DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 870 TM 035 243

AUTHOR	Johnson, Beth Bownes; Newton, Rose Mary
TITLE	What about the Other Gender?: Male Bias in English Studies.
PUB DATE	2003-08-00
NOTE	30p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; Community Colleges; English; *Gender Issues; Higher Education; *Males; *Sex Bias; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the results of a factorial experiment investigating the reactions of male students to a hypothetical English course offered at the community college level. The participants (n=136) consisted of students enrolled in English 1010 courses at 4 community colleges in a Southeastern state. The independent variables were gender of student, gender of the author assigned, and the type of reading assigned (narrative/expository). The dependent variable was a composite rating of student attraction to the course. Males preferred male authors and revealed less interest in the course than females. Testing also detected an interaction effect between gender of the author and style of writing. Unlike previous studies, males preferred a narrative style to expository assignments. The findings have practical implications for educational programs, English instructors, and future research. (Contains 3 tables and 39 references.) (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

TM TMTR 0234

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. B. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 480 870

TM035243

What about the Other Gender?: Male Bias in English Studies

Beth Bownes Johnson

Wallace State Community College

Rose Mary Newton

University of Alabama

Correspondence to:

Beth Bownes Johnson/Wallace State (256) 352-8028

PO Box 2000

Hanceville, AL 35077

beth.johnson@wallacestate.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This article reports the results of a factorial experiment investigating the reactions of male students to a hypothetical English course offered at the community college level. The participants ($N = 136$) consisted of students enrolled in English 101 courses at four community colleges located throughout a Southeastern state. The independent variables were gender of the student, gender of the author assigned, and the type of reading assigned (narrative/expository). The dependent variable was a composite rating of student attraction to the course. Males preferred male authors and revealed less interest in the course than females. Testing also detected an interaction effect between gender of the author and style of writing. Unlike previous studies, males preferred a narrative style as opposed to expository assignments. The findings have practical implications for educational programs, English instructors, and future research.

Educators continue to grapple with ways to reduce gender bias in the learning environment. Although tremendous improvements have occurred, especially in the areas of math, science, and computer science for females, the inequities faced by males in English classes have largely been ignored. This area is of particular concern because this bias affects males' attitudes toward English studies, their success in other areas of study, and ultimately, their career choice (McCracken, 1992; McCracken & Appleby, 1992; Warrington & Younger, 2000). Additionally, when males improve their scores in the area of English studies, their overall scores improve as well (Bowman, 1992).

Gender bias in English studies detracts from the educational experiences for males because often male students associate reading and writing with females, therefore, developing negative attitudes toward English studies. This bias is resulting in many colleges serving a disappropriate number of females. In fact, in some liberal arts colleges, the gender imbalance has become so serious that administrators have developed affirmative action programs for males, who are admitted with lower grades and test scores than females (Kleinfeld, 1998). Researchers need to continue to examine and understand how gendered identities form and which variables in educational settings contribute to and perpetuate these biases, especially for males in the field of English. The present study addresses this issue by investigating how males rated a hypothetical English course with assigned readings written by both genders and readings depicting a narrative or expository style.

Gender Bias in English Studies

The differences in reading preferences for males and females have been well documented (Bowman, 1992; Fetterly, 1978; McCracken, 1992; McCracken & Appleby, 1992; Rice, 2000), and there has been considerable research conducted on the inequality women experience in the English classroom. Males, however, experience biases in reading as well, although they experience these biases differently (Brozo & Schmelzer, 1997; Young, 2000). Millard (1998) maintains that often, as opposed to females, males are not encouraged to read at an early age. Additionally, according to the OFSTED report (1993), few teachers monitored differences in boys' and girls' reading differences, and boys had narrower experiences with fiction than females. Boys are also less inclined to understand character, theme, or motivation. Overall, boys do not read as often as girls and lack interest in traditional literature for various reasons. This lack of interest increases with each year of schooling, and as Davies and Brember (1994) discovered, the curriculum difference between the sexes which varied the most and which was the most negative continued to be the oldest boys' views toward reading.

