

A Case Study of an Equity Program in Teacher Education: Rethinking Feminist Leadership

Sharon Anne Cook

Open-ended admission policies to professional education programs, and particularly the admission of candidates with certain types of disabilities, have profound implications for teacher-education programs. Such policies and practices affect the entire educational community, including faculty members, university and faculty administrators, school partners, and pre-service teacher-education candidates. Through a case study of a special-needs candidate in one pre-service program committed to equity, I analyze some of the particular stresses experienced by leaders in faculties of education who aim to exercise leadership in socially transformative ways.

Les politiques d'admission aux programmes d'enseignement supérieur professionnel, notamment en ce qui concerne les candidats ayant certaines déficiences, ont des implications profondes pour les programmes de formation à l'enseignement. De telles politiques et pratiques ont une incidence sur tout le milieu de l'enseignement : membres du corps professoral, administrateurs universitaires et de facultés d'éducation, écoles partenaires et candidats à la formation à l'enseignement. Par le biais d'une étude de cas portant sur une personne ayant une déficience et un programme de formation à l'enseignement soucieux d'équité, l'auteure analyse certains des stress des décideurs qui, dans les facultés d'éducation, cherchent à exercer un leadership en vue de transformer la société.

I am a feminist. As an administrator and professor in a pre-service teacher-education program, I have tried to live feminist principles through my teaching and administrative practices. In addition to all that is implied in the dictum that the "private is public," this has required the active nurturing of learners so that they could develop their own distinctive voice as teachers, and the diversification of teaching practices and strategies to integrate a wider spectrum of race, class, and ability into the curriculum and teaching force. Having helped to frame the equity policy for my institution's faculty of education, I remain a proponent of equitable measures in education at all levels. However, one case during my administrative term crystallized for me, as for many of my peers, some of the limits of equity policies in teacher education. The experiences of one

candidate as discussed in this article demonstrated both the promise and some of the perils of equity programs for faculty members, co-operating teachers, school and university administrators, students, and the society these groups serve.

Within a context of organizational change, feminization of the teaching force, and the influence of feminism, I examine in this article one case of a special-needs student who appears to encapsulate many of the dissonances that suggest some of the unexpected limitations of inclusiveness. The methodology employed in gathering the data for this study included an analysis of the official procedures for admission of special-needs candidates at one university, the individual admission data provided by the candidate in question, all departmental, special-services, field-placement, and observation forms related to this candidate, and a personal journal maintained throughout one academic year. Finally, I offer some observations on the peculiar stresses experienced by leaders in faculties of education, particularly by those who define their role as socially transformative. Ultimately, this analysis represents an attempt to chart and understand the implications of the clash of practice and theory as all institutions, educational ones included, strive to respond responsibly and fairly to the challenge of inclusiveness.

THE PROMISE OF FEMINIST JUSTICE

One of my most vivid and cherished memories is of reading the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women through long winter nights in 1971. I remember my astonishment at realizing how little I understood about other Canadian women's lives, and especially the challenges and clear injustices faced by working-class and other marginalized women. For many Canadian second-wave feminists, the report served as a clarion call to work actively towards greater social justice (Friedan, 1963; Millett, 1970). Without a doubt, the report made clear education's implication in this process (Government of Canada, 1970, chap. 3). My belief — in 1971 and today — that feminism would make all the difference in the reform of Canadian society was shared by many others (Cumming, 2001a; Cumming 2001b; Speers, 2001).

I first became a school administrator in the 1980s. By that time, a fairly coherent approach to feminist leadership was developing, particularly among those of us who identified closely with liberal feminism. Although much of the energy of that period was channelled into having more women named to positions of responsibility in the school system, the period also

was characterized by major leaps in equitable curricula and resource materials. For those few women occupying administrative positions in schools, the main issues in feminist leadership included the importance of female models in the classroom, the introduction of co-operative, rather than strictly competitive, teaching strategies, and the enabling influence of women acting in a critical mass to achieve equity (Bourne, Masters, Amin, Gonick, & Gribowski, 1994; Stone 1994). However, wrestling positions, respect, and a measure of authority from organizational structures that had been established with very different objectives than feminists championed was one thing; implementing feminist principles once power had been achieved was something else again. The latter assumed not only equitable leadership practices, but also that complex organizations could respond to these challenges in a timely and fair manner. This task proved to be more difficult than most foresaw.

