

ISSN: 2219-8229

E-ISSN: 2224-0136

Founder: Academic Publishing House *Researcher*

DOI: 10.13187/issn.2219-8229

Has been issued since 2010.

European Researcher. International Multidisciplinary Journal



Pedagogical Sciences

Педагогические науки

UDC 378

Making Room for Gender Sensitivity in Pre-Service Teacher Education

Yasemin Esen

Ankara University, Turkey
Faculty of Educational Sciences, Cebeci Campus, Ankara
PhD (sociology of education), Assistant Professor
E-mail: yesen@ankara.edu.tr

Abstract. Education is an effective tool for effecting change both on an individual and social level and it is a key institution that can minimize the differences among social groups and genders. While teachers are key actors responsible for implementing this basic function of education, they themselves are raised in societies that are stratified by gender. Teachers act as carriers of the values and cultural codes of their societies and have a tendency to support students' opinions and behaviours and educational and professional choices shaped by sexist stereotypes, thereby contributing to inequality. Therefore, one strategy to adopt in combating inequality between genders is to raise awareness and sensitivity of teachers concerning gender inequality. With this strategy in mind, this study seeks to identify the key features of Gender Equality course for pre-service teachers in Turkey.

Keywords: Sexism; gender training; gender sensitivity; teacher education.

Introduction

Children learn to adopt and internalize the roles expected from their sex at an early age, during the preschool socialization process, and in different ways (such as through observation, modelling, being rewarded or penalised). By the time they start school, they are already equipped with gender-based thoughts and behaviours. Schools carry new and original effects that reinforce the sex role patterns adopted in the family. Teachers also play a key role in the reproduction of gender inequality in instructional practices and school life.

Studies on how gender stereotypes are acquired or reinforced in educational processes feature two varying views about the role of teachers in this process. According to one view, teachers have only passive roles in making children acquire gender stereotypes and sexist attitudes as children already acquire them before they start to attend school (Eccles & Blumenfeld, 1985). As is known, gender role socialization cannot be isolated from the general socialization process. In this framework, children are actually socialized in accordance with gender stereotypes from the moment they are born. Stereotypes are learned particularly in the family. Accordingly, schools and teachers should adopt a neutral attitude and give children the freedom to make their gender choices (Eccles & Blumenfeld, 1985). According to the second view, children are still forming their perceptions of gender when they start school and will continue to do so throughout their education. Like families, schools are settings where specific understandings about gender roles and gender

relations develop and take hold. Although these stereotypes begin to be acquired by students in their preschool years, teachers, despite their secondary roles, tend to do little in making students rethink their beliefs about these stereotypes. Mostly, it is seen that they ignore the influence of sexist stereotyping in shaping students' educational and professional choices, thereby contributing to inequality. However, teachers also have primary responsibility for directing students to question sexism in their norms and values (Eccles & Blumenfeld, 1985; Streitmatter, 1994). Therefore, teachers, as agents of change, should combat gender stereotypes that are acquired in preschool years, help students to limit the restrictions of traditional society, and realize that they are equal citizens (Gray & Leith, 2004; Sayman, 2007; Streitmatter, 1994). According to this perspective, for teachers to become effective agents of change, they should receive training in gender equality and associated instruction strategies during their professional training (Baba, 2007; Owens, Smothers & Love 2003).

This approach is frequently reiterated in all international documents and texts that seek to develop policies concerning women and, in particular, it is considered as a basic strategy for underdeveloped and developing countries where gender inequalities are more frequent. The 7th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Equality between Women and Men recommended that teachers should be made aware of sexist stereotypes in order to combat stereotypes in education, noting that teachers tend to believe girls or boys are successful in specific courses and that the awareness-raising efforts that target teachers and other education personnel should be encouraged for combating this and similar stereotypes (Council of Europe, 2007).

In recent years, the Turkish education system has also set out to make teachers aware of gender equality and gender sensitivity. In order to improve gender equality in various aspects of men and women's lives in Turkey, the General Directorate on the Status of Women (GDSW) that is affiliated to the Ministry of Family and Social Policies prepared the Gender Equality National Action Plan for 2008-2013. According to the national goals identified under the "education" subtitle of this policy document, educators, educational programs and materials will be required to be gender sensitive (GDSW, 2008). The measures for so doing were identified as follows:

- To integrate the issue of gender equality across the entirety of undergraduate and postgraduate courses on offer at Faculties of Education in Turkey.
- To provide Gender Equality Sensitivity Training to in-service teachers.
- To review and amend accordingly all content pertaining to education and training programmes, methodologies, learning materials and instructional aids, so that they are gender sensitive.
- To introduce the issue of gender equality to all formal and informal education settings and continue to support the drive for gender equality through life skills courses at all levels of learning.

