

Making Pedagogical Decisions: Reasons Female Faculty in Educational Leadership Select Instructional Methods

Jean F. Herron
University of Alabama

Jon Beedle and Stephanie B. King
Mississippi State University

A qualitative study of the pedagogical practices of the female faculty in a higher education program preparing college administrators revealed some of the reasons why female faculty choose their pedagogies. Surveys and interviews were used to determine what strategies faculty might have knowledge of and use in the classroom, as well as faculty members' experiences in professional preparation programs, and their selection of instructional pedagogies. Among the influences on choice of pedagogies were perceptions of faculty and student roles in the learning experience, promotion of student learning, role of assessment, and prior educational experiences. Findings indicated that faculty did not necessarily teach in the manner in which they were taught and that faculty valued collaborative approaches and empowerment of the student in the learning process.

Higher education is pervasively male dominated in its faculty, and consequently instructional methods tend to be those selected by men (Glazer, Bensimon, & Townsend, 1993; Hereford, 2002). A category of faculty is developing which is characterized as "new entrants" (McKenna, 2000, p. 64) who are in the 20- to 40-year age range and who have the prospects of influencing the academy as much as those faculty who came into higher education between the years of 1960 and the end of the 1980s. Women professors who now comprise 28% of senior faculty are 41% of these "new entrants" (McKenna, 2000). This new category of faculty is affecting the so-called "average" faculty member. According to McKenna (2000),

If you're an average full-time faculty member teaching at a college or university, you're probably white, male tenured and working at the peak of your powers. You came into the profession during the boom years, when state and federal dollars were flowing into higher education and expansion was the order of the day. (p. 65)

Even with this dramatic increase of women faculty members, their role as molders and meaning-makers of the academy has been largely ignored by higher education as a field of study. With more than one third of higher education faculty now represented by women (Hereford, 2002), research should examine their pedagogies, instructional strategies, and the reasons for choosing those strategies. After all, the strategies selected may greatly influence the leaders of the next generation of academics. The focus of this paper will be on the process leading female faculty members to select a teaching pedagogy and the influences on those choices.

Differences in Male and Female Faculty Instructional Strategies

There is little argument in the literature that male and female faculty often use different instructional strategies. Grossman and Grossman (1994) listed "gender-stereotypical teaching styles" (p. 140) with the caveat that the list included generalizations. According to them,

male faculty are more direct with their students, are more subject-centered, lecture more, and reinforce males for stereotypical male behavior. On the other hand, female faculty are more indirect, more student-centered, ask more questions, involve themselves more in classroom discussion, and negatively reinforce males for exhibiting stereotypical male behaviors.(p. 140).

However, the list does highlight differences that are supported elsewhere in the literature (McDowell, 1993; Constantinople, Cornelius, & Gray, 1988; Chamberlin & Hickey, 2001; Feldman, 1993). Earlier Constantinople, Cornelius, and Gray (1988) found similar results. They also found that female instructors were more self-assured than male instructors when presenting instructional materials and that female instructors created a classroom tone that encouraged open discussion and was less dominated by their own personal beliefs. McDowell (1993) reported that males "use the lecture method, a dominant and precise style more than females, while females feel more committed to teaching and are more informative, friendly, and open toward students..."(p. 2). One interesting finding by Chamberlin and Hickey (2001) was the difference in the ability of male and female faculty to detect

student boredom. Their research student groups evaluated female faculty as being more attuned to this classroom condition (Chamberlin & Hickey, 2001).

Some teaching strategies that are related to gender may be a consequence of classroom size. Male faculty often teach larger classes, which in turn affects the lack of participation in discussion (Constantinople, Cornelius, & Gray, 1988). Durkin (1987) attributes male faculty to be more dominant and controlling, which may result in assignment to larger classes and less classroom discussion and more lecture. The factor of classroom size, along with the gender-stereotypical styles of teaching, combine to contribute to the differences in male and female faculty instructional strategies, and several theories related to the reasons for the gender differences in selecting instructional strategies have been suggested.

