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Abstract

This descriptive study examines two aspects of teacher education (text materials and curricular methods) with respect to the question of how GLBT issues are presented and discussed. The first study focuses on a content analysis of a variety of textbooks (lifespan development, adolescent development, and multicultural/social foundations) that are available for use in teacher education programs. Findings here include the general inclusion of GLBT issues in lifespan and adolescence texts, though there were some structural and content treatment considerations. The second study involved a set of interviews with eleven teacher educators from a variety of programs around the country. Four main themes were derived from the data (curricular consistency, community/campus contexts, perceived administrative response, and perceived student response) and discussed. Findings suggest that while GLBT issues are increasingly a part of teacher education programs there is still inconsistency across and within programs. Implications for these studies include recommendations for incorporating GLBT issues into teacher preparation in a more formal manner as well as integrating the issues across the curriculum.
In the middle of Fall semester, one of us (Allison) received this email from an intern teacher for whom I served as a university supervisor. I was not expecting this, nor was I surprised. However, I was interested in the thinking this intern teacher demonstrated around these issues as it struck me as reasonably sophisticated, given the circumstances. What follows is the series of three emails for which I received permission to reproduce for this paper. Names have been changed to provide anonymity. Note that this discussion occurred shortly after the Matthew Shepard murder in Wyoming.

Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 19:31:02 -0500 (EST)
From: ryan@xmiedu
To: allison.young@xmi.edu
Subject: an interesting dilemma for you

I thought you were probably the best person to talk with about a situation that has cropped up at Nixon. I'm aware of rumors storming the NHS student body that I am gay. Now, I happen to be straight, contrary to a life's worth of public speculation. I guess that's what I get for being such a liberated man. To some, then, my problem would seem to have a simple solution: deny the rumors, which I can do without lying. So much the better. However that is exactly the course of action I don't want to take. I have quite intentionally not denied the rumors, even when it came to me in the form of an inappropriate joke by a student during class. I was quite surprised by this particular incident and admit that I didn't really know how to deal with it. I kind of gave the student a disapproving scowl and reminded him that there are appropriate ways to act interact in school and he was outside the bounds. Around the same time, some students were stunned when I reprimanded one for maliciously calling a student a "faggot" They were confused by the fact that I would be touchy about something that, after all "isn't a real cuss word." (No, it's just a word that is rooted in a culture which used to burn certainly individuals at the stake for their sexuality. Gee, I can't see where the inhumanity is in that). Any way, back to the comedian: I also kept him after class to remind him that there was a line in our relationship and he had crossed it. He seemed legitimately apologetic, but you know how people are. My unwillingness to publicly deny the "accusation" was taken by most as a tacit confession. Part of me is fine with that. Getting defensive about the issue and flaunting my heterosexuality would amount to saying there is something to be ashamed of if one is homosexual which I firmly believe there is not. I think about may gay students, and if I'm to believe statistics. I do have those, and what such an action on my part might have on them. And plus I think it's really unfair to my gay colleagues who don't have the same luxury of dismissing vicious gossip. The wrong-doing that I'm concerned with is that students are fixated on something that is inappropriate and none of their business. I would never dream of inquiring about their sex lives (which, I am confident, are infinitely more juicy than mine) because it would be an abuse of my role as teacher. Students should act likewise, shouldn't they?

I don't know what it is I want to hear from you. Some reassurance that I'm dealing with this appropriately. Are there any repercussions that I should be worried about as this rumor grows? Maybe I'm reaching here, but I felt a growing lack of respect for me and my instructions lately and I'm wondering if it's linked to the rumors. What's your perspective?

Ryan

ps. The reason I'm discussing this with you and not Jim [the mentor teacher], besides the obvious I guess, is that he has expressed what I perceive as some homophobic sentiments, which kind of multiplies the obstacles as I negotiate this thing.

Later.
Ryan had a few things in his favor. First, he came into the teacher preparation program with a disposition that was open to differences in sexuality. A conversation with him confirmed that he had friends who were gay or lesbian and a general openness to issues of difference. Second, Ryan’s teacher preparation program addressed the gay and lesbian issue at least twice -- once in an education course on adolescence and schooling and second in his English methods course. He had been part of a group of students who presented a class session on gay and lesbian literature which was encouraged by his English methods professor. However, this may not be the case in all teacher preparation programs. This paper is a preliminary investigation of how issues of sexual diversity are treated in teacher education programming.

Generally, we are aware that teacher beliefs about diversity are likely to have an impact on both the classroom climate as well as instructional practices (Grant & Secada, 1990; Richardson, 1996). Sears (1992) suggests that while preservice teachers’ personal beliefs do not always correlate with beliefs about professional conduct, personal beliefs may in fact lead a teacher to treat a student unfairly. Also, if the teacher has not been exposed to issues related to a certain group, he or she may be unprepared for how to handle the social or learning issues for members of that group should they arise. In order to address these personal beliefs around difference, many teacher preparation programs have begun to require multicultural education courses to help preservice teachers to grapple with issues of diversity. While race, gender and social class are often used as the more obvious signifiers of diversity issues, it remains unclear as to how GLBT issues are treated in these types of courses as well as in the preservice teacher education curricula more generally.

Even in American popular culture, gay and lesbian adolescents are “marginalized” at many levels or even excluded, reinforcing the invisibility of gay and lesbian adolescents and reifying a “spiral of silence” (Kielwasser and Wolf 1991). Sears (1991) points out that schools, places where youth spend much of their day, serve to confirm this conspiracy. He calls for a more psychological approach to more healthy depictions of the fluidity of sexual behavior and sexual
identity. Thus, in both the broader American culture as well as within most school communities, issues of sexual diversity have been largely ignored.

More specifically in teacher education, a 1994 study of prospective teachers in Ohio found that there was a high incidence of homophobic attitudes, high percentage of incorrect responses alluding to negative stereotypes, as well as an unwillingness to address gay/lesbian issues adequately in the context of schools or to exhibit supportive behaviors toward gays and lesbians (Butler, 1994). Given our understanding of the role of teacher beliefs, the findings in this study are not encouraging since they suggest that even if teachers were to present a "professional" demeanor as Sears (1991) suggests, their underlying beliefs would still be largely negative.

Finally, the April 1997 volume of Educational Leadership, a widely-read and respected education journal, put out a special issue on multicultural education which contained two articles on issues of sexual orientation (Anderson, 1997; Edwards, 1997). These articles highlighted the need for attention to GLBT issues in educational settings with respect to support staff and services, library resources, sexuality in the health curriculum, curriculum support and educating educators in particular (Anderson, 1997). While these articles brought sexual diversity issues to a more mainstream audience, the effects on teacher education programming remain to be seen.