Often the role models boys view reading are their mothers and their teachers, so reading may be seen as " a feminine pursuit" (Bleach, 1998, p. 41). "It is nearly axiomatic that boys will be taught to read in school by females because 85% to 95% of boys' teachers in elementary and middle schools are female" (Brozo & Schmelzer, 1997, p. 7). Some males consider English more of a "female" subject because females are considered emotional, subjective, beauty-valuing, passive, selfless, and cooperative. These gifts prefer humanities, whereas science is regarded as a male subject because the "definition of knowledge stems from male Western philosophers, and traits valued in this

disciple are considered male-oriented, such as rationality, objectivity, activity-oriented, selfishness, and competitiveness" (Chilisa, 2000, p. 62). Early on males may associate many of the readings assigned in coursework as an activity that is inconsistent with the image of boyhood and maleness because of stereotypical portrayal in popular culture. Therefore, males often fail to see the relevance of typically assigned literature to their everyday lives:

> They approach a text with a narrower spectrum of possible points of contact and quickly decide whether to accept or reject the text because of their assimilated belief system which says they have the authority to insist on seeing themselves in a text. (Schlender, 2001, p. 67)

Millard (1998) reported in the *Developing Readers in the Middle Years*, that there are seven primary reasons males often lacked interest in reading. First, beginning readings often included a concentration on narratives, which males found unappealing. Secondly, teachers discouraged certain types of reading materials that they considered unsuitable for the classroom. Boys stated that they enjoyed sharing and discussing the content of computer and other hobby-related magazines, but these were not permitted. Thirdly, readings had been used as fillers, so students, often male, who did not care to participate in the activity, could avoid the task. These reasons prevented many males from selecting and reading texts, which they found appealing; they preferred action, horror, adventure, and scientific readings. These factors do discriminate against males because they have found to be less willing to read independently.

Millard (1998) also found an apparent difference in attitudes toward reading between genders, which affected males' success in English coursework. Survey and

interview results confirmed that girls were generally more committed and better read than males. This resulted from sharing more outside the classroom, both with peers and other female family members. Boys asserted their interests were on other options. Millard concluded that this study highlighted the variations in access to literacy experiences between males and females, and the everyday practices of schools, communities, and society contributed and reinforced these gendered identities.

Whitehead, Capey, Maddren, and Wellings (1977) reported that the provision of books offered by the schools played an extremely important role in determining how well and how often students read, and libraries made contributions to enthusiasm. In order to assist males, two things were required: a wide provision of well-chosen texts and librarians who knew them well enough to match the student with the text. Boys read less than girls because often fathers are not involved in purchasing and recommending books, books fail to enlist males' interests, and non-fiction is not mixed with fact in order to allow a focus beyond relationships.

Bowman (1992) studied logs that 120 students documents as they read two novels. She reached the following conclusions about male readers:

1. Males identified and commented on male characters.
2. Boys were more judgmental in their readings.
3. Boys were more practical.
4. Males seldom compared the literary work to their everyday lives.
5. Males compared the literature to television and pop culture.
6. Boys were more impatient readers.

Bowman found that the "crossover" males (those that ranked in the top 10% of their class) were the exceptions in her study:

> The data from my study seem to suggest that what we must do is try to get boys to read literature and write about it more as the girls do, and at the same time encourage further development in the girls' work . . . Most males consider English to be a girls' subject, and only the most well-rounded, mature boys were secure enough to add feminine strategies to their repertoire. (p. 88)

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework formulated by Byrne (1971) informed the design of this study. Byrne hypothesized that individuals with similar attitudes are attracted to one another and that such attraction may bias the job selection process in variety of ways. For example, interviewers many evaluate prospective job applicants based on attitude-compatibility rather than job-related criteria. Therefore, using Byrne's hypothesis, the gender of the student and the gender of the author of an assigned reading may bias males' evaluations of a hypothetical English course. In addition, the researchers anticipated that such bias would extend to the writing style of the assigned readings because males are more prone to use an expository style of writing as opposed to females who use a narrative style (Millard, 1998). The following hypotheses were tested:

H-1: There will be no significant difference in student attraction to an English course at the community college level associated with the gender of the student (female/male).

