TEACHING TEACHERS ON THE TOPIC OF GLBT ISSUES: THE CURRENT CONDITION

OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

BY

NANCY SAMAR SHEDLOCK

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF

ALFRED UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

IN

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

DIVISION OF COUNSELING AND SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

ALFRED, NEW YORK

AUGUST, 2013

TEACHING TEACHERS ON THE TOPIC OF GLBT ISSUES: THE CURRENT CONDITION

OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

BY

NANCY SAMAR SHEDLOCK

PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE, B.S. (2004)

ALFRED UNIVERSITY, M.S. (2007)

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Lynn O'Connell
Committee Chairperson

Dr. Nancy Evangelista
Committee Member

Dr. Hannah Young
Committee Member

Dr. Arthur Greil
Committee Member

ACCEPTED BY   Dr. Mark Fugate
Chairperson, Division of School Psychology

ACCEPTED BY   Dr. Nancy Evangelista
Associate Provost and Director of Graduate Studies

ACCEPTED BY   Dr. Richard Stephens
Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the help of many faculty members at Alfred University and my family. First, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my dissertation committee for the insight and guidance each member provided along the way. I am especially grateful to Dr. O'Connell, my committee chairperson, for her consistent support and feedback, not to mention her amazing patience as I worked through this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Evangelista for challenging me to meet my full potential and for posing questions that made me think critically about my process and interpretation; to Dr. Young for her enthusiasm and encouragement that kept me going, especially when I needed it most; and to Dr. Greil, for guiding me through the statistics and for spending countless hours helping me dig deeper into the numbers.

I would like to acknowledge the faculty in the Division of Counseling and School Psychology at Alfred University. From my first day in the program, every professor has encouraged me to think bigger, has pushed me to break out of my shell, and saw potential in me that I was not aware of. I may never have had the courage to apply for the doctoral program if not for the support of the faculty.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband and family for the unconditional support they have provided. My parents instilled in me an appreciation for education and learning. It is because of them that I have made it this far. And to my husband, you always believed in me and never doubted that this would happen, even when I had my doubts. Thank you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Sexual minority students are targets of bullying and experience negative mental health and academic outcomes. Although teachers report positive attitudes towards the needs of sexual minority students, they do not feel prepared to effectively support such students. This study investigated the current ways in which teacher education programs integrate the topic of GLBT needs into the educational experience of pre-service teachers and factors that may affect the integration of the topic. Twenty directors of teacher education programs participated in phone interviews. Some information was also collected from institution and federal websites.

The results indicate that approximately half of teacher preparation programs expect pre-service teachers to develop GLBT related competencies prior to graduating, although very few assess these competencies. Pre-service teachers are most likely to learn about GLBT issues as they relate to family structures, bullying, and literature in a variety of education related courses. Hands-on experiences are limited, with few programs reporting a presence of GLBT faculty or students, few experiences with GLBT issues in the field, and few opportunities to engage in research on GLBT related topics. The results indicate no significant difference in the interview answers by institution type or program accrediting body. The institution's Carnegie Classification, student population, percent of the institution's students enrolled in the education program, and percent of ethnic minority students and faculty in the program were found to have relationships with factors extracted from the questionnaire. The results and implications for teacher education practices are discussed.

Chapter One: Introduction

Background

According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, all people have the right to an education that will strengthen their respect for diversity (General Assembly of the United Nations, 1948). In the United States of America, it is the responsibility of each state to ensure availability of free education to its people, whether it is stated in the states' constitutions, laws, or policies (Right to Education Project, 2008); however, many students experience harassment and feel unsafe, which negatively affects school performance, can lead to truancy, and can ultimately deny students their right to an education. Students who self-identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender (GLBT) experience high levels of harassment in schools and are at high-risk for emotional, social, and academic difficulties (Kosciw, Diaz, & Greytak, 2008); Lewis, Derlega, Clarke, & Kuang, 2006; National Association of School Psychologists [NASP], 2002; Rivers, 2004; Rosario, Schrimshaw, Hunter, & Gwadz, 2002; Savin-Williams, 1994). In many cases, sexual minority[1] students are denied their right to an education because school personnel are not trained to provide support and safety to GLBT students.

Many writers have theorized that sexual minority individuals progress through various stages as they form a full understanding and acceptance of their sexual and gender identities (Cass, 1979; Chapman & Brannock, 1987; Coleman, 1982; D'Augelli, 1994; Girshick, 2008; McCarn & Fassinger, 1996; Morales, 1989; Sophie, 1985-1986; Troiden, 1989). Social context and environmental factors help mold a child's developmental process (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and can affect an individual's progression through the stages of sexual identity development (Dubé & Savin-Williams, 1999; Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000).

Research has established that sexual minorities experience harassment more often than the general population (Balsam, Rothblum, & Beauchaine, 2005; Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995). In the school setting, sexual minority youth report alarmingly high rates of verbal and physical harassment, including cyberbullying and relational aggression (Ellis & High, 2004; Kosciw & Diaz, 2006; Kosciw et al., 2008). When youth experience harassment, while struggling to develop an appreciation for their sexual and gender identities, they can exhibit negative outcomes in behavior (NASP, 2002; Rosario et al., 2002; Savin-Williams, 1994), mental health (Lewis et al., 2006; Rivers, 2004), and academics (Kosciw et al., 2008; Savin-Williams, 1994).

Parental support can mediate the effects of victimization on sexual minority youths' well-being and can promote healthy coping skills and a strong self-image (Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995; Mohr & Fassinger, 2003). Families vary, however, in the reactions they experience when they learn of their children's sexual or gender identity, often progressing from feelings of anger or denial to a more accepting view (Savin-Williams & Dubé, 1998). As parents and families work through their personal feelings, GLBT youth can feel isolated. It is at this time that support from school personnel can be helpful (Gastic & Johnson, 2009; Kosciw et al., 2008).

Pre-service and in-service teachers generally believe that they will help sexual minority students who are being victimized; however, they are less willing to proactively advocate for the safety and acceptance of GLBT students (Bailey, 1996; Hirsch, 2008; Riggs, 2002). Yet, the majority of sexual minority students report that teachers do not react to victimization and do not attempt to help GLBT students who are being victimized (Kosciw et al., 2008). Research indicates that teachers feel they lack training and preparation to work with sexual minority students, and they feel they have inadequate resources in schools (McCabe & Rubinson, 2007;

O'Connell et al., 2007). These are important factors that can influence whether educators follow through with their anticipated behaviors (Ajzen, 1991; Sears, 1992).

Explicit instruction on the topic of sexual minority issues has been shown to have a positive effect on attitudes towards GLBT individuals (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Lambert, Ventura, Hall, & Cluse-Tolar, 2006; Riggs, 2002; Waterman, Reid, Garfield, & Hoy, 2001), which can strengthen an individual's intention to help GLBT youth (Ajzen, 1991; Mudrey & Medina-Adams, 2006; Sears, 1992). However, it is uncertain how the topic of sexual minorities is being approached in a variety of higher education programs. Ethical and training standards for school-related higher education programs, such as counselors and psychologists, are becoming inclusive of sexual orientation and gender identity, and explicitly state these as areas of diversity in which school personnel should be trained (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2005; American Psychological Association [APA], 2002, 2007; American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2007; Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2009; NASP, 2000a, 2000b, 2006). In response to these standards, some higher education training programs have integrated GLBT issues into the curriculum, particularly in APA accredited programs that train professional psychologists (Sherry, Whilde, & Patton, 2005).

Standards for teacher education training programs are less explicit. Ethical codes for teachers tend to neglect the importance of enumerated categories when discussing diversity and fail to mention GLBT youth as a group (Council for Exceptional Children, 1993; National Education Association, n.d.). Additionally, program accrediting bodies rarely use enumerated categories that include sexual orientation or gender identity. For example, teacher education training programs in New York State had three primary choices for accreditation: the National

Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), and the Regents Accreditation of Teacher Education (RATE). Of the three, NCATE is the only accrediting body that mentioned sexual orientation by including a footnote stating that the term "all students" in the main text includes sexual orientation and by asserting that education students be taught to understand the impact of discrimination based on differences including sexual orientation (NCATE, 2008; New York State Board of Regents, 2007; TEAC, n.d.). The lack of consistency in educational standards leaves room for teacher education programs to decide whether the topic of sexual orientation and gender identity will be included in the curriculum or if resources will be made readily available to individuals enrolled in the programs.

A variety of questionnaires and checklists have been developed that measure the levels of knowledge individuals have acquired regarding multiculturalism and sexual minority issues (Harris, 1998; Herek, 1988, 1998; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D'Andrea, 2003; Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Rieger, & Austin, 2002; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994; Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005). Only a few surveys and checklists have been found to date that systematically assess training programs' integration of multiculturalism (Hills & Strozier, 1992; Ponterotto, Alexander, & Grieger, 1995; Rogers, Hoffman, & Wade, 1998); of which, the Multicultural Competency Checklist (MCC) (Ponterotto et al., 1995) has been modified to measure training program integration of GLBT topics in counseling and psychology programs (Sherry et al., 2005).

Purpose of the Study

Sexual minority students in elementary, middle, and high schools frequently hear anti-gay remarks and experience harassment. School personnel, especially teachers who are in

frequent contact with these students, are in an ideal position to create a supportive atmosphere for sexual minority students by reacting appropriately to harassment and biased remarks. Although many teachers report *willingness* to help students in such situations, they feel *unprepared* and *untrained* to help. Therefore, teacher education training programs need to assess how they currently approach the topic and the extent to which pre-service teachers are trained in these professional competencies. Due to the lack of research in this area, this study is exploratory and will investigate the current state of teacher education training programs using a structured interview developed by combining and modifying common elements of the MCC and other program surveys of multicultural integration. The scope of this study will be limited to a sample of undergraduate teacher education training programs in New York State. A discussion of the current programs and suggestions for improvement will ensue.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Theories of Sexual Identity Development

   Stage theories. A number of models have been created in an attempt to explain the development of sexual identity. One of the earlier influential models is that of Vivienne Cass (1979) who created a stage model of sexual identity development based on observations of clients in a clinical setting. The stage model implies that individuals move forward through the stages – once they have passed through a stage they do not return to it. Cass's model includes the following six stages:

1. Identity confusion – the person becomes confused about his or her sexual orientation, wondering if he or she is gay or lesbian.

2. Identity comparison – the person accepts the possibility that he or she is gay or lesbian as a way to cope with the confusion present in the first stage.

3. Identity tolerance – the individual tolerates the fact that he or she is gay or lesbian, and recognizes some of the needs associated with being gay or lesbian; however, the person may not be comfortable revealing his or her orientation to others.

4. Identity acceptance – the individual increases contact with other gay and/or lesbian individuals due to a personal desire for this contact, which leads to a more positive self-image as gay or lesbian.

5. Identity pride – the individual immerses himself/herself into the gay community, at which point contact with heterosexual individuals is limited and negative emotions toward heterosexual individuals develop.

6. Identity synthesis – the person realizes that not all heterosexual individuals are untrustworthy, usually due to some unexpected positive experience with a heterosexual individual, which helps reduce the anger that developed in the previous stage.

Following Cass, a number of theorists developed alternative models to explain gay and lesbian identity development. Table 1 summarizes the general similarities between numerous sexual identity models. Many of the stages between the models overlap due to differences in the order and timing of events, therefore the table is a rough estimation of the similarities.

The development of gay and lesbian identity has commonly been discussed together, with the assumption that gay and lesbian individuals have the same experiences; however, some theorists developed models strictly regarding lesbian identity formation (Chapman & Brannock, 1987; Sophie, 1985-1986). One such model provides stages on two dimensions: the individual's sexual identity formation and a group membership identity (McCarn & Fassinger, 1996). The theorists suggested that as an individual self-identifies as a lesbian, she begins to connect with other gay and lesbian individuals.

Dynamic theory. Nearly a decade and a half after Cass's original theory of development, a dynamic model of gay, lesbian, and bisexual identity development was created by D'Augelli (1994), which theorizes that people move back and forth between steps due to contextual influences. This model reflects some of Cass's original ideas, but provides room for the ever-changing experiences and contexts of people's lives. The model includes six steps that begin with the recognition that an individual's sexual orientation is not heterosexual, similar to Cass's first stage of identity confusion. D'Augelli proposes that individuals then develop a personal lesbian-gay-bisexual identity status, accepting the fact that they are not heterosexual, after which they look for more community support and friendships, including the development of intimate

relationships; phases similar to Cass's stages of identity comparison, tolerance, and acceptance. A step included in this dynamic model not conceptualized in Cass's stage model is the act of coming out to an individual's biological family. The final step in D'Augelli's dynamic model is a combination of Cass's final two stages of identity pride and identity synthesis, in which individuals become immersed in a sexual minority community and become active in political and social settings.

      Transgenderism. Transgender individuals are a group of overlooked individuals in the realm of identity formation. Girshick (2008) conducted interviews and data collection to study the experiences of transgender individuals and discovered a few common themes. First, many individuals reported feeling different at a very early age, a stage similar to that described in models of gay and lesbian identity formation. Because of the social stigma against being different, some individuals reported suppressing their feelings, while others explored their feelings in hiding from others. Following this time of exploration, individuals began to understand their feelings and some applied labels to themselves. They then moved into a time of confusion. This confusion is called a mixed gender state, which occurs because individuals have been socialized as one gender but identify with another, leading to a sense of not being fully one or the other. Some individuals reported staying in this mixed gender state for years. Those who worked through it and fully identified as one gender had to decide if they wanted to change their physical body to match the identified gender, which Girshick calls the need for internal/external consistency. Only some transgender individuals experience this need for consistency and undergo a physical transition.

      Girshick (2008) discusses other factors that can affect an individual's outcome throughout the process, such as puberty and social pressure. Many respondents reported that, as

they hit puberty, they felt worse about themselves. Girls, who at one point were labeled tomboys, began to develop a woman's physique, while boys who were slender began to develop the build of a man. Social pressure pushed some individuals to contemplate and/or complete a transition through surgery or hormones in order to be completely accepted by society. Although not developed into a succinct theory of development, Girshick collected and synthesized important information regarding common experiences of transgender individuals. It appears that transgender individuals may initially have similar experiences in their identity development to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals; however, they also have unique experiences that can be affected by their surrounding environments.

Social-Contextual Factors Affecting Sexual Identity Development

    Ecological factors. The roles of the environment and genetics in determining human development have been debated in the sciences for years. A bioecological theory described by Bronfenbrenner and Ceci (1994) expresses the idea that the environment can help the genetics of an individual reach their full potential. In other words, the two interact with each other to determine behaviors and personal characteristics. Bronfenbrenner (1979) developed a model of ecological influences that can affect the development of a child. The level with the most direct influence is the microsystem, which includes all of the people and situations with which an individual comes into direct contact. Those factors, which Bronfenbrenner termed proximal processes, can interact with each other, creating another level of environmental factors that affect an individual. In addition to the proximal processes, each individual is affected by distal processes, those factors that an individual does not have direct contact with, such as people who indirectly influence a child or the larger culture that surrounds the child.

The models of sexual identity development compiled by D'Augelli (1994), Coleman (1982), and Troiden (1989) take into account the effects ecological experiences have on development. D'Augelli (1994) proposed three contextual variables that affect one's developmental outcomes, which include *personal subjectivities*, *interactive intimacies*, and *sociohistorical connections*. Personal subjectivities include how individuals feel about their identity and how they engage in intimate relationships. The variable of interactive intimacies includes the influence that parents and families have on a person's life and how they affect the individual's intimate relationships, similar to the microsystem level of Bronfenbrenner's model. Finally, the sociohistorical connections are the social norms and expectations that surround the individual, which parallels Bronfenbrenner's theory of distal processes. All three variables can affect one another and influence one's movement throughout the six steps previously outlined.

Coleman's (1982) five-stage sexual identity model was based on Cass's model, but he discussed ways in which social norms can affect individuals' experiences in each stage. Troiden (1989) also discussed the effect environments can have on people as they identify their sexual orientation; however, he was one of the first theorists to encourage the idea that widespread disclosure of identity should not be considered a stage in development. Instead, he supported the theory that disclosure of sexual identity to others can be dependent on personal and social factors.

Sexual identity development milestones. Other contextual issues have been suggested as important when considering models of sexual identity development. Savin-Williams and Diamond (2000) state that males and females tend to follow different paths from sexual attraction to sexual contact or activity, independent of sexual orientation. The desire for sexual contact is motivation enough for most men to act on it, partially due to hormones released at

puberty at approximately thirteen years of age. Women are influenced by social context to a great extent, despite many of the sexual hormones also released at puberty. This indicates that men are generally more likely than women to engage in sexual contact at an earlier age and within a shorter period of time from feeling attracted to someone, no matter what their sexual orientation.

There are some similarities and some differences in the order and timing of developmental milestones for sexual minority youth compared to the general population. Savin-Williams and Diamond (2000) studied the importance of three specific issues in furthering the model of sexual identity development in sexual minority youth, which include (a) the context of events, (b) the duration between milestones, and (c) the order of developmental milestones. The first question is whether the context of the events are emotionally based or sexually oriented. In other words, does the individual feel a special connection to someone of the same-sex or are they focused on the sexual attraction? The second issue investigated is the duration of time that passes between each important developmental milestone (e.g., the time between coming out to another individual and entering an intimate relationship). The last issue under question is the order of the developmental milestones. It is assumed that individuals experience sexual contact before labeling the self as gay, lesbian, or bisexual; however, this may not always be the case. The four developmental milestones that Savin-Williams and Diamond identified were (a) one's first sexual attraction to someone of the same sex, (b) the first same-sex sexual contact, (c) self-identifying as gay, lesbian, or bisexual for the first time, and (d) coming out to others for the first time.

Four interesting findings came from the Savin-Williams and Diamond (2000) study:

1. Females' sexual attractions, sexual contacts, and self-labeling experiences tend to occur within an emotional context. Those same milestones tend to occur in a sexually oriented context for males.

2. Females are more likely to experience their first sexual contact within a romantic relationship, which tends to happen at a later age (an average age of 18.5 years), compared to males whose first sexual experiences tend to happen outside of an intimate relationship and at an earlier age (average of 13.8 years). However, females who did have their first sexual contact outside of a romantic relationship experienced the milestone at the same average age as males (13.8 years).

3. The average gap between first sexual attraction and initial disclosure of sexual orientation is about ten years; however, the order of intervening milestones differs depending on gender. Females are more likely to follow a label-first trajectory, self labeling as lesbian or bisexual before engaging in sexual contact (80% of the female sample were in this category). Males, on the other hand, were split between the label-first and sex-first trajectories, with 49% falling into the first group and 51% reporting sexual contact before labeling the self as gay or bisexual.

4. Males are more likely to wait before disclosing their orientation to others, while females tend to entrust the information with someone almost immediately after self-labeling as gay, lesbian, or bisexual.

Ethnicity as a factor. One of the first attempts to create a model that explains the identity development of ethnic sexual minority individuals was developed by Morales (1989). He proposed a model of identity development that took into account various reference groups individuals belong to and the allegiance individuals have to each group. According to the theory,

individuals may feel a stronger allegiance to their ethnic group or to their sexual identity group, which can create confusion and feelings of guilt. The ideal goal for individuals in this situation is to find a middle ground and accept both of their identities as equally important.

The sexual identity development of White and ethnic minority men has been studied in detail. Dubé and Savin-Williams (1999) found that the age of initial disclosure of sexual orientation to others was similar among men, despite ethnic differences. There were differences found among men regarding awareness of attractions, age of initial sexual contact, and the order of reaching some of the milestones. Latino youth experienced awareness of their attractions earlier than African-American and White men. Asian-Americans, on the other hand, engaged in sex approximately three years later than all other men. Dubé and Savin-Williams (1999) suggest that these differences are culturally-based. Latino men become aware of their sexual attractions at an earlier age compared to White, African-American, or Asian-American men, perhaps due to strong cultural gender stereotypes. Sexual minority Latino men may come to the realization that they do not fit the traditional Latino male role at an earlier age. On the other hand, Asian-American men may refrain from becoming sexually active for a longer period of time because the traditional role of Asian men is to continue the family name and start a family. In addition, findings indicate that less than 50% of the ethnic minority men reported that they disclosed their sexual orientation to their families, suggesting that family support is less available for individuals who are of both ethnic and sexual minorities.

Overall, research indicates that the social context and timing of developmental milestones, as well as one's gender and ethnicity, interact to make sexual and gender identity development unique to each individual. On the other hand, there are several sexual developmental similarities that many sexual minority individuals work through. Being aware of

these differences and similarities can help people understand the kinds of support needed by individuals moving through the identity development process.

