Journal of Teacher Education
http://jte.sagepub.com/

A Content Analysis Exploring Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Topics in Foundations of Education Textbooks

Ian K. Macgillivray and Todd Jennings

Journal of Teacher Education 2008 59: 170 originally published online 1 February 2008
DOI: 10.1177/0022487107313160

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://jte.sagepub.com/content/59/2/170

Published by:
SAGE
http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:
AACTE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Teacher Education* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jte.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jte.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://jte.sagepub.com/content/59/2/170.refs.html

>> Version of Record - Feb 25, 2008

OnlineFirst Version of Record - Feb 1, 2008

What is This?

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

A CONTENT ANALYSIS EXPLORING LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER TOPICS IN FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION TEXTBOOKS

Ian K. Macgillivray
James Madison University
Todd Jennings
California State University, San Bernardino

This research analyzed the most widely used foundations of education textbooks for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) content. Because foundations of education coursework routinely introduces other diversity topics in education, the authors hold it is a good place to introduce LGBT topics. The ways in which LGBT topics are included in textbooks, however, or placed in relation to other material, can reinforce negative stereotypes and marginalize LGBT people. The authors paid particular attention to the textbook's presentation of LGBT topics in the following categories: discrimination and harassment against LGBT people; LGBT identities and experiences; LGBT parents, guardians, and families; LGBT history; strategies, resources, and curricula to increase safety and support; legal issues and professional responsibilities; personal beliefs and opposition; and conceptual terms and frameworks.

Keywords: *textbooks; textbook bias; homosexuality and education; gay; transgender; foundations of education; content analysis*

The purpose of this research is to examine how lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) topics are treated in foundations of education textbooks. For some time, scholars have been warning that negative attitudes toward LGBT people are prevalent among preservice and licensed teachers and that teachers are unprepared to affirm and address the needs of LGBT students and families (Blackburn & Donelson, 2004; Casper & Schultz, 1999; Kozik-Rosabal & Macgillivray, 2000; Macgillivray, 2004; Maney & Cain, 1997; Petrovic, 1998; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001; Roffman, 2000; Sears, 1992, 2005; Szalacha, 2004; Unks, 1993/1994). Moreover, attempts to remedy this situation are largely absent from many teacher preparation programs (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Jennings & Sherwin, 2007; Sherwin & Jennings, 2006). It seems reasonable to suggest that if schools are to be more affirming of sexual minority youth, so must teacher preparation programs. Teacher preparation programs' treatment of LGBT topics is informed by a variety of factors including national, state, and accreditation agency requirements and standards, as well as the expertise and values of education faculty. Also salient, however, are the representations of LGBT people and topics in the textbooks available to teacher educators. Sexual orientation topics may include such discussions as being gay, lesbian, bisexual, or straight, and examinations of heterosexual privilege and heterosexism. Gender identity topics may include discussions of how

Authors' Note: Please address correspondence to Ian Macgillivray at macgilik@jmu.edu or Todd Jennings at tjennin@csusb.edu.

Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 59, No. 2, March/April 2008 170-188
DOI: 10.1177/0022487107313160
© 2008 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

one identifies as male, female, or somewhere in between; transgenderism; and intersexuality (www.isna.org).

FRAMING THE ISSUE

Teacher preparation programs assume some responsibility in shaping preservice teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. Many teacher preparation programs, however, ignore LGBT issues (Jennings & Sherwin, 2007; Letts, 2002; Sherwin & Jennings, 2006). Teacher educators often exclude LGBT topics *unintentionally* because the issues are beyond their consciousness or *intentionally* because they are unsure of how to discuss them or whether they are permitted to discuss them (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Macgillivray, 2004) or because of their own antigay beliefs (Finnessy, 2007; Sears, 1992).

At the same time, the current political backlash from antigay activists, such as Christian fundamentalists' push for *No Promo Homo* laws (Macgillivray, in press-b; White, 2006), is creating a climate of fear and intimidation that prevents teachers from including or affirming LGBT youth and families in K-12 schools. Thus, educators' fear of the conservative right may silence discussion of LGBT issues in K-12 schools, and preservice teachers may enter their teacher preparation programs without having had the opportunity to discuss LGBT issues previously. College courses are, therefore, often the first exposure teacher education students have to factual information about sexual orientation and gender identity. Because foundations of education coursework routinely introduces other diversity topics (e.g., racial, ethnic, class, religious, and ability differences) in education, and is one of the first classes many preservice teachers are required to take, we hold that it is a good place to introduce LGBT topics as well.

Given that many instructors use the content and structure of their adopted textbooks to structure the content of their classes, the inclusion of LGBT topics in textbooks can help to facilitate their inclusion in foundations courses. Many foundations texts, however, exclude LGBT topics or address LGBT topics in ways that may reinforce negative or stereotypic representations of LGBT people. For instance, including LGBT content in the same section as depression, youth suicide, and HIV/AIDS has the effect of pathologizing LGBT identities (Rasmussen, 2005a, 2005b; Rofes, 2005a, 2005b; Talburt, 2005). To rely upon instructors' supplementation of textbooks is potentially flawed because it relies upon expertise and sensitivities that many instructors may not have without support from a text. The related research indicates that the way in which issues get presented to students connotes certain thought patterns and has a lasting impact, both consciously and subconsciously (Whatley, 1992; Young & Middleton, 2002). It is important, therefore, that textbook authors exercise sensitivity in their inclusion and treatment of LGBT topics. Thus, our main question is How are LGBT issues treated in foundations of education textbooks? Our study builds upon the methods and findings of previous studies, including content analyses of race and gender in psychology and education textbooks.

LGBT students are disproportionately susceptible to a variety of vulnerabilities that are linked to unaffirming school and social environments (Bart, 1998; Human Rights Watch, 2001; Kosciw & Diaz, 2006; Macgillivray, 2000; McCready, 2004; McFarland & Dupuis, 2001; Safren & Heimberg, 1998, 1999; Winters, Remafedi, & Chan, 1996). The systematic neglect of the needs of LGBT youth and families within teacher preparation coursework is rooted in heteronormative assumptions that present heterosexuality as the only legitimate sexual orientation.

> The dominance, or the coercive power, of the institution of heterosexuality . . . coupled with the exclusion of other ways of being [e.g., LGBT] . . . justifies the assumed superiority of the heterosexual social order, not only of schools, but of society by giving it a normative dignity while simultaneously hiding the mechanisms by which it asserts itself as the natural order. (Macgillivray, 2004, p. 113)

Thus, heterosexuals come to think of themselves as normal, and anyone who does not fit the norm (LGBT and other gender nonconformers) is seen as *not normal*, or *other*. Heteronormativity promotes homophobia, the irrational fear of and discomfort with homosexuality and homosexuals. Likewise, because

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

gender conformity is so closely linked to heterosexual behavior, as expressed through traditional rigid gender roles, heterosexism fuels transphobia, the irrational fear of transgendered individuals (Hill & Willoughby, 2005; Lombardi, Wilchins, Priesing, & Malouf, 2001), as well as heterosexist discrimination against LGBT people (Friend, 1993). The incidences of homophobia, heteronormativity, heterosexism, and transphobia within education extend beyond actual classrooms and schools. These same factors may, in part, explain the minimal treatment, maltreatment, or absence of LGBT topics within foundations of education textbooks for preservice teachers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Most diversity-related content analyses to date have focused on race and gender bias and have included textbooks from the fields of education and psychology. This review begins with those analyses because their methods gave us ideas for our own and because they provide a basis for comparison with our analysis of LGBT topics in foundations textbooks. Also, because the inclusion of LGBT topics in textbooks has occurred relatively recently, whereas race and gender topics have been included in textbooks for a longer period of time, this review will provide the reader with a more *historical understanding* of the evolution of the treatment of diversity topics over the years.

Content Analyses of Race

One of the oldest content analyses of race that we uncovered was reported by Powell and Garcia (1985). The authors examined the illustrations in a series of 7 elementary science textbooks. They reported, "Adult minorities are usually shown in roles or activities dealing with parental or familial situations and in such occupational roles as teachers and mechanical workers. They appear less often in science-related career roles" (p. 527).