H-2: There will be no significant difference in student attraction to an English course at the community college level associated with the gender of the author of the readings assigned (females/male).

H-3: There will be no significant difference in student attraction to an English course at the community college level associated with the type of readings assigned (narrative/expository).

H-4: There will be no significant two-way interaction between gender of the student (female/male) and the gender of the author of the readings assigned (female/male).

H-5: There will be no significant two-way interaction between the gender of the student (female/male) and the type of readings assigned (narrative/expository).

H-6: There will be not significant two-way interaction between the gender of the author assigned (female/male) and the type of readings assigned (narrative/expository).

H-7: There will be no significant three-way interaction between and among the gender of the student (female/male), gender of the author of the readings assigned (female/male), and the type of readings assigned (narrative/expository).

Method

This study reports the results of males' evaluations of an English course requiring assigned readings. Procedurally, students at four community colleges read and reacted to descriptions of the hypothetical course. The active independent variables manipulated in the simulated course descriptions were (a) the gender of the author of the assigned readings (female/male) and (b) the type of assigned readings (narrative/expository). The

gender of the student was an inactive independent variable. The dependent variable was student attraction to and willingness to enroll in the course. These parameters resulted in a 2 x 2 x 2 completely crossed, fixed –factor of analysis of variance (ANOVA) design (Keppel, 1991). Manipulation of the two levels of the gender of the author of the assigned readings and type of reading assigned yielded four unique course descriptions.

The Study Participants

The study population consisted of all students enrolled in English 101 courses at the community college level in a Southeastern state. The sampling procedure included dividing the state into four regions, based on geographical location, and randomly selecting one community college from each region. After the community colleges were drawn, students enrolled in English 101 courses at each of the four colleges were selected as a convenience sample.

The sample size for this study was determined by performing a power analysis according to procedures recommended by Cohen (1977, p. 384) to determine whether the design was sufficiently powerful to allow detection of an interaction effect. The parameters for the power analysis were (a) a specified level for power (power = .80), (b) a defined level of significance (alpha = .05), and (c) a desired small-to-medium effect size (d = .25). The formula suggested by Cohen (1977, p. 84) was used to compute the cell size for the 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design. The results of the power analysis indicated that a minimum sample size of 136 was needed to detect significant differences if they exist. Descriptive data for the study participants appear in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Participants were also surveyed concerning parental education and parental encouragement for reading at an early age. Forty-nine percent of the participants (36 females, 31 males) reported that their father had a high school education. Nineteen percent (13 females, 14 males) attended some college, 25% of participants' (15 female, 19 male) fathers graduated from college, and 5.9% (4 female, 4 male) accomplished post-college work. Participants mothers' (33 females, 28 males) educations included 44.9% high school, 24.3% (17 females, 16 males) attending some college, 27.9% (15 females, 23 males) graduating from college, and 2.9% (3 females, 1 male) received post-college educations.

Eighty-eight percent of students stated that they received parental encouragement for reading at an early age. Of this 88%, 61 were females and 59 were male participants. Eleven percent (7 females, 9 males) of participants did not receive encouragement. Of these students, 37.5% were encouraged by their mothers, 3.7% were encouraged by their fathers, 11.8 % were encouraged by neither parent, and 47.1% were encouraged by both parents. Of those students encouraged by their mothers only, 27 were females and 24 were males; 3 females and 2 males were encouraged only by their fathers; 7 females and 9 males were not encouraged by either parent, and 31 females and 33 males were encouraged by both parents to read. These descriptives are shown in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about Here

These participants responded to questions asking whether they enjoyed English courses, whether they felt English courses assisted them in other courses, whether they enjoyed reading, and whether doing well in English was important to them. The results are shown in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about Here

Seventy-two (52.9%) of the 136 participants agreed with the statement that they enjoyed English studies, while 64 participants (47.1%) did not. Of the 72 participants agreeing, 42 were female and 30 were male. Twenty-six females and 38 males did not enjoy English courses. One hundred and nineteen participants (87.5%) agreed with the statement that English courses assisted them in other courses, while 17 disagreed with the statement. Eighty-five participants (62.5%) stated that they enjoyed reading, and 51 participants disagreed with the statement. Within this sample, 52 females and 33 males stated that they enjoyed reading. One hundred and thirty participants (95.6%) stated that doing well in English studies was important to them. Six subjects (3 females, 3 males) felt doing well in English studies was not important.

