

Equity and Excellence in Education— Compatible Concepts or Hostile Abstractions?

Theresa E. McCormick

Education is the regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness; and the adjustment of the individual activity on the basis of this social consciousness is the only sure method of social reconstruction.¹ — John Dewey

Equity, Excellence and Trends of the 1980s

Since 1983, with the publication of five well-known national reports calling for reform in education,² the later release of other reports by prestigious groups (such as the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession and the Holmes Group), and the enactment of approximately 700 state statutes focused on school reform,³ the push for excellence has overshadowed earlier commitments to equity in schools. As Orlich writes, “In at least one instance, implementing the proposals of these two groups [Carnegie and Holmes] would have the same undesirable effect: reducing the number of minority teachers from few to virtually none.”⁴ This movement for excellence has had a narrowing effect on the level of social consciousness concerning sex and race equity in schools and in society. Any movement which restricts the growth of equity should be examined critically; for it, both as a topic of study and as a fact in practice, is a necessary component of an excellent and complete preparation of teachers in a pluralistic society. By providing programs that both “preach *and* practice” equity principles, today’s teacher educators assist the next generation of teachers to develop a contextual understanding of the field of teaching and a heightened social consciousness of their role in education.

The need for educators to address the interrelated issues of equity and excellence is made clear by recent national events and trends. Not only has the Executive branch of government abandoned equity issues but also the Judicial branch has made decisions in recent years which adversely affect educational equity for females and minorities. For example, the impact of Title IX (1972, P.L. 92-318)—which prohibits

discrimination on the basis of sex against students and any employee of a school receiving federal assistance—was severely curtailed by the *Grove City College v. Bell* Supreme Court case in 1984. While the Court's ruling narrowed Title IX's coverage and threatened the effectiveness of other civil rights statutes, efforts to pass the Civil Rights Restoration Act floundered in the U.S. Congress for nearly four years before it was finally enacted on March 22, 1988, with a rider tacked on to appease anti-abortion constituents. The Act requires that all universities and colleges which receive federal funding must provide coverage in their health plans for gynecological services, pregnancy and pregnancy-related conditions. The rider allows religiously controlled schools to request an exemption from these requirements if compliance would infringe on a religious belief.⁵

Immediately following the 1988 presidential election, the U.S. Department of Justice requested the Supreme Court to review the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision that legalized abortion. This move to dismantle *Roe v. Wade* is a strong indicator of the Bush administration's direction on civil rights for women.⁶ In its July 3, 1989, decision in the Missouri case, *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, the Supreme Court significantly curtailed women's constitutional right to abortion by giving states much more power to limit abortions.⁷

In addition, the disappearance of the Equal Rights Amendment from our national agenda of concerns and the Supreme Court's anti-civil rights decisions of 1989, indicate the comfortable complacency of our patriarchal leaders as well as their retreat from activism for civil rights for females, minorities, and the poor.⁸ For example, the Supreme Court's January, 1989, decision in the *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.* case ruled against the affirmative action "set aside" program for hiring of minorities in Richmond, Virginia.⁹ This decision bans racial quotas in awarding public work projects by state and local governments and allows white workers to legally challenge court-approved affirmative action plans.

Not only has the Reagan legacy undermined the legal underpinnings of civil rights but also its negative effect has "trickled down" to schools. The Reagan administration blamed the lack of excellence in the schools in the pursuit of equity. As Charol Shakeshaft reflects:

In retrospect, it appears that the release of *A Nation At Risk* was the event that those who are ideologically opposed to equality of education were awaiting to launch their attack. President Reagan . . . claimed that one reason that the schools were failing was the attention that had been focused on female, minority, and handicapped students . . . what the President failed to note is that, if these three groups of students are eliminated, only about 15% of the school population remains.¹⁰

These comments reflect a growing concern that the national reports calling for reform in education strongly link excellence with elitism to the

detriment of a significant portion of our school population. In a discussion of causes of conflict in schooling, Joel Spring says that an argument could be made “. . . that the best way to maintain political control is to deny schooling to all children except those of the elite.”¹¹ Since this is untenable due to industry’s need for a n educated work force, Spring contends:

