they are also in a unique position with respect to how, when, where and why students begin to learn about civility, social justice, inequalities, and their own prejudices and entrenched worldviews (Aragon & Brantmeier, 2009; Herideen, 1998; hooks, 1994; Spoor & Lehmiller, 2014; Wood & Hilton, 2012). Colleges and universities are generally more diverse than K-12 institutions and therefore can better expose students to “others”, that is, groups that are unlike them.

More and more colleges and universities are requiring their students to take diversity courses as a part of their required coursework. Diversity courses include, but are not limited to, Women and Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies and Multicultural courses. Experiences with diversity in college have been shown to have both cognitive benefits and personal benefits.

Students who engage in diversity experiences⁴ in college show a positive growth in purpose, are more able to recognize racism in society, and more likely to be volunteers (Bowman et al., 2011). Such experiences have been shown to make campuses feel safer and more inclusive for students (Bowman et al., 2011). College diversity courses have a positive impact on students' moral development, and, possibly even greater impacts for those students who enter college with less academic ability (Parker et al., 2016). Diversity courses and diversity experiences also encourage students' civic engagement and campus interactivity (Bowman et al., 2011; Gurin et al., 2002). College diversity experiences enhance students' ability to think critically. Not only that, but the benefits seem to even increase over time and in amount (Gurin et al., 2002; Pascarella et al., 2014). One study has shown that the positive benefits of diversity experiences in college persist even after thirteen years (Bowman et al., 2011). Interestingly, White students appear to have more immediate and long-term growth in Critical-thinking abilities from their college diversity experiences than any other racial groups of students (Loes, Pascarella & Umbach, 2012; Pascarella et al., 2014).

The Particular Role of Community Colleges in Serving Diversity

The mixing of groups unlike oneself is more likely to happen at a community college than at a four-year college or university. In the past few decades, more first-generation college students, more minority groups, and more students from all socio-economic strata have been able to attend colleges; community colleges (CCs) handle the bulk of that diverse student body. The AACC reports that 57% of its students are female, 36% of its students are first generation college

⁴ Diversity experiences include encounters with diverse individuals, (including students and faculty), exposure to diverse curriculum, and enrollment in diversity courses.

students, 17% are single parents, seven percent non-U.S. citizens, four percent are Veterans, and 12% are students with disabilities (2016). Community colleges in American also serve a generally older student body, are more community centric, and have students with a wider range of goals than four-year institutions do. As of Fall 2014, the AACC reports that community colleges in the United States representatively handle 45% of all undergraduates, 41% of first-time freshman, 62% of Native American students, 57% of Hispanic students, 52% of Black students and 43% of Asian/Pacific Islander students. Community colleges handle between 4.5 and 6.5 million college students each year and almost half of all undergraduates attending public institutions are at community colleges (AACC, 2016; Zamani-Gallaher, 2007).

Given their role as social equalizers and considering the diversity of community college students, community colleges have a particular responsibility to meet the needs of their diverse student population. Not only that, community colleges are in a prime position to implement diversity and inclusion programs, and, arguably, have a responsibility to do so (Aragon & Brantmeier, 2009; Herideen, 1998; Hurtado et al., 2012; Wood & Hilton, 2012; Zamani-Gallaher, 2007;). Community colleges are less frequently discussed in public policy literature and in education research than four-year institutions, and the gap in the literature is even wider in the discussion of social justice (Zamani-Gallaher, 2007) including feminism (Stoehr, 2016); yet arguably, community colleges, as the most diverse and accessible higher education institutions, could be places where social justice changes, including feminist based changes, would be most impactful and most likely to take hold.

Why Gender Coursework?

In the face of the many needs of such diverse communities, the pressing question becomes, Why Gender Coursework? Courses that include gender studies been shown to reduce

incidents of sexism on campus and increase student awareness of sexism (Eisele & Stake, 2008). These courses also enhance student outcomes in other ways, including increased activism, engagement, self-esteem, and self-efficacy (Crossley, 2010; Griffin & Hu, 2014; Herideen, 1998; Markowitz, 2005; Morrison, Bourkea, & Kelley, 2005; Reingold & Baratz, 2009; Shollen, 2015; Taylor & Stein, 2014; Titus, 2000). Furthermore, while the majority of CCs have tried to promulgate a more multicultural, diverse curriculum (AACC, 2016; Gordon, 2006), and have aimed a number of equity-based initiatives to close the gaps caused by access and opportunity issues, they haven't generally promoted a curriculum that includes gender components. Yet WGS courses and lessons in feminism are also more likely to include intersectionality and discussion of compound identity factors like race, gender, age, and ability than ethnic studies or other sociology courses are (Burke & Trumpy, 2016; Davis, 2008; McCallum, Rahaman & Turnbull.). As of 2016, the AACC reported that one percent of its expenditures goes to diversity and inclusion projects; there is no clear indication if these expenditures include initiatives aimed at women. In addition to serving broader diversity, access and opportunity goals, community colleges have a unique ability to "improve women's condition if their leaders desire" (Townsend & Twombly, 1998, p. 77). And, as the data continue to show, improving the lives of women improves the lives of those around them (Cook & Glass, 2016; World Bank, 2011).

Women's studies courses were born out of the Women's movement in America and a sense that schools reproduce sexism and gender identities (Stake, 2006; Lather, 1984). Women's studies courses were designed to challenge the male dominated canon and curriculum content and to move women's studies into standard curriculum (Gumport, 2002; Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985; Lather, 1984). Women and or Gender Studies courses improve college campuses in several ways; they influence: 1) student attitudes and engagement, 2) faculty attitudes and

engagement, and 3) campus climate (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Manago et al., 2009; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006). WGS faculty often have pedagogical practices designed to help students personally relate to the course materials, with the ultimate goals of increased student empowerment, self-confidence and self-efficacy in mind. The impact of WGS courses on student attitudes and engagement can be seen in increased egalitarian attitudes, professional confidence, cognitive development, personal and professional goals, and personal achievement in both male and female students. WGS courses increase students' ability to critically analyze patriarchal structures in society and often increase students' activism and civic engagement (Dickinson, 2005; Malkin & Stake, 2004; Spoor & Lehmillier, 2014; Stake, Sevelius, & Hanley, 2008).

WGS courses are also often shaped with more than just women and gender in mind; WGS courses try to develop in students an understanding and appreciation of marginalized groups in general, as well as encourage WGS students to become aware of social injustices perpetuated on all groups (Blackmore, 2006; Herideen, 1998; Kezar, 1998; Malkin & Stake, 2004; Stake, 2006). WGS faculty encourage their students:

[. . .] to assess their world more accurately. They provide alternate frameworks and fresh perspectives on the self and others as they attempt to transcend past paradigms and narrow, stereotyped ways of thinking (Hoffmann & Stake, 1998). Both the psychotherapy client and the WGS student are expected to become more open learners who can reevaluate how they understand their experience and how they act in the world (Malkin & Stake, 2004, p. 456).

WGS and feminist instruction also has a similar impact on faculty; teachers become aware of options to the standard cannon, of differing perspectives, and engage with their students more (Hedges, 1997; Herideen 1998; Moore, 1998).

WGS classes are not magic bullets, of course. There have been complaints, both within and without WGS instructor groups, that WGS are not as impactful or academic as would be wished, or that WGS faculty have gotten too wrapped up in an alternate political agenda to actually teach gender in an impactful way (Patai & Koertge, 2003). In addition, one study showed that up to a third of WGS students reported a decrease in egalitarian attitudes in a Post-class analysis (Stake, Sevelius & Hanly, 2008). This was ascribed to the student's own entrenched and or threatened worldview, which, as previously discussed, is often the product of an educational system that promulgates gender bias. This finding, however, further underscores the need for continued research on the subject.

Studies about Women and Gender Studies Programs at the community college level have been more limited (Stoehr, 2016). In addition, the inclusion of gender curriculum into non-elective coursework has been minimally studied, either at the community college or university level in America. It appears that outside of women's colleges, the study of feminism is not specifically required coursework anywhere within the United States. It is important to study the effects of exposure to non-elective feminism since most studies so far have to account for the fact the students opted into the course. Even those students who have a diversity requirement often get to pick into which diversity course they enroll, so they still have an option and their study of gender material represents elective rather than non-elective, self-selected coursework. As Schuster and Van Dyne (1985) so eloquently said, and with disconcerting relevance considering it has been three decades since their publication: "If we are to make higher education more responsible to the students [...] we need to reach more than the self-selected group of students who take our women's studies courses" (p.7)

Gender Coursework and Students' Attitudes Toward and Perceptions of Sexism/Gender Discrimination, Feminism, and Gender Roles and Norms

One argument for including a gender component into required coursework can be found in Title IX mandates. Currently, the main recourse for faculty and students, male or female, experiencing issues of sexism, sexual harassment, and sexual discrimination are Title IX protections (Seaver, 2015). However, Title IX is often inadequately enforced, and sexist and anti-woman attitudes prevail across many college campuses in the United States. Currently, one in five women are sexually assaulted while in college, and “Ninety-five colleges and universities (including three community colleges) are currently under federal investigation over concerns about how they handle sexual assault cases on campus (Kingkade, 2015)” (Seaver, 2015). Sexual discrimination and sexual assault for men is also an issue, as one in sixteen men in college is sexually assaulted (NSVRC.org, 2018). While Title IX does not ensure education regarding sexism or gender discrimination, providing such education may do much to offset harassment, discrimination, and assault (Dickinson, 2005; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Manago et al., 2009; Segran, 2014).

WGS courses may or may not (although they normally do) include feminism, that is, feminist theories and feminist texts, in the coursework. Like WGS courses, instruction in feminist theories can bring significant and positive change to students' attitudes toward sexism and feminism. Furthermore, taken together, the impacts on the student have a subsequent effect on campus climate and inclusivity (Crossley, 2010; Griffin & Hu, 2014; Malkin & Stake, 2004; Morrison, et al., 2005; Taylor & Stein, 2014; Titus, 2000). In addition, feminist identification has been shown to increase well-being, self-esteem, self-efficacy, empowerment, academic achievement, and awareness of sexism, rape culture, and societal devaluation of women (Eisele

& Stake, 2008; Manago et al., 2009; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006). Conversely, women who do not see patterns of institutionalized sexism are more likely to blame sexist-spawned discrimination on themselves, and they might also be more vulnerable to sexism related psychological negative side-effects (Manago et al., 2009). Those with feminist identification are more likely to engage in feminist activism (Dickinson, 2005; Eisele & Stake, 2008). This too, can have a positive effect on campus climate and inclusivity.

Studies have also shown that discussions of feminism, gender, and sexism are as freeing and empowering for male students as for female students (Harris & Harper, 2008; Herideen, 1998; Wood & Hilton, 2012). “Men who take a women’s studies class for the first time may learn about experiences and concerns particular to women that they have never thought about before. Thus, having to integrate and make sense of these different views allows people to stretch their minds and look beyond their own limited experiences” (Son Holoién, 2013, p. 4).

Additionally, WGS classes and studying a feminist viewpoint often allow for men to discuss, understand and potentially reject or reconsider ‘masculine’ gender identities, as well as learn about and acknowledge the pluralities of ‘masculine’ identities (Bukoski & Hatch, 2016; Jourian, 2016). Feminist pedagogy also makes learning communities more inclusive, empowers students, as well as increasing student success rates, (Blackmore, 2006; Herideen, 1998; Kezar, 1998; Wood & Hilton, 2012). This too, can have a positive effect on campus climate and inclusivity.

Current Research on Mainstreaming WGS

The idea of mainstreaming or integrating Women and Gender Studies, either its content, philosophy, activism, or pedagogical practices, is not new (Woodward & Woodward, 2015). Feminist theory has long been included in the Humanities, particularly as a tool for literary analysis, and gender is commonly a part of sociology, and has been integrated, with some

success in some sectors, in fields like science and economics (Woodward & Woodward, 2015). In the last few years, there appears to be an increased push to integrate gender into health and medicine education (Ludwig et al., 2015). In 2010, for example:

A new modular, outcome-based, interdisciplinary curriculum was introduced for undergraduate medical education at one of the largest European medical faculties. A key stated institutional goal was to systematically integrate sex and gender medicine and gender perspectives into the curriculum in order to foster adequate gender-related knowledge and skills for future doctors concerning the etiology, pathogenesis, clinical presentation, diagnosis, treatment, and research of diseases. (Ludwig et al., 2015, p. 996)

The efforts to implement both gender mainstreaming and the integration of gender into other areas of curricula than just WGS courses are global in scope, though again, countries other than the United States seem to take more of a lead.

Another related effort is to make gender more visible in academia outside of just curriculum. The GARCIA Project (Gendering the Academy and Research; combatting Career Instabilities and Asymmetries), is one such effort. It was launched in 2014 in the European Union. “The GARCIA Project is concerned with the implementation of actions in European Universities and research centres to promote a gender culture and combat gender stereotypes and discriminations” (Garciaproject.eu, 2018).

Factors that Impact Student Receptiveness to Instruction

Including gender in course curriculum can have transformative effects “if the course content, structure, and learning environment are purposefully crafted to enable students to deal

with anticipated or experienced struggles and engage in rather than resist the learning experience” (Shollen, 2015, p. 35). There are several factors that might impact a student’s receptiveness⁵ to instruction - both overall and in the cases of diversity or gender coursework. It is important to note that these factors have been studied on students who elected into WGS courses or courses that teach feminism. The factors impacting students include, but are not limited to, campus environment, course type, instructor characteristics, and characteristics of the students themselves.

Campus Environmental Factors that Impact Receptiveness

School environmental factors have been studied more in terms of general student outcomes than discipline specifically, so I cannot speak to the specific effects of campus environment on gender instruction. Student satisfaction with their schools has been linked to improved student outcomes, including persistence and degree completion (Kuh et al., 2006). Siming et al.’s (2015) study showed that a student’s experiences (with faculty, staff, peers, etc.) on campus have a significant impact on their level of satisfaction with the campus. Furthermore, student satisfaction and student engagement on campus is greater on campuses that are more inclusive and diverse (Hurtado et al., 2012; Kuh et al., 2006), which indicates receptiveness to learning the material. Hence, a student’s feeling of satisfaction and inclusion on campus could be predicted to have an impact on the student’s receptiveness to gender in the curriculum.

⁵ Receptiveness here means openness and participation in discussion, a lack of defensiveness to the subject matter, a willingness to listen to opinions of the teacher and fellow classmates, and Post-course changes in attitudes toward feminism, sexism and gender roles.

Course & Classroom Factors that Impact Receptiveness

I propose to study the impact of an intervention of a gender component in community college Critical-thinking courses, and these Critical-thinking courses come with their own particular implications. Critical-thinking courses are described in most community college catalogs as involving (at a minimum) argument, logical reasoning, identification of fallacies, knowledge of theory, and critical analysis and evaluation, and they may be taught in departments of philosophy, composition, or other disciplines. Both the University of California and California State University systems require most transfer students to complete a Critical-thinking course before transferring⁶. While the Critical-thinking component of the courses involved in this study should be relatively similar, the courses could differ between course type/academic discipline and classroom environment, faculty instruction, campus environment, and student demographics. However, above all, Critical-thinking courses should, ideally, encourage students who are independently capable of critically thinking about real and academic problems, develop practical and applicable skills in students, and instill civic and democratic values in students (Tsui, 1999).

More specific to gender instruction, classroom environments that are more egalitarian, more collaborative, and more student centered have been associated with a better response rate to lessons in gender studies and or feminism (Malkin & Stake, 2004; Stake, 2006; Stake et al., 2008). This holds true of classroom environments in general. Conversely then, it would appear

⁶ For some majors, for example impacted majors and some STEM majors, it is not required for applicants to complete all of the GE requirements. However, for the UCs, students must complete at least the two English course components of composition (1A, 101 etc.) and Critical-thinking and composition (102/103, 1B/1C etc.) and for the CSUs, students must complete a English composition course (1A, 101 etc.) and a Critical-thinking course (which, depending on major, might be in English, Communications, Philosophy, or Psychology) (admission.universityofcalifornia.edu, 2017 & Calstate.edu., 2017, assist.org, 2017).

that lecture or teacher centric classrooms and coursework would have an adverse effect on a student's receptiveness to feminism in the curriculum. In the case of gender and or feminism, course title alone might be enough to influence a student's attitude about and receptiveness to a class; for example, WGS courses that clearly indicated feminism in the course title are more likely to trigger students' negative reactions (Spoor & Lehmler, 2014).

Faculty Factors that Impact Receptiveness

The dynamics of teaching gender, sexism, power, leadership, and feminism are complex and multifaceted (Crossley, 2010; Griffin & Hu, 2014; Markowitz, 2005; Reingold & Baratz, 2009; Shollen, 2015; Taylor & Stein, 2014; Titus, 2000; Webber, 2005). Incorporating identity work into the feminist curriculum helps and adds to this challenge as well (Ely et al., 2011), and at least one study suggests that male students are becoming used to the idea of women in power and leadership positions, not necessarily because it is "taught" to them, but because of their relationships with strong females in their lives (Hickman, 2014). Additionally, students appear to be more receptive to lessons on "isms" (feminism, racism, sexism, classism) when the lessons come from middle class White male professors (Lerum, 2012), which further illustrates how ingrained sex, class and racial prejudices are in most student populations. These findings underscore why it is important to understand how much the teacher factors into a student's reception of gender coursework. Additionally, incorporating gender coursework would likely look different to each teacher involved in the instruction. Incorporating gender coursework could consist of as little as one or two class sessions discussing gender in the entire duration of the course, or as much as a whole semester presented through a feminist theory lens. Understanding different teachers' approaches to teaching a gender component is an important aspect of this

study as well. Therefore, the study collected data regarding the impact of the instructor and course design on student receptiveness.

Faculty gender, status, and pedagogical style appear to have a significant impact on student receptiveness to feminism in the curriculum. Across almost all disciplines, students give more favorable ratings to male faculty (Carson, 2001; Lerum, 2012). When learning about gender, instructor gender may have a particular impact on student receptiveness. Male students at least appear to be more receptive to instruction from male teachers, and all students tend to see male WGS instructors as having more credibility than female instructors (Lerum, 2012; Spoor & Lehmler, 2014).

Faculty likability is also associated with student responsiveness to lessons both in feminism and in general (Cottringer, 2002; Delucchi & Pelowski, 2000; Lerum, 2012; Morgan & Bergeron, 2007). Faculty status may also impact how a course with feminism is designed and implemented. Non-tenured and adjunct faculty are more vulnerable to student evaluations and might therefore want to be seen as more likable and ease up on feminist or gendered content (Acker & Webber, 2006). In terms of pedagogy, faculty who create more inclusive, open and validating classroom environments have a greater impact on students. The more students feel they can trust their teacher, the more open they are to change (Bauer, 2014; Stake et al., 2008). This type of pedagogy may in fact be more common in WGS studies, as WGS faculty are more likely to use Feminist Pedagogy, which is seen as more student centered than standard instruction, in their courses (Herideen, 1998; Kezar, 1998; Malkin & Stake, 2004; Stake, 2006) and use of Feminist Pedagogy has also been shown to improve responsiveness to gender coursework (Johnson, 2003; Malkin & Stake, 2004; Stake, 2006).

Student Factors that Impact Receptiveness

Of course, what the student brings into the classroom may be the biggest predictor of their responsiveness to gender in the curriculum, so it is important to understand what perspective the student brings to the classroom environment, as this informs how students respond to gender concepts, including feminism, sexism, and gender norms and roles (hooks, 1994; Manago et al., 2009; Spears Brown, 2008). Therefore the study collected data regarding the impact of the student's own demographical information. Studies of WGS classes have shown that several factors may influence a student's receptiveness to gender curriculum, including societal and cultural norms, race and ethnicity, and the student's gender and gender attitudes. In general, "students' initial attitudes toward a WGS course are shaped before they decide to enroll in a course. While attitudes can develop via in-depth, systematic processing, heuristics and other cues can both directly affect attitudes and bias how attitude-relevant information is processed [23,24]" (Spoor & Lehmiller, 2014, p. 2). The negative connotations surrounding feminism are a major factor impacting college students' receptiveness to feminism, even if they already have gender-egalitarian attitudes. Studies have shown that male students generally have a more negative attitude toward feminism than female students and may also be more resistant to feminism curriculum because it challenges their privileged status and the status quo (Burke & Trumpy, 2016; Spoor & Lehmiller, 2014). Students may see feminism as opposed to their own ideas of femininity and motherhood (Manago et al., 2009). Students may also begin the class with the viewpoint that feminism is not really academic content nor real knowledge, and that women's issues are not relevant any longer (Burke & Trumpy, 2016; Crossley, 2010; Spoor & Lehmiller, 2014; Webber, 2005). WGS students, both male and female, may see "men" as being excluded or picked on in feminism discussions (Burke & Trumpy, 2016; Webber, 2005). Racial or ethnic identity may also play a part in students' receptiveness to feminism. For example,

Latinas and African American women are more likely to face and to be aware of institutional discrimination, and therefore may be more likely to appreciate a feminist agenda than their White counterparts. On the other hand, they may also see feminism as the limited and perhaps equally discriminatory provenance of White middle-class women (Carter, 2007; Eisele & Stake, 2008; hooks, 1994; hooks, 2014; Manago et al., 2009). On the other hand, as White students appear to have more growth from their college diversity experiences than any other racial groups of students (Loes et al., 2012; Pascarella et al., 2014), it may be that White students similarly have more growth regarding gender. Religion has been associated with ideas of masculinity and femininity and coordinating gender roles (Haider, 2016; Whitehead, 2012). A person's age is often a good indicator of where they stand on positions of gender equality and also feminism (MacNaughton, 2006; Manago et al., 2009; Peltola, Milkie, & Presser, 2004; Vallente, 2014). It should be noted that students with the most resistant attitudes are generally less engaged in, and report more negative experiences, in WGS courses (Spoor & Lehmler, 2014).

Despite these preconceived attitudes, students with the most conservative views on gender and sexism do show the most change, although this may be simply because they are capable of more change than those with already fairly equitable gender attitudes (Stake, Sevelius, & Hanley, 2008). Furthermore, "it appears that all ethnoracial groups change similarly over the course of WGS classes in feminist attitudes, feminist identity, and feelings of self-efficacy" (Eisele & Stake, p. 2008, 240). While student characteristics may impact a student's receptiveness to gender in instruction, positive outcomes, even of varying degrees, appear to be the norm, which is a heartening discovery.

And, Of Course, There Is Post-Feminism

A final major factor that must be discussed is post-feminism. Post-feminism, like other post-theoretical frameworks, like post-modernism and post-colonialism, considers the changed worldviews and realities that now exist post whatever said phenomenon (Genz & Brabon, 2018). Post-feminism then, “refers to a shift in the understanding and construction of identity and gender categories (like ‘Woman, ‘Man’, and ‘Feminist’)” (Genz & Brabon, 2018, p. 23). For many, this has translated to an understanding that gender equality has been achieved and the need for a movement like feminism has passed (Genz & Brabon, 2018; McRobbie, 2009; Pomerantz & Raby, 2011). For others, post-feminism is wildly dangerous:

The advent of postfeminism has engendered not the eradication of sexism and inequality but their transformation into a more indirect and insidious form. In effect, we are now confronted with the possibility of an ‘enlightened sexism’ that draws on ‘embedded feminism’ to resurrect sexist stereotypes (Douglas 2010; 9; see Chapter 6). [...] In this vein, Susan Douglas (2010) summarily rejects postfeminism because the term ‘suggests that somehow feminism is at the root of this when it isn’t – it’s good, old-fashioned, grade-A sexism that reinforces good, old fashioned, grade-A patriarchy’ (10). In particular, the popular media is criticized for co-opting feminism’s language of choice and empowerment and selling women an illusion of progress that ends up subjugating and oppressing them even further and on more unconscious levels. (Genz & Brabon, 2018, p. 40-41)

In line with this, both the concepts of “girl-power” and the new category of “alpha girls” has led to a dangerous state for girls. A post-feminist worldview posits that, since gender inequalities have been resolved, the girls that fail or fall behind have only themselves to blame (Bettis et al., 2016; Genz & Brabon, 2018; McRobbie, 2009; Pomerantz & Raby, 2011). Furthermore, the

alpha girl is set a tall order of being successful, independent, and competent in all walks of life, and there is no excuse for her if she is not (Bettis et al., 2016; Pomerantz & Raby, 2011). “Thus, the alpha girl, though touted as a new subjectivity of empowerment and equality, might also signal another way in which feminism has been co-opted within a post-feminist, neoliberal landscape” (Bettis et al., 2016, p. 165). A post-feminism world view also complicates things for boys. The post-feminist boy must navigate older notions of masculinity with newer ideas of metro-sexuality and ‘re-masculinization’, plus being perceived as both the cause/perpetrator of sexism and the victim of feminist backlash (Genz & Brabon, 2018). Clearly, a post-feminism worldview would impact how students respond to gendered curriculum, let alone feminist curriculum, and this might also explain why both female and male students feel that gender inequality may be an overarching problem and yet are likely to shy away from ascribing it to flaws inherent in our education, social, and political institutions.

Conclusion

Because a study on the impact of feminism in non-elective coursework does not appear to have been conducted in the United States, the results of this study could not be neatly predicted. The exposure to gender related content, feminist theory, and or feminist texts in a non-elective setting could have had measurable positive impacts on student attitudes, or the exposure could have had no impact at all. I formed certain hypotheses based on how students in WGS courses respond to gender instruction and how students respond to diversity experiences, and those hypotheses indicate positive results. The findings of this study, though not in sync with all the hypotheses, have their own positive implications. These findings also only scratch the surface of the issue, and clearly additional research is necessary. An evaluation of current events and the current social and political climates confirm the need to investigate ways to combat sexism in

college classrooms, sexism on college campuses, and sexism in the country. The lack of gender equity and the prominence of sexism in America persist because we have not yet done enough to challenge the systems that perpetuate them. The way forward is not clear, and it will not be easy, but both necessity and research underscore the importance of this change.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS

In education, politics, many fields of work, media, and day-to-day encounters, women still face sexism, discrimination, and discrepancies in representation and wages. As educational processes often normalize sexism and gender disparity, there is a need to understand what the impact, if any, of moving gender into the mainstream coursework could have in changing students' perceptions and attitudes towards feminism, sexism, and gender roles. This embedded mixed methods study is a first step in the process. It was designed to measure the impact of non-elective gender coursework on community college students. This study sought to answer the following research questions:

- 1) Does incorporating gender into required coursework affect student perceptions of and reactions to gender, particularly concepts of sexism/gender discrimination?
- 2) Does incorporating gender into required coursework affect student perceptions of and reactions to gender, particularly concepts of feminism?
- 3) Does incorporating gender into required coursework affect student perceptions of and reactions to gender, particularly concepts of gender roles/gender norms?

Secondary inquiries for those three questions are:

- a. Are there patterns of student responsiveness to the gender coursework related to students' gender, race/ethnicity, age, or religious/cultural practices?
- b. Are there patterns of student responsiveness to the gender coursework related to the faculty member's age, race/ethnicity, or gender?
- c. Are there patterns of student responsiveness to the gender coursework related to campus climate?

Research Design and Rationale

This research design was developed to test hypotheses about how students would respond to a non-elective gender component. This research design compared students' reactions to taking a mandatory gender coursework unit versus no mandatory gender coursework across 24 classes at three community colleges. There were 13 classes taking the gender component course and 11 classes taking the non-gender component course. Students who took the course with the gender coursework were compared against students without the gender coursework. I assessed the impact of the gender coursework by measuring students' reactions to feminism, sexism, and gender roles and norms through Pre- and Post-course surveys, and by comparing students' reactions in courses with and without the unit. Survey findings were also supported by document analysis of student reflections.

I used a Transformative Embedded Mixed Methods design for this study. This type of design has an underlying premise of challenging social structures that are seen as oppressive in light of a conceptual framework or theory and this type of design operates out of a social justice agenda (Cresswell, 2014). Working out of a feminist framework, my study fell into the transformative category, as I am also seeking a "call to action" (p. 282).

The transformative paradigm is a meta-physical framework that "directly engages the complexity encountered by researchers and evaluators in culturally diverse communities when their work is focused on increasing social justice" (Mertens, 2009, p. 10). It focuses on the tensions that arise when unequal power relationships permeate a research context that addresses intransigent social problems (Greene, 2008). (Mertens, 2012, p. 2).

This approach is appropriate because I wanted to understand what, how and why. I sought, as Cresswell notes, "an understanding of participant views within the context of an experimental

intervention” (p. 282), with the gender component acting as the intervention. The qualitative and quantitative data were collected in non-sequential order, and the data collected were analyzed together.

My study’s research questions were best explored through a moderately large quantitative survey and supplemented by smaller qualitative document analysis. The Pre- and Post-surveys allowed me to engage a large number of students across multiple classes and campuses and helped show what if any changes occurred because of the “intervention”. The student reflections provided insight into both how and why students changed over the course of the semester as well as revealed in the students’ perceptions of the current state of gender issues nationally. Document analysis of student reflections was further useful here because, “Documents [...] may corroborate observational and interview data, or they may refute them, in which case the researcher is ‘armed’ with evidence that can be used to clarify, or perhaps, to challenge what is being told” (Yanow, 2007, p. 411). I also collected syllabi from instructors in order to understand how instructors conceptualized a gender component with the idea that that may have an impact on if, how, and why student attitudes changed over the semester.

A quantitative survey alone, although it would have been comprehensive, would likely not be able to speak to how and why students changed, but only show whether they did. Accordingly, the reflections piece was able to make up for some of the limitations in the survey method. Qualitative data alone would not be able to show generalizability or scale and scope of change. Taken together, the qualitative data complemented the quantitative findings of the impact of gender studies on students. As Maxwell (2013) notes, “This strategy reduces the risk that your conclusions will reflect only the biases of a specific method, and allows you to gain a more secure understanding of the issues you are investigating” (p. 102).

Strategies of Inquiry

This study examined the students enrolled in various Critical-thinking courses at three California Community College campuses.