This recent call for attention to GLBT issues in education may stem from the increasing publicity of gay-bashing incidents in K-12 schools such as the Nabozny case as well as the more recent Shepard incident at the post-secondary level. Regardless of the level of education, there is a great deal of ignorance around these issues and it is clear that such ignorance serves to collude in the conspiracy of silence and eventually leads to harm for gay, lesbian and bisexual students and faculty colleagues. It is equally clear that teachers, both preservice and inservice, are largely ignorant of these issues.

Because teacher preparation programs play a role in shaping preservice teacher’s beliefs about teaching, learning and students more generally, it seems incumbent upon these programs to raise and discuss issues of sexual diversity. For elementary educators, they will encounter GLBT families in their classrooms. For secondary educators, they will have students who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender. At both levels of education, teachers will have colleagues who identify as GLBT. To create a truly inclusive community, it is important that preservice teacher
preparation programs address GLBT issues directly (Mathison, 1998). However, very little work has been done to investigate how teacher preparation programs negotiate GLBT issues in the curriculum. We framed this study using two major questions: 1) What are teacher preparation programs doing with GLBT issues? and 2) What are the sources of information?

Method

Data Sources & Analysis

We chose to derive our data from two separate types of sources. In essence, we will report on two related studies which will inform one another, since both provide different types of preliminary findings. First, we engaged in a content analysis of textbooks frequently used in teacher preparation including human development, adolescent development, educational psychology and multicultural education or social foundations of education (see Appendix A). Twenty-three textbooks were examined for content related to gays, lesbians and/or homosexuality: eleven developmental psychology texts, five adolescence texts and seven multicultural/social foundations texts comprised our sample. We assessed these on structural dimensions such as index listings, placement among topics in chapters as well as pictures and captions; and theoretical dimensions such as theoretical perspectives presented and issues such as etiology, development, and social issues.

The second data source centered on teacher preparation programs. These programs represent a convenience sample nominated by faculty colleagues at our respective institutions. In no way is this portion of our research exhaustive, which is why these results should be considered as preliminary data for subsequent study. We engaged in brief interviews with eleven professors from ten teacher education departments or programs, focusing our sample on a variety of teacher preparation institutions predominantly from the midwestern United States. We purposely drew from this region because we were concerned about possible strong regional differences in attitudes about GLBT issues.
We used the following interview protocol for both phone interviews and email responses:

- What is the size and location of the institution?
- Approximately how many students do you recommend for teacher certification/year?
- To the best of your knowledge, how are GLBT issues raised in your teacher preparation curriculum? Are GLBT issues likely to be raised in certain courses more than others? What methods and materials are used to raise and discuss these issues?
- Who is likely to raise GLBT issues in your program? Students? Faculty? Do you make use of outside resources such as GLSEN, NGLTF, campus GLBT programs office, etc.?
- How have students responded to the inclusion of these issues? How might they respond?
- How are these issues discussed among teacher education faculty? What have been the results of these discussions?
- How does the administration (department chairs, deans, etc.) view the inclusion of these issues?

Names of informants were changed to provide anonymity and names of institutions were omitted for reasons of confidentiality. Table 1 presents a breakdown of respondents by region and institutional size.

**Study One - The Textbooks**

**Findings**

First the good news: all of the lifespan development and adolescence books dealt on some level with GLBT issues. This was not the case in the seven multicultural texts, where it only appears in two of these (Sadker & Sadker, 1991; Teidt & Teidt, 1995) and in one of these it is listed under “Homophobia.” In all of the lifespan texts, GLBT issues appear under the index heading of “Homosexuality.” Of the eleven lifespan texts, three use the terms “Gay” and “ Lesbian” in their indices. One of the five adolescence texts we investigated had an index heading for “Gay and lesbian parents” (Dusek, 1996) while still another used a cross-index between homosexuality and heterosexuality (Cobb, 1998).

In our examination of the structural aspects of the texts, we made several interesting observations. First, in the lifespan texts the discussion of GLBT issues was most likely found in the sections on social and personality development in early adulthood (eight of the eleven texts (73%)) showed this finding. GLBT issues were also found in the sections or chapters on social and personality development in adolescence in five of eleven texts (45%) and on physical and cognitive development in adolescence in four of the eleven texts (36%). Three texts discussed GLBT issues in sections on middle to late adulthood. One text discussed GLBT issues under
genetics, another discussed these issues under the prenatal heading as part of a commentary on teratogens and still another discussed GLBT issues within the context of a section on preschool androgyny. In the adolescence texts, GLBT issues were discussed within the chapter on adolescent sexuality while the two multicultural texts discuss GLBT under sections on families and on homophobia’s effect on education and schooling. Three of the texts (2 lifespan and 1 adolescence) discussed the issue of gay and lesbian parenting.

Our other observations were specifically related to the relations among content within the texts. We noted that in several cases in both lifespan and adolescence texts, the discussion of GLBT issues was directly preceded or followed by a discussion on STD's, teen pregnancy, or sexual abuse. We also analyzed the text within these discussions to examine how authors were portraying GLBT people. And finally, we examined pictures, figures and tables that were provided as well as any special sections which are often entitled “Highlights.” These provided additional information with respect to the portrayal of GLBT issues in these texts.

**Problematization**

GLBT issues were often included as an example of problems associated with adolescent development along with teen pregnancy and drug abuse and often mentioned in conjunction with AIDS. In the three page section entitled “Homosexual Attitudes and Behavior” in the Santrock text a discussion of AIDS makes up half of the section, including a picture of an end-stage AIDS patient. Similarly, Bee’s (1998) initial discussion of GLBT issue comes in a section entitled “Risky Behavior in Context” (p.281).

Evidence of such problematization was particularly evident in the structure of three of the adolescent development books, where we found that discussion of GLBT issues was likely to happen following or between sections such as teen pregnancy, STDs, or sexual abuse (Atwater, 1996; Dusek, 1996; Steinberg, 1996). This same finding was true for seven of the lifespan texts. Positioning discussions of GLBT issues so close to issues such as these serves only to connect GLBT issues to problems even if the text states otherwise.

Interestingly, in four lifespan texts and one adolescence texts AIDS was listed in the index under the heading “Homosexuality.” In at least two cases, AIDS was brought up only in the section on GLBT issues rather than under health concerns. While the connection between
homosexuality and AIDS cannot be denied, it may be problematic to correlate these topics so
directly in discussions of GLBT issues.

**Ghettoization/Marginality**
Most texts presented GLBT issues in contrast to heterosexuality, thereby marginalizing the
issues in much the same way that racial and ethnic differences are marginalized. One text presents
a discussion focused on etiology, ending with the comparative statement “Like ethnic minority
youth...” (p.314, Bee, 1998). Another text represented this position most effectively in that it
cautions readers against what it then proceeds to do, that “gays and lesbians adapt best when they
don’t define themselves in polarities, such as trying to live in an encapsulated gay or lesbian world
completely divorced from the majority culture or completely accepting the dictates and bias of the
majority culture” (p. 429, Santrock, 1997).