Consequently, a major conflict in modern educational systems arises between elites, who want to use schooling to control the population, and the dispossessed who want to use it to advance their social, political, and economic rights.¹²

The recurrence of conflict between the “haves” and the “have nots” in education is as American as the proverbial apple pie. While it is distressing that support and funding for civil rights and equity concerns have lost momentum at the national and state levels of government, of equal concern is that other elected officials, legal officers, the public and many educators fail to see the interdependence between equity and excellence. This is due, I think, to the still deeply ingrained and dysfunctional white male perspective that rejects the realities of cultural pluralism in the U.S. and to the view that equates excellence with measurable academic achievement. These views reflect remnants of social Darwinism (the academically fit will survive) and result from the logic of post-industrial U.S. society, a meritocracy, wherein, as Daniel Bell says, “Differential status and differential income are based on technical skills and higher education.”¹³ A meritocracy is based on credentials and certification of achievement and the gatekeepers for these credentials are still white males who maintain power and arbitrate what is “excellent” and what is “equitable,” both in society and in education, to perpetuate business as usual in their favor.

Perhaps these current events and trends concerning equity in education should come as no surprise and should be viewed cynically as part of the debris resulting from the historic neglect of the education of females and minorities and the persistence of the “genetic deficit” model of thinking.¹⁴ However, this stance not being tenable, educators must persist in efforts to unite excellence and equity, both in theory and in practice. The two ideas *are* compatible concepts, not hostile abstractions; however, the prevailing myth based on dualistic, either/or thinking is that one is attained only at the expense of the other. As Glen Harvey asserts, “. . . there are sound arguments for the view that labeling as ‘excellent’ an education that is inequitable is an abuse of the term . . . The choice is not between an excellent and an equal education, but between demanding that education be both excellent and equitable and agreeing to accept less.”¹⁵ Ira Shore affirms, “*Equality is excellence and inequality leads to alienation. Excellence without equality produces only more inequality. Inequality leads to learning deficits and resistance in the great mass of students.*”¹⁶

This paper will review some of the myths of equality, address the

necessity of incorporating equity concepts and practices into teacher education programs and into the ongoing education reform debate, explore some implications for future leadership, and make recommendations for attaining both excellence and equity in education. The goal is to bring a new “voice” to the reform debate, a voice that draws on feminist pedagogy to help transform education so that the education of all students is taken seriously.¹⁷

Myths of Economic and Occupational Equality

As indicated in the previous discussion, one explanation for the decline of emphasis on equity in education is that the administrations in Washington since 1980 have not been ideologically attuned to such concerns due to the prevailing philosophy supporting a powerful white patriarchal system that controls resources and excludes women and minorities for the most part. As Shakeshaft says, “The logic behind the attack on equity goes something like this: excellence and equity are different; equity threatens to take resources away from excellence; therefore, let’s abandon equity as a national concern so as to pursue excellence exclusively.”¹⁸

However, another ironic explanation for the decline of emphasis on equity in education lies in the perceived “successes” of the civil rights and women’s movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Because of the so-called advancements made during those years, it is commonly heard that sex inequity in education is a relic of the past, like hoop skirts. Advancements usually cited to support this belief are the increasing numbers of women enrolling in postsecondary education and graduating with advanced degrees. Also cited are examples of women entering non-traditional fields of work and climbing the corporate ladder.

That we have a continuing problem concerning educational and economic equity is denied or ignored by a significant portion of our population who only look at “surface” advancements and accept many of the popular myths about the progress women and minorities have made during the last twenty years. While the political winds may be “kinder and gentler” under the Bush administration, they are still gusting strongly to the right, with every new gust indicating that we are moving beyond a luke-warm climate to a pre-equity freeze-zone for women and minorities. When major segments of our society are denied equity, the delicate fabric of civil rights for all of society is weakened. It cannot be stated too strongly that inequity in education feeds inequity in the home and in the workplace.¹⁹