Site Selection: I conducted this study at California Community Colleges because CCCs handle 70% of the student population in California and have more students from diverse backgrounds, often students from historically marginalized or underrepresented communities; these are students that would be best served by an intervention of empowerment. Additional justifications for this site, as mentioned earlier, include the CCCs' commitment to diversity, which aligns with the social justice nature of this study design, and the lack of research on this subject with this particular population. Furthermore, this population is understudied in this specific area.

The three Southern California community colleges that participated in this study were Coastal College (pseudonym), Sweet Valley College (pseudonym), and Canyon Glen College (pseudonym). I chose these three particular community colleges for a number of reasons. First, they were colleges where I had enough access that I could persuade the school, departments and faculty to take part in the study, which required some faculty members to make a not insignificant effort, as they had to allow me class time, and the one instructor who did not have a gender component in his course had to include one for this study. As Table 3.1 below shows, the three CCCs I chose range in size, location, and student demographics, and, taken collectively, are representative of CCC student demographics, although they are all in Southern California. These sites represent diversity in student age, race/ethnicity, and SES. The campuses also represented different communities: Sweet Valley is fairly rural, with many specialized programs, and is part of a three-school district. Canyon Glen is part of a nine-college district, in a central urban

environment, easily accessible by public transportation, has more students over the age of 24 than the other two campuses, and has a large ESL and international population. Coastal College is a single college district, also in an urban area, and has larger African American, Asian American, and Pacific Islander populations than the other two schools. All three of the campuses are Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) and two have Hispanic students as the largest student population; on the other campus, White students make up the majority.

The Colleges' mission statements across the schools are also comparable. Each of the mission statements echo the values of equity, diversity and access; none currently include discussion of feminism or gender in their mission statements; this could be because they perceive feminism/gender studies as inherently a part of equity and/or diversity, or that they do not want to include a feminist agenda in the mission statement, or for an entirely different reason or reasons.

Table 3.1

Overview of Participating Community Colleges

	Student Age	Student Race/Ethnicity	Student SES*	Student Gender
Canyon Glen	23% under 20	42% Hispanic,	79% receiving any	57% female
	36% 20-24	30% White,	financial aid	43% male
	29% 25-39	10% Multiple	76% State/Local	
	12% 40-over.	Ethnicities, 8% Asian, 5% Black/African American	Grants or Scholarships 62% Pell grants 0% Student Loan Aid	
Coastal College	24% under 20	55% Hispanic,	80% receiving any	55% female
	40% 20-24	14% White,	financial aid	45% male
	21% 25-34	4% Multiple	79% State/Local	
	10% 35-49	Ethnicities,	Grants or	
	5% 50-over	12.43% Asian, Pacific Islander 13% Black/African American, 0.2% Native American /Alaskan	Scholarships 65% Pell grants 2% Student Loan Aid	
Sweet Valley	39.4% under 20	33% Hispanic,	44% receiving any	51% female
	38.6% 20-24	50% White,	financial aid	48% male
	16.8% 25-39	5% Multiple	42% State/Local	
	5.2% 40-over.	Ethnicities,	Grants or	
		8.5% Asian, 2% Black/African American, 0.2% Native American /Alaskan, 0.2% Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Scholarships 28% Pell grants 2% Student Loan Aid	

Note - * Data retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/>

As Table 3.2 shows, there was a total of 24 courses across the three campuses, 16 faculty members, and 539 students at the beginning of the semester, and 453 students by the end of the semester, which is just about the standard retention rate for CCCs, which is 85.14% (CCCCO.org, 2018).

Table 3.2

Overview of Courses Participating in Study by Campus

	Coastal College	Sweet Valley	Canyon Glen	Total
Total number of Classes studied	7 Pre / 7 Post	6 Pre / 6 Post	11Pre / 11 Post	24 Pre / 24 Post
English 1	6 Pre / 6 Post	1 Pre / 1 Post	2 Pre / 2 Post	9 Pre / 9 Post
English 2	1 Pre / 1 Post	4 Pre / 1 Post	2 Pre / 2 Post	7 Pre / 7 Post
English 3	0	1 Pre / 1 Post	7 Pre / 7 Post	8 Pre / 8 Post
Students:				
Pre-Survey	149	125	269	543
Post-Survey	133	119	201	453
Longitudinal Sample	86	61	94	241

Population

Faculty Participant Selection: After I recruited the three colleges, I worked with the department chairs to recruit instructors from the English department who taught Critical-thinking courses in the Fall 2017 semester (See Appendix C). For the gender component classes, all but one of the faculty members from the English department were already teaching their classes that semester with a gender component. Only one teacher added a gender component/gender studies into their course for the sake of this study – although this made the balance slightly uneven, 13-

12 instead of 12-12, it provided me with the only male instructor teaching a gender component. Recruiting both English department faculty members who taught a gender component in their Critical-thinking courses and faculty members who did not teach a gender component in their courses allowed me to compare the effect of the “intervention” (i.e. gender component students) with a comparable group of students who did not receive the intervention (i.e. with no gender component)⁷. I then met with faculty members to get a copy of their syllabus and to discuss any questions or concerns they had regarding the study. After that, I worked with the instructors to schedule convenient survey dates and times. At the end of the Fall 2017 semester, I sent faculty members a brief questionnaire to collect demographic information and any final thoughts on the semester (See Appendix J). I did not include any incentives other than being part of the process of a study; however, I did send the instructors thank you cards and \$10 Starbucks cards in the Spring 2018 semester to express my thanks.

At these three colleges, 16 faculty members allowed their classes to be surveyed for this study; of these faculty members, 8 taught two sections, bringing the total number of classes to 24. Table 3.3 below gives the genders, ages, and ethnicities of the instructor participants. The instructor biographies are also included in Appendix K. The number of faculty participants is not even across the campuses for two reasons. First, Canyon Glen has a larger student body and offers more English Critical-Thinking courses than Coastal College and Sweet Valley. Second, and more to the point, I had more faculty volunteers at Canyon Glen. This meant that seven

⁷ The courses in the study differ according to instructor design, but all must meet the requirements of the schools’ articulation agreements and Course Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes clearly defined by the various CCCs. The major marker of differentiation for the purpose of this study is the deliberate inclusion of a gender component on the part of the instructor.

classes were surveyed at Coastal College, six at Sweet Valley, and 11 at Canyon Glen. The instructors range in age and are about two-thirds white, and there are more female than male instructors, again, almost a 2-1 ratio.

Table 3.3

Overview of Instructor Participants Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

	Coastal College	Sweet Valley	Canyon Glen	Total
Number of instructors	4	3	9	16
Gender				
Female	3	2	5	10
Male	1	1	4	6
Age				
Age 25-34	1	0	1	2
Age 35-44	0	2	1	3
Age 45-54	2	0	3	5
Age 55-64	1	1	2	4
Age 65-75	0	0	2	2
Ethnicity				
Asian / Asian American	0	0	1	1
African American or Black	1	2	0	3
Hispanic or Latino	1	0	0	1
Multiracial / Multiethnic	0	0	1	1
White / Caucasian	2	1	7	10

A Note About The Faculty Participants

As I previously mentioned, all but one of the instructors of the gender component courses were female. The one male instructor who included a gender component, did so at my request, not because he had previously planned to include a component in his class. While I was more concerned about getting enough faculty participants for this study, the lack of male instructors of the gender component did not escape my notice. Naturally, I assumed this had to be more than mere coincidence. The 2013–14 HERI Faculty Survey reported that 17.3% of women members

“Taught an area studies course (e.g., women’s studies, ethnic studies, LGBTQ studies)” whereas only 10.8% of men faculty members taught an area studies course (p. 114). A quick look at the UCs, CSUs, and CCCs shows that the bulk of the women and gender studies faculty appear to be female. The 2013–14 HERI Faculty Survey also reported that 29.6% of women faculty members and 16.9% of men faculty members regularly used readings on women and gender issues as a method of instruction in their classes. In this study, five of the 10 women and none of the six men had already planned to include a gender component in their course. This suggests that a faculty member’s gender identity might be a motivating factor for their inclusion of gender coursework. On the other hand, no teacher in this study, male or female, with gender component or without, rated themselves below a 3 (on a Likert scale of 1-5) in feminist identity, and in fact, more teachers were 4s and 5s than anything else. In this study, feminist identity did not appear to be a determining factor of inclusion of gender coursework. From both my meetings with faculty members prior to the class and from the brief questionnaire at the end of the semester, I learned that faculty members appear to include gender coursework in their classes because they felt it was important in understanding motivations, in both fiction and reality, because the students wanted to discuss it, and because the students appear to be uninformed on the subject.

Many teachers spoke to the importance of gender as a lens for critical thinking. Three English 2 (Critical Thinking Through Literature Analysis) teachers who included a gender component spoke to the importance of gender in unpacking literary character development and motivation. Professor Coltrane wrote: “I think it is an important factor in understanding identity and motivations in characters in fiction” and Professor Ronstadt wrote: “Gender expectations have profound effects on the lives of literary characters and real people alike”. Professor Ono added that “Gender is always taught in my course, it's never separated out, neither is race,

religion, class, politics, etc.”, which again speaks to the identity and cultural factors that inform authors, their texts, and readers’ interpretations of those texts. Professor Gabriel, the one male gender component faculty member and an English 3 instructor, said simply: “I think it is relevant to critical thinking.”

The gender component professors had somewhat different attitudes regarding student awareness and responsiveness to gender. Professor Joplin, one of the longest teaching faculty members, commented that it was the students who pushed for gender content: “When students are interested in interpreting assigned readings in a gender-centered contexts, I follow their lead.” Professor Ono felt that students are more open to this discussion than before: “I have noticed that as the years pass, the students are more open to topics they once struggled over, gender being one of them. They are more tolerant, understanding, and supportive. I began teaching in 1989, students have changed quite a bit since then, for the better (well, that is until our current president took office).” Her comment regarding President Trump echoes the sentiments found in the student reflections; in fact, two of her students referred to the current administration in their reflections.

In contrast to that, Professor Bowie, an English 3 professor who teaches both in physical and virtual settings, observed:

I try to practice culturally responsive education, so it factors into my coursework fairly easily/naturally. It's also important (to me, anyway) to get students to think critically about topics that might not occur to them, and -- despite the prevalence of gender related issues in news, politics, and media -- I've found a good many students don't consider gender and the implications of inclusivity/exclusivity very often (if at all).

Taken together, these comments suggest that the professors feel that students are open to the discussion of the material, but that it is also important that discussion and content be informed and responsive. For Professor Slick, who recently started and runs the LGBTQIA+ center at Canyon Glen, the topic of gender and creating inclusive and responsive teaching is so important that she: “created an entire semester around gender”.

The teachers, both male and female, who did not include a gender component appeared to fall into two camps. For one group, although gender was not a part of their curriculum, they were more than willing to discuss it if it came up in class discussions. For example, Professor Davis mentioned, “This is a composition class, so all of the topics listed were topics that were discussed and/or written about. [...] Gender is discussed in certain sections of the course but is not the primary focus or theme of the writing and discussions.” And Professor Waits commented: “I didn't address it directly, but it was certainly discussed in terms of the other subjects.”

The other group of non-gender component teachers had a general aversion to including the subject in coursework. Professor Benetar explained that she no longer included gender in her coursework because the subject was too close to her heart, and she realized she couldn't respond in a neutral manner to students who came from a vastly different perspective. Professor Ant, Professor Credence, and Professor Crosby were worried more about the student comfort levels; Professor Ant commented: “It's more or less simply the idea behind feeling comfortable in the classroom and workplace”. Professor Credence noted that his students were equally male and female, implying that therefore teaching any gender component was either unnecessary or not a good fit for a balanced-in-gender class. Professor Crosby wrote: “Touchiness of students on the subject. Emotionality and divisiveness associated with it”. Interestingly, Professor Estefan cited

as her motivation for course development “understanding the foundation of our country that entitles all students to an equitable education and my approach is also creating a call to action to protect equity in the undeserved communities,” yet it appears that gender does not fit the criteria here for her.

Student participant selection: The student participants were the students enrolled in the classes of the faculty members I had recruited to participate in the study. These types of students generally identified as transfer-minded students (that is – students who take a Critical-thinking course generally do so because these courses are required for transfer to a UC or CSU). With instructor permission, I surveyed all students in each of the 24 classes. The students who take these courses typically represent the demographics of the CCC student population. On average, most CCCs offer upwards of 70 or more sections of English Critical-thinking courses, including online course sections. Class sizes ranged from 27 to 40 students per class. This would mean there would be about 6,500 potential students to survey at the beginning of the course and about 5,500 at the end of the semester (factoring in a 15% attrition rate). The sample population in my study was roughly eight percent of this population for the ALL survey population, and roughly four percent for the Longitudinal survey population.

More than 100 students completed surveys at each campus. Students provided data about their age, race/ethnicity, enrollment status, religious identity, and language most commonly spoken among other factors. In Table 3.4 below, some of the relevant student demographic data as related to the RQs and analysis are presented.

Table 3.4

Overview of Relevant Student Participants' Demographics

	Pre-	Post-	Longitudinal
Total Survey Participants	539	453 (84% of Pre-Survey takers)	241 (44.7% of Pre-Survey takers)
Gender Course Type			
Gender component	299 (55%)	258 (57%)	131 (54.4%)
No Gender Component*	240 (45%)	195 (43%)	110 (45.6%)
English Course Type			
Enrolled in English 1	202 (37.6%)	161 (35.5%)	96 (39.8%)
Enrolled in English 2	169 (31.3%)	148 (32.7%)	72 (29.9%)
Enrolled in English 3	168 (31.1%)	144 (31.8%)	73 (30.3%)
Enrollment Status			
Enrolled at CC part time	197 (35.6%)	176 (38.2%)	90 (36.5%)
Enrolled at CC full time	340 (63.1%)	274 (60.5%)	151 (62.7%)
Age			
24 and Under	426 (76.8%)	346 (75.7%)	184 (76.3%)
25-34	81 (15%)	76 (16.8%)	42 (17.4%)
Over 35	31	30	14
Gender Identity			
Man	246 (45.6%)	204 (45%)	97 (40.2%)
Woman	277 (51.4%)	236 (52.1%)	139 (57.7%)
Identified as other than Man or Woman ⁸	15 (1.5%)	12 (1.3%)	5 (.8%)

⁸ (Including: Non-conforming-gender variant; Non-binary; Prefer not to answer; Transgender man; Woman/Man; and Androgynous)

	Pre-	Post-	Longitudinal
Ethnicity			
Asian-American	40 (7.4%)	33 (7.3%)	17 (6.6%)
Black or African American	22 (4.1%)	20 (4.4%)	9 (3.7%)
Hispanic or Latino	240 (44.5%)	198 (43.7%)	115 (47.7%)
Multiracial-Multiethnic	90 (16.7%)	66 (14.6%)	34 (14.1%)
Other Ethnicity	34 (6.3%)	23 (5.1%)	12 (1.2%)
White	111 (20.6%)	111 (24.5%)	54 (22.4%)
Religion Practiced			
Catholicism	125 (23.2%)	110 (24.3%)	62 (25.7%)
Christianity	128 (23.7%)	105 (23.2%)	62 (24.9%)
No Religion/Atheist/Agnostic	220 (40.8%)	188 (41.5%)	93 (38.5%)
Other	60 (11.1%)	47 (10.4%)	23 (9.5%)

In order to better understand effects, some student groups in small percentages were combined into an “other” category (such as Other Religion or Other Ethnicity), or they were enfolded into an appropriate pre-existing category. In Student Religion, which had a wide variety of responses, the answer categories were recoded so that responses garnering under five percent were combined into an “other” category, leaving only Catholicism, Christianity, No Religion/Atheist/Agnostic, and Other Religion. Similarly, Student Gender Identity was recoded to create the categories of Man, Woman, and Other Gender Identity, since each of the other categories outside of Man and Woman had responses of less than one percent. Student Age was recoded to leave only the categories of 24 & Under, 25-34, and Over 35, as there were fewer than five percent of students under 18 and in the other categories of responses in the over 35 range. Accordingly, in Student Ethnicity, Pacific Islanders were joined with Asian/Asian American, and other ethnicities with small percentages were combined into an Other Ethnicity category.

A Closer Look At The Gender Component Courses

As I previously mentioned, faculty participants in this study had differing interpretations of what a gender component looks like in their classrooms. Three teachers were newer to the game, while the other seven had long included gender as a topic/point of view. Though gender is a favorite topic for Professor Slick, this was her first time devoting an entire semester to gender and using a gender based textbook. Professor Nicks was also using a heavily gendered piece in her class (*The Handmaid's Tale*) for the first time. As previously noted, this was Professor Gabriel's first time including it as a unit at all.

Four of the nine instructors had gender as a topic throughout the semester, in particular as a lens through which to view the world, though only Professor Slick had a whole textbook devoted to the subject. For Bowie, Piaf, and Ronstadt, gender as a lens/topic was woven throughout the course. The English 1 and English 3 classes, which are similar in many respects, looked at gender as topic of discussion and aspect of critical thinking. Piaf, Slick, and Bowie had gender as an aspect of the course throughout the semester, while Joplin and Gabriel had limited but concentrated units on gender. In the English 2 (Critical Thinking Through Literature) classes surveyed, of which there were a total of six with the gender component, there was more consistency in some ways. Two teachers included *The Handmaid's Tale*, and the other texts the teachers used in conjunction with the gender component were *Fences*, *Hamilton*, *Beloved*, and *Wuthering Heights*. The four instructors⁹ all included discussion of gender roles and norms when discussing the literary texts, and three of the four instructors discussed feminist literary criticisms. Three of the four instructors also combined discussions of gender with race and economic status.

⁹ Coltrane and Ronstadt each taught two sections of English 2.

There is an interesting potential problem involved with the English 2 classes that combined gender with literature, as students may understand that the gender issues presented in literary texts and yet not equate them with real world situations or real world realities. This point will be further discussed in Chapter Five.

Table 3.5

Timeline of Gender Instruction and Survey Administration

College	Pre-Survey Administered	Gender Component Began	Gender Component Ended	Post-Survey Administered	Style of Inclusion
Canyon Glen					
Bowie (2 sections) (Eng 3)	Week 6 Week 6	Week 2 Week 2	Week 15 Week 15	Week 15 Week 15	Discussed Throughout Semester
Gabriel (Eng 3)	Week 1	Week 5	Week 5	Week 8	Isolated Unit
Joplin (Eng 1)	Week 6	Week 10	Week 13	Week 16	Isolated Unit
Ono (Eng 2)	Week 7	Week 6	Week 16	Week 15	Discussed Throughout Two Thirds of Semester
Slick (Eng 3)	Week 6	Week 1	Week 16	Week 16	Discussed Throughout Semester
Coastal College					
Nicks (Eng 2)	Week 7	Week 10	Week 16	Week 15	Discussed Throughout Second Half of Semester
Piaf (2 sections) (Eng 1)	Week 6 Week 6	Week 2 Week 2	Week 16 Week 16	Week 15 Week 15	Discussed Throughout Semester

College	Pre-Survey Administered	Gender Component Began	Gender Component Ended	Post-Survey Administered	Style of Inclusion
Sweet Valley					
Coltrane (2 sections) (Eng 2)	Week 9 Week 10	Week 13 Week 13	Week 17 Week 17	Week 17 Week 18	Discussed Throughout Second Half of Semester
Ronstadt ¹⁰ (2 sections) (Eng 2)	Week 9 Week 10	Week 2 Week 2	Week 17 Week 17	Week 17 Week 18	Discussed Throughout Semester

Additionally, gender appeared to come up in discussion in some of the non-gender component courses, while other non-gender component teachers expressly avoided the subject. Professor Davis and Professor Brown both mentioned that it comes up in class and when it does, they include it in discussion.

Data Collection Methods

1) Pre- and Post-course surveys were administered to all student participants in this study to assess any changes in their attitudes and to assess the impact of a gender course on students' Post-scores. Survey findings were supported by student reflection document analysis. All students in the English Critical-thinking courses who consented to participate were surveyed twice during the semester: at about a month into instruction and then 8-10 weeks after, at the end of the semester. The resulting Longitudinal Data Set, though not the whole surveyed student body, was then analyzed to show any shifts in attitudes toward, and perceptions of, gender, including feminism, sexism, and gender roles and norms, and to see if there were any significant

¹⁰ In the initial meeting with Ronstadt, she told me she used gender as a lens throughout the semester in the follow up survey that she thought her students might not work as a sample since they had already been exposed to the gender material by the time I administered the Pre-Survey.

differences between the students in a gender component course and students in a non-gender component course.

The surveys appear extensive, but they are extensive in part because so many factors came into play in understanding students' responsiveness/reactivity to gender content. I developed these surveys to measure any change, or lack thereof, of student feminist identity, perception of issues of sexism/gender discrimination, and perception of gender norms and roles. My surveys requested information on students' age, gender, race/ethnicity, and religion. Not only are these some of the most common measures of co-variables, as the literature review showed, age, gender, race, religion can impact student responses to WGS and or feminism content. I also included questions that provided perspective on students' attitudes about the material and their instructors in case additional reference points were needed to understand the regression analysis. The literature also indicates that student demographics influence student attitudes toward feminism/gender studies; that is, students are more receptive to lessons from certain kinds of instructors and instruction methods, and that campus climate factors can affect student responsiveness, requiring the need to include questions addressing those factors in the surveys.

Student participants were given the Pre-survey within the first five to eight weeks of the semester. This first round of surveys was administered in class by me during class time with instructor permission. The paper surveys were later transferred to an electronic data set. The surveys requested some form of personal data tracking, such as student emails or IDs, from the students so that their Pre- and Post-surveys could be compared individually, as well as overall. Since all responses were optional, many did not share this information on the Pre- or the Post-surveys, meaning that the Longitudinal Data Set is much smaller than the total number of students who completed the surveys.

The response rate for surveys was close to one hundred percent. Only one student verbally declined to participate and handed the survey back to me, and only a handful of students on each campus returned the survey without filling out any questions. All other students completed, at least partially, the survey handed to them.

It was my goal to be able to survey any students who dropped the course as well, by following up with them through an email survey (enabled by collecting student emails in the initial survey), however, as I was unable to match all Pre- and Post- surveys, I could not do this. I would have liked to survey them to see if they may have dropped the course because of issues with the gender curriculum or some other factor. If they dropped because of the curriculum, that may lead to a kind of default selection effect in some ways.

The surveys were coded so that each class/campus combination had a different indicator; for example: Y-CG-BO-2-1-####. A Y or an N indicates whether there was a gender component, the next letters were the campus, the next were the instructor's pseudonym, then the English class type, and then a 1 or a 2 to indicate if it was the first or second section for that instructor, and then the student ID. I am the only person who knows the association of pseudonym to school and pseudonym to instructor.

2) Selected students were asked to respond to a reflection prompt asking about their attitudes toward gender issues in America and how and if they changed over the semester (See Appendix I). Since the number of survey participants was fairly large, I did a stratified non-random sample of classes across the three campuses, the various class types, and the units with and without a gender component. This ended up being reflections from 8 classes with the gender component and 6 classes without the gender component, which resulted in 203 reflections altogether, 132 from those with gender component in the course, and 71 from those without

gender component in the course. This was included with the Post-survey, again, administered with instructor permission, at the end of the semester (between weeks 15-18 depending on the school's semester length). The reflection questions asked students to write one to two paragraphs in response to set of related questions.

3) I collected syllabi from instructors in the Fall 2017 semester. Although not a research question, instructor syllabi partially show what the different Critical-thinking courses look like, including subject matter, length and presentation of unit, texts and materials distributed, and what coursework is involved. As the discussion of gender component in the previous chapter indicated, a gender component, even across only 13 different classes¹¹ had just as many iterations. For some instructors, it questioned gender roles in general, through literature and plays like *Hamilton* and *Fences*; it was also a discussion of literature under the lens of feminist criticism; it was also a discussion of critical race feminism, which combines discussions of race, gender and feminism. The document analysis of the syllabus was key to understanding what the “gender component” looked like for each instructor, but also to understanding what a course with a gender component looked like in comparison to course without it.

I also reached out to all the faculty participants to confirm that those who were supposed to teach a gender component did so, and to confirm that those who were not supposed to teach a unit did not end up doing so.

¹¹ There were 16 total gender component classes but only 13 instructors, as three instructors taught two sections each.

Data Analysis Methods

I used Multiple Regression as my primary analytic technique, in addition to running descriptive statistics, t-tests, correlations, and ANOVAs. The student reflections were transcribed and coded for signals of the units of observation, as well as reviewed for any additional units of observation not previously mentioned. This data was then quantified and paired with the findings of the survey. I coded first for change statements, then views on gender roles, views on sexism, and views on feminism. After that, I took themes as they emerged. The process is described in detail below.

Analytical Process for Survey Data

Each student survey was manually entered into an Excel spreadsheet. Pre-surveys were one set and Post-surveys were one set. Wherever possible, students' Pre- and Post-surveys were matched using volunteered identifying information provided on the surveys (such as name or email), and these cases were assigned a common subject identifier to link the longitudinal responses.

Both Excel data sets were imported into SPSS. Additionally, two merged sets were created. One set includes data for only the students who completed both the Pre- and Post-surveys and had matching student ID numbers – this is the LOGITUDINAL Student Data Set. The second set contained the data of all students – this is the ALL Student Data Set. As the tables above show, the Longitudinal Student Data Set is relatively similar in demographics to the Pre-

and Post-surveyed students, although it is overrepresented by women and by students from Coastal College, which makes it underrepresented among men and Canyon Glen students.¹²

Analysis of Pre/Post Longitudinal Student Data Set:

The first round of analysis was done on this set in two ways. I determined SUM Scores for students surrounding three constructs regarding sexism, feminism, and gender roles and norms, and checked the reliability of the SUM Scores through a Cronbach Alpha and ran the Post-sums through multiple linear regression controlling for the Pre-score, and then the other reference groups. The three Constructs were Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination, Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism, and Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Gender Roles and Norms. The three SUM Scores for those constructs were formed by giving numeric weight to survey questions and tallying the scores for each student. For Likert scales, the numeric weight was the same as set up in the survey. Questions with Yes, No and Unsure options were recoded to 0, 1, and 2 numeric scales¹³. Table 3.6 below lists the four questions that constituted the Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination Sum Score Scale. Table 3.7 below lists the three questions that constituted the Attitudes and Perceptions Re Feminism Sum

¹² Both Sweet Valley and Canyon Glen were affected by the 2017 winter wildfires, which caused both a delay in Post-survey administration and a drop in student participation. I'm not sure what caused the male/female representation discrepancy. Only one student, a female, asked not to participate. Otherwise students took the surveys and returned them to me as they completed them. If the male students were less inclined to complete the survey and just returned it blank, I have no way of knowing, as the surveys were immediately put into envelopes to ensure student privacy and confidentiality. It is also possible there were just fewer male students at the end of the semester; CCCs frequently have higher attrition rates of male students.

¹³ An answer of Unsure was not lumped in with an answer of No or Yes, but was given a 1; an answer of Unsure indicated a level of uncertainty that an answer of No or Yes does not have. Furthermore, if students changed their answer of Yes or No on the Pre-Survey to Unsure on the Post-Survey, this also indicates a change in level of certainty, though not a complete shift to the other perspective.

Score Scale. Table 3.8 below lists the ten questions that constituted the Attitudes and Perceptions Re Gender Roles and Norms Sum Score Scale.

Table 3.6

Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination Sum Score Scale Composition

Cronbach's alpha of .690

Sexism/Gender Discrimination is a problem in American Workplaces
(Likert scale, 1-5)
1=Completely Disagree, 2=Somewhat Disagree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 5=Completely Agree

Sexism/Gender Discrimination is a problem in American Politics
(Likert scale, 1-5)
1=Completely Disagree, 2=Somewhat Disagree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 5=Completely Agree

Have you ever felt discriminated against because of your gender?
Yes (valued 2), Unsure (valued 1), No (valued 0)

Thinking back over your time here at COLLEGE SURVEYED, would you say that you
have ever observed incidents of sexism or gender-based discrimination on campus?
Yes (valued 2), Unsure (valued 1), No (valued 0)

Table 3.7.

Attitudes/Perceptions Re Feminism Sum Score Scale Composition

Cronbach's alpha of .716

Feminist Identity 1 - What is your feminist identity?
(Likert scale, 1-5)
1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely feminist)

Feminist Identity 2 - Would you mind if someone labeled you a feminist?
(Likert scale, 1-6)
1=Yes, very much. 2=Yes, somewhat, 3=Neither upset or not upset, 4=No, not very much,
5=No, not at all, 6=I would be pleased

Feminism is only for women
(Likert scale, 1-5)
1=Completely Agree, 2=Somewhat Agree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Disagree, 5=Completely Disagree

Table 3.8.

Attitudes/Perceptions Re Gender Roles and Norms Sum Score Scale Composition

Cronbach's alpha of .807

Should people of all genders have equal rights?
Yes (valued 2), Unsure (valued 1), No (valued 0)

Should women and men have equal rights?
Yes (valued 2), Unsure (valued 1), No (valued 0)

Can women and men do all of the same jobs?
Yes (valued 2), Unsure (valued 1), No (valued 0)

If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the mother be the primary caregiver?
Yes (valued 0), Unsure (valued 1), No (valued 2)

If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the father be the primary wage earner?
Yes (valued 0), Unsure (valued 1), No (valued 2)

Men make better leaders than women.
(Likert scale 1-5)
1=Completely Agree, 2=Somewhat Agree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Disagree, 5=Completely Disagree

Men should take gender studies courses.
(Likert scale 1-5)
1=Completely Disagree, 2=Somewhat Disagree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 5=Completely Agree

Women should take gender studies courses.
(Likert scale 1-5)
1=Completely Disagree, 2=Somewhat Disagree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 5=Completely Agree

Everyone should take gender studies courses.
(Likert scale 1-5)
1=Completely Disagree, 2=Somewhat Disagree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 5=Completely Agree

People should be able to choose their gender identity.
(Likert scale 1-5)
1=Completely Disagree, 2=Somewhat Disagree,
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 5=Completely Agree

To evaluate my data for each construct, I first ran simple linear regression with Pre-scores as a predictor of interest. To address the primary RQs 1-3, this was followed by multiple regression. The Gender Component was the first additional reference added in. I then inserted a first block of references based off of student demographic data (RQ sub-question a). This included gender identity, age, ethnicity, and religion. I then inserted a second reference group block based off of teacher demographic data (RQ sub-question b). This included gender, race, and age. A final reference group block was inserted based off of college factors (RQ sub-question c). This included English Class Type, Enrollment Status, and Overall College Satisfaction. I chose to include enrollment status here instead of in the first block of student demographics because I see enrollment status as informing a student's college experience more than it informs a student's identity. Any reference group that showed statistical significance was carried throughout subsequent models, while reference groups with no statistical significance were dropped, with the exception of Gender Component, as this was the main focus of the research. There was only one model in which there was conflict; this was in the multiple regression analysis of the Gender Attitudes construct. It is discussed in Chapter Four.