Victimization and Support for GLBT Youth

       Prevalence of victimization. There are many forms of victimization that occur inside and outside of school walls. Society's general view of sexuality puts GLBT youth at higher risk of experiencing victimization than heterosexual individuals (Balsam et al., 2005). Common forms of victimization include psychological and sexual abuse, verbal and physical harassment, and school bullying (Balsam et al., 2005; Ellis & High, 2004; Kosciw et al., 2008). All of these forms of victimization have been linked to suicidality, truancy, academic failure, social isolation, and stigma consciousness (Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995; Kosciw et al., 2008; Lewis et al., 2006; NASP, 2002; Remafedi, Farrow, & Deisher, 1991; Rosario et al., 2002; Savin-Williams, 1994). Although there is some overlap between the forms of victimization, there are also distinct differences.

       Psychological and sexual abuses are fairly common forms of victimization that GLBT youth experience. It has been suggested that psychological abuse most often occurs within the family context (Balsam et al., 2005). It is common for families to experience feelings of anger and denial when they learn of their child's sexual orientation, which may lead the GLBT youth to feel alienated and alone until family members accept the individual's sexual identity (Savin-Williams & Dubé, 1998). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals are more likely to report experiencing psychological abuse than heterosexual males and females (Balsam et al., 2005). Furthermore, bisexual men and women report higher levels of abuse than gay and lesbian individuals.

Sexual minority individuals report higher levels of childhood sexual abuse compared to heterosexual individuals (Balsam et al., 2005). Balsam et al. found that 43.6% of lesbians and 47.6% of bisexual women reported experiencing sexual abuse in childhood compared to 30.4% of heterosexual women. An even greater difference was found for men, with only 12.8% of heterosexual men reporting some form of sexual abuse experience compared to 31.8% of gay men and 44.1% of bisexual men. An interesting theory posited to explain the difference observed is that gay youth, being scared of the reaction of their peers to their sexual orientation, turn to older men for sexual experiences, an event that was considered sexual assault in this study.

It has been estimated that more than half of gay and lesbian adults have experienced some form of verbal or physical harassment (Comstock as cited in Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995). A survey of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals 21 years of age and younger found that 80% of the sample had received verbal threats due to their sexual orientation, while only 17% reported experiencing physical assault (Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995). When studied as separate groups, it appears that bisexual men experience the most physical harassment compared to gay men, lesbians, and bisexual women (Balsam et al., 2005).

Bullying at school includes all of the forms of victimization discussed and is a large issue nationwide for all populations. Although GLBT youth are not the only individuals who experience this form of victimization, simply being of a sexual minority puts a student at risk for bullying. Increases in the frequencies of verbal abuse (7.7% to 36.6%), physical abuse (2.6% to 14.1%), and teasing (4.8% to 30.9%) against students who self-identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual have occurred within schools from the year 1984 to 2001 (Ellis & High, 2004). The 2007 National School Climate Survey conducted by the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network (Kosciw et al., 2008) reported the responses of GLBT students in 6th through 12th grade

from all fifty states on the topic of discrimination and harassment within schools. Based on the

6,209 survey responses, 86.2% of youth reported that they were verbally harassed and 44.1%

reported experiencing physical harassment in the last year due to their sexual orientation. In

comparison, 66.5% reported being verbally harassed and 30.4% reported being physically

harassed based on their gender expression. Cyberbullying is a form of victimization that is

increasing in prevalence within schools. Over half of the sexual minority respondents in the

survey reported being the victim of cyberbullying, compared to 4 out of 10 respondents in the

2005 survey (Kosciw & Diaz, 2006; Kosciw et al., 2008). In addition, nearly half of respondents

reported being the victim of relational aggression in their schools.

Outcomes of victimization. Experiences of victimization in or outside of school, can

lead to negative behavioral outcomes that might occur when GLBT individuals are still very

young. It is well documented that sexual minority youth are at higher risk of experiencing

suicidality than the general public (Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995; NASP, 2002; Remafedi et

al., 1991; Rosario et al., 2002). In fact, gay and bisexual men who have attempted suicide at least

once are more likely to report having been sexually abused (Remafedi et al., 1991); however,

being sexually abused does not directly increase the risk of suicide attempts. Rather, there may

be factors that mediate the two events. For example, an individual who has been sexually abused

might develop a substance abuse problem, which increases the risk of suicide.

Although suicide is one of the most widely discussed outcomes of victimization for

GLBT youth, the youth are also at higher risk of other negative outcomes. These include

additional physical and verbal harassment, exposure to the HIV virus, and substance abuse

(NASP, 2002). Based on a summary of studies, running away from home in order to avoid abuse,

conflict with the law, and school-related problems such as truancy and failing grades are other

common behavioral outcomes for GLBT youth who experience victimization (Savin-Williams, 1994). The 2007 National School Climate Survey (Kosciw et al., 2008) indicated that GLBT students in grades 6-12 were twice as likely to report having missed a day of school in the past month if they experienced verbal harassment often or frequently related to their sexual orientation, and were three times as likely to miss school if they experienced frequent physical harassment than if harassment rarely occurred. GLBT students who experienced frequent physical or verbal harassment were also more likely to report that they did not plan on attending college, and were more likely to have GPAs an average of almost half a grade lower than other students (2.4 compared to 2.8). Although individuals in the general population who experience harassment can be at risk to experience the same negative outcomes, sexual minority youth are not always looked upon in a favorable light, and therefore may experience more of these negative events than other youth.

The relationship between being bullied as a youth in school to experiencing mental health problems and symptoms of post-traumatic stress later in life have been established (Rivers, 2004). Rivers (2004) found that gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals who had experienced some of the most severe forms of school bullying as youth, and who experienced this for a prolonged period of time, were more likely to express symptoms of posttraumatic stress in adulthood. Another finding indicated that not all of the study participants had disclosed their orientation to anyone at the time of the bullying (Rivers, 2004). These individuals still experienced bullying that was homophobic in origin, evidenced by names and labels that were used at the time of the victimization. This may indicate that youth who bully others use homophobic remarks without knowing if the individual being victimized is a sexual minority.

The victimization experienced by GLBT youth can ultimately lead to the negative psychological outcomes of social constraint and stigma consciousness. Social constraint is the inhibition to talk with others about personal experiences due to social isolation and feelings of loneliness (Lewis et al., 2006). When individuals stop themselves from discussing personal experiences they tend to push problems back, causing mental health stress. Lewis et al. (2006) studied social restraint and its relationship with stigma consciousness, an individual's expectation that they will experience prejudice or discrimination. The study found that lesbians with high social constraints experienced a high level of stigma consciousness. In other words, individuals who do not talk about their feelings and perceptions push the issues to the back of their minds and begin to expect that others will treat them in a discriminatory manner. As stigma consciousness increases, individuals will find it more difficult to discuss their feelings due to fear that they will be met with negative responses from others. The perceptions that one will be treated in a discriminatory manner will remain unchallenged unless someone explicitly expresses openness to discussing issues with the GLBT individual.

Protection and social support. Social support systems provide sexual minority youth with supportive individuals with whom to discuss personal issues, thus enhancing the youths' ability to develop appropriate coping skills. Research has indicated that family support can mediate the effects of victimization on mental health (Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995). Individuals who report having parents supportive of their sexual orientation also report secure attachment patterns in childhood and adulthood. These secure attachments are directly related to greater comfort with their gay, lesbian, or bisexual identities and with openly expressing their sexual orientation in public (Mohr & Fassinger, 2003). The support of mothers indirectly affects the future self-acceptance and disclosure levels of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals by

developing healthy attachment patterns. The support of fathers, however, has a direct

relationship to a child's self-acceptance levels: the more supportive the father is, the more likely

a gay, lesbian, or bisexual youth will accept his or her sexual identity, regardless of attachment

patterns.

Family characteristics that are in place before an individual's coming out events can

affect parents' initial reactions to their children's disclosure of sexual orientation and the level of

support parents provide. In fact, parents who show greater levels of support for their children's

sexual identities are also more likely to be more sensitive and supportive as parents in general

(Mohr & Fassinger, 2003). Gay men from families with strong emotional bonds and

connectedness, and that are better able to adapt to change, report experiencing less negative

initial reactions from their parents to their sexual identity disclosure (Willoughby, Malik, &

Lindahl, 2006). In the same study, it was found that parents who use an authoritative parenting

style are believed to respond to their sons less negatively than authoritarian fathers.

Positive initial reactions from families are important for sexual minority youth who

disclose their sexual identity and are struggling to accept those identities; however, some youth

are met with negative reactions from parents. Researchers have developed models based on the

stages of grief in an attempt to explain the common steps parents go through when they learn that

their child is gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Savin-Williams and Dubé (1998) condensed

some of these models into one developmental model of parental reactions (see Table 2).

Although the common initial reaction from parents is that of shock, some GLBT youth are met

with denial or anger. As parents work through the stages, youth may begin to feel isolated from

their families.

Educators must be prepared to offer support to sexual minority youth as parents work through their personal emotions. GLBT students have reported that they feel more comfortable talking about sexual orientation or gender identity issues with a teacher or school counselor than other types of school staff, including a principal, nurse, coach, or librarian (Kosciw & Diaz, 2006). GLBT students who report having at least six supportive faculty and staff within their schools were half as likely to miss school as those with no supportive teachers (Kosciw et al., 2008). A greater number of supportive staff is associated to increased feelings of school safety and belonging for GLBT students, and is related to higher GPAs in general. Sexual minority youth in secondary school who have teachers as mentors are also more likely to go on to post-secondary education (Gastic & Johnson, 2009). Supportive educators are an important commodity for sexual minority students, especially if there is a temporary lack of support at home.

Anticipated and Actual Behaviors of Teachers towards GLBT Youth

   Teacher behaviors in elementary and secondary schools. Despite the need for supportive educators, many sexual minority students in 6th through 12th grade report that they do not see teachers react to harassment by attempting to stop it or by providing consequences (Kosciw et al., 2008). From the 6,209 surveys completed in the GLSEN School Climate Survey (Kosciw et al., 2008), nearly two thirds (63%) of students reported hearing their teachers and other school staff making homophobic remarks. Furthermore, less than one-fifth of the respondents reported that staff intervene when they hear students making homophobic remarks. The survey revealed that school staff are more likely to intervene regarding racist or sexist remarks than homophobic remarks.

Focus groups held to explore graduate students' views on advocating for GLBT students in their current and future jobs revealed two instances in which intervention is most likely to occur (McCabe & Rubinson, 2007). The focus groups were held with graduate students in urban settings from a variety of school professions including Early Childhood Education, Childhood Education, Special Education, School Counseling, and School Psychology programs, all of whom were working in a school in some capacity (e.g., employed as a teacher while completing graduate work or completing a practicum). These educators stated they would only intervene in the following two situations regarding GLBT issues: (1) when harassment is obvious and there is intent to harm and (2) if unequal access to a fair educational experience is documented. Otherwise, young educators would simply work to maintain the status quo due to fear of losing their jobs if found intervening on behalf of a GLBT student, and/or reported a feeling of having inadequate resources to handle such situations.

Other researchers recently looked at the reasoning behind this lack of staff intervention more closely. O'Connell et al. (2007) received 653 surveys completed by staff working in school districts in three rural counties. The surveys showed that staff viewed sexual minority youth in a less favorable light than other minority groups, such as ethnic minority students and students with disabilities, and did not feel prepared to work with such a group. A large percentage of teachers and administrative personnel (78.4%) stated that the mental health staff in schools have more resources to work with sexual minority students than themselves; however, they are, in general, willing to be trained to gain competence in this area (78.5%). On the other hand, the mental health staff felt that they did not have the proper resources to work with GLBT youth, even though they do see themselves as being better prepared than teachers.

Anticipated behaviors. Despite the lack of action that appears to occur in schools (Kosciw et al., 2008), pre-service teachers report more positive views regarding their ability to support GLBT students, especially to intervene when harassment of gay, lesbian, or bisexual students occurs (Hirsch, 2008; Riggs, 2002). Riggs (2002) and Hirsch (2008) both looked at contemporary beliefs of pre-services teachers regarding the behaviors they expect to engage in related to support of GLBT youth in their future school settings. Riggs (2002) assessed pre-service teachers with the Anticipated Professional Behaviors Relating to Homosexuality in the School (BEHAVIORS) measure. The BEHAVIORS scale was created by Bailey (1996) who reported a strong reliability coefficient for the entire scale ($\alpha = .91$). The scale contains 16 statements of supportive and professional behaviors relating to gay and lesbian issues in the school, and requires teachers to indicate their level of agreement to engaging in such activities. In Bailey's original study (1996), teachers who were working in schools reported that they were somewhat willing to address sexual orientation issues in their jobs, especially if students were being harassed; however, teachers were less willing to act proactively by advocating for sexual minority students.

Six years later (Riggs, 2002), pre-service teachers studying for certification to teach kindergarten to 12th grade reported slightly more supportive anticipated behaviors compared to the teachers in Bailey's study; however, there was still some reluctance to take proactive actions. Results suggest continued reluctance to have materials in the classroom that reflect issues of gay and lesbian individuals (61% of respondents indicated they would not have books about sexual minority issues in their classrooms), but a greater percentage (84%) replied that they would include lesbian and gay issues in the classroom curriculum. The overwhelming majority (92%) projected that they would refer a student to a counselor if he/she had questions about sexual

orientation, indicating a feeling of inadequacy to approach such topics in a one-on-one situation. It was also found that 98% of respondents indicated they would discipline a student for verbally or physically harassing another student about possible sexual orientation.

Hirsch (2008) found similar findings when she used the Anticipated Behaviors of Future Teachers Toward Sexual Minority Youth Scale (ABFTS) to study anticipated behaviors of pre-services teachers studying to teach kindergarten to 12th grade. Approximately 77% of her participants were undergraduate students. The ABFTS was a self-created scale with a strong reliability coefficient ($\alpha = .886$) that consisted of two parts.

Part A included 23 statements related to a vignette regarding a student looking for help with a relationship issue ($\alpha = .714$). The student in the vignette was either a heterosexual, gay, lesbian, or bisexual student. Part B consisted of 27 statements related to more general classroom behaviors to encourage diversity ($\alpha = .883$). When analyzing part A separately, Hirsch (2008) found that participants presented with a vignette about a heterosexual student were more likely to endorse items indicating they would react with positive and accepting behaviors compared to those presented with a similar vignette about a gay, lesbian, or bisexual student.

Part B of the scale revealed that almost half (49.7%) of the respondents were either neutral toward or agreed with the statement, "Even if I had sufficient training, I would still be reluctant to talk about homosexuality in the classroom." Similar to the previous study, the majority of participants responded that they would refer the student to the school counselors or psychologists rather than addressing questions about sexual identity themselves.

The studies suggest the presence of common beliefs among pre-services teachers. Many pre-service teachers report feeling more comfortable referring students with questions regarding sexual identity to an individual they view as being more knowledgeable rather than discussing

the concerns with the students themselves. Referring a student to another school professional might be done with the good intention of providing the student with positive support; however, this can inadvertently hurt the student because disclosure can be very difficult and often takes preparation. Students entrust this information to adults they feel safe with and whom they trust. The reluctance to discuss sexual identity issues one-on-one was also reflected in a reluctance to discuss the topic in the classroom, with participants showing greater willingness to initiate discussions of race and ethnicity in the classroom than topics of sexual identity. Pre-service teachers also report a willingness and anticipated ability to intervene if a gay, lesbian, or bisexual student is being harassed; however, reports from GLBT students indicate that this form of intervention rarely occurs (Kosciw et al., 2008).

Reports from educators and other school professionals suggest that there is a lack of preparation to work with sexual minority students in the school setting and uneasiness with supporting GLBT students if it is against the status quo (McCabe & Rubinson, 2007; O'Connell et al., 2007). If pre-service teachers and school personnel in the field do not feel prepared to work with GLBT students, and if they feel as if they are lacking in resources, what is being done in higher education to help intervene and develop competence?

The Role of Education

One role of higher education institutions has been described as the promotion of awareness and acceptance of diversity (Diehm & Lazzari, 2001; Lambert et al., 2006). In the past, moral views were generally taught in terms of right and wrong, a model that Fay and Gordan (1989) entitled the moralistic stand (MS). When viewing the world from this moralistic stand, individuals impose their moral codes on others; however, Fay and Gordan also describe the moral democratic stand (MDS). MDS promotes the recognition of differences among people

and the issues that come with those differences. It does this by providing all of the accurate information and allowing students to think critically about the topic at hand. Petrovic (1999) advocates for the use of MDS in schools, a movement that can be seen in higher education where students are expected to develop critical thinking skills.

Historically, heterosexist narratives have been used in higher education instruction (O'Connell, 2004). Heterosexism is the assumption that heterosexuality is the norm and the belief that it is superior to other sexual identities (Petrovic, 2005). Approaching education from a heterosexist angle leads to the continued oppression and silence of sexual minority groups. In order to teach from the MDS viewpoint, higher education institutions must become aware of the implicit heterosexism in courses and take steps to change the approach. Perhaps, if diversity of sexuality is explicitly taught and discussed in higher education, both in general education courses and in courses dedicated to GLBT studies, future professionals will be more likely to start their careers with an acceptance of sexual minority students.

Predictors of behavior. Connections between pre-service teachers' knowledge and attitudes regarding GLBT issues and their anticipated actions have been explored by researchers in the field. Sears (1992) found that pre-service K-12 teachers with more positive feelings and attitudes regarding gay and lesbian issues are more likely to express the feeling that, as professionals, they should be more proactive and supportive towards gay and lesbian students. Results also indicate that knowledge on the topic of gay and lesbian issues is positively related to attitudes and feelings towards gay and lesbian individuals.

When this study was replicated over a decade later, little variation from Sears' sample was found (Mudrey & Medina-Adams, 2006). Two hundred pre-service teachers studying to teach kindergarten through 12th grade and enrolled in a Midwestern university were surveyed

using the same questionnaires used by Sears (1992). Results indicate that pre-service teachers who are more knowledgeable regarding sexual orientation issues express a lesser degree of negative attitudes and feelings. Findings also indicate that ethnic minority pre-service teachers have less knowledge regarding gay, lesbian and bisexual issues and more negative attitudes towards gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals compared to the White respondents; however, ethnic minority respondents attending school full-time have higher levels of knowledge compared to ethnic minority respondents attending school part-time.

Similar relationships have been found in teachers working in the school setting. Teachers who have negative attitudes towards gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals are less likely to be knowledgeable about gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues, and less likely to believe that they would engage in supportive behaviors in the school (Bailey, 1996). These studies support the notion that accurate knowledge of a topic, specifically GLBT issues, is important if school staff are going to become active advocates for sexual minority students; however, it is still unclear whether attitudes affect knowledge, or if knowledge has an effect on attitudes.

The Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) proposes that there are two important aspects that are requirements for behaviors to occur: having behavioral control and the intention to perform a given behavior. In order to have behavioral control an individual must have the opportunity and resources to behave in a certain way. In the realm of sexual minority advocacy, knowledge of the topic and useful interventions are important resources to make behaviors possible.

The intention to perform a given behavior is an indication of "how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior" (Ajzen, 1991, p. 181). The theory proposes three independent determinants of

intention: (1) perceived behavioral control; (2) subjective norm; and (3) attitude toward the behavior. Perceived behavioral control is different from actual behavioral control in that someone may *feel* that they do not have the resources they need, even if they truly do. Therefore someone must feel that they are competent enough to act on the behavior and perceive that they have the freedom before they will act. Education on GLBT issues and available resources, as well as preparation to work in the school at the systems level, can increase the likelihood that educators will feel competent enough to act.

The subjective norm is the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior. If a non-tenured teacher believes he/she might lose his/her job for discussing sexual orientation in the classroom, the subjective norm is strongly negative. Education of state laws and knowledge of school conduct codes regarding the topic can help decrease such anxiety.

Attitude toward the behavior is the degree to which a person has a positive or negative view of the behavior. Ajzen (1991) explains that, through a review of studies conducted by himself and by independent parties, having a positive attitude toward the behavior is consistently related to strong intentions to act on the behaviors. The Riggs (2002) and Hirsch (2008) studies indicate that pre-service teachers have fairly positive attitudes towards behaving in ways that will protect gay, lesbian, and bisexual students; however, they do not feel that they have the resources and training to do so. Education continues to come up as the missing link between having the intention to act and actually taking action.

Effects of explicit instruction. Higher education in general has been shown to have an effect on attitudes towards gay and lesbian individuals (Lambert et al., 2006). Three-hundred-sixty-four lower and upper level students at a Midwestern university were surveyed regarding their views of homosexuality. The results showed that junior and senior students hold more positive views of

gay men and lesbians overall compared to the freshmen and sophomore students. Upper level students are more willing to apply civil rights to gay and lesbian individuals, and to work and socialize with gay and lesbian individuals, compared to younger students.

Although it appears that higher education affects tolerance and acceptance of diversity in general, having only one class dedicated to the study of sexual diversity has been shown to increase knowledge and positive attitudes toward sexual minority individuals (Waterman et al., 2001). Students from a variety of majors who took a course entitled Psychology of Homosexuality started the course wanting to learn about the facts of homosexuality. By the end of the course, the students wanted to learn ways in which they could support sexual minority individuals.