This is a prime time to challenge the myths of equality that still persist. One such myth is the notion that because of the Women’s Movement, which rendered greater access to education and other opportunities, women are now better off financially than in the past. The fact is that even with the same education as a man, a woman still earns much less. As Ivan Illich states unequivocally, economic discrimination against

women has clearly been established by fifteen years of feminist research.²⁰ He, and others such as Gollnick and Chinn²¹ challenge the myth that with more education, earnings are increased for women. Illich says, "The current median lifetime income of a female graduate, even if she has an advanced degree, is still only comparable to that of male dropouts."²²

While more and more women are entering the workforce, with a small percentage in high-status, high-paying positions, over-all, they still earn from 60 to 69 cents for each dollar earned by men. Succinctly, Illich states, "The wage gap is larger in the States now than it was twenty years ago, . . ."²³ Clearly, Margaret Mead's observations made forty years ago are sustained today,

Men may cook or weave, or dress dolls or hunt humming birds, but if such activities are appropriate occupations of men, then the whole society, men and women alike, votes them as important. When the same occupations are performed by women, they are regarded as less important.²⁴

Another noteworthy and worrisome example that challenges the myth that women have overcome financial inequality is the growing poverty of women, "the feminization of poverty" in the United States. The pauperization of children goes hand-in-hand with that of women. Marian Wright Edelman states, "Many children are poor in the U.S. because of the growth of single parent families, too often headed by a teen-aged mother. Many of these single parents want to work but lack skills or work experience."²⁵

About half of all poor families in the United States are headed by females. Referring to 1984 Bureau of the Censuses data, Sleeter and Grant note the following:

. . . while the average married-couple family earned \$29,612 and the average unmarried male earned \$23,325, the average unmarried female earned only \$12,803 . . . This situation heavily affects children: . . . about 21% of American children in 1985 were living in poverty, a proportion that had risen over time. . . .²⁶

Helping to explain the rise in poverty among children and women, in spite of the increase in the number of women working outside the home, is the fact that they are still predominantly employed in low-paying occupations. Sleeter and Grant observe that ". . . over 85% of female workers in 1982 were concentrated in low-paying 'pink-collar' ghettos, such as clerical work, nursing, teaching, daycare, health services, and domestic service. . . . And even in 1984, the jobs paying the most were still dominated by men."²⁷ These Census data included both African-American and Anglo-American women and men.

In a 1985 study of 100 female-headed black families in the Boston area, the data revealed that they did *not* fit into the mold of the stereotypic large family dependent upon welfare; rather, most of the families in the study were composed of a single mother working at a low-paying job to

support one child and herself.²⁸

Black women still suffer a wage disparity with all other groups of wage earners; yet, as George Jackson attests, the myth persists that blacks have reached parity in the labor force and are too persistent and aggressive in their demands for education, jobs and justice.²⁹ These misperceptions are maintained because of the myopia of a majority of citizens whose vision is still clouded by the ethnocentric sense of Anglo superiority and by a related blindness to the very real institutional racism that keeps African-Americans from advancing.

The issues of racism and sexism are inextricably linked when one is examining equity and education in the United States. One issue cannot be considered without the other intruding, especially when discussing the concerns of African-American women. It has been said that they are in double jeopardy in our society because of their race and sex. They have had dual obstacles to overcome in attaining their aspirations.

The well-known and marked differences in the historical experiences, socialization patterns, and status between African-American women and Anglo-American women suggest some of the complexities of achieving sex equity in a white male-dominated educational system. That so many African-American women have made significant contributions to education (Mary McLeod Bethune, Charlotte Forten Grimkel, Nannie Helen Burroughs) and to fields as varied as medicine (Rebecca Lee); law (Charlott Ray); and the arts (Edmonia Lewis) is testimony to their strength and tenacity.³⁰

A clue to the achievements (in spite of the odds) of African-American women lies in their history. They experienced the economic necessity of earning a living to help support their families long before Anglo-American women entered the work force in comparable numbers. This long history of work outside the home fostered the African-American woman's independence and equalitarian position in the family. Out of their struggle for human dignity, they developed a tradition of self reliance.³¹ Undoubtedly, Anglo-American working women could learn a lot about coping skills from these women who have been working outside of their own home for so many years. For example, African-American women have developed networks of supportive family members (including other children) and friends to help with child care.³²