Analytical Process for Reflection Data

Seven classes with a gender component were asked to complete reflections, and six classes without a gender component were asked to complete reflections. Out of the 493 students who completed the Post-survey, 203 students completed the reflections – 132 (65%) students had the gender component, and 71 (35%) did not have the gender component. This ratio is not equal to the 57/43 split of survey takers because the non-gender class students did not fill out the reflections at the same rate per class that students in the gender classes did – I often left a gender

component class with at least two thirds of the class completing the reflections, whereas I left the non-gender component courses with sometimes only half of the students completing the reflections. To the best of my knowledge, only one teacher (this was in a gender component course) used an incentive such as extra credit to prompt students to fill out the surveys and reflections – and this was due to having to move the Post-survey to an online format because of the wildfires in late 2017. The faculty from both groups cajoled their students equally about filling out the forms and taking their time and taking the endeavor seriously, but the non-gender component faculty (in general) did seem more concerned with having the surveys completed quickly whereas the gender component faculty more commonly remarked to me that I should take my time. Because of the wildfires, several of my reflection administration dates were the last day of class, or even the final exam, which also impacted how much time the students had to complete the reflections.

The Reflection Prompt was: *“What are your thoughts about gender/gender issues in America? Have your thoughts about gender and or gender issues changed over the course of the semester? If your thoughts regarding gender have changed over the course of this semester, what factors, including reflection, interactions with teachers/students/texts, exercises, and so forth do you think caused the change? If your thoughts regarding gender have not changed, explain here why you think that is?”*

While I had a coding scheme in mind before I started to analyze the reflection transcripts, I did a first pass of just reading them without any coding. The reading confirmed that the original umbrella themes I had intended to code for were still the most logical for my purposes, but it also tweaked my sub theme category understanding. After the initial read, I created four copies of the student responses, one copy for each major theme: 1) change 2) awareness or, perceptions and

attitudes regarding sexism/gender discrimination, 3) perceptions and attitudes regarding feminism, and 4) perceptions and attitudes regarding gender norms and roles.

The students' statements regarding change were the most important aspect for substantiating any quantitative claims of the impact of a gender component.¹⁴ The first round of coding involved sorting the reflections into three large categories: 1) student noted a change in attitudes and perceptions over the semester, 2) student noted no change in attitudes and perceptions over the semester, and 3) students made no comment about or reference to change. I then looked for subthemes first within the "student noted a change" categories, specifically what aspects they attributed change to, for example, the class, the texts, the teacher, and external environmental factors, and what level change they recorded. In the group of reflections coded "students noted no change in attitudes and perceptions," I looked for what aspects, or lack of aspects, they attributed the lack of change to, for example, no class discussion or ineffective texts. Two related subthemes I had not conceptualized also emerged. The first was that students felt they were already sufficiently informed and the semester only reinforced their perceptions/attitudes, and second was that they had previously established gender egalitarian views and that these had not changed over the course of the semester.

After coding for themes surrounding change, I focused on the three constructs this study addressed, which were perceptions and attitudes regarding sexism/gender discrimination, feminism, and gender norms and roles. Within comments surrounding sexism/gender discrimination, I looked for students' comments first around their awareness of sexism /gender

¹⁴ As the statistical analysis showed no significant impact on Post scores associated with the gender component courses, this ultimately became a less important theme in the discussion of the findings.

discrimination in America, and then followed that with their rating of how much sexism/gender discrimination is a problem in America, from low to high; this ranged from some students considering the issue resolved to students who felt it was more a problem now than ever. Within comments surrounding feminism, which were comparatively few, I coded for positive/neutral/negative associations with the concepts while concurrently coding for general perceptions of the meaning of feminism. I felt I had to do this as the statements regarding attitude toward and perception of were too commingled to try to disentwine them from each other. Within comments surrounding gender roles and gender norms, I looked first for students' attitudes attached to concepts of gender equality, as this was a prevalent theme that the first reading of the reflections showed, and then comments surrounding gender norms/roles separated into challenging gender norms/roles or reaffirming gender roles/norms.

I knew if a student was in a gender or non-gender component course throughout my coding process, but I did not know any of the student demographics. I did not look up student demographics until I had finished coding for all four themes – I did this both to check my own assumptions and counteract any implicit bias.

Ethical Considerations

I was the sole administrator of all the student surveys, with the exception of the 2 online courses and one wildfire interrupted class, all of which took the survey through Survey Monkey. A small handful of students knew me from previous classes (as I am a CCC English instructor); however, the number was small – fewer than 5. The second survey included the reflection piece and specific instructor questions, and I served as an impartial, survey administrator. I had a written protocol (See Appendix D) for introducing the survey, including a brief description of the

purpose of the study, comments on confidentiality, and a request for honest answers. The survey itself included the same information, as well as my contact information and IRB information.

The major ethical concerns I foresaw involved ensuring that students did not feel coerced/pressured into completing a survey and ensuring student confidentiality. A consent form, as established by UCLA's IRB, was administered with all surveys. I reassured all students that completing the survey and reflection pieces was entirely voluntary. If instructors offered any extra or participation credit to the students for completing the survey and reflections (only 2 did this), I arranged with the instructor to offer an alternate assignment for the same points to students who did not want to complete the survey or reflection pieces. As I asked students to volunteer their email addresses, so I could compare individual change across the semester, I have paperwork that connects a student's identity to their responses. To ensure confidentiality, I have kept all paper copies of the surveys in my personal, private, and secured possession for the entire duration of the study and at present. Survey responses were coded a first time by school site pseudonym, class type, and instructor pseudonym, then by a student numbering process unrelated to student's name or email. The code crosswalk is in my personal, private, and secured possession, and was not and will not be shared with instructors or school administrators.

The surveys were paper surveys, so the data was transcribed and uploaded to a secure cloud drive as well as an external hard drive. The paper copies are also being kept and stored. When the data is no longer needed, the paper copies will be shredded before being trashed securely, and the e-copies will be deleted. As the surveys could include confidential information, all e-storage is password protected, and the paper copies are kept in a secure and locked cabinet in my home office, to which co-workers and colleagues could have no access.

There may be some risks to instructors in that they may receive push back or negative comments from students who dislike the gender content. Hopefully, the majority of instructors (all but 1) teaching the gender component were already planning to do so, and this would already be a risk they had anticipated. A second risk might be that student comments of a sensitive nature about a faculty member collected in my surveys and or student reflections could reach administrators; however, to ensure confidentiality for participating instructors, pseudonyms were used, and the true names and identities were kept in my personal, private, and secured possession and not shared with college administrators outside of the college knowing that these faculty members participated in the study. However, if the student chose to lodge a complaint with the administration, I have no control over that.

Trustworthiness and Validity

The specific format of my study, which combines large numbers of student survey responses with samples of student reflection pieces, should help reduce any concerns of bias in interpretation of data or conclusions. I was able to use direct quotes from students to support survey findings, and I triangulated data in this way as well. Furthermore, my survey examined students who had exposure to a gender component and those who did not, so I was able to compare findings and any change in attitudes across the student groups. Although not a true random sample, the student participants were selected in a semi-random way through instructor participation in the study. The survey instrument itself went through an early test through Ed. 296 J, received an initial round of expert feedback, and was further refined and tested on three student groups. These three groups were not participants in the study, but received Critical-thinking instruction in the summer of 2017, and provided feedback on the survey questions.

Another concern surrounding credibility may be linked to concerns of the reactivity of the students. In the first test rounds of this survey, which I administered to my own students, I found that students provided a range of answers to the questions – there was no indication that they felt pressured to respond in any particular way. For this study, the surveyed students were not my own students- save for a handful of students I had previously instructed- so hopefully they did not feel any particular need to tailor their responses to me. Students had the option to remain anonymous on the survey, and the instructors were not involved in collecting and handling data, which was made very clear to the students at both Pre- and Post-survey dates. Additionally, students did not necessarily know what it was that I (or the instructor) would want them to say, especially with the Pre-survey; i.e. identification with feminism is not seen by all as a positive, and many types of sexism are subtle or benevolent, and gender roles are subjective. With the Post-survey, students may have more of a sense of what a “right” or “desirable” answer would be, however, again, the ability to be anonymous and the size of my survey sample likely offset any students who feel so compelled to provide a “right” answer.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This mixed methods study sought to determine if incorporating gender into required coursework affected California community college students' attitudes and perceptions toward gender related concepts, including sexism, feminism, and gender roles and norms.

A total of 992 surveys were collected over the course of the Fall 2017 semester at three southern California community colleges; 539 completed the Pre-survey, and 453 students completed the Post-survey. Overall, 241 students provided longitudinal data by completing both surveys. Linear regression of Sum scores in the categories of 1) Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination, 2) Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism, and 3) Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Gender Roles and Norms were run on the longitudinal data set. For brevity's sake, Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination Sum Scores are called simply "Sexism Awareness Sum Scores", Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism are called "Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores", and Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Gender Roles and Norms are called "Gender Attitudes Sum Scores". Frequencies and qualitative analysis of some survey responses were performed on the ALL Student Data Set. Additionally, 203 students completed reflections on the Post-survey; the surveys were coded for themes and subthemes.

Through regression analysis of the survey data and qualitative analysis of additional survey questions and the students' reflections, it appears that there is limited change in students' attitudes towards and perceptions of gender related concepts. Most notably, change and lack thereof, as well as attitudes towards and perceptions, seem unrelated to whether or not the student was enrolled in a class with a gender component. The students (28.6%) who reported a "change" in attitudes and or perceptions on the reflections attributed their change to aspects of the class they were in (the teacher, the assignments, the texts, and fellow classmates), the college

experience overall, and the current political/social climate. Furthermore, other interesting findings lie in the answers to the secondary RQ inquiries; the only factor that was a consistent significant predictor of Post-scores, besides Pre-scores, was Student Gender Identity.

In this chapter, I present an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data in response to each research question.

Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination

In general, there were no significant changes in student awareness of sexism/gender discrimination broadly, as the responses held steady. The change in means was .04178 overall.

Table 4.1 below provides the mean score of the students on the Pre-and Post-surveys.

Table 4.1

One Sample Statistics of Sexism Awareness Sum Scores

	N*	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Pre-	241	9.4938	2.8389	.1829
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Post-	239	9.5356	2.6769	.1732

Note: *N=number of students with answers to Sum Score questions.

Table 4.2 below shows the mean sum scores of the students, now separated by gender component course and non-gender component course. Within the groups, the change in means was .2284 for the non-gender component course and -.1155 for the gender component course. These changes were also not significant.

Table 4.2

Sexism Awareness Sum Scores by Gender/Non-Gender Class

	Gender Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Pre	0	110	8.9000	2.96447
	1	131	9.9924	2.63846
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Post	0	109	9.1284	2.59665
	1	130	9.8769	2.70519

However, a One-Way ANOVA (Table 4.3) showed that there is a significant between-group difference with the gender and non-gender component courses in both Pre- and Post-scores. The students in the gender component courses started and finished with higher sum scores than the students in the non-gender component course. Possible reasons for the differences in groups are discussed later in this chapter.

Table 4.3

Between and Within Group Differences in Sexism Sum Scores

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Pre-	Between Groups	71.348	1	71.348	9.154	.003
	Within Groups	1862.892	239	7.795		
	Total	1934.241	240			
Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Post-	Between Groups	33.215	1	33.215	4.707	.031
	Within Groups	1672.233	237	7.056		
	Total	1705.448	238			

In order to understand what factors do and do not impact a student's Post-Sum Score, I relied on a Linear Regression. As discussed in Chapter Three, the first model included only the Pre-Sum Score; the gender course component was added after that, then student demographics as a reference group, then faculty demographics, then campus factors. Table 4.4 below shows the six models of analysis, listing *Beta* and the standard error below in parentheses

Table 4.4

Sexism Awareness Sum Scores Post-Linear Regression Models

	Model S.1	Model S.2	Model S.3	Model S.4	Model S.5	Model S.6
Intercept	3.296*** (.444)	3.295*** (.448)	3.443*** (.526)	3.935*** (.535)	4.105*** (.734)	3.320*** (.443)
Pre-Test	.689*** (.045)	.689*** (.258)	.634*** (.50)	.635*** (.049)	.643*** (.050)	.636*** (0.48)
Gender Component (with=1; without=0)		.001 (.258)	-.003 (.266)	-.022 (.608)	.050 (.281)	.000 (.255)
Student Gender (male=0)						
Female			.147** (.287)	.133* (.281)	.152** (.278)	.135** (.273)
Other Gender Identification			.083 (.918)	.094 (.914)	.092 (.907)	.083 (.899)
Student Ethnicity (White=0)						
Asian/Asian American & Pacific Islander			-.056 (.559)			
Black or African American			.028 (.728)			
Hispanic or Latino			.011 (.337)			
Multiracial/Multiethnic			.028 (.437)			
Other Ethnicity Identification			.005 (.632)			

	Model S.1	Model S.2	Model S.3	Model S.4	Model S.5	Model S.6
Student Age (Under 24=0)						
25-34						
Over 35						
Student Religion (No Religion=0)						
Catholicism						
Christianity						
Other Religion						
Teacher Gender (male=0)						
Female						
Teacher Age (45-54=0)						
25-34						
35-44						
55-64						
65-74						

	Model S.1	Model S.2	Model S.3	Model S.4	Model S.5	Model S.6
Teacher Ethnicity (White=0)						
Asian – Asian American				.012 (.744)		
Black or African American				-.065 (.356)		
Hispanic or Latino				.020 (.651)		
Multiracial/Multiethnic				-.090 (1.590)		
English Course Level (English 1=0)						
English 2					-.051 (.338)	
English 3					-.049 (.318)	
Enrollment Status (Full Time=0)						
Part Time					.012 (.267)	
College Satisfaction (Neutral/Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied=0)						
Satisfied					-.086 (.607)	
Dissatisfied					.015 (.986)	
<hr/>						
R^2						.494
Model F -test (df_1, df_2)						57.040 4, 234

Note: *Significant at <.05 **Significant at <.01 ***Significant at <.001

Research Question 1 asked if including a gender component into non-elective curriculum would have an impact on students' attitudes towards and perceptions of gender related concepts, specifically sexism, and if there were any patterns in responses related to the Student's age, ethnicity, religion, or gender identity, related to the teacher, or related to the campus climate.

Model S.6 shows three important things. First, as a stand-alone factor, Sexism Sum Pre-scores are a significant predictor of Post-scores ($t=7.496$, $p=>.001$). As Sexism Sum Pre-scores increase, there is an associated .604 rise in Sexism Sum Post-scores, on average. It is not surprising, in the context of this study, that a Student's Pre-score would inform a Student's Post-score. Second, and specifically addressing RQ 1, a Gender Component was not a significant predictor of Post-scores. Lastly, a Gender Identity of Woman is a significant predictor of Post-scores ($t=2.687$, $p=.008$), but student age, ethnicity, and religion did not have any significant impact on a student's Post-scores. Furthermore, neither teacher nor campus factors appear to have any significant influence on a student's Post-scores in Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination.

While the statistical analysis here showed no significant change in attitudes towards or perceptions of sexism/gender discrimination, the means of student scores in both Pre- and Post-surveys, as well as the percentage of responses in answer 4 (somewhat agree) and 5 (completely agree) on the Likert scale (See Appendix M) indicate that more students than not, feel that sexism and gender discrimination are still problems in American politics and workplaces. The student reflections also show this: more than half of students, in total, 116 (57.1%) of 203 students claimed gender issues are a problem in America, and within in that 116, 45 students claimed it is a major problem (36 of those were students in the gender component course). The

students who felt it was a substantial problem tended to point to the imbalance of power between women and men. Student 017, an 18-24-year-old, White, male, English 1 enrolled in a gender component course student wrote: “I believe America is more dominated by white straight males who use their misunderstanding of god to push their power. No it hasn’t changed. Because I already felt this way before the class.” Though he reported no change, went from an 8 on the Pre-Sexism Awareness Sum Score to a 10 on the Post-. Similarly, Student 070, an 18-24-year-old, Latina, female English 2 student also enrolled in a gender component course, who had Pre- and Post-scores of 12, also spoke of gender inequity; she also referenced noticing how the inequity came out in gender roles for specifically and overall expectations of women.

I feel that America is a male dominated country and women have to work 5x harder to gain respect men are born with. No, I have always felt that women are put on a lower level than men because we are women, and men’s mentalities don’t help. Well, as a child I was taught that I need to cook and clean after a man in order to be a woman or be able to marry. I knew it wasn’t right then. I know it’s not right now, and now in 2017 I see men still feel women should be everything for them. Sexism is a big problem in our country and many people fail to notice.

Student 722, and 18-24-year-old, multiracial/multiethnic, female in an English 3 class with the gender component referenced, like Student 17, abuse of power. She also referenced the 2016 election and the rise in awareness of sexual misconduct, which is a theme that emerged across many student reflections. She wrote:

my thoughts on gender issues in America is that its ridiculous and sooo sad. especially with all of the sexual harassment claims coming out! pouring out! pouring out like a freaking waterfall! its sickening man. men are abusing their power and taking advantage

of women and its gross and needs to stop. also Hilary would've won if she was a man, just saying. my thoughts about gender has completely changed over the course of this semester because I learned so much stuff that I didn't know before! I feel super informed now. hearing other students opinions and ideas and input was really cool because I learned so much from them too! loved this class man.

While Student 722 remarked on her change over the semester, 44.8% of students who completed reflections noted no change over the course of the semester, another 26.6% of students made no comments about change one way or the other, and only 28.6%, less than a third, of students noted change in their attitudes and perceptions. Unfortunately, Student 722 is a student who either did not identify themselves on one of or did not complete one of the surveys, so I cannot know if there was any change from her Pre-scores.

On the other hand, 61 of the 116 students who claimed gender issues are a problem felt it was only a moderate level problem (45 of those with gender, 16 non-gender component), and 10 students claimed it is a minor problem (4 of those with gender, 6 non-gender component), and five claimed gender issues are exaggerated or overblown (3 of those with gender 2 non-gender component). For example, Student 004, an 18-24-year-old, Latino, Male student in an English 1 GC class wrote: "There are somewhat issues on gender in America, but I think people make it too much of a big deal." Though a smaller percentage, nine students claimed gender issues are not a problem at all (5 of those with gender 4 non-gender component). Many of these students compared the United States to other countries in their claims. Student 400, a 25-34-year-old, Latino male in a gender component course wrote: "I feel like America is far ahead of other countries as far as gender equality. If you are complaining about gender equality in America, then you're just a complainer. We still have a ways to go, but we've come so far." Student 497,

an 18-24-year-old White woman in a non-gender component course wrote: “Coming from a small country in EU, I would say that America is way ahead in ensuring that people have the same rights.” Similarly, Student 495, a 55-64-year-old White man in a non-gender component course wrote: “I think women has a very good situation in America. In future, men should try to have equal right with women. I born in a [Baha’i] family and the women have priority in education and has enough power. We men should be respectful with women and try to protect our right. They are much more powerful than men.”

Notwithstanding these last viewpoints, most students did feel that sexism/gender discrimination was a problem in the United States. While I had anticipated that the students might already have egalitarian attitudes and perceptions regarding gender; after all the bulk of them are millennials and Gen Zs --Baby Boomers and Gen Xers were a small percent (less than seven percent)-- of the student population, I was surprised by how much the students appeared to be aware of the problem of sexism/gender discrimination in American workplaces and politics. In discussions with my own English Critical-thinking classes, students often claim sexism isn’t really a problem anymore, like the students referenced in the preceding paragraph claimed. However, the reflections and Sexism Awareness Sum Scores show that students predominately have an awareness of sexism/gender discrimination in the workplace, politics, and household dynamics.¹⁵

¹⁵ This will be discussed at more length with the overview of RQ 3.

Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism

In general, there were no significant changes in student attitudes toward or perceptions of feminism broadly, as the responses held steady. The change in means was .3199 overall. Table 4.5 below shows the mean student scores from the Pre- and Post-Surveys.

Table 4.5

One Sample Statistics of Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores Pre-	239	10.4542	3.5213	.22730
Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores Post-	238	10.7741	3.3403	.21624

Table 4.6 below shows that within the groups, the change in means was .2 for the non-gender component course and .4255 for the gender component course. These changes were also not significant.

Table 4.6

Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores by Gender/Non-Gender Class

	Gender Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores Pre-	0	110	9.9364	3.41416
	1	130	10.8923	3.56392
Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores Post-	0	110	10.1364	3.30825
	1	129	11.3178	3.28820

Once more, a One Way ANOVA showed that there is a significant between group difference with the gender and non-gender component courses in both Pre- and Post-scores. The

students in the gender component courses started and finished with higher sum scores than the students in the non-gender component course. Possible reasons for the differences in groups is discussed later in this chapter. Table 4.7 below shows the differences in means as well as the level of significance in between group differences.

Table 4.7

Between and Within Group Differences in Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores Pre-	Between Groups	54.449	1	54.449	4.455	.036
	Within Groups	2909.047	238	12.223		
	Total	2663.496	239			
Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores Post-	Between Groups	82.876	1	82.876	7.622	.006
	Within Groups	2576.924	237	10.873		
	Total	2659.799	238			

Again, I used a Linear Regression; the first model included only the Pre-Sum Score; Model 2 the gender course component was added after that, then student demographics as a reference group, then faculty demographics, then campus factors. Table 4.8 below shows the five different statistical models, listing *Beta* and the standard error below in parentheses.

Table 4.8

Feminism Sum Scores Post-Linear Regression Models

	Model F.1	Model F.2	Model F.3	Model F.4	Model F.5
Intercept	3.313*** (.446)	3.140*** (.455)	2.944*** (.592)	2.801*** (.574)	3.265*** (.765)
Pre-Test	.754*** (.040)	.743*** (.041)	.743*** (.044)	.748*** (.042)	.745*** (0.42)
Gender Component (with=1; without=0)		.076 (.287)	.067 (.300)	.022 (.681)	.107* (.326)
Student Gender (male=0)					
Female			.045 (.324)		
Other Gender Identification			.034 (1.038)		
Student Ethnicity (White=0)					
Asian/Asian American & Pacific Islander			.046 (.645)		
Black or African American			.021 (.831)		
Hispanic or Latino			-.020 (.386)		
Multiracial/Multiethnic			-.059 (.494)		
Other Ethnicity Identification			-.017 (.723)		

	Model F.1	Model F.2	Model F.3	Model F.4	Model F.5
Student Age (Under 24=0)					
25-34			-.018 (.387)		
Over 35			-.018 (.613)		
Student Religion (No Religion=0)					
Catholicism			.045 (.380)		
Christianity			.014 (.389)		
Other Religion			.061 (.061)		
Teacher Gender (male=0)					
Female				.068 (.559)	
Teacher Age (45-54=0)					
25-34				.088 (.546)	
35-44				-.027 (.458)	
55-64				.013 (.597)	
65-74				-.044 (1.589)	

	Model F.1	Model F.2	Model F.3	Model F.4	Model F.5
Teacher Ethnicity (White=0)					
Asian – Asian American				.001 (.840)	
Black or African American				.018 (.401)	
Hispanic or Latino				-.011 (.733)	
Multiracial/Multiethnic				.134 (1.796)	
English Course Level (English 1=0)					
English 2					-.077 (.338)
English 3					-.033 (.359)
Enrollment Status (Full Time=0)					
Part Time					-.010 (.303)
College Satisfaction (Neutral/Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied=0)					
Satisfied					-.001 (.638)
Dissatisfied					.040 (1.095)
R^2		.573			
Model <i>F</i> -test		158.639			
(<i>df</i> ₁ , <i>df</i> ₂)		2, 236			

Note: *Significant at <.05 **Significant at <.01 ***Significant at <.001

Research Question 2 asked if including a gender component into non elective curriculum would have an impact on students' attitudes towards and perceptions of gender related concepts, specifically feminism, and if there were any patterns in responses related to the Student's age, ethnicity, religion, or gender identity, related to the Teacher, or related to the campus climate.

Model F.2 shows three important things. First, as a stand-alone factor, Feminism Sum Pre- scores are a significant predictor of Post-scores ($t=7.423$, $p=>.001$). As Feminism Sum Pre-scores increase, there is an associated .714 rise in Feminism Sum Post-scores, on average. Second, and specifically addressing RQ 2, a Gender Component was not a significant predictor of Post-scores, with the exception of in Model F.5, when the Gender Component factor became significant when campus climate factors were added in.¹⁶ Lastly, the linear regression shows that Student gender identity, age, ethnicity, and religion did not have any significant impact on a student's Post-scores. Furthermore, in terms of Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism, neither teacher nor campus factors appear to have any significant influence on a student's Post-scores.

Unpacking the Feminism Attitudes Sum Score and looking specifically at the three questions also reflects that lack of change, but it also provides a better understanding of where the students' current attitudes and perceptions lay (See Appendix N) and shows that for some students, though only a few, they did experience change over the semester. Overall, Feminist

¹⁶ As this was the only condition when the Gender Component was significant, I did not select Model F.5 as my final model, although Gender Component is later similarly made by significant in the linear regression of Attitudes and Perceptions of Gender Roles and Norms with the addition of the campus factors.

Identity 1 Post-mean score was 3.43 (out of five) – this was a growth of only .06 points, and it appears this might come from students moving from a ranking of four to a ranking of 5, while the other scores held fairly steady. Feminist Identity 2 Post-mean score was 3.83 (out of six) – this was a growth of only .15 points, and it appears this might come from students moving from a ranking of three to either four, five, or six. In both cases, the Post-mean scores translate to essentially neutral stances about the feminist label. There was also a small amount of growth in means in response to the question of “Feminism is only for women”, ending with a 4.2, which translates to a “Somewhat Disagree” stance on the Likert scale. The shifts were small, but paired with the student reflections, there is a feeling that students had misconceptions about feminism that the instructor was able to address. Student 002, an 18-24 year old, Latino male student, enrolled in a gender component English 1 class wrote: “I do not really care for gender issues but I think the more than two gender thing is pure 100% nonsense. My thoughts have not changed over this class. My thoughts have not changed because I was not convinced, but did change my mind on feminism.” Student 002 did in fact change from a somewhat agree to a neither agree nor disagree in regard to the statement, “Feminism is only for women.” His feminist identity did not change though, and, as he himself noted, his attitudes surrounding gender roles clearly did not change either. On the other hand, Student 523, a 18-24 year old Latina female, also enrolled in a gender component course, this time English 2, wrote: “Discussions in class with Dr. [Ono]¹⁷ have changed my views because before I thought feminism was about women not needing men, but it is not about that. It is about equality.” She moved from a 3 (neutral) to 5 (extremely feminist) in Feminist Identity 1.

¹⁷ All instructors have pseudonyms.

It is important to note here that students started with majority positive associations with feminism; over 50% of students identified as four or five on both Pre- and Post-Feminist Identity 1, and over 30% of students identified as five or six on both Pre- and Post-Feminist Identity 2. Again, this may be attributable to the rise in awareness surrounding issues of sexual misconduct and sexism/gender discrimination. Just 10.1% agreed that feminism is only for women on the Pre-survey, and that number dropped to 7.5% on the Post-survey. The student reflections showed that several students already considered themselves feminists and sufficiently knowledgeable on the subject, which probably did much to push the scores onto the positive end of the spectrum. Student 092, an 18-24 year old, multiracial/multiethnic woman in an English 2 class wrote:

Women all over America have been fighting for their rights and using their voices to protect them but men, and even some women who don't believe in feminism, don't take them seriously. This is ridiculous. My thoughts have not changed. I've always been somewhat of an advocate for feminism and gender equality and like to use my voice when I feel I've been discriminated against.

Student 726, also a 18-24 year old, multiracial/multiethnic woman, wrote: "I consider myself an intersectional feminist and strong advocate for the lives of underrepresented marginalized peoples. My ideals have not changed but rather strengthened over time. However not to the credit of this course." Student 726 was enrolled in an English 3 classes. Student 092 was not on the Longitudinal Student Data Set, but Student 726 was a 16 (the highest possible score) on both

the Pre- and Post- SUM scores.¹⁸ Both Student 092 and Student 726 were in a class with the gender component, as in fact, were all students who identified as being feminist. All students who identified as feminist in the reflections were also female. This might attribute to the gender gap between scores that is consistent across all three score constructs.

In addition, students were asked to identify the top five words they associated with feminism. Below are the top six selected terms from the Longitudinal Data Set, first overall Pre- and Post-, then split into the gender and non-gender component courses. Table 4.9 below shows the top words students associated with feminism, and Table 4.10 shows the top words students associated with feminism separated by gender and non-gender component.

¹⁸ Twenty students (8.4%) had scores of 16 on the Pre-survey and 20 (8.3%) students had scores of 16 on the Post-survey. Fifteen students altogether had Pre- and Post-Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores of the max of 16 .