Organizations have been defined in a variety of ways: as concrete entities with distinctive organizational designs, power systems, internal and external environments (Mintzberg, 1989), as "network[s] of interactions and events, invented and enacted according to different images and beliefs about how people behave, how things work, or how successful outcomes can be achieved" (Morgan, 1997, p. 100), or as stable groups of people who have developed shared meanings that influence, if not determine, their perceptions and behaviours (Middlehurst, 1997). Teacher-education programs, and the organizations that support them, demonstrate all these defining qualities to some degree. Because of their complexity and shared belief systems, to mention only two common characteristics, a good many details about how such an organization runs, and what is required to be successful in it remain unarticulated. It can often take an event where several organizational structures and cultures must co-operate on behalf of a struggling student, such as the practicum in teacher education, for the unexpressed organizational assumptions to surface. When this occurs, tensions that lurk just below the shiny surface of teacher-education programs can also arise, demonstrating the limits of these shared assumptions as one organizational culture positions itself against another to protect its own interests, and the lines are drawn between presumably collaborative organizations.

Three factors have shaped the educational culture of all faculties of education in this country over the past several decades: the increasing rate of feminization of the teaching force, feminism, and policies designed to make the teaching force more consonant with Canada's student population.

THE FEMINIZATION OF TEACHING

Since its feminization in Canada in the late 19th century (Danylewycz, Light, & Prentice, 1983; Prentice, 1977 [originally published in 1975], pp. 438–439), the profession of teaching at the elementary level has been closely associated with notions of nurturance, empowerment of learners, and tolerance of difference, as well as by an ethic of forbearance and patience, demanding a degree of selflessness by teachers. Carol Gilligan (1982) has explored the moral implications of a pervasive “ethic of care” (p. 74) among women, by far the majority of elementary-school teachers. Despite the centrality of the caring ethic in schools, and the deep value attached to it by some scholars and practitioners (Noddings, 1994), it appears to represent the culture of elementary schools more commonly than education at other levels. Secondary-school culture, as has frequently been observed, is not as committed to education through nurturance, influenced as it is by other market forces and societal expectations for older students (Hargreaves, 1994). At this level also, many of the same values apply to teachers’ work with students; indeed, as schooling increasingly adopts co-operative rather than competitive learning strategies, the role of the learner embarked on an educational odyssey of self- and societal-exploration requires the teacher to be supportive rather than rigidly dogmatic, democratic rather than autocratic, and collegial rather than independent (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992). All these qualities are popularly ascribed to women, although they are by no means absent in many male teachers’ practices, because they are influenced by the dominant teaching culture. Nevertheless, it has been argued that this construction often essentializes women (Acker, 1999, p. 278; Blackmore, 1996, p. 38; Grundy, 1987). The preponderance of women at the elementary level, and now also at the secondary level, has aided this process of envisioning the teacher as the “scribe on the side” rather than the “sage on the stage.” Many teacher-education programs consciously construct a climate that is avowedly nurturant, providing an enabling culture for growth.

Pre-service teacher-education programs reflect much of the culture of the schools because they prepare candidates to enter this particular professional setting. A cursory survey of teacher-education literature clearly demonstrates that reflection, nurturance, and tolerance for difference are underscored as signal virtues among teachers, and that these should be developed in the prospective candidate (Henderson, 1996; Knowles, Cole, & Presswood, 1994; Posner, 1989). This culture is also reflected in the Standards of Practice of the Ontario College of Teachers,¹ the most recent prescription of acceptable teaching practice in Canada. At the same time,

however, teacher-education programs are necessarily influenced by pan-university ideals and practices, many more of which are exclusionary, elitist, and male-centred (Caplan, 1994). University personnel and faculties of education take seriously their role as critical advocates for an improved society through education that is humane while being also challenging. In many ways, then, teacher-education programs both reflect school culture and depart from it, defending schooling's merits at the same time as they critique schooling's easily-accepted notions. Faculties engage in this sometimes awkward dance as they test the boundaries and substance of accepted ideas and practices in school culture.