Reasons for Gender Differences in Selection of Instructional Strategies

There are several reasons that have been hypothesized to impact gender difference in selection of instructional strategies. For instance, child-rearing practices may affect the differences between male and female faculty teaching. Smithson (1990) reported that “males and females are obviously raised differently in American society...most women value connections with others while most males value autonomy...” (p. 8). Also, some believe that socialization is in large part responsible for the differences in male and female instructional strategies. Specifically, males are modeled to be forceful, self-assured, and dominant in a mixed-sex group (Grossman & Grossman, 1994). Contrarily, females are socialized to be helpful, compassionate with their classmates’ disappointments and problems, and less competitive than males (Grossman & Grossman, 1994). It seems likely that male and female students and faculty take these learned behaviors into the classroom with them (Smithson, 1990).

Ideals associated with feminist pedagogy may also explain the reasons for gender differences in selection of instructional strategies. The liberation model of the feminist pedagogy looks at empowerment of non-dominant groups while the gender model validates the experiences of females (Maher, 1987). These issues of empowerment and value may affect the choices that female faculty make in the classroom as they value the varied views and needs of students and act on their own strengths as females. One important dynamic of teaching is that of “positionality, or the ways in which peoples’ gender, race, and class, and the shifting and dynamic relations among these and other variables, shape the construction of knowledge in each particular classroom” (Maher, 1998, p. 461).

In addition, the cultural influences on women may affect their pedagogical choices. According to Beauboeuf-Lafontant (2002), black female teachers may exhibit aspects of womanism, a perspective based on their unique legacies, and embrace maternal characteristics of caring in their classrooms. These traits of caring may affect how female faculty react to students and choose their instructional strategies.

Issues that are unique to women may also influence pedagogical decisions. Authority may be problematic for the female teacher who is trying to maintain a student-centered classroom but is still responsible for such issues as grading and meeting tenure requirements (Maher, 1990). Female faculty may deal not only with the effects of their pedagogical decisions as faculty members but the effects of their decisions as females if students question their authority or knowledge based on their gender.

The gender socialization of the students may also influence perceptions of differences in male and female choices of instructional strategies. Since much of the data regarding teaching styles is elicited from students, “part of what students view in their teachers including any differences they see between male and female teachers, they may have actually helped to encourage or to ‘produce’ by their own expectations and demands” (Feldman, 1993, p. 166). Issues of child-rearing practices, socialization, empowerment, value, cultural influences, and authority contribute to the selection of instructional strategies and may offer explanation for the differences seen between males and females; methods that faculty experienced as students may also contribute to their selection of instructional strategies.

Pedagogical Methods in Graduate Educational Leadership Preparation Programs

Another influence on pedagogy selection is the classroom methodologies that faculty themselves experienced as graduate students (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990, as cited in Even, 1993; Howard, 2002; Weidemann & Humphrey, 2002). Traditional instruction in educational leadership administration is very much instruction/teacher centered. According to Tanner, Galls, and Pajak (1997), the entire educational experience is scripted by the instructor. There are “learning objectives, lectures, and assignments provided by the instructor, formal class discussion, an occasional film and field trip to a school setting, tests, and papers written about the concepts identified in the instructor designed objectives” (Tanner, Galls, & Pajak, 1997, p. 4). Albanese and Mitchell (1993) add that in traditional instruction there are large-group didactic instructional sessions, prescribed laboratory experiences, and

regularly scheduled multiple-choice tests.

The instructional strategies used in the preparation of higher education faculty are important because it may influence the selection of teaching strategies of its graduates. From their classroom experiences, students construct concepts about good and bad teaching, what enhances student success, and what makes a good class (Feiman-Nemser, McDiarmid, Melnick, & Parker, 1987). During the class, students develop concepts of how teaching is done (or should not be done).

There are numerous influences on the pedagogical decisions of faculty members. Gender may play a role in strategy selection with female faculty who are more likely to encourage open discussion and male faculty who are more likely to use a dominant, lecture style. These differences may be related to socialization of the genders as women may be modeled to be more helpful and compassionate and men to be more dominant. In addition, faculty experiences with teacher-centered instruction in their own professional preparation programs may influence their pedagogical decisions. These influences play an important role in the pedagogical choices of the female (and male) faculty and possibly their effectiveness in the classroom.

Context of the Study

The female faculty members in the College of Education, which includes fields of teacher education and educational leadership, at a public, flagship university were participants in the current study. This research attempted to explore the instructional methods that the female faculty members in the educational leadership program employ and the reasons they select a particular approach.