Gay (1988) analyzed photographs in 18 introductory psychology textbooks from the mid-1980s for the presence of people of color and compared those numbers to U.S. census data. Gay concluded the number of Whites in the photographs was disproportionately large in comparison to the number of people of color. Moreover, Brown, Goodwin, Hall, and Jackson-Lowman (1985), in a review of psychology of women textbooks, found that 18 of the 28 texts analyzed made only token mention of, or had no references to, African American women.

In a similar study, Hogben and Waterman (1997) reviewed text and photographs in 28 introductory psychology textbooks for coverage of diversity issues. Coders searched for key phrases in each text's index; counted the number of paragraphs devoted to each aspect of diversity; searched photographs and any accompanying text for clues as to individuals' race, ethnicity, and gender; and examined differences between texts written by male, as opposed to female or mixed, authors. They reported, "Most minority groups receive little if any attention . . . [and] when textbook authors do mention minority issues, they focus primarily on Black people" (p. 99). They add, however, that "The constant parade of White male individuals in older textbook photographs has largely disappeared, and some racial/ethnic groups are represented in a proportion approximating their representation in the United States" (p. 99).

Content Analyses of Gender and Gender Bias

Multiple content analyses of the treatment of women in psychology and education textbooks, from the mid-1970s through the late 1990s, concluded that women and women's issues were often underrepresented and marginalized (Bertilson, Springer, & Fierke, 1982). Hogben and Waterman (1997) added, "if [photographs in] textbooks portrayed 5% fewer male and 5% more female individuals, the observed frequencies and expected frequencies would have been virtually identical" (p. 99).

Similarly, Titus's (1993) analysis of foundations textbook content concluded that although some texts may discuss sex or gender differences, they nonetheless mask "questions of inequality and power relations" (p. 41), leaving

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

preservice teachers unable to interrogate the ways in which schools allocate privileges based upon sex and gender. More recently, Zittleman and Sadker (2002) analyzed 23 teacher education texts for gender issues in education. They analyzed the space allocated to gender topics, the accuracy and integration of gender coverage, the gender of authors and contributors, photographs and line drawings, and the use of nouns and pronouns. Comparing their findings to those of Sadker and Sadker (1980), they concluded the percentage of foundations of education textbooks devoted to gender issues had increased 6.3% in the intervening time. Their other findings included "content is often segregated into one section or chapter," "distinctions between White women and women of color are rare," "females dominate textbook photographs . . . [but] the preponderance of females in photographs contrasts sharply to their very limited narrative coverage," and "foundations texts reveal a general improvement in the listings of women and gender topics . . . [but] critical topics continue to be omitted" (Zittleman & Sadker, 2002, p. 170). Based upon these studies, we conclude that improvements have been made in the inclusion of people of color and women but that there is room for more improvement.

Content Analyses of Sexual Orientation

Five authors included sexual orientation in their content analyses of high school– and college-level textbooks. Although these five content analyses involved mostly non-teacher education textbooks, they nonetheless point out themes and patterns in the (very brief) historical treatment of LGBT topics, which alerted us to look for them in our own analysis, and so they are included here. Temple (2005) analyzed 20 high school textbooks, representing five subject areas (personal and social education, moral education, family economics, human biology, and Catholic moral and religious education) for content related to sexuality and relationships. She found that 95% of the 610 pages she coded "made no reference at all to same-sex sexuality" and that 133 pages "explicitly defined sexuality as heterosexuality, while only 33 pages (5.4 percent) mentioned same-sex sexuality in any way" (p. 280). Moreover, where same-sex sexuality was mentioned, it was "in negative contexts almost 80 percent of the time" (p. 281). Negative contexts included sexually transmitted diseases, sexual abuse, and prostitution (p. 285). She concluded, "The definitions in these texts dichotomize heterosexuality/homosexuality, setting the stage to see sexuality in terms of opposites of normal and abnormal" (p. 281).

Hogben and Waterman (1997) also looked for sexual orientation in their analysis of psychology texts. They concluded, "Coverage of homosexuality, gay men, lesbians, homophobia, and heterosexism is minimal" (p. 98). Regarding bisexuality, they reported the coverage "was so sparse that we were unable to conduct any meaningful analyses" (p. 96).

In a similar study, Simoni (1996) analyzed 24 psychology textbooks for gay and lesbian content. Simoni reported a "low quantity of material in the textbooks; most referred to lesbians and gay men or their concerns on fewer than three pages. Two textbooks did not mention the topic" (p. 222). Moreover, gay and lesbian content often was reported within the context of sexuality, sexual disorders, and dysfunction (p. 222). Some texts "relegated the discussion to a box" (p. 223). Another disturbing problem, wrote Simoni, "was the scant coverage of ethnic minority issues and homosexuality; only two of the twenty-four textbooks mentioned these topics" (p. 223). Overall, Simoni rated over half the textbooks she reviewed as *poor*, 4 as *fair*, and 7 as *good*. Simoni's definition of good textbooks, "mentioned lesbians and gay men in contexts such as parenting or relationships," not just a sexual context (p. 222). Simoni concluded that because of this exclusion, "instructors must rely on supplementary materials and activities" (p. 223). Otherwise, students may be left with the impression that "compared to heterosexuality, homosexuality is deviant, less important, and less natural" (p. 223).

In another study, Whatley (1992) examined photographs of gays and lesbians in 14 health and 16 human sexuality college-level texts. Recognizing that photographic images carry certain connotations and imply subconscious messages, regardless of the editor's intent, she contended, "the selection of photographs is not

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

a neutral process" (p. 199). For instance, she explained that because there are so few photographs of gays and lesbians, each one "may be taken as representative of gay men or lesbians as a group . . . and everyone not *labeled* as gay or lesbian is assumed to be heterosexual" (p. 199). Thus, photographs of underrepresented groups tend to carry more weight because the viewer is more likely to attach all their ideas of what it means to be gay or lesbian, for instance, to that one image of a gay or lesbian person.

Whatley (1992) scanned the texts and indexes for photographs of gay and lesbian people, taking note of setting, activity, age, and race. She looked for patterns of representation and identified several themes based on the context of the images. Seventy photos representing gays and lesbians were found in the sexuality texts and 15 in the health texts. Five health texts contained no photos of gays and lesbians. She found that "homosexuality was isolated as a topic, rather than integrated into more general discussions of sexuality" (p. 202), which sends a message in itself. For instance, the "chapter labeled as 'Sexual Preference' did not discuss heterosexuality, perhaps implying that it is a given" (p. 202), which is an example of heteronormativity. It should also be noted that sexual *preference* is an outdated term and sexual *orientation* is a more accurate descriptor.

Regarding gender, 62 gay men and 30 lesbians were pictured. In the health texts alone, there were images of 8 gay men and no lesbians, reflecting the sexism of the larger society. Regarding race, only 3 people of color were identified in the 100 individual photographs of gays and lesbians, rendering gays and lesbians of color nearly invisible. Likewise, of the gays and lesbians represented, they were "almost entirely young and physically-abled" (Whatley, 1992, p. 203). Whatley (1992) also concluded that gays and lesbians with children were underrepresented (only 3 photographs of lesbians and 3 of gay men with children). On a positive note, she wrote "only a few photographs were likely to reinforce popular negative stereotypes," such as gay life being associated with bars and bathhouses, "as opposed to doing dishes or walking the dog" (p. 204). She concluded, "This move away from sensationalism can be seen as a positive response to gay and lesbian political activism" (p. 204), and "gay men and lesbians are becoming visible in textbooks, but are still isolated and ghettoized" (p. 208).

Content Analysis of Sexual Orientation in a Teacher Education Text

Only one content analysis of LGBT issues in teacher education texts was found (Young & Middleton, 2002), and this study is the one that is most similar to ours. Young and Middleton reviewed 23 textbooks: 16 developmental psychology/adolescence texts and 7 foundations/multicultural texts. The authors assessed index listing, placement among other topics, pictures, and captions, and also compared previous editions to newer ones. They reported that all 16 developmental psychology/adolescence texts included LGBT issues to some extent, but only 2 of the 7 foundations/multicultural texts did. Furthermore,

> the adolescence texts discussed lgbt issues in chapters on adolescent sexuality . . . [and] in several cases . . . the discussion of lgbt issues was directly preceded or followed by a discussion of STDs, teen pregnancy, or sexual abuse. (p. 93)

The 2 foundations/multicultural texts "discussed them in sections on families and on homophobia's effect on education and schooling" (p. 93).