The Ministry of Education, the GDSW and the Council of Higher Education are tasked with implementing these measures, which are clearly meant to have a strategic impact on Turkey's institutions and academic practices.

This study aims to stress the importance of boosting teachers' gender sensitivities and to discuss various proposals about a curriculum that can be applied at the national level in Turkey. To this end, first, a framework that helps us to understand how teachers reproduce gender inequalities will be briefly presented. Then the national and international situation on gender equality training will be discussed, and finally, a course proposal for teacher training institutions will be described.

The Reproduction of Gender Inequality in the Classroom Climate: The Role of the Teacher

The tradition of questioning the reproduction of patriarchal ideology in the education system and instructional processes in Turkey gained ground after the 1970s. Having accelerated since the second half of the 1990s when women's studies became established as an academic field, we have seen how feminist educational studies have contributed to the formation of a national literature, particularly on how curricula and course books reproduce gender discrimination. Other than course books and curricula, there is unfortunately a shortage of in-depth research in Turkey that focuses on sexist ideas and behaviour patterns reproduced by school cultures, classroom climates, and their relationships and actors. Thus, there is a lack of detailed national empirical data particularly concerning the reproductive roles of teachers within this structure. Despite the lack of research in Turkey, the international literature shows that school life and culture reproduces asymmetrical gender power relations in various ways. Schools and teachers have a key role in how

children construct and code gender through classroom practices, language, expectations and behaviours, and values system and attitudes (Younger & Warrington, 2008). Schools shape/socialize students via the official and hidden curriculum, in other words through behaviour codes, classroom organization and the informal pedagogical methods used by teachers (i.e., discipline and punishment methods, etc.). Gender emerges as an important organizational/administrative category in all stages of the educational system (from preschool to higher education). In traditional schools, there is a strong relation between the definitions of masculinity and femininity, which is supported by the spatial organization of the school, school uniforms, classroom activities and the curriculum (Arnot, 2002). For instance, girls and boys are usually segregated into different areas within the same school building, and their play areas and objects, classroom seating, responsibilities and so on are generally determined by their gender (Delamont, 1990; Gray & Leith, 2004).

Sadker and Sadker (1986) define schools as places that systematically reproduce gender inequality. Girls and boys who sit in the same classrooms, study the same course books and listen to the same teacher can still receive a rather different education. In all stages of education, girls are the invisible members of the classroom. Teachers interact more with boys, ask them better questions, and give them more valuable and helpful feedback. While girls learn to wait in patience, boys learn that they are the main actors of class life (Sadker, Sadker & Zittleman 2009).

Studies on classroom interaction models have shown that the school climate encourages female students much less than their male counterparts to participate in curricular and extracurricular activities. Findings of previous studies have shown that teachers are more involved with male students in the classroom, support them more, put them in the spotlight especially in science and math classes, ignore female students, and prevent them from speaking their minds and improving their verbal skills (Eccles & Blumenfeld, 1985; Stanworth, 1990; Streitmatter, 1994; Li, 1999; Duffy, Warren & Walsh, 2001; Tsouroufli, 2002; Smith, Hardman & Higgins 2007). Further, even when a difference does not exist between male and female students' math scores, teachers report that males are more successful (Tiedemann, 2002). A study conducted in Turkey similarly concluded that teachers find boys more successful in math, physics and sports, while they find girls more successful in verbal fields and music (Baç, 1997).

Regarding tasks and responsibilities, female students are mostly put in charge of classroom cleanliness and spatial organization, while boys are given tasks that require more responsibility such as taking care of materials and equipment, or manage the classroom and ensure discipline when the teacher is not there (UNESCO, 2004). Teachers' expectations from their students and the way they interpret student behaviours also vary with respect to gender. They normally expect girls to be polite, respectful, conscientious, helpful, eager to please, obeying without question (Robinson, 1992) or hard-working, rule-following, cooperative, conscientious and academically able (Renold, 2006). The adjectives teachers use to define their students are parallel to their expectations. For instance, the Turkish teachers who participated in Baç's (1997) study used the adjectives 'adventurous, reckless, aggressive, active, and intelligent' for boys and 'tidy, quiet, sensitive, respectful, and reliable' for girls. In addition, teachers seem to be more tolerant of resistant behaviours such as 'asking irrelevant questions' or 'disrupting class' which are mostly displayed by boys who are defined as 'dominant, disruptive, underperforming and generally challenging' (Sadker&Sadker, 1985; Robinson, 1992; Renold, 2006).