Instrument Development

Procedures recommended by Anastasi (1982) were used to establish validity for the course descriptions. This process began with a review of the literature that addressed

course attraction for females and males (Bowman, 1992; Flynn & Schweickart, 1986; Gabriel, 1990; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; McCracken & Appleby, 1992; Millard, 1998; Pace, 1992; Sadker & Sadker 1992, 1984; Smithson, 1990). This review indicated that students might be attracted to English courses based on the gender of the author assigned (female/male) and the type of reading assigned (narrative/expository).

Based upon the works of Gabriel (1990), McCracken and Appleby (1992), Pace (1992), and Sadker and Sadker (1992, 1984), the operational definition for gender of the assigned readings is quite simply, "readings written by either females or males." The operational definitions of the type of readings follow: "Narrative readings tell a story by focusing on characters' feelings, emotions, and ideologies. Expository readings provide information in a factual and practical manner in order to provide an explanation" (Wyrick, 2002, p. 189).

In terms of content, one version of the course description contained assignments with female authors and narrative readings. A second version contained assignments with male authors and narrative readings. A third version included assignments with all female authors and expository readings. The fourth version included assignments with all male authors and expository assignments.

In terms of format, each course description contained three paragraphs. The first paragraph contained general information held constant for most English 101 courses in two-year schools (e.g. course requirements, hours earned, evaluative procedures). The second paragraph described the simulated course with either female or male authors. The third paragraph described the readings assigned for the course.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was necessary to assess the reliability of the dependent variable (attraction to the course description). Students (N = 76), similar to the participants in the actual study, were provided a packet including (a) biographical data form (b) one of the four versions of the course descriptions; (c) a course evaluation form; and (d) a two-item questionnaire designed to determine whether the participants accurately perceived the manipulation of the independent variables. For the manipulation to be successful, participants had to recall whether the gender of the author of the readings was male or female and whether the type of reading assigned was narrative or expository. The manipulation was successful with 97.4% of students recalling the gender of the author and type of reading for the course. Therefore, the initial instrument was used in the actual study without modification.

The dependent variable in this study was interval scaled and consisted of a five-item additive composite score for student attraction to an English course. Student attraction was measured by adding 5-point Likert-type scales to seven items. The items were (a) "How would you rate the attractiveness of the course described?" (b) "How likely are you to enjoy the readings?"(c) "How likely would you be to recommend this course to your friends?" (d) "How likely would you be to enroll in the course?" (e) "How well are you likely to perform in this course?" (f) "How likely are you to enjoy the course?" (g) "How likely is it that this course will assist you in other courses?"

This approach to measurement of the dependent variable draws on the theory and research relating to the decision-making processes that individuals use in evaluating job opportunities (Schwab, Rynes, & Aldag, 1986). This study applies the theory relating to the evaluation of jobs to the evaluation of community college courses. The items, the

scale, and the wording have been used extensively in previous educational research (e.g., Rynes & Lawler, 1983, Newton, (in press); Winter, 1998; Winter & Kjorlien, 2000) assessing applicant reactions to job opportunities.

Coefficient alpha was used to assess the reliability of the seven evaluation items. The deletion of the fifth item ("How likely are you to perform well in this course?") increased the overall reliability of the resulting composite score from .86 to .89. Accordingly, a six-item composite score served as the dependent variable measure in the actual study. Additionally, to prevent order effects, all items on the instrument were counterbalanced according to procedures recommended by Keppel (1991). At the data collection stage, the study participants completed a biographical sheet, read one of the four course announcements, and then completed the evaluation instrument.