FEMINISM

In addition to the nurturant, female-dominated culture in both the elementary school and teacher-education faculties, two additional forces, feminism and equity strategies such as affirmative action initiatives, have deeply influenced Canadian universities. The resurgence of feminism since the 1980s in society at large, and within pre-service teacher-education programs, has added another element to a professional bearing already committed to nurturing those in its charge. Teacher-education programs validate many of the skills, areas of knowledge (Alcoff & Potter, 1993; Longino, 1993), and goals that have come to be associated with feminism through their policies and practices (Cott, 1986, pp. 49-62). This includes recognition of the double- and triple-tasking so familiar to women with households and families also engaged in waged labour. An appreciation of the burden carried by many of the pre-service students finds expression in attempts to accommodate parents' needs for timetabling and assignment loading. Many programs eschew competitive ranking practices in favour of large-scale, co-operative group work; fewer formal examinations than one typically finds in the rest of the university community; and classroom practices that encourage learning through conversation. Empathy and support, consensus strategies, and aiming to utilize the range of competencies of all participants are fundamental in most of these programs (Bourne et al, 1994; Culley & Portuges, 1985; hooks, 1984; Lenskyj, 1994). Beyond this, feminism has demanded that a re-examination of the curriculum as it applies in all sectors of schooling, and acknowledgement that androcentrism, sexism, and gender ideology bias the curricula in many ways (Lather, 1984). Feminism has also interrogated the goals of education, broadly and specifically to a given age group, exploring the roots of unequal and unjust practices in education, including the investigation of hegemonic meaning systems that distort consciousness and ethical possibility (Grundy,

1987; Reynolds & Young, 1995; Gaskell, McLaren, & Novogrodsky, 1989). Taken as a whole, the cultural mantra of pre-service programs might be termed one of *nurturant feminism*. This discourse emphasizes the value of a student's right to self-discovery. It also finds expression in the powerful desire to ensure that every candidate entering teacher education emerges successfully with a degree in hand. The assumption that all candidates wishing to serve children and society in this way must be facilitated to do so is clearly at odds with other deeply held and avowedly non-feminist beliefs of such organizations as the remaining university community, schools, and parents' groups.

The literature is still divided on whether feminist administrators produce a distinctive approach to leadership. While much research points to a definable style arising from feminist principles (Harris, 1995; Reynolds & Young, 1995; Reynolds, 1995; Young, Staszewski, McIntyre, & Joly, 1993), others argue against a feminist leadership style as essentialist (Middlehurst, 1997.) However, perceptions of power that a leader exercises do seem to vary considerably, and in direct response to the organizational culture. These give rise to dominant norms and practices that either support the leader or abandon her to her own resources (Harris, 1995). Further, the leader's perceptions of power give rise to views of the range of allowable power invested in others.

EQUITY POLICIES

A third factor that has influenced the culture of pre-service programs across North America has been the introduction of affirmative action and other equity policies to provide incentives for members of underrepresented groups in the population to enter teaching. At my own institution, the "Access Program" currently allocates 14% of the spaces among incoming teacher-education candidates to visible minorities, Aboriginal peoples, and individuals with certain disabilities.² Access programs such as this have become fairly common over the past decade (Carr, 1995; James, 1997; Lundy & Lawrence, 1995). They have been sustained through considerable public support for the general notion of a teaching force more closely reflective of the student population in terms of race, ethnicity, and disabilities (Mahrouse, 2001). The incoming student cohort has been encouraged to declare status in one of these identified groups to obtain preference in the highly competitive admission process. An increasing number of applicants follow this recommended route.