Even having one class period dedicated to the topic of GLBT issues can result in better understanding and conceptualization of sexual and gender identity. In Athanases and Larrabee's study (2003), three education classes with a total of 97 pre-service teachers read articles by lesbian and gay authors, wrote reflections on the articles, and had a guest speaker talk about being an openly gay-identified middle school science teacher in one of their class periods. The dominant theme that occurred from the students after the class period was an appreciation for the challenges facing lesbian and gay youth and reports of plans to advocate for them in schools. The participants also linked the difficulties of gay and lesbian youth to other social justice issues on their own.

In a similar study, pre-service teachers reported changes in attitudes and knowledge immediately following two 90 minute training sessions (Riggs, 2002). The sessions were designed to promote more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian individuals, increase knowledge regarding homosexuality and related issues, and to increase willingness to act as

supportive allies in the schools. Individuals who went through the sessions reported more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian individuals, greater knowledge regarding issues that are common in gay and lesbian studies, and more willingness to act in support of sexual minority students.

Whether after a semester or one class period, education of the reality and myths surrounding sexual orientation and gender identity can lead people towards advocating for sexual minority individuals. Despite the amount of research that shows the positive effects of a course, or even a short workshop, on attitudes and knowledge of GLBT issues, there is a lack of research that looks at the amount of time dedicated to the topic in teacher education programs. Teaching about the topic will help develop future educators' willingness to advocate for GLBT students; however, professional training programs differ in the level of importance they place on this topic.

Teaching to the Topic

Ethical standards. National associations for many of the helping professions have intentionally added sexual orientation as a form of diversity in ethical codes and accreditation standards. The American Psychological Association (APA), American Counseling Association (ACA), and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) are explicit about listing sexual orientation and gender identity with other forms of diversity each time it is mentioned in the ethical guidelines. The APA lists Respect for People's Rights and Dignity under its general ethical principles, stating:

>Psychologists are aware of and respect cultural, individual, and role differences, including those based on age, gender, *gender identity*, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, *sexual orientation*, disability, language, and socioeconomic status and consider these factors when working with members of such groups. Psychologists try to

eliminate the effect on their work of biases based on those factors, and they do not

knowingly participate in or condone activities of others based upon such prejudices.

(APA, 2002, Principle E; italics added)

Ethical standard 2.01 further asserts that:

Where scientific or professional knowledge in the discipline of psychology establishes

that an understanding of factors associated with age, gender, *gender identity*, race,

ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, *sexual orientation*, disability, language, or

socioeconomic status is essential for effective implementation of their services or

research, psychologists have or obtain the training, experience, consultation, or

supervision necessary to ensure the competence of their services, or they make

appropriate referrals. (APA, 2002; italics added)

Sexual orientation is listed in the same manner under principles 3.01 and 3.03, which assert that

psychologists do not engage in discrimination or behavior that is harassing based on such factors.

The ACA and NASP are as explicit in their inclusion of sexual orientation as a form of

diversity as is the APA. The ACA also explicitly includes gender identity as a form of diversity.

In the ACA ethics code C.5., it states, "[c]ounselors do not condone or engage in discrimination

based on age, culture, disability, ethnicity, race, religion/spirituality, gender, *gender identity*,

sexual orientation, marital status/ partnership, language preference, socioeconomic status, or any

basis proscribed by law" (ACA, 2005; italics added).

NASP continues the stance by explicitly including sexual orientation in its delineations of

types of diversity. The NASP code of ethics states that school psychologists "respect all persons

and are sensitive to physical, mental, emotional, political, economic, social, cultural, ethnic and

racial characteristics, gender, *sexual orientation*, and religion" (NASP, 2000a, III.A.2.; italics

added) and do not engage in behaviors that discriminate against others based on those factors

(NASP, 2000a, III.D.3.). School psychologists also conduct assessments and testing of cognitive,

academic, social, and emotional needs; and need to be cognizant of how individual differences,

including sexual orientation or gender identity, might affect the outcomes (NASP, 2000a,

IV.C.1.b.).

Educational standards. The program accreditation and approval standards for these

professions differ in how they approach the topic of sexual orientation. The APA's Standards for

Psychology Doctoral Training Programs make it clear in Section 5 of Domain A that the

document's discussions of diversity always include sexual orientation and gender identity:

"Throughout this document, the phrase 'cultural and individual diversity' refers to diversity with

regard to personal and demographic characteristics. These include, but are not limited to, age,

disability, ethnicity, gender, *gender identity*, language, national origin, race, religion, culture,

sexual orientation, and social economic status" (APA, 2007; italics added). The section

continues to say that program policies should reflect respect for and understanding of cultural

and individual diversity in all aspects of its work. The topic is again brought up in regards to

being covered in the curriculum (B.3.d.), as it relates to the science and practice of psychology

(D.2.), and in an assertion for positive relationships between faculty and students (E.3.).

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

(CACREP) is a recommended accrediting body by the ACA. CACREP standards for counseling

program accreditation assert that program objectives and curricula for all counseling professions

should include a core area of study regarding social and cultural diversity that provides an

understanding of multicultural trends, experiences of culturally diverse clients, various forms of

identity development, and strategies for working with and advocating for diverse populations

(CACREP, 2009). It is under the school counseling standards that CACREP specifies sexual identity as a form of diversity that counselors should be aware of and should understand the effects it may have on student achievement (CACREP, 2009, p. 42, E.4.).

The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) publishes their position regarding working with GLBT youth in the position statement entitled "The Professional School Counselor and LGBTQ Youth" (ASCA, 2007). ASCA states that school counselors must be committed to the affirmation of all youth, regardless of sexual orientation and identity. In order to achieve this, school counselors should work to assist students through the identity development process by advocating for equitable educational opportunities, addressing inappropriate language or behaviors from others in the school, promoting sensitivity and acceptance of diversity, and promoting a safe and positive school climate through a variety of activities. School counselors are also expected to provide individual services to GLBT students when appropriate, which requires knowledge of community resources and common issues related to "coming out" (ASCA, 2007).

The NASP approval standards fail to explicitly list sexual orientation as an area of diversity that should be introduced to students in school psychology training programs. They do, however, suggest that training programs teach the ethical standards of the profession (NASP, 2000b, II.2.10). In addition, NASP publishes a series of position statements that describe best practices to deal with school related issues. There is a position statement specifically regarding sexual minority students that describes the role school psychologists have in creating safe environments for sexual minority students (NASP, 2006).

In response to these guidelines, higher education programs for mental health professionals are beginning to integrate the topic of GLBT issues into the curricula. As

demonstrated by Sherry et al.'s research (2005), APA accredited clinical and counseling doctoral programs have begun to incorporate GLBT issues into parts of their curriculum. Clinical psychology programs include the topic in multicultural classes and practicum experiences. Counseling psychology programs, however, incorporate the topic more often than clinical programs by *requiring* multicultural courses and mentoring students in GLBT research. Although there is some incorporation of the topic, it is predominantly in one or two multicultural classes. Any other time spent on the topic is determined by where the student completes his or her practicum (if sexual minority issues are discussed there) and whether or not the student is interested enough in the topic to pursue relevant research.

  Teacher education training programs. Teacher education programs nationwide may lack this extra push to explicitly teach about sexual orientation. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) asserts that education training programs should provide educators with the skills and resources needed to "help all students learn" (2008, p.12). In the footnotes, "all students" is defined as "students with exceptionalities and of different ethnic, racial, gender, *sexual orientation*, language, religious, socioeconomic, and regional/geographic origins" (2008, p.12; italics added). Unless the reader looks through the standards very carefully, it is likely that this detail might be missed. Sexual orientation is brought up one other time in the main text under Standard 4.d., which asserts that education students be taught to understand the impact of discrimination based on race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and language on their learning (p.37). NCATE also states that education programs should prepare students to act ethically in all situations (NCATE, 2008); however, there is a lack of consistency regarding the code of ethics a program might choose to follow. For example, the National Education Association states that educators should not be biased against individuals

based on differences, including sexual orientation (National Education Association, n.d.). The

Council for Exceptional Children does not mention sexual orientation in its code of ethics

(Council for Exceptional Children, 1993). The lack of consistency makes it difficult for any

accrediting body to evaluate whether or not the ethical standards regarding sexual orientation are

being taught.

In addition to the lack of consistency in the ethical standards, some accrediting bodies

other than NCATE do not mention sexual orientation as a form of diversity with which

prospective teachers should be trained to work. The Teacher Education Accreditation Council's

(TEAC's) accreditation standards for teacher education programs states that prospective teachers

should understand the effects of gender, race, and individual differences and the implications of

ethnic and cultural perspectives for education (TEAC, n.d.). At the time of this study, New York

State education programs had a third option for accreditation through Regents Accreditation of

Teacher Education (RATE), provided by the New York State Board of Regents; however, the

handbook regarding accreditation did not mention the term "sexual orientation" throughout the

entire text, except for a footnote stating that the State Education Department "does not

discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status,

national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or *sexual orientation* in

educational programs, services and activities" (New York State Board of Regents, 2007; italics

added). It appears that there is a lack of consistency in ethical and training standards, as well as a

paucity of research in this area, suggesting a need for a stronger focus.

Multicultural Training and Assessment

A model of multicultural competency. The broad topic of multicultural competency has

been studied extensively in the counseling profession. A model was developed that proposed

three dimensions that determine multicultural counseling competence. First, counselors need to be aware of their assumptions or biases against a culture. Second, they must understand the worldviews of their clients. Third, they should develop appropriate intervention strategies and techniques that are culturally sensitive (Pedersen, 2003; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). Within each dimension, counselors need to become aware of their beliefs and attitudes, gain knowledge about how their beliefs affect the situation, and develop skills to benefit the client (Sue et al., 1992). Although originally developed for counselors, the three dimensions of the model partly reflect the factors described in Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior (1991) and can be applied to other professionals in the school system.

A similar model of multicultural competence was proposed by Howard-Hamilton (2000); however, he suggested that all faculty and students in postsecondary education settings could benefit from expanding their knowledge base to become culturally sensitive individuals. The model theorizes that individuals can develop awareness, understanding, and appreciation of diversity by increasing their knowledge of self and of other cultures, by practicing skills that will help build understanding (e.g., self-reflection), and by demonstrating positive attitudes about cultural differences.

The models are also relevant in the discussion of a specific population, such as sexual minorities (Fassinger & Richie, 1997; Israel & Selvidge, 2003). To be competent when working with GLBT students in the field, teachers should be aware of their own feelings and beliefs, have a general understanding of the issues, and have some skills to work one-on-one with the students. It is ideal for teachers to explore and develop these skills in the safety of a teacher education training program.

Training others to be competent. Training programs can integrate the topic of sexual minority issues into the higher education curriculum by applying one or more of the six designs outlined by Ridley and colleagues (as cited in Berg-Cross & Chinen, 1995). The designs are as follows:

1. Traditional design – the topic of diversity is minimally discussed in any classes.

2. Workshop design – trainees take part in day long or weekend workshops that are focused on the topic.

3. Separate course design – a full course in the program is designated to the topic.

4. Interdisciplinary cognate design – a program teaches about a topic by presenting viewpoints from various disciplines.

5. Subspecialty design – a number of courses or experiences are required to be considered a specialist.

6. The integrated program design – the topic is integrated into all areas of the program when possible and the program teaches that all things are affected by cultural differences.

Integrating diversity into other areas of a program - such as integrating it into field experiences, ensuring that faculty is knowledgeable in the topic, having a diverse faculty, and having diverse students - can further benefit the learning experience of all students in the training program (Nuttall, Sanchez, & Webber, 1996).

Studies have demonstrated that the general topic of multiculturalism is being integrated into postsecondary general education programs in various ways. Reports from postsecondary faculty indicate that the majority of them attempt to include multicultural instruction in their courses (Pope & Mueller, 2005; Sciame-Giesecke, Roden, & Parkinson, 2009) using a variety of methods, including case studies, films, small group discussions, team projects, and guest

speakers (Sciame-Giesecke, et al., 2009). Postsecondary general education programs have also been encouraged to integrate diversity awareness into curricula through the use of role plays and by requiring community-based experiences such as volunteering at a non-profit organization (Rosner-Salazar, 2003; Rubin, 2009). It has been demonstrated that faculty are more likely to incorporate diversity into class content if they identify as an ethnic minority, work for a department that emphasizes the importance of diversity, or have a department chair who promotes respect for group differences (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006).

There is some support to suggest that the philosophy of liberal arts colleges is conducive to multicultural growth and awareness. Information collected from postsecondary students through the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) indicates that students attending liberal arts colleges are more likely to engage in diversity-related activities, and they report significantly higher gains in understanding of various cultures, than peers from other types of colleges (Umbach & Kuh, 2006). The NSSE information also suggests that the level of engagement in diversity-related activities and the gains in cultural understanding in students attending liberal arts colleges are related to having contact with culturally diverse individuals, experiencing a positive institutional climate to diversity, and learning about diverse perspectives in classes (Umbach & Kuh, 2006).

Teacher education training programs have been encouraged to include multicultural training in the curriculum and through field experiences for several decades (Baker, 1973, 1977; Rao, 2005). Preparing teachers to work with students from diverse backgrounds has been included as a standard programs must meet to be accredited (New York State Board of Regents, 2007; NCATE, 2008; TEAC, n.d.); however, the accrediting bodies have focused on diversity in the forms of race, gender, and ethnicity. Based on reports from teachers working in schools, it is

apparent that there has been some integration of multiculturalism in teacher education training programs; however, the training has been reported as limited in scope and focuses on race, gender, and socioeconomic status when it occurs (Miller, Miller, & Schroth, 1997). Additionally, faculty in training programs are reported to exhibit more discriminatory behaviors regarding sexual orientation than race, gender, and social class (Miller et al., 1997). If accrediting bodies developed standards that explicitly stated sexual orientation and gender identity as forms of diversity to be studied and understood, teacher education training programs might be more inclined to include the topics in the curriculum, just as other forms of diversity have begun to be integrated.

Assessment of individuals' competencies. A variety of scales have been created to measure individual gains in awareness, knowledge, and skills of multicultural counseling competencies, including the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey (MAKSS), both original and revised editions (D'Andrea, Daniels & Heck, 1991; Kim et al., 2003); the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS) (Ponterotto et al., 2002); and the Multicultural Competency Inventory (MCI) (Sodowsky et al., 1994). The Sexual Orientation Counselor Competency Scale (SOCCS) was also developed in response to the three tiered multicultural competency model, but measures counselors' competencies to work with gay and lesbian clients (Bidell, 2005). Studies that used these scales have demonstrated that individuals gain self-awareness, knowledge, and skills to work with diverse populations after completing a multicultural course or an internship in which direct contact was made with diverse populations (D'Andrea et al., 1991; Keim, Warring, & Rau, 2001; Manese, Wu, & Nepomuceno, 2001; Rutter, Estrada, Ferguson, & Diggs, 2008).

Assessment of training program competencies. Other studies evaluate multicultural training by looking at various psychology programs rather than the students within the programs. These studies explore the prevalence of diversity in coursework; field experiences; faculty and student demographics; research and professional development activities; and university, department, and program environment and resources (Hills & Strozier, 1992; Rogers et al., 1998). The Multicultural Competency Checklist (MCC) provides a systematic way to assess a training programs' integration of diversity in these program areas (Ponterotto et al., 1995). By using the MCC, a program can be aware of the areas in which their students are and are not exposed to the topic of diversity, such as when the students are working at practicum or internship sites, or if there are research topics in the area of diversity available to students. The MCC also identifies physical representation of cultures (e.g., the number of diverse faculty and students) and the level of faculty knowledge on the topic of multiculturalism as additional program competencies that should be assessed (Ponterotto et al., 1995). The MCC has demonstrated over time that counseling programs have increased the level of integration of multiculturalism in the curriculum and in research opportunities, while practical experiences may be neglected (Ponterotto, 1997; Tomlinson-Clarke, 2000).

Although originally created to assess the integration of multiculturalism within counseling training programs, the MCC has been revised to look specifically at GLBT competencies within similar training programs. Items were changed to refer to GLBT issues rather than multicultural issues, and the revised version was used to assess clinical and counseling psychology graduate programs (Sherry et al., 2005). As described earlier, the study found some incorporation of GLBT issues in both clinical and counseling programs, mostly

contained within one or two multicultural courses. Any other opportunities were provided at practicum sites and in research experiences.

The MCC provides important information to training programs regarding program competencies in preparing pre-professionals to work with GLBT individuals in future careers. Graduate psychology programs have made use of the general outline of the MCC (Sherry et al, 2005), and with further revisions and the integration of items from other multicultural surveys it can be a helpful tool for education training programs. There has been no research found to date that systematically assesses the current state of education training programs' competencies in GLBT issues. Improvements cannot be made until the areas in need of improvement are known.

The Present Study

GLBT youth experience victimization in school more often than the general student population. This victimization has been linked to suicidality, truancy, academic failure, social isolation, and stigma consciousness. While family support can be a mediator between victimization and mental health stressors, many families go through a number of difficult stages before accepting the GLBT youth's sexual identity. In such cases educators can act as mediators, offering support to GLBT students.

Many pre-service teachers report willingness to support GLBT students, especially in cases where the youth is being harassed; however, many GLBT students in middle and secondary schools report that they do not see school personnel take action against harassment when it occurs. This lack of action may be due to educators feeling unprepared to discuss issues and to deal with situations regarding GLBT youth. A general lack of education regarding this topic may be a major cause of inaction.

One role of higher education is to prepare professionals, including teachers, to be accepting of diversity. While directly teaching the topic of sexual diversity can lead to greater acceptance, many professional training programs decide what to teach based on accreditation standards. Many standards have begun to include sexual orientation and gender identity as a form of diversity that should be visible and discussed in programs that train school professionals, including psychologists and counselors. A study of clinical and counseling psychology has shown that GLBT issues are beginning to be integrated as an important part of these programs. Yet education programs lack consistency in standards, leaving room for programs to decide how sexual orientation will be included in curriculum objectives.

The current study addresses the lack of research on teacher education training programs' integration of GLBT issues. This investigation will explore the current levels of integration of GLBT issues in childhood, middle childhood, and adolescent regular and special education training programs. The scope of the investigation will be limited to New York State due to the variability between states regarding education standards and general beliefs regarding sexual orientation and gender identity differences. Measuring GLBT program competencies as an outcome variable will provide a more complete picture of diversity integration in education training programs. Programs that attempt to integrate GLBT issues through a variety of avenues provide their students with more opportunities to explore the topic, challenge their beliefs, and arrive at new conclusions in their own time. In contrast, some programs may force students to draw conclusions after being provided with a limited amount of information, such as after attending one multicultural course.

Research Questions

1. What program and school competencies are childhood, middle childhood, and adolescent regular and special education training programs in New York State currently meeting in regards to promoting awareness and acceptance of the GLBT population?

    a. Program competencies include curricular inclusion, faculty research interests, practical experiences, GLBT faculty and student population, and physical climate towards GLBT individuals

    b. School competency explores available support and/or advocacy groups on campuses.

2. To what extent do differently accredited teacher education training programs meet GLBT program competencies? The accrediting bodies within New York State include NCATE, TEAC, and the NYS Board of Regents.

3. To what extent do different types of teacher education training programs meet GLBT program competencies? The type of institution is defined as public, private with a religious affiliation, and private with no religious affiliation.

Chapter Three: Method

Participants

   Program and institution demographics. Directors of 20 teacher training programs in

New York State (NYS) were interviewed in an effort to measure current teacher training

program competencies in GLBT issues. The sample of program directors was limited to NYS in

order to reduce some of the variability that may be found between states. TEAC and RATE were

the accrediting units of six programs each, while NCATE was the accrediting unit of eight

programs. Five of the programs were in public institutions, twelve were in private institutions

without a religious affiliation, and three were in private institutions with a religious affiliation

(Table 3).

   The participating directors were from programs that offered a variety of certifications.

Eighteen of the 20 programs (90%) were state approved for Childhood Education Certification

(Kindergarten through 6th grade). Ten of those programs also offered Childhood Special

Education Certification. Two of the programs that offered both Childhood and Childhood

Special Education Certification also provided Middle Childhood and Middle Childhood Special

Education Certification options. Fifteen of the 20 programs (75%) offered Adolescent Education

Certification, three of which also offered Adolescent Special Education Certification. Thirteen of

the 15 programs with an Adolescent Education Certification option were in programs that also

included Childhood Education options, while the other two programs only offered Adolescent

Education (Table 4).

   The participating directors worked in institutions located in various areas throughout

NYS. Eight of the programs (40%) were identified as Baccalaureate Colleges through the

Carnegie Classification, while 11 (55%) were classified as Master's Colleges and Universities,

and 1 (5%) was identified as a Research University. The schools also varied in the setting. Six (30%) schools were in a rural area, 5 (25%) were in a suburb, and 9 (45%) were in a city (Table 5).

Participant recruitment. Due to the complexity of certification levels and to the wide variety of specialty areas offered at the middle childhood and adolescent levels, the following steps were followed to develop a sample. A list of NYS schools with accredited programs through NCATE, TEAC, or RATE was compiled. In order for a school to be included in the study, they had to meet at least one of the following criteria:

1. The education program offered a degree that led to a regular education *or* special education certification in childhood education.