Results

Based upon an alpha level of .05, there was a main effect for gender [F (1, 128) =5.12, $p < .05$]. Males rated the hypothetical English course lower than females. Statistical testing also detected an interaction effect between gender of the student (female, male) and the gender of the writer (female, male), [F (1,128) = 5.27, $p < .05$]. Males rated the courses with assigned readings written by males higher (M = 16.61) as opposed to readings written by female authors (M = 14.88).

A second interaction effect was found between the gender of the author assigned (female, male) and the style of reading assigned (narrative, expository), [F (1, 128) = 5.12, $p < .05$]. Expository readings written by female authors were rated higher than were expository readings written by male authors. In contrast, narrative readings written by

male authors were rated higher than narrative readings written by female authors. A summary of cell means and standard deviations are revealed in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about Here

Calculations for omega-squared (Keppel, 1991) indicated that the interaction effect accounted for 7% of the variance in student reaction to the hypothetical English course. Cohen (1977) developed an *f* statistic (.25), which converted to omega-squared, and is characterized by Cohen as a small-to-medium effect size for an analysis of variance computation.

There was no significant interaction found between the gender of the student (female, male) and style of reading assigned (narrative, expository), [$F(1, 128) = .07, p > .05$]. Furthermore, no significance was found with a three-way interaction between gender of the student (female, male), gender of the author assigned (female, male), and the style of readings assigned (narrative, expository), [$F(1, 128) = .058, p > .05$].

Discussion

Our society is in the process of redefining relationships and roles between males and females in all aspects of public and private life. The challenge for educational systems is to accommodate these changes while determining the factors that contribute and perpetuate these differences, which cause a variation in educational outcomes for both genders (Grossman & Grossman, 1994).

This study is based upon a social learning perspective, which supports that sex role belief systems are learned and instilled. The family, schools, teachers, and language

are among the most important socializing agents, determining youths' attitudes, self-esteems, belief systems, behaviors, and careers (Lottes & Kuriloff, 1992). Schools, especially, are viewed as instrumental in the reproduction of gender roles and expectations by transmitting consistent treatment and attitudes toward females and males based entirely upon societal expectations. Consequently, both males and females are sorted and shaped to fit "their positions" (Holland & Eisenhart, 1988, p. 115). One area of academia, where both genders experience inequity is English studies. Although females' inequities are consistently stressed in this area, few studies address the importance of meeting the needs of both males and females.

Analysis of the descriptive data for this study indicated that for both genders, regardless of how the data are disaggregated, student attraction to the English course fell slightly below or slightly above the middle (3) range. One explanation for overall moderate scores may be that the course descriptions did not specify the actual reading topics, and according to Bowman (1992), this is especially important to male readers who are more subjective in their reading choice. Although the readings specified the author gender and the type of reading required, the subject matter was not revealed in this study. Additionally, the moderate range may have resulted from the age of the student ($M = 18$). Some students, who had positive literary experiences, previously, may have rated the course attraction as high, while those students who experienced negative reading assignments in English courses, may have rated the course much lower. It may be beyond the scope of this study to account for these modest ratings; therefore, in the future, research would warrant the examination of course content and student attraction.

The study results did, however, reveal that females reported a stronger preference for the English course than did males. This finding supports the results of previous studies indicating that females enjoy and excel in English courses, whereas males prefer other subjects such as math, computer science, and science (Brozo & Schmelxer, 1997; Connell, 1996; Davies & Brember, 1994; Flynn & Schweickart, 1986; Gabriel, 1990; McCracken & Appleby, 1992). Females prefer and excel in English studies more than males for numerous reasons. English is considered more of a feminine course of study because it deals with communication, and many females are more inclined to prefer reading and writing because often assignments in the English classroom deal with discussions of character, emotion, and theme. Females also have role models that read. Furthermore, according to Schlender (2001), unlike males who quickly decide to accept or reject a text, females are more patient and open-minded readers. As a result, females are exposed to a variety of characters, themes, and experiences through reading materials, unlike most males. Males, on the other hand, may not find many reading assignments of interest, especially if the assignments have been selected by a female instructor, limiting their topic selection.

