How to hit a moving target: 35 years of gender and sexual diversity in teacher education

Lee Airton [a, *], Austen Koecher [b]

[a] Faculty of Education, Queen's University, Duncan McArthur Hall, 511 Union Street, Kingston, ON, K7M 5R7, Canada
[b] Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, ON, M5S 1V6, Canada

HIGHLIGHTS

- A review of the literature on integrating gender and sexual diversity in teacher education.
- There is a citational reliance on the school-sited suffering of gender and sexual minority youth.
- It is important to cite GSDTE and teacher education research and not only youth outcome research.
- This will help prepare teachers for gender and sexual diversities that are presently unimaginable.

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This essay shares findings from an exhaustive review of the English-language published scholarship on integrating gender and sexual diversity in teacher education (GSDTE) since 1982. The 158 sources substantiate a largely USA-based field with an array of studied pedagogies and a citational reliance on statistics that reveal the school-sited suffering of gender and sexual minority youth. Implications for the field are shared, including: critical questions about the field's construction, objects and beneficiaries; the importance of citing GSDTE and teacher education research and not only youth outcome research; and preparing teachers for gender and sexual diversities that are presently unimaginable.

1. Introduction

The great hope of teacher education efforts oriented toward diversity, equity, and social justice is that a line can be drawn from teacher education, to graduate teacher candidates, to their pupils, to their pupils' families and participation in the social world. Teacher educators who actively take up gender and sexual diversity in our courses aim to make the world more hospitable to the many ways gender and sexuality are lived through a similar trickle-down of our practice. Ideally, the teachers we prepare can do things like reflect on their own situatedness in relation to gender and sexuality, deliver anti-homophobia and anti-transphobia curriculum, disrupt heteronormativity in the classroom, maintain pockets of safety for queer and/or transgender students,[1] loosen up norms of gender and sexuality for *all* students, or be leaders in changing hostile school environments. However, if we consider scope, scale, notions of outcome, intended beneficiaries, and conceptual foundations, each of these capacities is very different from the others, in

[1] We are using the term 'queer' as an umbrella term for people whose sexual orientations are other than heterosexual, and we are using the term 'transgender' as an umbrella term for people whose gender identities and/or gender expressions do not align with stereotypical expectations for the sex they were assigned at birth. Here and throughout the article, we use different conjunctions between the words 'queer' and 'transgender.' In each instance, a conjunction (and, or, and/or) was deliberately selected based on the sentence's meaning and context, and should be interpreted as such. Importantly, our uses of the and/or conjunction (e.g., queer and/or transgender) do not indicate a collapsing of these two terms; rather, the phrase 'queer and/or transgender' is generally used to hold space for their separateness, as in e.g., people who are transgender but not queer.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: lee.airton@queensu.ca (L. Airton), austen.koecher@mail.utoronto.ca (A. Koecher).

a sea of still more. Which manifestations of gender and sexual diversity teacher education or GSDTE are intended to cultivate these different capacities in teacher candidates, and how so? In short, what do GSDTE practitioners do, try to do and want to do?

In this essay, we explore these questions by describing and interpreting findings from an exhaustive review of the English-language GSDTE literature,[2] the first of its kind to be published.[3] There have been many studies of LGBTQIA+[4] teacher candidates' (TCs) (e.g., Cosier, 2008; Nixon & Givens, 2004) and teacher educators' (e.g., Benson, 2008; Eyre, 1993; Whitlock, 2010) experiences, a sharing of pedagogies (see Table 1) and accounts of content integration across teacher education programs (e.g., Jennings & Sherwin, 2008; Shedlock, 2013; Sherwin & Jennings, 2006), but contributions can be disconnected from the body of GSDTE literature (e.g., Cosier & Sanders III, 2007; Swartz, 2003b), inexplicit (e.g., Atkinson & DePalma, 2008a; 2008b) or buried in seemingly unrelated sources (e.g., Darvin, 2011; Shaw et al., 2003). In light of Jennings and Sherwin's (2008) insistence that further research is required on all aspects of teacher education pertaining to gender and sexual diversity, and as GSDTE researchers and practitioners ourselves, we completed this review in order to provide memory to a rapidly expanding field so that future work can build, with precision, on the methodologically- (Table 2) theoretically-diverse (Table 3) scholarship that has already been published. We begin with an account of our review methodology, offer a descriptive overview containing general findings on the state of the field, and provide an interpretative overview intended to provoke thinking on the field's direction in the years to come.

2. Methodology

The review was intended to be exhaustive to the maximum possible extent. To this end, we tested and refined multiple Boolean searches[5] in major research databases (e.g., ERIC, Education Abstracts and LGBT Life), performed keyword searches in teacher education journals,[6] and reviewed all source references. With these strategies we located 120 journal articles, 19 dissertations (e.g., Benson, 2008; Elsbree, 2002; Foy, 2014; Shedlock, 2013; Woodruff, 2014), 10 chapters in otherwise unrelated books (e.g., Evans, 1999; Gutierez-Schmich & Heffernan, 2016; Martino & Berrill, 2007; Rasmussen, Mitchell, & Harwood, 2007; Sears, 1992),[7] four publically available conference papers (Rofes, 1995; P.; Taylor, 2001; Wilson, 1998; Young & Middleton, 1999), one research report (K. L. Butler, 1994) and four books (Covington, 2001; Kissen, 2002; Klein & Markowitz, 2009; Maney & Cain, 1997; McEntarfer, 2016; Murray, 2015; Taylor & Coia, 2014a; Zacko-Smith & Pritchy Smith, 2010). In order to focus on pre-service teacher education, we excluded sources on in-service teacher education and school leader education, as well as sources only offering recommendations for teacher education.[8] Sources were organized and thematically coded using Zotero.

3. Descriptive overview of the reviewed literature

The 158 publications span 35 years (1982–2017) and represent a range of genres from research articles (both quantitative and qualitative) to teacher educator reflections and descriptions of exemplars, to impassioned appeals on the need to incorporate gender and sexual diversity in teacher education. Many are a combination. Despite many authors assuming a first-person experiential narrative voice, there is great diversity in the scope and scale of reported GSDTE efforts. Authors share findings across whole programs (e.g., Jennings, 2007; Koch, 2000; Sears, 1992), within their own courses (e.g., Curran, Chiarolli, & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2009; Kitchen & Bellini, 2012a; Petrovic & Rosiek, 2003), and within specialized GSDTE-related modules (e.g., Benson, Smith, & Flanagan, 2014; Mitton-Kukner, Kearns, & Tompkins, 2016). Some report on courses that take gender and/or sexual diversity as their standalone topic (e.g., Gutierez-Schmich & Heffernan, 2016; Kintner-Duffy, Vardell, Lower, & Cassidy, 2012; McEntarfer, 2016), and others report on broader diversity, equity or social foundations courses (e.g., Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001; Schmidt, Chang, Carolan-Silva, Lockhart, & Anagnostopoulos, 2012).