2. The education program offered a degree that led to a regular education *or* special education middle childhood generalist certification.

3. The education program offered a degree that led to a regular education *or* special education middle childhood specialist certification in *at least* 3 specialty areas, two of which must be Biology, Chemistry, English, Earth Science, Math, Physics, or Social Studies.

4. The education program offered a degree that led to a regular education *or* special education adolescent specialist certification in *at least* 3 specialty areas, two of which must be Biology, Chemistry, English, Earth Science, Math, Physics, or Social Studies.

SPSS was used to compile a random stratified sample of 60 schools from the complete list of 100. The sample was stratified so that 23% of the sample were public schools, 58% were private schools without a religious affiliation, and 19% were private schools with a religious affiliation,

reflecting the percentage of schools in those categories in the compiled list. The percentages of

schools in each category closely matched the percentages in New York State compared to a

comprehensive list of colleges and universities available on the National Center for Education

Statistics website (n.d.), which indicated that 19% of four-year institutions were public, 58%

were private institutions without a religious affiliation, and 23% were private institutions with a

religious affiliation. Of the original 60 schools, 17 were excluded from the list because 3 no

longer had education programs, 13 were found to only offer certification at the graduate level,

and 1 had taken part in a trial run of the interview. Of the remaining 43 schools, 19 responded to

the initial e-mail or follow-up phone call, 12 of which agreed to take part. Due to the 28%

response rate, the remaining 40 schools on the original list were used. Again, seven of the

remaining schools were excluded because five only offered certification at the graduate level and

two no longer offered certification or education programs. Of the remaining 33 programs, 11

responded to the request to take part, 8 of which agreed. Of the 10 who indicated that they did

not want to take part, four said that it was due to time constraints, five indicated that they did not

have much information on the subject or that the education director had recently left the

program, and one did not provide a reason. (See Table 6 for a summary of the response rates.)

Materials

The interview schedule created for this study can be found in Appendix A. It was

developed based on common themes and questions used in studies of multicultural training in

various graduate programs (Hills & Strozier, 1992; Ponterotto et al., 1995; Ponterotto et al.,

2002; Rogers et al., 1998) and based on recommended questions for counseling programs to

consider if they are interested in including gender identity and sexual orientation in their training

(Fassinger & Richie, 1997; Sherry et al., 2005). The questions were designed to collect

information about teacher education program demographics; the assessment of student and faculty competence in sexual orientation and gender identity issues; curriculum inclusion and training experiences regarding this topic; student and faculty GLBT research activities; and the university and program environment, climate, and resources regarding sexual orientation and gender identity diversity. Lastly, program directors were asked to indicate whether or not various sources from outside and within the program are encouraging the program to include GLBT topics in the curriculum.

Because previously developed questionnaires and interviews have primarily focused on multicultural training in a variety of graduate programs, the commonly used questions were collected and reworded to apply to sexual orientation and gender identity training in teacher education training programs. The topic of gender identity and sexual orientation continues to be controversial, so the wording of the questions was altered to be sensitive to the varying views and beliefs of respondents. When possible, questions were worded so as not to imply any correct or acceptable answers. In addition, the interviewers were instructed to refrain from offering their own opinions on the topic and to remain neutral during the interviews.

Archival data was used to answer as many of the questions as possible in order to shorten the interviews and provide the interviewers with some background knowledge. More specifically, some of the demographic information, course offerings, faculty research activities, and availability of GLBT related resources on campus were found through archival data available on institution websites. Information known to the program directors regarding the visibility of GLBT individuals in the program, specific course content, student research activities and project topics, assessment of student and faculty competencies, and program climate regarding sexual orientation and gender identity diversity, were collected through the interviews.

Each interview was expected to take approximately 30 minutes. Fifteen of the twenty interviews lasted between 20 to 40 minutes, three lasted between 40 to 50 minutes, and the remaining two took about an hour to complete.

Procedures

In order to collect the archival and interview data in a timely manner, six graduate assistants from a School Psychology graduate program were recruited to assist the primary investigator. The assistants were required to attend a training session in which the entire process for collecting data on one school was demonstrated and discussed. The session began with a description of the purpose for the study and the reasoning behind the topics covered in the interview. Following the general discussion, the items on the structured interview were discussed and various responses to the questions were demonstrated. Assistants were explicitly instructed to remain neutral on the topic, regardless of the responses they might receive from participants. In addition, they were instructed on how to respond if program directors chose to discontinue the interview.

Initial contact was made with the directors of the randomly selected programs by e-mail. The e-mail explained the nature of the study and explained the time commitment necessary to complete the interview (see Appendix B). The e-mail also described the opportunity for program directors to enter a random draw to receive a packet of resources that promote knowledge and understanding of GLBT issues. The resources can be introduced to their undergraduate students as possible materials to use in their future jobs. Program chairs were given the option to receive a summary of the research results and a checklist based on items in the structured interview to assess changes in their programs' integration of GLBT topics (Appendix C).

Within a week of sending the e-mail, the primary investigator contacted the directors by telephone to answer any questions they had and to schedule a convenient time for the interview if they chose to participate. As a list of participating programs was developed, the researcher and research assistants collected archival data regarding those programs including faculty research areas, course requirements, course descriptions, and general school information (e.g., Carnegie classification and size of institution) from the colleges' and universities' websites, and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) website. The information was used to answer questions on the structured interview. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, course syllabi were requested from the program directors for multicultural or diversity courses, developmental courses, exceptionality courses, and any other courses the directors believe the topic of GLBT issues is discussed. Lastly, after the data was collected and analyzed, a checklist that programs may use to self-monitor changes in their teacher education training programs' GLBT competencies was developed based on the interview-schedule and prior studies of multicultural training in graduate programs.

Research Design & Analysis

The study of GLBT integration into post-secondary education training programs is in an explorative stage; therefore, qualitative and quantitative analyses of the data were conducted. This study utilized archival data and a structured interview format to collect information regarding the current status of education training programs. Information collected through forced answer questions were precoded and used for quantitative analyses.

The competencies being met by teacher education training programs in NYS are discussed and explored through descriptive statistics, frequencies, and narrative exploration; including curricular inclusion, faculty research interests, practical experiences, GLBT faculty

and student population, physical climate towards GLBT individuals, and available GLBT support/advocacy groups on the school campuses. In order to answer the remaining two research questions, a factor analysis was completed. All of the interview items regarding the assessment of student competencies in GLBT issues, curriculum inclusion and training experiences, student and faculty research activities, and the climate regarding sexual orientation and gender identity were entered into the analysis. The four factors were then used as dependent variables in t-tests and one-way ANOVAs to compare the extent to which differently accredited teacher education training programs and different types of teacher education training programs (e.g., public, private with a religious affiliation, and private with no religious affiliation) meet GLBT program competencies.

Answers to open-ended questions and any additional information provided by the respondents were analyzed by the researcher and two graduate assistants to identify themes. Each reviewer independently analyzed the data, reading through the information multiple times and then organizing answers to each open-ended question into themes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The reviewers then compared their findings. Any differences in the way answers were organized were discussed until the three reviewers were in agreement on the groupings and themes of each group. Some of the original themes developed by each individual were combined while others were reduced as the process progressed.

Chapter Four: Results

The results of this study are based on the participation of 20 teacher education program directors in New York State. Seventy-six directors were invited to take part through e-mail and follow-up phone calls, resulting in a 26.3% participation rate. Of the directors that participated, six worked in programs accredited by TEAC (30%), six worked in programs accredited by RATE (30%), and 8 worked in programs accredited by NCATE (40%). Almost all of the programs were state approved for Childhood Education Certification (90%), while half offered Childhood Special Education Certification (50%). Only 10% of the programs provided Middle Childhood and Middle Childhood Special Education Certification options. Lastly, 75% of the programs offered Adolescent Education Certification, three of which also offered Adolescent Special Education Certification.

The institutions in which the programs were located were also diverse. The majority of the institutions were classified as private without a religious affiliation (60%), while 25% were identified as public institutions and the remaining 15% were private institutions with a religious affiliation. Almost half of the institutions were located in a city (45%), while 30% were in rural areas and 25% were in the suburbs. Lastly, over half of the institutions were identified as Master's Colleges and Universities (55%) through the Carnegie Classification system, while almost half were identified as Baccalaureate Colleges (40%) and one was identified as a Research University.

Question One: What Program and School Competencies Are Being Met

Curricular inclusion. All of the participants reported expectations that their students will develop specific multicultural or diversity competencies through the program (Table 7). Three themes were determined in their answers, including an increase in general knowledge and

sensitivity regarding diversity, awareness and advocacy for social justice, and the development of skills to teach groups of diverse students. When asked specifically what types of skills or knowledge teacher education students are expected to develop regarding sexual minorities, 8 of the 20 participants (40%) reported that the topic is rarely discussed or that it is not clearly included in the program. While reasons for not including the topic were not often identified, those who did provide reasons reported high minority and/or religious school and community populations, while on occasion it was noted that the program was focusing on another topic, such as students with disabilities. Specific expectations reported by the remaining participants included learning about the issues within social justice discussions (15%), developing knowledge and awareness of personal biases (40%), or learning to navigate issues or to teach about the topic in the field (15%). The context in which the topic is generally discussed was identified as a theme in the answers. Five programs discuss the topic in the context of the family (25%), such as students who may have same-sex parents. Three noted that it comes up in the context of bullying in schools (15%), while three reported that the topic might come up in multicultural or practicum classes (15%). Lastly, three respondents reported that the topic comes up in literacy courses (15%), two of whom explained that the literacy teachers discuss the possibility of including books that explore GLBT related issues or that include characters with same-sex parents in a classroom library. Lastly, only four of the programs (20%) reported that student GLBT competencies were assessed, three through class assignments and experiences, and only one program included it as part of a consistent and intended assessment or rubric.

Participants were asked three 5-point Likert scale items regarding the level of encouragement program faculty is given to include sexual orientation or gender identity issues into their courses, as well as the level of importance the program attaches to learning how to

work with GLBT students or with students of same-sex parents. On the question of encouragement given to the faculty, 1 indicated *no encouragement* while 5 indicated *a great deal of encouragement.* On the questions regarding the importance the program attaches to learning about issues related to sexual orientation and gender identity, 1 indicated that the area was *not important at all* and 5 indicated that it was *very important.* The answers were varied for all three questions, with 36.9% reporting that there is some level of encouragement to faculty members to include the topic in classes (providing a score of 4 or 5). In regards to the importance of training program participants to work with various populations of students, 63.2% reported that it is important to prepare students to be competent in working with GLBT students, and 47.3% reported that it is important to prepare students to be competent in working with students who have same-sex parents. In contrast, 100% of participants reported that it is important to prepare students to be competent in working with children from culturally diverse backgrounds. Seventy-five percent of participants reported an increase in positive attitudes of faculty about the importance of discussing GLBT issues in the curriculum, although one participant replied that attitude is the key word because change in behaviors has not necessarily occurred. Some of those who reported no change in attitudes also noted that the focus in the program has been on other issues, such as ethnicity or students with disabilities. (See Table 8 for summary.)

Specific questions regarding the number of courses available that discuss the topics of sexual orientation and gender identity were asked (Table 9). While 60% of the programs require the completion of a multicultural course to earn a teacher certification or degree, 55% offer a multicultural course. The others require students to complete a multicultural course offered by another department. Of all the programs interviewed, only half reported that the topics of sexual orientation and gender identity are addressed in the offered multicultural courses. In addition,

70% of the participants reported that the program addresses GLBT issues through other courses. Based on their responses, the topic is most likely to occur in reading and literacy courses, human development courses, or sociology courses; although it may be briefly discussed in various reflective or methods seminars, inclusion management courses, or learning theories classes.

Follow-up e-mails were sent to eight participants, all of whom originally indicated they could forward syllabi for classes in which GLBT issues might be discussed. Five participants forwarded a total of eight syllabi. Three of the programs provided one syllabus each, a fourth program provided syllabi for two classes, and the fifth program provided syllabi for three different sections of the same course. Six of the syllabi indicated that the purpose of the course was to understand how society or diversity has influenced education, while one focused on children's literature and the last focused on the needs of children in diverse and inclusive classrooms. Although all eight syllabi noted the development of knowledge of diversity as it relates to the course subject as an objective, four also included the themes of developing positive attitudes regarding diversity and developing skills to work with children of diverse identities.

The topic of diversity was also found in the schedules, readings, and assignments. Seven of the syllabi clearly included the topic of diversity or multiculturalism in the schedule and in the readings, but only three of those schedules and two of those readings clearly included sexual orientation. Last, six of the syllabi listed assignments on various topics of diversity. Of those six, all of them included assignments that required reading or doing research on a diversity topic, four of the classes required an assignment that involved personal reflection of beliefs, and three classes included assignments aimed to increase awareness and skills through personal experiences. Four of the six classes included an assignment that could cover sexual orientation; however, three of those four indicated that sexual orientation was one of many other topics from

which the student could choose. Only one assignment was found that all students would have to complete, which involved self-reflection on the topic of sexual orientation. Only one syllabus mentioned gender identity as a possible topic to research or reflect on in two assignments.

Participants were also asked if there was a specific course devoted to GLBT issues available for students to take at the institution. Only 30% (6 of 20) reported that there was a course available, while 30% (6 of 20) said there was not and 40% (8 of 20) did not know. On further investigation of course catalogs and class descriptions, 55% of the institutions (11 of 20) offered at least one course devoted to GLBT issues, while 25% (5 of 20) covered the topic in other courses, and 20% (4 of 20) did not appear to discuss the topic in any course. Lastly, only 20% of participants (4 of 20) reported that the program has offered a seminar or workshop that specifically addressed GLBT issues; although 25% (5 of 20) indicated that there have been workshops or activities sponsored by other departments or off-campus.

Research interests and opportunities. Five questions were posed regarding faculty professional development and research opportunities for faculty and students (Table 10). Half of the participants reported that there was at least one faculty member in the program who was developing professional expertise in this area. Of those ten, 50% reported that only one faculty member was developing professional expertise, 30% reported 2 to 5 faculty members, and 20% reported that all of their faculty were developing expertise in this area. Six participants reported that faculty with expertise in this area are recognized in the program; however, one of the six noted that their expertise is not typically utilized by others in the program. Three main ways in which they are developing expertise were identified: including the topic in their courses; engaging in outreach and advocacy efforts; and engaging in self-teaching methods, such as

reading relevant literature, attending discussions at conferences, or helping others in their research efforts.

Specifically in regards to conducting research, 15% of the participants (3of 20) reported the presence of at least one faculty member whose primary research interest was sexual orientation or gender identity. Of those three respondents, one also reported the presence of at least one faculty member who occasionally helps in research regarding sexual minorities. One of the 17 program directors who reported that GLBT issues was not a primary research focus for any of the faculty in the program did report the presence of a faculty member who helps in GLBT related research. In addition, 25% of the programs have faculty who have published articles or conducted presentations regarding sexual minority issues. Overall, it appears that less than a quarter of programs who participated have faculty members who engage in research on the topic of GLBT issues, although half of the programs have faculty who are developing professional expertise.

The lack of research activity limits the possibilities for students to support faculty in research of GLBT issues (Table 10). Only 10% of the programs reported that students have helped faculty conduct research on this topic in the past few years. In addition 15% of the participants reported that at least one student has completed a large project or conducted their own research on the topic in the last few years.

Practical experiences. Only 25% of participants reported that students in the program have encountered issues related to gender identity or sexual orientation in field experiences (Table 11). Of those 25%, two reported that the problems involved youth discussing their sexual orientation with a student teacher while in the field, two reported that the issues were in regards to schools' responses to GLBT issues where student teachers were placed, and one issue was in

regards to a transgender student. Two of the participants reported that such incidents are used as teaching opportunities by discussing them in classes.

GLBT population. The physical presence of individuals who openly identify as an ethnic minority has been identified as a component of program multicultural competency; therefore, the presence of faculty and students who openly identify as GLBT was assessed (Table 11). Thirty percent of participants reported the presence of openly GLBT faculty in the program, while 65% reported no openly GLBT faculty. Programs with openly GLBT faculty indicated that 1% to 25% of the faculty members in the program were openly GLBT.

While 30% of participants reported the presence of openly GLBT students in the program, only 20% of the participants said that there were no openly GLBT students. Forty-five percent of participants responded that they did not know if there were openly GLBT students in the program.

Physical climate. The physical climate of the teacher education program was assessed with two questions (Table 12). "Do the physical surroundings of the education department reflect an appreciation of diversity that includes GLBT issues…?" and "Are GLBT resources easily accessible within the department or through the university to students enrolled in your program?" Overall, 55% of the participants reported that the physical surroundings of the department reflect an appreciation of diversity that includes GLBT issues. However, on further exploration, only four of the participants reported that faculty have Safe Zone or pink triangle stickers on their doors to indicate a safe place for individuals of various sexual and gender identities, while three participants reported that there are occasionally books or posters on display. Eight of the participants reported that there is often artwork or posters visible in the department that reflect an appreciation of diversity or that welcome all students, but they do not specifically reflect diverse

forms of sexual orientation or gender identity. Two of the participants indicated that the education departments share spaces with other groups and therefore do not have a physical space in which to display artwork or visual signs of acceptance.

In contrast, 90% of the participants reported that GLBT resources are easily accessible within the department or through the university. Four of the respondents felt that resources, such as videos, books, or materials for classes, were easily accessible within the teacher education departments. Two of those respondents, as well as three others, reported that the main college or university library had resources available. Five individuals reported the presence of individual faculty members who openly identify as GLBT or who are very supportive and who act as resources to various departments and individuals. The most common type of support was various types of groups, including student run clubs, resource centers, or counseling support. Twelve of the participants identified these clubs or centers as resources.

Institution competencies. Three questions about the climate of the institution were asked (Table 12). First, participants were asked if the institution has an active GLBT student organization or club. Eighty percent of the participants said that there was an active club. Online searches of the school websites confirmed their answers. Participants were also asked if the institution's counseling center offers GLBT support groups. Only 10% of the participants answered, "yes," while the remaining 90% did not know. Phone calls to each of the counseling centers indicated that all of the centers provide individual counseling to students who may need support with issues related to sexual orientation or gender identity; however, group support was limited. The majority of the counseling centers who do not offer group counseling reported that it is due to the low number of students who seek out counseling for GLBT related issues. Many also reported that a group could be formed if there were enough students.

Lastly, 90% of the participants reported that the institution recognizes and is supportive of GLBT perspectives. When asked how this support is reflected or communicated to the students, a few themes became apparent. Seven participants reported the presence of clubs or support groups as a way in which the institution communicates its acceptance to the students, while twelve of the participants reported various types of activities, workshops, or events that occur on campus in support of GLBT individuals. Lastly, two participants reported that their institutions had a high number of GLBT faculty. Whether or not participants were able to name specific ways in which the institutions communicate their acceptance to students, seven participants indicated that there is a general presence of support for everyone and willingness to openly discuss issues. Only two participants indicated that the institution was in the process of becoming more aware and open.

External influences. The influence various factors have on the development of coursework and research that includes GLBT issues in the education programs was also investigated. A 5-point Likert scale was used, in which 1 indicated no influence and 5 indicated a great deal of influence. Participants generally felt that the programs' accrediting bodies had little influence on whether or not GLBT issues was included in the program, with all participants providing ratings of 1 through 3. The level of influence from the university, program faculty, program students, community, and professional associations was more varied, although the majority of people reported little to no influence from these factors. Only 10.6% of the respondents gave scores of 4 or 5 indicating that the university or college encourages the teacher education program to include the topic of GLBT issues in their training, while 36.9% indicated that the program faculty influence the inclusion of the topic, 27.8% indicated that the students influence the inclusion of the topic, and 26.4% indicated that the community around the

institution influences the inclusion of the topic. Lastly, 22.2% indicated that professional

associations influence the inclusion of GLBT issues in the program. (See Table 13 for summary.)

Factor Analysis

In order to answer the remaining two research questions, a factor analysis was completed

using a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. All of the yes/no and quantitative

interview items regarding the assessment of student competencies in GLBT issues, curriculum

inclusion and training experiences, student and faculty research activities, and the climate

regarding sexual orientation and gender identity were entered into the analysis. Four factors were

found with eigenvalues greater than two. Items in each factor with a loading of .4 or greater were

then examined to determine conceptual similarities. Reliability tests were run on those items that

were similar in concept and that had loadings of .4 or higher. The factors can be thought of as

representing the level of faculty interest in the topic (Factor 1 Cronbach's alpha = .801), the level

of collegiality and collaborative atmosphere (Factor 2 Cronbach's alpha = .842), ways to develop

student competencies on GLBT topics (Factor 3 Cronbach's alpha = .812), and the school

climate (Factor 4 Cronbach's alpha = .780). The factors and the variables that load on them are

shown in Table 14. The four factors were then used as dependent variables in *t*-tests and one-way

ANOVAs to compare the extent to which different types of teacher education training programs

(e.g., public, private with a religious affiliation, and private with no religious affiliation) and

differently accredited teacher education training programs meet GLBT program competencies.