Young and Middleton (2002) cited the *problematization of LGBT issues* and *marginalizing LGBT identity* as two common themes in the presentation of LGBT people and perspectives. The problematization of LGBT issues referred to the placement of text relating LGBT people with problems such as suicide and drug abuse. For instance, five texts "listed AIDS in the index under 'Homosexuality'" (p. 94). Also, three of the texts "showed photos highlighting political activism, and in one case, an AIDS patient" (p. 97).

Marginalizing LGBT identity occurred when authors "continue[d] to hold gayness up against a heterosexual norm" (Young & Middleton, 2002, p. 95). Young and Middleton (2002) gave

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

the example, "gay partnerships are far more like heterosexual relationships than they are different," which appears benign at face value but has the effect of reinforcing heterosexual relationships as the norm by which to judge and compare all others. An example highlighting the marginalization of LGBT people of color was that the LGBT people "in the photos were predominantly white/Caucasian" (p. 97). Finally, the authors reported, "there was little mention of transgendered people in any of the texts" (p. 95). Because this study included only two foundations textbooks, we wanted to give a broader perspective by analyzing the most widely used foundations textbooks in teacher education programs in the United States and to provide future researchers with data that can be used as a basis for comparison to judge if and how the coverage of LGBT topics in foundations textbooks has changed over time.

Including Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues in Teacher Preparation Coursework

Many teachers are finding creative ways to incorporate LGBT topics into all levels and content areas of the pre–K-12 and college curricula and extracurricula (Mayo, 2004). Consequently, there is a growing body of literature exploring this inclusion (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; DeJean, 2004; Dykstra, 2005; Kissen, 2002; Letts & Sears, 1999; Macgillivray, in press-a, 2004, 2005b, 2007; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001; Sausa, 2005; Sherwin & Jennings, 2006). A frequent roadblock to inclusion, however, is that young "children are generally perceived to be asexual and 'too young' to understand or deal with sexuality" (Robinson, 2005, p. 230), a perception that stems, in part, from early theories of child development. Robinson (2005) reminds us, however, that "Heterosexual desire is part of everyday early childhood settings," from mock heterosexual weddings to children's kissing games to having girlfriends or boyfriends. The effect of these activities is to "normalize the construction of heterosexual desire and gendered performances in young children's lives" (p. 230). Thus, concludes Robinson, a goal of early childhood educators should be to help children disrupt notions of compulsory heterosexuality and other "gender/sexuality binaries" (p. 232) to bring visibility to power relations and oppression. For instance, explained Renold (2005), "Failure to conform to dominant gender traits can result in gendered (e.g., 'sissy boy' 'girl' 'tomboy') and homophobic ('queer,' 'poof') name-calling" (p. 238) among children, with negative consequences for their development into adults.

When it comes to secondary education, preservice teachers can weave LGBT issues into their content areas. Lipkin (2005) gave numerous examples, such as "gay content in English as a Second Language (ESL) materials"; explorations of same-sex "imagination, relationships, and desire" in theater, music, and dance; studying biographies of LGBT scientists in the hard sciences or discussing biological theories of sexual orientation and gender identity; constructing math word problems so as "not to assume a heterosexual context"; and "Physical education and sports curricula can address the homophobic insults that typically encourage solidarity and performance among males" and "can deal with girls' being lesbian-baited for their skill and dedication to sport" (p. 244).

Swartz (2005), a professor of children's literature, used children's books with LGBT themes, videos, class discussions, and writing to challenge preservice teachers' homophobia and heterosexist assumptions. Most of her students were "white Appalachians living in socioeconomically depressed rural areas and small towns" and few "have begun to think through the ways in which heterosexuality has been normalized in the culture" (p. 126). She helped her students to understand that "Not intervening in hate speech . . . gives tacit approval for such behavior and attitudes" (p. 128), just as the omission of LGBT people from textbooks carries the connotation that LGBT people and the issues affecting their lives are not important enough to warrant mentioning. Some of the prejudices and fears she encountered among her students were the beliefs that introduction of LGBT themes in the elementary school classroom would lead to name calling, that sexual orientation differences are not already a part of students' consciousnesses so

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

"Why bring them up?," that young children are unable to discuss differences in sexual orientation, and that being gay is immoral and should not be discussed in school. Swartz helped her students to understand that even though they personally may hold antigay sentiments, they should not "deny the importance of just treatment for *all* students in the classroom" (p. 135) and should help their own students "understand the humanity of all people" (p. 140). Finally, Swartz wrote of the importance of LGBT teachers to come out of the closet and for heterosexual teachers to speak out against homophobia and heterosexism and to serve as role models for heterosexual preservice teachers and administrators.

Athanases and Larrabee (2003) investigated how nearly 100 teacher preparation students responded to instruction regarding gay issues in school and modes of instruction in teacher preparation coursework that promoted an advocacy stance toward gay and lesbian students. They reported that three fourths of their students put positive value on learning about gay and lesbian people, a topic on which most of them had no prior knowledge. Many of the students had neither been given the opportunity to hear gay and lesbian people speak openly about themselves nor had been given the opportunity to discuss gay and lesbian issues with others. Information the students found especially meaningful included terminology, symbols, and historical perspectives on queer culture. As a result, almost 62% of the students reported ways they thought they would become advocates for gay and lesbian students.

Despite the willingness of many preservice teachers to learn about LGBT issues in education, research indicates that LGBT topics are still excluded or given only scant attention in many teacher preparation programs. Research from across the United States indicates that 44.4% of elementary and 40% of secondary teacher preparation programs fail to include sexual orientation topics within program curriculum endorsed by faculty (Jennings & Sherwin, 2007; Sherwin & Jennings, 2006). Although additional discussions of LGBT topics may occur outside official program curricula, the absence of LGBT topics within so many programs' official curriculum indicates significant gaps in the diversity goals of many programs.

METHOD

Research Questions

The overarching question guiding this research is How are LGBT topics treated in foundations of education textbooks? Based on the findings of the content analyses reviewed here, we were interested in answering the following more pointed questions:

(a) Which foundations of education textbooks include LGBT topics?
(b) What percentage of the text is devoted to LGBT content?
(c) What LGBT themes are included?
(d) How are LGBT people portrayed?
(e) Where, in relation to other topics, are LGBT topics placed within the text?
(f) How do the texts treat discussions of sexual orientation?
(g) How do the texts treat discussions of gender identity?
(h) Which LGBT topics are excluded from the texts?

Textbook Selection

The purpose of the project was to investigate comprehensive textbooks used in foundations of education courses. This excluded anthologies or reading collections. Because the textbook market is highly competitive, publishers do not provide hard statistics on book sales and adoption rates. Therefore, it proved impossible to select books based on sales data to determine book popularity. In addition, the number of foundations texts currently in print is fairly limited, and the researchers felt confident that a sample of textbooks could be collected that represented the majority of textbooks currently available. Toward this effort, we followed the leads of previous research by Zittleman and Sadker (2002), who conducted interviews with editors, sales representatives, and instructors. Also, like Titus (1993) and Sadker and Sadker (1980), we asked publishers to forward copies of their most frequently adopted textbooks. Beyond these two strategies, we conducted a search for foundations texts within a popular

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

online bookseller's catalogue and also searched foundations course syllabi on an Internet clearinghouse for foundations of education professors. We worked to gather all major texts currently in print and that are used in foundations courses based upon one or more of the following: (a) our familiarity with the book, (b) title and author recognition, (c) discussions with other professors who teach foundations courses, (d) a survey of other professors' foundations syllabi to determine what texts, if any, they use, (e) anecdotal evidence from authors and publishers as to which texts are most popular and available, and (f) the inclusion of the texts in online booksellers' catalogs. In the end, we reviewed eight foundations texts that to the best of our knowledge are the most widely used foundations texts currently in print as of January 2007 (see the appendix). No other criteria were used to limit the collection of texts. It should be noted that to preserve the validity and integrity of this research, one of the most widely used foundations texts (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2008) was excluded from our analysis because one of the authors of this article (Macgillivray) was an ancillary author for that textbook.