Diversity of scope and scale aside, however, the reviewed literature is overwhelmingly from the USA. Exceptions come from Australia (see Robinson & Ferfolja, 2008, etc.), Canada (Airton, 2014b; Benson, 2008; Benson et al., 2014; Berrill & Martino, 2002; Britzman & Gilbert, 2004; Eyre, 1993; Goldstein, 1997, 2004; Goldstein, Russell, & Daley, 2007; Grace, 2006; Grace & Benson, 2000; Grace & Wells, 2006; Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, 2017; Kitchen, 2014; Kitchen & Bellini, 2012a, 2012b; MacIntosh, 2007; Martino & Berrill, 2007; Mitton-Kukner et al., 2016; Pendleton Jiménez, 2002; Stiegler, 2008; Sumara, 2008; Sumara, Davis, & Iftody, 2006; Sykes & Goldstein, 2004; C.; Taylor, 2002, 2004; Turnbull & Hilton, 2010), South Africa (Richardson, 2008), New Zealand (Carpenter & Lee, 2010; Lee & Carpenter, 2015), Spain (Barozzi, 2015; Barozzi & Ojeda, 2014), and Turkey, where Dedeoglu, Ulusoy, and Lamme (2012) studied TC responses to the children's picture book *And Tango Makes Three* (Richardson, Parnell, & Cole, 2005) featuring same-sex penguin parents.

---

[2] We have only included English-language sources in this review for two reasons. First, while one author is functionally bilingual in English and French, they lack the requisite fluency and specialized lexicon to analyse relevant French-language sources at the same level as the English-language sources discussed herein. Second, we agree with Viviane Namaste (2011) that language is pivotal to how gender and sexual identities are lived, and that the Anglophone lexicon and conceptual archive around what we are calling gender and sexual diversity cannot simply be translated to other linguistic contexts. Thus, we believe that reviewing only the English-language scholarship is a relevant undertaking. That said, in producing an English-language review, we do not wish to imply that work in this area is not being undertaken in other languages.

[3] Prior reviews of the field (Brant, 2014a; Szalacha, 2004) were not exhaustive. Further, Szalacha's review (2004) was not excluded to teacher education practices, programs and studies, but included in-service education and in-service teacher attitudes.

[4] There are many variations of 'the acronym' in service across writings and practices related to gender and sexual diversity. For the purpose of this article, we have used this variation, which explicitly names lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex and agender, but also via the '+' indicates the problem attending all variations: that there is no way that 'the acronym' can ever represent or contain the full spectrum of gender and sexual diversity, which is always changing.

[5] These included variations on the following: ("teacher education" OR "teacher preparation" OR "pre-service") AND (LGBT*); ("teacher education" OR "teacher preparation" OR "pre-service") AND queer; ("teacher education" OR "teacher preparation" OR "pre-service") AND (lesbian OR gay OR bisexual OR transgender OR "sexual diversity"); ("teacher education" OR "teacher preparation" OR "pre-service") AND ("gender diversity" OR transgender OR transsexual OR intersex).

[6] These were the *Teaching and Teacher Education, Journal of Teacher Education, The Teacher Educator, Journal of Education for Teaching, Studying Teacher Education, European Journal of Teacher Education, Action in Teacher Education, Teacher Development, Teacher Education Quarterly, Teachers and Teaching,* and *Teaching Education.*

[7] Chapters in Kissen (2002) and Taylor and Coia (2014a,b) are not counted separately in the book chapter tally; chapters in the tally are in otherwise unrelated books.

[8] By 'pre-service' teacher education we mean either undergraduate (e.g., Bachelor of Education) or graduate (e.g., Master of Teaching) programs that provide initial preparation for students who are not yet formally teaching in schools. By 'in-service' teacher education we mean professional development for experienced teachers, and by 'school leader education' we mean (usually) graduate-level and practice-focused programs for educators who wish to be principals or administrators. Our review exclusively focused on pre-service teacher education.

Table 1
Pedagogical approaches.

Pedagogical approach	Source	Location	Level	Course Topic
Reading children's and young adult literature	Dedeoglu et al. (2012)	Turkey		children's literature
	Hermann-Wilmarth (2007)	USA	N/A	children's literature
	Hermann-Wilmarth (2010)	USA	E	children's literature
	Parsons (2015)	USA		young adult literature
	Phillips and Larson (2012)	USA	U	children's literature
	Schieble (2012)	USA	E	children's literature
	Wolfe (2006)	USA	early childhood	various
	Mason (2010)	USA	S	N/A
	Copenhaver-Johnson (2010)	USA	G	DESF
	King and Brindley (2002)	USA	U, E	seminar
Inviting LGBTQ guest speakers	Athanases and Larrabee (2003)	USA	U	DESF
	Bresser (2002)	USA	U, G	DESF ('human relations')
	Curran et al. (2009)	Australia	E	
	Dykes (2010)	USA	N/A	special education
	Eyre (1993)	Canada	E, S	physical education methods
	Fifield and Swain (2002)	USA		science methods
	Goldstein (1997)	Canada	S	
	Goldstein et al. (2007)	Canada	N/A	N/A
	Grace and Wells (2006)	Canada	N/A	N/A
	Hall (2006)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Kissen (1993)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Lipkin (2002)	USA		GSDTE module
	McDermott and Marty (1983)	USA	E, S	human sexuality
	Mulhern and Martinez (1999)	USA	U, E	various
	Pendleton Jiménez (2002)	Canada	U	DESF
	Staley and Leonardi (2016)	USA	S	language arts methods
	Turnbull and Hilton (2010)	Canada		GSDTE module
	Wolfe (2006)	USA	early childhood	various
Doing fieldwork or (leading) professional development	Gutierez-Schmich and Heffernan (2016)	USA	U, G	GSDTE
	Letts (2002)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Lipkin (2002)	USA		GSDTE module
	Crocco (2002)	USA	G	gender and sexuality-focused social studies
	Schmidt et al. (2012)	USA	U	DESF
	Williamson and Williams (1990)	USA	U	physical education methods
Reading LGBTQ-themed fiction and non-fiction	Athanases and Larrabee (2003)	USA	U	DESF
	Clark (2010a, 2010b)	USA	G, S	language arts
	Elsbree and Wong (2008)	USA	E, S	various
	Grace and Wells (2006)	Canada	N/A	N/A
	Kissen (1993)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Miller (1999)	USA		DESF
	North (2010)	USA	E	social studies methods
	O'Malley, Hoyt, and Slattery (2009)	USA		DESF
	Petrovic and Rosiek (2003)	USA		
	Riggs, Rosenthal, and Smith-Bonahue (2011)	USA		N/A
	Sadowski (2010)	USA	G	various
	Schmidt et al. (2012)	USA	U	DESF
	Sumara et al. (2006)	USA	S	language arts
	Swartz (2003a)	USA	U	children's or young adult literature
	Swartz (2003b)	USA	U	children's literature
	Vavrus (2009)	USA	G	GSDTE module
	Mulhern and Martinez (1999)	USA	U, E	various
Brainstorming and gathering TC prior knowledge or assumptions about gender and sexual diversity	Barozzi (2015)	Spain	E, S	English as a Foreign Language
	Barozzi and Ojeda (2014)	Spain	E	English as a Foreign Language
	Barozzi and Ojeda (2016)	Spain	E	English as a Foreign Language
	Bower and Sature (2011)	USA	U, E	
	Davis and Kellinger (2014)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Gard (2002)	USA		physical education methods
	Kintner-Duffy et al. (2012)	USA	U, early childhood	GSDTE
	Kissen (1993)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Petrovic and Rosiek (2003)	USA		
	Riggs et al. (2011)	USA		N/A
	Schmidt et al. (2012)	USA	U	DESF
	Turnbull and Hilton (2010)	Canada		GSDTE module
	Vavrus (2009)	USA	G	GSDTE module
	Kitchen and Bellini (2012a)	Canada	U, S	GSDTE module
	Kitchen and Bellini (2012b)	Canada	U, S	GSDTE module