Table 4.9

Top Six Words Associated With Feminism

	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Pre-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism						
equality between sexes	133	55.2%	108	44.8%	241	100.0%
gender equality	148	61.4%	93	38.6%	241	100.0%
women's rights	168	69.7%	73	30.3%	241	100.0%
social equality	149	61.8%	92	38.2%	241	100.0%
economic equality	101	41.9%	140	58.1%	241	100.0%
empowerment	100	41.5%	141	58.5%	241	100.0%
Post-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism						
gender equality	163	67.6%	78	32.4%	241	100.0%
women's rights	165	68.5%	76	31.5%	241	100.0%
Social equality	155	64.3%	86	35.7%	241	100.0%
political equality	107	44.4%	134	55.6%	241	100.0%
economic equality	104	43.2%	137	56.8%	241	100.0%
empowerment	104	43.2%	137	56.8%	241	100.0%

Table 4.10

Top Six Words Associated With Feminism by Gender Component

	No Gender Component	Gender Component	Total
Pre-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism			
equality between sexes	58	75	133
gender equality	68	80	148
women's rights	79	89	168
Social equality	58	91	149
economic equality	43	58	101
empowerment	42	58	100
Post-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism			
gender equality	67	96	163
women's rights	75	90	165
Social equality	67	88	155
political equality	47	60	107
economic equality	43	61	104
empowerment	41	63	104

The top six words for each were almost the same in Pre- and the Post-, though “equality between the sexes” dropped to only 93 responses or 38.6% and was supplanted by “political equality”. This again shows that both the gender and non-gender component courses are similar and already lean more toward a positive perception of feminism than a negative perception.

On the other hand, while a positive association with feminism was the norm, some students did have some negative associations with feminism. Many students identified as one or two on Feminist Identity 1 and Feminist Identity 2, though in both cases, it was less than 20%. Students with a negative association equated feminism with misandry and general uselessness. Only two students specifically criticized feminists in their reflections: Student 016, and 18-24 year old, Latino, male in a gender component English 2 class wrote: “No because gender equality is a minor issue in the states places that do need gender equality is place like the middle

east which women are stoned to death for showing any skin. Feminist don't want to help those women because they would ruin their lives.” Student 400, a 25-34 year old Latino male in a gender component English 3 class wrote: “However, I feel most ‘feminists’ are hypocritical (sorry) and misandric. That is why I feel the feminist movement will never gain enough momentum.” Student 400 is also a student who either did not identify themselves on one of the surveys or did not complete the Pre-survey. Student 16, however, went from a 9 down to a 3 in Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores. In fact, Student 16 scores dropped across all three Sum scores.

Though only two students specifically criticized feminists, additional students commented on the over saturation of feminism/sexism/gender in class content and in general discussion. Furthermore, not insignificant percentages of students also associated feminism with the words: Misandric, Pointless, Outdated, and Not applicable. Table 4.11 below shows the words students least associated with feminism, and Table 4.12 shows the words students least associated with feminism separated by gender and non-gender component.

Table 4.11

Negative Words Associated With Feminism

	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Pre-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism						
Misandry	33	13.7%	208	86.3%	241	100.0%
Pointless	9	3.7%	232	96.3%	241	100.0%
Outdated	9	3.7%	232	96.3%	241	100.0%
Not Applicable	5	2.1%	236	97.9%	241	100.0%
Post-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism						
Misandry	30	12.4%	211	87.6%	241	100.0%
Pointless	12	5.0%	229	95.0%	241	100.0%
Outdated	11	4.6%	230	95.4%	241	100.0%
Not Applicable	6	2.5%	235	97.5%	241	100.0%

Table 4.12

Negative Words Associated With Feminism by Gender Component

	No Gender Component	Gender Component	Total
Pre-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism			
Misandry	13	20	33
Pointless	5	4	9
Outdated	5	4	9
Not Applicable	4	1	5
Post-Survey – Words Associated with Feminism			
Misandry	18	12	30
Pointless	7	5	12
Outdated	5	6	11
Not Applicable	3	3	6

Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Gender Roles and Norms

In general, there were no significant changes in student attitudes toward or perceptions of gender roles and norms broadly, as the responses held steady. The change in means was -.7005 overall. Table 4.13 below shows the means of the Gender Attitudes Pre- and Post-Sum Scores.

Table 4.13

One Sample Statistics of Gender Attitudes Sum Scores

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gender Attitudes Sum Scores Pre-	239	29.1172	5.25754	.34008
Gender Attitudes Sum Scores Post-	240	28.4167	5.80302	.37458

Table 4.14 below shows the means by gender and non-gender component. Within the groups, the change in means was -1.0878 for the non-gender component course and -.3557 for the gender component course. These changes were also not significant.

Table 4.14

Gender Attitudes Sum Scores by Gender Class

	Gender Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Gender Attitudes Sum Scores Pre-	0	108	28.3333	4.81431
	1	131	29.7634	5.53149
Gender Attitudes Sum Scores Post-	0	110	27.2455	5.68466
	1	130	29.4077	5.73808

A One Way ANOVA showed that there is a significant between group difference with the gender and non-gender component courses in both Pre- and Post-scores, as shown in Table 4.15 below.

The students in the gender component courses started and finished with higher sum scores than the students in the non-gender component courses. Possible reasons for the differences in groups is discussed later in this chapter.

Table 4.15

Between and Within Group Differences in Gender Attitudes Sum Scores

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender Attitudes Sum Scores Pre-	Between Groups	121.056	1	121.056	4.443	.036
	Within Groups	6457.664	237	27.248		
	Total	6578.720	238			
Gender Attitudes Sum Scores Post-	Between Groups	278.568	1	278.568	8.533	.004
	Within Groups	7769.765	238	32.646		
	Total	8048.333	239			

Once again, I used a Linear Regression as the primary analytic technique; the first model included only the Pre-Sum Score; the gender course component was added after that, then student demographics as a reference group, then faculty demographics, then campus factors. Table 4.16 below shows the six models listing *Beta* and the standard error below in parentheses.

Table 4.16

Linear Regression Models of Gender Scores Post-

	Model G.1	Model G.2	Model G.3	Model G.4	Model G.5	Model G.6
Intercept	4.816** (1.432)	4.678** (1.427)	3.424* (1.615)	5.203** (1.781)	5.034** (1.754)	4.507** (1.511)
Pre-Test	.737*** (.048)	.726*** (.049)	.706*** (.053)	.694*** (.052)	.711*** (0.51)	.710*** (0.51)
Gender Component (with=1; without=0)		.079 (.511)	.052 (.521)	-.022 (1.187)	.112* (.581)	.098* (.569)
Student Gender (male=0)						
Female			.100* (1.173)	.128** (.563)	.124** (.555)	.128** (.550)
Other Gender Identification			.005 (1.804)	-.005 (1.769)	.026 (1.770)	.022 (1.767)
Student Ethnicity (White=0)						
Asian/Asian American & Pacific Islander			-.005 (1.116)	-.002 (1.101)	-.000 (1.080)	.008 (1.075)
Black or African American			.012 (1.438)	.016 (1.386)	.007 (1.387)	.013 (1.378)
Hispanic or Latino			.126* (.671)	.092 (.663)	.107 (.646)	.109* (.637)
Multiracial/Multiethnic			-.015 (.854)	-.024 (.852)	-.005 (.843)	.002 (.836)
Other Ethnicity Identification			.028 (1.251)	.065 (1.222)	.040 (1.214)	.036 (1.215)
Student Age (Under 24=0)						
25-34			.025 (.671)			
Over 35			.022 (1.062)			

	Model G.1	Model G.2	Model G.3	Model G.4	Model G.5	Model G.6
Student Religion (No Religion=0)						
Catholicism			-.073 (.657)			
Christianity			.087 (.687)			
Other Religion			.025 (.922)			
Teacher Gender (male=0)						
Female				.058 (.967)		
Teacher Age (45-54=0)						
25-34				-.008 (.939)		
35-44				-.097 (.813)		
55-64				-.180* (1.114)		
65-74				-.015 (2.712)		
Teacher Ethnicity (White=0)						
Asian – Asian American				-.018 (1.459)		
Black or African American				-.011 (.693)		
Hispanic or Latino				.118* (1.262)		
Multiracial/Multiethnic				.103 (3.100)		
English Course Level						

	Model G.1	Model G.2	Model G.3	Model G.4	Model G.5	Model G.6
<hr/>						
(English 1=0)						
English 2					-.125* (.687)	-.113* (.680)
English 3					-1.955** (.623)	-.149** (.617)
College Satisfaction (Neutral/Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied=0)						
Satisfied					-.856 (1.108)	
Dissatisfied					-2.472 (1.996)	
<hr/>						
<i>R</i> ²						.596
Model <i>F</i> -test						30.353
(<i>df</i> ₁ , <i>df</i> ₂)						11, 226

Note: *Significant at <.05 **Significant at <.01 ***Significant at <.001

Research Question 3 asked if including a gender component into non elective curriculum would have an impact on students' attitudes towards and perceptions of gender related concepts, specifically gender norms and gender roles, and if there were any patterns in responses related to the Student's age, ethnicity, religion, or gender identity, related to the Teacher, or related to the campus climate.

Model G.6¹⁹ shows several important things. First, as a stand-alone factor, Gender Sum Pre-scores are a significant predictor of Post-scores ($t=15.233$, $p=>.001$). As Gender Sum Pre-

¹⁹ In Model G.5, I removed the teacher reference block, even though both Teacher Ethnicity of Hispanic/Latino and Teacher Age of 55-64 had significant values because there was only one Hispanic/Latino teacher, and that same teacher is one of the four teachers aged 55-64.

scores increase, there is an associated .781 rise in Gender Sum Post-scores, on average. Second, and specifically addressing RQ 2, a Gender Component was not a significant predictor of Post-scores, until English Class Type was added in as a reference group, indicating that within the different types of English classes, the Gender Component may become meaningful. In Model G.6, there is an associated 1.131 rise in Gender Sum Post-scores, on average, due to Gender Component. Third, the linear regression shows that Student Gender Identity, Student Ethnicity, and English Class Type are significant predictors of Post-scores. Lastly, student religion did not have any significant impact on a student's Post-scores, nor did teacher, nor campus factors appear to have any significant influence on a student's Post-scores.

Though not significantly, Gender Attitudes Sum Scores did decrease over time, on the surface, at least, indicating a minuscule move toward less egalitarian views. However, when looking at the analysis of the set of 10 questions, two questions stand out with significant changes in Pre- and Post-means (See Appendix O). The first question is: "Can women and men do all of the same jobs?". The number of NOs and UNSUREs went up in the Post-survey while YES responses went down. First, I must acknowledge, this is an imperfect question. For example, this does not necessarily reflect that a student has moved to thinking there are some jobs men can do that women can't; in fact, it could mean the opposite. Some students pointed out "breastfeeding" on their surveys, taking time to write in that note.

The second question, which on its own had a significant response, was if "Men make better

Furthermore, adding in the teacher reference block removed significance from Student Ethnicity of Hispanic. More than 40% of students in this study are Hispanic/Latino, and are therefore less likely to be an outlier triggering a significant value.

leaders than women”. This is another imperfect question. This question asked for students to pick their response out of a set of Completely Agree (1) to Completely Disagree (5). That this number went down reflects that more students moved from “Completely Disagree” and “Somewhat Disagree” to the more neutral choice of “Neither Disagree nor Agree” (See Appendix O), which could actually be considered as a more egalitarian attitude, if the student considered a selection of “Completely Disagree” to indicate that women are better leaders than men. A modification to the response options could include: “Neither gender makes better leaders”.

The means of students’ Gender Attitudes Sum Scores, both Pre- and Post-, are above the 80th percentile (out of a possible Score of 35, the Pre-mean was 29.1172, and the Post- was 28.467), indicating that the students have fairly egalitarian gender views already. Indeed, the student reflections support this. Forty (19.7%) of the 203 students made statements about believing in gender equality, and within that theme, multiple students noted the need for old ideas/norms to fall away. Student 380, a 25-34 year old, Latina woman in a gender component English 3 class wrote:

Gender issues exist in America because people are afraid of those who are and think differently. People are too worried about how others live their lives and need to work on personal growth. Old ideas and old social norms are not correct and people need to need to build a new foundation as a society. My thoughts have not changed and I feel that this course has helped me to know more about the people who oppose gender equality. Knowing why they oppose is key to helping people open their minds and hearts to humanity.

Similarly, Student 403, an 18-24 year old, multiracial/multiethnic woman in a non-gender English 2 class commented: “Transgender is a new idea for older people, so I think they’re afraid

of change. The community and advocates of gender equality are doing a great job of advocating acceptance and equality for all. I feel and believe that America can achieve agreements for gender equality.”

Additionally, 27 (13.3%) of the 203 Students claimed people should be able to identify (re gender) as they please, most frequently expressed as a kind of “it’s not really my business” or a “you do you” attitude. Student 076, an 18-24 year old, African American woman in a gender component English 2 class wrote: “My thoughts on gender issues in America are that everyone should be allowed to identify themselves. I also believe that transgenders should be allowed to use any restroom they want. Unfortunately the rest of the world may not agree, but we’ll get there.” And Student 101, another 18-24 year old Latino man enrolled in a non-gender component English 1 class wrote: “I do not care about gender issues. Everybody should feel free to do whatever they want to do as long as nobody is harmed. There are more important things to concern myself with than if the male feels he is female. Nothing has influenced me, I just know gender issues is none of my business.”

There were also older students who felt open to the changing nature of gender identity. Student 144, a 45-54 year old multiracial/multiethnic male in a non-gender component English 1 class wrote: “Honestly, how someone identifies with gender is none of my business unless they are taken advantage of or discriminated against. I’ve learned quite a lot about gender identification via my sons 2 best friends. It’s quite fascinating.” Student 514, a 45-54 year old, White woman in a non-gender component English 3 class walked a more cautious line, although she was still open to the idea of changing gender identity:

As far as gender issues, I personally would never change my gender because I am very happy with who I am and comfortable under my skin. Nor will I dictate to others what

they should do with themselves. However, they should really think hard before making any changes, because I knew that some people who have undergone changes have had second thoughts and are sorry now. So, I believe that a lot of thought should be put into their decision.

Not all students embraced changing gender norms, but it was a small number who did not. Only 5 (2.5%) of the 203 students who completed reflections claimed people should not be able to identify (re gender) as they please. On the surveys, the mean score for the question: “People should be able to choose their gender identity” was 4.26 in Pre- and 4.21 in Post-, equating a Somewhat Agree stance. Around 11% percent of students in Pre- and Post- disagreed with this, while more than 75% of students in Pre- and Post- agreed with this statement. The students who pushed back against changing gender identity reference a biological viewpoint. Student 636, an 18-24 year old, White male in a non-gender component English 1 class wrote: “If a male likes a male he’s gay. If a girl likes a girl she is gay. If a male has a penis he is a male. If a girl has a vagina, she’s a girl.” Student 281, an 18-24 year old White woman in a gender component English 2 class wrote: “There are only 2 genders. People need to see that.” Student 258, an 18-24 year old, Middle Eastern male, also in a gender component English 2 class, approached the concept a bit differently, and in fact seemed more concerned with the impact on himself than whether or not people chose different gender identities. He wrote: “It seems like you gotta be careful what you say because there is like 6 different genders now.”

Altogether, six students identified as non-conforming/gender variant, one student identified as non-binary, and one student identified as a transgender male. Five of these students were in a gender component course, and three were in non-gender component courses. Amidst all the perspectives, two students with non-traditional gender identities provide additional

perspective on how gender identity impacts a person's understanding of gender norms. For both of these students, their attitudes and perceptions of the issues regarding gender roles and norms are informed by their personal experiences with challenging gender roles and norms.

Student 099 identifies as a transgender male. He is 18-24 and Latino, enrolled part time. He was enrolled in a non-gender component English 1 class. He stayed at 12 in Attitudes Regarding Feminism Pre- and Post-scores, and moved from 34-35 in Attitudes Regarding Gender scores, and stayed at 14 in Awareness of Sexism scores. He identifies as Christian. Student 099 wrote: "I believe that gender/gender issues in America need to be resolved. There is a lot of discrimination connected to gender. I hope that someday most of those issues will be fixed. My thoughts regarding to gender have not fully changed throughout the semester only because I am forced to constantly be aware of them. My gender identity really impacts my thoughts regarding to gender. I have been affect by gender discrimination for many years."

Student 226 identifies as White, Catholic, and as non-conforming/gender variant. They are 18-24 years old and enrolled in a gender component English 2 class. They had a sum score of 14 in both the Pre- and Post-Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores. They had a 28 in Gender Pre-Sum Score and 27 in Gender Post-Sum Scores. This comes from a change in the answer of No to Unsure to the question "If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the father be the primary wage earner? That is, should the father be more responsible for providing income to the family?". They had a drop from 10 to 9 in Sexism Sum Scores. This comes from a change from completely agree to somewhat agree that "Sexism/Gender Discrimination is a problem in American politics." Student 226 attributed their change in perceptions and attitudes regarding gender roles and norms to their own battle with identity, in addition to the course content and their overall experiences in the world: "My thoughts have changed because my identity has changed a bit. I'm just me; I

don't have to be hyper-masculine to make up for my female body. This is in part due to this class, particularly that story with Troy Maxson (I forget what it's called) as well as my Intro to Psych class and my experiences working and in life." This leads to the next point of discussion- what causes student change- where college experience itself, as Student 226 calls out, exposes students to new ideas, and this exposure is not necessarily confined to one class experience.

Student "Change"

While 28.6% of students who completed the reflections discussed a change in their opinions, the statistical analysis does not support any claims to change. However, when considering both the statistical analysis and the student's reflection, it becomes clear that students might not have "changed" so much as they refined their perspectives and became more educated on the subject. Student 069, a 45-54 year old, Latina woman enrolled in a gender component English 2 course noted: "My opinions have sharpened somewhat over the course of the semester, but mostly due to current politics. This class has served as a great way to reflect more on those opinions." Student 553, a 18-24 year old multiracial/multiethnic woman also enrolled in a gender component English 2 class, echoed this theme. "My thoughts of gender/gender issues haven't really changed/ mainly gotten stronger over the course of the year. I've met more liberal people here than my previous school, so I feel safer to express lack of love for gov and gov policies and conditions re women." Student 268, an 18-24 year old Latina woman, also in a gender component English 2, also felt that her attitudes/perceptions were reaffirmed by the course content: "My beliefs haven't really changed. If anything they were strengthened due to watching /having such inspiring teacher help me understand the concepts of gender equality, gender discrimination and gender differences."

The Gender Effect

Research sub questions a, b, and c asked if there was any effect on students' attitudes/perceptions regarding gender concepts, specifically sexism, feminism, and gender roles and norms associated with a) Student Identity factors such as age, religion, ethnicity and gender; b) Faculty demographics factors such as age, ethnicity, and gender; and c) campus climate related factors, such as class type, enrollment status, and college satisfaction. From this list of many factors, the only one that had consistent significant predictive power was a gender identity of woman. Not only do women score higher on these values, but they score higher even when controlling for the pretest. This falls in line with my original hypothesis that a student's gender would have an impact on their receptiveness to gender curriculum. The literature shows that women would likely have higher scores across all three subjects: women are more likely than men are both to experience and be aware of sexism/gender discrimination (Berman, 2013; Bomey, 2016; Fingerhut, 2016); women are more likely than men to identify as feminist and have stronger feminist attitudes (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Swanson, 2013); and women are more likely to have more egalitarian notions of gender (Araujo et al., 2017; Cook & Glass, 2016).

It would appear that women benefit from the discussion of gender related concepts more than men do and there are aspects to this gendered difference that are both heartening and disheartening in ways. There is, of course, a fear that teaching gender studies is a mix of preaching to the choir and falling on deaf ears. Certainly, as women are more likely to experience gender based discrimination than men, it is important that women are aware of the likelihood they may face sexism and gender discrimination in their lives as this could lead them to be more aware when they are the recipients of discrimination and to fight against it. The increased awareness of discrimination is also important because women who do not recognize

institutionalized sexism often blame themselves for the side effects of sexism and are more vulnerable to the related side-effects (Manago et al., 2009). Furthermore, as women also practice sexism/gender discrimination, increased awareness could impact their own potentially discriminatory behavior. Additionally, as a feminist identity has been correlated with positive personal effects, including self-esteem and academic success (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Manago et al., 2009; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006). On the other hand, it is disheartening that male students appear to be less impacted by the gender coursework, as they are also potential victims of entrenched gender norms and ideas of masculinity, and raising awareness of sexism/gender discrimination in men, as well as increasing their feminist identity, would lead to increase activism on their part. Furthermore, as the Department of Gender and Women Studies at UC Berkeley states on their website: “But gender is a system we all live within, and includes all genders; understanding and changing hierarchies in which gender and sexuality play a part requires the participation of everyone, including straight white men!” (womensstudies.berkeley.edu, 2018).

Gender Class Gaps

The One Way ANOVAs of the Longitudinal Student Data Set Sums repeatedly showed that Gender Class had a significant Between Subject Mean differences. The gap between the two groups could have a variety of sources. This could potentially be a selection effect; students selecting into the class with the gender component could have been aware of the content they would be learning about, or they could have been familiar with the instructor, and therefore the instructor’s likelihood of discussing gender as part of the course. As a part of the survey, students were asked to check all reasons for enrolling into this specific course. The top four reasons students chose the courses they enrolled into were that if fit their schedule, a counselor

recommendation, the professor got good reviews, and that it was a required course. On the one hand, this does not seem to indicate that knowledge of course content was a primary driver of course selection. For example, the students who indicated they used a rating site like Rate My Professor is the most compelling evidence to indicate that self-selection impacted the study results. However, a review of Rate My Professor did not turn up any mention of feminism, sexism, or gender for any of the gender component instructors except Professor Piaf who had two reviews mentioning the discussion of gender. On the other hand, knowledge of the course content, texts, or the professor drove some students' choices, as indicated in Table 4.17, a point that cannot be dismissed. Professor Bowie, a gender component instructor, told me that about half of the students in her class and previously taken a class with her. Yet with Bowie's students, I have to ask, did they follow the content or the teacher? I would argue that students often follow an instructor because of the familiarity and comfort more than the content of the course.

Anecdotally, I can say that I always have a handful of students who follow me from a lower level English class to a higher level one. These include students who have complained about my materials and students who have praised them - although, student praise must always be taken with a grain of salt. Not to appear cynical, but often that praise came just at a time when I was about to finalize grades. The review of Rate My Professor indicates that her students liked her for her teaching methods, as not one student who posted a comment included a notation about gender. The case with Professor Slick is less clear. One student remarked that they had met Slick at a faculty student mixer and had discussed the upcoming course content which intrigued the student. Slick also had a textbook with gender in the title which undoubtedly impacted some student's choice to remain enrolled in the class once they discover the course's required text. The timeline could also have led to a default selection effect in that students who did not like the

material may have dropped the course. However, an examination of the Pre- and Post-Feminist Identity scores individually, for example, show that while Gabriel (surveyed the first day) and Slick had the highest Feminist Identity 1 means of 4.0 and 4.47 respectively, Piaf had the second to lowest at 2.96, and Joplin has the lowest Feminist Identity 2 mean of 2.33.

Table 4.17

Students' Reasons for Enrolling Into Surveyed Course

	No Gender Component	Gender Component	Total
Counselor Recommendation	46	49	95
Friend/ Peer Recommendation	10	7	17
Fit Schedule	49	46	95
Easiness of Course	2	2	4
Course Seemed Challenging	9	12	21
Professor Got Good Reviews	28	41	69
Course Got Good Reviews	7	11	18
Had This Professor Before	12	10	22
Knew and Liked Course Content	8	13	21
Knew and Liked Course Texts	0	5	5

A second explanation for the differences between groups could also be related to the timing of the Pre-survey rather than the idea that students opposed to the gender content dropped the course. The Pre-survey was not administered at the very start of the semester when the students were “untainted” by the gender component material. I reference table 3.5 in Chapter

Three, now table 4.18, below. Professors Bowie, Slick, Piaf, and Ronstadt (a total of seven sections) had already begun their gender component instruction by the time I administered the Pre-survey. Professors Gabriel, Joplin, Ono, Nicks, and Coltrane (a total of six sections) all administered their gender component after I administered the Pre-survey. However, as gender was a part of their planned coursework, with the exception of Gabriel, these may be instructors who wove attention to gender and equity into the course from the beginning.

Table 4.18

Timeline of Gender Instruction and Survey Administration

College	Pre-Survey Administered	Gender Component Began	Gender Component Ended	Post-Survey Administered	Style of Inclusion
Canyon Glen					
Bowie (2 sections) (Eng 3)	Week 6	Week 2	Week 15	Week 15	Discussed Throughout Semester
	Week 6	Week 2	Week 15	Week 15	
Gabriel (Eng 3)	Week 1	Week 5	Week 5	Week 8	Isolated Unit
Joplin (Eng 1)	Week 6	Week 10	Week 13	Week 16	Isolated Unit
Ono (Eng 2)	Week 7	Week 6	Week 16	Week 15	Discussed Throughout Two Thirds of Semester
Slick (Eng 3)	Week 6	Week 1	Week 16	Week 16	Discussed Throughout Semester
Coastal College					
Nicks (Eng 2)	Week 7	Week 10	Week 16	Week 15	Discussed Throughout Second Half of Semester

College	Pre-Survey Administered	Gender Component Began	Gender Component Ended	Post-Survey Administered	Style of Inclusion
Piaf (2 sections) (Eng 1)	Week 6 Week 6	Week 2 Week 2	Week 16 Week 16	Week 15 Week 15	Discussed Throughout Semester
Sweet Valley					
Coltrane (2 sections) (Eng 2)	Week 9 Week 10	Week 13 Week 13	Week 17 Week 17	Week 17 Week 18	Discussed Throughout Second Half of Semester
Ronstadt ²⁰ (2 sections) (Eng 2)	Week 9 Week 10	Week 2 Week 2	Week 17 Week 17	Week 17 Week 18	Discussed Throughout Semester

However, this speculation that the students were tainted by the time of the Pre-survey creates its own problematic speculations. If students were “tainted” in some way by the gender component, does that mean students could be tainted by the gender component, that is, might this mean a gender component did influence some students’ attitudes? This will be discussed in Chapter Five.

Conclusion

To reiterate, the study shows that a gender component does not have a predictive impact on student scores of their Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination, of their Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism, and of their Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Gender Roles and Norms. Furthermore, students seem to be, by and large, aware of problems of sexism/gender discrimination in this country, have a neutral to slightly positive attitudes toward

²⁰ In the initial meeting with Ronstadt, she told me she used gender as a lens throughout the semester; in the follow up survey that she thought her students might not work as a sample since they had already been exposed to the gender material by the time I administered the Pre-Survey.

and perceptions of feminism, and have predominately accepting and inclusive attitudes towards and perceptions of challenging gender roles and norms. The further implications and meanings of all of these findings will be discussed in the following chapter, as will some of the themes unearthed by the student reflections.

CHAPTER FIVE

This study has meaning for me for several reasons: first, as I've made abundantly clear, I believe there is a need for more gender studies curriculum, especially more mainstream and normalized gender studies curriculum; second, the research has not shown us yet how students who don't elect into these types of classes respond to this type of content; and third, operating out of a feminist framework and mindset, I believe in an overall assessment and re-approach to how colleges and universities, particularly community colleges, deal with issues of sexism and gender discrimination on their own campuses and how they ready students to be transformative agents of change in the world. This study is just a small part of that larger agenda.

Accordingly, in this chapter, I discuss first some additional themes that emerged as a result of this research process, then proceed to a discussion of the significance of the findings overall. I then discuss the limitations of this study, opportunities for further research, potential implications for policy change, and finally, my closing thoughts on both this study and this experience.

Discussion of Findings

As Chapter Four shows, students showed no real change in their attitudes towards and perceptions of gender concepts, and, again, change/lack of change are presumably unrelated to the gender component. My initial hypotheses were that if students showed any change, the students in the gender component courses would have a more significant change than students in non-gender component courses. This hypothesis proved to be wrong, at least in the context of this study. The Between Subjects factor of Gender Class tantalizes that there may be more to the story than this study, with this timeline, was able to capture.

I had an additional hypothesis that faculty drove responsiveness to the material. In some ways this appears to hold true enough, although why and how is much more uncertain. Faculty race, gender, and age were not consistent determiners of student change, nor was the faculty member's overall rating. A lengthier review of pedagogical approach, which this study does not allow, might reveal the correlation, but at the present moment, I can only hazard a guess that the unique combination of teacher identity elements, their pedagogical style, the elements of their course design, and the composition of the students who chose to take this particular professor (which is somewhat driven by expectations from sites like Ratemyprofessor.com, class availability, and the student's own schedule) are what drive, or do not drive, student responsiveness.

I had also hypothesized that campus climate factors might influence receptivity and responsiveness, but this too is not the case in this study. College satisfaction and enrollment status were also not significant predictors. However, English Class Type was a significant predictor of Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Gender Roles and Norms Sum scores, but not a significant predictor with Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination Sum scores or Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Feminism Sum scores. As I mentioned in Chapter Four, this significance may be related to the fact that students in English 2 and 3 had already taken an English Critical-thinking course and might therefore have a dissimilar trajectory than students in English 1, which is the first Critical-thinking English course CCC students take. Students in English 2 and 3 have been attending college longer than students in English 1 and have, therefore, likely been exposed to more diversity, both in experiences with classmates and in their coursework. This may be why they had less of a change but also often started out with higher Sum Scores than students in English 1. This again speaks to the idea that the college experience

itself is a driving source of change in students' awareness of issues such as sexism/gender discrimination and changing gender norms. Age might, in this line of thinking, also correlate with a student's Sum Score, however, at CCCs, students in English 1 range in age from under 18 to over 60, and therefore age does not equal amount of college experience. Accordingly, this study does not support the hypothesis that age had an effect on student responsiveness to gender coursework.

I had also initially assumed that student factors such as age, ethnicity, religion, and gender would have an impact on how much change a student showed. This does not appear to be the case, with the exception of gender. Although a student's identifications appeared to have an impact on responses to some questions, what factor, outside of gender identity, impacted the response was inconsistent. Gender identity did consistently reveal differences in responses, although not always in change. Men were regularly the lowest in SUM scores, while women and students who identified with another gender identity had consistently higher SUM scores. As I discussed in Chapter Four, this is not unexpected news; women and people who do not identify with conventional gender norms are more likely than men to experience sexism/gender discrimination, more likely than men to identify with a feminist label, and more likely to have egalitarian concepts of gender roles and norms. This also suggests a further line of study: what tactics/approaches/materials are more likely to reach male students in classes with a gender component.