Rich scientific data about the classroom climate shows that teacher behaviours, attitudes, actions and words discourage girls in different ways and affect their self-confidence adversely. Similar to many other countries, Turkish girls have better academic success and higher learning motivation than boys. However, when one is to participate in the lesson, discuss an issue or speak out, a teacher or a male student can easily break the spirit of female students (Sayan, 2007). Such blows to girls' brevity and self-confidence may affect not only their educational development but also their career/professional choices (Bailey, 1993; Duffy et al., 2001). Teachers are also known to influence students' career plans and decisions, and particularly encourage girls who choose a male dominant work field (Streitmatter, 1994). As shown in several studies such as that of Baç (1997), however, on the whole teachers see professions related to power and merchandise as fit for boys, and those requiring caring, domestic work, verbal ability and physical presentation as fit for girls.

Tan (2007) showed in her study that the most important actors of sexism in instructional processes in Turkey were teachers. According to the results of this study, teacher expectations and

behaviours particularly reinforce gender discrimination among high school students, encourage them to choose certain professions and gender roles, and control their sexuality. These negative influences are valid for teachers of both sexes. Tan lists teachers' sexist behaviours as follows: Interfering with students' appearance and clothing, blaming them for befriending the opposite sex, not allowing girls to talk during in-class discussions or ignoring their questions, planning course content in relation to gender, seating girls and boys separately in the classroom, choosing members of one sex for classroom leadership, cleaning, or tasks such as carrying things (Tan, 2008). These start as early as the preschool period, and continue both explicitly and implicitly even at university when students have become adults.

Teachers, the backbone of instructional practices, are also born into societies shaped by gender roles and thus also become carriers of the values and cultural codes of their own societies. Teachers may not openly discriminate between the two sexes in their classrooms but their expectations, instructional and discipline methods are directly related to their gender-biased attitudes and behaviours (Streitmatter, 1994). In other words, the differences in teacher behaviours towards girls and boys, the interaction styles they use with them, and the roles and responsibilities they give them are generally determined by a patriarchal worldview that preserves the hierarchical structure between the sexes (Robinson, 1992; Arnot, 2002; UNESCO, 2004; Tan, 2008).

According to UNICEF's report (2003), *A Gender Review in Turkish Education*, the social environment that teachers grow up in and their ways of socialization and education often precludes them from questioning gender inequality. Teachers ignore whether schools are patriarchal places and thus pay no attention to sexist approaches and the conservative or sexist content of course books. Female teachers too are gender blind like their male counterparts; they are largely insensitive about directing students to traditional gender roles and reinforcing sexism. According to Torun's (2002) study, even though gender stereotypical thoughts and beliefs play a crucial role in the teacher-student interaction, neither teachers nor students are aware of this. The fact that teachers are not aware of, question or care about gender discrimination shows that they too have internalized the traditional viewpoint regarding gender (UNICEF, 2003).

Gender Training: A Conceptual Framework

The concept 'gender' stresses that inequality between women and men stems not from biological differences, but from social and cultural contexts, which can be transformed through various strategies. The aim of this transformation is to attain gender equality, i.e., ensuring that no one suffers from inequality or discrimination due to his/her gender (UNDP, 2001). Being one of the main strategies that can be wielded in attaining this aim, gender education is an activity of enhancement that seeks to create awareness, knowledge, skills and behavioural change about gender (UNESCO, 2000).

Training implemented with the aim of fostering the gender equality mindset generally intends to make individuals acquire two basic skills. The first of these is gender sensitivity that is defined as the skill of acknowledging the differences between genders as well as problems and inequalities associated with these differences, bringing them into view and incorporating them into strategies and actions (UNDP, 2001; UNESCO, 2010). Gender sensitivity is considered as the starting point for gender awareness. Gender awareness is a more critical and exacting understanding of the fact that differences between sexes - which affect individuals' skills for accessing and controlling resources and services - are dependent on acquired behaviours (UNESCO, 2010). Gender awareness is the ability to detect, even when they are not salient, the problems stemming from gender inequality and discrimination (USAID, 2007). This awareness entails gender mainstreaming.

In this conceptual framework, a gender education activity to be designed for teachers has the potential to trigger the intended social change about gender equality. This is because teachers are positioned as strategic agents of change as they function as role models with their attitudes, methods and practices inside and outside the classroom. Therefore, teachers should be able to diagnose sexist stereotypes and biases, i.e. the inequality-producing structure of the society in which they live, and then to recognize in their individual and professional lives the beliefs, behaviours and attitudes that reproduce this structure. To this end, they need to undergo special sensitivity and awareness training.