Question Two: Is the Program Accrediting Body Related to GLBT Competencies

To determine whether or not the programs accrediting body (NCATE, TEAC, or RATE)

was related to the level of GLBT competencies demonstrated, four separate one-way ANOVAs

were conducted with the four factors used as the dependent variables. There were no statistically

significant effects found for the type of accrediting body on the competency factors (see Table 15). The results also indicated small effect sizes, with partial Eta^2's ranging from .019 to .096.

Question Three: Is the Type of Institution Related to GLBT Program Competencies

To determine whether the type of institution or religious affiliation of the institution was related to the level of GLBT competencies demonstrated, one-way ANOVAs were conducted with the four factors identified through the factor analysis used as the dependent variables. There were three independent variables, including public institutions, private institutions without a religious affiliation, and private institutions with a religious affiliation. There were no statistically significant effects found for the type of institution on the competency factors (see Table 16). All effect sizes were also small, with partial Eta^2's ranging from .016 to .104.

Exploration of Other Factors

Numerous *t*-tests, ANOVAs, and regressions were completed to explore other relationships between possible independent variables and the dependent factors. Four separate one-way ANOVAs were run with the setting in which the institution is found according to The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System used as the independent variable. The setting groups were rural/town, suburban, and city. There were no statistically significant effects found for the institution setting on the four competency factors and all effect sizes were small (see Table 17).

An independent t-test was run using Carnegie Classifications as the independent variable (see Table 18). Two groups were created: institutions that are Baccalaureate Colleges and those that are Masters Universities or higher. There was a significant relationship between the Carnegie Classification and Factor 4, which is a measure of school climate ($t = -2.39$, df $= 7$, $p = .048$, two-tailed). Institutions with a Carnegie Classification of a Masters University or higher

reported more positive climates (mean = 5.00, *SD* = .00) than those with a classification of a Baccalaureate College (mean = 3.50, *SD* = 1.77).

Each of the factors was independently regressed on the student population of the institution. There was a significant relationship between school population and Factor 1, level of faculty interest in GLBT topics (see Table 19). Student population explains about 31% of the variance in Factor 1 scores ($R^2 = 0.308$), a result that is significant at the .011 level (F = 8.008). As the student population increases, faculty interest in the topic increases.

The factors were then regressed on the percent of the student population enrolled in the education program. There was a significant relationship between the percent of students in the education program and Factor 2, level of collaboration in including GLBT issues in the curriculum (see Table 19). The percent of students enrolled in the education program explains 27% of the variance in Factor 2 ($R^2 = 0.270$), a result with a significance of .027 (F = 5.910). The results suggest that as the department accounts for a greater percentage of the students enrolled in the institution, the feeling and level of collaboration between everyone to include sexual orientation and gender identity decreases.

Each of the factors was regressed on the percent of faculty members in the education program who identified as ethnic minorities. There was a significant relationship between percent of faculty and Factor 4, school climate (see Table 19). The percent of faculty members who identify as an ethnic minority explains 26% of the variance in the school climate factor ($R^2 = 0.264$), a result that is significant with a *p* value of .021 (F = 6.454). The results suggest that teacher education programs with greater percentages of faculty who identify as ethnic minorities are more likely to be found in institutions where the school climate is less accepting towards GLBT perspectives.

The factors were also regressed on the percent of students in the education program who identified as ethnic minorities. There was a significant relationship between the percent of students and Factor 4, school climate (see Table 19). The percent of students who identify as an ethnic minority explains 33% of the variance in the school climate factor ($R^2 = 0.331$), a result that is significant with a *p* value of .020 (F = 6.942). The results suggest that as the percentage of students in the program who identify as ethnic minorities increases, the school climate factor decreases. A one-way ANOVA was run to determine if the percentage of ethnic minority students in the teacher education programs varies based on setting (rural/town, suburban, or city). The results indicated that there were no significant differences in the percentage of ethnic minority students enrolled in the teacher education programs by setting.

The four factors were also regressed on the number of full time faculty working in the education programs, and on the number of students enrolled in the education programs. No statistically significant relationships resulted.

Four multiple regressions were then run using the enter method. Each of the previously identified factors was used as the dependent variable. The independent variables that were found to have statistically significant relationships with one or more of the factors were used as predictor variables. Dummy variables for the type of institution (public versus private), religious affiliation (yes or no), and education accrediting body were also included as predictor variables. No models emerged as significant; however, the percent of faculty that identify as an ethnic minority, whether the school is public or private, and the religious affiliation of the school were significant predictors for Factor 3 (see Table 20).

To check for suppression effects, a series of multiple regressions were run. Each model included three predictor variables, two of which were dummy variables identifying either the

type of institution (public, private with a religious affiliation, or private without a religious affiliation) or the education program's accrediting body. The third predictor variable was one of the variables found to have a statistically significant relationship with a factor. These included Carnegie Classification, student population, percent of students in the education program, percent of faculty in the education department who identify as an ethnic minority, and percent of students in the education department who identify as an ethnic minority. Each model was run using the four factors identified through the factor analysis as the dependent variables. No suppression effects were found for Factors 1 and 4. While the percent of an institution's student population enrolled in the teacher education program continued to be a significant predictor on Factor 2, this was only true when controlling for the accrediting body. When controlling for the type and religious affiliation of an institution, the percent of students in the education program was not found to be a predictor of Factor 2. In other words, there was no significant relationship between the percent of an institution's students enrolled in the education program and the level of reported collegiality and collaboration among faculty within programs located in public schools, in private schools without a religious affiliation, or in private schools with a religious affiliation. For Factor 3, a significant model emerged with the type of school, religious affiliation, and percent of students who identify as an ethnic minority as the predictor variables (see Table 21). The current model explains 36.6% of the variance. The type of school was not a significant predictor, but the other two variables were. The results suggest that a program's score on Factor 3, which measures ways in which programs develop student competencies on GLBT topics, increases in institutions without a religious affiliation and as the percent of students who identify as an ethnic minority decreases.

To help determine whether the findings in the study that involve students with ethnic minorities can be generalized to other institutions and teacher education programs, additional information was analyzed. The percentage of ethnic minority students at each institution in the sample was calculated using data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). IPEDS provides the total enrollment number for an institution, as well as the number of students enrolled under each of the following categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, two or more races, race/ethnicity unknown, and nonresident alien. The enrollment numbers were collected for the institutions in which the participating directors worked, as well as for institutions in which the program directors who declined to participate or who did not respond to the request to participate were located. The sum of the enrollment numbers in each category, except White and race/ethnicity unknown, was divided by the total enrollment number for each institution to develop a percentage of ethnic minority students. Then an independent t-test was run comparing the percentage of ethnic minority students in institutions within the participating sample to institutions that did not participate in the study. The results indicate that there is no significant difference in the percentage of enrolled ethnic minority students between the institutions of the program directors that took part in the study compared to those that did not take part in the study. This suggests that the findings that include ethnic minority students may be generalizable to other institutions. In addition, a dependent t-test comparing the percentage of ethnic minority students enrolled in the participating education programs to the percentage of ethnic minority students enrolled in the respective institutions indicates that the percentage in the program (18.24 ± 21.75) is consistently lower than the percentage in the institution [(27.70 ± 21.85) ($t(15) = -4.475, p < .001$)]. This suggests that there is an unequal amount of ethnic

minority and White American individuals studying to become teachers, and that ethnic minority

recruitment in teacher education programs is an area that needs improvement.

Chapter Five: Discussion

The development of multicultural awareness and sensitivity in education has been discussed in the literature since the 1970's (Baker, G. C., 1973 & 1977); however, the inclusion of factors other than ethnicity and race under the umbrella of multiculturalism has occurred more recently. One variable that seems to be rarely discussed but experienced often is that of sexual orientation and gender identity. Literature has established that GLBT students experience high levels of harassment and bullying, which is related to significant mental health and academic concerns (Kosciw et al., 2008; Lewis et al., 2006; NASP, 2002; Rivers, 2004; Rosario et al., 2002; Savin-Williams, 1994). Being able to identify school personnel who are supportive of GLBT students, however, is related to less truancy, increased feelings of school safety and belonging, and higher GPAs (Kosciw et al., 2008). Such findings suggest that all school personnel, including teachers at all levels, should be prepared with the knowledge and skills to support GLBT individuals, despite personal beliefs or biases.

Studies that measure teachers' attitudes, knowledge, and skills in regards to working with students who self-identify as GLBT have found that while teachers are generally willing to help sexual minority students, they feel unprepared or uneasy if helping goes against the status quo (Hirsch, 2008, Kosciw et al., 2008; McCabe & Rubinson, 2007; O'Connell et al., 2007; Riggs, 2002). In order to better serve GLBT students, teacher education training programs need to assess how they currently approach the topic and the extent to which pre-service teachers are trained in these professional competencies. While some education related professions, such as school counseling, have begun to develop measures to assess GLBT program and student competencies, such measures had not been adapted or used to assess teacher education training programs prior to this study. The purpose of this study was to assess the current status of GLBT

program competencies in New York State teacher education programs, and to begin looking for

factors that may be related to developing these competencies.

What Are Programs Doing?

   Curricular inclusion. All of the participants reported expectations that the programs will

help students develop specific multicultural or diversity competencies, such as increasing their

general knowledge and sensitivity regarding diversity, developing awareness of and advocacy for

social justice, or developing skills to teach groups of diverse students. However, only three-fifths

of the participants reported expectations for their students to develop GLBT related

competencies, such as learning about the issues within the framework of social justice,

developing knowledge and awareness of personal biases, or learning to navigate issues or teach

about the topic in the field. The directors of the remaining programs reported that the topic is

either not included, or is included "minimally." One respondent noted that GLBT issues are

supposed to be a part of the framework, but that "it doesn't happen." Another director reported

that GLBT issues had been "neglected" but recent concerns about bullying has prompted the

inclusion of a unit about GLBT issues in an educational psychology course.

   In addition, only one-fifth of the programs assess GLBT competency development in

their students, the majority of which are assessed by one faculty member during a course in

which the topic may be discussed. Only one respondent indicated that a formal competency

assessment, which includes students' GLBT based awareness and skills, is used on a regular

basis.

   By not consistently including GLBT based knowledge as an area of expected

development, faculty within programs have little reason to include the topic in their classes

unless they have personal beliefs in the importance to develop awareness and skills. This is

confirmed by the finding that only slightly more than one-third of the respondents reported that program faculty are given some encouragement to include GLBT issues in their classes.

Although those who have more positive attitudes and feelings regarding sexual orientation issues are more likely to express the feeling that they should be more proactive and supportive towards sexual minority students (Sears, 1992), it does not guarantee changes in actual behaviors. This seems to be true given that three-fourths of the respondents in this study have observed positive changes in the attitudes of faculty toward the importance of discussing GLBT issues in school because it is becoming more relevant and has grown in societal issues, and yet little action appears to be happening. For example, one director reported that the topic has been discussed in department meetings in regards to how it can be included in the curriculum, but that there was no follow through. A few directors noted that new faculty in the program, or "new blood," has helped push the importance of the topic, however, some programs are more focused on other issues in education, such as the inclusion of children with special needs.

Based on reports, nearly three-fourths of the programs include the topic of GLBT issues in at least one education related course. It appears that the topic may be brought up in other courses more often than in multicultural courses. This may be due to the lack of a consistent definition of what multiculturalism encompasses, ranging from limited inclusion of a few factors, such as gender, race, and ethnicity, to inclusion of all types of differences. While it seems like sexual orientation is being discussed in some capacity in education programs, the discussions focus on GLBT issues as they relate to the context of families, bullying in schools, or the use of literature that explores GLBT topics in the classroom.

Despite the small number of syllabi that were provided, a clear pattern was noted. All syllabi stated the expectations for students to develop knowledge of multicultural issues and most explicitly included diversity in the readings, topics, and assignments. However, despite the fact that these were courses believed to include the topic of GLBT related issues, less than half of the syllabi reflected the topic of sexual orientation and even fewer included assignments or readings explicitly on the topic. Even among the syllabi that included assignments regarding sexual orientation and identity, only one had a requirement covering the topic, while the others provided sexual orientation as one of a few possible topics. Of the four classes that included assignments regarding sexual orientation and identity, one focused on the development of knowledge; one focused on self-awareness; one encouraged the development of knowledge and skill development; and the final encouraged the development of knowledge, skill development, and self-awareness.

Covering the topic in one or two periods of a course is one of a few ways in which changes in knowledge or attitudes can be achieved. Others include taking a complete course dedicated to GLBT issues or attending a workshop on the topic. Despite the fact that over a half of the institutions in the study offered at least one course dedicated to GLBT issues, less than one-third of the participants knew that a course was available. Not knowing about such options can limit students' chances at taking such courses if they are interested in developing their knowledge and skills in this area. In addition, less than one-half of the participants reported that there had been workshops or activities available for their students to attend on this topic. Overall, the findings indicate that a teacher education student is most likely to learn about GLBT related issues in an education related course, although what they learn on the topic may vary depending

on the course in which it is discussed. In addition, their competencies on the topic are typically not assessed in a reliable or consistent manner.

Practical experiences. Recent surveys and questionnaires have indicated that 3.4% to 3.5% of adults in the United States openly identifies as GLBT (Gates & Newport, 2012; Gates, 2011). The number varies by state and district, ranging from 1.7% in North Dakota to 10% in the District of Columbia (Gates & Newport, 2013). These numbers may be an underestimation of the true number of GLBT individuals, because over 4% of respondents to a Gallup survey refused to provide an answer or responded with neither yes or no answers (Gates & Newport, 2012). In addition, data from The National Survey of Family Growth suggests that 11% of Americans acknowledge experiencing some same-sex sexual attraction (Chandra, Mosher & Copen, 2011). There also appears to be a trend in which younger individuals are more likely to identify themselves as GLBT, with 6.4% of individuals aged 18 to 29 reporting that they are GLBT compared to 2.6% of 50 to 64 year olds or 1.9% of individuals 65 and older (Gates & Newport, 2012). The number of openly GLBT individuals suggests that prospective teachers are likely to interact with students who identify as GLBT or who have GLBT parents at some point in their career. Therefore knowledge and prior experience with individuals who identify as GLBT may help prepare them for future interactions and can lead to more positive attitudes and beliefs (Waterman et al., 2001; Riggs, 2002; Athanases & Larrabee, 2003).

Despite the physical presence of GLBT individuals in the population, only 30% of participants reported the presence of openly GLBT faculty or of openly GLBT students in the teacher education programs. The invisibility of GLBT faculty and students may be due to a variety of issues. For example, individuals who self-identify as GLBT may not feel comfortable openly discussing their sexual orientation or gender identity in some settings, leading to the

invisibility of their identities to others. No matter what the reason, however, the fact that 70% of teacher education programs do not have openly GLBT individuals suggests that the experiences of students attending the programs may be limited. This is compounded by the fact that only 25% of the respondents know of a student who has encountered issues related to GLBT issues during practicum or student teaching experiences.

Half of the programs interviewed have faculty developing professional expertise on the topic of GLBT issues. This is generally achieved by including the topic in their courses, engaging in outreach and advocacy efforts, and self-teaching by reading or attending conferences. Despite the fact that half are trying to develop professional expertise, less than a quarter engage in research. The limited amount of faculty engagement in research limits the chances of students to help in such research. In addition, only 15% of the respondents knew of one or more students who had recently completed large projects or independent research on the topic.

If the majority of students are not encouraged to explore the topic, then it is likely that only those who already have an interest in or appreciation for the topics of sexual orientation and gender identity will pursue furthering their knowledge on the topic. By including class activities and assignments that further develop knowledge, awareness and skills related to the topic of GLBT issues in school, all prospective teachers can be better prepared to work with GLBT youth and demonstrate sensitivity to their needs. It may also strike an interest in some individuals who did not originally have an interest in the topic, therefore increasing the frequency with which pre-service teachers help with research or conduct their own studies or projects on the topic.

Climate and resources. The physical climate of a setting can portray acceptance of diversity, specifically diversity in sexual orientation and gender identity. This can be done

through noticeable actions, such as putting up Safe Zone stickers or including posters that portray same-sex couples, or in subtle ways like including books on GLBT rights on bookshelves. Because of this, the physical surroundings of a department should be assessed when determining a program's multicultural and GLBT competencies. While almost all of the participants reported the presence of artwork or signs that reflect an appreciation of diversity in general, slightly more than half reported that the symbols or displays depict acceptance specifically of GLBT individuals. One-fifth of the programs have faculty who prominently display safe-zone or pink triangle stickers, indicating that their offices are safe-places for GLBT individuals. This means that students in almost half of the programs do *not* see signs or symbols in their program departments that depict acceptance of GLBT issues. While the absence of such symbols or signs does not mean a program is unaccepting of GLBT students, it also does not communicate acceptance to GLBT students who may be new to a campus or program. We must be aware of the fact that over 80% of GLBT youth have experienced verbal harassment in middle school or high school (Kosciw et al., 2008), therefore it is reasonable to assume that a high percentage of GLBT youth entering postsecondary education are used to environments that condone or ignore homophobia. Providing explicit signs of acceptance for GLBT students can therefore provide a sense of safety to those students as they start a program.

While providing a sense of safety to pre-service teachers who may identify as a sexual minority is important, teacher preparation programs may need to broaden the exposure of some prospective teachers to new types of diversity. It is likely that all teachers will encounter GLBT related issues during their careers, therefore every prospective teacher, regardless of their personal views or backgrounds, should be ready to work with and accept students of all forms of diversity. While teaching about GLBT related issues in classrooms is helpful, providing exposure

to issues through physical surroundings and on-campus activities can bring the issues to life and can help prospective teachers become more comfortable with the topic. In addition, prospective teachers may learn how to provide a positive and welcoming climate to GLBT students if the program and institution they attend models such warmth and acceptance.

In addition, only one-fifth of the respondents felt that resources related to GLBT issues were easily accessible within the teacher education program. In contrast, almost all of the respondents felt that resources were easily accessible through other avenues of the university, such as the library or through support groups and clubs. While such groups and resources can be very helpful, students asking for information may carefully choose an adult who they trust to ask for support and may not be comfortable going to student clubs or checking material out from the library. Students may be uncomfortable doing this because they may be worried that others will assume they identify as GLBT, they may not be ready to talk to others, or they may not want to get involved with a group. Having resources available within a department can provide students with support and answers without pushing them into an uncomfortable position before they are ready. It is also important to note that GLBT clubs are typically social gatherings meant to provide support and safety to GLBT youth and their allies. While they may also work to advocate for GLBT needs, their primary purpose is not to educate prospective teachers on the needs of GLBT youth in elementary or secondary schools.

In regards to the institution's climate towards GLBT perspectives, almost all of the respondents felt that their institutions recognize and support GLBT perspectives. This tends to be communicated to the students by providing student clubs or holding campus wide events. Despite the widespread belief that campuses are supportive of GLBT youth, only ten percent of the respondents were certain that counseling services were available to youth regarding GLBT

issues. In reality, all of the counseling centers provide support to youth with questions and many are willing to develop groups for students to support one another if they have enough students asking for help. If the faculty do not know what kinds of support the counseling centers can offer, how are the students expected to know?

Related and Influential Factors

The final interview question attempted to determine what factors influence the development of coursework and research that includes GLBT issues in the education programs. Participants generally felt that the programs' accrediting bodies had little influence on whether or not GLBT issues were included in the program. The quantitative data was consistent with their responses, indicating that there were no significant differences in the program outcomes between programs accredited by various organizations. Factors that are most likely to influence the inclusion of GLBT issues in the program, according to the respondents, were program faculty members, students enrolled in the education program, and the community in which the institution is located. One respondent stated that the students in the program have voiced a greater interest in the topic, which has encouraged the faculty to discuss GLBT related issues more often, while another respondent noted that newer faculty members in the program have taken the initiative to include the topic in their courses because they see the need for prospective teachers to be aware of the issues that can appear in schools.

The quantitative data also supported the findings. The results suggested that as the percent of ethnic and racial minority students increases, especially in institutions that are associated with a religion, the inclusion of GLBT issues in the curriculum and discussions tends to decrease. One participant responded directly to this issue, stating that the high number of ethnic minority and religious students in the program and community makes discussing the needs

of GLBT youth difficult. The added variable of having a religious affiliation can make discussing such issues even more difficult because a large number of religions teach that homosexuality or gender identity variations are innately wrong or sinful. However, an institution's religious affiliation was only a predictor of curricular inclusion of GLBT issues when the percentage of ethnic minority students was considered. The religious affiliation of an institution was not a consistent predictor of GLBT program competencies, either alone or in combination with other factors. This may be due to the limited number of programs in religiously affiliated institutions in the sample; however, it is also possible that the degree to which each institution adheres to the religious beliefs and integrates those beliefs into its daily workings may have a stronger relationship with GLBT program competencies.