This southeastern research university's faculty makeup is similar to other universities, but not as large. Nationally, in August, 2005, the percentage of full-time higher education female faculty members was 39% (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 2005-6, p. 26). According to the Executive Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at the institution studied, among the entire fulltime faculty, women faculty currently represent approximately 36% of the faculty (Executive Director, personal communication, October 9, 2005).

However, the percentage of female faculty members is not uniformly distributed across the different colleges and departments. In the institution studied, we found a much higher concentration of female faculty members in the College of Education, where 51% of the fulltime faculty members were female. In educational leadership (the area of the researchers' interest), 63% of the faculty members were female, a much higher percentage than both the national average and the institution average. This higher

percentage of female faculty members in this College of Education is supported by the research that female faculty members are consistently found in just a few academic fields such as nursing, foreign languages, library science, and education, and not evenly distributed across disciplines or colleges (Bradburn & Sikora, 2002; Glazer, Bensimon, & Townsend, 1993; Moore & Sagaria, 1993).

Methodology

The researchers used a basic qualitative design to frame their research methods (Creswell, 1994). Faculty members were asked background questions through an advance survey, but the research relied heavily on one-to-one semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998). Interviews were transcribed verbatim. Standard qualitative techniques, such as constant comparison (Merriam, 1998; Creswell, 1998) and inductive analysis for data evaluation, were used.

The sample for this study was a total population sample and involved a single-stage sampling procedure (Creswell, 1994). Of the nine female faculty in the department studied, seven were interviewed. One faculty member was on sabbatical and could not be reached, and one declined to be interviewed.

Researchers developed a survey (see Appendix A) that collected demographic data from the faculty. Included were questions regarding number of years in teaching and administration, and the number of pedagogy courses taken. The survey included a list of possible instructional strategies that the faculty might have knowledge of and consequently use in the classroom, including discussion, technology, cooperative learning, lecture, feminist, collaborative learning, and an open-ended blank for "others." In the one-to-one interviews, faculty were asked questions regarding their experiences in their professional preparation programs, their instructional pedagogy, influences on the selection of this strategy, their beliefs regarding the role of students and instructor in this strategy, and other questions related to classroom interaction (see Appendix B)

The demographic data reported by the seven faculty members interviewed showed an average of just over five and a half years ($M = 5.57$) years graduate teaching experience, with a high of twelve and a low of two. Average time spent teaching at the research institute studied was over two years ($M = 2.1$), with a high of three and one with with a low of one year. One faculty member was tenured. Five others were tenure track and one was a contract faculty member. The group had extensive experience at all levels of teaching and educational administration. The average number of years working in an educational environment was over 16 years ($M = 16.5$). (This data was skewed because two

faculty members had each spent more than 30 years in teaching and administration at all levels.) If the median is reported ($Mdn=11$), the data are better represented.

Other information reported from the survey data included that the faculty had experiences in teaching and administration in elementary, middle, undergraduate, and graduate level activities. Curiously, none indicated experience in secondary teaching or administration. Degrees obtained by the subjects included five PhDs and two EdDs.

Of course, the entire sample studied was female and the majority of the group, (five professors), were in the 35 to 44 year old age range, followed by two who were in the 45 to 54 year old age range, and one who was between 55 and 64 years of age. Only three professors, out of the seven female faculty members interviewed, had participated in formal coursework in pedagogy.

Findings

Several themes emerged from the data analysis. Particularly dominant themes included female faculty members' perceptions (a) of the role of faculty in the classroom, (b) of the role of students in the classroom, (c) of the best ways to help students learn, (d) of the influence of assessment in selecting a strategy, and (e) of the effect of female faculty members' prior experiences and professional preparation on the selection of an instructional strategy.

Perceptions of Faculty Role

Each of the female faculty members interviewed was a promoter of the empowerment of students, with the focus on the student's participation in his or her learning. Overwhelmingly, faculty members reported that their role in the classroom was to facilitate or act as a resource for classroom learning. This facilitation often involved encouraging students to question the faculty member's beliefs and opinions and to embrace their own truth and reality.

Another perceived part of the faculty member's role was seizing a teachable moment. Faculty members were concerned about preparing students to learn and therefore capitalized on any event to learn. Faculty felt that most opportunities could be turned into teaching and learning opportunities.