The Gender Agenda in Teacher Education

One of the major problems related to teacher training programs on a global scale is the lack of courses that focus on the gender issue. Both in developed and underdeveloped countries, the institutions that train teachers are still undecided about organizing courses, seminars or workshops on gender equality as part of their teacher training programs (Gaudet & Lapointe, 2002; Gudbjornsdottir, 2012). Various studies on teachers and teacher trainers reveal there is no systematic education focus on gender neither in pre-service nor in-service settings despite the global emphasis on the importance of the gender issue (The American Association of University Women, 1999; Cushman, 2010; Knipe, Leith, Gray, McKeown & Carlisle, 2002; Malmgren & Weiner, 2001; Weiner, 2000; Younger & Warrington, 2008; Buchberger, Campos, Kallos & Stephenson, 2000).

The sufficiently intensive curricula, used in teacher training institutions, are identified as one of the reasons for this. The proponents of this approach argue that it is not easy to integrate the gender equality perspective with a number of areas that teachers deal with such as design, content and teaching approach (Oxfam, 2004). Moreover, in the US, gender is treated as part of the courses on diversity and multiculturalism and, therefore, some argue there is no need to develop a special course on this matter (Weiner, 2000). Thus for most teacher trainers, gender remains a low-priority issue. Coupled with other factors, this results in a general lack of gender discourse in the teacher training area (Weiner, 2000).

However, special efforts to fill this gap through gender education seminars, elective courses and workshops with pre-service teachers, in-service teachers and teacher trainers have reportedly produced quite successful results (Allana, Asad & Sherali, 2010; Kawana, 2009, Sanders, 1996). Studies indicate that gender education creates in participants a more flexible gender role orientation, and reinforced sense of control and self-respect in their lives (Haris, Melas & Rodacker 1999). Moreover, those who attended these training courses tend to develop consciousness/awareness about sexism and other social inequalities, and acquire self-respect/self-confidence and motivation for social activism and develop more egalitarian attitudes toward women and other oppressed groups (Stake, 2006; Stake & Hoffmann, 2001).

Currently, the curricula of higher education institutions that prepare teachers in Turkey do not include special courses on the gender issue. There are efforts to tackle this deficiency by introducing some elective courses or incorporating gender content into some compulsory courses at some universities. For instance, Erden (2009) reported favourable changes in the attitudes of pre-service teachers who attended her elective course on gender equality. Another study conducted by Esen (2013) found positive changes in the pre- and post-training levels of sensitivity and awareness of pre-service teachers after gender education was incorporated into a compulsory course. According to the results of this study the most striking difference after the training emerged when participants began to question whether or not to conform to the values of the traditional patriarchal society and how to apply their gender awareness to the professional domain. Esen showed in her study that as a result of a systematic study of gender issues, prospective teachers were able to question traditional value judgments and to gain motivation for personal change/transformation in their own lives and settings.

Elsewhere some private institutions in Turkey have begun to implement gender training as seen in the Sabancı University project group tasked with "educating the educator". This initiative has produced a certificate programme for in-service teachers, which includes the following gender specific aims: - To establish gender studies tasked with helping to instil best practice throughout the Turkish high school education system and its various extra-curricular activities. – To encourage the adoption of such practices so that teachers routinely foster in their students appropriate behaviour towards women and awareness of their rights. – To adjust and sensitise the language of programme participants so that they can readily express and advance gender equality at school. – To utilise a pragmatic and personalised "learning to learn" approach to gender equality in the classroom, one that empowers and sustains high school teachers to implement gender sensitive education.

One of the reports discussed during the 2008-2013 Gender Equality Action Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Meeting organised by the GDSW (2011) was entitled "Women and Education." This provides information about the progress made in Turkey concerning the targets and strategies set forth in the Action Plan. Examination of the report indicates that significant efforts are being

undertaken within the Ministry of Education (ME) through various campaigns and projects, for instance, the "Mothers and Daughters at School" Anti-illiteracy Campaign, projects for boosting the schooling rate of girls, a project for Supporting Gender Equality in Education, the Conditional Education Aids, etc. Moreover, a Gender Equality Commission was set up as part of the Education and Discipline Department of the ME with a view to removing sexist language, images, expressions and similar elements that are portent of gender discrimination as well as gender stereotypes from curricula, course books and other educational materials. The report detailed how the ME had been undertaking significant work in terms of policies and practices for ensuring gender equality in recent years.