Within the section entitled “Divorce and Remarriage,” Berk (1998) discusses both never-
marrid parents as well as gay and lesbian parents, though her depiction of gay and lesbian parents
is generally positive.

Families headed by a homosexual parent or a gay or lesbian couple are very
similar to those of heterosexuals. Gay and lesbian parents are as committed
to and effective at the parent role, and sometimes more so. Indeed, some
research indicates that gay fathers are more consistent in setting limits and
more responsive to their children’s needs than are heterosexual fathers,
perhaps because gay men’s nontraditional gender-role identity fosters
(Berk, pp.475-476)

A similar statement is found Bee’s(1998) discussion on debunking myths which ends with “All
this means that gay partnerships are far more like heterosexual relationships than they are
different.” (p.368) to

This is similar to findings of psychologists (c.f., Graham) where African-Americans are
considered only in contrast to European-Americans. Most textbooks in our study focused on
GLBT development and social issues in contrast to heterosexual development and social issues.
Marginalization is especially evident in the multicultural or social foundations texts, where only two
of the seven books we examined mentioned homosexuality in passing.

**Common Theoretical Perspectives**
Three major common theoretical positions appeared in the analysis. First, most of the
developmental/lifespan psychology and adolescence texts show some concern with etiology or
explanation. This is especially true of the five adolescence texts that we examined. These texts attempt to answer the natural question of "How and why are people gay?" Typically this includes a discussion of the combination of nature and nurture in influencing development. One adolescence text (Rice) discusses "biological theories, psychoanalytic theories and social learning theories" of etiology. We did find one interesting theme, though. Some texts recognize the prevalence of GLBT behavior, but qualify this by suggesting that this may be a phase that many people outgrow. This appeared to us to be a way of ameliorating the fears that heterosexuals might have around the subject.

Second, some texts attempt to display GLBT issues as part of the variability of development, focusing on the individual differences aspect. This is particularly true in the developmental or lifespan texts where these issues can be seen throughout the text. GLBT relationships are discussed during adolescence and early adulthood and in a few of the texts, even into late adulthood. However, some texts include a discussion of GLBT relationships under "non-marital lifestyles." Even the discussion of GLBT parents is discussed in relation to non-married parents. Texts use heterosexual norms such as married or non-married as opposed to representing the range of behaviors exhibited in relationships or in parenthood.

Finally, some texts were careful to raise the issue of context in that there is significant discrimination against GLBT people and many link it to mental health issues for GLBT people. They focus on the individual ramifications for societal beliefs and behaviors. This is particularly important for preservice teachers who may hold outdated beliefs about homosexuality as abnormal behavior.

**A Picture Is Worth a Thousand Words**

A range of pictures, figures and tables were found in the textbooks. Photos representing men and women; youth and adults; single people and couples were presented in at least nine of the eleven lifespan texts and four of the five adolescence texts. Three of the lifespan texts showed photos which highlighted political activism, and in one case, an AIDS patient. None of the multicultural education texts showed any such photos. Three texts, one lifespan and two adolescence books, used some figural representation of the Kinsey scale to supplement the text. One text offered a table depicting the likelihood of the incidence of gay/lesbianism in twins while
another illustrated differences among gays and lesbians on the basis of other demographic variables such as rural vs. urban and race/ethnicity. Of the twelve photos or figures we found, only one was immediately negative which was a photo of a man on a respirator dying of AIDS. Non-group photos were equally likely to depict women/lesbians and gay men, but the people in the photos are predominantly white/Caucasian.

Implications

While these texts do raise GLBT issues in a straightforward way, it is clear that some may need to consider the placement of the discussion of GLBT issues as well as choice of illustrative photos. Integration of GLBT issues throughout the text, as in the Berger text for example, is a crucial step in combating subtle homophobia (Whatley, 1992). This would prevent the Ghettoization we found in many of the texts we reviewed. In addition, texts should continue to integrate photos with positive connotations of gays and lesbians. The majority of photos we found were positive in nature, many with GLBT people who appeared smiling and we presume, happy; with partners and in groups; showing affection and doing mundane tasks. This range of photos helps to break down stereotypes of gay and lesbian people.

Also, authors and editors should carefully consider the language used to discuss GLBT issues as well as the way in which theoretical perspectives are presented (e.g., Dusek, 1996). As Friend (1993) points out, it is important to place emphasis on the contextual factors that create stress for GLBT people rather than locating homosexuality within individuals. Several of the texts we examined did just this (e.g., Berger, Feldman, Santrock), but many of the text continue to use language focusing on group or individual differences (e.g., Berk, Papalia & Olds, Sigelman & Shaffer, LeFrancois). For instance, while the discussion of the etiology of homosexuality presented in the lifespan texts may be important, it should also be treated with some caution. Feldman’s discussion of this topic raises some questions about Freudian perspectives on this topic, which will help the student to be appropriately critical of psychological theories. This is particularly important for teacher education students who may only take one or two psychology courses as a part of their coursework.

This issue of textbook materials may be especially important in larger teacher preparation programs where textbooks often serve to unify multiple sections of a course, particularly those
programs with a moderate cadre of part-time/adjunct faculty teaching those sections. Textbook materials often become the basis for lectures and discussions. If the individual instructor is not particularly sensitive to the nuances of discussing GLBT issues, it is imperative that the text deals with these issues in a responsible manner.

Study Two - The Interviews

Findings

Again, the good news is that from our interviews it appears that a variety of different teacher preparation institutions have some kind of discussion of GLBT issues with their students. We will explore here the four major themes we found in our data: “This depends on professor/program” (curricular consistency), “If they’re opposed, they don’t say anything” (perceived administrative response), “This is a VERY provincial, conservative area in which we live” (campus and community context), and “I wouldn’t say the group is anti-gay, they are uninformed” (perceived student response). Each theme presents a different perspective on the picture of GLBT issues in teacher education.

“It depends on the professor/program.” - Curricular Consistency

To begin with, we found that GLBT issues across the teacher education curriculum. Seven of the respondents located the discussion of GLBT issues in the context of a course on diversity issues or multicultural education course in their programs. Two located GLBT issues in the adolescent development course, two in a contemporary issues course and one in a methods class. One respondent taught reading methods and had included appropriate children’s literature in her course. So it appears that GLBT issues can occur anywhere in a teacher preparation program.

Sometimes GLBT issues are raised outside of the teacher preparation sequence. General education courses may deal with GLBT issues. Respondents mentioned women’s studies courses and human sexuality courses as possible avenues for students to examine these GLBT issues.