So, Why No Impact?

The statistical analysis showed that participation in a gender component class was not a significant predictor of change in attitudes/perceptions regarding gender related concepts when compared to students in a non-gender component course. Considering that the literature shows

that students walk out of WGS classes with measurable changes in attitudes, perspectives, and awareness, as well as with positive personal benefits, it was genuinely surprising to me that the two sets of classes, gender and non-gender, reflected the same change or lack of change over the semester. So, why was there no impact? I speculate that the timing of the pre-survey, the current social and political climates, and the reality of post-feminism all impacted the findings of this study.

The Timing of the Pre-Survey

I would argue that the most significant limitation of this study is the timeline of the Pre-survey administration. Because of delays in the approval process at the community colleges, the bulk of the surveys are only separated in administration by eight weeks, and 10 at the outside. My initial goal had been to survey students during the first week or two of the semesters, which would have meant 12-16 weeks between survey administrations and which would have given me a cleaner data set. Sweet Valley had the earliest start date of the semester, as well as the longest semester at 18 weeks, and was nine weeks into instruction by the first survey. Coastal College and Canyon Glen were only six-seven weeks into instruction by the first survey. As previously discussed, for some students, the impact moment, if there were one, might have already happened when I administered the Pre-survey; but this supposes that an impact moment exists, which would back claims that gender instruction has an impact, which is not a claim I am attempting to make based on this study. However, not all of the gender instruction in the classes had occurred yet, and in some classes, it had only partially been discussed, while in other classes, the gender content was semester length and or an ongoing and recurrent factor. While Professor Gabriel's students were surveyed on the first day of class, as it was a late start class, Professor

Ronstadt's students at Sweet Valley would certainly have been exposed to the gender content by the time I surveyed them.

The question surrounding the idea of the "tainting" of students' attitudes and perceptions troubles and intrigues me the most. It is tantalizing to think that if only I had managed to get to the students week one I would have a potentially vastly different set of findings to share here. Only a duplication of this study with an early Pre-survey administration could answer the question. The gaps between the two groups of students, in particular on the Pre-Sum Scores, if not explained by a selection effect, must be explained by something.

The Current Social and Political Climates

I began to wonder, especially when some students referenced President Trump, politics, sexism in the news, etc. that if the timing of the Me Too movement and or the rise in public discussion of sexual misconduct and gender based discrimination had any bearing on students' attitudes and perceptions of sexism/gender discrimination. While the Me Too movement started in 2006, it was the more recent social media storm that put figures like Harvey Weinstein into widespread public conversation; the #MeToo movement went viral in October of 2017 (Chuck, 2017, metoomvmt.org, 2018). While this was "officially" after the Pre-survey administration, the die may have already been cast. Even before Weinstein's story broke, figures like Bill Cosby, Donald Trump, and Bill O'Reilly were in the news for sexual misconduct, and sexual misconduct had become more mainstream public conversation. The discussion of sexism and sexual discrimination had also been promulgated by the 2016 presidential election race, and events like the now annual Women's March. Consider the following student perspectives. Student 027, an 18-24 year old, Latina, woman in a gender component English 1 class spoke about the rise in vocalization about issues of sexual misconduct: "Right now a lot of rape victims

are speaking up and that's important. We must all learn about gender in order for us as a society to make progress. Speaking up and allowing others to voice their experiences is a step towards progression!" Student 341, a woman in a non-gender component English 3 course, echoed this sentiment: "The sexism in this country is disgusting. With the surge of sexual harassment coming to light, it's quite important to see that sexism is systemic and there needs to be reform."

Furthermore, the critique unfolds around a particular group. Student 017, previously referenced, mentioned "straight white males," and Student 263, a 25-34 year old, multiracial/multiethnic man in a gender component English 2 class, also pointed to that specific group, though he added in two additional modifiers: "It's great old white rich men are seeing consequences for what they do." The critique was also repeatedly tied to the current presidential administration, more frequently by the female students: "Starting with POTUS we have taken a huge step backwards," says Student 413, a 55-64 year old, African American woman in a non-gender component English 2 class. Student 068, an 18-24 year old, White woman in a gender component English 2 class commented: "My thoughts have changed over the semester because the Trump administration keeps doing stupid things and many women and men are being brave enough now to speak up against sexual assault." Lastly, Student 262, an 18-24 year old, Latino woman in a gender component English 2 class wrote: "President Trump has made remarks in the past that portray women as objects rather than people and unfortunately it sets the tone for how women are viewed in politics."

The student reflections hint that the current spotlight on issues of sexism, sexual assault, and sexual harassment have increased students' awareness of the issues, which might explain why the responses started out higher on the Likert scale, but also why there was not significant change over the course of the semester. This may just be coincidence, but it would be interesting

to see if this study had been conducted a year previously, or possibly even a year hence, the responses would be similar.

The Effect of Post-Feminism

As discussed in Chapter Two, the effects of a post-feminist reality are very real. A final major factor that must be discussed is post-feminism. The post-feminism myth that gender inequality and inequity are over, means that current students are more likely to ascribe those inequalities and that inequity to flaws in an individual, not the system (Genz & Brabon, 2018; McRobbie, 2009; Pomerantz & Raby, 2011). Younger generations of students are also more likely to associate feminism with rigid and repressive ways of thinking (Genz & Brabon, 2018). The so called crisis of masculinity is also a byproduct of post-feminism, and though the crisis is not new at all, younger men are likely to feel picked on by discussions of sexism, feminism and gender equality (Genz & Brabon, 2018), which the student reflections also showed. Post-feminism creates demanding archetypes, which both females and males try to embody, such as the Alpha Girl, the metrosexual and the “New Man” (Bettis, et al., 2016; Genz & Brabon, 2018; McRobbie, 2018; Pomerantz & Raby, 2011). The reality of post-feminism also shows in this study in other ways. More than one student in this study felt resistance to the material because they already knew how to treat women, because they felt they had enough knowledge on the subject and there was nothing new to learn. This echoes again the idea that, “the trouble is over, so why do we keep talking about it?”

On the other hand, the students in this study seemed to have an awareness of sexism/gender discrimination, which could be a result of, as mentioned above, sexism and gender discrimination dominating much of the current political and social climates. The argument that sexism is over may have been checked by stories of sexual misconduct and the

election to office of President of the United States, a man recorded talking about grabbing women by their genitals. However, post-feminism has co-existed with blatant sexism for decades now, so I hesitate to say that the current spotlight shed by movements like MeToo and Times Up has really affected any kind of permanent sea change.

Additional Points of Interest

What About A Negative Impact?

One reassuring finding of this study is that there did not appear to be a negative impact as a result of the inclusion of a gender component. As discussed in Chapter Two, WGS students have sometimes reported that men are either picked on during, or excluded from, feminism discussions (Burke & Trumpy, 2016; Webber, 2005), and at least one study showed that WGS students' egalitarian attitudes decreased after their time in the course (Stake, Sevelius & Hanly, 2008). One of my largest concerns with this study was that I might find that, in fact, gender coursework had a negative impact on students' attitudes and perceptions regarding gender. My findings show that doesn't appear to be the case; in fact, there was no significant change at all, and in general, students had an awareness of sexism/gender discrimination, positive associations with feminism, and a considered approach to gender roles and norms. Furthermore, these attitudes and perceptions were unrelated to whether a student was in the gender component course.

There were four students who, in their reflections, criticized the idea of gender studies classes, yet a critique of gender studies did not necessarily equal more traditional views of gender or a lack of awareness of sexism/gender discrimination. A critique of gender studies did not equal a critique of gender equality either. The students who critiqued a gender studies class concept appeared to feel sufficiently knowledgeable on the subject already and were irritated by

the continued discussion of a topic of which they were already well aware. Student 264, an 18-24 year old, White male in a gender component English 2 course remarked:

Yes, there is still unequal treatment of gender in America. While it is a problem, forcing people (especially men) to take a class about gender studies is degrading. There are lots of people who do sexually abuse and discriminate women but making everyone take the class is not fair. Men should not be forced to take a class about how to respect and learn about women. This class respected that. We looked at texts that deal with discrimination of both.

Student 320, an 18-24 year old, multiracial/multiethnic male, wrote:

Gender/feminism/sexism have been very prevalent in our readings. In this class and others, these topics have been discussed over and over. I feel, as a male, I understand well the hardships women face but lack the perception of a woman. I am supportive of equality and have no bias against women, but the constant bombardment of gender/feminism/sexism has become a turn off when they come up. Again, equality appeals to my sense of logic and justice but I really don't feel this issues should be imposed upon everybody (i.e. gender studies).

Student 320's comment is additionally interesting because he was in a non-gender component course; however, his teacher, Professor Davis, remarked that gender came up in class, but was not a focused area of study. Another student dismissed the topic entirely: "This is not something I or people I know care or talk about. Race, Gender and thoughts on said subjects are only brought up in weird tests like these." Student 407, the source of this quote, is a 25-34 year old, multiracial/multiethnic man in a non-gender component English 2 course. These students had drops in their Gender and Feminism Attitudes Sum Scores and increases in their Sexism

Awareness Sum Scores; however, only Student 264 was in a class with a gender component. A drop in score may be just as likely in a gender component as a non-gender component.

On the other hand, there were students who took the opposite stance, and who called for more gender studies/discussion of gender to be included in education Student 025, an 18-24 year old Latina woman in a gender component English 1 classes commented: “I would most definitely take other gender studies classes. I would take them to be educated and educate those who don’t know anything about the subject.” On the other hand, Student 107, an 18-24 year old, White woman in a non-gender component English 1 course, remarked: “We did not talk about these issues at all in class, which is unfortunate because I believe we all could’ve learned from each other.” Students 318 and 383 spoke to the need for gender content being more common in the curriculum. Student 318, an 18-24 year old, White, non-conforming/gender variant person wrote: “I love the idea of gender/queer courses. I’ve taken Native American history, women’s history, women in media, and enrolled in a sociology course called gender in society. This is important for the climate in today’s society” while Student 383, an 18-24 year old, multiracial/multiethnic woman in gender component English 3 course wrote: “I feel like gender equality needs to be more dominant in education especially in young children in elementary school. It’s important that the awareness of equal rights be understood by all.” Student 025 did not have matched data, but the other three students did. Student 107 had the same scores in Pre- and Post-, Student 318 showed a drop in gender score only, and Student 383 had a two point increase in Gender score, a one point drop in Feminism scores, and a two point drop in Sexism score.

This study seems to indicate that pursuing more inclusion of gender curriculum could have either a neutral or positive impact on students’ attitudes and perceptions, just as general

college exposure appears to; at the very least, it appears to be no more likely to have a negative impact than a non-gender component course.

What About the “Gender Component” Really Matters?

That there was no single way of teaching the subject of gender is, in some ways, a potential limitation of this study, however I am disinclined to call it that. Nine teachers taught gender nine different ways, with nine different sets of texts and resources, and with nine different lengths of class time allotted to the gender instruction. These nine teachers also have nine personalized understandings of gender, feminism, and sexism, including what that means to their own lives and their pedagogy. This meant any data analysis would have to include a number of variables, and so it has. Such is the messy nature of the study of education. This inconsistency was also a strength in some ways, as it meant there was flexibility in how gender was taught, and therefore this study could examine multiple approaches in case one type of approach was vastly different than another in success or failure. Even with covering multiple methods of approach, there was no significant result in students’ feminism, sexism, and gender construct scores, which leads to another line of questioning. Does how gender is taught have no more bearing on how the topic is received? Is there any added impact behind the teacher’s motivation for including gender? Professor Gabriel included it for the sake of the study; Professor Slick is passionate about the subject and dressed in wonder woman costume the last day of class. What does it mean if that doesn’t matter, if only that it is taught matters?

Is Gender Already Mainstream?

One possible reason the student groups, statistically at least, more or less mirrored each other in terms of change is that discussion of gender may already be common fodder. As previously mentioned, the 2013–14 HERI Faculty Survey reported that 22.3% of faculty (29.6%

of women faculty members and 16.9% of men faculty members) regularly used Readings on women and gender issues as a method of instruction in their classes, but discussion of gender and gender related concepts likely exceeds that percentage. In this study, some non-gender component instructors ending up addressing the subject in class anyway. Professor Davis mentioned, "Gender is discussed in certain sections of the course but is not the primary focus or theme of the writing and discussions." And Professor Waits commented: "I didn't address it directly, but it was certainly discussed in terms of the other subjects." As for the instructors who expressed an aversion to the subject, they can likely get through a semester without referencing feminism or sexism, but can they get through a semester without talking about gender roles and norms at all? Many students in non-gender component courses indicated on the survey that they discussed gender in class. A total of 304 students (67.1%) who took the Post-survey indicated that the class covered the topic of Gender- 69 of those students (or 35.4% of all non-gender component students) were in a non-gender component class. In the Longitudinal Data Set, 43 of the 110 students in a non-gender component course indicated on the survey that gender was discussed in class. Furthermore, more than one student in a non-gender component course remarked about the overabundance of discussion regarding gender related concepts. I'll refer again to Student 320, an 18-24 year old, multiracial/multiethnic male, who wrote:

"Gender/feminism/ sexism have been very prevalent in our readings. In this class and others, these topics have been discussed over and over."

However, even if gender is a common point of discussion in most English classes, and perhaps most critical-thinking classes, discussed with frequency does not mean mainstream. Nor does its presence in the classrooms mean that gender is mainstream on the institutional level:

According to Lombardo (2013), gender mainstreaming is a network of structures, mechanisms and processes that are put in place within an organisation's framework to guide, plan, monitor and evaluate gender equity. Gender mainstreaming requires all public policies to counter gender bias, reorganise policy structures and gender perspectives. (Thobejane, Mogorosi, & Okere, 2017, p. 8930)

On the other hand, some scholars posit that in some ways, the institutionalization of women's studies has led to women's studies depoliticized and disempowered state, and the co-opting of women studies into other identity studies has further limited the power of women's studies courses to effect change. Even the change from Women's Studies to Gender Studies or Women and Gender Studies could indicate a "postfeminist world where men's studies and masculinity were more important areas of research" (Woodward & Woodward, 2015). Furthermore, it can be argued that, "women's studies has lost its political force and radical edge, and is trapped in a series of accusations and guilt among women and among feminists around which subjective experiences and ways of being should be of primary concern" (Wright, 2016, p. 217).

Limitations

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the first and most significant limitation of this study is the timeline between Pre- and Post-surveys. Yet another limitation of the study is that the number of students in the Pre- and Post-groups are not balanced, and this occurred for several reasons. Attrition accounts for a bulk of the percentage in loss, as does normal student absences. The several wildfires in southern California over December which caused the closures of several area community colleges also impacted the second round of data collection, moving some to an online format, some to finals week – meaning a time crunch on completing the survey and a reduced number of willing participants – and finally absences due to the wildfire.

A third limitation was the inability to match all student participants. Respect for privacy and student comfort and safety meant that only students willing to volunteer traceable data could be matched. Under other conditions, matching all students might be feasible, but under the conditions of the IRB, the participating CCCs own requirements and conditions for study, and the nature of the survey format, it just was not possible to ensure this. However, as the MATCHED Student Data Set was similar in demographics to the ALL Student Data Set, I am satisfied that the samples were similar and an accurate representation of the student body.

The limitations of this study also include the comparatively small scope of the study population against the extensive size and population of the CCC network of schools. With a larger research team, it would be feasible to include more CCCs, more classes, and more students. Another limitation is the brief period of time this study covers; ideally, I would like to be able to survey students again a third time 3 months to a year later to measure any lasting change, but time did not permit. Also, as I was unable to survey and follow up with students who dropped the course, I cannot know if any students dropped the course because of the gender content (thereby indicating a potential decrease in scores), or if they dropped it for other reasons.

An unfortunate implication of these limitations is that this study cannot definitively answer the question of what the potential impact of inclusion of a gender component into more mainstream coursework might be.

Opportunities for Further Study

The study of gender curriculum on students who do not elect into gender classes is still vastly under-researched, as is the area of gender studies and community college students. This study had a limited scope, informed by the constraints of dissertation research, so it can only add to what little we currently know on the subject and act as a springboard for further research.

Furthermore, there appears to be a potential self-selection effect, which means that even this study may have students who “elected” into a gender course. If this study were to be conducted on a larger scale, students who appeared to have elected into the gender component course could also be compared against students in the same class who took the course for other reasons than familiarity with the professor or course materials. This same study could be repeated at multiple campuses across California, as well as across multiple states. Variants of this study that have a clearer “control” group and a clearer “intervention” group could also be attempted, although it might impact the natural experiment vibe this study attempted to maintain for the sake of authenticity. This study could also be conducted on students who have not yet taken a Critical-Thinking Course, such as students in English 28, since the Critical-Thinking component could be the source of the change in students’ attitudes/perceptions. A longer duration study could also be attempted in order to measure any increased activism, self-esteem, and student success, which the literature shows is associated with WGS courses. Additionally, this study might yield interesting results if conducted in a city, county or state less left-leaning than Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, or the state of California. If further study can show that required gender coursework could transform students and increase student engagement and connectivity to the campus, especially when non-elective, this would help substantiate an argument for the mainstreaming of feminism curriculum at the community college level.

The impact of gender coursework is not a well-studied area within community colleges or within non-elective gender coursework. Considering the potential benefits of such curriculum changes as well as the general community college mission of access and social justice, the impact of gender coursework should become an area of study.

Implications for Policy Makers

In full disclosure, I felt there already was sufficient compelling evidence and research to argue that gender coursework be embraced by higher education institutions. I had hoped by my study might add to the already weighty volumes of evidence. Unfortunately, this study does not add to the statistical evidence of the benefits of including a gender component into required coursework. This study shows that students in the gender component courses reported feeling more knowledgeable and informed on subjects of gender, feminism and sexism, however, this study could not measure any long reaching impacts of the inclusion of gender coursework. That does not mean the long reaching impacts might not be there. It is hard to deny that sexism and gender discrimination are still problems in this country. And, as I point out in Chapters One and Two, the data and literature around WGS courses shows the positive impact those classes have on their students. The literature and data also show that exposing students to diverse and new concepts and to the practice of critical thinking also have numerous positive impacts on students. Once more, I see both the state of sexism and gender discrimination in this country and the data around the benefits of WGS instruction as more than adequate evidence to prompt Deans and Department Chairs to encourage faculty to bring more diversity and gender content into their texts and teachings. Faculty may be inclined to shy away from “uncomfortable” content for a variety of reasons but having a department head’s support could make the task less daunting. Making the inclusion of this content, generally associated with race and gender, mandatory in some form and clearly articulated could do even more to take the burden off of the professors individually and onto the school collectively. Offering faculty members training in how to incorporate diversity components like gender and race into their coursework would also facilitate this process and likely serve the equity campaigns central to CCCs’ agendas at this moment. I

also believe the CCCs need to promulgate a curriculum that is just as aware of Gender Studies as it is of Ethnic Studies, and a curriculum that makes these “studies” mainstream, not elective. In no way do I see this as an either/or circumstance, but rather a both/and situation. Regardless of the outcome of this study, the current research supports an enriched curriculum with wide exposure to students of many, not just select, diverse components. The study of gender is one such component that frequently gets left behind.

The effects of such an implementation would also need to be measured across the manifold and diverse California Community College student bodies to see if the success is consistent or if certain groups of students remain resistant to any change in their current attitudes toward/perceptions of gender, specifically feminism, sexism/gender discrimination, and gender roles and norms.

Final Thoughts

As an educator, I find it beyond heartening to know that students are capable of growth and change and that exercises in critical thinking have a genuine impact on the way students think and ultimately act. It is for this very reason that I think the content that we (and by we I mean any teacher) teach matters so much.

And I am brought back to the question that started this whole process for me – why haven’t CCCs done more to push the incorporation of gender content in mainstream and or required curriculum. CCCs are in a position to take the shaping role on how the conversation of gender and sexism plays out.

It appears we are at a turning point. Of course, the world is always at a turning point; the next generation of leaders is always being formed; there is always something that can be done

today to change tomorrow. We've always had the unique opportunity (that we've had hundreds of times over) to direct the conversation and set the tone. We should not waste it.

Appendix A: Timeline

May 2017: Dissertation proposal finalized, Finalized survey tools.

June 2017: Preliminary Orals, Test survey on my own Critical-thinking course students.

July 2017: IRB application and approval.

July – August 2017: Submitted survey/study requests to CCCs.

September 2017: All schools granted permission to study on their campuses. Recruited faculty partners. Retrieved syllabi from participating faculty members. Confirmed and scheduled survey administration dates.

October 2017: Administered first round of surveys at campuses (Pre).

December 2017: Administered second round of surveys at campuses (Post).

January – February 2018: Completed transfer of surveys and student reflections from paper to electronic format. Coded and analyzed student reflection pieces.

March – April 2018: Ran statistical analysis of survey data.

April 2018: Compiled and analyzed all findings. Completed chapter four.

May 2018: Completed chapter five.

June 2018: Dissertation Defense.

July 2018: Made recommended changes to Dissertation.

August 2018: File dissertation.

Appendix B: IRB Approval

webIRB

University of California Los Angeles
10889 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 830
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1406

<http://ora.research.ucla.edu/ohrpp>
General Campus IRB: (310) 825-7122
Medical IRB: (310) 825-5344

APPROVAL NOTICE

New Study

DATE: 8/16/2017

TO: JENNIFER SMITH, Doctorate of Education
EDUCATION

FROM: TODD FRANKE, PhD
Chair, NGIRB

RE: IRB#17-001074 Smith Dissertation - Study of Community College Students through
survey and document analysis. Version: Version 1 (7/11/17)

The UCLA Institutional Review Board (UCLA IRB) has approved the above-referenced study.
UCLA's Federalwide Assurance (FWA) with Department of Health and Human Services is
FWA00004642.

Submission and Review Information

Type of Review Expedited Review

Approval Date 8/16/2017

Expiration Date of the Study 8/15/2020

Specific Conditions for Approval

-- The IRB has determined that this study meets the criteria for a 3 year extended approval. (For
reference, please see the OHRPP guidance document "Extended Approval for Minimal Risk
Research Not Subject to Federal Oversight" at

http://ora.research.ucla.edu/OHRPP/Documents/Policy/4/Extended_Approval.pdf).

Regulatory Determinations

-- Expedited Review Category(ies) - The UCLA IRB determined that the research meets the
requirements for expedited review per 45 CFR 46.110 category(ies) XXX

-- Waiver of Signed Informed Consent - The UCLA IRB waived the requirement for signed
informed consent for the research under 45 CFR 46.117(c)(2).

Documents Reviewed included, but were not limited to:

Document Name	Document Version #
17-001074 - Smith Recruitment email to faculty.docx.pdf	0.01
17-001074 - Smith Recruitment Notice to Students.doc.pdf	0.01
17-001074 - Student Consent Form.doc.pdf	0.01

Important Note: Approval by the Institutional Review Board does not, in and of itself, constitute approval for the implementation of this research. Other UCLA clearances and approvals or other external agency or collaborating institutional approvals may be required before study activities are initiated. Research undertaken in conjunction with outside entities, such as drug or device companies, are typically contractual in nature and require an agreement between the University and the entity.

General Conditions of Approval

As indicated in the PI Assurances as part of the IRB requirements for approval, the PI has ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the study, the ethical performance of the project, the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, and strict adherence to any stipulations imposed by the IRB.

The PI and study team will comply with all UCLA policies and procedures, as well as with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects in research, including, but not limited to, the following:

Ensuring that the personnel performing the project are qualified, appropriately trained, and will adhere to the provisions of the approved protocol,

Implementing no changes in the approved protocol or consent process or documents without prior IRB approval (except in an emergency, if necessary to safeguard the well-being of human subjects and then notifying the IRB as soon as possible afterwards),

Obtaining the legally effective informed consent from human subjects of their legally responsible representative, and using only the currently approved consent process and stamped consent documents, as appropriate, with human subjects,

Reporting serious or unexpected adverse events as well as protocol violations or other incidents related to the protocol to the IRB according to the OHRPP reporting requirements.

Assuring that adequate resources to protect research participants (i.e., personnel, funding, time, equipment and space) are in place before implementing the research project, and that the research will stop if adequate resources become unavailable.

Arranging for a co-investigator to assume direct responsibility of the study if the PI will be unavailable to direct this research personally, for example, when on sabbatical leave or vacation or other absences. Either this person is named as co-investigator in this application, or advising IRB via webIRB in advance of such arrangements.

Appendix C: Recruitment Email

Smith – Recruitment Email to Faculty

Dear [Faculty Member's Name],

My name is Jennifer Smith. I'm in the English department at CGC (Pseudonym for college). I am conducting research here at CGC during the Fall 2017 semester as a part of a UCLA dissertation and with consent from CGC's research department.

I want to do my study around students taking English critical thinking courses at community college, comparing classes where there is a unit on gender and with classes where there is no unit on gender. I am looking for 4 faculty members teaching sections with gender coursework and 4 faculty members teaching sections without any gender coursework. I am emailing you because you are teaching sections of English 1, 2 or 3 in the fall.

My first question is: Would you be interested in participating in the study and letting me survey your students? I would administer the surveys during your class time, once at the start of the semester, and once at the close of the semester. The surveys should not take more than 20 minutes of classroom time, if that. The Post- survey may include a short reflection piece, if you are amenable to that.

The second question is: Do you plan to teach your Fall 2017 class with any kind of gender coursework, such as feminist theory or with feminist texts?

And the third question: If necessary, would you have any interest in including gender coursework into your Fall 2017 class?

I know this is a lot to throw at you in an email, and I am happy to give you more information about my project at any time. Thank you for reading this and I hope to hear from you!

Jennifer Smith

Protocol ID:IRB#17-001074 UCLA IRB Approved Approval Date: 8/16/2017 Through: 8/15/2020 Committee: North General IRB

Appendix D: Student Recruitment Script

Delivered to students before surveys were handed out.

Hello CGC Students! My name is Jennifer Smith. I am a professor here at CGC and a doctoral student at UCLA with the Department of Education. I am conducting research on how certain coursework you will undertake in this class impacts your feelings, perceptions and attitudes.

Participation in this research includes two surveys, one administered in the first few weeks of class, and the second administered in the last few weeks of class. The surveys should take only about 10-15 minutes of class time to complete.

Some of you may also be asked to complete a short reflection piece with the second survey.

Participation in this research is voluntary. (THEN REVIEW TERMS OF THE CONSENT FORM).

Let me stress again, no one at the school, including the professor, will see your responses.

If you have any questions, let me know.

I can also be reached at smithja@CGC.edu or at 323.481.8294.

Thank you very much!

Appendix E: Student Consent Form

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

Smith Dissertation – Non-Elective Gender Studies Impact on Community College Students

Jennifer Smith, from the Department of Education, Educational Leadership Program at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), with Dr. Eagan as Faculty Sponsor, is conducting a research study.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are enrolled in a class, which the instructor for this class is a study participant. Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

Why is this study being done?

This study is being done to observe any change in attitudes based on your experiences in this class.]

What will happen if I take part in this research study?

If you volunteer to participate in this study, the researcher will ask you to do the following:

Complete two surveys, each taking about 15 minutes of your in class time

Complete one short reflection exercise, taking about 10 minutes of your in class time

How long will I be in the research study?

Participation will take a total of about 40 minutes of your time This study will take place over the course of this semester only, and in just two class periods.

Are there any potential risks or discomforts that I can expect from this study?

There are no reasonable foreseeable risks, discomforts, or inconveniences to you because of this study.

Are there any potential benefits if I participate?

You will not directly benefit from your participation in this research.

The results of the research may determine if certain course components have an affect on students.

What other choices do I have if I choose not to participate?

If you chose not to participate, your instructor may offer you an alternate assignment.

Will information about me and my participation be kept confidential?

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify you will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law.

Confidentiality will be maintained by means of secure, offsite storage that will only be accessed by researchers, not your participating institution or any of its members.

Your responses will be coded so your responses remain confidential.

What are my rights if I take part in this study?

You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time.

Whatever decision you make, there will be no penalty to you, and no loss of benefits to which you were otherwise entitled.

You may refuse to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

Who can I contact if I have questions about this study?

The research team:

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to the one of the researchers. Please contact:

Jennifer Smith, smithja@g.ucla.edu, 323-481-8294

Dr. Eagan, Faculty Sponsor, keagan@ucla.edu

UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP):

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers, you may contact the UCLA OHRPP by phone: (310) 206-2040; by email: participants@research.ucla.edu or by mail: Box 951406, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1406.

Protocol ID:IRB#17-001074 UCLA IRB Approved Approval Date: 8/16/2017 Through: 8/15/2020 Committee: North General IRB

Appendix F: Pre-Survey – All Students

Thank you for filling out this survey. This survey is being used for a UCLA project and is not offered by COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN .

The survey should take about 10-15 minutes of your time.

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. These surveys are confidential and your responses will not be shared with your instructor, so please answer as honestly as possible.

Name:

Email address:

Date:

Demographics

1. What is your age? (circle one)

- Under 18
- 18 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 to 74
- 75 or older

2. What is your current enrollment status? (circle one)

- Attending community college full time (12 or more units).
- Attending community college part time (1-11 units).
- Attending community college and another undergraduate college/university.
- Attending community college and graduate school.
- Attending community college and high school.