Table 1 (*continued*)

Pedagogical approach	Source	Location	Level	Course Topic
Scenarios, role plays, or simulations (acting or analyzing)	Williamson and Williams (1990)	USA	U	physical education methods
	Barozzi (2015)	Spain	E, S	English as a Foreign Language
	Benson et al. (2014)	Canada	N/A	workshop for queer TCs
	Darvin (2011)	USA	G, E	literacy
	Goldstein (2004)	Canada	U	various
	Kearns et al. (2014)	Canada	U	GSDTE module
	Kissen (1993)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Sykes and Goldstein (2004)	Canada	U, E	GSDTE
	Kitchen and Bellini (2012a)	Canada	U, S	GSDTE module
	Kitchen and Bellini (2012b)	Canada	U, S	GSDTE module
	King and Brindley (2002)	USA	U, E	seminar
Guiding TCs in self-reflective writing on their own identities, memories or related understandings	Conley (2005)	USA	G, early childhood	DESF
	Copenhaver-Johnson (2010)	USA	G	DESF
	Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, and Tompkins (2017)	Canada	U	GSDTE module
	Koerner and Hulsebosch (1996)	USA	N/A	GSDTE module
	Letts (2002)	USA	N/A	N/A
	Oesterreich (2002)	USA		DESF, social studies methods
	Robinson and Ferfolja (2001)	Australia	U	DESF
	Sanlo (2002)	USA	U	DESF
	Sarmiento and Vasquez (2010)	USA	E	literacy
	Simone (2002)	USA		DESF
	Vavrus (2009)	USA	G	GSDTE module
	Crocco (2002)	USA	G	gender and sexuality-focused social studies
Screening the video *It's Elementary* (Chasnoff and Cohen (1996)	Clark (2010a, 2010b)	USA	G, S	language arts
	Bresser (2002)	USA	U, G	DESF ('human relations')
	Goldstein (2004)	Canada	U	various
	Hermann-Wilmarth (2007)	USA	N/A	children's literature
	Kearns et al. (2014)	Canada	U	GSDTE module
	Miller (1999)	USA		DESF
	Mulhern and Martinez (1999)	USA	U, E	various
	Pendleton Jiménez (2002)	Canada	U	DESF
	Petrovic and Rosiek (2003)	USA		
	Riggs (2001)	USA		N/A
	Riggs et al. (2011)	USA		N/A
	Sanlo (2002)	USA	U	DESF
	Swartz (2003a)	USA	U	children's or young adult literature
	Swartz (2003b)	USA	U	children's literature
	C. Taylor (2002)	Canada		
	Wolfe (2006)	USA	early childhood	various
	Clark (2010a, 2010b)	USA	G, S	language arts
	Copenhaver-Johnson (2010)	USA	G	DESF

E: elementary, S: secondary, G: graduate, U: undergraduate.
DESF: diversity, equity and/or social foundations.
GSDTE module: separate unit, workshop or training.
N/A: not applicable *blank*: unclear or unavailable.

In a relatively recent article, Schmidt et al. (2012) offer an observation on GSDTE that has held true for other commentators over the years (Goldstein et al., 2007; Szalacha, 2004). Although "specific terminology varies across authors, the literature generally suggests three paradigms through which teacher education redresses heteronormativity: tolerance, acceptance, and queerness/criticality" (p. 2). Furthermore, "the tolerance and acceptance paradigms dominate" (p. 2). While we observe that queer theory approaches to GSDTE are becoming more common (see subsequent section), we can corroborate these observations that the overarching goal espoused in the GSDTE literature is to foster tolerance and acceptance of particular gender and sexual minority people. As we discuss in the interpretive section of the essay, however, we believe this to be a very different goal from disrupting how gender and sexual rigidity circumscribe the lives and life chances of all people in schools, in various ways and to varying degrees.

Indeed, the 'gender and sexual diversity' in our GSDTE acronym indexes our interest in approaches to pre-service teacher education that seek to trouble or expand traditional ways of living and doing gender and sexuality. While our own use of the phrase 'gender and sexual diversity' exceeds how these diversities are currently coded along identity lines (or as particular gender and sexual minority people e.g., those falling under the LGBTQIA + umbrella), carrying out this kind of review requires the use of search tools that depend on gender and sexual minority terminology. Much of the educational research literature on 'gender' uses that term synonymously for girls and women, and often without a theoretical framework, and there is much 'sexuality' literature that takes up sexual health education alone. These difficulties are apparent from the Boolean operators that we used in our search (included in a prior footnote). We offer this less as a limitation and more as a puzzle on how to bring together and speak productively across scholarship on our topic of interest – approaches to pre-service teacher education that seek to trouble or expand traditional ways of living and doing gender and sexuality, as above – without relying on particular identitarian subjects. This dilemma re-appears and is discussed in places across the essay, most notably in the conclusion.