Yet, the prime responsibility for implementing these policies and practices falls on the shoulders of teachers and school administrators. If the policies designed to ensure gender equality are not realised in school and in-classroom processes, it will be impossible to attain the specified targets. In this regard, the revision of policies applicable to teacher training by the Council of Higher Education should be implemented as soon as possible. Several initiatives were launched to insert the gender equality vision into curricula in four basic areas (education, media, health and law) with the aim of creating gender awareness in higher education course contents, but the continuation of these initiatives is uncertain. Thus, concrete steps are yet to be taken with regards to one of the most important strategies in the Action Plan, i.e. ensuring that education faculties offer undergraduate and graduate programs concerning gender equality.

Gender Equality Sensitivity Training for Undergraduate Programs of Faculties of Education: A Course Proposal

Mindful of the positive and negative developments concerning gender education in Turkey, we have considered a framework for a "Gender and Education" (GE) course that can be inserted as a compulsory or elective course within the curricula of education faculties. The purpose of this effort is to establish curriculum or module development on this subject.

Target Group: Students who are attending an education faculty and professional teachers via in-service training.

General Purpose of the GE Course: To boost course attendants' gender sensitivity and awareness. In other words, the overall goal of this course would be to improve pre-service teachers' existing knowledge and conceptions about gender inequality and to help ensure that they put into practice their potentials for combating this inequality in their social and professional spheres. The sub-goals of the course regarding knowledge, skills and attitudes can be summed as follows:

- The knowledge aspect: The GE course should provide participants with knowledge on gender inequality, implicit/explicit discrimination, stereotypes/prejudices as a form of discrimination, and the potential of the school culture for reproducing gender inequality.

- The skills aspect: The GE course should endow participants with skills for recognizing stereotypes in social and cultural patterns, and written and visual materials, particularly in their own lives. On a professional level, it should assist participants to identify gender inequality in their curricula, education materials and methods, and interaction processes in the classroom. Thereby helping them to detect gender inequality interference in social and professional processes.

- The attitudes aspect: The GE course should engender the empathy of participants for individuals and groups who suffer from discrimination. It should also foster determination for improving gender equality, the belief that individual efforts can make a difference, and enable participants to adopt critical perspectives about stereotypes.

Learning Attainments of the Course: In this context, it is of importance to identify the skills and attitudes which participants are expected to develop as well as the information to be used in the process. In other words, the attainments of the GE course should be discussed at the knowledge, skills and attitude levels from a general perspective. The course should enable participants to competently:

1. Explain the significance of gender equality from a human rights perspective;
2. Recognize that gender inequalities do not stem from biological differences, but from discriminatory perspectives in their society and culture;
3. Exemplify the perspective they have acquired about gender equality in their own lives;
4. Discuss causes and effects of gender inequality in a local and universal setting;

5. Propose solutions to potential problems they may encounter in future by using the perspective they have acquired about gender equality;
6. Acknowledge that the views that are based on gender biases and stereotypes are an obstacle to gender equality;
7. Recognize the importance of advocating gender equality; and
8. Assume responsibility for positively transforming views that are based on gender biases and stereotypes.

Content of the Course: Course materials and activities should facilitate the learning attainments with emphasis on:

1. The meanings of the terms sex and gender,
2. The acquisition of sex and gender roles during socialization (the influence of the family, peer groups, TV, schools, etc.),
3. Gender stereotyping in the context of cultural/social values,
4. Discrimination between sexes in various areas in social life (in daily life, in human relations, in working life, etc.),
5. Gender in the context of educational processes and school culture,
6. The transformative role of schools and teachers in attaining gender equality (implementation of gender-friendly policies and strategies), and
7. Ways and methods for creating a gender-friendly classroom.

The practices to be developed within the scope of the last item are particularly important for pre-service teachers. First of all, gender equality in the classroom is a key that binds training and citizenship to human rights. On the other hand, gender equality in pedagogical practices affects the very nature of learning experiences of both girls and boys, thereby emerging as the central component not only of a quality education, but also of a better standard of living. For these reasons, the quest for attaining gender equality should be regarded as a fundamental human rights issue (Oxfam, 2004).

Teaching Methods and Techniques: Participants should be provided with a theoretical/conceptual framework with the foregoing headings in mind and at the same time, applied practices should be conducted. During this exercise, the mere presentation of descriptions or explanations about the topic should be carefully avoided or least used by the facilitator. This is because given the goals, attainments and contents, such a course should be able to position participants at the centre as much as possible. The knowledge acquired in the classroom should pave the way for participants' making sense of the real conditions related to their daily lives (Shor, 1980). To do this, the learning processes used should feature affinity to the daily lives of participants and rely on their intellectual, emotional and cultural resources, i.e., life-oriented knowledge should be placed at the centre.