3. What is your ethnicity? (Please select all that apply.)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian/Asian American
- Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Middle Eastern
- White / Caucasian
- Multiracial/ Multiethnic
- Other (please specify)

4. What language do you speak most often? (Circle one)

Arabic
Armenian
Chinese
English
Farsi / Persian
French
French Creole
German
Greek
Gujarati
Hindi
Italian
Japanese
Korean
Polish
Portuguese
Russian
Spanish
Tagalog
Urdu
Vietnamese
Other (please specify)

5. Were you raised with or in the tradition of any of the following religions? (Please circle all that apply.)

Buddhism
Catholicism
Christianity
Hinduism
Islam
Judaism
Native American
Protestantism
Inter/Non-denominational
No religion
Other (please specify)

6. Do you currently identify with/practice any of the following religions? (Please circle all that apply.)

- Buddhism
- Catholicism
- Christianity
- Hinduism
- Islam
- Judaism
- Native American
- Protestantism
- Inter/Non-denominational
- No religion
- Other (please specify)

7. With what gender identity do you most identify?

- Woman
- Man
- Transgender Woman
- Transgender Man
- Non-Conforming/ Gender Variant
- Prefer not to answer
- Not Listed (please specify)

COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN Satisfaction Questions

In this next section, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN.

8. How long have you been at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN College? (Circle one)

- Less than six months
- Six months to a year
- 1 - 2 years
- 3 -5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- More than 10 years

9. Overall, how satisfied are you with COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN College? (Circle one)

- Completely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Completely dissatisfied

10. Overall, how satisfied are you with the faculty (instructors) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN College? (Circle one)
Completely satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Completely dissatisfied

11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Counselors at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN College? (Circle one)
Completely satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Completely dissatisfied

12. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Staff (for example, those non-teaching employees working in admissions, student services, maintenance, IT, etc.) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN College? (circle one)
Completely satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Completely dissatisfied

13. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns about COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN overall?

Critical Thinking Course Questions

In this section, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences with any prior Critical Thinking course and the Critical Thinking Course you are currently enrolled in.

14. Have you ever been enrolled in Critical thinking course at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN before this one? (Circle one).

Yes (please specify which course or courses you were enrolled in) _____

No

Unsure

15. Have you ever been enrolled in a Critical thinking course before at any Community College or University? (Circle one)

Yes (please specify which course or courses you were enrolled in) _____

No

Unsure

16. If you were enrolled in critical thinking courses before, on a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your experience in those classes? (Circle one)

1- a bad experience 5 – an excellent experience

1 2 3 4 5

17. Which COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN critical thinking course are you currently enrolled in? (Circle all that apply)

English 1A

English 1B

English 1C

18. Why did you sign up for this particular critical thinking course? (Circle all that apply)

Counselor recommendation

Friend or peer recommendation

Fit your schedule

Thought it would be easy

Thought it would be challenging

Professor got good reviews on Rate my Professor or similar website

Course got good reviews on Rate my Professor or similar website

You had this professor for a class before

You knew and liked what the content of the course would be

You knew and liked what the texts used in the course would be

Other (please specify)

19. What topics do you expect you will discuss, learn and read about in this course? (Circle all that apply)

Argument

Culture

Ethics

Gender

Law

Logic

Philosophy

Race

Society

Other (please specify)

Questions about Gender, Sexism and Feminism and COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN

In this section, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences with any Gender Studies Course you have taken or are currently enrolled in and your thoughts about gender, sexism and feminism.

20. Have you ever taken a Gender Studies class? (This could be a Women's Studies class or Women's literature, Women and Art, Women in Film, Gender Studies, etc.) (Circle one)

Yes

No (if no, skip to question 23)

If you have taken a course, please write the name of the course here. If you don't remember the name of the course, please write "don't remember".

21. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your experience in this class? (Circle one)

1- a bad experience 5 – an excellent experience

1 2 3 4 5

22. Is there anything you'd like to share about the women and or gender studies class?

23. Which words do you most commonly associate with the term feminism? (Choose up to five)

Equality between the sexes

Gender Equality

Misandry (hatred of males)

Advocacy

Relevant

Women's rights

Feminine

Activism

Reproductive Rights

Social equality

Political equality

Economic equality

Pointless

Outdated

Empowerment

Not applicable

Victimization

Other (please specify)

24. To what extent do you consider yourself to be feminist? (Circle one)
1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely feminist)

1 2 3 4 5
 No opinion

25. Would you mind if someone labeled you as a feminist?

Yes, very much
Yes, somewhat
Neither upset or not upset
No, not very much
No, not at all
I would be pleased

26. Have you observed incidents of sexism or gender discrimination on campus in the last 6 months? (Circle one)

Yes
No
Unsure

27. Thinking back over your time here at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN, would you say that you have ever observed incidents of sexism or gender discrimination on campus? (Circle one)

Yes
No
Unsure

28. Have you ever reported incidents of sexism or gender discrimination on campus to faculty, administrators, staff or fellow students? (Circle one)

Yes
No

29. Are you currently or have you ever been a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for women's rights and or women's equality? (Circle one)

Yes, currently
Yes, previously and currently
Yes, previously, but not currently
No

30. Have you ever observed incidents of racism on campus in the last 6 months? (Circle one)

Yes
No
Unsure

31. Thinking back over your time here at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN, would you say that you have ever observed incidents of racism on campus? (Circle one)

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

32. Have you ever reported incidents of racism on campus to faculty, administrators, staff or fellow students? (Circle one)

- Yes
- No

33. Are you currently or have you ever been a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for racial equality? (Circle one)

- Yes, currently
- Yes, previously and currently
- Yes, previously, but not currently
- No

34. Have you ever felt discriminated against because of your gender?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

35. Have you ever discriminated against someone because of their gender?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

36. Should women and men have equal rights?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

37. Can women and men do all of the same jobs?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

38. If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the mother be the primary caregiver? That is, should the mother be more responsible for care and feeding of the child than the father?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

39. If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the father be the primary wage earner? That is, should the father be more responsible for providing income to the family?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

40. Sexism/gender discrimination is a problem in American workplaces today? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

41. Sexism/gender discrimination is a problem in American politics today? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

42. Men make better leaders than women? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

43. Feminism is only for women? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

44. Men should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

45. Women should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)
- Completely Agree
 - Somewhat Agree
 - Neither Agree or Disagree
 - Somewhat Disagree
 - Completely Disagree
46. Everyone should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)
- Completely Agree
 - Somewhat Agree
 - Neither Agree or Disagree
 - Somewhat Disagree
 - Completely Disagree
47. People should be able to choose their gender identity? (Circle one)
- Completely Agree
 - Somewhat Agree
 - Neither Agree or Disagree
 - Somewhat Disagree
 - Completely Disagree
48. Should people of all genders have equal rights?
- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
49. COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN cares about ensuring gender equality on campus? (Circle one)
- Completely Agree
 - Somewhat Agree
 - Neither Agree or Disagree
 - Somewhat Disagree
 - Completely Disagree
 - Other: please explain
50. COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN cares about ensuring racial equality on campus? (Circle one)
- Completely Agree
 - Somewhat Agree
 - Neither Agree or Disagree
 - Somewhat Disagree
 - Completely Disagree
 - Other: please explain

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Just as a reminder, all your responses and your identity will be kept confidential.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact Jennifer Smith at smithja@g.ucla.edu.

Appendix G: Post- Survey - For With Gender Component Classes

Thank you for filling out this survey. This survey is being used for a UCLA project and is not offered by COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN. There are 69 questions. The survey should take about 15-20 minutes of your time. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. These surveys are confidential and your personal responses will not be shared with your instructor, so please be honest.

Name:

Email address:

Date:

Demographics

1. What is your age? (circle one)

- Under 18
- 18 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 to 74
- 75 or older

2. What is your current enrollment status? (circle one)

- Attending community college full time (12 or more units).
- Attending community college part time (1-11 units).
- Attending community college and another undergraduate college/university.
- Attending community college and graduate school.
- Attending community college and high school.

3. What is your ethnicity? (Please select all that apply.)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian/Asian American
- Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Middle Eastern
- White / Caucasian
- Multiracial/ Multiethnic
- Other (please specify)

4. What language do you speak most often? (Circle one)

Armenian
Chinese
English
Farsi / Persian
French
French Creole
German
Greek
Gujarati
Hindi
Italian
Japanese
Korean
Polish
Portuguese
Russian
Spanish
Tagalog
Urdu
Vietnamese
Other (please specify)

5. Were you raised with or in the tradition of any of the following religions? (Please circle all that apply.)

Buddhism
Catholicism
Christianity
Hinduism
Islam
Judaism
Native American
Protestantism
Inter/Non-denominational
No religion
Other (please specify)

6. Do you currently identify with/practice any of the following religions? (Please circle all that apply.)

- Buddhism
- Catholicism
- Christianity
- Hinduism
- Islam
- Judaism
- Native American
- Protestantism
- Inter/Non-denominational
- No religion
- Other (please specify)

7. With what gender identity do you most identify?

- Woman
- Man
- Transgender Woman
- Transgender Man
- Non-Conforming/ Gender Variant
- Prefer not to answer
- Not Listed (please specify): _____

COLLEGE Satisfaction Questions

In this next section, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN.

8. Overall, how satisfied are you with COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (Circle one)

- Completely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Completely dissatisfied
- No opinion

9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the faculty (instructors) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (Circle one)

- Completely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Completely dissatisfied
- No opinion

10. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Counselors at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (Circle one)

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Staff (for example, those working in admissions, student services, maintenance, IT, etc.) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (circle one)

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

12. Overall, what is your level of satisfaction with the administration (Presidents, VPs, Deans, etc.) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (Circle one)

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

13. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns about COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN overall?

Critical Thinking Course Questions

In this section, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences with the Critical Thinking Course you are currently enrolled in.

14. Which COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN Critical-thinking course are you currently enrolled in? (Circle one)

English 1

English 2

English 3

15. How many times have you been absent from this Critical Thinking Course? (Circle one)

1

2

3-4 times

5-10 times

More than 10 times

Not currently enrolled (dropped, was excluded, or withdrew from the course)

16. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your instructor for this class?

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

17. What did you like about your instructor for this class? (Chose up to five)

Their appearance / the way they look

They are objective

They are knowledgeable

They are nice

They are strict

They present information in multiple ways

They are passionate

They are fair

They are helpful

They seem concerned about their students

Did not like anything about the instructor

Other (please specify)

18. What did you dislike about your instructor for this class? (Chose up to 5)

Their appearance / the way they look

They didn't seem objective

They didn't seem knowledgeable

They aren't nice / nice enough

They aren't strict / strict enough

They didn't present information multiple ways

They aren't passionate

They aren't fair

They do not seem concerned with the students

They seemed sexist

They seemed racist

Did not dislike anything about the instructor

Other (please specify)

19. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your instructor for this class?(Circle one)
1- a bad teacher 5 – an excellent teacher

1 2 3 4 5

20. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your experience in this class? (Circle one)
1- a bad experience 5 – an excellent experience

1 2 3 4 5

21. What did you like about this class? (Chose up to five)

Class Discussions in general.
Discussions / content about critical thinking
Discussions / content about culture.
Discussions / content about feminism.
Discussions / content about politics.
Discussions / content about philosophy
Discussions / content about racism
Interactions with other students.
The instructor.
The texts and or readings.
Did not like anything about the class.
Other (please specify)

22. What did you dislike about the class? (Chose up to five)

Class Discussions in general.
Discussions / content about critical thinking
Discussions / content about culture.
Discussions / content about feminism.
Discussions / content about politics.
Discussions / content about philosophy
Discussions / content about racism
Interactions with other students.
The instructor.
The texts and or readings.
Did not dislike anything about the class.
Other (please specify)

23. On a scale of 1-5, how likely are you to recommend this course to a friend, peer, or fellow student?

1- very unlikely 5 – very likely

1 2 3 4 5

24. What topics do you discuss, learn and read about in this course? (Circle all that apply)

Philosophy

Logic

Argument

Gender

Culture

Race

Law

Ethics

Society

Other (please specify)

25. What was your favorite topic in this course? (Circle one)

Philosophy

Logic

Argument

Gender

Culture

Race

Law

Ethics

Society

No favorite

Other (please specify)

26. What was your least favorite topic in this course? (Circle one)

Philosophy

Logic

Argument

Gender

Culture

Race

Law

Ethics

Society

No least favorite

Other (please specify)

27. What was your favorite aspect of this course? (Circle one)

The subjects being taught

The teacher

Classmates

The texts

No favorite

Other (please specify)

28. What was your least favorite aspect of the course? (Circle one)

The subjects being taught

The teacher

Classmates

The texts

No least favorite

Other (please specify)

29. If the topic of gender came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

Gaining insight from other students. Like / Dislike

Gaining insight from the instructor. Like / Dislike

Agenda or message of the teacher. Like / Dislike

The texts and or readings. Like / Dislike

New or different ideas about gender. Like / Dislike

Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of gender .

Or: Other (please specify)

30. If the topic of feminism specifically came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

Gaining insight from other students. Like / Dislike

Gaining insight from the instructor. Like / Dislike

Agenda or message of the teacher. Like / Dislike

The texts and or readings. Like / Dislike

New or different ideas about feminism. Like / Dislike

Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of feminism.

Or: Other (please specify)

31. If the topic of sexism specifically came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

Gaining insight from other students. Like / Dislike

Gaining insight from the instructor. Like / Dislike

Agenda or message of the teacher. Like / Dislike

The texts and or readings. Like / Dislike

New or different ideas about sexism. Like / Dislike

Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of sexism.

Or: Other (please specify)

32. If the topic of racism specifically came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| Gaining insight from other students. | Like / Dislike |
| Gaining insight from the instructor. | Like / Dislike |
| Agenda or message of the teacher. | Like / Dislike |
| The texts and or readings. | Like / Dislike |
| New or different ideas about racism. | Like / Dislike |
- Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of racism.
Or: Other (please specify) _____

33. Is there anything else you'd like to share about this critical thinking class?

Questions about Gender, Feminism, Sexism and Racism and COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN

In this section, you will be asked to answer questions about your perceptions of Gender, Feminism, Sexism, and Racism.

34. How likely are you to take a Gender Studies class? (This could be a Women's Studies class or Women's literature, Women and Art, Women in Film, Gender Studies, etc.) (Circle one)

Extremely likely

Somewhat likely

Somewhat unlikely

Extremely unlikely

Undecided/Not sure

Have already taken a Gender Studies course (write the name of the course)

35. How likely are you to take an Ethnic Studies class? (This could be African American studies, Chicano studies, Jewish Studies, etc.) (Circle one)

Extremely likely

Somewhat likely

Somewhat unlikely

Extremely unlikely

Undecided/Not sure

Have already taken an Ethnic Studies course (write the name of the course)_____

36. Which words do you associate with the term feminism? (Chose up to five)

- Equality between the sexes
- Gender Equality
- Misandry (hatred of males)
- Advocacy
- Relevant
- Women's rights
- Feminine
- Activism
- Reproductive Rights
- Social equality
- Political equality
- Economic equality
- Pointless
- Outdated
- Empowerment
- Not applicable
- Victimization
- Other (please specify)

37. To what extent do you consider yourself to be feminist? (Circle one)

1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely feminist)

1 2 3 4 5 No opinion

38. Would you mind if someone labeled you as a feminist?

- Yes, very much
- Yes, somewhat
- Neither upset or not upset
- No, not very much
- No, not at all
- I would be pleased

39. To what extent do you find feminism applicable in your life? (Circle one)

1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely applicable)

1 2 3 4 5 No opinion

40. To what extent did you enjoy learning about gender studies? (Circle one)

1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely enjoyed)

1 2 3 4 5 No opinion

41. To what extent do you feel you understand the concepts of feminism? (Circle one)

1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely well)

1 2 3 4 5

42. To what extent do you feel you understand the concepts in gender studies? (Circle one)
1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely well)

1 2 3 4 5

43. Thinking back over your time here at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN, do you think you have ever observed incidents of sexism or gender discrimination on campus? (Circle one)

Yes
No
Unsure

44. Have you observed incidents of sexism or gender discrimination on campus in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

Yes
No
Unsure

45. Have you ever reported incidents of sexism or gender discrimination on campus to faculty, administrators, staff or fellow students in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

Yes
No

46. Are you currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for women's rights? (Circle one)

Yes
No

47. If you are not currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for women's rights, how likely are you to become one in the next year? (Circle one)

Extremely likely
Somewhat likely
Somewhat unlikely
Extremely unlikely
Not sure/undecided

48. Thinking back over your time here at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN, would you say that you have ever observed incidents of racism on campus? (Circle one)

Yes
No
Unsure

49. Have you observed incidents of racism on campus in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

Yes
No
Unsure

50. Have you reported incidents of racism on campus to faculty, administrators, staff or fellow students in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

Yes

No

51. Are you currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for racial equality? (Circle one)

Yes

No

52. If you are not currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for racial equality, how likely are you to become one in the next year? (Circle one)

Extremely likely

Somewhat likely

Somewhat unlikely

Extremely unlikely

Not sure/undecided

53. Have you ever felt discriminated against because of your gender?

Yes

No

Unsure

54. Have you ever discriminated against someone because of their gender?

Yes

No

Unsure

55. Should women and men have equal rights?

Yes

No

Unsure

56. Can women and men do all of the same jobs?

Yes

No

Unsure

57. If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the mother be the primary caregiver? That is, should the mother be more responsible for care and feeding of the child than the father?

Yes

No

Unsure

58. If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the father be the primary wage earner? That is, should the father be more responsible for providing income to the family?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

59. Sexism/gender discrimination is a problem in American workplaces today? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

60. Sexism/gender discrimination is a problem in American politics today? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

61. Men make better leaders than women? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

62. Feminism is only for women? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

63. Men should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

64. Women should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

65. Everyone should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

66. People should be able to choose their gender identity? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

67. Should people of all genders have equal rights?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

68. COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN cares about ensuring gender equality on campus?

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

69. COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN cares about ensuring racial equality on campus?

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Just as a reminder, all your responses and your identity will be kept confidential. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Jennifer Smith at smithja@g.ucla.edu.

Appendix H: Post- Survey – For Without Gender Component Classes

Thank you for filling out this survey. This survey is being used for a UCLA project and is not offered by COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN.

There are 65 questions. The survey should take about 15 minutes of your time.

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. These surveys are confidential and your personal responses will not be shared with your instructor, so answer as honestly as possible.

Name:

Email address:

Date:

Demographics

1. What is your age? (Circle one)

- Under 18
- 18 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 to 74
- 75 or older

2. What is your current enrollment status? (Circle one)

- Attending community college full time (12 or more units).
- Attending community college part time (1-11 units).
- Attending community college and another undergraduate college/university.
- Attending community college and graduate school.
- Attending community college and high school.

3. What is your ethnicity? (Please select all that apply.)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian/Asian American
- Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Middle Eastern
- White / Caucasian
- Multiracial/ Multiethnic
- Other (please specify)

4. What language do you speak most often? (Circle one)

- Armenian
- Chinese
- English
- Farsi / Persian
- French
- French Creole
- German
- Greek
- Gujarati
- Hindi
- Italian
- Japanese
- Korean
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Russian
- Spanish
- Tagalog
- Urdu
- Vietnamese
- Other (please specify)

5. Were you raised with or in the tradition of any of the following religions? (Please circle all that apply.)

- Buddhism
- Catholicism
- Christianity
- Hinduism
- Islam
- Judaism
- Native American
- Protestantism
- Inter/Non-denominational
- No religion
- Other (please specify)

6. Do you currently identify with/practice any of the following religions? (Please circle all that apply.)

Buddhism
Catholicism
Christianity
Hinduism
Islam
Judaism
Native American
Protestantism
Inter/Non-denominational
No religion
Other (please specify)

7. With what gender identity do you most identify?

Woman
Man
Transgender Woman
Transgender Man
Non-Conforming/ Gender Variant
Prefer not to answer
Not Listed (please specify)

COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN Satisfaction Questions

In this next section, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN.

8. Overall, how satisfied are you with COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (Circle one)

Completely satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Completely dissatisfied
No opinion

9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the faculty (instructors) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN ? (Circle one)

Completely satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Completely dissatisfied
No opinion

10. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Counselors at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN ? (Circle one)

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Staff (for example, those working in admissions, student services, maintenance, IT, etc.) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (Circle one)

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

12. Overall, what is your level of satisfaction with the administration (Presidents, VPs, Deans, etc.) at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN? (Circle one)

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

13. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns about COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN overall?

Critical Thinking Course Questions

In this section, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences with the Critical Thinking Course you are currently enrolled in.

14. Which COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN Critical-thinking course are you currently enrolled in? (Circle one)

English 1

English 2

English 3

15. How many times have you been absent from this Critical Thinking Course? (Circle one)

0

1

2

3-4 times

5-10 times

More than 10 times

Not currently enrolled (dropped, was excluded, or withdrew from the course)

16. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your instructor for this class?

Completely satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Somewhat dissatisfied

Completely dissatisfied

No opinion

17. What did you like about your instructor for this class? (Chose up to five)

Their appearance / the way they look

They are objective

They are knowledgeable

They are nice

They are strict

They present information in multiple ways

They are passionate

They are fair

They are helpful

They seem concerned about their students

Did not like anything about the instructor

Other (please specify)

18. What did you dislike about your instructor for this class? (Chose up to 5)

Their appearance / the way they look

They didn't seem objective

They didn't seem knowledgeable

They aren't nice / nice enough

They aren't strict / strict enough

They didn't present information multiple ways

They aren't passionate

They aren't fair

They do not seem concerned with the students

They seemed sexist

They seemed racist

Did not dislike anything about the instructor

Other (please specify)

19. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your instructor for this class? (Circle one)

1- a bad teacher 5 – an excellent teacher

1 2 3 4 5

20. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your experience in this class? (Circle one)

1- a bad experience 5 – an excellent experience

1 2 3 4 5

21. What did you like about this class? (Chose up to five)

Class Discussions in general.

Discussions / content about critical thinking

Discussions / content about culture.

Discussions / content about feminism.

Discussions / content about politics.

Discussions / content about philosophy

Discussions / content about racism

Interactions with other students.

The instructor.

The texts and or readings.

Did not like anything about the class.

Other (please specify)

22. What did you dislike about the class? (Chose up to five)

Class Discussions in general.

Discussions / content about critical thinking

Discussions / content about culture.

Discussions / content about feminism.

Discussions / content about politics.

Discussions / content about philosophy

Discussions / content about racism

Interactions with other students.

The instructor.

The texts and or readings.

Did not dislike anything about the class.

Other (please specify)

23. On a scale of 1-5, how likely are you to recommend this course to a friend, peer, or fellow student?

1- very unlikely 5 – very likely

1 2 3 4 5

24. What topics do you discuss, learn and read about in this course? (Circle all that apply)

Philosophy
Logic
Argument
Gender
Culture
Race
Law
Ethics
Society
Other (please specify)

25. What was your favorite topic in this course? (Circle one)

Philosophy
Logic
Argument
Gender
Culture
Race
Law
Ethics
Society
No favorite
Other (please specify)

26. What was your least favorite topic in this course? (Circle one)

Philosophy
Logic
Argument
Gender
Culture
Race
Law
Ethics
Society
No least favorite
Other (please specify)

27. What was your favorite aspect of this course? (Circle one)

The subjects being taught

The teacher

Classmates

The texts

No favorite

Other (please specify)

28. What was your least favorite aspect of the course? (Circle one)

The subjects being taught

The teacher

Classmates

The texts

No least favorite

Other (please specify)

29. If the topic of gender came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

Hearing from other students. Like / Dislike

Hearing the instructor's ideas. Like / Dislike

Agenda or message of the teacher. Like / Dislike

The texts and or readings. Like / Dislike

New or different ideas about gender. Like / Dislike

Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of gender .

Or: Other (please specify)

30. If the topic of feminism specifically came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

Hearing from other students. Like / Dislike

Hearing the instructor's ideas. Like / Dislike

Agenda or message of the teacher. Like / Dislike

The texts and or readings. Like / Dislike

New or different ideas about feminism. Like / Dislike

Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of feminism.

Or: Other (please specify)

31. If the topic of sexism specifically came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

Hearing from other students. Like / Dislike

Hearing the instructor's ideas. Like / Dislike

Agenda or message of the teacher. Like / Dislike

The texts and or readings. Like / Dislike

New or different ideas about sexism. Like / Dislike

Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of sexism.

Or: Other (please specify)

32. If the topic of racism specifically came up in class, did you like or dislike the following aspects?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| Hearing from other students. | Like / Dislike |
| Hearing the instructor's ideas. | Like / Dislike |
| Agenda or message of the teacher. | Like / Dislike |
| The texts and or readings. | Like / Dislike |
| New or different ideas about racism. | Like / Dislike |
- Or: Did not like or dislike anything about the topic of racism.
Or: Other (please specify)

33. Is there anything else you'd like to share about this critical thinking class?

Questions about Gender, Feminism, Sexism and Racism and COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN

In this section, you will be asked to answer questions about your perceptions of Gender, Feminism, Sexism, and Racism.

34. How likely are you to take a Gender Studies class? (This could be a Women's Studies class or Women's literature, Women and Art, Women in Film, Gender Studies, etc.) (Circle one)

- Extremely likely
- Somewhat likely
- Somewhat unlikely
- Extremely unlikely
- Undecided/Not sure
- Have already taken a Gender Studies course

35. How likely are you to take an Ethnic Studies class? (This could be African American studies, Chicano studies, Jewish Studies, etc.) (Circle one)

- Extremely likely
- Somewhat likely
- Somewhat unlikely
- Extremely unlikely
- Undecided/Not sure
- Have already taken an Ethnic Studies course

36. Which words do you associate with the term feminism? (Chose up to five)

- Equality between the sexes
- Gender Equality
- Misandry (hatred of males)
- Advocacy
- Relevant
- Women's rights
- Feminine
- Activism
- Reproductive Rights
- Social equality
- Political equality
- Economic equality
- Pointless
- Outdated
- Empowerment
- Not applicable
- Victimization
- Other (please specify)

37. To what extent do you consider yourself to be feminist? (Circle one)

1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely feminist)

1 2 3 4 5

No opinion

38. Would you mind if someone labeled you as a feminist?

- Yes, very much
- Yes, somewhat
- Neither upset or not upset
- No, not very much
- No, not at all
- I would be pleased

39. Thinking back over your time here at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN, would you say that you have ever observed incidents of sexism or gender based discrimination on campus? (Circle one)

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

40. Have you observed incidents of sexism/gender based discrimination on campus in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

41. Have you ever reported incidents of sexism or gender based discrimination on campus to faculty, administrators, staff or fellow students in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

Yes

No

42. Are you currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for women's equality? (Circle one)

Yes

No

43. If you are not currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for women's rights, how likely are you to become one in the next year? (Circle one)

Extremely likely

Somewhat likely

Somewhat unlikely

Extremely unlikely

Not sure/undecided

44. Thinking back over your time here at COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN, would you say that you have ever observed incidents of racism on campus? (Circle one)

Yes

No

Unsure

45. Have you observed incidents of racism on campus in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

Yes

No

Unsure

46. Have you reported incidents of racism on campus to faculty, administrators, staff or fellow students in the last 3 months? (Circle one)

Yes

No

47. Are you currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for racial equality? (Circle one)

Yes

No

48. If you are not currently a member of a club, campaign, or organization that advocates for racial equality, how likely are you to become one in the next year? (Circle one)

Extremely likely

Somewhat likely

Somewhat unlikely

Extremely unlikely

Not sure/undecided

49. Have you ever felt discriminated against because of your gender?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

50. Have you ever discriminated against someone because of their gender?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

51. Should women and men have equal rights?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

52. Can women and men do all of the same jobs?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

53. If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the mother be the primary caregiver? That is, should the mother be more responsible for care and feeding of the child than the father?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

54. If a heterosexual couple has a child, should the father be the primary wage earner? That is, should the father be more responsible for providing income to the family?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

55. Sexism/gender discrimination is a problem in American workplaces today? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

56. Sexism/gender discrimination is a problem in American politics today? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

57. Men make better leaders than women? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

58. Feminism is only for women? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

59. Men should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

60. Women should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

61. Everyone should take gender studies courses? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

62. People should be able to choose their gender identity? (Circle one)

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree

63. Should people of all genders have equal rights?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

64. COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN cares about ensuring gender equality on campus?

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

65. COLLEGE PSUEDOYMN cares about ensuring racial equality on campus?

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
- Other: please explain

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Just as a reminder, all your responses and your identity will be kept confidential.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact Jennifer Smith at smithja@g.ucla.edu.

Appendix I: Reflection Prompt

Please consider the questions below and write a brief response below.

Thank you very much!

What are your thoughts about gender/gender issues in America?

Have your thoughts about gender and or gender issues changed over the course of the semester?

If your thoughts regarding gender have changed over the course of this semester, what factors, including reflection, interactions with teachers/students/texts, exercises, and so forth do you think caused the change?

If your thoughts regarding gender have not changed, explain here why you think that is?

Appendix J: Follow Up Faculty Survey

Thank you for filling out this survey. It should take no more than about 5 minutes of your time.

They are to help me process the data I receive from students and provide accurate background information (not just my guesses) about each of you to my committee if they required those demographics.

Q1 Your Name

Q2 What is your age?

25-34

45-44

55-64

65-74

Over 75

Prefer not to answer

Q3 What is your employment status?

Full time at one college

Full time at one college at part time at another

Part time at multiple colleges

Part time at only one college

Other (please specify)

Q4 What is your ethnicity? (Please select all that apply.)

American Indian or Alaskan Native,

Asian/Asian American

Pacific Islander

Black or African American

Hispanic or Latino

Middle Eastern

White / Caucasian

Multiracial/ Multiethnic

Other (please specify)

Q5 What language do you speak most often?

Arabic

Armenian

Chinese

English

Farsi / Persian

French

French Creole

German

Greek

Gujarati
Hindi
Italian
Japanese
Korean
Polish
Portuguese
Russian
Spanish
Tagalog
Urdu
Vietnamese
Other (please specify)

Q6 Were you raised with or in the tradition of any of the following religions?

(Please select all that apply.)

Buddhism
Catholicism
Christianity
Hinduism
Islam
Judaism
Native American
Protestantism
Inter/Non-denominational
No religion
Other (please specify)

Q7 Do you currently identify with/practice any of the following religions?

(Please select all that apply.)

Buddhism
Catholicism
Christianity
Hinduism
Islam
Judaism
Native American
Protestantism
Inter/Non-denominational
No religion
Other (please specify)

Q8 With what gender identity do you most identify?