Running parallel with the data on the poverty of women and their low-paying jobs is this correlate: Women continue to be underrepresented in high-status managerial, administrative positions in government, business and education. Illustrating this phenomenon in schools, Gollnick and Chinn comment, ". . . 67% of all public school teachers are women, whereas over 82% of the principals are men."³³ Harvey also highlights the disparities between male and female educators in leadership positions by making some historical comparisons. She indicates that presently, at the *secondary education level*, the percentage of women who are principals (about 10%) is less than in the 1950s.³⁴ This

bleak picture of few female administrators in public schools is mirrored in higher education. Metha reports that, "Eighty-six percent of the administrators in higher education are men."³⁵ Taking stock of departments and colleges of education across the country, the same skewed pattern of male administrators is noted.

Lack of role models for female college students is a serious issue, not only in relation to administrators, but also in having women faculty available. This is especially significant for minority females because there are so few minority women faculty on campuses today.³⁶ These examples should help nullify the myth that female students and educators now have the same access to leadership opportunities as males.

Myths of Classroom Equality

In addition to the myths of economic and occupational equality that future teachers need to understand are some persistent misconceptions about classroom equality. Adhering to such myths can influence teacher decision making about the education of females and disguise the reality of differential treatment of males and females in schools. Differential educational opportunity and treatment result in self-esteem problems among females and in differential outcomes, both in educational achievement and eventually in occupational and economic achievement.

A whole set of myths has developed around the school environment in which students learn. Shared by many parents and teachers is the myth that elementary schools are more hospitable to girls than to boys. Countering this myth about school climate Harvey says:

... it is typically the academic and behavioral problems of boys, not those of girls, that are the primary focus of the school's energy and resources. Thus what is perceived to be a supportive environment for girls is in reality one that ignores female learning deficits. What is perceived to be hostile to boys is really an emphasis on early identification and attention to male learning deficits.³⁷

Another myth, that all students receive equal instructional treatment in classrooms, has gained credence as a result of efforts over the past twenty years to raise awareness concerning equity in education. However, this notion has been shown to be wishful thinking by a recent research report compiled by the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development³⁸ and by Myra and David Sadkers' studies. In summary, the Sadkers' research (which included both minority and white teachers and students of both sexes) indicates that: (1) Boys receive more attention from instructors than girls do. (2) Boys are given more time to talk in the classroom. (3) Boys receive more precise teacher feedback than girls do. (4) Boys get more detailed instructions about how to do things for themselves, while girls are more likely to have the task done for them. (5) Minority girls receive the least attention from teachers. (6) Teachers are usually unaware that they interact differentially with boys and girls.³⁹

In a 1987 commentary on their research, the Sadkers state:

The student most likely to be involved in an intellectual exchange with the instructor is a white male. . . . Second in line for instructor time and attention are minority males. The third group is white females, while the least interactive group of students are minority females. *That rank order may sound familiar because it also represents the payscale.* [emphasis mine] In the workplace, a major part of value and recognition is represented by the size of the paycheck, with white males receiving the most money and minority females the least. *In the classroom, the currency is teacher attention and questions, and the same pattern prevails.* [emphasis mine]⁴⁰

These research findings and comments point to the significant role that the teacher plays in the socialization of female students to be passive and dependent and of male students to be more assertive and independent. Such traits contribute directly to the student's academic achievement, aspirations, and later career choices and/or options.

Differential teacher interactions with male and female students also help explain why talented girls are less likely to become committed to careers even though their overall grades are better than boys';⁴¹ why the self-esteem of college women declines as they progress through their college training;⁴² and why girls graduating from high school since 1972 have lower SAT scores both in reading and in basic computation than boys'.⁴³ The latter point is especially disturbing in view of the fact that girls start school equal to or ahead of boys in both skill areas.