Table 2
Methodological approaches.

Methodological approach	Sources
Mixed-methods	Barozzi (2015), Benson et al. (2014), Kearns et al. (2017), Kitchen and Bellini (2012a, 2012b)
Qualitative: Analyzing assignments	Barozzi and Ojeda (2016), Bower and Sature (2011), Conley (2005),Copenhaver-Johnson (2010), Crocco (2002), Darvin (2011), Kearns et al. (2014), McEntarfer (2016), Parsons (2015), Petrovic and Rosiek (2003), Phillips and Larson (2012), Sadowski (2010), Staley and Leonardi (2016), Swartz (2003b), Sykes and Goldstein (2004), Vavrus (2009), Williamson and Williams (1990)
Qualitative: Analyzing classroom dialogue	Conley (2005), Hermann-Wilmarth (2010), Hyland (2010), McEntarfer (2016), Schmidt et al. (2012), Schmidt et al. (2012), Staley and Leonardi (2016), Hermann-Wilmarth (2010), Mason (2010), Schieble (2012), Schmidt et al. (2012), Staley and Leonardi (2016),Wolfe (2006)
Qualitative: Analyzing TCs' written feedback	Athanases and Larrabee (2003), Curran et al. (2009), Eyre (1993), Geasler, Croteau, Heineman, and Edlund (1995), Goldstein (1997), Sanlo (2002), Wolfe (2006)
Qualitative: Focus groups	Barozzi (2015), Barozzi and Ojeda (2014, 2016), Hermann-Wilmarth and Bills (2010), Kearns et al. (2014), Pendleton Jiménez (2002), Zack, Mannheim, and Alfano (2010)
Qualitative: Interviews with TCs	Benson et al. (2014), Bower and Sature (2011), Clark (2010a, 2010b), Crocco (2002), Darvin (2011), Elsbree and Wong (2008), Goldstein (2004), Kearns et al. (2017), Kintner-Duffy et al. (2012), McEntarfer (2016), Sumara et al. (2006), Sumara et al. (2006)
Qualitative: Observation	Barozzi (2015), Conley (2005), Crocco (2002), Darvin (2011), Goldstein (2004), Phillips and Larson (2012), Sumara et al. (2006)
Qualitative: Practitioner narrative	Copenhaver-Johnson (2010), Curran et al. (2009), Davis and Kellinger (2014), Eyre (1993), Fifield and Swain (2002), Goldstein (1997), Gutierez-Schmich and Heffernan (2016), Hermann-Wilmarth (2010), King and Brindley (2002), Lipkin (2002), McDermott and Marty (1983), Mulhern and Martinez (1999), Oesterreich (2002), Parsons (2015), Pendleton Jiménez (2002), Robinson and Ferfolja (2001), Sanlo (2002), Sarmiento and Vasquez (2010), Simone (2002), Sykes and Goldstein (2004), C. Taylor (2002)
Qualitative: Self-study	Conley (2005), Conley and Colabucci (2009), Davis and Kellinger (2014) Mulhern and Martinez (1999), Wolfe (2006), chapters in M. Taylor & Coia (2014a)
Quantitative: Measuring changes in self-reported TC attitudes or beliefs	Barozzi (2015), Bateman (1995), Bresser (2002), Dedeoglu et al. (2012), Fischer (1982), K. L. Butler (1994), Koch (2000), Larrabee and Kim (2010), Maddux (1989), Milburn and Palladino (2012), Morgan (2003), P. Taylor (2001), Riggs (2001), Riggs et al. (2011), Riggs et al. (2011), Sears (1992)
Quantitative: Pre- and/or post- surveys	Benson et al. (2014), Clark (2010a, 2010b), Kearns et al. (2017), Kintner-Duffy et al. (2012)

Table 3
Theoretical approaches.

Theoretical approach	Sources
Anti-oppressive education	Clark (2010a, 2010b), Elsbree and Wong (2008), Goldstein (2004), Gutierez-Schmich and Heffernan (2016), Kearns et al. (2014), Staley and Leonardi (2016)
Critical pedagogy	Barozzi (2015), Bedford (2002), Conley (2005), Darvin (2011), Hermann-Wilmarth (2010), Hermann-Wilmarth (2010), Mulhern and Martinez (1999), Sarmiento and Vasquez (2010), Simone (2002), Vavrus (2009)
Feminist theory	Conley (2005), Elsbree (2002), Eyre (1993), Hermann-Wilmarth and Bills (2010), Letts (2002), Oesterreich (2002), Sykes and Goldstein (2004)
Foucault	Curran et al. (2009), Ferfolja and Robinson (2004), Hyland (2010), North (2010), Phillips and Larson (2012), Robinson and Ferfolja (2001), Sumara et al. (2006), Sykes and Goldstein (2004), Turnbull and Hilton (2010), Wickens and Sandlin (2010)
Multicultural education	Athanases and Larrabee (2003), Bresser (2002), Conley (2005), Elsbree and Wong (2008), King and Brindley (2002), Koerner and Hulsebosch (1996), Vavrus (2009)
Psychoanalysis	Britzman (1995), Britzman and Gilbert (2004), Kintner-Duffy et al. (2012), Mcconaghy (2004), Sumara (2008), Sumara et al. (2006), C. Taylor (2002)
Queer theory	Athanases and Larrabee (2003), Atkinson and DePalma (2008a, 2008b), Barozzi (2015), Barozzi and Ojeda (2014, 2016), Bower and Sature (2011), Clark (2010a, 2010b), Curran et al. (2009), Elsbree and Wong (2008), Fifield and Swain (2002), Goldstein et al. (2007), Hermann-Wilmarth and Bills (2010), Kitchen and Bellini (2012b), Kuzmic (2014), Letts (2002), MacIntosh (2007), McEntarfer (2013, 2016), Murray (2011, 2015), O'Malley et al. (2009), Rasmussen et al. (2007), Robinson and Ferfolja (2008), Schieble (2012), Schmidt et al. (2012), Staley and Leonardi (2016), Vavrus (2009), Whitlock (2010), Zavalkoff (2002)

In what follows, we offer a descriptive overview of the reviewed literature, with findings grouped into the following categories: pedagogical approaches to integrating gender and sexual diversity, methodological approaches used to study this integration, and theoretical approaches to both pedagogy and research. In each section, we provide a table in order to encourage others' use of our findings for further research and analysis.