Choosing the appropriate instructional method was also viewed as part of the faculty member's role; situational influences were not overlooked as guideposts for teaching strategies. Faculty recognized that all instructional methods have merit and the choice of which methods to use should be based on the course, class size, the number of sites to which instruction is delivered, and other related factors. The choice of the

instructional methods also depended on the needs of students, and faculty recognized this as part of their role. When faculty realized that students did not comprehend information, they chose new approaches to teaching, constantly evaluating and adjusting the strategies until the students' needs were met.

Planning and preparation were viewed as key roles of the faculty members. Faculty saw themselves as designers of the learning environment, suggesting that faculty allow adequate planning time prior to delivery or facilitating. They experienced anticipation and enthusiasm during their planning for the class meeting and looked forward to learning along with the students. Faculty did allow flexibility in planning for the class, developing strategies as the class progressed and allowing more flexibility for graduate students. Clearly, faculty must plan the learning that should take place during the class. However, female faculty are often more open to different paths that learning make take that have not been entirely planned by the faculty member.

Perceptions of the Role of Students

Self-reliance and responsibility for learning were among the roles the faculty members saw for students in their classrooms. Faculty expected students to take part in the learning process, sharing the responsibility for learning with the faculty member and playing a role in their classmates' learning as well. Students were seen as responsible for constructing their own knowledge, adding the course content to what they already knew and in some cases sharing that new knowledge with classmates. Students were expected to develop accountability and problem solving skills rather than relying on the faculty member to tell them everything they should know. Faculty felt that students should be engaged with the course, growing and developing in the classroom in different ways, and that students should take themselves seriously, possibly even elevated to the status of colleague. These responsibilities were not without problems, especially with regard to the students' willingness to join in classroom discussions, possibly due to cultural expectations. Faculty believed that some students find it difficult to be engaged in order to take ownership of the information and concepts because they have been socialized to revere the instructor as the expert.

Other roles for students were identified as well. Writing was an important role for students as reported by faculty, with requirements for the student to know the subject matter but also to obtain the skills and tools needed for teaching and research. Students may also have other responsibilities including evaluating instruction and influencing the faculty member's future courses.

Promotion of Student Learning

Faculty members recognized their roles in enhancing student learning through choosing appropriate strategies. They attributed increased learning to classroom discussion because of the exposure to perspectives that are new and completely different. In addition, relevance was an issue in selecting the best instructional strategies, emphasizing the need for problem-solving skills in order to solve problems encountered outside the classroom. But, faculty indicated that class size was a contributor to student learning with the majority preferring small class sizes to allow students to feel comfortable with each other and to communicate in the classroom. Small class size was preferable for all delivery modes, including on-line.

The Role of Assessment

The role of assessment in the choice of methodology varied among the faculty members but was not the driving force in the selection of their primary instructional methodology. Faculty referred to using more formal assessment methods with undergraduates but less structured assessment methods with graduate students. Graduate students were still asked to demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways such as discussion, compressed video conferencing, and face-to-face instruction.

Prior Experiences and Training

When asked about the primary method they were exposed to, many faculty indicated that lecture was the primary method. Faculty were exposed to a variety of strategies including case studies, lecture, team approach, collaborative learning, service activity, and small and whole group discussion.

The effect of these earlier instructional strategies and their influences on why faculty chose a particular teaching method were varied. Faculty did not necessarily teach in the manner in which they were taught. Much of the research literature on faculty teaching is based on men, which may not correctly reflect female faculty teaching. As a whole, the faculty members interviewed were proponents of collaborative approaches, student-centered learning, and valuing the knowledge and experience of their students. Several described their relationship with students as being co-colleagues, searching together for knowledge. The majority of the participants (seven) mentioned using informal lecture to a small degree either to provide background for a topic or to set the stage for a project or discussion. None of the professors interviewed used lecture as a primary delivery method. Faculty tried to

replicate the instructional pedagogy of classes that they felt benefited them the most, whether the classes were in graduate school or early school experiences.

Other experiences also had an influence. Earlier careers, such as working with a certain group of students, influenced pedagogy selection. External influences such as peer discussion and trends in literature also influenced their teaching methods.