Validity and Reliability

We enhanced internal validity, along with construct validity, by each of us first analyzing the texts independently and then working together in a constant comparative process to construct and clarify the definition of each category as themes emerged. This was an organic process and thus precluded any measure of intercoder agreement. Consistent with the constant comparison method, we sought to reach consensus on categories that accurately reflected our collaborative analyses of the text. Our contention was that consensus would generate more accurate categories than independent analyses that are then computed for degree of overlap. We believe this collaborative methodology enabled us to arrive at categories that were more fully descriptive than those we initially developed independently. Thus, our categories were triangulated against the data and each of our own interpretations of the data, as well as being built upon the categories developed in the previous research highlighted in the literature review. These measures, along with providing the details of our sampling techniques and calculations, also enhance reliability.

Content Analysis

The eight texts were reviewed for subject index entries including *gay*, *lesbian*, *bisexual*, *queer*, *gender identity*, *sexual diversity*, *sexual identity*, *homosexual*, *sexual orientation*, *sexual preference*, and *transgender*. Essentially, we scanned the indexes and tables of contents and included any word or phrase that we thought might have something to do with LGBT topics. Following identification of entries in the indexes, the texts were also analyzed page by page, line by line, for any inclusion of LGBT topics that may not have been cited in the indexes and table of contents. Once illustrations and sections of text were identified, they were coded and grouped into related patterns, which were then grouped into related descriptive categories using theme analysis (Spradley, 1980) and constant comparison (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). The goal was to develop descriptive thematic categories that represented the treatment of LGBT content within the texts. The placement of the LGBT sections of text in relation to other topics was also recorded.

Both of us first performed independent analyses of the texts to generate categories that described the data. Following independent category development, we then compared the emerging categories for commonalities and differences. This constant comparative process involved clarifying the definition of each category, condensing or expanding the categories until we were able to construct categories that were triangulated against the data and each of our own interpretations of the data as well as categories developed in previous research. The following categories and descriptions emerged from this process:

1. Discrimination and harassment against LGBT people: Descriptions of discrimination and harassment of LGBT people.
2. LGBT identities and experiences: Descriptions of LGBT people that include references to LGBT culture,

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

LGBT youth behavior, developmental issues, social identities (such as victims or activists), and how LGBT people experience life.
3. LGBT parents/guardians and families: Descriptions and demographics of LGBT parents/guardians and family structures.
4. LGBT history: Descriptions of the roles LGBT people have played in history, including the history of education.
5. Strategies, resources, and curricula to increase safety and support: Descriptions of what teachers can do to increase safety and support of LGBT students and their allies, where educators can go for more information, how to include LGBT issues in the curriculum, and examinations of how LGBT issues are currently included or excluded from the curriculum.
6. Legal issues and professional responsibilities: Descriptions of laws, policies, and court cases that establish the legal rights of LGBT people, the professional obligations of teachers regarding LGBT people and topics, and the stance of professional teacher organizations regarding LGBT people and issues.
7. Personal beliefs and opposition: Beliefs of educators and others regarding LGBT issues in the schools, political and cultural battles, and opposition to the inclusion of LGBT content in schools.
8. Conceptual terms and frameworks: Description of vocabulary and conceptual frameworks such as homophobia, heterosexism, and heteronormativity that equip future educators with the language and concepts to critically interpret and analyze power relations and educational contexts surrounding LGBT people and issues.

FINDINGS

Amount of Coverage

Our first two research questions were Which foundations of education textbooks included LGBT topics? and What percentage of the text is devoted to LGBT content? All eight textbooks contained some LGBT content. To calculate the percentage of each textbook devoted to LGBT content, we estimated the total number of lines in the textbook by multiplying the number of lines of narrative on one representative page by the number of pages in the textbook. We excluded pages that were dedicated to prefaces, appendixes, glossaries, reference lists, and indexes because they do not contain any material that is not covered elsewhere in the book. Next, we counted the number of narrative lines that included discussion of or reference to LGBT people or issues. It is important to note that we counted actual lines of text and not just complete sentences. This enhanced internal validity between us and enabled us to more accurately quantify the percentage of LGBT content, because the length of particular sentences is highly variable. For example, if a single sentence included LGBT content, we counted the number of lines on the page in which that sentence resided and rounded up partial lines. In cases where a section of text was formatted into two columns, we counted a column line as one half of a page line. To arrive at the percentage of LGBT content per text, we divided the number of LGBT content lines by the total number of narrative lines in the textbook, as shown in Table 1. We acknowledge that at this time there is no basis for comparison to make much sense of the percentages of text dedicated to LGBT content reported in the tables (other than comparing them to percentages of text dedicated to race or gender issues, for instance). We include them here, however, in the hope that future researchers will find them useful in comparing if and how the percentages and treatment of LGBT content have changed.

Separate from our analysis of narrative content, we also analyzed each text for any illustrations reflecting LGBT content. After a page-by-page search of each textbook, we found only two of the eight textbooks contained illustrations of LGBT content. Diaz, Pelletier, and Provenzo (2006) included a map of the United States showing which states have safe schools laws that include sexual orientation and gender identity (p. 252) and a photograph of a school's gay–straight alliance marching in a parade (p. 251). Under their discussion of privacy issues in teachers' lives, Sadker and Zittleman (2007) included a photograph of a gay male couple getting married (p. 264). To calculate the percentage of LGBT illustration content, we used the same strategy used in calculating narrative content, only instead of counting actual lines of narrative text we calculated the number of narrative lines displaced by the illustration, as shown in Table 2. Calculating line displacement kept our analysis of illustrations consistent with our analysis of narrative text. Again, there is no basis for comparison to draw conclusions about these percentages at this

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

TABLE 1 Estimated Percentage of Textbook Dedicated to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered (LGBT) Narrative Content

Textbook	*Estimated Total No. of Lines in Book*	*No. of Lines in Book With LGBT Content*	*Estimated % of Textbook Dedicated to LGBT Written Content*
Webb, Metha, & Forbis Jordan (2007). *Foundations of American Education* (5th ed.)	23,856	168	0.70
Sadker & Zittleman (2007). *Teachers, Schools & Society: A Brief Introduction to Education* (1st ed.)	23,650	148	0.63
Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman (2008). *Teachers, Schools & Society* (8th ed.)	25,584	155	0.61
Ryan & Cooper (2007). *Those Who Can, Teach* (11th ed.)	23,667	105	0.44
Diaz, Marra Pelletier, & Provenzo (2006). *Touch the Future . . . Teach!*	25,245	79	0.31
Breitborde & Swiniarski (2006). *Teaching on Principle and Promise*	26,803	48	0.18
Sadovnik, Cookson, & Semel (2006). *Exploring Education* (3rd ed.)	24,576	23	0.09
Pugach (2006). *Because Teaching Matters*	20,750	17	0.08
Ornstein & Levine (2006). *Foundations of Education*	20,560	17	0.08

NOTE: Though Sadker et al. (2008) was not included in the qualitative part of our content analysis, we include the percentage of text here for the sake of comparison and future related research.

TABLE 2 Estimated Percentage of Textbook Dedicated to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered (LGBT) Illustrations

Textbook	*Estimated Total No. of Lines in Book*	*No. of Lines in Book Displaced by LGBT Illustrations*	*Estimated % of Textbook Dedicated to LGBT Illustrations*
Diaz, Marra Pelletier, & Provenzo (2006). *Touch the Future . . . Teach!*	25,245	64	0.25
Sadker & Zittleman (2007). *Teachers, Schools & Society: A Brief Introduction to Education* (1st ed.)	23,650	27	0.11
Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman (2008). *Teachers, Schools & Society* (8th ed.)	25,584	18	0.07

NOTE: Though Sadker et al. (2008) was not included in the qualitative part of our content analysis, we include the percentage of text here for the sake of comparison and future related research.

time, but we hope they will be useful in the future. Another possibility for future content analyses would be to compare the total number of illustrations in the textbook to those that contain LGBT content, which we did not do.