3.1. Pedagogical approaches

The GSDTE literature is first and foremost an archive of pedagogical approaches that teacher educators have used to integrate gender and sexual diversity into their work with beginning teachers. The table below sets out the most common approaches in the literature, with additional information on location, level (undergraduate, graduate, elementary or secondary, as available) and any information we could glean as to the topic of the course in which

that pedagogical approach was reportedly used or recommended by the author.[9] A legend follows the table for ease of reading.

While the table is extensive, it has two limitations the reader should note. First, the table privileges clearly set-out and intentional moments in the classroom, planned by the teacher educator in advance. We want to flag that discussion of pedagogically significant yet more organic moments are also present in the literature, but not in the table (e.g., Hyland, 2010; Jennings, 2015; Kumashiro, 2004). Second, the table is not well-suited to complex

---

[9] Please note that the pedagogical approaches table does not include all 158 sources. Rather, it includes sources that centered pedagogy. Some sources (e.g., Atkinson & DePalma, 2008a, 2008b; Berrill & Martino, 2002) approached GSDTE as research site to study TCs but without focussing on pedagogy. Also, if a study focused on TC beliefs, attitudes or attitudes without a pedagogical 'intervention' conducted under the auspices of the study itself, (e.g., Baldwin, 2002; Brant, 2014b) it was not included in the table.

and multi-method studies such as the dissertations and subsequent books published by Murray (2011, 2015) and McEntarfer (2013, 2016). Taken together, this work goes into the greatest depth in the reviewed literature in terms of studying particular GSDTE courses and their impact on TCs.

Many of the strategies in the table aim to generate empathy and encourage TC perspective-taking in relation to future pupils who might be non-heterosexual, gender non-conforming, and/or on the transgender spectrum. Of particular note is screening the documentary film *It's Elementary* (Chasnoff & Cohen, 1996) in class.[10] This film depicts teachers and principals across the United States discussing lesbian and gay issues with students in elementary schools in the 1990s, and is suggested or referenced *seventeen* times. We recommend that further study be devoted to how this and other 'canonical' texts of GSDTE have been used by teacher educators, as well as what sort of impact these texts are having in the teacher education classroom and on the direction of the field.

Interspersed among these predominant approaches are some less common ones, as follows. In an introductory GSDTE course, O'Malley et al. (2009) laid the groundwork for subsequent sessions on the experiences of gender or sexual minority K-12 students by discussing heterosexual marriage and courtship: "we find that this lecture actually helps to advance our goal of establishing trust with students who are preoccupied with dating and marriage issues" (p. 102). Goldstein's (2007; Sykes & Goldstein, 2004) pedagogy of performed ethnography incorporates plays written from Goldstein's ethnographic research on the challenges faced by transnational and structurally-diverse LGBTQ families, inviting TCs to step into others' shoes by acting or witnessing. Zavalkoff (2002) brings queer theory and queer culture directly to bear on pedagogy, deploying a continuum of 'subversive drag performance' to lead TCs in reckoning with the visual and relational character of gender. The continuum provides "an analytical lens through which to evaluate the material consequences of people's gendered and sexualized performances" (p. 246), whether they be drag queens, K-12 pupils or TCs themselves.

Another less common pedagogy is to have TCs take on the role of teacher-activists, educators and leaders themselves. The final assignment in Crocco's (2002) standalone GSDTE course consisted of creating "plans for three 2-h faculty development workshops for a hypothetical school setting of students' own creation" (p. 226). Lipkin's (2002) sexual diversity course has TCs "observe and evaluate a school-based anti-homophobia project" (p. 24) using the conceptual framework developed throughout the course as a guide. Lipkin asks TCs to do fieldwork and interviews at schools, school board offices, gay straight alliances and satellite educational organizations. Gutierez-Schmich and Heffernan (2016) offer the concept of public pedagogy as a tool in GSDTE, providing TCs with opportunities to bridge the gap between teacher education and public engagement through field activities such as visiting high school gay straight alliances, helping to plan a queer prom, and hosting school assemblies and public lectures. In their courses, TCs are asked to reflect on the ways that their experiences engaging with the public affected their own identity development, their professional development, and public discourse on LGBTQIA + issues. Murray (2015) describes a fieldwork assignment in which TCs are asked to interview teachers or principals about gender and sexual diversity in their school, and another which asks TCs to conduct observations in a classroom or other educational setting — videotaping if possible — and analyse their own observations for the presence or absence of ideas around gender and sexual diversity.

Overall, the range of strategies discussed informs teacher educator readers about a variety of pedagogical approaches, and demonstrates the possibility, albeit often also the difficulty, of doing GSDTE work. In assembling this overview, we hope that teacher education researchers can study and connect to other research on specific GSDTE pedagogies so that these diverse approaches can each be given their analytical due.

3.2. Methodological approaches

Studies on GSDTE feature a variety of research methods, as shown in Table 2, most of which have been used to ascertain the impact or 'success' of the above pedagogies on TCs. Different notions of 'success' are in circulation, however, as will be discussed later on. Quantitative studies have tended to measure changes in self-reported TC attitudes or beliefs, usually before and after an 'intervention' such as an LGBTQIA + speaker presentation. Qualitative studies have use methods like interviewing TCs, analyzing their assignments, recording and studying classroom dialogue, and less often, conducting focus groups or action research projects. These qualitative studies generally combine multiple methods (e.g., interviews with TCs *and* assignment analysis), and are altogether more recent than the quantitative studies. The emerging preponderance of qualitative work in GSDTE is replacing the two formerly dominant practices of either analyzing quantitative data on attitudinal changes or offering anecdotal practitioner narratives. Regarding the latter, Taylor and Coia's (2014a) recent edited collection of self-studies of GSDTE practice is an effort to move beyond the anecdotal in practitioners reporting on their own pedagogy.

There has been ongoing meta-level discussion in the GSDTE literature on the kind of research necessary to grow the field, and we find that the 'paradigm wars' (see Anderson & Herr, 1999; Lather, 2004) between post-positivism and constructivism in educational research are most certainly in evidence in GSDTE.[11] In concluding a prior review of GSDTE, Szalacha (2004) insisted that the responsibility of GSDTE practitioners is not only pedagogical but also entails conducting research on the effects — short-term and longitudinal — of our pedagogy. The 'our' is, however, tenuous. Wilson (1998) found no consensus on how to teach educators about sexual diversity but, preceding Szalacha (2004), also called for objective, empirical and longitudinal research on GSDTE outcomes in order to 'find what works.' Wilson controversially suggested that such research "be done by persons who are able to remain completely detached from the study and its results" (p. 9). Pivotally, this would undermine any 'first-person' approach including self-study (Kitchen & Bellini, 2012b; Taylor & Coia, 2014a) and also presumes that detachment is at all possible in GSDTE, which is most certainly up for debate (see Benson, 2008; Pendleton Jiménez, 2002). Wilson (1998) and Szalacha's (2004) prescriptions for improving the GSDTE research base diametrically oppose the suggestion made by Hermann-Wilmarth and Bills (2010) and others that queer educational research may involve leaving prefabricated questions behind and following the trail of queerness wherever it leads in educational life.