In spite of the discouraging trends just noted, there are two encouraging conclusions drawn from the Sadkers' studies (which included multicultural populations of both students and teachers): That focused teacher training can reduce or eliminate bias from classroom interactions and that increasing equity in classrooms also increases the overall effectiveness of the teacher. In the Sadkers' equity programs, teachers, in a modified microteaching setting,

. . . practiced equitable teaching skills, received feedback on their performance, and practiced again. . . . The trained instructors at all levels achieved equity in verbal distributions; . . . [they] had higher rates of interaction [than the control groups], more precise reactions, more academic contacts, and a great number of student-initiated comments. In short, the training resulted in more intentional and more direct teaching. Developing equity in teaching had promoted excellence as well.⁴⁴

While research indicates that teachers can learn how to change their classroom interactions and the school climate to be more supportive of female and minority students, social custom, resistance to change, and stereotypes continue to play a powerful role in maintaining a biased education system.

Leadership for the 21st Century

The fact that women are now breaking through **some** barriers of the past is due largely to the consciousness-raising and education induced by the women's movement and the civil rights movement. However, a polarity is developing between the generations, with the "post-feminist" younger generation of females expressing a sense of alienation from the movement which made possible their current advancement. The young women who deny that sexism permeates society and education say that they have never experienced discrimination and feel that the struggles and victories of the women's movement are like vague tales from by-gone days. Critics attribute this denial to apathy or to the internalization of traditional female socialization to be passive, nonconfrontive and conformist. Denial of inequality occurs for many reasons, but a prime one, according to Linda Ellerbee⁴⁵ is that feminism (the belief in equality between males and females) is seen as unattractive by younger women who believe the myth that feminism means "turning the tables on men."

A renewed dialogue between women of all ages and of all racial and ethnic groups is urgently needed to redefine our agenda for the future—one which addresses our common concerns. As Florence Howe observes:

Only when women of various groups begin to understand *what all women have in common* [emphasis mine] and also what is distinct about the historical experience of particular groups among them can we deal with sexual stereotypes and begin to look to the future. . .

..⁴⁶

While it is necessary for women to unite around a common agenda for continued advancement, it is also imperative that the teaching aspect of the women's movement be revived and reinforced in the socialization and education of males presently in positions of leadership and power and of those who will share those positions in the future. A study of sex equity in relation to excellence in education holds relevance and the possibility of benefit to males as well as to females.

One final myth—that women do not make good leaders—needs to be exhumed and exposed before it becomes further ingrained in society and in educators' thinking and practice. Leadership skills are not sexual attributes, rather they are learned through socialization and cultural conditioning. Traditional training of Anglo-American males to be ambitious, assertive and goal-oriented provides them with an advantage for leadership roles that was not afforded to females and minorities. Functioning at a societal level, the traditional separation of males and females into provider and nurturer roles bound them into a patriarchal system in which she, to be an ideal woman, had to be selfless and he, to be ideal, had to be competitive and individualistic.⁴⁷

Growing out of the last two decades of social change, a reevaluation of traditional male and female sex roles and leadership styles has gained momentum. Referred to as the "beta" leadership style by Nickels and Ashcraft, women's leadership is characterized as integrative, people

oriented, and focused on long-range goals. In contrast, the male “alpha” style is more centered on individualistic power, hierarchical relationships, and short-term goals.⁴⁸

The problem has been that only the “alpha” style has been valued and permitted to flourish in our white male-dominated institutions. Nickles and Ashcraft state that the “beta” “perspective involves a sensitivity to those who are not in power and fosters a more fertile environment for growth and learning. Within this system, women will provide a positive rather than a negative leadership force.”⁴⁹ In this light, it is valid to teach all students overtly that women *do* have special strengths in the areas of communication and interpersonal skills which have been institutionally negated in the past, but which indeed, are prerequisites for effective leadership.

Shakeshaft reports that studies have found that men and women school administrators approach the job in different ways and create different school climates. She says:

In schools with female administrators, the following things tend to occur: Relationships with others become central. Women spend more time with people, communicate more, care more about individual differences, and more concerned with other teachers and with marginal students, and are better motivators than men. . . . Building community is an essential part of a woman administrator’s style. From speech patterns to decision-making styles, women exhibit a more democratic participatory style of leadership than men, a style that encourages inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness in schools.⁵⁰

Research clearly indicates that sex discrimination which devalues women is the reason that they do not become school administrators.⁵¹ The loss to our communities and nation from not having access to a balance of leadership styles and the skills that women have to offer is inestimable. Not only at the local and national levels are women’s leadership skills greatly needed, but this need prevails also in the global arena.