- In small liberal arts schools the students sometimes have courses where they’ve dealt with these issues before they get to teacher education, so there can be a snowball effect. Here, students may have encountered these issues in previous classes. - Jane
• Unless you’re taking a course on gender or women’s studies, it’s just not there. There is a women’s studies course that is cross-listed with sociology called “Sexual Orientation.” - Nancy

• Issues are raised as part of at least three courses: 1) a General Education course, Exceptional Person in Society; 2) and Early Childhood Education course; 3) College of Education-wide course. - Janine

• Our women’s studies program has also presented programming [on GLBT issues] to the university as a whole. - Kacey

Recognizing the other places where students might be exposed to GLBT issues allows teacher educators to build on students prior experiences. Some institutions may even require a general education course such as a women’s studies course for all students.

Whether or not GLBT issues are addressed within the teacher preparation sequence is partly a function of whether they are seen as part of the formal curriculum. For instance, one or two professors in a program may address GLBT issues in their courses while these issues go unrepresented in any other course.

• This depends on the professor. program, but I know some of the professors of the diversity course cover these issues, and some of us in ed. psych. cover these issues when we talk about development (particularly identity and adolescent devel.). - Caren

• I do not believe that GLBT issues are included in the formal curriculum at any point in the program. In the intro to education course, issues are likely to be discussed in terms of addressing student needs. Also, some discussion of teacher rights may use GLBT examples for case discussions. - Kacey

• ...its in the curriculum, so faculty really can’t skip it. - Jane

Kacey’s comment best depicts this distinction between formal and informal, the idea being that if GLBT issues are formalized within the curriculum then they will be addressed. This is what Jane refers to in her comment. Generally, our respondents saw GLBT issues treated more informally, thus making the discussions dependent on individual professors.

As for how these issues are presented, our respondents reported using a variety of materials most of which were supplemental to the textbooks used in those classes.

• I use both readings and stories. I have three stories to assist them in believing that this is an issue. The stories are true stories from my own experiences. - Lisa

• The adolescence course uses a panel discussion which is the only “direct hit” on GLBT issues. The panel, representing professional educators from the community provides information and discussion on the treatment of GLBT youth in secondary
classrooms...The panel is usually comprised of local GLSEN and PFLAG representatives. - Judith

- My colleague and I developed a WebQuest (that covers many areas of diversity -- GLB issues included. This can and is used in several ways/classes. Also, speakers, videos, handouts. - Caren

- The curriculum is largely based on articles (Ramafedi with grad students, Willis’ “Teaching Gay Students” which is an ASCD publication), but this is a heavily experiential program so we’ve begun to work with faculty from a local high school who come in a give us updates on what’s going on there. ...We try to bring it in at a political action level as well as at the classroom level. - Jane

- I use the Riddle scale in talking about this. Its a scale that goes from absolute antipathy to absolute tolerance. And I go through this with them and tell them that they must be at the level of support to be teaching in the public schools. ... I use GLSEN materials all the time. I think students respond really well to “I just want to say,” the GLSEN video with Martina Navratilova, and “It’s Elementary.” I maintain memberships in GLSEN, PFLAG, GLAAD, LAMBDA-legal, and NGLTF so that I can get information and use it in my teaching. - Nancy

- In the Adolescence course I raise it, and it is also raised in the text as well as in the syllabus. - Kerry

- In my area (Language Arts) multicultural issues are addressed through appropriate children’s literature. We think this is an appropriate classification for g/l/b. - Myra

Clearly, different materials and methods are being used, though these are resources that are collected and managed outside of the textbooks. Such a collection of materials requires a focused interest in the area of GLBT issues as well as time and often, money. At Jane’s institution, a group of faculty worked on the inclusion of these issues over the course of a year, attending conferences and developing curriculum materials as well as making contacts with the local high school. Judith and Lisa’s institution continues to

Thus, we found that three factors influence the development and implementation of the inclusion of GLBT issues in teacher education curriculum: interest, time, and money. Time and money are related to administrative response in that release time for curriculum development or financial support for such activity come under the auspices of administrators. However, we also found that institutions that had a gay/lesbian faculty member or a strong GLBT ally appeared more likely to raise these issues in a significant way. This idea of a champion of the GLBT cause was an interesting and somewhat unexpected, though not surprising, finding.

---

1 Jane also provided six pages of resources her program provides to students. These are included in Appendix B.
2 Nancy provided a copy of the Riddle scale which is provided in Appendix C.
We are the champions, my friends (with apologies to Queen)

It was clear from the data that at a number of institutions there was currently or had been a person who had championed the inclusion of GLBT issues in teacher education. Often, this person was him or herself gay or lesbian, but there was the occasional ally.

- The person I replaced was a lesbian faculty member who was instrumental in maintaining a group that worked on these issues as they relate to education. - Jane

- For instance, we had a graduate assistant who taught courses for us a few years ago and he was active in raising these issues in his course as well as raising the issues in faculty discussion. He wasn’t gay himself, but he felt strongly about social justice for all students. His wife was a military chaplain and he did a lot of work with the campus Safe group. Since he has left, we haven’t had these discussions front loaded. - Kerry

- I don’t know about other classes, but I always raise the issue. - Caren

- GLBT issues are generally raised by instructors, typically glb instructors or allies. I am the only lesbian instructor between the two campuses, but there are a number of allies. - Rhonda

Of our respondents, three identified in their interview as lesbian and two are out, as evidenced in one of the comments above. However, the issue remains that these issues really require an advocate irrespective of his or her personal sexual orientation. One interesting comment came from Lisa, who was responding to the question about administrative support:

- Bottom line, I think the response is linked to who presents the issues and how they present it. People who are homophobic or fence-sitters may have a negative political agenda with the presenter and can mask their homophobia. If you have someone who is respected, trusted and valued, you would get a very different response.

This notion of having a champion of the GLBT cause leaves these issues vulnerable because once the person has left the faculty, the discussion of these issues decreases or disappears. Unless there has been some formal institutionalizing of these issues within the curriculum, they run the risk of not being self-sustaining. This is especially problematic at larger institutions which may have multiple sections of the same course which are taught by a wide variety of people including part-time or adjunct faculty. Though faculty often control and drive the development of specific curricular reforms, administrators play a key role in the process of institutionalizing curriculum, which is why we asked our respondents about the administrative support for the inclusion of GLBT issues at their universities.
"If they’re opposed, they don’t say anything." - Perceived Administrative Support

There was a range of perceived administrative support. The overarching tone, however, was that as supportive as administrators might be, few were actively working towards inclusion of GLBT issues in their programs.