Consistent with the literature review and Byrne's theory of attraction, the findings revealed that student reactions to English courses are influenced by the gender of the author. Males rated courses with male writers higher ($M = 16.61$) than those readings written by female authors ($M = 14.88$). The results lend credence to other findings indicating that both females and males prefer readings by their own gender.

Millard (1998) concluded that males are more congruent with stereotypical behavior than females; therefore, they are attracted to readings about males, especially

stories dealing with stereotypical roles, depicting women as less important characters. This inequitable behavior stems from a myriad of activities, opportunities, encouragements, discouragements, overt behaviors, covert suggestions, and various forms of guidance that they have experienced or failed to experience at home and throughout their educational careers (Witt, 1997). Males prefer male authors because they have been exposed to male authors primarily throughout their years studying English and because males may assume male authors will relay a male experience, not a female one.

However, contrary to previous research, males preferred male authors depicting a narrative style. In fact, males rated female and male authors the same when using the expository style ($M = 16.11$), while rating female authors and narratives as the lowest, ($M = 13.64$). The preferred style for males was a male reading depicting a male experience (narrative, $M = 17.11$). This suggests that males enjoy other male experiences told from a first or second person point of view over factual or process information, and the readings least likely to be enjoyed are those told by a female about her personal experience. Although previous research supports that males prefer expository readings and writings, this study reveals that males are attracted to narratives only when told from a male point of view. The findings suggest that males continue to value readings based upon the male experience, with male characters, situations, and solutions.

Future Research

The results of this study and an understanding of gender by students and teachers have practical and important implications for the ways in which English teachers work with elementary, secondary, and college students. This study reveals distinct differences or preferences for male readers. As explained previously, study participants did react

differently to course descriptions based upon the gender of the author of the readings and the style of reading required. If future research reveals more information concerning the attraction of particular reading assignments and student likelihood of enrolling in English studies, educators may be capable of using this information to attract greater numbers of both male and female students into areas of English, thereby improving their overall educational capabilities and success.

Educators should prepare males and females equally, and schools must foster androgynous gender roles. However, this research suggests that both genders have particular preferences when it pertains to reading materials. These are not mutually exclusive positions, but educators must consider student preference, especially in the English classroom, if educators want to enlist an enjoyment for reading and communicating. Educators need to familiarize themselves with the variety of techniques and styles preferred by both genders and utilize them accordingly to encourage and prepare all students equally. These data confirm Norvell's (1973) study, showing that sex is so dominant a force in each individual that it needs to be carefully considered when reading programs are planned. Each gender requires separate but equal consideration.

Finally, by becoming more sensitive to these issues, educators can conduct further research and publish materials to assist in modifying behaviors that encourage stereotypical behaviors, thereby establishing a nonsexist role. Instructors can omit instructional materials omitting women, stereotypical instructional materials presenting females in stereotypical roles with stereotypical personalities and characteristics, select a balance of literary contributions that both males and females find appealing, and assist students in concluding that English is a subject matter that can interest both males and

females equally. With this knowledge educators can increase power within the classroom for both female and male students, increase student understanding of themselves and their gender, and improve the likelihood that students will be prepared for interaction in a community that has been defined by gender (Slavkin, 2001).

Study Limitations

This research is subject to a number of limitations. First, the study addresses the need to provide an equitable educational experience for males at the community college level. Consequently, the findings may not generalize to learning organizations beyond the community college level. Furthermore, the regional nature of the study sample (Southeastern United States) should be considered when interpreting the findings. Students in other geographical regions may respond to the attributes of the courses differently. Finally, there may be other ways that gender discrimination manifests itself at the community college level. For example, hiring a disproportionate number of males or females to teach English classes may perpetuate a form of gender discrimination. Future research should examine other manifestations of gender bias.

Conclusion

There has been little research exploring the factors inhibiting and/or encouraging gender bias for males and females in English studies. Both genders are discriminated against in different but effectual ways throughout English courses. This study begins to examine factors that influence males' perceptions of these courses and can contribute to the acquisition of additional knowledge concerning disparate educations. By determining what factors influence student attraction in the field of English, educators can foster

equity by "investing students with confidence in their own authority" (Gerlach & Hart, 1992, p. 49).