The fact of growing global interdependence prompts futurists to project that leadership for the 21st century must be geared toward global understanding and cooperation in order to avert conflict and possible annihilation. The infusion of the “beta” perspective into the present androcentric global system—where, as Fritjof Capra indicates, aggression and dominance are equated with masculinity, and where “warfare is held to be the ultimate initiation into true manhood”—could not only aid women in fulfilling their leadership potential, but also could be a key to our global survival.⁵²

Conclusion

Emerging in the last twenty years is a truer picture of both Anglo and minority women’s leadership roles in our national development. In spite of the cultural restraints on females’ full participation in a patriarchal

society and a biased recording of history, it is now widely known that women have been actively involved in theological thought, government and politics, abolition, social and humanitarian reform, artistic creation and performance, industrialization and labor movements, as well as in the traditional female occupations of social work, nursing and teaching. The leadership qualities and strengths of women which prompted these national contributions can and should be extended to the global community where a diversity of problem solving and decision making skills are sorely needed.

In order to bring the “voice” of women into the debate about education reform and to promote the accomplishment of both excellence *and* equity in education, the following recommendations are offered specifically for the consideration of teacher educators:

(1) Integrate accurate information about the contributions, history, values and perspectives of *both* sexes and about different racial and ethnic groups into the content of all teacher education courses. This means transforming the curriculum from one of white male dominance over the “content and substance of knowledge itself” to one that “interweaves issues of gender with ethnicity, race, and class.”^{5:3}

(2) Require a course in the teacher preparation program on multi-cultural nonsexist education and require that it be taught on a rotating basis by all faculty, not only by a specialist in that field.

(3) Infuse equity concepts and practices into all aspects and phases of the teacher education program (e.g. advising, evaluation, academic program, pre-student teaching field experiences, student teaching, and placement).

(4) Provide students with role models who are sensitive to and knowledgeable about women’s issues and concerns. This means that teacher education programs must provide staff development for faculty and administrators on equity issues and strategies and take affirmative steps to hire more women faculty and administrators (both minority and Anglo).

(5) Initiate a mentoring program for minority female students and faculty members.

(6) Incorporate a balanced use of cooperative learning and problem solving strategies into teacher education courses instead of the usual use of competitive approaches.

(7) Critique teaching materials (texts, media, computer software and evaluation instruments) for sex bias.

(8) Actively promote self-esteem among female students and encourage leadership behaviors.

(9) Take feminist teacher educators, women students and their education seriously. Because the teaching field, often called “women’s true profession,” is largely made up of women, isn’t it time that education reformers and teacher educators listened to what women have to say about teaching?

Notes

¹John Dewey. "My Pedagogical Creed." *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom—Selections From Great Documents*. R. Ulrich, ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959) 637.

²The five national reports published in 1983 are: (1) *A Nation at Risk* (The National Commission on Excellence in Education), (2) *Making the Grade* (Twentieth Century Fund), (3) *Academic Preparation for College* (The College Board), (4) *Educating Americans for the 21st Century* (National Science Foundation), (5) *Action for Excellence* (Education Commission of the States).

³Donald Orlich. "Education Reforms: Mistakes, Misconceptions, Miscues." *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 70, No. 7 (March, 1989) 512-517.

⁴*Ibid.*, 514

⁵*National NOW Times*. "Title IX Complaints Pick Up After Passage of the CRRRA." Vol. 21, No. 4 (October, November, December, 1988) 13.

⁶*National NOW Times*. "High Court Asked to Review Roe v. Wade." Vol. 21, No. 4 (October, November, December, 1988) 1.

⁷"States Can Limit Abortions." *The Daily Tribune* [Ames, Iowa] (July 3, 1989) A1-A2.

⁸Alain Sanders. "Chipping Away At Civil Rights." *Time*. Vol. 133, No. 26 (June 26, 1989) 63, 66; James P. Gannon. "Reagan's Shadow Over Civil Rights." *Des Moines Sunday Register*. (January 29, 1989) 2C.