Based on our review of the GSDTE literature, we offer our ambivalent agreement with Szalacha (2004) and can report that

---

[10] For discussion of similar empathy-generating films used by GSDTE practitioners in other contexts, see Richardson (2008) in South Africa and Mcconaghy (2004) in Australia.

[11] An illustration of (and productive/positive response to) the paradigmatic conflict is the decision in 2016 by the Queer Studies in Education Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association — an international disciplinary hub for work of this kind — to have two 'tracks' in their submissions: one for queer theoretical work, and one for work on LGBTQIA + people in schools.

the identified lack of longitudinal or follow-up studies of GSDTE has persisted. We are ambivalent because the necessity or even the possibility of longitudinal work in this area is itself a paradigmatic assertion that gender and sexual diversity can stand still long enough to be consistent indicators of teacher 'effectiveness' across time. In the broader field of social justice teacher education — composed of teacher educators who teach diversity, equity or social justice courses or related content in teacher education (see Airton, 2014a,b) — the problem of assessing effectiveness with reference to down-the-line outcomes like K-12 pupil learning (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Grant & Secada, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1995) has been a topic of continuous engagement for decades. We are skeptical that GSDTE practitioners must follow TCs into their future classrooms to ascertain if our work was 'successful,' and also encourage agnosticism in relation to what that 'success' might mean. Berrill and Martino (2002) are similarly ambivalent: "although it is important to stress that as teacher educators we cannot transform the homophobic and heterosexist cultures of schools, what we can do is provide our students with a theoretical framework for understanding how they have been formed and how they fashion themselves as particular kinds of individuals" (p. 67). This begs the question of whether TC *learning* — read: conscious, sayable and accessible to evaluation — is necessarily the outcome or object of study engaged by GSDTE researchers. Theoretical and paradigmatic objections notwithstanding, the existence of over three decades of GSDTE scholarship suggests that there is an opportunity for follow-up of some kind, but that the ontological and epistemological implications of following up remain — and ought to remain — uncertain. Considering what is particular about GSDTE relative to other social justice efforts in teacher education – or whether GSDTE is a 'social justice effort' at all – bears further thinking.

3.3. Theoretical approaches

This brings us to common theoretical approaches to GSDTE scholarship, as shown in Table 3 below. We did not perform a deep analysis of each article's purported use of theory, but took authors' claims of a particular theoretical framework at face value. Subsequent research should explore how the 'same body of theory' is differently deployed among GSDTE studies that claim the same theoretical approach.

In the reviewed literature, queer theory is dominant, although "[it] is only in the last decade or so that teacher educators have more readily used queer theory as a means to conceptualize and question the field of teacher education" (Taylor & Coia, 2014b, p. 20). Other approaches in circulation include feminist theory, critical pedagogy, psychoanalysis, and explicit citation of Michel Foucault (as opposed to more general invocations of queer theory to which Foucault's work is foundational). While queer theory is ascendant, however, some authors have articulated concerns as to the value of queer deconstructive approaches for a practical endeavour like GSDTE: "while examination of the social construction of [lesbian and gay] identities may further students' conceptual understanding of limitations binding all of us by a cultural insistence on heteronormativity, the focus of such a discussion may not provide future teachers with practical skills they will need in the classroom" (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003, p. 256; see also; Jennings & Sherwin, 2008; for an opposing view see; Cosier & Sanders, 2007; Lipkin,

2002). Rasmussen et al. (2007) suggest one way to bridge this gap in their critique of *The Heterosexual Questionnaire*.[12] The *Questionnaire* is a popular deconstructive pedagogical tool that uses humour to trouble heteronormativity. The *Questionnaire* asks heterosexuals questions they are (presumably) never asked about their sexuality but which are commonly received by openly non-heterosexual people (e.g., "when did you first realize you were heterosexual?"). Rasmussen et al. suggest that such pedagogies are limited by an assumption of the "capacity of students and teachers to engage in the process of deconstruction" (p. 106) and by positioning the facilitator as "somehow more self-reflexive than those who 'fail' to get the joke" (p. 110). Rather, they argue that "there is credence in making queer pedagogical devices more explicit" (p. 111). As such, queer theoretical approaches are both common and contested. This contestation may be unsurprising given our initial observation that the field generally seeks to foster empathy for gender and sexual minority *people*, as opposed to foregrounding the deconstruction of gender and sexual *norms* blighting all school constituents to varying degrees.

3.4. Two meta-level findings: justification and citation

In addition to the above pedagogical, methodological, and theoretical patterns, our review yielded two meta-level findings on how literature is used in GSDTE. The first pertains to how scholars construct research problems, or, how they seek to justify a piece of writing and its contribution. The second is a rather monastic tendency of GSDTE to citationally separate itself from relevant teacher education scholarship that is 'not about gender or sexuality.' We describe each of these findings in turn.

The early GSDTE literature (1980s and 1990s) relied almost exclusively on psychological studies of homophobic attitudes and their harmful effects on non-heterosexual people, reflecting the need to justify the initial integration of gender and sexual diversity content in teacher education. Although this singular reliance has receded over time, we find that studies revealing the negative school experiences of LGBTQIA + youth (e.g., Bochenek & Brown, 2001; Kosciw, Diaz, & Greytak, 2008) *constitute the most commonly referenced body of scholarship across all sources, exceeding even GSDTE's own well-developed scholarship*. At least 53 sources grounded their research problem in studies of gender and sexual minority youth experiences in schools, but made no substantive connections to teacher education at all. In addition, LGBTQIA + youth victimization studies often 'headline' a source i.e., are cited at the very beginning in marquee fashion.

This citational dominance is problematic for several reasons. First, we share Lipkin's (2002) concern about the "habitual reliance on victimization statistics" (p. 23), the worry being that although "our victim strategy succeeds in cultivating sympathy among potential teacher allies … it is easy to get stuck" (p. 24) in the expectation of queer and/or transgender people as necessarily victimized (see also Airton, 2013; MacIntosh, 2007; Talburt & Rasmussen, 2010). In particular relation to trans people, this practice obscures what Raha (2017) has called "the stratification of livable trans and gender-nonconforming lives along the lines of race, class, gender, dis/ability, nationality, and migration status" (p. 633) in which some (white, middle-class, transmasculine) trans lives are becoming rapidly more livable and other (racialized, working class or poor, transfeminine) lives are becoming rapidly less livable.