The quantitative data also indicated that programs with higher percentages of ethnic and racial minority faculty and students are more likely to be in institutions with climates that are less accepting of GLBT perspectives. For example, the institution may be less likely to have a GLBT club or resource center. The school may also offer fewer workshops or sponsor fewer activities that promote awareness and support of GLBT youth. The negative relationship between percentage of ethnic or racial minority individuals and the school climate towards GLBT individuals may be related to the various views held by cultures regarding adherence to traditional gender roles (Dubé & Savin-Williams, 1999). For example, the traditional beliefs of what constitutes masculinity and femininity, or the beliefs that homosexuality is unnatural, can lead to negative attitudes towards sexual minority individuals. In addition, research suggests that family support is less available for individuals who are of both ethnic and sexual minorities (Dubé & Savin-Williams, 1999). This may indicate that self-identifying as a sexual minority is less acceptable for individuals who are also an ethnic or racial minority than it is for European-

Americans. A community or institution where a large number of people have negative attitudes or beliefs regarding GLBT issues can feel unsafe to youth who do not identify with the norm. It can also be very difficult in such climates for those who do accept GLBT individuals to speak up or advocate for a more positive environment.

On the other hand, a factor that had a positive relationship with the school climate was the level of an institution's Carnegie Classification. Institutions with a classification of a Master's College or University or of a Research University typically reported more positive climates towards GLBT perspectives than institutions with a Baccalaureates or Associates College classification. Lambert et al. (2006) found that students who have been in college longer had more positive attitudes and beliefs regarding GLBT issues than those who had been in college for one or two years. If the amount of time an individual spends in a postsecondary setting positively impacts their views of sexual orientation and gender identity issues, then perhaps institutions that offer Master and Doctorate degrees have a greater percentage of students who are accepting of GLBT perspectives, therefore positively impacting the institutions overall climate.

While the faculty members in a program have influence over whether or not GLBT issues are integrated in classes and in the program, the level of faculty interest appears to be related to the student population of the institution. Faculty in larger institutions appear to have greater interest in GLBT issues than those working in smaller institutions. This may be because as institutions become larger and student populations increase, the population of GLBT students is also likely to increase. Having a larger population of GLBT students in an institution may lead to an increase in the number of issues regarding sexual orientation and gender identity that the school must discuss or deal with. In addition, institutions with greater numbers of openly GLBT

students may be more likely to have GLBT student clubs and support groups that thrive, also increasing the likelihood of campus events that reach out to others and attempt to educate other students as well as faculty.

Although a larger student population may bring to light GLBT issues that cannot be ignored or open the door to topics to be discussed in classes, it can also have a negative impact on collaboration efforts. The larger the program, the more difficult it can be for individuals to collaborate and work together on incorporating diversity topics, especially those regarding GLBT issues. When more people are involved in making a decision it becomes more difficult to find common ground. In such situations, decisions on whether or not to include GLBT issues in classes or how to accomplish such efforts may be left up to individual faculty members.

A Missing Group

Prior to beginning each interview, the abbreviation *GLBT* and the term *sexual minority* were defined by the interviewers to include gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender. In addition, the term *gender identity* was consistently used in conjunction with *sexual orientation* during interview questions. Although it is not possible to determine whether the respondents' answers included the topic of transgenderism, only one participant made a clear reference to gender identity in response to one question. In addition, the collected syllabi often mentioned gender in the text. However, the term *gender identity* was only mentioned in one syllabus as a possible topic to focus on for two assignments, and the term *transgender* was not mentioned at all. Gender identity and transgenderism have a history of being grouped with sexual orientation despite the fact that they do not involve sexual attraction to others or sexual identity. As teacher education programs begin to integrate the topic of sexual minority issues, it is important that care

be taken to include transgenderism as a separate topic because the issues and ways to deal with them can differ drastically from issues regarding sexual orientation.

Implications for Practice

The study provided an initial look at what teacher education training programs are doing to better prepare future teachers to positively interact with GLBT youth. By knowing how the topic is currently being integrated, programs, accreditation units, and ethics committees can make informed decisions for future changes.

While the majority of programs seem to be discussing GLBT issues in some respect within teacher education related courses, few encourage faculty to engage in discussions on the topic, have clear expectations to increase student competencies on the topic, or use a consistent measure to assess student knowledge on the topic. For programs wanting to increase the integration of GLBT issues and topics, open discussions with and between faculty may be the first step. It has been shown that faculty are more likely to integrate the topic of diversity into their courses if they work for a department that emphasizes the importance of diversity, or have a department chair who promotes respect for group differences (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006). This may also be true for the topic of sexual minorities. Having a department chair who promotes respect for GLBT differences and who emphasizes the importance of the topic may encourage faculty to be more open about the topic and include it in their classes. Knowing who includes the topic in classes, how it is included, and what kind of resources each faculty has is also helpful. By doing this, faculty members can become more aware of who they can approach when students or other adults have questions or concerns. Encouraging discourse on the topic is also necessary to build collaboration between colleagues and departments. Such collaboration can lead to increased inclusion of the topic in multiple courses.

When programs review the student based multicultural competencies and how those competencies are assessed, an additional discussion of how GLBT based knowledge and skills can be included should occur. Including GLBT issues under the multicultural umbrella may reduce the stress of having to find time to cover yet another topic in an already busy program. Providing specific expectations can also help faculty figure out how best to incorporate the topic in courses. Again, collaboration becomes an important aspect, as faculty who are more comfortable with GLBT issues can offer support to others in figuring out how GLBT issues are related to course topics and how they can be integrated.

There is also limited awareness of the types of courses or supports available to students who may wish to explore the topic, despite the fact that many of the institutions offer courses that clearly discuss GLBT issues and counseling services on the topic. The most common forms of support and resources cited included student clubs, campus-wide events typically sponsored or run by the students clubs, and the campus library. Increasing faculty awareness of such groups and opportunities can be accomplished through discourse and open discussions. However, collaborating with student associations or other departments may show students in the program that GLBT perspectives are supported and encouraged. It is one thing to say we accept GLBT issues, it is another to show acceptance through actions. On the other hand, those resources cannot replace explicit instruction aimed at increasing knowledge of GLBT issues as they relate to education, awareness of personal beliefs and biases, and skills to best support GLBT individuals in schools.

Showing acceptance is not only accomplished by taking part in activities and events. It can also be done by consciously showing support within a department. Taking a critical look at the physical environment and making minor adjustments to display diversity, including same-sex

relationships and various gender identities, is recommended. This does not mean that every faculty member must display signs of acceptance, like Safe Zone stickers or posters, but those who are comfortable doing so can be encouraged. Also, common areas where students congregate provide opportunities for posters or books to be displayed that demonstrate acceptance for all individuals, including those of various orientations or identities.

In order to better support and encourage change in teacher education programs, changes in the standards set by accrediting bodies and expectations stated by ethics committees may need to change. Although some education programs are taking the initiative to include the topics of sexual orientation and gender identity in education curricula, others continue to need specific standards to work towards. In addition, programs that do include GLBT issues lack consistency in how this is done or in what context it is discussed. Having ethical standards that clearly encourage teachers to support and be sensitive to the needs of diverse students, including GLBT students, is a necessary step for the profession to move forward in this area. Standards for accreditation that include sexual orientation and gender identity as enumerated categories of diversity are also important in achieving such ethical standards. Finally, teacher education programs should reevaluate their policies to ensure that the development of pre-service teachers' understanding and sensitivity towards sexual minority students, as well as students of other diverse backgrounds, is a clearly stated goal that all faculty can strive to reach.

Limitations of this Project

Although steps were taken to maximize participation of program directors, including those in institutions with religious affiliations, few directors responded. Those who responded but declined to participate often reported that they did not have time to complete the interview or that they did not feel they had enough information to accurately represent the education program.

Some directors who agreed to take part in the study reported that they felt the topic was gaining importance in teacher education programs. Overall, the sample that took part in this study may be biased towards the inclusion of GLBT issues and may provide an overestimation of what is currently happening in teacher education programs

In addition to the small sample size, the interviews obtained the perspective of one individual in a program. The number of years a respondent has spent working in the same program and the size of the program could affect each participant's knowledge of the specifics within that program.

Another concern is that only eight syllabi were received and analyzed, which limits the ability to generalize the results of the analysis. The syllabi collected were also only for courses in which the topic of GLBT issues was believed to be discussed. Collecting syllabi for all required education courses may provide a clearer picture of how diversity in general is covered, and how GLBT issues may be included. There may also be courses that clearly cover the topic that were unknown to the participants.

Lastly, the topic of transgenderism or gender identity was rarely discussed separately from sexual orientation. Only one student was reported as having practical experience with this topic during student teaching, and it was not mentioned at all in the collected syllabi. During the interviews, transgenderism was grouped with sexual orientation due to the fact that this study was one of the first to look at the inclusion of sexual diversity in teacher education programs. The current findings may not apply specifically to the topic of transgenderism, which deserves to be studied as an independent factor.

Directions for Future Research

This study was an initial attempt to identify ways in which teacher education training programs are preparing future teachers to work with GLBT youth. While the study allowed for a general examination of what is occurring and exploration of possible factors, the information gathered was limited to the knowledge of one individual within a program. Future research may attempt to collect information from multiple individuals within a program who could each provide specific information regarding the courses they teach, the resources available to each person, the resources each person can provide to others, and personal endeavors.

The current study was also limited to programs within New York State due to its explorative nature and the time commitment necessary to conduct the interviews. Future research endeavors may consider using online or digital questionnaires that can be completed at the participant's leisure in an attempt to reach a greater number of programs both within and outside of New York State.

In addition, the current study collected information regarding undergraduate level teacher education programs due to the significant variability between graduate level requirements. Future studies may look at the differences in which programs incorporate GLBT issues in undergraduate and graduate level programs. Differences in the attitudes, knowledge or skills of students in undergraduate versus graduate level programs may also be an area of study. Although studies have measured the GLBT related skills and knowledge of pre-service and working teachers, the differences between educators in different levels of education have not been assessed. Future studies may explore the differences in attitudes, knowledge, and skills of early childhood, childhood, and middle school or adolescent educators.

As more information is gathered, the focus of research endeavors may move towards assessing outcomes of skill application. For example, one may consult with teacher education training programs to increase GLBT program competencies. In such cases, pre- and post-tests of pre-service teachers' attitudes and knowledge regarding GLBT issues may assess the effectiveness of such changes.

Conclusions

All people in the United States are supposed to be given the opportunity for an education (Rights to Education Project, 2008); however, students who identify as GLBT or who others perceive to be GLBT experience high levels of harassment in schools and are at risk for emotional, social and academic difficulties (Kosciw et al., 2008; Lewis et al., 2006; NASP, 2002; Rivers, 2004; Rosario et al., 2002; Savin-Williams, 1994). Although many pre-service and in-service teachers want to help sexual minority students who are being victimized, students report that teachers often do not intervene (Kosciw et al., 2008). This may be because of a lack of training and preparation for teachers to work with sexual minority students (McCabe & Rubinson, 2007). Standards for teacher education training programs lack expectations on how to integrate GLBT issues; however, checklists and questionnaires used to assess counseling programs' integration of multicultural or GLBT issues (Hills & Strozier, 1992; Ponterotto et al., 1995; Rogers et al., 1998) were modified and used for this study.

The current findings suggest that the topic of GLBT issues is showing up in the majority of education programs in some courses, but it is not consistent. Faculty are not often given encouragement to include the topic, and students are not consistently expected to develop GLBT related competencies. The type of school, religious affiliation, and accrediting bodies are not consistent predictors of programs meeting more indicators of GLBT competence, suggesting that

this is an area in which almost all programs can continue to grow. Ethnicity, especially in institutions with a religious affiliation, can lead to the topic being discussed and included less often, possibly due to the negative beliefs still held by numerous religions regarding GLBT issues and due to the strict gender roles held in many cultures. Student and faculty beliefs and interests do affect what topics are focused on in many teacher education programs; however, if the interest in GLBT issues is not strong enough or if students and faculty are not loud enough, the topic is easily forgotten.

At a time when multiple new initiatives are being introduced to the educational system and school personnel are expected to meet increasing goals on a shrinking budget, training future teachers to be accepting and helping towards GLBT youth may not seem to be a priority. This was apparently true according to some of the respondents who participated in the study as well as some who declined to participate. Current expectations include the continued inclusion of students with disabilities in general education, providing individualized interventions to support all students in general and special education, and using student success as a measure of teacher accountability. So it is not surprising that some teacher education training programs are more focused on ethnicity, race, disabilities, or socioeconomic status as forms of diversity than sexual orientation or gender identity. What is often forgotten, however, is that sexual orientation and gender identity intersect with all other forms of diversity. Silence on the topic will not make it disappear. Discussing the current issues and encouraging the development of self-awareness and knowledge, however, can help create teachers who are understanding and know where to turn for resources when necessary.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50,* 179-211.

American Counseling Association. (2005). *ACA code of ethics.* Retrieved November 25, 2007, from http://www.counseling.org/Resources/CodeOfEthics/TP/Home/CT2.aspx

American Psychological Association. (2002). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct.* Retrieved November 25, 2007, from http://www.apa.org/ethics/

American Psychological Association. (2007). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology.* Retrieved November 25, 2007, from http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/

American School Counselor Association. (2007). *The professional school counselor and LGBTQ youth*. Retrieved April 1, 2009, from http://asca2.timberlakepublishing.com//files/PS_LGBTQ.pdf

Athanases, S. Z., & Larrabee, T. G. (2003). Toward a consistent stance in teaching for equity: Learning to advocate for lesbian- and gay-identified youth. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 237-261. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00098-7

Bailey, N. J. (1996). Attitudes/Feelings, knowledge, and anticipated professional behaviors of middle level teachers regarding homosexuality and gay and lesbian issues as they relate to middle level students. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57,* 1549A.

Baker, G. C. (1973). Multicultural training for student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 24*(4), 306-307.

Baker, G. C. (1977). Multicultural education: Two preservice training approaches. *Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(3), 31-33.

Balsam, K. F., Rothblum, E. D., & Beauchaine, T. P. (2005). Victimization over the life span: A comparison of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and heterosexual siblings. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*(3), 477-487. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.73.3.477

Berg-Cross, L., & Chinen, R. T. (1995). Multicultural counseling training models and the person-in-culture interview. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 333-356). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Bidell, M. P. (2005). The sexual orientation counselor competency scale: Assessing attitudes, skills, and knowledge of counselors working with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44,* 267-279. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Professional Development Collection database.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). Data analysis and interpretation. In *Qualitative research for education* (4th ed., pp. 147-184). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review, 101*(4), 568-586. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.568

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality, 4*(3), 219-235. doi: 10.1300/J082v04n03_01

Chandra A., Mosher, W., & Copen, C. (2011, March). Sexual behavior, sexual attraction, and sexual identity in the United States: Data from the 2006-2008 National Survey of Family Growth. *National Health Statistics Reports, 36.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr036.pdf.

Chapman, B. E., & Brannock, J. C. (1987). Proposed model of lesbian identity development: An empirical examination. *Journal of Homosexuality, 14*(3-4), 69-80. doi: 10.1300/J082v14n03_05

Coleman, E. (1982). Developmental stages of the coming out process. *Journal of Homosexuality, 7*(7), 31-43. doi: 10.1300/J082v07n02_06

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). *CACREP 2009 Standards.* Retrieved April 28, 2010, from http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20cover.pdf

Council for Exceptional Children. (1993). *CEC code of ethics for educators of persons with exceptionalities.* Retrieved May 31, 2008, from http://www.cec.sped.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ProfessionalDevelopment/Professional Standards/EthicsPracticeStandards/default.htm

D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70,* 143-150. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Professional Development Collection database.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 312-333). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Diehm, T. M., & Lazzari, M. M. (2001). The university's role in promoting human rights through nurturing human diversities. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 13*(1/2), 171-189.

Dubé, E. M., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (1999). Sexual identity development among ethnic sexual-minority male youths. *Developmental Psychology, 35*(6), 1389-1398. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.35.6.1389

Ellis, V. & High, S. (2004). Something more to tell you: Gay, lesbian or bisexual young people's experiences of secondary schooling. *British Educational Research Journal, 30*(2), 213-225. doi: 10.1080/0141192042000195281

Fassinger, R. E., & Richie, B. S. (1997). Sex matters: Gender and sexual orientation in training for multicultural counseling competency. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 83-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fay, J., & Gordon, S. (1989). Moral sexuality in education and democratic values. *Theory into Practice, 28*(3), 211-216. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476627

Gastic, B., & Johnson, D. (2009). Teacher-mentors and the educational resilience of sexual minority youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 21*(2), 219-231. doi: 10.1080/10538720902772139

Gates, G. J. (2011, April). How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender? *The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law*. Retrieved from http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/category/research/census-lgbt-demographics-studies/.

Gates, G. J., & Newport, F. (2012, October). Special report: 3.4% of U.S. adults identify as LGBT. *Gallup.* Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/158066/special-report-adults-identify-lgbt.aspx.

Gates, G. J., & Newport, F. (2013, February). LGBT percentage highest in D.C., Lowest in North Dakota. *Gallup.* Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/160517/lgbt-percentage-highest-lowest-north-dakota.aspx.

General Assembly of the United Nations (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights.* Retrieved May 28, 2009, from http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/.

Girshick, L. B. (2008). *Transgender voices: Beyond women and men.* Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England.

Harris, M. B. (1998). Knowledge about homosexuality questionnaire. In C. M. Davis, W. L. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of sexuality-related measures* (pp. 383-384). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 25*(4), 451-477. Retrieved January 8, 2008 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3812894

Herek, G. M. (1998). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale. In C. M. Davis, W. L. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of sexuality-related measures* (pp. 392-394). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hershberger, S. L., & D'Augelli, A. R. (1995). The impact of victimization on the mental health and suicidality of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths. *Developmental Psychology, 31*(1), 65-74. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.31.1.65

Hills, H. I., & Strozier, A. L. (1992). Multicultural training in APA-approved counseling psychology programs: A survey. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 23*(1), 43-51. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.23.1.43

Hirsch, D. (2008). Future teachers' attitudes and anticipated behaviors toward sexual minority youth. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68* (9), 3807A. (UMI No. 3282119)

Howard-Hamilton, M. (2000). Programming for multicultural competencies. *New Directions for Student Services, 90,* 67-78. Retrieved May 2, 2010, from EBSCO Host database

Hudson, W. W., & Ricketts, W. A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality, 5*(4), 357-372. doi: 10.1300/J082v05n04_02

Israel, T., & Selvidge, M. M. D. (2003). Contributions of multicultural counseling to counselor competence with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31,* 84-98. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Professional Development Collection database

Keim, J., Warring, D. F., & Rau, R. (2001). Impact of multicultural training on school psychology and education students. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 28*(4), 249-252. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Education Research Complete database

Kim, B. S., Cartwright, B. Y., Asay, P. A., & D'Andrea, M. J. (2003). A revision of the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 36*(3), 161-180.

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

Kosciw, J. G., Diaz, E. M., & Greytak, E. A. (2008). *2007 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools.* New York: Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network.

Lambert, E. G., Ventura, L. A., Hall, D. E., & Cluse-Tolar, T. (2006). College students' views on gay and lesbian issues: Does education make a difference? *Journal of Homosexuality, 50*(4), 1-30. doi: 10.1300/J082v50n04_01

Lewis, R. J., Derlega, V. J., Clarke, E. G., & Kuang, J. C. (2006). Stigma consciousness, social constraints, and lesbian well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(1), 48-56. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.48

Manese, J., Wu, J., & Nepomuceno, C. (2001). The effect of training on multicultural counseling competencies: An exploratory study over a ten-year period. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*(1), 31-40. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Professional Development Collection database.

Mayhew, M. J., & Grunwald, H. E. (2006). Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 148-168. Retrieved May 2, 2010, from Project Muse database

McCabe, P. C., & Rubinson, F. (2007, March). *Committing to social justice: A model for behavioral change to serve LGBT youth.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, New York, NY.

McCarn, S. R., & Fassinger, R. (1996). Revisioning sexual minority identity formation: A new model of lesbian identity and its implications. *The Counseling Journal, 24*(3), 508-534.

Miller, S., Miller, K., & Schroth, G. (1997). Teacher perceptions of multicultural training preservice programs. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24*(4), 222-232. (ERIC

Document Reproduction Service No. EJ558430) Retrieved July 22, 2009, from ERIC
database.

Minton, H. L., & McDonald, G. J. (1984). Homosexual identity formation as a developmental
process. *Journal of Homosexuality, 9*(2-3), 91-104. doi: 10.1300/J082v09n02_06

Mohr, J. J. & Fassinger, R. E. (2003). Self-acceptance and self-disclosure of sexual orientation in
lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Counseling
Psychology, 50*(4), 482-495. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.50.4.482

Morales, E. S. (1989). Ethnic minority families and minority gays and lesbians. *Marriage and
Family Review, 14,* 217-239.