References

Anastasi, A. (1982). *Psychological testing* (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Bleach, K. (1998). Why the likely lads lag behind an examination of reasons for some boys' poor academic performance and behavior in school. In K. Bleach (Ed.), *Raising boys' achievement in schools.* (pp. 1-20). Staffordshire, England: Trentham.

Bowman, C. A. (1992). Gender differences in response to literature. In N.M. McCracken & B. C. Appleby (Eds.), *Gender issues in the teaching of English* (pp. 80-114). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Brozo, W., & Schmelxer, R. (1997). Wildmen, warriors, and lovers: Reaching boys through archetypal literature [Electronic version]. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 97,* 4-12.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm.* New York: Academic.

Chilisa, B. (2000). Towards equity in assessment: Crafting gender-fair assessment [Electronic version]. *Assessment in education: Principles, Policy, & Practice, 7,* 61-82.

Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (Rev. ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Connell, R. W. (1996). Teaching the boys: New research on masculinity, and gender strategies for schools [Electronic version]. *Teachers College Record, 98,* 206-238.

Davies, J., & Brember, I. (1994). Attitudes to school and the curriculum year 2 and year 4: changes over 2 years [Electronic version]. *Educational Review, 46,* 247-259.

Fetterly, J. (1978). *The resisting reader: A feminist approach to American fiction.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Flynn, E. A., & Schweickart, P.P. (Eds.). (1986). *Gender and reading.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Gabriel, S.L. (1990). Gender, reading, and writing: Assignments, expectations, and responses. In S. L.Gabriel & E. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the classroom* (pp. 127-139). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Gerlach, J., & Hart, B.L. (1992). Gender equity in the classroom: An inventory. *Teaching English in the two-year college, 19*, 49-54.

Grossman, H., & Grossman, S.H. (1994). *Gender issues in education.* Boston: Allyn &Bacon.

Heilbrun, C. G. (1990). The politics of mind: Women, tradition, and the university In S. Gabriel & I. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the classroom* (pp. 28-41). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Holland, D.C. & Eisenhart, M.A. (1988). Moments of discontent: University Women and the gender status quo. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 19*, 115-38.

Keppell, G. (1991). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kleinfeld, J. (1998). The myth that schools shortchange girls: Social science in the service of deception [Electronic version]. *The Women's Freedom Network.* Washington, DC: The Women's Freedom Network.

Lottes, I.L., Kuriloff, P.J. (1992). The effects of gender, race, religion, and political

Orientation on the sex role attitudes of college freshmen. *Adolescence, 27*, 675-688.

McCracken, N.M. (1992). Re-gendering the reading of literature. In N.M. McCracken & B.C. Appleby (Eds.), *Gender issues in the teaching of English* (pp. 55-68). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

McCracken, N.M., & Appleby, B. C. (Eds.). (1992). *Gender issues in the teaching of English.* Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.

Millard, E. (1998). Balancing the books. In A. Clark & E. Millard (Eds.), *Gender in the secondary curriculum.* (pp.43-59). London: Routledge.

Newton, R.M., & Seitoun, P. (in press). Is androcentric bias in educational Administration on the wane? Perplexing findings. *Journal of School Leadership.*

Norvell, G. (1973). *The reading interests of young people.* Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press.

Pace, B.G. (1992). The textbook canon: Genre, gender, and race in US literature anthologies. *English Journal, 81,* 33-38.

Rice, P.S. (2000). Gendered readings of a traditional 'feminist' folktale by sixth -grade boys and girls. *Journal of Literacy Research, 32,* 211-236.

Rynes, S. & Lawler, J. (1983). A policy-capturing investigation of the role of expectancies in decisions to pursue

Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1982). *Sec equity handbook for schools.* New York: Longman.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness how our schools cheat girls.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Schlender, E. A. (2001). Beyond reader-response theories of reading: Psychoanalytic theories and sex/gender in the high school English classroom. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Canada, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62,05.*

Schwab, D.P., Rynes, S.L., Aldag, R.J. (1987). Theories and research on job Search and choice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 5*, 129-166.