Our second objection to this citation practice in GSDTE is that *the literature on queer and/or transgender student victimization is not a body of literature on teaching teachers to work against its continuation.* We argue that findings on the latter ought to be situated alongside similar findings in order to develop a robust research

---

[12] *The Heterosexual Questionnaire* is available in many places online, including the website of the USA-based organization Advocates for Youth: http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/for-professionals/lesson-plans-professionals/223?task=view. Advocates for Youth attribute the original development of the Questionnaire to Martin Rochlin in January 1977.

base. As an illustration, we found 26 reviewed sources in which authors *exclusively* cited the LGBTQIA + youth victimization literature with no reference whatsoever to prior GSDTE scholarship. This may contribute to the ubiquity of incorrect[13] claims such as Baldwin's (2002) that "very little research has focussed on preservice teachers' preparation for dealing with LGBT equity issues" (p. 32). Although refutable even in the early 2000s, Baldwin's claim is exemplary of many others. In the tradition of queer theory we are curious about what such claims are doing. What purpose is served by GSDTE claiming its own underdevelopment and perennial minoritarian status against the evidence?

Another meta-level finding of our review relates to the above citational reliance on LGBTQIA + youth experiences: a long-term disconnect of GSDTE from broader teacher education scholarship (exceptions include Donahue, 2008; Simone, 2002; Sumara et al., 2006). Teacher education scholars who do not necessarily engage gender and sexuality nevertheless produce findings relevant to GSDTE, including how TCs relate course content to practicum experiences and the development of teacher knowledge, skills and dispositions. Although beyond the scope of this essay, it is likely also true that GSDTE scholarship is not widely cited in the broader teacher education literature, as is suggested by a lack of gender and sexuality integration in teacher education 'diversity courses' (King & Brindley, 2002; Macgillivray & Jennings, 2008; Mathison, 1998). Letts (2002) goes so far as to decry multicultural education's treatment of minoritized sexualities as "'thin,' if not emaciated" (p. 120; see also Gorski, Davis, & Reiter, 2013; Gorski & Goodman, 2011). While some GSDTE scholars have indeed begun to situate their work in conversation with foundational scholarship on social justice teacher education (e.g., Bower & Sature, 2011; Darvin, 2011; Hansen, 2015; Hyland, 2010; Mitton-Kukner et al., 2016), however, mutual integration remains an area of development for GSDTE.

4. Interpretive overview of the reviewed literature

Having set out the more descriptive findings in the preceding section, the remainder of the essay is devoted to interpretive engagements with the reviewed body of GSDTE literature. This section is organized around three questions: relevance or what 'counts' as gender and sexual diversity integration in teacher education, outcome or what is 'good' GSDTE, and object or what (who?) is gender and sexual diversity? In providing some answers of our own alongside answers from the reviewed literature, we aim to open a space for thinking broadly about what it means to do, study and, ultimately, envision this work going forward.

4.1. Relevance: what 'counts' as GSDTE?

What 'counts' as GSDTE, or, what must happen in class for a teacher educator to know and assert that they have done something about gender and sexual diversity? Conversely, what does *not* 'count' as GSDTE? For example, university faculty, teacher educators among them, are and have been queer and/or transgender people whose struggles for safety, belonging and academic freedom have preceded the emergence of gender and sexual diversity into the official curriculum of higher education (Benson, 2008; Casper, Cuffaro, Schultz, Silin, & Wickens, 1996; D'Augelli, 1989; Whitlock, 2010). While we can assume that the presence of gender

and sexual minority people in faculties of education has impacted beginning teachers, does this 'count' as GSDTE? We also do not doubt that 'teacher education' on or about gender and sexual diversity — in any of its guises — 'happens' without the familiar markers of what GSDTE has come to be in the present, and that it most certainly 'happened' prior to the publication of Fischer's (1982) dissertation on changing the attitudes of teachers toward homosexuality. That McDermott and Marty (1983) invited "students representing the gay community [to] examine attitudes about homosexuality" (p. 8) with TCs in a human sexuality course seems incredible given that this article appears long before the field of GSDTE would begin to emerge with any coherence. But that article is 'the first' because it could be accessed through language-based literature search methods and using terminology that has come to be associated with contemporary iterations of 'gender and sexual diversity'. While language is needed to carry out a literature review, what else is or was happening that is *also* 'GSDTE' in a less representational (in language) fashion? We argue that this 'what else' does appear fleetingly across the GSDTE literature under review here, and we will highlight a few instances.

First, King and Brindley (2002) insist that we need to give TCs tools as practical as how to seek and foster parental consent to curriculum or resource inclusion, where applicable, including how to refine an oral script for this purpose. Sadowski (2010) points out that, because some TCs must argue for including LGBTQIA + issues in their teaching, they should be taught general argumentation skills. Kluth and Colleary (2002) recommend fostering TCs' advocacy skills so that they can assist students and parents in navigating the education system (see also Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Dykes, 2010). While not ostensibly 'about' gender and sexual diversity, do these practical skills 'count' as GSDTE outcomes? If teacher candidates emerge from their program with these skills but not, say a facility with LGBTQIA + terminology, has GSDTE happened?

A capacity to tolerate uncertainty (Todd, 2008) can be honed in teacher education, and may help TCs encounter differences of many kinds, whether those of gender and sexual minorities or, pivotally, themselves as ever-changing gendered and sexual beings. To this end, preparing TCs to tolerate uncertainty is a practical skill found across the GSDTE literature. Reflecting on his own prior practice of providing 'accurate' and stable knowledge of sexual minorities to TCs, Kumashiro (2004) suggests "that we prepare teachers to be a lot less certain about what and how they are teaching, and to view this uncertainty as a useful element of teaching and learning" (p. 113; see also North, 2010). Kumashiro suggests teaching a quintessential anti-homophobia lesson and then working through the gaps in the lesson in order to de-centre the appearance of the teacher educator's own certainty. This pedagogy promotes a provisional approach to knowledge which is important for remaining open to the other's difference (see also Sumara, 2008), but is not instruction on teaching about gender and sexuality, or meeting the needs of LGBTQIA + students. GSDTE narratives of 'failure' (Copenhaver-Johnson, 2010; Hermann-Wilmarth & Bills, 2010; Hyland, 2010; Mcconaghy, 2004; Simone, 2002) — usually in the face of student resistance (Britzman, 1995; Clark, 2010a; Curran et al., 2009; Eyre, 1993; King & Brindley, 2002; Miller, 1999; Mills, 2004; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001, 2002) — encourage teacher educators to model our own contingency and uncertainty in this work, including when our pedagogical intentions and outcomes become other than what we had in mind.