- Open, but not proactive. In other words, I think they agree the issues need to be addressed and have instituted a multicultural initiative for diversity -- but they seem to leave it up to faculty to figure out what and where to include issues. - Caren

- If they’re opposed, they don’t say anything. They aren’t really doing anything active about it... - Nancy

- The administration sees inclusion as appropriate, acceptable. I know the chair of our counseling department would be really open to it and the chair of educational administration wouldn’t sweep it under the rug. The dean would support us if we wanted to talk about it. - Kerry

- OK the university President has a task for, and the University has a Safe Zone Ally Program.... - Janine

- Our administration is very supportive on all multicultural issues. - Myra

- So far, they have been supportive of the inclusion of any issues/ideas that we care to add to the curriculum. I suppose it’s more a matter of benign neglect than actual support, though. - Kacey

For the most part, these comments present a reasonably positive view of potential administrative response. However, in all but the last comment there is a subtext that administrators may have a laissez-faire attitude toward GLBT issues. They will support the issue in conversations, but may not be likely to push the point with faculty groups. This attitude is problematic, especially around issues that are likely to be perceived by at least some students as controversial. It is important for faculty to feel that they are supported in their inclusion of GLBT issues into their courses. The laissez-faire message may allow faculty to forgo discussing these issues if they are at all anxious about addressing them.

A few respondents talked about what we might consider the ideal situation:

- The president and dean are supportive. They’ll give me time and money to develop curriculum and materials on GLBT issues. The assistant dean is very supportive. This was one of the first private universities in the state to provide domestic partnership benefits. - Rhonda
Another respondent who is a dean herself stated:

- Oh, I think inclusion is viewed positively. I’d have to say that’s true even across campus. - Jane

These two respondents happen to represent smaller (under 5,000 students), more liberal institutions. Smaller institutions may be more immediately responsive to including GLBT issues. Fewer faculty and a commitment to students and teaching seems to play a role in administrative response. This is evidenced in a comment by Rhonda:

- We have a small faculty, six people. They’re supportive of me bringing these issues into the classroom. All the faculty here see the importance of raising these issues...

When these issues are raised in the context of a smaller community, the level of responsiveness can be more immediate. The issue may also have a “face” in a way that we might not see at a larger institution. When there is personal significance, people may be more supportive.

Two respondents from the same institution had this to say about their perceptions of the administrative response:

- The assistant dean would be supportive. I don’t have an adequate read on the department head. I think the dean would be open, more supportive because he’s a former superintendent. - Judith

- I think our department chair would support a formalization of these issues in the curriculum. Around campus, I think the response would be mixed, but they seem supportive to the advisor to GLBT issues. Responsiveness and support is varied among administration and faculty. I think it’s like where people were with African-American people in 1940, that’s where we are with lgb people. - Lisa

Even at this larger, public institution it appears that support is positive. One interesting note is the connection Lisa makes to the issues for African-Americans in the 1940’s. She sees GLBT issues as a cultural issue akin to that of race/ethnicity and she is likely to present it that way to her students.

One respondent presented the scenario that we might have expected to see more often:

- I’m sure the department chair would be willing because she is interested in school reform projects that focus on at-risk and diversity issues. I’m sure support would be there. We currently have an interim chair, so I don’t know there. Our old dean would have said “No, keep it out of the discussion. If that’s how they want to live, fine, but we aren’t going to make a big deal out of it.” If our assistant dean becomes dean, I think she would support it if our faculty felt it was something we were interested in pursuing. - Viola
Many of us both expect and dread the kind of response portrayed here for the "old dean" at this institution. However, it does not appear to be the picture most people paint of their administration.

In sum, the sentiment is that if the faculty is interested in the inclusion of GLBT issues, it would be supported. At smaller schools it may be easier to rally faculty support to create such change while at the larger institutions this may be more challenging. It also may depend on the norms and values generally accepted on campus as well as those of the broader community. Smaller schools tend to be more insular so that the campus tone around GLBT issues might be more influential. Larger, public universities may draw a greater range of attitudes from both faculty and students.

"This is a VERY provincial, conservative area..." - Campus and Community Context

One particularly interesting finding was the importance of campus or broader community context. Several respondents raised this issue entirely unsolicited from the interview:

- We draw our student body from a more rural area which leaves us with a more sheltered population rather than the religious right wingers. - Nancy

- We're in a Lutheran community and I'm a member of a women's service group where GLBT issues would not really be accepted, but generally our church is pretty accepting. There is a definite Christian flavor here. - Kerry

- This is a VERY provincial, conservative area in which we live. - Myra

- You have to realize that contrary to popular perception, this community is pretty Mormon and we have a fairly conservative city and school district, so these issues are generally ignored and I don't know how much is out there. - Viola

- The campus is pretty open and willing to deal with things like this, in contrast to the state legislature which is very conservative. We are this liberal pocket. - Jane

- [Ours] is such an incredibly conservative state, that [the university] has been nicknamed "Sodomy Univ." by one activist who believes that providing such programming is anti-god, etc. - Kacey

This last comment regarding the campus community is important in that the campus is sometimes more immediate than the city. Campus support of GLBT issues can provide support for discussion of these issues in teacher education courses in a variety of ways, not the least of which is by validating the discussion:

- ...the University has a Safe Zone Ally Program - People who are safe to talk with about the issues have a sign posted outside their office with a pink triangle on it. - Janine
• We have a 10% Society on campus that participates in our campus-wide “Coming Out Week” programs. - Kacey

However, the education college within the university might not have active involvement:

• There is a campus group, but it’s not active within the College of Education. - Viola

Campus GLBT programs offices can provide a variety of resources and materials for students. Often, these offices can provide speakers’ panels for classes (Mathison, 1998). At the institution where Lisa and Judith teach, the GLBT programs office sponsors a “Safe One Campus” program, similar to the Safe Zone Ally Program that Janine mentions. This particular program provides faculty and staff with a two hour training session and a Safe On Campus sticker for the office door/space. These stickers can be found on the majority of doors on the hallways where the teacher educators offices are located. In a recent training session attended by the dean’s office staff, one of the student presenters at the Safe On Campus program mentioned that she feels good about the fact that so many doors are adorned with these stickers in the College of Education. Thus, connections with the GLBT programs office can have positive, far-reaching consequences.

Overall, though some respondents were likely to classify the community in which the institution is located as “conservative,” it did not seem to influence their raising of GLBT issues. As Kerry puts it:

• It’s important for students to realize that as a professional, they need to be supportive of all students.

Thus, the importance of serving GLBT students in K-12 settings supersedes the cultural climate of the community. Obviously, this may be true to varying degrees in different places. The fact remains that even in the relatively conservative climate of the midwest, several teacher preparation programs are addressing the needs of GLBT students and teachers.