In this context, those methods and techniques that would ensure active participation such as dramatization, classroom debate and opinion development, should be included in the teaching/learning process in the classroom setting. For instance, the drama technique can be used to find out how our and others' sexist views, attitudes and behaviours are reflected in our daily lives and educational processes. A case study about violence against women, a widespread social problem, may be made. The forms of reproduction of sexism in the media may be discussed with reference to advertisements and TV series.

Learning Resources for the Course: The learning resources for this course should mainly include books, academic research, and institutional reports. In addition, special emphasis should also be placed on internet resources, visual materials (short films, documentaries, newspaper clippings, etc.), and expert views about the subject matter.

Assessment Criteria for the Course: Given the objectives, attainments sought and context of this course, it is clear that traditional measurement and assessment approaches (written tests, etc.) will not apply. A significant part of the process is to orient participants toward applied practices where they make active use of their attainments and to encourage them to come up with various products. For instance, participants may conduct small-scale research using scientific research techniques (survey, interview, observing participants, etc). They may also conduct interviews or shoot spot films or design banners and posters about a specific social problem of interest within the scope of gender inequality.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Education is the main driver for triggering social change on gender equality. Although educational policies advocate gender equality in education, equality cannot be attained unless these policies enable teachers to perform a decisive role. In this sense, one of the best strategies is to equip teachers with sensitivity and awareness about gender equality. As they establish face to face and close relationships with students, teachers may play a major role in the development of new criteria, roles and attitudes regarding gender equality (Frawley, 2005). The resistance and new in-class strategies that teachers develop at the micro level against gender inequality may be used to change/transform gender-based layering. The most important way of realizing this is for teacher education policies to include gender sensitivity in the definition of a “high quality teacher” and ensure that teacher education institutions treat this concept in compulsory courses.

A few studies conducted at education faculties in Turkey found that even a brief training session on gender helped participants to start to question traditional value judgments and acquire a motivation for change/transformation, starting from their own lives (Esen, 2013) and attain positive attitudes (Erden, 2009). Furthermore, it was reported that gender education was able to create new forms of awareness and sensitivity or help participants to attain skills for supporting existing forms of awareness and sensitivity with a conceptual framework. In conclusion, training pre-service teachers about gender equality clearly is important and can make a difference. Yet, it is hard to suggest that the positive opinion and attitude changes this training will create during the pre-service period will be maintained in the long run (Erden, 2009). Therefore, instead of focusing on the efforts that would create one-time awareness, teachers should be supported with in-service training activities for sustainable gender sensitivity (Chisholm & McKinney, 2003). These activities should help teachers to develop practical solutions, accompanied by monitoring and follow-up support. Pre-service educational institutions and in-service professional development providers should be maintained in coordination with each other and these activities should be systematically documented. Moreover, exercise-centred materials should be prepared for teachers and networks should be established for encouraging teachers to conduct joint work on new pedagogical approaches (Oxfam, 2004).

The discussion about the existing structures and programs of teacher training faculties should be updated as well. Indeed, given the teaching methods and course books used in teacher training institutions and the attitudes of the academics working at these institutions, teacher education has been seen to reproduce the male-dominated structure (Lumadi & Shongwe, 2009; Zittleman & Sadker, 2002). It is a regrettable shortcoming that teacher training processes in Turkey have not been studied from this angle. In this context, it would be a major step to reinforce and support gender perspective in the research traditions of educational sciences and organize seminars to boost sensitivity among academics of education faculties. Tasks that can be performed by education faculties include incorporation of gender equality into curricula, training academics who wish to study on this subject and development of relevant educational materials and modules.

References:

1. American Association of University Women Educational Foundation (1999). *Gender gaps: Where schools still fail our children*. Washington, DC. <http://www.aauw.org/learn/research/upload/GGES.pdf>
2. Allana, A.; Asad, N. & Sherali, Y. (2010). Gender in academic settings: Role of teachers. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 1 (4), 343-348. Retrieved from <http://www.ijimt.org/papers/63-C053.pdf>
1. Arnot, M. (2002). *Reproducing gender*. London: Routledge.
4. Baba, H. B. (2007). *Teacher candidates as the agents of change for a more gender equal society*. Unpublished master's thesis. The Graduate School of Social Sciences of METU.
5. Baç, G. (1997). *A study on gender bias in teachers' behaviours, attitudes, perceptions and expectations toward their students*. Unpublished master's thesis. Department of Educational Sciences, METU.
6. Bailley, S.M. (1993). The current status of gender equity research in American schools. *Educational Psychologist*, 28 (4), 321-339.