Additional information collected via the survey and interviews revealed the following. Technology knowledge and use drew the sharp lines of division among the faculty. Although five of the seven surveyed included technology as an instructional strategy of which they had knowledge, only four mentioned implementing technology into her classroom activities. Two faculty members used technology extensively in their delivery method while another two only mentioned technology negatively, referring to its susceptibility to mechanical failure. The two professors who were self-declared feminists did not use technology at all. The two professors who labeled themselves constructivists consistently used technology for instruction.

The faculty were unanimous in their agreement on some aspects of classroom pedagogy. All faculty responses supported the use of collaborative learning and empowerment of the student. All seven respondents have some aspect of feminist pedagogy whether or not they use it as a primary instructional method. (Feminist pedagogy is a student-centered pedagogy that allows students to actively participate in their own learning. Students and faculty work cooperatively on developing the learning outcomes for the course. Students also work cooperatively to gain knowledge by participating in groups and discussing to learn more about the subject (Feminist Pedagogy, 2005).

It is interesting to note that only two of the professors, named their pedagogical style. Two of the seven professed to be feminist while the other five used a combination of pedagogical strategies. Six of the seven professed to be chameleons, their pedagogical color being guided by the situation and the student.

Discussion

Faculty who refuse to lecture refute some of the findings in the literature. According to a review of the literature conducted by the researchers, many faculty members tend to adopt the instructional strategy that they experience in their own professional preparation [Flood & Moll, 1990; Ball & McDiarmid, 1990 as cited in Even (1993)]. Additionally, Lucas (1989, as cited in Travis, 1995) also reported that the instructional methodology that faculty choose is similar to the instructional strategy they (the faculty) have experienced. According to Travis (1995), this influence

may result in regrettable selection of instructional styles.

Female faculty members reported that they feel that students have a responsibility to participate in their own learning, such as taking part in discussion, questioning, researching and writing, developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills, and, in some cases, determining the classroom pedagogy. Chilwiniak (1997) found that “women faculty are more likely to provide participatory environments” (p. 16). According to Lowman (1984), students in female faculty classrooms interact more and without prompting than in male faculty classroom and are more likely to interact with their female faculty as “full partners in the learning process” (p. 135).

Elevating students to co-colleague in the female faculty’s classroom is not without problems. When a course first ensues, there are formal roles that need to be hashed out and established. This may be problematic because students have been socialized to revere the instructor as the expert. According to Maher (1993), “habits of inferiority and passivity of looking to the teacher for the answer have to be deliberately challenged to be broken” (p. 573). Brookfield (1998) found that because of the entrenched hierarchical culture of higher education, faculty cannot dismiss the students’ perception of faculty as being superior. After thoughtful attention to how students perceive them and their interpretation of what teachers say and do will they come to comprehend that “authentic collaboration can happen only after they have spent considerable time earning students’ trust by acting democratically and respectfully toward them” (p. 532). Regardless of how much instructors want to be a co-teacher or co-learner, “culturally learned habits of reliance on, or hostility toward authority figures (especially those from the dominant culture) cannot so easily be broken” (Brookfield, 1998, p. 531). A learning environment can emerge that transforms the instructor into the learner and the learner into the student. The instructor must then take the responsibility to encourage students to find and develop this relationship (Turner, 2001). According to Bridges and Hallinger (1992), professors who believe that their teaching is the same as their students’ learning and who have attachments to the methods used to instruct them (the professors), will have much difficulty in changing the traditional role of student and teacher.

Some faculty may not use discussion in the classroom. There may be various reasons for not using discussion but according to Almasi, O’Flahave, and Arya (2001), research has found that some instructors do not want to use discussion as an instructional strategy because they have to surrender some control within the classroom setting. In a traditional classroom setting, “the instructor expert is seen as possessing

superior knowledge and wisdom...” (Bosworth, 1994, p. 25). One area of inquiry has investigated the effects of lecturing versus discussion and found practically no evidence that lecture (the most commonly use instructional strategy in male dominated higher education) is just as efficient in delivering subject matter content to students as is discussion (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998). However, the drawback comes when the instructional objective is to develop critical thinking and problem solving skills rather than the communication of factual information. Discussion wins under those circumstances (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998).