To work effectively, teacher-education programs must develop a close and respectful relationship with partners in the educational community

at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels. In cultural terms, elementary-school educators can identify with many of the objectives of nurturant feminism. These institutions mainly agree that the aim of education is to enable all learners to reach their potential through the active intervention of teachers as professionals. However, where persons with severe disabilities or particular areas of disability such as blindness enter elementary schools as teachers rather than learners, the educational system often has less sympathy. Provisions relating to teachers' custodial responsibilities under the Education Act in Ontario and comparable legislation in other provinces challenge full integration of the teaching force.

One instance underscored the competing interests of access and underrepresentation, nurturant feminism, and demanding standards, and personal actualization and safety. As it developed, this case cast into a confusing melange the interests of underrepresented pre-service teachers and their proponents, and those of some children and teachers, with the explicit principles underlying faculty and general university policy.

THE CASE OF A SPECIAL NEEDS PRE-SERVICE TEACHER

The case involved an applicant who applied for admission through the access program's "disability corridor" to the anglophone pre-service program for which I was responsible. The candidate, here called David,³ indicated that he had a visual impairment. He did not admit to almost total blindness, however. As a forthright and conscientious individual who also happened to be a member of a visible minority, David immediately claimed the sympathies and efforts of most who interacted with him. During the frequent interviews held between David and a range of university personnel attempting to facilitate his success in the pre-service program, he repeatedly made two claims: first, that his candidature should be seen as a "test case" within the university, school system, and community. From the viewpoint of the Faculty of Education, on the other hand, the candidate represented one instance in a range of exceptionalities that we would hope to accommodate within a flexible program. David's second assertion was that, to be successful, he believed that services should be accessed as *he* dictated them, not according to the views of the general community of interest, the position of the faculty. The question of who held the locus of power in this case was very much contested from the beginning.

Consistent with the culture of nurturant feminism in our pre-service, teacher-education program, the instructors devoted themselves to this candidate's success. Because textbooks could not be placed on auditory

tape quickly enough to keep pace with the rapidly unfolding program, instructors reworked their materials, provided individual tutoring, and accepted oral assignments to evaluate his understanding of basic pedagogical knowledge. When even this was not enough, many responded with more time and personally generated support documents to translate materials into a form that David could understand. With the first assessments of his academic knowledge, he demonstrated a lack of fundamental pedagogical knowledge. Nevertheless, faculty members still found it exceedingly difficult to declare his lack of progress a failure. One premise grounding most teacher-education programs is the gradual development of pedagogical skills as a reflection of student teachers' learning and personal readiness in the journey to assume the teaching role. The broader university standard, however, is that a variety of formal and informal assessments indicate progress, or lack of it. If these assessments indicate progress to be inadequate at crucial junctures, students are failed. Instructors and students generally agree on how assessment operates within the university, but teacher education claims itself as a special case. Here, both candidates and instructors strongly resist the category of failure. Candidates experiencing difficulty typically summon even greater efforts on the part of their instructors to make knowledge accessible.

And so it was in this case. David requested a teaching assistant to help him prepare his assignments, including researching and writing reports and lesson plans. On behalf of the university, I declined this request because it went beyond accommodation into the arena of academic tasks that he was required to master and demonstrate independently to be recommended for teaching certification to the Ontario College of Teachers. Within the university community, the interpretation of necessary accommodation proved to be uneven. As director, I very much wanted to have this candidate experience satisfaction and success, but more than this, I feared that without help in the classroom, David would be unable to exercise the custodial functions required of anyone placed in charge of children under the terms of the Education Act. All pre-service candidates must be willing and able to assume the formal (and legal) role of a surrogate, custodial parent, acting *in loco parentis*. The university special services team took a different position from that of the Faculty of Education, as one would expect because of the different organizational cultures: it operated on the premise that candidates such as this one should declare their needs for accommodation, that help would be given where possible, and that the special-needs candidate would either pass or fail, just as would any student. Both positions were outlined for David, creating confusion

and tension. This fundamental difference in interpretation of what constitutes adequate accommodation for special-needs candidates consistently bedevilled the process on which we were embarked.