7. Buchberger, F.; Campos, B.P.; Kallos, D. & Stephenson, J. (2000). *High quality teacher education for high quality education and training. Green paper on teacher education in Europe, Umea*. Retrieved from <http://tntee.umu.se/publications/greenpaper/greenpaper.pdf>
8. Chisholm, L. & McKinney, C. (2003). Reforms, innovations and approaches used to work with teachers to use them as change agents and facilitators of gender equality in different countries: Strengths and limitations. *Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2003/4, The Leap to Equality*, UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001467/146757e.pdf>
- 1) Council of Europe (2007). *Recommendation CM/Rec (2007) 17 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on gender equality standards and mechanisms*. Retrieved from <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1215219&Site=CM>
10. Cushman, P. (2010). Three men teachers, three countries and three responses to the physical contact dilemma. *International Journal of Education*, 1 (1), 1-16.
11. Delamont, S. (1990). *Sex roles and the school*. London: Routledge.
12. Duffy, J., Warren, K. & Walsh, M. (2001). Classroom interaction: Gender of teacher, gender of student and classroom subject. *Sex Roles*, 45 (9-10), 579-593.
13. Eccles, J.S. & Blumenfeld, P. (1985). Classroom experiences and student gender: Are there differences and do they matter? In L.C. Wilkinson ve C.B. Marrett (Eds.), *Gender influences in classroom interaction*. (pp.79-114). Orlando: Academic Press.
14. Erden, F. T. (2009). A course on gender equity in education: Does it affect gender role attitudes of preservice teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 409-414.
15. Esen, Y. (2013). Hizmet öncesi öğretmen eğitiminde toplumsal cinsiyet duyarlılığını geliştirme amaçlı bir çalışma. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 38(169), 280-295.
16. Frawley, T. (2005). Gender Bias in the Classroom: Current controversies and implications for teachers. *Childhood Education* 81(4):221-27.
17. Gaudet, J. A. & Lapointe, C. (2002). What could an equitable instructional design achieve? An experiment with trainers. *New Horizons in Adult Education*, 16(3), 13-26. Retrieved from <http://education.fiu.edu/newhorizons/journals/volume16no3.pdf>
18. General Directorate on the Status of Women. (2008). National Action Plan Gender Equality 2008-2013. Retrieved from http://www.kadininstatusu.gov.tr/upload/kadininstatusu.gov.tr/mce/eski_site/Pdf/NAP_GE.pdf
19. General Directorate on the Status of Women. (2011). Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliği Ulusal Eylem Planı İzleme ve Değerlendirme Toplantısı-2011. Retrieved from http://www.kadininstatusu.gov.tr/upload/kadininstatusu.gov.tr/mce/2012/uep_2011.pdf
20. Gray, C. & Leith, H. (2004). Perpetuating gender stereotypes in the classroom: A teacher perspective. *Educational Studies*, 30 (1), 3-17.
21. Gudbjornsdottir, G. (2012). *Exchange of good practices on gender equality. Gender training in education, Portugal 18-19 October 2012*. Comments paper-Iceland. European Commission. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/genderequality/files/exchange_of_good_practice_pt/pt_discussion_paper_pt_2012_de.pdf
22. Haris, K. L.; Melas, K. & Rodacker, E. (1999). The impact of women's studies courses on college students of the 1990s. *Sex Roles*, 40 (11-12), 969-977.
23. Kawana, S. (2009). Gender and teacher education policy in Japan: Feminist teachers organising for change. *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies*, 3. Retrieved from <http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles/2009/Kawana.html>
24. Knipe, D.; Leith, H.; Gray, C.; McKeown, E. & Carlisle, K. (2002). *Betty the builder, Neil the nurse: Sex-typing of occupations in primary schools*. Belfast: Equality Commission for Northern Ireland. Retrieved from http://www.equalityni.org/sections/default.asp?secid=8vecms=Publications_Sex_research+reportsvecmsid=7_39_186veid=186
25. Li, Q. (1999). Teachers' beliefs and gender differences in mathematics: A review. *Educational Research*, 41 (1), 63-76.
26. Lumadi, M. W. & Shongwe, S. S. (2010). The need for training gender-sensitive teachers: addressing challenges of gender sensitive education for gender sensitive national development. *Contemporary Issues In Education Research*, 3 (3), 41-50.
27. Malmgren, G. & Weiner, G. (2001). Disturbing boundaries in teacher education: Gender and the 'F' word - feminism. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5 (2), 237-255.