“I wouldn’t say the group is anti-gay, they are uninformed” - Perceived Student Response

Overall, it appears that most respondents felt that their student population would be fairly receptive to dealing with GLBT issues. They describe the following situations:

• Most students respond positively, for many its asking them to think about things they’ve never thought of before. I wouldn’t say the group is anti-gay, they are uninformed. The only overtly closed responses come from a small percentage of students raised in right-wing, religiously conservative families (3-5%). - Judith
• Most are pretty open and thankful. Of course, there is always dealing with GLBT issues in classrooms and what is age-appropriate. - Caren

• Students responses range from the supportive “Oh, I didn’t know that” to the more right-wing types of response which is less supportive. Some say these issues should not be included and some say they definitely should….I’d say roughly 70% would advocate discussing the issues in class and about half of those would say that they would actively support GLBT students in their own classrooms, for example by putting up a pink triangle or safe space sticker. - Rhonda

• There are always a couple who rebel. Most accept it as part of their professional responsibility, but they haven’t struggled with it with respect to what they’ve been taught growing up. Like any diversity issue they may not have internalized the reality for themselves, but most want to be good teachers so they trust me enough to work with these issues in a professional manner. Basically, about 10% won’t want to deal with these issues, 50% accept it as part of their responsibility and the rest are somewhere in between. - Kerry

• For most students, this is the first time they’ve dealt with the issue. It raises awareness and fosters introspection. It’s something they’ve never thought about before. - Nancy

• When the area is addressed in Language Arts classes, students respond positively but say they would be reluctant to bring up the issues in their elementary/secondary classrooms without guidance from administrators. - Myra

• Students have been OK with the discussion - not extreme either way.- Jan

• Students always respond with silence, dead silence, no matter who brings it up. People don’t know how to respond. - Lisa

• In my course, students have been pretty insistent that a teacher’s private life is not the business of the school or community. Some of them have expressed concerns about teachers who make their sexual orientation an issue, but they are in the minority. - Kacey

• I’ve worked with the master’s level class that has been pretty receptive and open. Even the Mormons in that class are willing to listen and discuss these issues. Its such a permeating thing on campus that its hard not to be open. - Jane

Only one respondent described her student population as markedly closed:

• I haven’t heard any responses, but my sense is that they wouldn’t be very receptive. Our students have an average age of 28-30, so you’re looking at a lot of Mormon mothers who are coming back to get teaching degrees. - Viola

It appears that for most students, these conversations are the first time they’ve negotiated GLBT issues in a classroom setting. Of course, if a student is gay, lesbian or bisexual him or herself or if they have a friend who is gay, lesbian or bisexual, this may influence how they approach the topic.

But for the good majority of students, this is their initial contact with these issues. Until the issue is
raised somehow, students are allowed to remain ignorant of GLBT issues and the harm that can come from such ignorance. However, it also appears that most of our respondents feel that the majority of their students are open to learning more about GLBT issues.

When faculty raise these issues, students are more likely to seek out that person for further questions. Judith had this to say:

- I was recently approached by a former student who asked to talk with me privately. She asked me to close the door [to my office], which is a big thing. She lives with another former student and she explained that a man she had been dating had recently “come out” to her and her response had been “Okay, well, I gotta go.” and she got out of the car and went inside her house. She felt badly about her poor reaction and began to question her skills as a future teacher. Her roommate told her to come talk to me because “she’s the only teacher we’ve had who’ll talk about this stuff.” The student in my office was ashamed of her reaction. She thanked me for allowing them to talk about issues like that so openly in class.

This is important because students need safe places to raise questions like the one described above. One of several reflection questions posed by Mathison (1998) is “If a teacher education student wanted to talk to someone about ways to better serve gay and lesbian children and adolescents in the classroom, would he or she feel comfortable coming to me?” Clearly, in Judith’s program, students feel that there is someone to whom they can turn with these questions.

Discussion

While there are thoughtful attempts to include GLBT issues, there are still some limitations inherent in the way GLBT youth, adults and relationships are represented in teacher preparation. This is primarily true of the textual representations we found. GLBT people are clearly recognized on the continuum of development. However, they are often viewed in opposition to normative development or linked to problems or sexual attitudes and behaviors. Moreover, GLBT issues are indeed raised across the lifespan and there is an attempt to dispel myths related to these issues. However, through placement in the text and theoretical and graphical representation GLBT people continue to be marginalized.

Similarly, we see that faculty are willing to address these issues in the courses they teach, but they may not be able to influence how these issues are presented elsewhere in the curriculum or
how they might more effectively raise awareness throughout a teacher preparation program. Faculty themselves are likely to have been trained in graduate programs (aside from those perhaps in feminist or critical theory) which included little or no mention of GLBT issues. The first step in this process will be to help existing faculty of graduate and teacher education programs to recognize and respond to their own heterosexist attitudes and behaviors. For example, among their recommendations for college teachers, studies (Lopez and Chism, 1993; Smith, 1995) suggest that faculty reflect on the language they use including the examples they present to illustrate points, as well as they way they incorporate GLBT issues into content decisions and respond to student interest in these issues. In depth activities such as the “pink triangle exercise” presented by Chesler and Zuniga (1991) would allow both faculty and students to personally experience the subtle heterosexism faced by gays and lesbians, perhaps leaving participants with a heightened sensitivity to these issues.

Moreover, faculty may not have the tools, such as course readings, activities and other curriculum materials needed to address these issues. In Jane’s case, the faculty developed their GLBT materials over the course of three years. Her institution has a ten page resources packet including organizations, hotline numbers, books and articles as well as film and videotapes. These materials as well as the field experiences students have in the program are used in discussing these issues. Suggestions such as those presented in Walling (1996) and Simoni (1996) may provide concrete ideas for teacher education faculty to address these issues in teacher preparation.

Once the issues are raised by faculty (or students), students appear more willing to discuss their personal experiences or curiosities in how to handle GLBT issues in the classroom. Clearly, the willingness to address these issues was apparent across a range of teacher preparation programs, even in places that are seen by both insiders and outsiders as “conservative.” A good majority of the programs we interviewed see the need for K-12 teachers to support ALL students, including gay and lesbian students. This is evidence of the commitment described by Mathison (1998):

Teacher educators profess to believe that all students are precious, that all students deserve care. If this is the belief, if these are truly teacher educators’ values, they must help future teachers reach out to their gay and lesbian students without hesitation and without apology. (p.155)
For students to become confident in navigating these issues in their K-12 classrooms, teacher educators must themselves be confident in broaching the subject in their own classrooms. If we open the discussions, it will be much easier for students to follow our lead.

Administrative support remains an area that requires significant attention. The laissez-faire approach described by so many of our respondents leaves the inclusion of GLBT issues to the initiative of the faculty. The inclusion of GLBT issues may require more active support on the part of teacher education leaders, such as deans and department chairs, to provide a sense of validity and institutionality. It is possible that this “benign neglect” comes from a sense that “all is well in Dullsville.” For instance, in a recent survey of high school counselors, psychologists and administrators, administrators tended to underestimate the support provided by their schools for GLBT issues (GLSTN-Detroit, 1996). This may be the case in post-secondary education as well. Future research should investigate the attitudes, perceptions and behaviors of post-secondary administrators with respect to GLBT issues. Regardless, it will be important to elicit the active support on the part of administrators.