Mudrey, R., & Medina-Adams, A. (2006). Attitudes, perceptions, and knowledge of pre-service
teachers regarding the educational isolation of sexual minority youth. *Journal of
Homosexuality, 51*(4), 63-90. doi: 10.1300/J082v51n04_04

National Association of School Psychologists. (2000a). *Professional conduct manual, principles
for professional ethics, & guidelines for the provision of school psychological services.*
Retrieved May 28, 2008, from
http://www.nasponline.org/standards/ProfessionalCond.pdf

National Association of School Psychologists. (2000b). *Standards for training and field
placement programs in school psychology & standards for the credentialing of school
psychologists.* Retrieved May 28, 2008, from
http://www.nasponline.org/standards/FinalStandards.pdf

National Association of School Psychologists. (2002). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. In Alex
Thomas & Jeff Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV: Vol. 2* (pp. 1711-
1713). Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2006). Position statement on gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (GLBTQ) youth (formerly sexual minority youth). *NASP Position Statements.* Retrieved February 17, 2008, from http://www.nasponline.org/about_nasp/position_paper.aspx

National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *College Navigator* [Online data file]. Retrieved March 10, 2013, from http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions.* Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/NCATE%20Standards%202008.pdf

National Education Association. (n.d.). Code of ethics of the education profession. *2009 Handbook* (pp. 425-426). Retrieved July 24, 2009, from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/2009Handbook.pdf

New York State Board of Regents and the Commissioner of Education. (2007). *Regents accreditation of teacher education: Handbook of accreditation.* Retrieved June 28, 2009, from New York State Education Department Office of Higher Education Website: http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/documents/Handbook2007_12.pdf

Nuttall, E. V., Sanchez, W., & Webber, J. J. (1996). MCT theory and implications for training. In D. W. Sue, A. E. Ivey, & P. B. Pedersen (Eds.), *A theory of multicultural counseling* (pp. 123-138). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

O'Connell, L. M., Atlas, J. G., Saunders, A., Bouchard, M. J., Decker, R. F., Peterson, R. W., et al. (2007, August). *Perceptions of school staff regarding sexual minority youth.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

O'Connell, S. P. (2004). Telling tales in school: A queer response to the heterosexist narrative structure of higher education. *Journal of Homosexuality, 47*(1), 79-93. doi: 10.1300/J082v47n01_05

Pedersen, P. (2003). Increasing the cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills of culture-centered counselors. In F. D. Harper & J. McFadden (Eds.), *Culture and counseling: New approaches* (pp. 31-46). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Petrovic, J. E. (1999). Moral democratic education and homosexuality: Censoring morality. *Journal of Moral Education, 28*(2), 201-209. doi: 10.1080/030572499103214

Petrovic, J. E. (2005). Heterosexism. In J. T. Sears (Series Ed.), *Youth, education, and sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (Vol. 1, pp 398-402). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Ponterotto, J. G. (1997). Multicultural counseling training: A competency model and national survey. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 111-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ponterotto, J. G., Alexander, C., & Grieger, I. (1995). A multicultural competency checklist for counseling training programs. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 23*(1), 11-20. Retrieved January 8, 2008, from Academic Search Premier database

Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Rieger, B. P., & Austin, R. (2002). A revision of the multicultural counseling awareness scale. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30,* 153-180. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Professional Development Collection database

Pope, R. L., & Mueller, J. A. (2005). Faculty and curriculum: Examining multicultural

    competence and inclusion. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 679-688.

    Retrieved May 2, 2010, from Project Muse database

Rao, S. (2005). Effective multicultural teacher education programs: Methodological and

    conceptual issues. *Education, 126*(2), 279-291. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Psychology

    and Behavioral Sciences Collection database

Remafedi, G., Farrow, J. A., & Deisher, R. W. (1991). Risk factors for attempted suicide in gay

    and bisexual youth. *Pediatrics, 87*(6), 869-875.

Riggs, A. (2002). The impact of a combined cognitive-affective intervention on pre-service

    teachers' attitudes, knowledge, and anticipated professional behaviors regarding

    homosexuality and gay and lesbian issues. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62* (10),

    3353A. (UMI No. 3027581)

Right to Education Project (2008). National constitutional provisions – United States of America.

    Retrieved May 2, 2010, from Right to Education Project Website: http://www.right-to-

    education.org

Rivers, I. (2004). Recollections of bullying at school and their long-term implications for

    lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *Crisis, 25*(4), 169-175. doi: 10.1027/0227-

    5910.25.4.169

Rogers, M. R., Hoffman, M. A., & Wade, J. (1998). Notable multicultural training in APA-

    approved counseling psychology and school psychology programs. *Cultural Diversity*

    and Mental Health, 4(3), 212-226. doi: 10.1037/1099-9809.4.3.212

Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., Hunter, J., & Gwadz, M. (2002). Gay-related stress and

    emotional distress among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youths: A longitudinal examination.

Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 70(4), 967-975. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.70.4.967

Rosner-Salazar, T. A. (2003). Multicultural service-learning and community-based research as a model approach to promote social justice. *Social Justice, 30*(4), 64-76. Retrieved, May 2, 2010, from ProQuest Research Library database

Rubin, K. (2009). Globalizing general education. *International Educator, 18*(5), 20-29. Retrieved May 2, 2010, from EBSCO Host database

Rutter, P. A., Estrada, D., Ferguson, L. K., & Diggs, G. A. (2008). Sexual orientation and counselor competency: The impact of training on enhancing awareness, knowledge and skills. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling, 2*(2), 109-125. doi: 10.1080/15538600802125472

Savin-Williams, R. C. (1994). Verbal and physical abuse as stressors in the lives of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual youths: Associations with school problems, running away, substance abuse, prostitution, and suicide. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*(2), 261-269. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.62.2.261

Savin-Williams, R. C., & Diamond, L. M. (2000). Sexual identity trajectories among sexual-minority youths: Gender comparisons. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 29*(6), 607-627.

Savin-Williams, R. C., & Dubé, E. M. (1998). Parental reactions to their child's disclosure of a gay/lesbian identity. *Family Relations, 47*(1), 7-13. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/584845

Sciame-Giesecke, S., Roden, D., & Parkinson, K. (2009). Infusing diversity into the curriculum: What are faculty members actually doing? *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*(3), 156-165. doi: 10.1037/a0016042

Sears, J. T. (1992). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal feelings

    related to professional beliefs. *Journal of Homosexuality, 22*(3/4), 29-80. doi:

    10.1300/J082v22n03_03

Sherry, A., Whilde, M. R., & Patton, J. (2005). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual training competencies

    in American Psychological Association accredited graduate programs. *Psychotherapy:*

    Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 42(1), 116-120. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.42.1.116

Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T. B., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of the

    Multicultural Counseling Inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies.

    Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41(2), 137-148. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.41.2.137

Sophie, J. (1985-1986). A critical examination of stage theories of lesbian identity development.

    Journal of Homosexuality, 12(2), 39-51. doi: 10.1300/J082v12n02_03

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and

    standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70,* 477-486.

    Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Professional Development Collection database

Teacher Education Accreditation Council. (n.d.). *About TEAC goals and principles.* Retrieved

    January 8, 2009, from http://www.teac.org/index.php/accreditation/goals-principles/

Tomlinson-Clarke, S. (2000). Assessing outcomes in a multicultural training course: A

    qualitative study. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 13*(2), 221-231. doi:

    10.1080/095150700411746

Troiden, R. R. (1989). The formation of homosexual identities. *Journal of Homosexuality, 17*(1-

    2), 43-73. doi: 10.1300/J082v17n01_02

Umbach, P. D., & Kuh, G., D. (2006). Student experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 169-192. Retrieved May 2, 2010, from Project Muse database

Waterman, A. D., Reid, J. D., Garfield, L. D., & Hoy, S. J. (2001). From curiosity to care: Heterosexual student interest in sexual diversity courses. *Teaching of Psychology, 28*(1), 21-26.

Willoughby, B. L. B., Malik, N. M., & Lindahl, K. M. (2006). Parental reactions to their sons' sexual orientation disclosures: The roles of family cohesion, adaptability, and parenting style. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*(1), 14-26. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.1.14

Worthington, R. L., Dillon, F. R., & Becker-Schutte, A. M. (2005). Development, reliability, and validity of the lesbian, gay, and bisexual knowledge and attitudes scale for heterosexuals (LGB-KASH). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(1), 104-118. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.104

Footnotes

[1] The term *sexual minority* refers to individuals whose sexual identity or orientation differs from the majority. Although the meaning is more inclusive then the acronym *GLBT* (which stands for gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender), the two terms will be used interchangeably in this study.

Table 1

Summary of Sexual Identity Development Theories

Cass (1979)	Coleman (1982)	Troiden (1989)	Minton & McDonald (1984)	Sophie (1985-1986)	Chapman & Brannock (1987)	D'Augelli (1994)	McCarn & Fassinger (1996)
Identity confusion	Pre-coming out	Sensitization	Egocentric interpretation	First awareness	Same-sex orientation	Exiting heterosexual identity	Awareness
Identity comparison	Coming out	Dissociation/ Signification		Testing & exploring	Incongruent	Developing personal LGB identity	Exploration
Identity tolerance	Exploration	Coming out	Sociocentric-internalized assumptions		Self-questioning	Developing LGB social identity	
						Disclosure to family	
Identity acceptance	First relationship		Universalistic post-conventional	Identity acceptance	Self-identification	Developing LGB intimacy status	Deepening/ Commitment
Identity pride				Identity Integration		Entering LGB community	Integration/ Synthesis
Identity synthesis	Identity integration	Commitment			Choice of lifestyle		

Table 2

Model of Parental Reactions to Children's Disclosure of Sexual Orientation

Stage	*Description*
Shock	The initial reaction to a child's disclosure of sexual identity. It may be the most frightening reaction to the youth.
Denial & Isolation	Denial of the child's sexual orientation. Parents may refuse to talk about it and feel isolated, as if they are the only ones who are going through the experience.
Anger	Angry feelings can lead to rejection of the child. Parents may single out an external cause (e.g., the child's friends) to blame and at which to be angry.
Bargaining	Parents might try to work out a "deal" with the child. If the child does not tell anyone and never talks about it, then the parents will continue to support the child.
Depression	Sometimes parents will take on a resigned tolerance and begin to feel guilty. They will begin to acknowledge that their child is not heterosexual.
Acceptance	Acceptance occurs when the parents acknowledge that their child is GLB.

Table 3

Accreditation and Type of Participating Programs

Accrediting unit		Type of institution & religious affiliation			
		Public	Private without affiliation	Private with affiliation	Total
NCATE	Count	5	2	1	8
	% of Total	25.0%	10.0%	5.0%	40.0%
TEAC	Count	0	5	1	6
	% of Total	.0%	25.0%	5.0%	30.0%
RATE	Count	0	5	1	6
	% of Total	.0%	25.0%	5.0%	30.0%
Total	Count	5	12	3	20
	% of Total	25.0%	60.0%	15.0%	100.0%

Table 4

Certification Offerings of Participating Teacher Education Programs

General Education Certifications		Special Education Certifications						
		Childhood only	Adolescent only	Childhood & Middle Childhood	Childhood & Adolescent	Childhood, Middle Childhood, & Adolescent	None	Total
Childhood only	Count	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
	% of Total	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	20%
Adolescent only	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
	% of Total	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	5%	10%
Childhood & Middle Childhood	Count	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% of Total	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Childhood & Adolescent	Count	5	0	0	1	0	6	12
	% of Total	25%	0%	0%	5%	0%	30%	60%
Childhood, Middle Childhood, & Adolescent	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% of Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	5%
Total	Count	7	1	1	1	1	9	20
	% of Total	35%	5%	5%	5%	5%	45%	100%

Table 5

Institution Demographics

	N	n	%
Setting	20		
Rural/Town		6	30%
Suburban		5	25%
City		9	45%
Carnegie Classification	20		
Doctoral or Research Universities		1	5%
Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)		6	30%
Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)		3	15%
Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)		2	10%
Baccalaureate Colleges – Arts & Sciences		5	25%
Baccalaureate Colleges – Diverse Fields		2	10%
Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges		1	5%

Table 6

Summary of Participation and Response Rates

	n	% within group	N	% of sample
Programs requested to participate				
Agreed to participate			20	26.3
Declined to participate			10	13.2
Declined due to time constraints	4	40		
Declined due to a perceived lack of information on the subject	5	50		
Declined with no reason provided	1	10		
No response			46	60.5
Total			*76*	*100.0*
Programs excluded from participant list				
No longer offered an education or certification program			5	20.8
Only offered certification at the graduate level			18	75.0
Took part in pilot study			1	4.2
Total			*24*	*100.0*

Table 7

Competency Goals for Pre-Service Teachers

	N	n	%
Competencies related to diversity issues (more than 1 answer possible)	20		
Knowledge and sensitivity		9	45%
Advocacy for social justice		8	40%
Skills to teach diverse students		11	55%
Competencies related to GLBT issues (more than 1 answer possible)	20		
Not included/rarely discussed		8	40%
Seen as part of social justice		3	15%
Knowledge and awareness of personal biases		8	40%
Navigating issues or teaching about it in the field		3	15%
Context in which GLBT issues are discussed (more than 1 answer possible)	20		
Family structure		5	25%
Bullying in schools		3	15%
Multicultural issues/practicum experiences		3	15%
Literacy based resources		3	15%
Ways in which GLBT competencies are assessed	20		
Part of a consistent/year end assessment/rubric		1	5%
Class assignments & experiences assessed by instructors		3	15%
Not clearly assessed		12	60%
Missing		4	20%

Table 8

Encouragement and Importance of Including GLBT Issues in Curriculum

Degree of encouragement given to program faculty members to integrate sexual orientation or gender identity issues into courses			
	N	n	%
Rating:	19		
1 - 3 (Little or no encouragement)		12	63.2%
4 - 5 (A great deal of encouragement)		7	36.9%

Importance to prepare students to work with children from culturally diverse backgrounds			
	N	n	%
Rating:	20		
1 - 3 (Not important)		0	0%
4 - 5 (Very important)		20	100%

Importance to prepare students to work with GLBT youth			
	N	n	%
Rating:	19		
1 - 3 (Not important)		7	36.8%
4 - 5 (Very important)		12	63.2%

Importance to prepare students to work with youth who have same-sex parents			
	N	n	%
Rating:	19		
1 - 3 (Not important)		10	52.6%
4 - 5 (Very important)		9	47.3%

Question 5: In the past 5 years have you seen any change in the attitudes of faculty about the importance of discussing GLBT issues in the curriculum?			
	N	n	%
	20		
Yes, seen as more important		15	75%
No changes in attitude		5	25%

Table 9

Course Offerings and Inclusion of GLBT Issues

	N	n	%
The program offers a specific multicultural or diversity course	20		
Yes		11	55%
No		9	45%
A multicultural or diversity course is required	20		
Yes		12	60%
No		8	40%
GLBT issues are addressed in multicultural courses	20		
Yes		10	50%
No		9	45%
Do not know		1	5%
GLBT issues are addressed in other education courses	20		
Yes		14	70%
No		6	30%
The institution offers a course devoted to GLBT issues	20		
Yes		6	30%
No		6	30%
Do not know		8	40%
The program has offered a seminar or workshop that addressed GLBT issues as they relate to teaching in the last two years	20		
Yes		4	20%
No		16	80%

Table 10

Research Activities and Faculty Competency Development

	N	n	%
Number of program faculty developing expertise on topic	20		
0		10	50%
1		5	25%
2-5		3	15%
All faculty		2	10%
How program faculty are developing expertise on topic	8		
Self-teaching		4	50%
Including topic in course		2	25%
Experience and engaging in outreach and advocacy efforts		4	50%
Is it a primary area of interest for research for any faculty	20		
Yes		3	15%
No		17	85%
Do program faculty occasionally help with research	20		
Yes		2	10%
No		17	85%
Do not know		1	5%
Have faculty published articles or conducted presentations	20		
Yes		5	25%
No		15	75%
Have students helped faculty conduct research on the topic	20		
Yes		2	10%
No/Do not know		18	90%
Have students completed large projects on the topic	20		
Yes		3	15%
No		17	85%

Table 11

Practical Experiences and GLBT Population

	N	n	%
Students have encountered issues related to gender identity or sexual orientation while completing field experiences	20		
Yes		5	25%
No		15	75%
There are openly GLBT faculty in the program	20		
Yes		6	30%
No		13	65%
Do not know		1	5%
There are openly GLBT students in the program	20		
Yes		6	30%
No		4	20%
Do not know		9	45%
Missing		1	5%

Table 12

Program and School Climate Toward GLBT Perspectives

	N	n	%
The physical surroundings of the education department reflect an appreciation of diversity that includes GLBT issues	20		
Yes		11	55%
No		9	45%
Ways in which physical surroundings reflect appreciation of GLBT perspectives	20		
Safe Space or pink triangle stickers on doors		4	20%
Books or posters		3	15%
Reflect diversity in general		8	40%
GLBT resources are easily accessible	20		
Yes		18	90%
No		1	5%
Do not know		1	5%
Types of GLBT resources available (more than 1 answer possible)	20		
Class materials in education department		4	20%
Main institution library		5	25%
GLBT faculty members		5	25%
Resource centers/support groups/student clubs		12	60%
Does the school have a GLBT club	20		
Yes		16	80%
No		3	15%
Do not know		1	5%

Does the counseling center have a GLBT support group	20		
Yes		2	10%
No		0	0%
Do not know/maybe		18	90%
Does the institution recognize and support GLBT perspectives	20		
Yes		18	90%
No		2	10%
Ways in which institution demonstrates support of GLBT perspectives (more than 1 answer possible)	20		
Clubs or support groups		7	35%
Activities and workshops		12	60%
High number of GLBT faculty		2	10%
General presence of support/willingness to discuss issues		7	35%

Table 13

Ratings of Influence Various Groups have on GLBT Inclusion

Ratings		No Influence			A great deal of influence			
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	Missing
Accrediting body	n	12	4	3	0	0	19	1
	%	63.2%	21.1%	15.8%	.0%	.0%	100%	
The university	n	9	2	6	1	1	19	1
	%	47.4%	10.5%	31.6%	5.3%	5.3%	100%	
Program faculty	n	4	3	1	4	4	19	1
	%	21.1%	15.8%	5.3%	21.1%	21.1%	100%	
Program students	n	4	7	2	4	1	18	2
	%	22.2%	38.9%	11.1%	22.2%	5.6%	100%	
Community	n	9	2	3	4	1	19	1
	%	47.4%	10.5%	15.8%	21.1%	5.3%	100%	
Professional Associations	n	5	4	5	4	0	18	2
	%	27.8%	22.2%	27.8%	22.2%	.0%	100%	

Table 14

Factors from Principal Component Factor Analysis of Education Training Program Diversity

Questionnaire Items

	Eigenvalue	*% of Variance Explained*	*Cumulative %*
Factor 1 Faculty interest	7.813	26.043	26.043
Faculty expertise (.572)			
Faculty research (.900)			
Faculty publications and/or presentations (.741)			
Student support on research (.819)			
Physical surroundings of offices (.602)			
Factor 2 Collegiality and collaborative atmosphere	3.436	11.452	37.496
Change in attitudes of faculty (.415)			
Influence of program faculty on coursework (.850)			
Influence of students on coursework (.557)			
Influence of institution on coursework (.833)			
Influence of community on coursework (.708)			
Factor 3 Ways to develop student GLBT competencies	2.843	9.476	46.972
Encouragement to faculty to include topic (.499)			
Importance to work with GLBT students (.852)			
Importance to work with students with same-sex parents (.906)			
Address GLBT issues through other courses (.637)			
Seminar or workshop addressing GLBT issues (.582)			
Resources available on campus (.419)			

Factor 4 School climate	2.450	8.166	55.138

GLBT student organization or club on campus (.806)

University recognizes and is supportive of GLBT perspective (.699)

Note. Factor loadings for each item in parentheses.