Slavin, M. (2001). How can awareness of gender identity improve the performance Of students? *Journal of College Reading & Learning, 32*, 32-40.

Smithson, I. (1990). Introduction: Investigating gender, power, and pedagogy. In S.L. Gabriel & I. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the classroom* (pp. 1-28). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Warrington, M., Younger, M., & Williams, J. (2000). Student attitudes, image and The gender gap [Electronic version]. *British Educational Research Journal, 26,* 393-408.

Whitehead, F., Capey, A., Maddren, W., & Wellings, A. (1977). Children
Whitehead, F., Capey, A., Maddren, W., & Wellings, A. (1977). Children
and their books. *Final Report of the Schools Council Project on children's reading habits 10-16.* Basingstoke, England: Evans/Metheren Educational.

Winter, P. (1998). Community college faculty recruitment practices: The effects of Applicant gender, instructional programs, and job attributes [Electronic version]. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 22,* n.p.

Winter, P., & Kjorlien, C.L. (2000). Community college faculty recruitment: Effects of job mobility, recruiter similarity-dissimilarity, and applicant gender [Electronic version]. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 24*, 547-566.

Witt, A.A., Wattenbarger, J.L., Gollattscheck, J.F., & Suppinger, J. E. (1994). *America's community colleges.* Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.

Young, J. P. (2000). Boy talk: Critical literacy and masculinities. [Electronic Version]. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35,* 312-338.

Tables

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Participants in Actual Study

Variable	Mean	SD	Range
Gender	(a)	(a)	(a)
Age (years)	18	4.1	18-45
Ethnicity	(b)	(b)	(b)
Class standing	(c)	(c)	(c)
GPA	3.26	.51	2.00-4.00
Residence	(d)	(d)	(d)
Transfer plans	(e)	(e)	(e)

Note: N = 136

(a) Female = 68, Male = 68

(b) Black = 14, Native American = 2, Hispanic = 1, White = 119

(c) Class = Freshman = 123, Sophomore = 13

(d) Residence = Rural = 91, Urban = 12, Suburban = 33

(e) Transfer Plans = 1 = Transfer Plans (121) = 2 = No Transfer Plans (15)

Table 2

Influences on Attitudes Toward English Classes

	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Father's education			
High school	67	49.3	49.3
Some college	27	19.9	69.1
College graduate	34	25.0	94.1
Post-college	8	5.9	100.0
Mother's education			
High school	61	44.9	44.9
Some college	33	24.3	69.1
College graduate	38	27.9	97.1
Post-college	4	2.9	100.0
Encouragement for reading			
Mother	51	37.5	37.5
Father	5	3.7	41.2
Neither parent	16	11.8	52.9
Both parents	64	47.1	100.0

$N = 136$

Table 3

Participant Responses

	Males		Females		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	N
Enjoy English classes	30	38	42	26	136
English assists in other courses	57	11	62	6	136
Enjoy reading	33	35	52	16	136
Doing well in English is important	65	3	65	3	136

Table 4

Summary of Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Independent variables	Gender (female, male), Gender of the author assigned (female, male), Type of reading assigned (narrative, expository)			
Gender of participant	Female		Male	
Gender of author	Female	Male	Female	Male
Type of reading assigned				
Narrative				
M	17.58	17.52	13.64	17.11
SD	5.55	5.32	4.44	4.87
Expository				
M	20.00	15.64	16.11	16.11
SD	5.61	5.38	5.06	3.35

$N = 136$

TM035243

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: What about the Other Gender?: Male Bias in English	
Author(s): Beth Bownes Johnson Rose Mary Newton	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1 ✓

Level 1

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Beth Bownes Johnson	Printed Name/Position/Title: Beth Bownes Johnson
Organization/Address: Wallace State College	Telephone: (256) 352-8028 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: beth.johnson@wallacestate.edu Date: 8/28/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC/CSMEE
1929 Kenny Road
Columbus
Ohio
43210-1080

Phone: 614-292-6717
Toll Free: 800-276-0462
FAX: 614-292-0263
email: ericse@osu.edu
http://www.ericse.org

Attn: NIQUI BECKRUM