Faculty members also worried about safety issues, even in the university classroom: movement into group work could be dangerous as the large machines required for enlarging print were located in very confined classroom space. On one occasion, David narrowly missed falling down a flight of stairs as he negotiated his way with a cart and large-print reader. David assumed that his peers would read to him any transparency overhead documents needed for in-class discussions, and otherwise translate materials that were out of his view. This assumption, too, is consistent with the culture of caring of faculties of education and teachers generally. But this enormous task placed a burden on other students, who were themselves pressed by the short duration and heavy workload of the program, part-time jobs, and even new families. Although David remained an object of sympathy, fewer classmates made themselves available to him as the term wore on, either in class or outside, demonstrating the limits for a peer in difficulty. Once I received complaints from some of David's classmates about the stress this enforced helping relationship produced for them, I again discussed the problem with David, pointing out the multiple interests involved. An impasse resulted, with David's interests and those of his classmates now clearly in opposition, and as director I had to choose between these competing interests. As a result, I required that a teaching assistant be present in all university classes to ensure safety and to undertake any academic translation required to complete in-class tasks. David's response was predictable: he did not see the need for such help in the classroom and, as the arbiter in any accommodation dispute, he insisted that the assistant be removed. Faced with David's insistence that he control the situation and the reality that a special services team who imperfectly understood the culture of a pre-service program implicitly supported him in these demands, I struggled to maintain my own balance. My task was to judiciously shape these demands so that they did not compromise the interests of other pre-service students, David, or ultimately the teaching profession. Co-operation, collegiality, and democratic decision making were eroded as the crisis deepened. Within the protected setting of the university, the limits of integration were first tested.

The practicum presented a far greater challenge. David had chosen to qualify at the Junior/Intermediate Division, that is, to teach grades 4 to 10. Safety concerns assumed a heightened significance with David's personal mobility problems in the enclosed classroom space, to say nothing

of the children's safety, normally monitored by the custodial teacher. David requested and received a placement at the Junior Division for his first practicum because of the anticipated discipline challenges with Intermediate Division students. To arrange for the practicum, the university placement officer approached an administrator of a single-floored school. Fortunately, this principal had been a special-education consultant, and had chosen a hard-working, knowledgeable staff, committed to extending the range of teacher models into the special-needs population. The staff, who worked effectively as a team, had a positive relationship with the parents of this middle-class neighbourhood. The board of education's media consultant equipped the classroom with a print-enlarging reader, and with a specially fitted overhead projector that allowed David to give instructions with visual aids to the students. David's associate teacher provided an exceptional model of professionalism, patience, and creativity. Finally, the class itself was smaller and more homogenous than many, with very few special-needs children. These preparations for the practicum consumed many hours of the field placement co-ordinator and myself because we repeatedly interviewed David about his hopes and concerns, and we co-ordinated services for him. It appeared that the selection of classroom could not have been more welcoming.

To ensure that the school staff felt supported, various university personnel regularly visited the school before, during, and after the practicum. During two extended meetings, the school staff's and university's expectations were set down in writing. This became a supplemental document to the one that usually governs the practicum. The university placement officer presented these expectations to David, and made changes as a result of some of his questions or concerns. Predictably, the school staff was primarily worried about issues of student safety, coverage of the curriculum, and David's probable exhaustion. David rejected all these concerns. To help with the workload and children's safety issues, the university hired another teaching assistant to accompany David while at school. Three individuals from the university shared David's practicum supervision, and all of them used formal and informal observations, followed by written reports and discussion with David and with each other.

Problems arose almost immediately. David could not reasonably be asked to teach or supervise any activities in which students were moving quickly, as in sports. His associate teacher compensated for this by teaching this portion of the curriculum for him. David could not easily monitor children's movements in and out of the classroom, a clear requirement to maintain order and safety. His associate teacher suspended a bell above

the door that rang each time it was opened — which it did, many times each day. This strategy to monitor student movement resulted in regular interruptions, as children, parent volunteers, co-op education students, administrators, and many other visitors arrived and left. Each time the bell rang, David stopped, asked for information, and then continued. David's teaching assistant interpreted other classroom interruptions for him, creating even more disturbance. Soon, everyone in the classroom was almost permanently distracted.