28. Owens, S. L.; Smothers, B.C., & Love, F.E. (2003). Are girls victims of gender bias in our nation's schools? *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 30(2), 131-136.
29. Oxfam. (2004). *Pedagogic strategies for gender equality: A beyond access project policy paper*. Retrieved from http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/issues/education/downloads/ba_strategies.pdf
30. Renold, E. (2006). Gendered classroom experiences. In C. Skelton, B. Francis ve L. Smulyan (Eds.), *The sage handbook of gender and education*. (pp.439-450). London: Sage.
31. Robinson, K.H. (1992). Classroom discipline: Power, resistance and gender. A look at teacher perspectives'. *Gender and Education*, 4(3), 273-288.
32. Sadker, M. P. & Sadker, D. M. (1985) Sexism in the schoolroom of the 80's. *Psychology Today*,19(3), 54-57.
33. Sadker, M.P. & Sadker, D.M. (1986). Sexism in the classroom: From grade school to graduate school. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 67(7), 512-515.
34. Sadker, D.M., Sadker, M.P. & Zittleman, K.R. (2009). *Still failing at fairness: How gender bias cheats girls and boys in school and what we can do about it*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
35. Sanders, J. (1996). *Institutionalizing gender equity in teacher education*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED392779.pdf>
36. Sayan, S. (2007). *Kız öğrencilerin okul yaşantılarına ilişkin nitel bir araştırma*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara University.
37. Sayman, D. (2007). The elimination of sexism and stereotyping in occupational education. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 15(1), 19-30.
38. Shor, I. (1980). *Critical teaching and everyday life*. Boston: South End Pres.
39. Smith, F., Hardman, F. & Higgins, S. (2007). Gender inequality in the primary classroom: Will interactive whiteboards help? *Gender and Education*, 19 (4), 455-469.
40. Stake, J. E. (2006). Pedagogy and student change in the women's and gender studies classroom. *Gender and Education*, 18 (2), 199-212.
41. Stake, J. E. & Hoffmann, F. L. (2001). Changes in student social attitudes, activism, and personal confidence in higher education: The role of women's studies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(2), 411-436.
42. Stanworth, M. (1990). *Gender and schooling: A study of sexual divisions in the classroom*. Cambridge: The University Pres.
43. Streitmatter, J. (1994). *Toward gender equity in the classroom: Everyday teachers' beliefs and practices*. New York: State University.
44. Tan, M. (2007). Eğitimde cinsiyetçilik: Farkında mıyız? *Kadın*, 8 Mart, Eğitim-Sen Bülten Eki, 15-18.
45. Tan, M. (2008). Eğitim. M. Tan, Y. Ecevit, S. S. Üşür ve S. Acuner (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliği: Sorunlar, öncelikler ve çözüm önerileri* (ss.23-105). İstanbul: TÜSİAD-KAGİDER.
46. Tiedemann, J. (2002). Teachers' gender stereotypes as determinants of teacher perceptions in elementary school mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 50(1), 49-62.
47. Torun, Y. (2002). *Gender bias in student-teacher interactions and its effect on reproduction of gender roles in the classroom*. Unpublished master's thesis. Department of Gender and Women's Studies, METU.
48. Tsouroufli, M. (2002). Gender and teachers' classroom practice in a secondary school in Greece. *Gender and Education*, 14(2), 135-147.
49. UNDP (2001). *Introductory gender analysis ve gender planning training module for UNDP staff*. Retrieved from [http://arabstates.undp.org/contents /file/Gender Mainstreaming Training.pdf](http://arabstates.undp.org/contents/file/Gender%20Mainstreaming%20Training.pdf)
50. UNESCO (2000). *Gender sensitivity, module 5*. France: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001304/130428e.pdf>
51. UNESCO (2004). *Gender sensitivity: A training manual for sensitizing education managers, curriculum and material developers and media professionals to gender concerns*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001376/137604eo.pdf>

52. UNESCO (2010). *Gender sensitizing. Reorienting teacher education to address sustainable development: Guidelines and tools*. Bangkok: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001890/189054e.pdf>
53. UNICEF (2003). *Eğitimin toplumsal cinsiyet açısından incelenmesi Türkiye raporu*. Ankara: UNICEF. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/turkey/pdf/_ge21.pdf
54. USAID (2007). *Gender terminology*. Retrieved from <http://www.usaid.gov>
55. Weiner, G. (2000). Gender and teacher education in Europe: A critical review of gender and teacher education in Europe. *Pedagogy, Culture ve Society*, 8 (2), 233-247.
56. Younger, M. & Warrington, M. (2008). The gender agenda in primary teacher education in England: Fifteen lost years? *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(4), 429–445.
57. Zittleman, K. & Sadker, D. (2002). Gender bias in teacher education texts: New (and old) lessons. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53 (2), 168-179.
58. Sabancı University, Purple Certificate Program <http://genderforum.sabanciuniv.edu/tr/Morserttanitim>