Table 15

One-Way ANOVA Results for Program Accrediting Body by Factors

	df	F	η^2	p
Factor 1 Faculty interest	2, 19	.881	.094	.433
Factor 2 Collegiality and collaboration	2, 18	.847	.096	.447
Factor 3 Development of student competencies	2, 19	.502	.056	.614
Factor 4 School climate	2, 19	.167	.019	.847

Table 16

One-Way ANOVA Results for Type of Institution by Factors

	df	F	η^2	p
Factor 1 Faculty interest	2, 19	.138	.016	.872
Factor 2 Collegiality and collaboration	2, 18	.767	.087	.481
Factor 3 Development of student competencies	2, 19	.983	.104	.394
Factor 4 School climate	2, 18	.752	.081	.486

Table 17

One-Way ANOVA Results for Setting (Rural, Suburban, City) by Factors

	df	F	η^2	p
Factor 1 Faculty interest	2, 19	.550	.061	.587
Factor 2 Collegiality and collaboration	2, 18	1.778	.182	.201
Factor 3 Development of student competencies	2, 19	.321	.036	.729
Factor 4 School climate	2, 18	.070	.008	.933

Table 18

T-Test Results for Factors by Carnegie Classification

	Baccalaureate Colleges		Masters Universities or Higher			
	N	*M (SD)*	*N*	*M (SD)*	*95% CI*	*t*
Factor 1 Faculty interest	8	2.00 (1.34)	12	2.27 (1.34)	[-1.55, 1.02]	-.436
Factor 2 Collegiality and collaboration	8	2.33 (.98)	11	2.58 (1.32)	[-1.43, .91]	-.460
Factor 3 Student competencies	8	3.23 (.94)	12	3.51 (1.21)	[-1.35, .79]	-.559
Factor 4 School climate	8	3.50 (1.77)	12	5.00 (.00)	[-2.98, -.02]	-2.39*

Note. Scores range from 1 to 5. Factor 4 *p* = .048, 2-tailed. **p* <.05

Table 19

Statistically Significant Relationships Between Various Independent Variables and Factors

	R^2	*B*	*SEB*	β	*p*
IV = school population					
Factor 1	.308	.000	.000	.555	.011
IV = % of student population enrolled in the education program					
Factor 2	.270	-.105	.043	-.519	.027
IV = % of education faculty identified as an ethnic minority					
Factor 4	.264	-.034	.013	-.514	.021
IV = % of education program student identified as an ethnic minority					
Factor 4	.331	-.038	.014	-.576	.020

Table 20

Multiple Regression of All Variables Found to Have a Relationship with a Factor, Regressed on Factor 3

	B	Adjusted R^2	F	p
Model		.567	2.962	.121
Population of school	.041			.887
Percent of ethnic minority faculty in program	**1.543**			**.034**
Carnegie classification of bachelors or masters	.293			.345
Are there openly LGBT faculty in the program	.257			.491
Percent of ethnic minority students	-1.050			.063
Percent of student population enrolled in education program	.812			.128
Type of School	**-1.235**			**.031**
Religious Affiliation	**-3.132**			**.026**
Accrediting body dummy variable – TEAC	-.079			.807
Accrediting body dummy variable – RATE	.339			.432

Note. Variables in bold denote statistically significant effects.

Table 21

Percent of Ethnic Minority Students, Religious Affiliation, and Type of School as Predictor Variables for Factor 3

	B	Adjusted R^2	F	p
Model		.366	3.881	.038
Type of School	-.277			.231
Religious Affiliation	-.502			.040
% of ethnic minority students	-.541			.032

Appendix A

Education Training Program Diversity Questionnaire

<u>Demographics</u>

1. Is the program in a public or private school?
    ☐Public ☐Private   ☐Other, please explain:_____

2. Does the school have a religious affiliation?
    ☐No
    ☐Yes - What is the school's religious affiliation? _____

3. In what setting is the school located?
    ☐Rural ☐Town ☐Suburban ☐City

4. Approximately how many students attend the institution? _____

5. What is the institution's Carnegie classification?
    ☐RU/VH   Research Universities (very high research)
    ☐RU/H   Research Universities (high research activity)
    ☐DRU   Doctoral/Research Universities
    ☐Master's/L Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)
    ☐Master's/M Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)
    ☐Master's/S Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)
    ☐Bac/A&S Baccalaureate Colleges – Arts & Sciences
    ☐Bac/Diverse Baccalaureate Colleges – Diverse Fields
    ☐Bac/Assoc: Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges
    ☐Other: _____

6. What degrees are offered by the program? (E.g., bachelor, master, doctorate) _____
    (If they offer master degrees) Are the masters programs for "already practicing teachers"
    or for individuals seeking their initial teacher certification? _____

7. What NYS recognized certification levels are offered by the program at the **bachelor** degree
    level? (Check all that apply.)
    ☐Regular Education Childhood (from Kindergarten to 6th grade)
    ☐Special Education Childhood (from Kindergarten to 6th grade)
    ☐Regular Education Middle Childhood (5th to 9th grade, generalist and/or subject areas)
    ☐Special Education Middle Childhood (5th to 9th grade, generalist and/or subject areas)
    ☐Regular Education Adolescent (7th to 12th grade)
    ☐Special Education Adolescent (7th to 12th grade)
    ☐Regular Education General (K-12)
    ☐Special Education General (K-12)
    ☐Other, please specify/explain:_____

8. Through which accrediting body is the program accredited or seeking to become accredited?
    ☐NCATE ☐TEAC ☐NYS Regents ☐Other: _____

9. How long have you worked in the program in any capacity (as director or a faculty member)?
    _____

10. How many full-time faculty members are in the teacher education program? _____

11. Approximately how many adjunct professors teach in the program each year?_____

12. How many faculty working in the program are male? _____ female? _____

13. How many of the program's faculty self-identify as an ethnic minority? _____

14. Do any of the faculty members associated with the teacher education program openly identify as GLBT? ☐No ☐Yes ☐Don't Know
    If "yes," approximately how many openly identify as GLBT? _____

15. How many students are currently enrolled in the program? _____

16. How many of the enrolled students self-identify as an ethnic minority? _____

17. Do any of the students in the program openly identify as GLBT?   ☐No ☐Yes ☐
    Don't Know
    If "yes," approximately how many openly identify as GLBT? _____

Faculty and Student Competencies

1. a. What kinds of knowledge and abilities related to cultural diversity or multicultural issues does your program aim to develop in its students? _____

    b. Could you say a little about how sexual orientation and gender identity issues fit in that framework?_____

2. a. Going back to the broader multicultural framework within the program, how are students assessed on their knowledge and abilities related to cultural diversity? _____

    b. And within that, is their knowledge and abilities related to sexual orientation and gender identity assessed in any way? In what ways? _____

3. On a scale of 1 to 5, what degree of encouragement is given to faculty members in your program to integrate sexual orientation or gender identity issues into their courses? 1 indicating no encouragement and 5 indicating a great deal of encouragement.

           1   2   3   4   5
           ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

4. The following three items use a rating scale to answer the questions. On a scale from 1 to 5, how important does the program feel it is to prepare your students to be competent in the following areas? 1 indicates that the area is not important at all and 5 indicates that it is very important:

    a. Working with children from culturally diverse backgrounds:

not important   very important

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

    b. Working with GLBT students:

not important   very important

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

    c. Working with students who have same-sex parents:

not important   very important

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional Comments: _____

5. In the past 5 years (or "Since you have joined the program") have you seen any change in the attitudes of faculty about the importance of discussing GLBT issues in the curriculum?

☐ No

☐ Yes (ask the following):

    a. Do faculty members seem to be finding issues more important or less important? _____

    b. Why do you think this change has occurred? _____

6. Are any faculty members in the program developing professional expertise in this area?

☐ No

☐ Yes (ask the following):

a. Approximately how many faculty? _____

b. How are they going about doing this (provide examples of attending conference presentations or looking up research if necessary)? _____

c. Is faculty expertise in these areas recognized and utilized by other faculty or students? _____

d. Are these individuals recognized or rewarded for their efforts?

    ☐ No

    ☐ Yes. In what ways are they recognized or rewarded? _____

Curriculum Content and Training Experiences

1. Does your teacher education program offer a specific course devoted to multicultural or diversity issues?
   ☐No: additional notes: _____
   ☐Yes (ask following questions):
      How many multicultural or diversity courses are offered? _____
      What are the course titles? _____

2. Are *any* multicultural or diversity courses *required* for the completion of the bachelor's degree? (This includes multicultural or diversity general education courses that may be offered through a different program – such as the psychology department.)
   ☐No ☐Yes
      Additional notes: _____

*If answers to questions 1 **and** 2 in this section are "No," skip number 3 and go to item 4.

3. As far as you are aware, are GLBT issues addressed in any of the multicultural courses offered?
   ☐No
   ☐Yes (ask following question if answer to question 2 is "Yes"):
      Are they addressed in the required multicultural course? ☐No ☐Yes ☐Don't Know
      Additional notes: _____

4. To the best of your knowledge, does your *institution* offer a specific course devoted to covering GLBT issues? ☐No ☐Yes ☐Don't Know

   (Information found online: _____)

5. Does your teacher education program address GLBT issues through any other courses (for example, in human development, exceptionality, classroom management, or special topics classes)?
   ☐No
   ☐Yes (ask following question):
      What are the course titles in which you think GLBT issues are discussed? _____
      Due to the exploratory nature of this project, we would like to collect syllabi for courses that you feel may discuss sexual orientation and gender identity topics. Can the primary investigator contact you through e-mail with a list of the courses you mentioned in order to get copies of those syllabi? ☐No ☐Yes

6. In the past 2 years, has the program offered a seminar or workshop for students to attend that specifically addressed GLBT issues as they relate to teaching?
   ☐No
   ☐Yes (ask following question):
      Can you tell me a bit about it? _____
   Additional notes: _____

7. Over the past 5 years, have any students enrolled in the program encountered issues related to gender identity or sexual orientation while completing student teaching or any other field placement experiences?
☐No
☐Yes – Ask respondent to describe the issues and prompt with follow questions as needed:

_____

      a. How did you or the other faculty members learn about the experiences?_____
      b. Approximately how many students encounter issues related to gender expression or sexual orientation each year?_____
      c. Can you describe the general nature of the issues that occurred?_____
      d. When these issues come up, are they highlighted and used as teaching opportunities?_____

Student and Faculty Research Activities

"I understand that the amount of research conducted and the range of research topics within divisions can depend on the size of the program and the number of faculty members. I will take into consideration the size of each program when analyzing the information; however, I would like to gain an understanding of the prevalence of GLBT issues in research from various post-secondary institutions."

1. Are there faculty members whose primary research interest is in sexual orientation or gender identity issues? ☐No
      ☐Yes, how many?_____

2. Are there faculty members who occasionally help or take part in research regarding sexual orientation or gender identity issues? ☐No
      ☐Yes, how many? _____

3. To the best of your knowledge, have any faculty members in your program published articles or conducted presentations regarding sexual orientation or gender identity?
☐No
☐Yes (ask following questions):
    a. Approximately how many publications have been completed in the past 5 years?

    _____

    b. Approximately how many presentations have been completed in the past 5 years?

    _____

4. In the past 5 years (or "Since you have joined the program"), have any students helped faculty conduct research on this topic?
☐No
☐Yes. How many students have been involved? _____

5. In the past 5 years (or "Since you have joined the program"), have any students completed large projects or conducted their own research in this topic?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes. Approximately how many? _____

Institutional Climate & Resources

"The following questions address the overall school climate and resources available on the campus on the topic of GLBT issues and for diverse groups of students. If you do not know the answer to any of the questions, please feel free to say so."

1. Do the physical surroundings of the education department reflect an appreciation of diversity that includes GLBT issues, such as through artwork or posters?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes. How is this appreciation visible in the program? _____

2. Are GLBT resources easily accessible within the department or through the university to students enrolled in your program (such as the availability of library resources, information available from professors)?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes. What types of resources are available? _____
   ☐ Don't know

3. Does your college or university have an active GLBT student organization or club?
   ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Don't Know (Website information: _____)

4. Does your institution's counseling center have a GLBT support group?
   ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Don't Know ☐ Maybe (Website information: _____)

5. Do you feel the university recognizes and is supportive of GLBT perspectives?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes (ask following question):

   How does the university reflect and communicate its support to students? (In other words, what activities or projects are coordinated through the university, such as colloquia, internal grant funding for relevant research projects, special programs, workshops, events, affirmative action policies): _____

Final Question

"The final question is a 6 part question. Some programs that prepare people for school-related professions are being encouraged by various sources to develop coursework and research in the area of GLBT issues. On a scale from 1 to 5, 1 indicating no influence at all and 5 indicating a great deal of influence, how much influence are you experiencing from the following sources?"

	No Influence				A great deal of influence
	1	2	3	4	5
Program's accrediting body	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The university	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Program faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Professional Associations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Would you like to receive a summary of the study results, which will include a checklist based on information in the interview that programs can use to self-monitor changes they may make in the integration of GLBT issues? ☐No ☐Yes

Would you like your program to be included in a random draw for resources and programs regarding sexual orientation and gender identity in schools? ☐No ☐Yes

End Time:

Appendix B

E-Mail to Program Directors

Dear _____,

I am a graduate student in the School Psychology Doctoral Program at Alfred University, and am currently conducting research for my dissertation about the level of integration of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) topics in bachelors' level teacher education training programs. I will be collecting data through structured telephone interviews with program directors from teacher education training programs around New York State. Although it is a sensitive and controversial topic, I feel it is important to collect information from numerous programs that have various views. I hope you will consider participating.

The study looks at the current level of integration of diversity issues in teacher education programs, with a focus on how gender identity and sexual orientation are present in program curricula, faculty and student interests, field experiences, and in the availability of resources through the institution. The topic of sexual and gender identity is the focus because there is a lack of research in this specific area of diversity.

The interview is fairly structured and takes approximately 30 minutes to complete. The answers programs provide will remain confidential. A unique identification number will be recorded on the interview forms, and a separate key will be created in which the schools are listed with their respective I.D.s. If at any point during the interview, you decide that you do not want to be a part of the study, I will end the interview and all of your answers up to that point will not be included in the results.

Each program that takes part has the option to receive a summary of the study results and can be entered in a random draw at the completion of the study. The program's name who is drawn will receive a collection of helpful resources and materials regarding sexual orientation and gender identity in elementary, middle, and high schools, which can be shared with pre-service teachers in the training program.

I will contact you by telephone within a week to answer any questions you may have regarding the study and to schedule a time that is convenient for you to complete the interview if you choose to participate. Agreeing to take part in the interview will be considered informed consent and the information collected will be included in the results of the study unless you withdraw from participation prior to its completion. If you have any questions you would like answered prior to the telephone call, please feel free to contact me through e-mail at nsi7@alfred.edu or by telephone at (585) 610-6673.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Nancy Issa, MA/CAS, NCSP
School Psychology Doctoral Candidate

Appendix C

Education Training Program GLBT Competency Checklist
Items on the following checklist were modified from surveys and checklists used to assess multicultural competencies in graduate level programs.

Indicator:	Met	Not Met

---

1. The program has a required multicultural course.   ___ ___

---

2. GLBT issues are covered in a multicultural course.   ___ ___

---

3. GLBT issues are covered in a course other than a multicultural course.   ___ ___

---

4. GLBT issues are integrated into all coursework.   ___ ___

   a. All program faculty can specify how this is done in their courses.   ___ ___
   b. Syllabi clearly reflect GLBT inclusion.   ___ ___

---

5. Students are exposed to GLBT individuals during field experiences.   ___ ___

---

6. GLBT issues are addressed in field experiences or supervision.   ___ ___

---

7. The program has a faculty member whose primary research interest is in GLBT issues.   ___ ___

---

8. There is clear faculty research productivity in GLBT issues, evidenced by faculty journal publications and conference presentations on GLBT issues.   ___ ___

---

9. The program has a faculty member who, although GLBT issues are not a primary research interest, contributes intermittently to the GLBT literature or concerns.   ___ ___

---

10. Students are actively mentored in GLBT research. ___ ___

11. One component of a student's yearly and/or end of program
evaluation include their sensitivity to and knowledge of GLBT
issues. Your program has a mechanism for assessing this
competency. ___ ___

12. One component of faculty teaching evaluations is the ability to
integrate GLBT issues into the course. Faculty are assessed on their
ability to make all students, regardless of cultural or sexual identity
background, feel equally comfortable in class. The program has a
mechanism to assess this competency (e.g., questions on student
evaluations of professors). ___ ___

13. The physical surroundings of the program area reflect an
appreciation of diversity that includes GLBT issues (e.g. posters,
reading materials that are GLBT in nature and readily visible to
students, staff, faculty and visitors upon entering the program area,
faculty offices, etc.). ___ ___

14. There is a physical area that incorporates GLBT resources of some
form in the program (or within the department or academic unit)
where students can convene. Diversity is reflected in the décor of
the room and in the resources available (e.g. books, journals, films,
etc.). ___ ___

15. The institution has an active GLBT student organization. ___ ___

16. The institution's Counseling Center has a GLBT support group. ___ ___

17. There are faculty in the program who self-identify as GLBT. ___ ___

18. There are students in the program who self-identify as GLBT. ___ ___

19. There are support staff in the program who self-identify as GLBT. ___ ___

Program GLBT Competency Checklist References

Hills, H. I., & Strozier, A. L. (1992). Multicultural training in APA-approved counseling

psychology programs: A survey. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 23*(1),

43-51. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.23.1.43

Ponterotto, J. G., Alexander, C., & Grieger, I. (1995). A multicultural competency checklist for

counseling training programs. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development,*

23(1), 11-20. Retrieved January 8, 2008, from Academic Search Premier database

Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Rieger, B. P., & Austin, R. (2002). A revision of the

multicultural counseling awareness scale. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and*

Development, 30, 153-180. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Professional Development

Collection database

Rogers, M. R., Hoffman, M. A., & Wade, J. (1998). Notable multicultural training in APA-

approved counseling psychology and school psychology programs. *Cultural Diversity*

and Mental Health, 4(3), 212-226. doi: 10.1037/1099-9809.4.3.212

NANCY SHEDLOCK

nancy.shedlock@outlook.com

EDUCATION

Alfred University – Alfred, NY
Doctor of Psychology in School Psychology (2013)
Certificate of Advanced Study (2009)
Master of Arts in School Psychology (2007)

Pacific Union College – Angwin, CA
Bachelor of Science in Psychology (2004)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

School Psychologist   07/2009-Present
Hornell City School District – Hornell, NY
- Participate in pre-referral teams and student success teams
- Consult with parents, teachers, and administrators on needs of students
- Consult with building and district level teams on district needs
- Conduct academic, cognitive, social-emotional and behavioral evaluations
- Collaborate with teachers, parents and students in the development of individual behavior plans
- Assist in developing IEPS and 504 plans

Adjunct Instructor – Cultural Diversity PSYC 601 & 602   01/2011-12/2012
Alfred University – Alfred, NY
- In PSYC 601, introduced school psychology, school counseling, and mental health counseling graduate students to basic concepts regarding forms of diversity and focused on current issues in American society and schools
- In PSYC 602, introduced school psychology doctoral students to the intersection of diversity and mental health needs
- Supported discussion and activities that encouraged the development of self-awareness, knowledge, and skills regarding diversity based on gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, ethnicity, race, age, social class, and ability

School Psychologist Intern   06/2008-06/2009
Wellsville Central School District – Wellsville, NY
- Provided individual and group counseling to middle and high school students
- Conducted academic, cognitive, social-emotional and behavioral evaluations
- Consulted with general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators
- Promoted a positive school climate by helping to organize a variety of school activities
- Designed and implemented a Safe Space workshop for high school faculty and staff

Instructor – Research Techniques: Child Psychology PSYC 352   01/2008-05/2008
Alfred University – Alfred, NY
- Developed syllabus and overall course structure
- Supported students in the development and completion of research studies at a local preschool
- Introduced students to statistics most commonly used in social science research

Graduate Clinician   08/2006-05/2008
Alfred University Child & Family Services Center – Alfred, NY
- Engaged in play therapy with toddlers to facilitate development of communication skills
- Provided family counseling services
- Collaborated with professionals at local schools and agencies when appropriate
- Assessed cognitive abilities and academic skills of students in local colleges and universities
- Supervised graduate clinicians in counseling sessions and college assessments

School Psychology Lab Coordinator   08/2006-05/2007
Alfred University – Alfred, NY
- Instructed first year graduate students in the use of a variety of norm-referenced tests
- Traveled to practicum sites to observe implementation of tests and rapport building skills with children

High School History & Literature Teacher   03/2005-06/2005
Yap Seventh-Day Adventist School – Yap, Federated States of Micronesia
- Participated in administrative meetings regarding disciplinary actions for student behaviors
- Taught a variety of high school history classes, including American History, Micronesian History, World History, and U.S. Government
- Improved class participation and increased student initiative in homeroom class

Behavioral Science Department Lab Instructor   09/2003-12/2004
Pacific Union College – Angwin, CA
- Child Development Lab: Supervised students through the process of implementing research
- Social Psychology Lab: Facilitated the development of research studies; graded research reports
- Research Design Lab: Taught undergraduate psychology majors how to navigate and use SPSS

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS & AFFILIATIONS

School Psychologist, Permanent Certification in New York State
Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP)
National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)
New York Association of School Psychologists (NYASP)

PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP & ACTIVITIES

Publications
- Issa, N., & Lauback, C. (2011). Theory into practice: Arming school psychologists with intervention strategies for GLBTQ youth. *Trainers' Forum,* 30, 20-26.
- Issa, N., & Lauback, C. (2009). Call for action: School psychology's responsibility to promote social justice for GLBTQ youth. *Trainers' Forum,* 28, 20-29.

Presentations
- "School Psychology's Responsibility to Promote Advocacy for GLBTQ Youth" at the annual National Association of School Psychologists conference in Boston, Massachusetts, 2009
- "Get it, got it, go! Progress monitoring using literacy measures in a preschool setting" at the annual New York Association of School Psychologists conference in Albany, New York, 2007