David's supervisors observed that, although he was clearly working very hard, he demonstrated profound gaps in pedagogical and even subject-based knowledge, and used a narrow range of teaching strategies. Discussions following the observations were often taken up with the need to clarify fundamental skills associated with lesson and unit preparation. The associate teacher and principal were both very concerned with the knowledge and practice-based deficiencies, and attempted to introduce these to David while shouldering their regular duties. This support resulted in higher levels of fatigue for everyone closely associated with David, and he became progressively more stressed and anxious.

The school principal's leadership style emphasized collegial support and respect for David. This validated David's professional aspirations, but because criticism was strictly limited in the effort to treat him as a colleague, it also masked the depth of the problems. David was peculiarly insensitive to social messages, and therefore did not understand the degree to which his work fell short of an acceptable standard. For her part, the principal understandably chose to devote her energies to shoring up her flagging staff members. In consequence and contrast, my feedback to David was starkly negative.

The expected fatigue experienced by David mounted. Lesson preparations became spotty. He depended increasingly on the teaching assistant to check students' work, to help him with presentations, and to answer students' questions. Soon, with the overwhelming workload apparent to her, the (untrained) teaching assistant was researching materials for David, both outside and in the class. The teaching assistant also assumed an increasing amount of pedagogical responsibility. David's associate teacher also responded to his obvious distress by providing prepared lessons and generating new teaching strategies to make them more meaningful to this group of children. The principal and other school staff members added their labour, too, with other staff members providing support when the exhausted (and pregnant) associate teacher was near the breaking point. In short, the school staff made every attempt to nurture David to success; David lacked much understanding of or empathy for

the Herculean effort being made on his behalf. When the principal noted that her team could not carry on much longer, David protested that they had not offered him help, and demanded another teaching assistant for the preparation of lessons during the evening and on weekends.

The closing chapter of this sad case study came with a series of meetings at the school during which David's pedagogical skills, personal proclivities, and prognosis for improvement over the next weeks were reviewed. It was obvious to everyone but David that the situation was degenerating. At length, the principal determined that she could no longer expose her students to the low quality of instruction and weak classroom management that had become the norm in David's classroom. His associate teacher was close to collapse, and it was feared that David was also not far from this fate if the practicum were to continue.

I met with David to give him the difficult news that we were terminating the practicum. A painful and explosive meeting ensued during which David expressed shock and refusal to accept the decision. Finally, however, he had to reluctantly accept that the matter was beyond his control. In a matter of days, he voluntarily withdrew from the program; afterwards he attempted to rescind his withdrawal. He eventually left the university.

CONCLUSION

What are the lessons to be learned in this case study, particularly for those who have chosen to serve in leadership positions in faculties of education? If it is true that much administrative policy arises out of problematic cases such as this one, it is also true that, through such experiences, administrators learn much about their own strengths and weaknesses. This case weighed heavily on me for months afterwards, eliciting anger, frustration, and deep sadness. I continue to feel remorse for everyone connected with this saga: for the dedicated school authorities who poured their energies into this candidate's cause to no more effect than his anger that they were helping too little; for the children who genuinely tried to help during David's period in their classroom and whose learning became sadly muddled by the end of the period; for the university personnel who offered regular instruction and support while watching the situation disintegrate before their eyes; for myself, torn between the realization of David's inability to complete the job required, and yet wanting him to succeed against all the odds in this personalized "movie of the week"; but most of all, I regret the terrible loss sustained by this young man during those difficult weeks, a loss of dignity, of the possibilities in teaching, of repaying the hope that had been invested in him and that he had

internalized. I particularly grieved the loss of inspiration and hope to the wider educational system that he would have symbolized.