Thematic Categories

Our third research question was What LGBT themes are included? As described under our methodology, eight thematic categories emerged from our analysis. We summarize each category's treatment:

Theme 1: Discrimination and Harassment Against LGBT People

All eight textbooks contained references to discrimination and harassment of LGBT students. Diaz et al. (2006), Sadker and Zittleman (2007), and Webb, Metha, and Forbis Jordan (2007) focused on and gave statistics of the harassment and abuse experienced by LGBT students at the hands of their peers. Pugach (2006) and Ornstein and Levine (2006) also included gays and lesbians in discussions of harassment in schools. Breitborde and Swiniarski (2006) pointed out that teachers frequently do nothing to stop antigay harassment and sometimes are the source of homophobic comments.

Theme 2: LGBT Identities and Experiences

The portrayal of LGBT people tended to focus on them as hapless victims. Five of the eight texts focus on risk factors associated with being LGBT. Ryan and Cooper (2007), Sadker and Zittleman (2007), and Webb et al. (2007)

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

embedded their treatment of LGBT students alongside topics such as drug and alcohol abuse, HIV/AIDS, violence, depression, and suicide. Ryan and Cooper used words such as *outcasts*, *frightened*, and *high risk* to describe LGBT youth, and Diaz et al. (2006) gave statistics on LGBT youth who experience severe isolation and attempt suicide. There was one exception. Breitborde and Swiniarski (2006) described the hostile climate of schools without focusing on a self-destructive victim narrative.

Theme 3: LGBT Parents/Guardians and Families

Five texts, Ryan and Cooper (2007), Diaz et al. (2006), Webb et al. (2007), Sadker and Zittleman (2007), and Pugach (2006), mentioned LGBT parents and families. There were no photos of LGBT families with children.

Theme 4: LGBT History

Four texts acknowledged the existence of gay and lesbian people in educational history. Sadker and Zittleman (2007) described early 20th-century stereotypes of single female teachers as lesbians and single male teachers as gay. Ornstein and Levine (2006), Ryan and Cooper (2007), and Webb et al. (2007) included sexual orientation among the factors that historically left teachers victims of dismissal for "immoral behavior."

Theme 5: Strategies, Resources, and Curricula to Increase Safety and Support

Six texts discussed creating a safe and supportive learning environment for LGBT students. Pugach (2006) and Sadker and Zittleman (2007) contended that schools should curtail harassment but did not provide any strategies for how to accomplish that. Ryan and Cooper (2007) and Webb et al. (2007) provided strategies to help educators make their schools safer. Webb et al. also pointed the reader to online resources. Diaz et al. (2006) pointed to the formation of gay–straight alliance (GSA) student clubs as a way to increase school safety and support for LGBT students and their allies.

Pugach (2006) included four LGBT-themed books for curricular purposes, and Webb et al. (2007) called for the inclusion of sexual identity in health education and gay and lesbian writers in English classes. Breitborde and Swiniarski (2006) pointed out that curricular exclusion sends the message that LGBT people are not important and antigay harassment is okay. Sadovnik, Cookson, and Semel (2006) discussed controversies over LGBT curricular content.

Theme 6: Legal Issues and Professional Responsibilities

Six of the texts discussed the legal rights and responsibilities of teachers as related to LGBT issues. Ryan and Cooper (2007) and Sadker and Zittleman (2007) drew on court decisions and state laws involving privacy and employee rights of LGBT teachers. Webb et al. (2007) cited the 1996 U.S. Supreme Court case *Nabozny v. Podlesny* to make the point that educators can be sued for large sums of money for failing to stop antigay abuse. Webb et al. and Sadker and Zittleman highlighted protections afforded LGBT youth under Title IX. Diaz et al. (2006) provided a color illustration of a U.S. map depicting which states have laws prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Webb et al. explained students' legal right to form a GSA under the 1984 Federal Equal Access Act. And Breitborde and Swiniarski (2006), Ryan and Cooper, and Webb et al. quoted the 1975 National Education Association's *Code of Ethics for the Education Profession*, which included prohibitions against discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Theme 7: Personal Beliefs and Opposition

Six texts addressed personal beliefs and political and cultural opposition to educational equity for LGBT students. Breitborde and Swiniarski (2006) and Ryan and Cooper (2007) explained the opposition's belief that in promoting tolerance of LGBT people, schools also condone and promote homosexuality among students. Sadker and Zittleman (2007) and Sadovnik et al. (2006) mentioned censorship in reaction to parental opposition. Diaz et al. (2006) and Ryan and Cooper asked preservice teachers to examine their personal beliefs and attitudes that may prevent them from carrying out their legal, ethical, and professional responsibilities to educate LGBT students.

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

Theme 8: Conceptual Terms and Frameworks

The introduction of vocabulary and conceptual terms related to LGBT issues was limited. In many cases, terms were either left undefined or defined only minimally. Webb et al. (2007) defines only sexual orientation. Sadker and Zittleman (2007) defined sexual orientation and homophobia. None of the texts defined gender identity, transgender, or heteronormativity. Likewise, none expressly addressed issues of domination, subordination, and power relations.

Portrayal of LGBT People

Our fourth research question was How are LGBT people portrayed? By and large, the texts portrayed LGBT students as victims of harassment, bullying, depression, self-destructive behavior, and societal discrimination. Consistent with the larger body of literature on LGBT students, several of these texts focused on statistics of antigay peer abuse (Diaz et al., 2006; Sadker & Zittleman, 2007; Webb et al., 2007). The texts frequently used words such as *victims*, *outcasts*, *isolated*, *frightened*, and *high risk* to describe LGBT students. LGBT students were written about as needing "safety and support," but only three texts described strategies upon which educators can draw to enhance school safety (Diaz et al., 2006; Ryan & Cooper, 2007; Webb et al., 2007).

Placement of LGBT Topics

Our fifth research question was Where, in relation to other topics, are LGBT topics placed within the text? Three of the texts (Ryan & Cooper, 2007; Sadker & Zittleman, 2007; Webb et al., 2007) placed their sections on LGBT topics within or adjacent to content dedicated to "students at risk," which included such issues as drug abuse, HIV/AIDS, violence, depression, and suicide.

Treatment of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Our sixth research question was How do the texts treat discussions of sexual orientation? One of the most interesting items we noticed is that the texts frequently used the term *sexual orientation* but did not define it. Our seventh research question was How do the texts treat discussions of gender identity? As mentioned above, none of the texts defined gender identity. Transgender individuals were mentioned in the heading of a paragraph in Sadker and Zittleman (2007, p. 102) and in a section on sexual orientation in Diaz et al. (2006, p. 250), but the sections contained no explanation or further mention of what it means to be transgendered. Webb et al. (2007) was the most inclusive of transgender individuals despite their making no attempt at a definition; there were entries in the index for transgender students (pp. 265-267, 327) and transgender teachers (p. 306).

Exclusion of LGBT Topics

Our eighth and final research question was Which LGBT topics are excluded from the texts? Only Diaz et al. (2006) and Webb et al. (2007) mentioned GSAs, a contemporary phenomenon happening in more than 3,000 middle and high schools across the United States and other countries (Macgillivray, 2005a, 2007; Miceli, 2005). Bisexual individuals were mentioned in only two textbooks (Sadker & Zittleman, 2007, Webb et al. 2007). None of the texts defined or discussed what it means to be bisexual or offered perspectives shared by many bisexual individuals. There were no discussions of the intersections of LGBT identities with race, ethnicity, ability, or socioeconomic class, with the exception of listing them all as potential forms of diversity associated with student risk factors.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Below, we discuss the potential unintended consequences of the ways in which LGBT topics are included in textbooks, as well as the implications of excluding LGBT people and perspectives altogether. Finally, we give an example of how these potential problems can be remedied.