Statham, Richardson, and Cook (1991) also published results regarding how gender affects university teaching. They found that female professors tend to see students as a valuable source for learning, not only for the other students but also for the faculty member. According to the interviews they conducted, they found that female professors were more apt to view their students as an important component to have a say in what goes in the classroom. The same researchers reported that the instructional strategies used by female faculty were more student-centered than instructor-centered and experiential. Female faculty “often said that they used experiential teaching methods in which they encouraged students to learn by doing and by experiencing the subject matter” (Statham, Richardson, & Cook, 1991, p.55).

For some, job satisfaction for female faculty is closely correlated to their ability to create teaching and learning relationships with their students. “Women faculty seem to take their relationships with their students very seriously” (Ropers-Hullman, 2000, p. 24). An axiom of gender study is that females (faculty and students, alike) identify more with relationships to others than with separation. The opposite is true for males (Smithson, 1990).

Traditionally, university education has been fed by competition and separation. Competition and separation are promoted among students, “separating ‘A’ students from ‘C’ students and offering professors who often dispense knowledge from their position of authority and power instead of facilitating learning” (Smithson, 1990, p. 16). This position is characteristic of a masculine instructional strategy in higher education. Fortunately for the students of the faculty studied in this research, this appears not to be true. Rather, student knowledge and experience is valued and recognized in the classroom.

Recommendations for Future Research

Part of the mission statement of the College of Education at the institution studied supports the development of professional educators to be successful

decision makers who aid, and not impede, student learning, and to promote lifelong learning among the educators. Constructivism is also endorsed as the instructional strategy of choice. The female faculty members at this institution generally adhere to that philosophy. However, some report using only one instructional approach, which may not address all of the learning styles in a classroom, e.g., the two self-proclaimed feminists and those who do not use technology in their classrooms.

The women faculty members at this institution mirror much of the research literature findings. They are supportive of students and value their input. They promote interaction within the classroom and invite questioning. The faculty viewed themselves as facilitators of learning, not the fountainhead of knowledge. The faculty members were aware of their pedagogies and acknowledged the need for flexibility in some cases. They also recognized that choosing an instructional strategy is critical to the learning that takes place in the classroom and is a very important player in the hidden curriculum. Often the students learn as much from the strategy as they do from the information presented.

The interview process employed in this study created an increased awareness of the pedagogical/instructional preferences of female faculty in the College of Education and the dynamics that exist within the classroom. The college's mission is to offer exemplary professional programs, which prepare educators to be effective decision makers who facilitate student learning, and its goal is to prepare professionals as reflective practitioners and ethical decision makers. Based on the findings of this study of female faculty pedagogical/instructional preferences, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. A study should be conducted to determine the feasibility of including alternative pedagogical methods in the college's mission and vision.
2. To enhance the reflective process, the female faculty interviewed should be provided results of the study in order that each may reflect on the types of instruction she provides.
3. A study should be conducted to provide data on the instructional pedagogies of the male faculty in the higher education in general, and the institution studied in particular.
4. A study should be conducted to provide data on the instructional pedagogies of male and female faculty at smaller private institutions.
5. Faculty who have been at an institution for a longer period of time should be examined for their position on instructional strategies.
6. College curricula should be reviewed to determine if pedagogy is included in the

course series, especially in graduate instructional leadership programs.

7. Regional differences in instructional strategies in higher education should be examined.

Several suggestions for this faculty have resulted from the research. Noting the lack of course work in pedagogy experienced by the female faculty, perhaps this might be an area of faculty development through workshops, observation, or research. Peer observations might also be helpful. Teaching is primarily a profession that is conducted in isolation (Sadker & Sadker, 1990). A review with an eye toward rewriting/restructuring student evaluation forms to gather more in-depth information could provide the data needed for instructional changes.

Another recommendation would be to team faculty with different pedagogical approaches to teach together where both could learn from each other.

References

- Albanese, M., & Mitchell, S. (1993). Problem-based learning: A review of literature on its outcomes and implementation issues. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 68(1), 52-81.
- Almasi, J. F., O'Flahavan, J. F., & Arya, P. (2001). A comparative analysis of student and teacher development in more and less proficient discussions of literature. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(2), 96-122.
- Ball, D. L., & McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). The subject-matter preparation of teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 437-448). New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Beauboeuf-Lafontant, T. (2002). A womanist experience of caring: Understanding the pedagogy of exemplary black women teachers. *The Urban Review*, 34(1), 71-86.
- Bosworth, K. (1994). Developing collaborative skills in college students. In K. Bosworth & S. Hamilton (Eds.), *Collaborative learning: Underlying processes and effective techniques. New directions for teaching and learning*, 59 (pp. 25-31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bradburn, E., & Sikora, A. (2002). Gender and race/ethnic differences in salary and other characteristics of postsecondary faculty: Fall, 1998. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Bridges, E., & Hallinger, P. (1992). *Problem based learning for administrators*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse.