Some conclusions present themselves. As a hopeful teacher educator, I too am deeply embedded in an organizational structure and culture characterized by nurturant feminism, with all that that implies about a liberating pedagogy and self-direction through supportive relationships. This places me in good company with many teacher-education leaders. This case in no way belies the fundamental justice of equity initiatives, nor the ongoing systemic inequity of the educational system that these programs struggle to mediate. At the same time, this case demonstrated for me some of the limitations of inclusionary measures, and certainly of nurturant feminism. The practicum element of all teacher-education programs forces institutions like mine to face some hard facts:

- the will to teach is not enough, especially when the essential sense of sight is lacking;⁴
- institutions cannot in good conscience provide sufficient accommodations for some candidates to succeed without at the same time compromising their ability to meet professional standards;
- university procedures, themselves a product of cultural understandings, that are designed to accommodate special-needs candidates are frequently inadequate when these candidates must exercise custody of school children reliant on them for security;
- as partners in the practicum process, school staffs feel that they cannot afford to be as inclusive as can universities, nor does the organizational culture of schools make them as accepting of difference among teachers;
- leadership to guide well-meaning educators and candidates through stressful experiences, such as the one outlined here, inevitably falls on the teacher-education administrator as the one effective bridge between the field and university, between general principles of accommodation and specific demands for exercising *in loco parentis*, and between the many official and unofficial partners who support and make demands of the candidate.

At the end of the day, neither nurturant feminism nor inclusionary policies saved this candidate or the educational system from failure, and more, from a general loss of confidence in the system's ability to absorb candidates of difference. Despite my wish that all of this had happened to someone else in another time and place, I learned much from it. The fundamental lesson for me is that much more than a strong desire to succeed is needed to make a competent teacher because teaching is both difficult and one of society's sacred trusts.

NOTES

- 1 This professional body licenses new teachers for the province of Ontario, disciplines professional transgressions, and publicly represents the profession of teaching. See the Foundations of Professional Practice [1999] (Ontario College of Teachers, Toronto).
- 2 For documentation on the "Access Entry" initiative, see the Faculty of Education Teacher Education Calendar, 2000–2001, University of Ottawa, p. 4.
- 3 This name is a pseudonym.
- 4 In attempting to understand this candidate's difficulties, particularly when compared with other pre-service teachers with serious disabilities, it has been suggested that several other factors influence success of such candidates. These include, but are not limited to, the extent and quality of the candidate's personal supportive network, the degree to which candidates have developed effective coping mechanisms that engage others' help rather than resist aid on several levels, the extent of social facility so that social cues are acted on appropriately, and the degree of familiarity between the institutions and the candidates so that accommodation can be helpful. For more on these and other relevant factors, see Duquette (2000) and Lortie (1975).

REFERENCES

- Acker, S. (1999). Caring as work for women educators. In E. Smyth, S. Acker, P. Bourne, & A. Prentice (Eds.), *Challenging professions: Historical and contemporary perspectives on women's professional work* (pp. 277–295). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Alcoff, L., & Potter, E. (1993). Introduction: When feminisms intersect epistemology. In L. Alcoff & E. Potter (Eds.), *Feminist epistemologies* (pp. 1–14). New York: Routledge.
- Blackmore, J. (1996). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership and educational change*. Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press.
- Bourne, P., Masters, P., Amin, N., Gonick, M., & Gribowski, L. (Eds.). (1994). *Feminism and education: A Canadian perspective* (2 vols.). Toronto: OISE Press.
- Government of Canada. (1970). *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Caplan, P. (1993). *Lifting a ton of feathers: A woman's guide for surviving in the academic world*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Carr, P. R. (1995). Employment equity for racial minorities in the teaching profession. *Multicultural Education Journal* 13, 28–42.