Woman
Man
Transgender Woman

Transgender Man
Non-Conforming/ Gender Variant
Prefer not to answer
Not Listed (please specify)

Q9 How long have you been teaching at this college (the college at which I surveyed your students)?

Less than 6 months
Six months to a year
1-3 years
4-8 years
9-15 years
Over 15 years

Q10 Overall, how satisfied are you with your College?

Completely Dissatisfied
Somewhat Dissatisfied
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
Somewhat Satisfied
Completely Satisfied

Q11 What topics did you cover in this course? (Check all that apply)

Q12 Do you have any particular reason for including or for not including gender into your planned coursework?

Q13 To what extent do you consider yourself to be feminist?
(1 - not at all 5-extremely feminist)

Q14 Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns about the Fall 2017 semester class that you'd like to share?

Appendix K: Faculty Participant Bios

Coastal College:

1. Prof. S. Piaf, Woman, Black or African American and White, Age 25-34, primary language is English, Raised Inter/non-denominational, currently practices no religion. She is a part time faculty member at multiple colleges, and has been teaching at Coastal College for 4-8 years. She is completely satisfied with Coastal College. The topics she covers in her critical thinking English class are Culture, Gender, Race, and Society. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “I believe the topic of gender has so many different topics to be addressed, and it always creates a good discussion in my classes.”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all 5-extremely feminist), she rates herself as a 5.
2. Prof. K. Nicks, Woman, White/Caucasian, Age 45-54 (Did not respond to survey)
3. Prof. C. Estefan, Woman, Hispanic or Latino, Age 55-64, primary language is English, Raised Catholic, Currently Catholic. She is a part time faculty member at multiple colleges, and has been teaching at Coastal College for 9-15 years. She is somewhat satisfied with Coastal College. The topics she covers in her critical thinking English class are Argument, Culture, Ethics, Law, Philosophy, Race, Society, and Communities. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for not including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “Not really. I base my coursework on understanding the foundation of our country that entitles all students to an equitable education and my approach is also creating a call to action to protect equity in the undeserved communities”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all 5-extremely feminist), she rates herself as a 4.
4. Prof. C. Waits, Man, White/Caucasian, Age 45-54, primary language is English, Raised Catholic, Currently practices no religion. He is a part time faculty member at multiple colleges, and has been teaching at Coastal College for 1-3 years. He is Completely satisfied with Coastal College. The topics he covers in his critical thinking English class are Culture, Ethics, Logic, Race, Society, and Advertising. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for not including gender into your planned coursework?” he responded: “I didn't address it directly, but it was certainly discussed in terms of the other subjects”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), he rates himself as a 4.

Sweet Valley College:

5. Prof. T. Coltrane, Woman, Black or African American, Age 35-44, primary language is English, raised with no religion, currently practices no religion. She is a full time faculty member at Sweet Valley College, and has been teaching there for 1-3 years. She is somewhat satisfied with Sweet Valley College. The topics she covers in her critical thinking English class are Culture, Gender, Philosophy, Race, and Society. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “I think it is an important factor in understanding identity

and motivations in characters in fiction.”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), she rates herself as a 5.

6. Prof. D. Ronstadt, Woman, White/Caucasian, Age 35-44, primary language is English, raised with Catholicism, currently practices Catholicism. She is a full time faculty member at Sweet Valley College, and has been teaching there for 9-15 years. She is completely satisfied with Sweet Valley College. The topics she covers in her critical thinking English class are Argument, Culture, Gender, Logic, Race, and Society. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “Gender expectations have profound effects on the lives of literary characters and real people alike”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), she rates herself as a 4. She made this additional comment regarding feminist identity: “(I believe in equal rights for women, but I become disheartened with some feminists who seem to have a guilty-until-proven-innocent view of men. I also resent feminists who think all feminists must be pro-choice. I think it's sad that we live in a society that's so hostile to mothers and children that we have labeled as sympathetic and helpful the men and women who advise women to terminate pregnancies rather than fix the social and other ills that make termination look like a good option”. She also made this additional comment about the semester: “The feminist school of literary criticism is infused throughout the semester, so if my students' results don't seem that different from the first survey to the last, that may be why. They had already been exposed to feminist criticism in our class before they took the first survey”.
7. Prof. M. Davis, Man, Black or African American, Age 55-64, primary language is English, raised with Christianity, currently practices no religion. He is a part time faculty member at Sweet Valley College, and has been teaching there for 9-15 years. He is completely satisfied with Sweet Valley College. The topics he covers in his critical thinking English class are Argument, Culture, Ethics, Gender, Law, Logic, Philosophy, Race, and Society. He added: “This is a composition class, so all of the topics listed were topics that were discussed and/or written about”. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” he responded: “Gender is discussed in certain sections of the course but is not the primary focus or theme of the writing and discussions”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), he rates herself as a 4.

Canyon Glen College:

8. Prof. Gabriel, Man, White/Caucasian, Age 45-54, primary language is English, Raised Catholic, Currently practices no religion. He is a part time faculty member at multiple colleges, and has been teaching at Canyon Glen College for 1-3 years. He is somewhat satisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics he covers in his critical thinking English class are Argument, Culture, Ethics, Gender, Logic, and Society. Gender is a part of his standard course content. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” he responded: “I think it is relevant to critical thinking”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), he rates himself as a 4.

9. Prof. Credence, Man, White/Caucasian, Age 55-64, primary language is English, Raised with Buddhism & Protestantism & Atheism, currently practices no religion. He is a full time faculty member at Canyon Glen College, and has been teaching there for more than 15 years. He is somewhat satisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics he covers in his class are argument, culture, ethics, logic, philosophy, society, literature, art and culture. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for not including gender into your planned coursework?” he responded: “The reason I do is that a good number of the students are female and good number are male”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), he rates himself as a 3, with the note: “I am still baffled as to what that word means exactly”.

10. Prof. Ant, Man, White/Caucasian, Age 35-44, primary language is English, Raised with no religion, currently practices no religion. He is a part time faculty member at multiple colleges. He has been teaching at Canyon Glen College for 4-8 years. He is somewhat satisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics he covers in his class are argument, culture, gender, ethics, logic, law, philosophy, race, and society. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” he responded: “It's more or less simply the idea behind feeling comfortable in the classroom and workplace”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), he rates himself as a 3.

11. Prof. Crosby, Ph.D., Man, White/Caucasian and Native American, Age 65-74, primary language is English, raised with Christianity, currently practices Buddhism and Judaism. He is a full time faculty member at Canyon Glen College, and has taught there for more than 15 years. He is somewhat satisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics he covers in his class are argument, culture, ethics, logic, philosophy, race, and society. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for not including gender into your planned coursework?” he responded: “Touchiness of students on the subject. Emotionality and divisiveness associated with it”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), he rates himself as a 5.

12. Prof. Ono, Ph.D., Woman, Asian/Asian American, Age 45-54, primary language is English, raised with Buddhism & Christianity, currently practices Buddhism and “A rather confused animism (my Buddhism was never official, just my parents' version)”. She is a part time faculty member at Canyon Glen College and has been working there for 4-8 years. She is somewhat dissatisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics she covers in her class are Argument, Culture, gender, law, Ethics, Logic, race, society, composition and grammar. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “Gender is always taught in my course, it's never separated out, neither is race, religion, class, politics, etc.”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5-extremely feminist), she rates herself as a 4 with the additional note: “I tend not to jump on bandwagons, which means my feminism card has often been taken away from me”. She makes this additional comment: “In terms of gender, no. I have noticed that as the years pass, the students are more open to topics they once struggled over, gender being one of them. They are more tolerant,

understanding, and supportive. I began teaching in 1989, students have changed quite a bit since then, for the better (well, that is until our current president took office)”.

13. Prof. Bowie, Woman, White/Caucasian, Age 25-34, primary language is English, raised with Catholicism, currently practices no religion. She is a part time faculty member at multiple colleges and has been working at Canyon Glen College for six months to a year. She is somewhat satisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics she covers in her class are Argument, Culture, gender, philosophy, Ethics, Logic, race, and society. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “I try to practice culturally responsive education, so it factors into my coursework fairly easily/naturally. It's also important (to me, anyway) to get students to think critically about topics that might not occur to them, and - despite the prevalence of gender related issues in news, politics, and media -- I've found a good many students don't consider gender and the implications of inclusivity/exclusivity very often (if at all)”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5- extremely feminist), she rates herself as a 5.
14. Prof. Benetar, Woman, White/Caucasian, Age 55-64 (Did not respond to survey)
15. Prof. Joplin, Woman, White/Caucasian, Age 65-74, primary language is English, raised with Judaism, currently practices Judaism. She is a part time faculty member at Canyon Glen, and has been working there for more than 15 years. She is completely satisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics she covers in her course are logic and writing skills. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for not including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “When students are interested in interpreting assigned readings in a gender-centered contexts, I follow their lead.”. She also made these comments about her course: “Students [enroll] with a particularly broad range of skills and experiences. I am trying to encourage their abilities to build on their strengths while remedying any weaknesses or gaps”. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5- extremely feminist), she remarked: “I prefer to view all human beings as occupying a range of choices which may vary at different points in their lives”.
16. Prof. Slick, Woman, White/Caucasian, Age 45-54, primary language is English, raised with Christianity, currently practices Christianity. She is a full time faculty member at Canyon Glen, and has been working there for 1-3 years. She is completely satisfied with Canyon Glen College. The topics she covers in her course are argument, culture, ethics, gender, logic and society. In response to the question “Do you have any particular reason for including gender into your planned coursework?” she responded: “Yes, created an entire semester around gender and chose the textbook *Composing Gender* because I think it's important (and I have a passion for gender studies). I am also the LGBTQIA+ Co-advisor at our college”. She also made these comments about her course: “ It was the first time I taught an entire semester on gender and not just a unit; it was well-received by most though I know some did not like discussing gender all semester long, but they were told the content of the course day one and it was emphasized. I am teaching it again, and it feels like it is going much better. Out of a scale of 1-5 (1 - not at all /5- extremely feminist), she rates herself as a 5.

Appendix L: Course Catalog Descriptions of English Course Types

English Course 1

Canyon Glen College:

English 1 is required for AA and GE/ transfer completion. Student placement in English 1 is determined by multiple measures of assessment. This course introduces students to academic reading and writing, critical thinking, and principles of rhetoric. Students will use their creative compositional and critical thinking skills to write college-level essays in response to academic articles.

Coastal College Description:

In this course, students read and analyze college-level texts in order to write researched, thesis-based essays. Transferable to UC or CSU; see counselor for limitations

Sweet Valley Description:

Emphasizes expository writing and research, demonstrating principles of thesis and support, rhetorical organization, control of diction, clear sentence and paragraph construction, and command of the conventions of English usage. Develops analytical and interpretive reading skills. Students cannot complete both ENGL 1 and ENGL 1H courses because credit will only be awarded for the first course completed. Applies to Associate Degree. Transfer credit: CSU; UC

English Course 2

Canyon Glen College:

This course develops reading, writing, and critical thinking skills beyond the level achieved in English 1 and requires the writing of a minimum of 10,000 words in essays and a research paper throughout the semester. It emphasizes logical reasoning, analysis, and strategies of argumentation using literature and literary criticism. Evaluations of texts reveal the multicultural/global aspects of our society, which include traditional and contemporary forms in fiction, poetry, essays, and drama.

Coastal College Description:

This introduction to analysis of and writing about literature focuses on the three major genres of fiction, drama and poetry. Writing assignments are designed to develop students' critical thinking and reading skills through the analysis and interpretation of the reading material. Transferable to UC or CSU; see counselor for limitations

Sweet Valley Description:

Develops critical thinking and writing skills in close textual analysis of issues and themes in fiction, poetry, and drama as well as in non-fictional literature and literary criticism. Reviews deductive and inductive reasoning, recognition and avoidance of logical fallacies, and relationships between language and meaning while emphasizing detailed critical analysis. Honors work challenges students to be more analytical and creative through expanded assignments, real-world applications and enrichment opportunities. Students cannot complete

both ENGL 2 and ENGL 2H courses because credit will only be awarded for the first course completed. Applies to Associate Degree. Transfer credit: CSU; UC

English Course 3

Canyon Glen College:

This course is designed to help students develop critical thinking, writing and research skills beyond the level achieved in English 1. Students will read and critically evaluate (for meaning, purpose, strategy, and style) expository and argumentative essays from a variety of classical sources and multi-cultural perspectives and then use these essays as rhetorical models for their own writing assignments.

Coastal College Description:

This course offers an introduction to the elements and uses of critical thinking and writing. Analytical, persuasive, evaluative, and argumentative writing will be emphasized, as well as the evaluation and use of both electronic and conventional sources.

Transferable to UC or CSU; see counselor for limitations

Sweet Valley Description:

Develops advanced skills in critical thinking, reading, and writing. Focuses primarily on the analysis and evaluation of non-fiction works to develop logical reasoning as well as analytical and argumentative writing skills. Students cannot complete both ENGL 3 and ENGL 3H courses because credit will only be awarded to the first course completed. Applies to Associate Degree. Transfer credit: CSU; UC

Appendix M: Descriptive Statistics Re Construct – Awareness of Sexism/Gender Discrimination

Sexism/Gender discrimination is a problem in American politics (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	8	3.3	3.4	3.4
	2	10	4.1	4.2	7.6
	3	21	8.7	8.9	16.5
	4	53	22.0	22.4	38.8
	5	145	60.2	61.2	100.0
	Total	237	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		241	100.0		

Sexism/Gender discrimination is a problem in American politics (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	6	2.5	2.5	2.5
	2	11	4.6	4.6	7.2
	3	20	8.3	8.4	15.6
	4	61	25.3	25.7	41.4
	5	139	57.7	58.6	100.0
	Total	237	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		241	100.0		

Sexism/Gender discrimination is a problem in American workplace (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	8	3.3	3.4	3.4
	2	9	3.7	3.8	7.2
	3	26	10.8	11.0	18.1
	4	81	33.6	34.2	52.3
	5	113	46.9	47.7	100.0
	Total	237	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		241	100.0		

Sexism/Gender discrimination is a problem in American workplace (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	1.2	1.3	1.3
	2	13	5.4	5.5	6.8
	3	24	10.0	10.2	16.9
	4	81	33.6	34.3	51.3
	5	115	47.7	48.7	100.0
	Total	236	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		
Total		241	100.0		

Ever Observed Sexism Numeric Recode (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	184	76.3	76.7	76.7
	1.00	25	10.4	10.4	87.1
	2.00	31	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	240	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		241	100.0		

Ever Observed Sexism Numeric Recode (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	170	70.5	71.1	71.1
	1.00	38	15.8	15.9	87.0
	2.00	31	12.9	13.0	100.0
	Total	239	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		241	100.0		

Ever felt discrimination because of gender (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	.4	.4	.4	.4
	no	143	59.3	59.3	59.8
	unsure	14	5.8	5.8	65.6
	yes	83	34.4	34.4	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Ever felt discrimination because of gender (post)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	.8	.8	.8
no	154	63.9	63.9	64.7
unsure	18	7.5	7.5	72.2
yes	67	27.8	27.8	100.0
Total	241	100.0	100.0	

**Sexism gender discrimination in politics (pre) * Gender Class
Crosstabulation**

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
sexism gender discrimination in politics	1	6	2	8
	2	4	6	10
	3	9	12	21
	4	29	24	53
	5	59	86	145
Total		107	130	237

**Sexism gender discrimination in politics (post) * Gender Class
Crosstabulation**

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
sexism gender discrimination in politics	1	3	3	6
	2	5	6	11
	3	11	9	20
	4	36	25	61
	5	53	86	139
Total		108	129	237

**Sexism gender discrimination in workplace (pre)* Gender Class
Crosstabulation**

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
sexism gender discrimination in workplace	1	5	3	8
	2	6	3	9
	3	11	15	26
	4	42	39	81
	5	43	70	113
Total		107	130	237

**Sexism gender discrimination in workplace (post)* Gender Class
Crosstabulation**

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
sexism gender discrimination in workplace	1	2	1	3
	2	7	6	13
	3	11	13	24
	4	47	34	81
	5	41	74	115
Total		108	128	236

Observed sexism ever (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
Observed sexism ever		1	0	1
	no	91	93	184
	unsure	9	16	25
	yes	9	22	31
Total		110	131	241

Observed sexism ever (post)* Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
Observed sexism ever		1	1	2
	no	84	86	170
	unsure	13	25	38
	yes	12	19	31
Total		110	131	241

Felt discrimination because of gender (pre)* Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
felt discrimination because of gender		1	0	1
	no	74	69	143
	unsure	3	11	14
	yes	32	51	83
Total		110	131	241

Felt discrimination because of gender (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
felt discrimination because of gender		1	1	2
	no	74	80	154
	unsure	9	9	18
	yes	26	41	67
Total		110	131	241

Appendix N: Descriptive Statistics Re Construct – Attitudes and Perceptions Re Feminism

Descriptive Statistics of Feminism Construct Questions

		Feminist identity Question 1 Pre	Feminist identity Question 1 Post	Feminist Identity Question 2 Pre	Feminist Identity Question 2 Post	Feminism Is Only For Women Pre	Feminism Is Only For Women Post
N	Valid	193	196	239	235	237	239
	Missing	48	45	2	6	4	2
Mean		3.37	3.43	3.68	3.83	4.13	4.20
Std. Deviation		1.227	1.261	1.372	1.410	1.155	1.111
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	6	6	5	5

Feminist Identity 1 Pre-Survey

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	28	11.6	14.5	14.5
	2	8	3.3	4.1	18.7
	3	52	21.6	26.9	45.6
	4	75	31.1	38.9	84.5
	5	30	12.4	15.5	100.0
	Total	193	80.1	100.0	
Missing	System	48	19.9		
Total		241	100.0		

Feminist Identity 1 Post- Survey

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	25	10.4	12.8	12.8
	2	14	5.8	7.1	19.9
	3	51	21.2	26.0	45.9
	4	64	26.6	32.7	78.6
	5	42	17.4	21.4	100.0
	Total	196	81.3	100.0	
Missing	System	45	18.7		
Total		241	100.0		

Feminist Identity 2 - Pre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	12	5.0	5.0	5.0
	2	18	7.5	7.5	12.6
	3	114	47.3	47.7	60.3
	4	19	7.9	7.9	68.2
	5	42	17.4	17.6	85.8
	6	34	14.1	14.2	100.0
	Total	239	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		241	100.0		

Feminist Identity 2 - Post

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	14	5.8	6.0	6.0
	2	13	5.4	5.5	11.5
	3	97	40.2	41.3	52.8
	4	22	9.1	9.4	62.1
	5	53	22.0	22.6	84.7
	6	36	14.9	15.3	100.0
	Total	235	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.5		
Total		241	100.0		

Feminism Is Only For Women- Pre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	9	3.7	3.8	3.8
	2	15	6.2	6.3	10.1
	3	45	18.7	19.0	29.1
	4	35	14.5	14.8	43.9
	5	133	55.2	56.1	100.0
	Total	237	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		241	100.0		

Feminism Is Only For Women - Post

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	8	3.3	3.3	3.3
	2	10	4.1	4.2	7.5
	3	50	20.7	20.9	28.5
	4	30	12.4	12.6	41.0
	5	141	58.5	59.0	100.0
	Total	239	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		241	100.0		

Appendix O: Descriptive Statistics Re Construct – Attitudes and Perceptions Re Gender Roles and Norms

Frequency Table

All genders should have equal rights (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	no	1	.4	.4	1.2
	unsure	2	.8	.8	2.0
	yes	236	98.0	98.0	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

All genders should have equal rights (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		16	6.6	6.6	6.6
	no	1	.4	.4	7.1
	unsure	3	1.2	1.2	8.3
	yes	221	91.7	91.7	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Everyone should take gender studies (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	2.9	3.0	3.0
	2	7	2.9	3.0	6.0
	3	64	26.6	27.2	33.2
	4	46	19.1	19.6	52.8
	5	111	46.1	47.2	100.0
	Total	235	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.5		
Total		241	100.0		

Everyone should take gender studies (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	11	4.6	4.6	4.6
	2	8	3.3	3.3	7.9
	3	67	27.8	28.0	36.0
	4	44	18.3	18.4	54.4
	5	109	45.2	45.6	100.0
	Total	239	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		241	100.0		

Man should be primary wage-earner (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		4	1.7	1.7	1.7
	No	173	71.8	71.8	73.4
	Unsure	29	12.0	12.0	85.5
	up to them	1	.4	.4	85.9
	Yes	34	14.1	14.1	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Man should be primary wage-earner (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	no	176	73.0	73.0	73.9
	unsure	42	17.4	17.4	91.3
	yes	21	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Men and women do same jobs (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	no	19	7.9	7.9	8.7
	unsure	27	11.2	11.2	19.9
	yes	193	80.1	80.1	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Men and women do same jobs (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	no	30	12.4	12.4	13.3
	unsure	30	12.4	12.4	25.7
	yes	179	74.3	74.3	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Men and women equal rights (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	unsure	2	.8	.8	1.7
	yes	237	98.3	98.3	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Men and women equal rights (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	no	2	.8	.8	1.7
	unsure	5	2.1	2.1	3.7
	yes	232	96.3	96.3	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Men are better leaders than women (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	1.2	1.3	1.3
	2	14	5.8	5.9	7.1
	3	63	26.1	26.5	33.6
	4	20	8.3	8.4	42.0
	5	138	57.3	58.0	100.0
	Total	238	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		241	100.0		

Men are better leaders than women (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	2.1	2.1	2.1
	2	12	5.0	5.0	7.1
	3	74	30.7	31.0	38.1
	4	38	15.8	15.9	54.0
	5	110	45.6	46.0	100.0
	Total	239	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		241	100.0		

Men should take gender studies (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	2.1	2.1	2.1
	2	8	3.3	3.4	5.5
	3	76	31.5	32.1	37.6
	4	47	19.5	19.8	57.4
	5	101	41.9	42.6	100.0
	Total	237	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		241	100.0		

Men should take gender studies (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	4.1	4.2	4.2
	2	5	2.1	2.1	6.3
	3	78	32.4	32.5	38.8
	4	45	18.7	18.8	57.5
	5	102	42.3	42.5	100.0
	Total	240	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		241	100.0		

People should be able to choose their gender identity (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	15	6.2	6.4	6.4
	2	10	4.1	4.2	10.6
	3	30	12.4	12.7	23.3
	4	24	10.0	10.2	33.5
	5	157	65.1	66.5	100.0
	Total	236	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		
Total		241	100.0		

People should be able to choose their gender identity (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	16	6.6	7.1	7.1
	2	10	4.1	4.5	11.6
	3	29	12.0	12.9	24.6
	4	24	10.0	10.7	35.3
	5	145	60.2	64.7	100.0
	Total	224	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	17	7.1		
Total		241	100.0		

Woman should be primary caregiver (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	No	177	73.4	73.4	74.3
	unsure	34	14.1	14.1	88.4
	up to them	1	.4	.4	88.8
	Yes	27	11.2	11.2	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Woman should be primary caregiver (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.8	.8	.8
	no	172	71.4	71.4	72.2
	unsure	43	17.8	17.8	90.0
	yes	24	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	241	100.0	100.0	

Women should take gender studies (pre)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	1.2	1.3	1.3
	2	7	2.9	3.0	4.2
	3	80	33.2	33.8	38.0
	4	47	19.5	19.8	57.8
	5	100	41.5	42.2	100.0
	Total	237	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		241	100.0		

Women should take gender studies (post)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	8	3.3	3.3	3.3
	2	5	2.1	2.1	5.4
	3	76	31.5	31.8	37.2
	4	49	20.3	20.5	57.7
	5	101	41.9	42.3	100.0
	Total	239	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		241	100.0		

All genders should have equal rights (pre)* Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
all genders should have equal rights		2	0	2
	no	0	1	1
	unsure	1	1	2
	yes	107	129	236
Total		110	131	241

All genders should have equal rights (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
all genders should have equal rights		11	5	16
	no	0	1	1
	unsure	2	1	3
	yes	97	124	221
Total		110	131	241

Everyone should take gender studies(pre)* Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
everyone should take gender studies	1	5	2	7
	2	4	3	7
	3	36	28	64
	4	22	24	46
	5	41	70	111
Total		108	127	235

Everyone should take gender studies (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
everyone should take gender studies	1	8	3	11
	2	2	6	8
	3	34	33	67
	4	24	20	44
	5	41	68	109
Total		109	130	239

Man should be primary wage-earner (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
man should be primary wage-earner		3	1	4
	no	73	100	173
	unsure	12	17	29
	up to them	0	1	1
	yes	22	12	34
Total		110	131	241

Man should be primary wage-earner (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
man should be primary wage-earner		1	1	2
	no	74	102	176
	unsure	20	22	42
	yes	15	6	21
Total		110	131	241

Men and women do same jobs (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men and women do same jobs		2	0	2
	no	14	5	19
	unsure	14	13	27
	yes	80	113	193
Total		110	131	241

Men and women do same jobs (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men and women do same jobs		1	1	2
	no	14	16	30
	unsure	15	15	30
	yes	80	99	179
Total		110	131	241

Men and women equal rights (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men and women equal rights		2	0	2
	unsure	2	0	2
	yes	106	131	237
Total		110	131	241

Men and women equal rights (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men and women equal rights		1	1	2
	no	2	0	2
	unsure	3	2	5
	yes	104	128	232
Total		110	131	241

Men are better leaders than women (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men are better leaders than women	1	0	3	3
	2	6	8	14
	3	37	26	63
	4	6	14	20
	5	59	79	138
Total		108	130	238

Men are better leaders than women (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men are better leaders than women	1	1	4	5
	2	7	5	12
	3	38	36	74
	4	15	23	38
	5	48	62	110
Total		109	130	239

Men should take gender studies (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men should take gender studies	1	2	3	5
	2	2	6	8
	3	41	35	76
	4	23	24	47
	5	40	61	101
Total		108	129	237

Men should take gender studies (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
men should take gender studies	1	6	4	10
	2	3	2	5
	3	38	40	78
	4	25	20	45
	5	38	64	102
Total		110	130	240

People should be able to choose their gender identity (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
people should be able to choose their gender identity	1	9	6	15
	2	3	7	10
	3	15	15	30
	4	14	10	24
	5	65	92	157
Total		106	130	236

People should be able to choose their gender identity (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
people should be able to choose their gender identity	1	8	8	16
	2	4	6	10
	3	15	14	29
	4	12	12	24
	5	59	86	145
Total		98	126	224

Woman should be primary caregiver (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
woman should be primary caregiver		2	0	2
	no	77	100	177
	unsure	14	20	34
	up to them	0	1	1
	yes	17	10	27
Total		110	131	241

Woman should be primary caregiver (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
woman should be primary caregiver		1	1	2
	no	71	101	172
	unsure	22	21	43
	yes	16	8	24
Total		110	131	241

Women should take gender studies (pre) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
women should take gender studies	1	2	1	3
	2	3	4	7
	3	43	37	80
	4	22	25	47
	5	38	62	100
Total		108	129	237

Women should take gender studies (post) * Gender Class Crosstabulation

		Gender Class		Total
		0	1	
women should take gender studies	1	5	3	8
	2	3	2	5
	3	36	40	76
	4	25	24	49
	5	40	61	101
Total		109	130	239

References:

- Acker, S. (1987). Feminist theory and the study of gender and education. *International Review of Education / Internationale Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft / Revue Internationale De L'Education*, 33(4), 419-435. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3444244>
- Acker, S. & Webber, M. (2006) Women working in academe: Approach with care. *Sage Handbook of Gender and Education*. Ed. C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Alcoff, L. (1988). Cultural feminism versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory. *Signs*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Spring, 1988), pp. 405-436. Published by: The University of Chicago Press. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3174166>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2016). <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/pages/fastfactsfactsheet.aspx>.
- Andersen, M. (1985). Women's Studies / Black Studies: Learning from Our Common Pasts / Forging a Common Future. *Women's Place in the Academy: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curriculum*. Editors: Marilyn Schuster & Susan Van Dyne. Roman & Allanhead.
- Aragon, A. & Brantmeier, E. (2009). Diversity-Affirming Ethics and Critical Epistemology: Institutional Decision Making in Community Colleges. *NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES*, no. 148, Winter 2009. Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com). DOI: 10.1002/cc.385
- Araújo, E., Araújo, N., Moreira, A., Herrmann, H., & Andrade Jr., J. (2017). Gender differences in scientific collaborations: Women are more egalitarian than men. *PLoS ONE* 12(5): e0176791. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176791>

- Banet-Weiser, S. & Miltner, K. (2015) #MasculinitySoFragile: culture, structure, and networked misogyny. *Feminist Media Studies*, 16:1, 171-174. DOI: 10.1080/14680777.2016.1120490
- Bauer, K. (2014). Black Male Community College Students and Faculty-Student Engagement: Differences in Faculty Validation and Time Status. *Journal of Progressive Policy & Practice* Volume 2 – Issue 2. Retrieved from: <https://cceal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Bauer.pdf>
- Berman, J. (2013). 11 Ways The American Workplace Is Still Really, Really Sexist. *The Huffington Post*. February 20th, (2013). Retrieved from: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/20/sexist-workplace_n_2718249.html
- Bérubé, M. (2008). "Canons and Contexts" in Context. *American Literary History*, 20(3), 457-464. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20492240>
- Bettis, P., Ferry, N. & Roe, M. (2016). Lord of the Guys: Alpha Girls and the Post-feminist Landscape of American Education. *Gender Issues*, 33:163–181 DOI 10.1007/s12147-016-9153-x
- Bialik, K. & Krogstad, J. M. (2017). 115th Congress sets new high for racial, ethnic diversity. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/01/24/115th-congress-sets-new-high-for-racial-ethnic-diversity/>
- Bian, L., Leslie, S.J., & Cimpian, A. (2017). Gender Stereotypes About Intellectual Ability Emerge Early and Influence Children's Interests. *Science* 355 (6323), 389-391. DOI: 10.1126/science.aah6524

- Black Chen, M. (2015). To Lead or Not to Lead: Women Achieving Leadership Status in Higher Education. *Advancing Women in Leadership* Vol. 35, pp.153-159. Retrieved from:
https://cdn.atria.nl/eazines/IAV_607167/IAV_607167_2015_35.pdf
- Blackmore, J. (2006) Social Justice and the Study and Practice of Leadership in Education: A Feminist History. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 38:2, 185-200.
DOI: 10.1080/00220620600554876
- Bomey, N. (2016, September 27). Sexism in the workplace is worse than you thought. *USA Today*. September 27th, 2016. Retrieved from:
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2016/09/27/lean-in-study-women-in-the-workplace/91157026/>
- Bongiorno, R., Bian, P. & David, B. (2014). If you're going to be a leader, at least act like it! Prejudice towards women who are tentative in leader roles. *British Journal of Social Psychology* (2014), 53, 217–234. Retrieved from:
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/bjso.12032>
- Bowman, N., Brandenberger, J., Hill, P., & Lapsley, D. (2011). The Long-Term Effects of College Diversity Experiences: Well-Being and Social Concerns 13 Years After Graduation. *Journal of College Student Development*, Volume 52, Number 6, pp. 729-239. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.\(2011\).0075](https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.(2011).0075)
- Bukoski, B. & Hatch, D. (2016). “We’re Still Here . . . We’re Not Giving Up”: Black and Latino Men’s Narratives of Transition to Community College. *Community College Review* 2016, Vol. 44(2) 99–118. DOI: 10.1177/0091552115621385

- Burke, K. & Trumpy, A. (2016). Demystifying Male Privilege and Illuminating Intersectionality. *Teaching Gender and Sex in Contemporary America*. Ed. K. Haltinner & R. Pilgeram. Springer.
- Bush, D. (2016). Election 2016: The hidden sexism that could sway the election. PBS NewsHour. Retrieved from: <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/features/hidden-sexism/>.
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2018). <http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/> Datamart. <https://datamart.cccco.edu>
- Caplan, P. & Ford, J. (2014). The Voices of Diversity: What Students of Diverse Races/Ethnicities and Both Sexes Tell Us About Their College Experiences and Their Perceptions About their Institutions' Progress Toward Diversity. *Voices of Diversity*, Vol.6, Issue 3. Retrieved from: https://diversity.missouristate.edu/assets/diversity/Voices_of_Diversity_Project_Caplan_Ford.pdf
- Carson, L. (2001). Gender relations in higher education: exploring lecturers' perceptions of student evaluations of teaching. *Research Papers in Education* 16(4) 2001, pp. 337-358. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520152731990>
- Carter, S. P. (2007). "Reading all that Crazy stuff." Black young Women unpacking Whiteness in a high school British Literature Classroom. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, Vol. 41.2, Vol. 42.1, pages 42 – 54. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ780286.pdf>
- Chuck, E. (2017, October 16). "#MeToo: Hashtag Becomes Anti-Sexual Harassment and Assault Rallying Cry." *NBC News*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/sexual->

[misconduct/metoo-hashtag-becomes-anti-sexual-harassment-assault-rallying-cry-n810986](#)

Condis, M. (2016). Playing the Game of Literature: Ready, Player One, the Ludic Novel, and the Geeky “Canon” of White Masculinity. *Journal of Modern Literature*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (Winter 2016), pp. 1-19. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/jmodelite.39.2.01>

Cook, A. & Glass, C. (2016). Do women advance equity? The effect of gender leadership composition on LGBT-friendly policies in American firms. *Human relations* 2016, Vol. 69(7) 1431–1456. Reprints and permissions: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav.