The Portrayal of LGBT People

Focusing on students-as-victims to build support for safety and inclusion of LGBT students is a common tactic but can backfire by

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

reinforcing negative stereotypes. Calling upon "familiar and identifiable narratives," in this case "the victim narrative," has the effect of essentializing and pathologizing LGBT identities (Talburt, 2005; Rasmussen, 2005a, 2005b; Rofes, 2005a, 2005b), rendering them as hapless victims with no self-determination or agency (Blackburn, 2005). Undoubtedly, it would be irresponsible to dismiss the presence and ravaging effects of discrimination against LGBT people, particularly upon youth. However, focusing only upon this acute situation risks the negative portrayal of LGBT people in the name of advocacy. Without minimizing the detrimental effects of antigay harassment and bullying that too many LGBT students face daily, textbooks could balance their discussions with narratives that affirm LGBT people and identities and present examples of LGBT students, teachers, and parents who are empowered, happy, and well adjusted, or who are simply engaged in activities of daily life such as doing homework, dating, or caring for children.

Despite discrimination, there are many examples of school contexts that affirm LGBT youth and depict youth who are engaged in acts that attest to their pride and healthy development despite discrimination they may face (Savin-Williams, 2005). Stories of success and progress, although not suggesting all is well, may empower new teachers to believe they can take actions to affirm and empower LGBT youth and that having LGBT parents is not a source of shame or embarrassment.

Also, as predicted by earlier research, the discussion of LGBT youth was noticeably focused on high school students, with little attention given to LGBT diversity in elementary schools. Given the research detailing many elementary teachers' homophobic beliefs (Casper, Cuffaro, Schultz, Silin, & Wickens, 1996; Swartz, 2005), the fact that elementary school is the period when many students first sense their sexual orientation (Savin-Williams, 2005), and the nature of LGBT discrimination within elementary school contexts (Bickmore, 1999; Cahill & Theilheimer, 1999; Renold, 2000), we recommend including LGBT issues in discussions of early childhood and elementary education. Aside from what some authors have done already to include LGBT parents, guardians, and families, this would be a useful place to discuss elements of homophobia, heterosexism, and heteronormativity as they present themselves within the hidden curriculum and girls' and boys' socialization beginning in elementary education.

Last, the fact that one of the photographs (presumably of LGBT people) contained people of color was evidence of progress in recognizing peoples' multiple identities. In subsequent editions, we hope to see others included, such as LGBT families with children and differently-abled LGBT people, so that the mostly White and able-bodied individuals usually depicted in photographs are not taken to be representative of all LGBT people (Whatley, 1992). The photograph of two men getting married in a traditional wedding ceremony is also evidence of progress, but we wonder, as do Young and Middleton (2002), about the marginalizing effect in the viewer's mind of reinforcing heterosexual relationships as the norm by which to judge and compare all others. Perhaps a photograph such as this could be balanced with another photograph of an LGBT family not based on a heterosexual model and some narrative that explains how they came to choose one another and form a family.

Pathologizing LGBT Identities

The placement of LGBT topics within or adjacent to content dealing with drug abuse, HIV/AIDS, depression, and suicide can be considered a case of unintentional "stigmatization through association." Young and Middleton (2002) referred to this practice as the problematization of LGBT issues and marginalizing LGBT identity, which they identified as two common themes in the presentation of LGBT people and perspectives. Talburt (2005), Rasmussen (2005a, 2005b), and Rofes (2005a, 2005b) also write of how this practice has the unintended effect of pathologizing LGBT identities and essentializes LGBT students as victims without any self-determination.

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

Including Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Textbooks

Not defining the terms sexual orientation and gender identity is problematic for several reasons, one being that the reader may surmise they only matter to LGBT people. It neither points out the fact that everybody has a sexual orientation and gender identity nor calls into question heterosexual assumptions about what is normal. Moreover, treating sexual orientation as a diversity issue only, assumes that heterosexuals are not affected or constrained by their own sexual orientation. Thus, issues of social power and hegemony go unquestioned (MacIntosh, 2007).

In addition, the inclusion of sexual orientation differences may have negative consequences if not thought through carefully. We have already discussed the negative impression left by the many tales of antigay abuse (victim narratives) and the placement of LGBT issues adjacent to issues of disease and mental health. Similarly, Webb et al. (2007), in its discussion of legal issues, employment, and teacher rights, cited one teacher's membership in The North American Man–Boy Love Association as an example where freedom of association was overturned and resulted in a teacher's dismissal. The negative association unintentionally suggests that pedophilia is somehow associated with LGBT people.

Exclusion

Overall, the texts fail to describe the contributions of LGBT people in educational history, including the relationship of the LGBT movement to the modern multicultural education movement. Although the texts described the historic presence of heterosexist or heteronormative gender roles, they did not introduce or define the terms and concepts. Furthermore, although much was made of the exclusion of racial minorities and women in the curriculum, the same was not true for LGBT people or movements. It would be helpful for textbooks to include LGBT people and the LGBT rights movement within their discussions of educational history (Blount, 2003, 2005; Hickson, 1995; Lugg, 2003a, 2003b; Myers, 2005) along with discussions of heteronormativity, heterosexual privilege, and power.

There was also a lack of discussion acknowledging LGBT people as having multiple identities, highlighting intersections of LGBT with race, class, and ability, for instance. This, coupled with the absence of photographs of LGBT people of color (except for the one photo in Diaz et al. 2006, which clearly contained people of color) and different abilities, reinforces ethnocentric, classed, childless, and able-bodied conceptions of LGBT people in readers' minds. Textbooks could include photos, discussions, and resources that depict LGBT people in all of our forms. We must acknowledge, however, that we, too, are omitting topics that could be included in LGBT content in foundations of education texts, for example, postmodern critiques of queer identity, queer theory, and racism and sexism in LGBT communities. Any list contains omissions.

Another form of exclusion was the almost complete absence of conceptual terms and frameworks that might assist new teachers in developing a critical lens through which to view and think about LGBT topics in education. For the most part, the texts made the assumption that students had adequate understanding of terms such as *sexual orientation*, *homosexuality*, *heterosexuality*, *bisexuality*, *gay*, *lesbian*, and *transgender.* Of equal concern was the failure of the texts to introduce conceptual terms that could assist students in interpreting the nature of schooling around sexual diversity issues and power relations in society. For example, discussions of heterosexism and heteronormativity could provide analytic tools for new teachers to understand and interpret schools, their own experiences, and their future behaviors from a critical perspective.

The final pattern of exclusion we detected was a relationship between percentage of text devoted to LGBT topics and whether it got listed in the text's table of contents. That is, the texts with the highest percentage of LGBT content listed something akin to "sexual orientation" or "gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and questioning youth" in its table of contents (Breitborde & Swiniarski, 2006; Diaz et al.,

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

2006; Ryan & Cooper; 2007; Sadker & Zittleman, 2007; Webb et al., 2007). Not every instance of inclusion of LGBT topics was listed in the tables of contents or indexes in these texts, however, which necessitated a line-by-line search of each text. Although it is beneficial to integrate LGBT topics into other topics, mentioning LGBT-related court cases in a larger section on school law, for instance, we also contend it is important to list LGBT topics in a text's table of contents and index to make a statement that the authors value that information enough to make it visible and to help readers locate the information with greater ease. It is not possible to know if or why a conscious decision was made to list LGBT content (or not) in a text's table of contents, paragraph headers, chapter titles, or index, or if it means anything. Our suspicion is that there may be instances where LGBT topics are not given stand-alone treatment so as not to arouse the passions of antigay readers, reviewers, and potential buyers and adapters of the book. For the sake of visibility, it might be better for each text to have a separate section that deals exclusively with LGBT topics. But there is also a danger in isolating the LGBT content, which in effect can marginalize the portrayal of LGBT people and perspectives. Perhaps textbook authors could consider striving for both stand-alone treatment (with clear entries in the table of contents, index, and with appropriate headers) to afford depth and visibility, with the integration of LGBT people and perspectives within other issues, such as including LGBT teacher rights in sections on law.