- Cott, N. F. (1986). Feminist theory and feminist movements: The past before us. In J. Mitchell & A. Oakley (Eds.), *What is feminism: A re-examination* (pp. 49–62). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Culley, M., & Portuges, C. (Eds.). (1985). *Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching*. London, U.K.: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Cumming, J. (2001a). Florence Bird. In S. A. Cook, L. R. McLean, & K. O'Rourke (Eds.), *Framing our past: Canadian women's history in the twentieth century* (pp. 257–258). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Cumming, J. (2001b). Women, peace activism, and the environment: Rosalie Bertell and the development of a feminist agenda, 1970–1990s. In S. A. Cook, L. R. McLean, & K. O'Rourke (Eds.), *Framing our past: Canadian women's history in the twentieth century* (pp. 259–262). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Danylewycz, M., Light, B. & Prentice, A. (1983, May). The evolution of the sexual division of labour in teaching: A nineteenth-century Ontario and Quebec case study. *Histoire sociale/Social History* 16(31), 81–109. Reprinted in J. Gaskell & A. McLaren (Eds.), (1987). *Women and education: A Canadian perspective*. (pp. 33–60). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Duquette, C. (2000). Examining autobiographical influences on student teachers with disabilities. *Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice*, 6(1), pp. 215–228.
- Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York: Dell.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). (1992). *Teacher development and educational change*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Gaskell, J., McLaren, A., & Novogrodsky, M. (1989). *Claiming an education: Feminism and Canadian schools*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Educational Foundation.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychology theory and woman's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, S. (1987). Educational leadership as emancipatory praxis. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), *Gender issues in the theory and practice of educational administration and policy*. Proceedings from the National Conference held at Deakin University, Victoria, Australia, pp. 228–240.
- Harris, C. (1995). Innovative leadership in a community context: Elizabeth Murray and the history plays of Tatamagouche. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 173–192). Calgary, AB: Detselig.

- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Henderson, J. G. (Ed.) (1996). *Reflective teaching: The study of your constructivist practices*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory from margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.
- James, C. (1997). Contradictory tensions in the experiences of African Canadians in a Faculty of Education with an Access Program. *Canadian Journal of Education* 22, 158–174.
- Knowles, J. G., Cole, A. L., with Presswood, C. S. (1994). *Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry*. Toronto: Maxwell MacMillan Canada.
- Lather, P. (1984). Critical theory, curricular transformation and feminist mainstreaming. *Journal of Education*, 166(1), 49–62.
- Lenskyj, H. J. (1994). Commitment and compromise: Feminist pedagogy in the academy. In P. Bourne, P. Masters, N. Amin, M. Gonick, & L. Gribowski (Eds.), *Feminism & education: A Canadian perspective*, vol. 2, pp. 3–16. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Longino, H.E. (1993). Subjects, power and knowledge: Description and prescription in feminist philosophies of science. In L. Alcoff & E. Potter (Eds.), *Feminist epistemologies* (pp. 101–120). New York: Routledge.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lundy, J., & Lawrence, D. (1995). Equity in access to teacher education: Issues for visible minorities and First Nations candidates. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), *Multicultural education: The state of the art: Studies of Canadian heritage* (pp. 11–22). Winnipeg, MB: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.
- Mahrouse, G. (2001). *Navigating access: Managing the ambiguity of "special admissions."* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Ottawa.
- Middlehurst, R. (1997). Leadership, women and higher education. In H. Eggins (Ed.), *Women as leaders and managers in higher education*. London, UK Open University Press.
- Millett, K. (1970). *Sexual politics*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publishers.
- Noddings, N. (1994). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional

- arrangements. In L. Stone (Ed.), *The education feminism reader* (pp. 171–183). New York: Routledge.
- Posner, G. J. (1989). *Field experience: Methods of reflective teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Prentice, A. (1977). The feminization of teaching in British North America and Canada, 1845–1875. *Histoire sociale/Social History* (1975) 8, 5–20. Reprinted in S. Mann Trofimenkoff & A. Prentice (Eds.) (1977), *The neglected majority: Essays in Canadian women's history* (pp. 49–65). Toronto: McLelland and Stewart.
- Reynolds, C. (1995). Feminist frameworks for the study of administration and leadership in educational organizations. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 3–17). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Reynolds, C., & Young, B. (Eds.) (1995). *Women and leadership in Canadian education*. Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Speers, K. (2001). The Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada, 1967–1970: Liberal feminism and its radical implications. In S. A. Cook, L. R. McLean, & K. O'Rourke (Eds.), *Framing our past: Canadian women's history in the twentieth century* (pp. 252–256). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Stone, L. (Ed.) (1994). *The education feminism reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Young B., Staszewski, D., McIntyre, S., & Joly, L. (1993). Care and justice in educational leadership. *The Canadian Administrator*, 33(2), 1–8.