⁹*City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co. U.S. Supreme Court Bulletin*. Vol. 49, No. 36A (May 8, 1989) B764-B860.

¹⁰Charol Shakeshaft. "A Gender at Risk." *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 67, No. 7 (March, 1986) 499.

¹¹Joel Spring. *Conflict of Interests—The Politics of American Education*. (New York: Longman, 1988) 25.

¹²*Ibid.*

¹³Daniel Bell. "On Meritocracy and Equality." *Power and Ideology in Education*. J. Karabel and A. Halsey, eds. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977) 607-635.

¹⁴Judith Whyte. "The Development of Sex Stereotyped Attitudes Among Boys and Girls: Different Models of Their Origins and Their Educational Implications." *Girls and Women in Education—A Cross-National Study of Sex Inequalities in Upbringing and in Schools and Colleges*. (Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1986) 57.

¹⁵Glen Harvey. "Finding Reality Among the Myths: Why What You Thought About Sex Equity in Education Isn't So." *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 67, No. 7 (March, 1986) 511.

¹⁶Ira Shore. "Equality Is Excellence: Transforming Teacher Education and the Learning Process." *Harvard Educational Review*. Vol. 56, No. 4 (November, 1986) 411.

¹⁷Susan Laird. "Reforming 'Women's True Profession': A Case for 'Feminist Pedagogy' in Teacher Education?" *Harvard Educational Review*. Vol. 58, No. 4 (November, 1988) 449-463.

¹⁸Shakeshaft, 499.

¹⁹Robert Parelius and Ann Parelius. *The Sociology of Education*. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1987) 263-307. See chapter eight, "Education and Stratification" for a full discussion of the direct connection between educational attainment and occupational and income attainment.

²⁰Ivan Illich. *Gender*. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982) 22.

²¹Donna Gollnick and Philip Chinn. *Multicultural Education in A Pluralistic Society*. (Columbus: Merrill, 1986) 181.

²²Illich, 26.

²³*Ibid.*, 25.

²⁴Margaret Mead. *Male and Female*. (New York: W. Morrow, 1949) 159.

²⁵Marian Wright Edelman. "1995: Poverty, the Underclass and the Workplace." *The World*. Vol. 2, No. 2 (March/April, 1988) 6.

²⁶Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant. *Making Choices for Multi-cultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender*. (Columbus: Merrill, 1988) 10.

²⁷*Ibid.*

²⁸Nina McCain. "Things You Wanted to Know About Women But (Maybe) Were Afraid to Ask." *Des Moines Sunday Register*. (July 14, 1985) 7E.

²⁹George Jackson. "Racism, Affirmative Action or No Action? Black Americans from Kennedy to Reagan." *Iowa State University Daily*. (March 31, 1986) 2-3.

³⁰Charilynn Spenser and Janet Sams—Wood, eds. Catalog for Exhibit: "Black Women Achievement Against The Odds." (Washington, D.C.: The Smithsonian Institute, 1984) 1-12.

³¹Robert Staples. "The Black American Family." *Ethnic Families in America*. C. Mindel and R. Habenstein, eds. (New York: Elsevier, 1981) 221-247.

³²McCain, 7E.

³³Gollnick and Chinn, 183.

³⁴Harvey, 509-512.

³⁵Arlene Metha. "A Decade Since Title IX: Some Implications For Teacher Education." *Action in Teacher Education*. Vol. 5, No. 3 (Fall, 1983) 24.

³⁶Mary Gray. "Bush Must Act Quickly on Civil-Rights Issues if he is to Create a 'Kinder, Gentler Nation' ". *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Vol. 35, No. 16 (December 14, 1988) B1.

³⁷Harvey, 510.