Toward LGBT Inclusion: An Example

As noted earlier, one of the most widely used foundations textbooks (Sadker et al., 2008) was excluded from our analysis because Macgillivray was an ancillary author for that text. As a professor who uses foundations texts, Macgillivray approached David Sadker and Karen Zittleman offering a critique of their treatment of LGBT topics. At that point, Sadker and Zittleman contracted Macgillivray to write the sections on LGBT students for the new eighth edition of the textbook. Macgillivray attempted to correct many of the potential problems this content analysis highlights in other textbooks, problems that were also apparent in the seventh edition (Sadker & Sadker, 2005) of the text. Whereas most other foundations texts portrayed LGBT students as hapless victims, Macgillivray attempted to depict LGBT youth in a positive light while still acknowledging the discrimination against LGBT students. Macgillivray also attempted to overcome the problematization of LGBT issues (Young & Middleton, 2002) and essentialization of LGBT identities (Talburt, 2005; Rasmussen, 2005a, 2005b; Rofes, 2005a, 2005b) by depicting LGBT students as having multiple and complex identities. For instance, the text now contains a picture and a profile of a gay boy who is Latino, a good son, a caring brother, and also proves himself to be a student leader despite hardships in his life (such as the divorce of his parents and rejection by his father). Moreover, the LGBT-themed content was split between several chapters and was disassociated from bullying, youth suicide, or other youth risk factors.

Macgillivray also ensured the inclusion of important conceptual terms and frameworks. For instance, the concept of gender identity was defined and appropriately associated with transgenderism, as well as being situated within a brief discussion of assumptions about everyone being either male or female. The section also describes how heterosexuality is currently embedded in the curriculum and includes a definition of heteronormativity, as well as a brief discussion on heteronormative assumptions about school curriculum, practices, and policies. Finally, it offers preservice teachers who may have antigay beliefs a way around their potential objections to this topic. The text explains that they do not have to agree "it's okay to be gay," but they should agree upon and teach their future students democratic ideals such as "it's not okay to discriminate against those who are gay."

CONCLUSION

We were happy to see LGBT topics included in all of the texts we analyzed. Nonetheless, there was great disparity in the range of topics

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

and the depth of coverage. We would like to see more uniform coverage, greater attention given to the portrayal of LGBT people in narrative and photographs, and greater care exercised in the placement of LGBT topics within the texts. In the 5 years that have lapsed between Young and Middleton's (2002) content analysis and our own (and considering the limited scope of their study), it is impossible to determine whether any progress has been made. We hope that such an analysis will be possible in another 5 years. Furthermore, we believe that our findings hold broad relevance for other issues of identity and representation in textbooks. This work is a reminder of how texts can become the de facto curriculum and that we, as educators, must remain mindful and critically analyze the material we present to preservice teachers for any unintentional and subconscious messages.

APPENDIX
Textbooks Included in This Research

Breitborde, M. L., & Swiniarski, L. B. (2006). *Teaching on principle and promise: The foundation of education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Diaz, C. F., Marra Pelletier, C., & Provenzo, E. F., Jr. (2006). *Touch the future . . . teach!* Boston: Pearson.

Ornstein, A. C., & Levine, D. U. (2006). *Foundations of education* (9th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Pugach, M. C. (2006). *Because teaching matters.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Ryan, K., & Cooper, J. M. (2007). *Those who can, teach* (11th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sadker, D. M., & Zittleman, K. (2007). *Teachers, schools, and society: A brief introduction to education* (1st ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Sadovnik, A. R., Cookson, P. W., Jr., & Semel, S. F. (2006). *Exploring education: An introduction to the foundations of education* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Webb, L. D., Metha, A., & Forbis Jordan, K. (2007). *Foundations of American education* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

REFERENCES

Athanases, S., & Larrabee, T. (2003). Toward a consistent stance in teaching for equity: Learning to advocate for lesbian and gay identified youth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *19*(2), 237-261.

Bart, M. (1998, March). Creating a safer school for gay students. *Counseling Today*, *26*, 36-39.

Bertilson, H. S., Springer, D. K., & Fierke, K. M. (1982). Underrepresentation of female referents as pronouns, examples, and pictures in introductory college textbooks. *Psychological Reports*, *51*, 923-931.

Bickmore, K. (1999). Why discuss sexuality in elementary schools? In W. Letts & J. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education* (pp. 15-25). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Blackburn, M. V. (2005). Agency in borderland discourses: Engaging in gaybonics for pleasure, subversion, and retaliation. In M. L. Rasmussen, E. Rofes, & S. Talburt (Eds.), *Youth and sexualities: Pleasure, subversion, and insubordination in and out of schools* (pp. 177-200). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Blackburn, M. V., & Donelson, R. (Eds.). (2004). Sexual identities and schooling [Special issue]. *Theory into Practice*, *43*(2).

Blount, J. (2003). Homosexuality and school superintendents: A brief history. *Journal of School Leadership*, *13*, 7-26.

Blount, J. (2005). *Fit to teach: Same-sex desire, gender, and school work in the twentieth century*. New York: SUNY Press.

Breitborde, M. L., & Swiniarski, L. B. (2006). *Teaching on principle and promise: The foundation of education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Brown, A., Goodwin, B. J., Hall, B. A., & Jackson-Lowman, H. (1985). A review of psychology of women textbooks: Focus on the Afro-American woman. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *9*(1), 29-38.

Cahill, B., & Theilheimer, R. (1999). Stonewall in the housekeeping area: Gay and lesbian issues in the early childhood classroom. In W. Letts & J. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education* (pp.38-48). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Casper, V., Cuffaro, H. K., Schultz, S., Silin, J., & Wickens, E. (1996). Toward a most thorough understanding of the world: Sexual orientation and early childhood education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *66*(2), 271-293.

Casper, V., & Schultz, S. (1999). *Gay parents/straight schools: Building communication and trust.* New York: Teachers College Press.

DeJean, W. (2004). *Examining the lived experiences of out gay and lesbian k-12 educators.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Diaz, C. F., Marra Pelletier, C., & Provenzo, E. F., Jr. (2006). *Touch the future . . . teach!* Boston: Pearson.

Dykstra, L. A. (2005). Trans-friendly preschool. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *3*(1), 7-14.

Finnessy, P. (2007, January). *Queer aporias: Straight teachers and a sexual minority curriculum*. Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on Teacher Education and Social Justice, Chicago.

Friend, R. (1993). Choices, not closets: Heterosexism and homophobia in schools. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools* (pp. 209-235). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gay, J. (1988). The incidence of photographs of racial minorities in introductory psychology texts. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *15*(1), 77-79.

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

Hickson, A. (1995). *The poisoned bowl: Sex, repression and the public school system*. London: Constable.

Hill, D., & Willoughby, B. (2005). The development and validation of the genderism and transphobia scale. *Sex Roles*, *53*(7/8), 531-544.

Hogben, M., & Waterman, C. K. (1997). Are all of your students represented in their textbooks? A content analysis of coverage of diversity issues in introductory psychology textbooks. *Teaching of Psychology*, *24*(2), 95-100.

Human Rights Watch. (2001). *Hatred in the hallways: Violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered students in U.S. schools*. New York: Author.

Jennings, T., & Sherwin, G. (2007, April). *Sexual orientation curriculum in elementary teacher preparation: Programs, content and priorities from across the United States*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Kissen, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kosciw, J. G., & Diaz, E. M. (2006). *The 2005 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York: Gay Lesbian Straight Education Network.

Kozik-Rosabal, G., & Macgillivray, I. K. (Eds.). (2000, May). Sexual orientation and gender identity in America's urban schools [Special issue]. *Education and Urban Society*, *32*(3).

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Analyzing and interpreting ethnographic data.* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Letts, W. (2002). Revisioning multiculturalism in teacher education: Isn't it queer? In R. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 119-132). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Letts, W., & Sears, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lipkin, A. (2005). Secondary curriculum. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Youth, education, and sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (pp. 241-245). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Lombardi, E. L., Wilchins, R., Priesing, D., & Malouf, D. (2001). Gender violence: Transgender experiences with violence and discrimination. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *42*, 89–101.

Lugg, C. (2003a). Our straitlaced administrators: The law, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered educational administrators, and the assimilationist imperative. *Journal of School Leadership*, *13*, 51-85.

Lugg, C. (2003b). Sissies, faggots, lezzies, and dykes: Gender, sexual orientation, and the new politics of education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(1), 96-134.