- Brookfield, S. (1985). Discussion as an effective educational method. In S. Rosenblum (Ed.), *Involving adults in the educational process* (pp. 55-67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chamberlin, M., & Hickey, J. (2001). Student evaluations of faculty performance: The role of gender expectations in differential evaluations. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 25(2), 3-14.
- College of Education, North Carolina State University. (2002). Retrieved December 19, 2002, from www2.ncsu.edu:8010/ncsu/cep/teachered/sthandbook/conceptframe.html
- Constantinople, A., Cornelius, R., & Gray, J. (1988). The chilly climate: Fact or artifact? *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(5), 527-550.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Durkin, M. J. (1987). Teacher's sex. In M. J. Durkin (Ed.) *An international encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (pp. 606-608). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Even, R. (1993). Subject-matter knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge: Prospective secondary teachers and the function concept. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 24(2), 94-116.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., McDiarmid, W., Melnick, S., & Parker, M. (1987). *Changing beginning teachers' conceptions: A description of an introductory teacher education course*. Retrieved October 7, 2005 from <http://ncrtl.msu.edu/http/rreports/html/pdf/rr891.pdf>
- Feldman, K. (1993). College students' view of male and female college teachers: Part II--Evidence from students' evaluations of their classroom teachers. *Research in Higher Education*, 34 (2), 151-211.
- Feminist pedagogy. (n.d.). Retrieved October 7, 2005, from <http://www.edb.utexas.edu/wie/pmain.htm>
- Flood, B., & Moll, J. (1990). *The professor business: A teaching primer for faculty*. Medford, NJ: Learned Information.
- Glazer, J., Bensimon, E., & Townsend, B. (Eds.) (1993). *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Grossman, H., & Grossman, S. (1994). *Gender issues in education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hereford, L. *It's women's work*. Retrieved March 20, 2002, from <http://chostvgw11.epnet.com/delivery>.
- Howard, D. (2002). *American psychos: Insanity, academe, and other special topics*. Retrieved online January 25, 2002, from <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2002/01/2002012502c.htm>
- Maher, F. (1987). Toward a richer theory of feminist pedagogy: A comparison of "liberation" and "gender" models for teaching and learning. *Journal of Education*, 169(3), 91-100.
- Maher, F. (1993). Classroom pedagogy and the new scholarship on women. In J. Glazer, E. Bensimon, & B. Townsend (Eds.), *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective* (pp. 565-577). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Maher, F. (1998). Response from the feminist classroom: A response to Maralee Mayberry. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 35(4), 461-462.
- Maher, F. (1999). Progressive education and feminist pedagogies: Issues in gender, power, and authority. *Teachers College Record*, 101(1), 35-59.
- McDowell, E. (1993). An exploratory study of GTA's attitudes toward aspects of teaching and teaching styles. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED370147)
- McKenna, B. (2000). Higher education's lower teacher profile. *Education Digest* (65)8, 65-69
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, K., & Sagaria, M. (1993). The situation of women in research universities in the United States: Within the inner circles of academic power. In J. Glazer, E. Bensimon, & B. Townsend (Eds.), *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective* (pp. 227-240). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1998). From how college affects students. In K. Feldman & M. Paulsen (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in the college classroom* (pp. 415-430). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Ropers-Hulman, B. (2000). Aren't you satisfied yet? Women faculty members' interpretations of their academic work. In L. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff? New directions for institutional research* 105, (pp. 21-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1990). Confronting sexism in the college classroom. In S. Gabriel &