- ³⁸Constantina Safilios-Rothschild. "Sex Differences in Early Socialisation and Upbringing and Their Consequences for Educational Choices and Outcomes." *Girls and Women in Education—A Cross-National Study of Sex Inequalities in Upbringing and in Schools and Colleges*. (Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1986) 38-45.
- ³⁹Myra Sadker and David Sadker. "Sexism in the Classroom: From Grade School to Graduate School." *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 67, No. 7 (March, 1986) 512-515; Myra Sadker and David Sadker. "Sexism in the Schoolroom of the 80s." *Psychology Today*. Vol. 19, No. 3 (March, 1985) 54-57.
- ⁴⁰Myra Sadker and David Sadker. *The Intellectual Exchange—Excellence and Equity in College Teaching*. (Kansas City, Missouri: The Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, 1987) 32.
- ⁴¹Parelius and Parelius, 268-269.
- ⁴²Sadker and Sadker, (1986) 514.
- ⁴³Parelius and Parelius, 269.
- ⁴⁴Sadker and Sadker, 1986, 514-515.
- ⁴⁵Linda Ellerbee. "Rocky Progress on Road to Equality for Women." *Des Moines Sunday Register*. (February 26, 1989) 1C.
- ⁴⁶Florence Howe. "Sexism, Racism, and the Education of Women." *Today's Education*. Vol. 62, No. 5 (May, 1973) 48.
- ⁴⁷Elizabeth Nickles and Laura Ashcraft. *The Coming Matriarchy: How Women Will Gain the Balance of Power*. (New York: Berkeley Books, 1981).
- ⁴⁸**Ibid.**
- ⁴⁹Nichols and Ashcraft, 175.
- ⁵⁰Shakeshaft, 503.
- ⁵¹**Ibid.**, 502.
- ⁵²Fritjof Capra. "National Insecurity." *New Age Journal*. Vol. 5, No. 2 (March/April, 1988) 41; Also see Betty Reardon. *Sexism and the War System*. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1985) for a full analysis of the roots of war in patriarchy and the links between sexism and militarism. For a fictional projection into the 21st century on the chilling theme of the subjugation of women in a post-nuclear war, male-dominated society, see Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*, 1985. Also, see Riane Eisler's *The Chalice and the Blade* (1987), in which she describes the biggest cover-up in history: The thousands of years of egalitarian peaceful living by men and women in pre-patriarchial times.
- ⁵³Jane R. Martin. "Excluding Women from the Educational Realm." *Harvard Educational Review*. Vol. 52, No. 2 (May, 1982) 133-148; Mary Thompson Tetreault. "Integrating Content about Women and Gender into the Curriculum." *Multicultural Education Issues and Perspectives*.

Critique

Theresa McCormick argues that equity and excellence in education should not be accepted as being on opposite ends of a continuum, but rather should be viewed as two related components of education. The twin concepts of equity and excellence are compatible and must be identified as important goals of education. Educators at all instructional levels in all subject disciplines need to include a study of and value these educational and social concepts. These concepts can be taught to young people as “fairness” and “goodness.” More mature students can examine the concepts from the perspective of several academic disciplines.

The article could be examined as three shorter writings incorporated into a longer article which concludes with overall recommendations for teacher educators. The information presented should be well known to those interested in gender and minority issues; however, McCormick attempts to link gender and minority issues and asks if the achievement of equity and excellence are hostile or compatible to each other.

McCormick provides background information concerning the educational reform movement of the 1980s. She notes the major reform reports provide strong statements concerning the need to achieve educational excellence, but that these reports fail to recognize the ongoing inequities in education. The reports assume that equity has been achieved due to social and economic reforms of the 1960s and 1970s, and because of these reforms, a lack of excellence exists in our schools. What needs further examination are other variables which extend beyond the school but influence educational achievement for all students.

McCormick blames the Reagan and Bush administrations, Congressional inaction, and judicial decisions for turning back earlier equity victories for women and minorities. She notes the national attitude of retrenchment concerning opportunities for women and minorities is clearly evident in education at all levels but does not offer recommendations for the formulation of social policy which would provide equity for all citizens.

Finally, McCormick addresses equity issues related directly to the educational setting. It is well known that for many reasons male students receive greater individualized attention in the classroom and in time assume leadership positions in education and elsewhere. These inequitable practices hinder the intellectual abilities and leadership skills of female and minority students. What needs to be studied are the efforts to