Macgillivray, I. K. (2000). Educational equity for gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered and queer/questioning students: The demands of democracy and social justice for America's schools. *Education and Urban Society*, *32*(3), 303-323.

Macgillivray, I. K. (2004). *Sexual orientation and school policy: A practical guide for teachers, administrators, and community activists*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Macgillivray, I. K. (2005a). Shaping democratic identities and building citizenship skills through student activism: Mexico's first gay-straight alliance. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *38*(4), 320-330.

Macgillivray, I. K. (2005b). Using cartoons to teach students about stereotypes and discrimination: One teacher's lessons from South Park. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *2*(1), 133-147.

Macgillivray, I. K. (2007). *Gay-straight alliances: A handbook for students, educators, and parents*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.

Macgillivray, I. K. (in press-a). My former students' reflections on having an openly gay teacher in high school. *The Journal of LGBT Youth: The Interdisciplinary Quarterly of Practice, Research, Policy, and Theory*.

Macgillivray, I. K. (in press-b). Rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered students and teachers. In E. F. Provenzo, Jr. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social and cultural foundations of education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MacIntosh, L. (2007). Does anyone have a band-aid? Anti-homophobia discourses and pedagogical impossibilities. *Educational Studies*, *41*(1), 33-43.

Maney, D., & Cain, R. (1997). Preservice teachers' attitudes toward gay and lesbian parenting. *Journal of School Health*, *67*(6), 236-241.

Mayo, C. (2004). Queering school communities: Ethical curiosity and gay-straight alliances. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*, *1*(3), 23-35.

McCready, L. T. (2004). Some challenges facing queer youth programs in urban high schools: Racial segregation and denormalizing whiteness. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *1*(3), 37-51.

McFarland, W. P., & Dupuis, M. (2001). The legal duty to protect gay and lesbian students from violence in school. *Professional School Counseling*, *4*(3), 171-179.

Miceli, M. (2005). *Standing out, standing together: The social and political impact of gay-straight alliances*. Oxford, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.

Myers, K. (2005). Dilemmas of leadership: Sexuality and schools. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 5(4), 285-302.

Ornstein, A. C., & Levine, D. U. (2006). *Foundations of education* (9th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Petrovic, J. (1998). The democratic sieve in teacher education: Confronting heterosexism. *Educational Foundations*, *12*, 43-56.

Powell, R. R., & Garcia, J. (1985). The portrayal of minorities and women in selected elementary science series. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *22*(6), 519-533.

Pugach, M. C. (2006). *Because teaching matters.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Rasmussen, M. L. (2005a). *Becoming subjects: Sexualities and secondary schooling*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Rasmussen, M. (2005b). Safety and subversion: The production of sexualities and genders in school spaces. In M. L. Rasmussen, E. Rofes, & S. Talburt (Eds.), *Youth and sexualities: Pleasure, subversion, and insubordination in and out of schools* (pp. 131-152). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

Renold, E. (2000). "Coming out": (Hetero)sexuality and the primary school. *Gender and Education*, *12*(3), 309-326.

Renold, E. (2005). Primary curriculum. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Youth, education, and sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (pp. 237-241). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Robinson, K. H. (2005). Early childhood curriculum. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Youth, education, and sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (pp. 230-233). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Robinson, K., & Ferfolja, T. (2001). "What are we doing this for?" Dealing with lesbian and gay issues in teacher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *22*(1), 121-133.

Rofes, E. (2005a). Martyr-target-victim: Interrogating narratives of persecution and suffering among queer youth. In M. L. Rasmussen, E. Rofes, & S. Talburt (Eds.), *Youth and sexualities: Pleasure, subversion, and insubordination in and out of schools* (pp. 41-62). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rofes, E. (2005b). *A radical rethinking of sexuality & schooling: Status quo or status queer?* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Roffman, D. M. (2000). A model for helping schools address policy options regarding gay and lesbian youth. *Journal of Sex Education & Therapy*, *25*(2/3), 130-136.

Ryan, K., & Cooper, J. M. (2007). *Those who can, teach* (11th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (1980). Sexism in teacher education texts. *Harvard Educational Review*, *50*, 36-46.

Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (2005). *Teachers, schools, and society* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill. (Note: This text was not included in our analysis and served only as a comparison from the 7th to the 8th editions.)

Sadker, D. M., & Zittleman, K. (2007). *Teachers, schools, and society: A brief introduction to education* (1st ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Sadker, D. M., Sadker, M. P., & Zittleman, K. R. (2008). *Teachers, schools and society* (8th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Sadovnik, A. R., Cookson, P. W., Jr., & Semel, S. F. (2006). *Exploring education: An introduction to the foundations of education* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Safren, S. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (1998, November). *The effects of sexual orientation and social anxiety on social support and positive events in adolescents.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Washington, DC.

Safren, S. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (1999). Depression, hopelessness, suicidality, and related factors in sexual minority and heterosexual adolescents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *67*, 859-866.

Sausa, L. A. (2005). Translating research into practice: Youth recommendations for improving school systems. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *3*(1), 15-28.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (2005). *The new gay teenager.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sears, J. (1992). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal feelings related to professional beliefs? In K. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curriculum* (pp. 29-79). New York: Haworth.

Sears, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Gay, lesbian, and transgender issues in education: Programs, policies, and practices*. New York: Harrington Park Press.

Sherwin, G., & Jennings, T. (2006). Feared, forgotten, or forbidden: Sexual orientation topics in secondary teacher preparation programs in the U.S.A. *Teaching Education*, *17*(3), 207-223.

Simoni, J. M. (1996). Confronting heterosexism in the teaching of psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, *23*(4), 220-226.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation.* Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.

Swartz, P. C. (2005). It's elementary in Appalachia: Helping prospective teachers and their students understand sexuality and gender. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Gay, lesbian, and transgender issues in education: Programs, policies, and practices* (pp. 125-146). New York: Harrington Park Press.

Szalacha, L. (2004). Educating teachers on LGBTQ issues: A review of research and program evaluations. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*, *1*(4), 67-79.

Talburt, S. (2005). Intelligibility and narrating queer youth. In M. L. Rasmussen, E. Rofes, & S. Talburt (Eds.), *Youth and sexualities: Pleasure, subversion, and insubordination in and out of schools* (pp. 17-40). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Temple, J. R. (2005). "People who are different from you:" Heterosexism in Quebec high school textbooks. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *28*(3), 271-294.

Titus, J. (1993). Gender messages in education foundations textbooks. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *44*, 38-44.

Unks, G. (1993/1994). The gay teenager [Special issue]. *The High School Journal*, *77*(1/2).

Webb, L. D., Metha, A., & Forbis Jordan, K. (2007). *Foundations of American education* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Whatley, M. H. (1992). Images of gays and lesbians in sexuality and health textbooks. In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curricula* (pp. 197-211). New York: Harrington Park Press.

White, M. (2006). *Religion gone bad: The hidden dangers of the Christian Right*. New York: Tarcher.

Winters, K. C., Remafedi, G., & Chan, B. Y. (1996). Assessing drug abuse among gay/bisexual young men. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, *10*, 228-236.

Young, A. J., & Middleton, M. J. (2002). The gay ghetto in the geography of education. In R. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 91-102). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Zittleman, K., & Sadker, D. (2002). Gender bias in teacher education texts: New (and old) lessons. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), 168-180.

Ian K. Macgillivray *(www.IanMacgillivray.com) is an assistant professor of foundations and curriculum at James Madison University. He is the author of* Gay-Straight Alliances: A Handbook for Students, Educators, and

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014

Parents *(2007, Haworth Press) and* Sexual Orientation and School Policy: A Practical Guide for Teachers, Administrators, and Community Activists *(2004, Rowman & Littlefield). He sits on the board of editors for* The Journal of LGBT Youth: The Interdisciplinary Quarterly of Practice, Research, Policy, and Theory.

Todd Jennings *is a professor of educational psychology and counseling at California State University, San Bernardino, where he teaches in teacher preparation and the doctoral program in educational leadership. His research focuses upon human rights education and diversity issues in the preparation of education professionals.*

Downloaded from jte.sagepub.com at CAPELLA UNIVERSITY on March 20, 2014