In sum, these themes are related to one another with respect to how GLBT issues are institutionalized as part of teacher education (see Figure 1). Curricular consistency, administrative support and campus and community contexts all influence the integrated institutionalization of GLBT issues. One respondent put it like this:

- I think formalization can and should be done in a manner that assists people regardless of their beliefs to increase sensitivity and awareness. - Lisa

This may be especially important for larger, public universities which are more likely to offer multiple sections of their courses. For integrated institutionalization to occur, a commitment to GLBT issues should be established on the part of the faculty and the administration, both of whom have influence over curricular consistency. Active administrative support is crucial for faculty members to feel supported in raising these issues. Knowledge of campus resources and attitudes will help in shaping the ways in which GLBT issues are integrated across the teacher education sequence. For instance, GLBT issues are readily presented in a variety of courses from educational and developmental psychology to multicultural and methods courses in order for preservice
teachers to begin to consider the psychosocial, moral, ethical and legal dimensions for GLBT students and teachers. And finally, knowing the general attitudes of the community or communities in which students live and interact is a consideration in the move toward how these issues are institutionalized in teacher education programs.

This analysis remains preliminary in nature and our findings do not represent an exhaustive inquiry into our research questions. Our data represent the perspective of one or two faculty members in each of ten teacher education programs. Though we believe this is important information, there may be aspects of those teacher preparation program of which that individual is unaware. Our work represents a snapshot of the preparation teachers are receiving on GLBT issues. We continue to pursue questions regarding the comparability/generalizability of our findings, differences by type of institution and region of the country, and the nature of informal vs. formal curriculum development around GLBT issues in teacher education course sequences. Future research might include a more broad-based survey approach to examine these questions at different levels (i.e., students, post-secondary administrators, teacher education faculty) as well as continuing to refine more interpretive methods of collecting data. For example, more descriptive work might include case study approaches to working with teacher preparation students who are resistant to working on GLBT issues.

Implications for this work involve the potential development of teacher preparation materials that are specifically designed to raise awareness of GLBT issues as well as how to deal with them in the K-12 classroom. Teacher preparation programs should be encouraged to reflect on their own programming around GLBT issues and to begin to address these issues in a more institutionalized fashion. It is important for all teacher education students to consider their own stance on heterosexism/homophobia and how they will negotiate this in their classrooms. Raising these issues while students are in preservice preparation in addition to providing inservice training and support for practicing teachers is strongly recommended. Certainly, if Ryan is any indication of the kinds of thinking we might expect from students in teacher preparation programs that deal effectively with these issues, this bodes well for K-12 students. Unfortunately, he is still probably more the exception than the rule.


Table 1
Demographic Data for Institutions of Interview Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Respondent's Name</th>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Certifications per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myra</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Jane (dean)</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viola</td>
<td>20,000(under grad)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>Caren</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>400-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Kerry (dpt. ch)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kacey</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>100 secondary only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Major Themes Related to Inclusion of GLBT Issues in Teacher Education
Appendix A
Textbook List

Lifespan Development/Human Development


Adolescence


Multicultural Education/Social Foundations Texts


Other Resources

for early childhood educators:

for adolescence:

for elementary educators:
RESOURCES (AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS)

The following professional and community organizations provide resources or have established positions on issues relating to gay and lesbian students. The NEA does not necessarily endorse any of these; this listing is provided only for information.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Psychiatric Association, Division of Minority/National Affairs, 1400 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005; (202) 682-6097

American Psychological Association, Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; (202) 955-7649

American School Counselor Association, 5999 Stevenson Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22304; (703) 823-9800

American School Health Association, Box 708, Kent, Ohio 44240; (216) 678-1601

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1250 N. Pitt Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1403; (703) 549-9110

Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD), P. O. Box 741346, Los Angeles, California 90004; (213) 931-9429

National Association of Social Workers, 7981 Eastern Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910; (301) 565-0333

National Coalition of Black Gays, Box 57236, West End Station, Washington, DC 20037; (202) 387-8096

National Education Association, Human and Civil Rights, 1201 Sixteenth St., NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 822-7700

National Education Association, Health Information Network, 1201 Sixteenth St., NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 822-7570

National Education Association Gay and Lesbian Caucus, P. O. Box 314 Roosevelt, New Jersey 08555; (609) 448-5215

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute, 1734 Fourteenth St., NW, Washington, DC 20009-4309; (202) 332-6483

National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, Suite 330, 1400 1 Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005; (202) 682-4114

Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, Box 27605, Washington, DC 20038; (202) 638-4200

Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, 130 West 42nd Street, Suite 2500, New York, New York 10036; (212) 819-9770
STATE ORGANIZATIONS

Asian American Lesbian and Gay Men's Coalition, Box 2337, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103; (215) 849-4612

Bay Area Network of Gay and Lesbian Educators (BANGLE84 Castro Street, Suite 173, San Francisco, California 94114; (415) 285-5078

Campaign to End Homophobia, Box 819, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Counseling and Training Associates, (Jerald L. Newberry), 1215 Quaker Hill Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22314; (703) 938-1660

Equity Institute, 6400 Hollis Street, Suite 15, Emeryville, California 94608; (415) 658-4577

Friends of Project 10, Inc., 7850 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90046; (213) 651-5200, (818) 441-3382

Gay and Lesbian Parents Coalition International (GLPCI Network), P.O. Box 50360, Washington, D.C. 20036

Governor's Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth, State House, Room 111, Boston, Massachusetts 02133 (617) 828-3039.

Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center, Youth Program, 1213 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90038; (213) 464-7400

Hetrick Martin Institute, Inc., 401 West Street, New York, New York 10014; (212) 633-8920, TTY: (212) 633-8926

Institute for Sexual Inclusiveness through Training and Education (INSITE), 1012 Fourteenth Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20005; (202) 783-4406

Illinois Gay and Lesbian Task Force, Youth and Education Committee, 615 West Wellington, Chicago, Illinois 60657; (312) 975-0707

Latin American Lesbian and Gay Men's Coalition, c/o Reyes, 562 Guerrero, #1, San Francisco, California 94110

Maryland State Teachers' Association, Task Force on Sexual Minorities, 344 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201; (301) 727-7676

Minnesota Department of Education, AIDS Prevention Unit, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101; (612) 296-5825

Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, Box 27605, Washington, D.C. 20038; (202) 638-4200

Personal Liberty Fund, Advisory Committee on Lesbian and Gay Adolescents, Box 1431, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903; (908) 469-9135
PROJECT 10: THE MODEL CONCEPT

EDUCATION

Sensitization and awareness training of staff

Direct liaison with counselors, school nurses, and school psychologists regarding special needs of gay and lesbian youth

Expansion of the school library in both fictional and non-fictional areas; removal of inaccurate and out-of-date materials