Cottringer, W. (2002). *The power of likability*. Retrieved from: http://www.sq.4mg.com/Cottringer_article.htm

Cresswell, J. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. Sage Publications.

Crossley, A. (2010). “When it suits me, I’m a feminist.” International students negotiating feminist representations. *Women's Studies International Forum*, Volume 33, Issue 2, March–April 2010, Pages 125–133. Retrieved from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0277539509001368>

Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory*. SAGE Publications. Vol. 9(1): 67–85. 1464–7001. DOI: 10.1177/1464700108086364

Delucchi, M., & Pelowski, S. (2000). Liking or learning? The effect of instructor likability and student perceptions of learning on overall rating of teaching ability. *Radical Pedagogy*, 2(2).

Department of Gender and Women Studies. (2018). Misconceptions about GWS. University of California, Berkeley. Retrieved from:

<http://womensstudies.berkeley.edu/about/misconceptions-about-gws>

DiCanio, D., Schilling, L., Ferrantino, A., Gretchen, C., Hunter, T., Morote, E., & Tatum, S.

(2016). The Glass Maze and Predictors for Successful Navigation to the Top Seat to the Superintendency. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*; Winter (2016). Vol.12. Issue 4, p65-84, 20. P. 3. Retrieved from:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Denise_Dicanio2/publication/320864095_The_Glass_Maze_and_Predictors_for_Successful_Navigation_to_the_Top_Seat_to_the_Superintendency/links/5ac909f14585151e80a7a48a/The-Glass-Maze-and-Predictors-for-Successful-Navigation-to-the-Top-Seat-to-the-Superintendency.pdf?origin=publication_detail

Dickinson, T. (2005). Strengthening women's studies through applied activism: Theoretical, classroom, regional, and cross-border strategies for participating in change. *Women's Studies International Forum* 28 (2005) 114–126. Retrieved from:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2005.04.002>

Di Prete, T.A. & Buchmann, C. (2013). *The Rise of Women: The Growing Gender Gap in Education and What It Means for American Schools*. Retrieved from:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287276341_The_Rise_of_Women_The_Growing_Gender_Gap_in_Education_and_What_It_Means_for_American_Schools

Dyches Bissonnette, J. j., & Glazier, J. j. (2016). A Counterstory of One's Own. *Journal Of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 59(6), 685-694. DOI:10.1002/jaal.486

- Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Berdan Lozano, J., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R. & Hurtado, S. (2014). *Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2013–2014 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Eagly, A. (2016). Research News: Why Do So Few Women Hold Positions of Power? IPR briefing examines potential and challenges for women leaders. Institute for Policy Research. Northwestern University. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ipr.northwestern.edu/about/news/2016/why-so-few-women-hold-positions-of-power.html>.
- Eisele, H. & Stake, J. (2008). The Differential Relationship of Feminist Attitudes And Feminist Identity to Self-Efficacy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32 (2008), 233–244. Wiley Periodicals, Inc. American Psychological Association. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00432.x>
- Ely, R., Insead, H., & Kolb, D. (2011). Taking Gender into Account: Theory and Design for Women’s Leadership Development Programs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2011, Vol. 10, No. 3, 474–493. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0046>
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2016). Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009. United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
www.eeoc.gov.
- Farrell, W. (2012). The Myth of Male Power: Why Men Are the Disposable Sex. *New Male Studies*. ISSN 1839-7816 ~ VOL. 1, ISSUE 2, 2012, PP. 4-33 Australian Institute of Male Health and Studies. Retrieved from:
<https://newmalestudies.com/OJS/index.php/nms/article/download/35/36/>

- Fingerhut, H. (2016, August 16th). In both parties, men and women differ over whether women still face obstacles to progress. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from:
<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/08/16/in-both-parties-men-and-women-differ-over-whether-women-still-face-obstacles-to-progress/>
- Flood, M. (2011). Men as Students and Teachers of Feminist Scholarship. *Men and Masculinities*. Vol 14, Issue 2, pp. 135 - 154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X11407042>
- Francis, B. (2006). The Nature of Gender. *Sage Handbook of Gender and Education*. Ed. C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Fry & Kochar. (2016, May 11). Are you in the American middle class? Pew Research Center. Retrieved from: www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/05/11/are-you-in-the-american-middle-class/
- GARCIA Project. (2018). GarciaProject.eu
- Genz, S. & Brabon, B. (2018). Postfeminism: Cultural Texts and Theories. Second Edition. Edinburgh University Press.
- Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of white supremacy: whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20:4, 485-505. DOI: 10.1080/02680930500132346
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. (1997). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1996, Vol.70, No. 3, 491-512. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Griffin, B. & Hu, W. (2014). The interaction of socio-economic status and gender in widening participation in medicine. *Medical Education*, Vol. 49, Issue 1, Pages 103–113. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12480>

- Gumport, P. (2002). *Academic Pathfinders: Knowledge Creation and Feminist Scholarship*. *Greenwood Studies in Higher Education series*. Greenwood Press.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330–366.
Retrieved from:
<https://igr.umich.edu/files/igr/Diversity%20and%20Higher%20Education.pdf>
- Haider, S. (2016). The Shooting in Orlando, Terrorism or Toxic Masculinity (or Both?). *Men and Masculinities* 2016, Vol. 19(5) 555-565. DOI: 10.1177/1097184X16664952
- Harlan, J. (1998). *Feminism: a reference handbook*. Contemporary World Issue Series. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.
- Harris III, F., & Harper, S. R. (2008). Masculinities go to community college: Understanding male identity socialization and gender role conflict. In J. Lester (Ed.), *Gendered perspectives in community colleges*. *New Directions for Community Colleges* (No. 142, pp. 25-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hausmann, Tyson, & Zahidi. (2015). *The Global Gender Gap Report*. World Economic Forum.
Retrieved from: <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2015/>
- Hedges, E. (1997). *Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation*. *Women in the Curriculum Series*. National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women. Towson University. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED432956.pdf>
- Heller, R. & Stepp, P. (2011). *Re-Examining the Female Path to Leadership Positions in Business; A White Paper from the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies (CAHRS)*. Ed. Thompson, S. Cornell Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies.
Retrieved from:

<https://est05.esalestrack.com/eSalesTrack/Content/Content.ashx?file=82ab307e-e667-4b11-8862-552d39c822b4.pdf>

Herideen, P. (1998). *Policy, Pedagogy, and Social Inequality: Community College Student Realities in Post-Industrial America*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Harvey.

Hickman, L. (2015). Women's Leadership: Young Men's Expectations of Female Leaders. *Advancing Women in Leadership* Vol. 35, pp. 22-30. Retrieved from:

<https://journals.tdl.org/awl/index.php/awl/article/viewFile/131/116>

Hideg, I. & Ferris D. (2016). The Compassionate Sexist? How Benevolent Sexism Promotes and Undermines Gender Equality in the Workplace. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 111, No. 5, 706-. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000072>

hooks, bell. (1994, July 13). Black Students Who Reject Feminism. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Black-Students-Who-Reject/90392/>

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress*. New York: Routledge

hooks, bell. (2014). *Feminism is for Everybody*. New York: Routledge

Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M. & Arellano, L. (2012). A Model for Diverse Learning Environments: The Scholarship on Creating and Assessing Conditions for Student Success. *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research*. Volume 27. Smart, J. C. & Paulsen, M.B. Editors. Retrieved from:

https://odi.osu.edu/uploads/A_Model_for_Diverse_Learning_Environments.pdf

Jean, V. A., Payne, S. C., & Thompson, R. J. (2015). Women in STEM: Family-related Challenges and Initiatives. In *Gender and the Work-Family Experience: An intersection of two domains* (pp. 291-311). Ed. Mills, M. New York: Springer.

Johnson, T. (2003). The influence of Feminist Pedagogy on Student Participation and Student Perception of Learning Environment in Distance Education. A dissertation submitted to the Graduate School of Education and Professional Development at Marshall University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education Leadership. Powell Toth, Ph.D., Chair. Huntington/ South Charleston, West Virginia 2003. Retrieved from:

<http://mds.marshall.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1089&context=etd>

Jones, K., Peddie, C., Gilrane, V., King, E. & Gray, A. (2016). Not So Subtle: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Correlates of Subtle and Overt Discrimination. *Journal of Management* Vol. 42 No. 6, September 2016 1588–1613. DOI:

10.1177/0149206313506466

Jones, S. & Myhil, D. (2004). Seeing things differently: teachers' constructions of under achievement. *Gender and Education*, 16:4, 531-546. DOI:

10.1080/09540250042000300411

Jourian, T. J. (2016): Trans*forming higher education men and masculinity studies: a critical review. *NORMA*. DOI: 10.1080/18902138.(2016).1260313.

Kezar, A. (1998). Exploring New Avenues for Leading Community Colleges: The Paradox of Participatory Models. Eric Review. *Community College Review*. Vol. 25 No. 4. 75-87.

Retrieved from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/009155210102900305>

Khan, Q. & Sultana, N. (2012). Transformative Education, School Textbooks and Gender. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*. Winter (2012). Vol. 6. No. 2. Pages 109-115. Retrieved from:

<http://sbbwu.edu.pk/journal/WINTER-2012-vol-6-No-2/10.pdf>

- Kingma, B. & van Marken Lichtenbelt, W. (2015). Energy consumption in buildings and female thermal demand. *Nature Climate Change* 5, 1054–1056 (2015).
DOI:10.1038/nclimate2741.
- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J., Bridges, J., & Hayek, J. (2006). What Matters to Student Success: A Review of the Literature Commissioned Report for the National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success: Spearheading a Dialog on Student Success. Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education. Retrieved from:
https://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/kuh_team_report.pdf
- Lather, P. (1984). Critical Theory, Curricular Transformation and Feminist Mainstreaming. *The Journal of Education*, Vol. 166, No. 1, Gender, Class and Schooling. pp. 49-62.
Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748416600105>
- Lauter, P. (1991). *Canons and Context*. Oxford University Press.
- Lerum, K. (2012). What's Love Got to Do With It?: Life Teachings from Multiracial Feminism. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Ed: Gutierrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., Gonzalez, C., & Harris, A. The University Press of Colorado. Utah State University Press.
- Levy, M. & Perry, M. (2015). Distantly Reading the Romantic Canon: Quantifying Gender in Current Anthologies. *Women's Writing*. 22:2, 132-155. DOI:
10.1080/09699082.2015.1011836
- Loes, C. & Pascarella, E. & Umbach, P. (2012). Effects of Diversity Experiences on Critical-thinking Skills: Who Benefits? *The Journal of Higher Education* 83(1), 1-25. Retrieved from:
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.696.7115&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Ludwig, S., Oertelt-Prigione, S. Kurmeyer, C., Gross, M., Gruters-Kieslich, A., Regitz-Zagrosek, V., & Peters, H. (2015). A Successful Strategy to Integrate Sex and Gender Medicine into a Newly Developed Medical Curriculum. *JOURNAL OF WOMEN'S HEALTH*. Volume 24, Number 12. DOI: 10.1089/jwh.2015.5249
- Ma, J. & Baum, S. (2016). Trends in Community Colleges: Enrollment, Prices, Student Debt, and Completion. *College Board Research, Research Brief*. Retrieved from: <https://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/trends-in-community-colleges-research-brief.pdf>
- MacNaughton, G. (2006). Constructing Gender in Early Years Education. *Sage Handbook of Gender and Education*. Ed. C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Malkin, C. & Stake, J. (2004). Changes in Attitudes and Self-Confidence in the Women's and Gender Studies Classroom: The Role of Teacher Alliance and Student Cohesion. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 50, Nos. 7/8. Retrieved from: http://www.academia.edu/7820953/Changes_in_Attitudes_and_Self-Confidence_in_the_Womens_and_Gender_Studies_Classroom_The_Role_of_Teacher_Alliance_and_Student_Cohesion
- Manago, A., Spears Brown, C. & Leaper, C. (2009). Feminist Identity Among Latina Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, Volume 24, Number 6. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558409341079>
- Markowitz, L. (2005). Unmasking moral dichotomies: can feminist pedagogy overcome student resistance? *Gender and Education*, Volume 17, 2005 - Issue 1, Page 39-55. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0954025042000301294>

- Martino, W. (2008). Boys Underachievement: Which Boys Are We Talking About? University of Western Ontario. The Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat. Retrieved from: <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/literacynumeracy/inspire/research/Martino.pdf>
- Maxwell, J. (2013). *Qualitative Research Design; An interactive approach, 3rd Edition*. Sage Publications.
- McCallum, k., Rahaman, F. & Turnbull, H.(2015). Paradox of Inter/Disciplinarity: A Rethinking of the Politics of Inter/Disciplinarity and ‘Women’s and Gender Studies’ for the Current Moment. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice*. Vol 37, No 1. Retrieved from: http://journals.msvu.ca/index.php/atlantis/article/viewFile/2882/pdf_30
- McGreevy, P. & Megerian, C. (2015). California now has one of the toughest equal pay laws in the country. *The Los Angeles Times*.
- McNeil, M. (2010). Post-Millennial Feminist Theory: Encounters with Humanism, Materialism, Critique, Nature, Biology and Darwin. *JOURNAL FOR CULTURAL RESEARCH*, Volume 14, Number 4. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14797581003765382>
- McRobbie, A. (2018). *The Aftermath of Feminism*. Sage Publications.
- Merriam-Webster.com. (2011). “Feminism.” Retrieved from: www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/feminism
- Mertens, D. (2012). Transformative Mixed Methods. *American Behavioral Scientist* 56(6):802-813 · May 2012. DOI: 10.1177/0002764211433797.
- Me Too Movement. (2018). <https://metoomvmt.org>.
- Miller, J. (2008). Otherness. In *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 588-590). Editor: Given, L. M. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781412963909.n304

- Milkman, K.L., Akinola, M. and Chugh, D. (2014). “What Happens Before? A Field Experiment Exploring How Pay and Representation Differentially Shape Bias on the Pathway into Organizations.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Volume, 100, Number 6, pp:1678-712. DOI: 10.1037/apl0000022. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25867167>
- Minnich, E. (2016). Transforming How and What We Teach Is Movement Work. *Transformations: The Journal Of Inclusive Scholarship & Pedagogy*, 26(1), 18-21. DOI: 10.5325/trajincschped.26.1.0018. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/trajincschped.26.1.0018>
- Moore (1998). Re-thinking the Story of Male Resistance in the Feminist Classroom: How Familiar Conceptions Can Keep Us From Seeing Positive Effects. *Feminist Teacher*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1998), pp. 44-63. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40545806>
- Morgan, T. & Bergeron, A. (2007). The Effect of Teacher Likability on Student Compliance. *Journal of Undergraduate Psychological Research* 2007, Vol. 2. Retrieved from: http://library.wcsu.edu/dspace/bitstream/0/67/1/morgan_bergeron.pdf
- Morrison, Z., Bourkea, M., & Kelley, C. (2005). Stop making it such a big issue’: Perceptions and experiences of gender inequality by undergraduates at a British University. *Women in higher Education: Issues and challenges — Women's Studies International Forum*, Volume 28, Issues 2–3, pp: 150–162. Retrieved from: <http://www.psi.edu/sites/default/files/imported/import/about/staff/mbourke/bourkepubs/2005/morrison.pdf>

- Moss-Racusin, C., Dovidio, J., Brescoll, V., Graham, M. & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. Edited by Shirley Tilghman. *PNAS* Volume 109, Number 41, pp: 16474-16479. DOI:10.1073/pnas.1211286109
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). Data and Tools. Institute of Educational Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/datatools/>
- National Sexual Violence Center. (2018). Statistics. <https://www.nsvrc.org/statistics>
- Orginos, A. (2015, July 26). Rise of the Social Justice Bullies. *Real Clear Politics*. Retrieved from:
https://www.realclearpolitics.com/2015/07/26/rise_of_the_social_justice_bullies_361815.html
- Oromaner, M. (1999). Book Review: Policy, Pedagogy and Social Inequality. *Community College Review*. Vol. 27. No. 1. Pages 72-76. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/009155219902700106>
- Paechter, C. (2006). Constructing Femininity/Constructing Femininities. *Sage Handbook of Gender and Education*. Ed. C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 181–209. Retrieved from: <https://scholar.harvard.edu/pager/publications/sociology-discrimination-racial-discrimination-employment-housing-credit-and>
- Parker, P. (2015). The Historical Role of Women in Higher Education. *Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research*. Spring (2015). Vol. 5, No. 1: 3-14. DOI: 10.5929/(2015).5.1.1

- Parker, E. T. , III & Barnhardt, C. L. & Pascarella, E. T. & McCowin, J. A. (2016). The Impact of Diversity Courses on College Students' Moral Development. *Journal of College Student Development* 57(4), 395-410. Retrieved from:
http://ethicaldevelopment.ua.edu/uploads/8/4/9/8/84986096/_2016__the_impact_of_diversity_courses_on_college_students_moral_development.pdf
- Pascarella, E. T. & Martin, G. L. & Hanson, J. M. & Trolian, T. L. & Gillig, B. & Blaich, C. (2014). Effects of Diversity Experiences on Critical-thinking Skills Over 4 Years of College. *Journal of College Student Development* 55(1), 86-92.
DOI:10.1353/csd.2014.0009
- Patai, D. & Koertge, N. (2003). *Professing Feminism*. Lexington Books.
- Peltola, P., Milkie, M., & Presser, S. (2004). The "Feminist" Mystique: Feminist Identity in Three Generations of Women. *Gender and Society*, 18(1), 122-144. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4149377>
- Pew Research Center. (2015, May 12). America's Changing Religious Landscape. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewforum.org/2015/05/12/americas-changing-religious-landscape>
- Pomerantz, S. & Raby, R. (2011). 'Oh, she's so smart': girls' complex engagements with post/feminist narratives of academic success. *Gender and Education*. Vol. 23 No. 5, 549-564. DOI: 10.1080/09540253.2010.538014
- Reingold, R. & Baratz, L. (2009). Feminism and Multiculturalism: Two Common Foundations for a Vision and a Practice of Transformative Social Activities and Education in Israel. *Journal of International Women's Studies*. Volume 10, Issue 4. Retrieved from:
<https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol10/iss4/4/>

- Said, E. W. (1994). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Sandberg, S. (2015, September 30). When Women Get Stuck, Corporate America Gets Stuck. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/sheryl-sandberg-when-women-get-stuck-corporate-america-gets-stuck-1443600325>
- Saunders, K. & Kashubeck-West, S. (2006). The Relations Among Feminist Identity Development, Gender-Role Orientation, and Psychological Well-Being in Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30 (2006), 199–211. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00282.x>
- Sax, L., Riggers, T., & Eagan, M. K. (2013). The Role of Single-Sex Education in the Academic Engagement of College-Bound Women: A Multilevel Analysis. *Teachers College Record* Volume 115, 010302. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncgs.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/The-Role-of-Single-Sex-Education-in-the-Academic-Engagement-of-College-Bound-Women-A-Multilevel-Analysis.pdf>
- Seaver, K. (2015). Title IX: How It Affect Community Colleges and Students. *Innovation Showcase*, Vol. 10. Issue 7. Retrieved from: <https://www.league.org/innovation-showcase/title-ix-how-it-affects-community-colleges-and-students>
- Segran, E. (2014, August 7). If We Want Feminism to Have a Real Impact, Then Let's Stop Teaching So Much Theory. *The New Republic*. Retrieved from: <https://newrepublic.com/article/118996/womens-studies-departments-are-failing-feminism>
- Schuster, M. & Van Dyne, S. (1985). *Women's Place in the Academy: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curriculum*. Rowman & Allanhead Publishers.

- Shollen, S. L. (2015). Teaching and learning about women and leadership: Students' expectations and experiences. *Journal of Leadership Education*. Volume 14, Issue 3, R3. DOI: 10.12806/V14/I3/R3
- Siming, L., Niamatullah, J. G., Dan, X., & Khurram, S. (2015). Factors Leading to Students' Satisfaction in the Higher Learning Institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice* Vol.6, No.31. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083362.pdf>
- Skelton. (2006). Boys and Girls in the Elementary School. *Sage Handbook of Gender and Education*. Ed. C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Smith, D. (1999). *Writing the social: Critique, theory and investigations*. University of Toronto Press.
- Son Holoien, D. (2013). DO DIFFERENCES MAKE A DIFFERENCE? The Effects of Diversity on Learning, Intergroup Outcomes, and Civic Engagement. Produced by the Trustee Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity Princeton University, Princeton. Retrieved from: www.princeton.edu/reports/2013/diversity
- Spears Brown, C. (2008). Perceived Experiences with Sexism among Adolescent Girls. *Child Development*, Vol. 79, No. 3 (May - Jun., 2008), pp. 685-704. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27563511>
- Spelke, E. (2005). Sex Differences in Intrinsic Aptitude for Mathematics and Science? A Critical Review. *American Psychologist*. Vol. 60, No. 9, 950–958 DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.60.9.950
- Spoor, J. & Lehmilller, J. (2014) The Impact of Course Title and Instructor Gender on Student Perceptions and Interest in a Women's and Gender Studies Course. *PLoS ONE* 9(9): e106286. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0106286

- St. Pierre, E. (2000) Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13:5, 477-515. DOI: 10.1080/09518390050156422
- Stake, J. (2006) Pedagogy and student change in the women's and gender studies classroom. *Gender and Education*, 18:2, 199-212. DOI: 10.1080/09540250500380687
- Stake, J., Sevelius, J. & Hanly. (2008). Student Responsiveness to Women's and Gender Studies Classes: The Importance of Initial Student Attitudes and Classroom Relationships. *NWSA Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 2, Women, the Criminal Justice System, and Incarceration: Processes of Power, Silence and Resistance (Summer, 2008), pp. 189-215. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40071281>
- Stamarski, C. & Son Hing, L. (2015). Gender inequalities in the workplace: the effects of organizational structures, processes, practices, and decision makers' sexism. *Frontiers in Psychology*. Vol 6. [http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.\(2015\).01400](http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.(2015).01400) DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.(2015).01400
- Stepler, R. (2016, June 27). 5 key takeaways about views of race and inequality in America. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from: www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/06/27/key-takeaways-race-and-inequality
- Stoehr, A. (2016). *The present status of women's and gender studies programs at community colleges*. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 15197. Retrieved from: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/15197>
- Stolzer, J. M. (2008). Boys and the American Education System: A Biocultural Review of the Literature. *Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry*, Volume 10, Number 2. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1891/1559-4343.10.2.80>

Strapagiel, L. (2013, April 15). Men's Rights Movement Sees Resurgence Among Millennial Males. *The Huffington Post Canada*. Retrieved from:

https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2013/04/15/mens-rights-millennial-males-canada_n_3061876.html

Swanson, Emily. (2013, April 16). Poll: Few Identify As Feminists, But Most Believe In Equality Of Sexes. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from:

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/04/16/feminism-poll_n_3094917.html

Taylor, C. & Stein, L. (2014). Stories of Generational Leadership: Women Higher Education Administrators Voices. *Advancing Women in Leadership*. Vol. 34, pp. 1-10. Retrieved from: <file:///C:/Users/faculty/Downloads/121-227-1-SM.pdf>

Thobejane, T., Mogorosi, L., & Okere, B. (2017). A study on gender mainstreaming : the case of a rural university in Limpopo province, South Africa. *Gender and Behaviour*, Volume 15 Number 2, 2017, p. 8926 – 8943. Retrieved from:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02589340500353631>

Titus, J. (2000). Engaging Student Resistance to Feminism: 'How is this stuff going to make us better teachers?' *Gender and Education* Vol. 12, Issue 1. Retrieved from:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250020382>

Townsend, B. & Twombly, S. (1998). A Feminist Critique of Organizational Change in the Community College. *New Directions for Community Colleges*. No. 102.

DOI:10.1002/cc.10208

Tsui, L. (1999). Courses and Instruction Affecting Critical-thinking. *Research in Higher Education*. Vol. 40. No. 2. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018734630124>

- U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). Quick Facts. Retrieved from:
<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045217>
- U. S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. (2014). Data Snapshot: School Discipline. CIVIL RIGHTS DATA COLLECTION. Retrieved from:
<https://ocrdata.ed.gov/downloads/crdc-school-discipline-snapshot.pdf>
- U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2013). The Gender Wage Gap. Retrieved from: https://www.dol.gov/wb/media/gender_wage_gap.pdf
- U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2016). Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity, (2015). Report 1062. Retrieved from:
<https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/race-and-ethnicity/2015/home.htm>
- Valliente, C. (2015). Age and Feminist Activism: The Feminist Protest Within the Catholic Church in Franco's Spain. *Social Movement Studies*, Volume 14, 2015 - Issue 4, Pages 473-492. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4149377>.
- Wagner, L. (2015, December 4). Sweden Gives 'We Should All Be Feminists' To Every 16-Year-Old Student. The Two Way. *NPR International News*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/12/04/458514464/sweden-gives-we-should-all-be-feminists-to-every-16-year-old-student>
- Webber, M. (2005). “Don't be so feminist”: Exploring student resistance to feminist approaches in a Canadian university. *Women in higher Education: Issues and challenges — Women's Studies International Forum*, Volume 28, Issues 2–3, Pages 181–194. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2005.04.006>
- Westdon, C. & Zimmerman, H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*. Vol. 1, Issue 2, pp. 125-151. DOI: 10.1177/0891243287001002002.

- Whitehead, A. (2012). Gender Ideology and Religion: Does a Masculine Image of God Matter?. *Review of Religious Research*. 54. 139-156. DOI:10.1007/s13644-012-0056-3.
- Wood, J. & Hilton, A. (2012). Five Ethical Paradigms for Community College Leaders: Toward Constructing and Considering Alternative Courses of Action in Ethical Decision Making. *Community College Review*, Volume 40, Number 3, Pages 196–214. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552112448818>
- Woodward, K. & Woodward, S. (2015). Gender Studies and Interdisciplinarity. *Palgrave Communications*. Volume 1. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2015.18>
- World Bank. (2011). World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development. Retrieved from: <https://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDR2012/Resources/7778105-1299699968583/7786210-1315936222006/Complete-Report.pdf>
- Wright, T. (2016). Whatever happened to the F word in higher education? *Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 215–227. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2014.931801>
- Yanow, D. (2007). Qualitative-interpretive methods in policy research. In F. Fischer, G. Miller & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis: theory, politics, and methods*. Taylor & Francis.
- Zamani-Gallaher, E. 2007. The Confluence of Race, Gender, and Class Among Community College Students: Assessing Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action in College Admissions. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40: 241–251. DOI: 10.1080/10665680701434569