- I. Smithson (Eds.). *Gender in the college classroom: Power and pedagogy* (pp. 176-187). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Smithson, I. (1990). Introduction: Investigating gender, power, and pedagogy. In S. Gabriel & I. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the classroom: Power and pedagogy* (pp. 1 – 27). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Statham, A., Richardson, L., & Cook, J. (1991). *Gender and university teaching*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tanner, C., Galls, S., & Pajak, E. (1997). Problem-based learning in advanced preparation of educational leaders. *Educational Planning 10*, 3, 3-12.
- The Chronicle of Education Higher Education Almanac (2005). *Number of full-time faculty members by sex, rank, racial and ethnic groups*. The Chronicle of Higher Education, LII(1), 26.
- Travis, J. (1995). *Models for improving college teaching: A faculty resource*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Turner, P. K. (2001). Wisdom, eloquence, and a little bit of yourself: a philosophy for teaching. *Communication Studies*, 52(4), 272-277.
- Weidemann, W., & Humphrey, M. B. (2002). Building a network to empower teachers for school reform. *School Science & Mathematics*, 102(2), 88-93.
- JEAN FOSTER HERRON, EdD, is an Assistant Professor in the Higher Education Administration program at the University of Alabama and is Assistant Director of the Executive Ed.D. Cohort. She has master's degrees in both adult education and instructional technology. Her doctorate is in higher education administration. Her research interests are problem-based learning, online pedagogy, the pedagogy of college faculty, and assessment in online courses.
- JON BEEDLE finished his PhD at the University of Alabama in Instructional Leadership. He is currently an Assistant Professor at the University of Southern Mississippi Technology Education Gulf Coast Student Service Center. Jon's research interests include multiplayer video gaming, technological legal issues in education, mobile uses of computers in education, and improving test scores in the vocational arena. He is a member of ISTE, AECT, and MECA.
- STEPHANIE BURDINE KING, PhD, is a Curriculum Specialist at Mississippi State University and serves as the Curriculum Project Manager at the Research and Curriculum Unit. She has a doctorate in educational leadership. Her research interests include community college leadership and instruction, vocational education, and workforce preparation.

Appendix A

Demographic Survey

Research indicates that college faculty frequently teaches in the same manner they were taught. If a graduate student is primarily taught with a specific instructional strategy (such as lecture), then that student will be more likely to use that particular method in their own instructional efforts. We are interested in determining attitudes, philosophies, and experiences of female professors concerning their teaching methodologies in graduate education and what influences their selection of a particular pedagogy. Our population will include all female professors within the Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies area. Our two main questions will focus on:

1. What instructional pedagogy does this flagship research institution Higher Education female faculty members use in the classrooms?
2. Why do female faculty members choose that particular method?

Demographics:

How many years have you taught at the graduate level? _____

How many years have you taught at this institution? _____

Are you: (Please circle one)

Tenured

Tenure track

Other

How many years have you worked in any educational environment? _____

What educational areas have you worked in? (Please circle teaching, administration or both next to the area worked).

Elementary teaching administration both

Middle teaching administration both

Secondary teaching administration both

Undergraduate teaching administration both

Graduate teaching administration both

Professional teaching administration both

Highest degree earned _____

Institution where terminal degree was completed: _____

Have you ever completed a course in pedagogical theory? _____

Age

25 - 34

35 - 44

45 - 54

55 - 64

65 and above

Of what instructional strategies do you have knowledge? Check all that are appropriate.

_____ Discussion

_____ Technology

_____ Cooperative Learning

_____ Lecture

_____ Collaborative Learning

_____ Feminist

_____ Other (please indicate)

Appendix B

Pedagogy Survey

Research Title: The Pedagogies of Female Faculty in Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies

Researchers:

Interview Protocol:

Interviewee:

Interviewer:

Time:

1. Describe your teaching philosophy.
2. What primary teaching methods were you exposed to during your graduate studies?
3. What other exposures to teaching methods have you had, e.g., undergraduate work, professor/school teacher parents, coursework, professional experiences?
4. Which of these were the most influential in affect the way you teach?
5. What is your primary instructional pedagogy?
6. What is your reasoning for relying on this method more often than other methods of teaching?
7. Why did you choose this primary method of instruction?
8. What is the role of the student in your preferred instructional methodology?
9. What is the role of the instructor in your preferred instructional methodology?
10. What influence (if any) did the means of assessment contribute to your decision to use this particular method?
11. What might be other factors that affect the choice of a particular pedagogy?
12. Does class size affect your choice of methods? How or why?