Development and coordination of a speakers bureau

SCHOOL SAFETY

School environment free of harassment and intimidation of sexual minorities

Staff members trained in methods of recognizing and responding to victims of sexual harassment

Backup system developed so that incidents are reported and acted upon swiftly

DROP OUT PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Informal rap groups, drop-in counseling, and peer counseling experiences

Inclusion of the gay and lesbian perspective in suicide and substance abuse prevention programs

Youth programs that give affirmative social experiences

SUPPORT SERVICES

Accessibility to community resources

Referrals to mental health personnel for in-depth counseling

Private sector

Human resource agencies

Hot lines
HOTLINES

Gay and Lesbian Youth Hotline
(Thursday-Saturday 7:00-11:45 p.m.)
1-800-347-TEEN

National AIDS Hotline (CDC)
(Spanish Language)
(TTY)
1-800-342-AIDS
1-800-344-7432

National AIDS Information Clearinghouse
1-800-458-5231

National Runaway Switchboard and
Adolescent Suicide Hotline (24 hour)
1-800-621-4000

Department of Justice Hate Crimes Hotline
1-800-347-HATE

State AIDS Hotlines

Local Crisis Lines in Many Communities

Hotline numbers often change. It is recommended that local hotlines, in particular, be double-checked prior to conducting workshops.
AIDS RESOURCES

The following state and national hotlines can provide information about HIV or AIDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Region</th>
<th>Hotline Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>(800) 455-3741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>(800) 478-2437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>(800) 334-1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>(800) 445-7720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (Northern)</td>
<td>(800) FOR-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (Southern)</td>
<td>(800) 922-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>(303) 331-8305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>(203) 566-1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>(302) 995-8422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>(800) 342-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>(800) FLA-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(800) 551-2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>(808) 922-1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>(208) 334-5944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>(800) AID-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>(317) 633-8406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>(800) 532-3301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>(800) 232-0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>(800) 654-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>(800) 992-4379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>(800) 851-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>(800) 638-6252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>(800) 235-2331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>(800) 872-2437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>(800) 248-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>(800) 826-2961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>(809) 765-1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>(406) 252-1212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Region</th>
<th>Hotline Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>(800) 782-2437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada (Reno)</td>
<td>(702) 329-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada (Las Vegas)</td>
<td>(702) 383-1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>(603) 271-4490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>(800) 624-2377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>(505) 827-0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>(800) 462-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>(919) 733-7301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>(800) 592-1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>(800) 342-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>(405) 271-6434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>(503) 229-5792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>(800) 692-7254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>(809) 765-1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>(401) 227-6502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>(800) 342-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>(800) 472-2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>(800) 342-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (Dallas)</td>
<td>(214) 359-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (Houston)</td>
<td>(713) 524-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>(800) 843-9388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>(800) 882-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>(800) 535-4148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>(800) 642-8244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>(800) 334-AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>(307) 777-7953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: "Responding to HIV and AIDS"
NEA Health Information Network
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
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Growing Up

Campaign to End Homophobia. "I Think I Might Be Gay...Now What Do I Do?" and "I Think I Might Be Lesbian...Now What Do I Do?" (Brochures) Box 819, Cambridge, MA 02139.


One Out of Ten Students. Advisory Committee on Lesbian and Gay Adolescents, Personal Liberty Fund, New Jersey Lesbian and Gay Coalition, Box 1431, New Brunswick, NJ 08903


Parents and Educators


BEST COPY AVAILABLE
Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (P-FLAG), Department RAY1, Box 27605, Washington, D.C. 20038.


Respect All Youth Series, by Ann Thompson Cook and Wayne Pawlawski.

"Who Is Killing Whom?"
"You Can Help."
"Youth and Homosexuality."


Counseling


Markowitz, Laura M. "Homosexuality: Are We Still in the Dark?" 26-29.

Sears, James T. (editor). Empathy: An Interdisciplinary Journal for Persons Working to End Oppression the Bases of Sexual Identities. Subscriptions from Gay and Lesbian Research Project (GLARP); mail to Empathy, Box 5085, Columbia, South Carolina 29250.

Health


*Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide, "Gay Male and Lesbian Youth Suicide."* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration.


*Homosexuality and Homophobia*


*Rights and the Law*


*Schools and Curriculum*


BEST COPY AVAILABLE
Teachers and Educational Employees


FILMS/VIDEOTAPES

(Write or call for rental and purchase information; all materials should be previewed for suitability for training purposes and target audiences)

A Little Respect

(Video format, 25 minutes, color) Available from Rutgers State University, Department of Health Education, University Heights, 299 University Avenue, Newark, New Jersey 07102; (201) 648-1236

Homosexuality: Nature Versus Nurture

(Video format, 26 minutes, color) Available from Films for the Humanities and Sciences, Box 2053, Princeton, New Jersey 08543-2453; (800) 257-5126

Homosexuality: What About McBride?

(Film and video formats, 11 minutes, color) Available from CRM Films, 2233 Faraday, Carlsbad, California 92008; (800) 421-0833

It Is What It Is

(Video format, 58 minutes, color). Available from Gay Men’s Health Crisis, Inc., 129 West 20th Street, New York, New York 10011-0022; (212) 807-6664

On Being Gay: A Conversation with Brian McNaught

(Vide o format, 80 minutes, color; can be viewed in two 40-minute segments) Available from TRB Productions, Box 2362, Boston, Massachusetts 02107

Sticks, Stones, and Stereotypes/Palos, Piedras, y Estereotipos

(Video format, 20 minutes, color, bilingual--Spanish and English) Available from the Equity Institute, Tucker-Taft Building, 48 North Pleasant Street, Amherst, Massachusetts 01002; (413) 256-0271

What If I’m Gay?: A Search for Understanding

(Video format, color, available in 47- and 29-minute versions) Produced by Learning Corporation of America, distributed by Coronet/MTI Film and Video, 108 Wilmot Road, Deerfield, Illinois 60015; (800) 621-2131

Who’s Afraid of Project 10?

(Video format, 28 minutes, color) Available from Project 10, Fairfax High School, 7850 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90046; (213) 651-5200
Appendix C
Attitudes Towards Difference: The Riddle Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repulsion</td>
<td>People who are different are strange, sick, crazy and aversive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>People who are different are somehow born that way and that is pitiful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Being different is just a phase of development that...most people ‘grow out of.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Implies that one needs to make accomodations for anothers’ differences: does not acknowledge that another’s identity may be of the same value as their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Works to safeguard the rights of those who are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiration</td>
<td>Acknowledges that being different in our society takes strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Values the diversity of people and is willing to confront insensitive attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>Assumes the differences in people are indispensable in society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from *Alone No More: Developing a School Support System for Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Youth*, 1994, Appendix A, developed by Dorothy Riddle, PhD, psychologist from Tuscon, AZ.
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