Letts (2002) advocates strategies such as autobiographical writing about 'troubling' times in a TC's schooling history, a critical incident paper recalling a moment when the difference of another was realized, and a 'cultural plunge' wherein TCs enter and write about an unfamiliar situation. Gutierez-Schmich and Heffernan (2016) ask TCs to engage in and reflect on behaviours that

---

[13] We have located 35 sources published prior to Baldwin's dissertation. Differing conceptions of 'research' may in this case have contributed to our different findings. Regardless, Baldwin's only GSDTE citation is of Sears (1992), even though the ten years in between Sears and Baldwin's dissertation had seen an outpouring of relevant scholarship.

(correctly or incorrectly) publicly mark them as queer, such as wearing a gay pride lanyard. Such approaches are queer in the sense of queer *theory* — they evoke uncertainty, contingency and fluidity — but not in the sense of queer *people*. Being able to encounter ourselves as strangers (Moisio, 2009) is a queer skill indeed. But if this is what TCs take away with them, can we say that they have experienced GSDTE? How can these approaches be studied alongside GSDTE approaches that foreground K-12 gender and sexual minority students?

In addition to developing various practical skills and developing a tolerance for uncertainty, other rumblings around the edges of explicit 'gender and sexual diversity integration' appear in the reviewed literature. Gard (2002) writes from physical and health education, suggesting that teacher educators foreground bodily pleasure in movement with TCs as opposed to emphasizing competition and goal-setting. Here, GSDTE "might mean helping students to see scientific knowledge about the human body as unstable, partial, and highly political" (p. 54). Robinson and Ferfolja (2008) insist on the importance of deconstructing, with TCs, "hegemonic discourses of childhood and 'childhood innocence' … in order to acknowledge how these concepts are socio-cultural historical discursive constructions rather than 'fixed' and 'natural' components of human development" (p. 856; see also Curran et al., 2009, p. 165).

Pivotally, the authors we have highlighted in this section suggest queer theoretical frameworks for TE pedagogy, implicitly arguing that GSDTE need not only address 'how to do something for or about gender and sexual minorities' in schools. Some even scale back from gender and sexuality altogether and take up relations of difference and sameness more broadly (Jennings, 2015; North, 2010). We agree that learning to de-centre one's own understanding is of great importance for the kind of work attempted by GSDTE practitioners. As Britzman and Gilbert (2004) ask, "what if difference cannot be assimilated into pre-existing understandings, if there is nothing to understand at all" (pp. 81–82)? Our ultimate question to the field about GSDTE 'about-ness,' then, is whether a particular course, lesson or activity was 'GSDTE' if TCs did not recognize at the time that GSDTE was taking place.

4.2. Outcome: what is 'good' GSDTE?

The question of 'good or successful GSDTE' is also diffusely answered across the reviewed literature. Some 'goodness' is affective in the sense of feeling. Gard (2002) suggests that "what represents 'success' in teacher education is not a straightforward matter. … I take 'success' to mean class experiences that 'felt good,' where discussions among my students were lively and thoughtful and where students later talked about thinking differently about [gender and sexuality] issues" (p. 55). Similarly, O'Malley et al. (2009) find success when they "create an atmosphere that encourages the expression of multiple viewpoints and autobiographical experiences in affirming tones" (p. 96). Through an analysis of TCs' autoethnographic narratives, Vavrus (2009) found his pedagogy to have helped TCs "feel more *comfortable* and confident about facing rather than ignoring the pain young people can regularly experience" (p. 389; added emphasis). Conversely, though still affective, McEntarfer (2016) reports success when her students experience a marked *discomfort* upon encountering their own internalization of heteronormativity through a narrative writing activity. The presence of affective gauges for 'good GSDTE' is both common and an object of suspicion in the GSDTE literature. Can 'success' be ascertained by the quality of the experiences in our own classrooms, or is the barometer always somewhere down the line: in TCs' future classrooms where gender and sexual diversity are or are not flourishing (see Airton, 2009)? Or, might our own

sense of GSDTE 'success' be found down the line in colleagues' responses to our published work? For example, Kitchen (2014) worries about a past workshop on LGBTQ issues, in which his pedagogical decision "to create a safe environment in which all teacher candidates would feel respected and cared for … could be viewed as a reluctance to challenge the unexamined heteronormativity that is the basis of homophobia" (pp. 131–132); is one's own judgment sufficient even if our work "could be viewed as cowardly, apolitical, and assimilationist" (p. 132) by others?

Asking questions about 'GSDTE success' also means thinking about what merely 'sufficient' or 'bad' GSDTE might look like. Explicit TC resistance is widely cited as inhibiting GSDTE 'success,' particularly by teacher educators who work with religiously conservative TCs. Time and again, religion is named in the reviewed literature as a trouble spot for GSDTE practitioners, and evangelical Christianity is consistently linked to e.g., homophobic TC responses (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Bresser, 2002; Copenhaver-Johnson, 2010; Cosier & Sanders III, 2007; Hermann-Wilmarth, 2007; Hermann-Wilmarth & Bills, 2010; Hyland, 2010; Koch, 2000; Maddux, 1989; Mulhern & Martinez, 1999; O'Malley et al., 2009; Petrovic & Rosiek, 2003; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001; Sears, 1992; Swartz, 2003b; C. Taylor, 2002, 2004; Zack et al., 2010; see also McEntarfer, 2016 on anti-religious and anti-Christian bias in standalone GSDTE courses). For Catherine Taylor (2002), however, this particular resistance begs the question: "if we cannot always dislodge homophobia, given the strength of some identity structures, how can we at least challenge the feeling of entitlement to act on it" (p. 231)? She argues that we must look beyond "the usual methods of fighting bigotry [that] are structurally doomed to fail in cases of deep investment in a homophobic discourse" (p. 223). By making an ethical claim about justice and not foregrounding a moral claim about the acceptability of homosexuality, Taylor challenges evangelical Christian TCs to refrain from acting on their homophobia. She also finds that engaging evangelical homophobia(s) in her classroom is instructive for TCs who may encounter this in their schools someday.

Taylor's (2002, 2004) work challenges GSDTE practitioners to think through our attachments to or anxieties around a particular version of 'success.' These versions often take shape in the drive to look for precisely the 'right' resource or text that will have the 'right' effect on TCs (Clark, 2010a). Similarly, Pendleton Jiménez (2002), self-situating as an out and visibly queer teacher educator, reflects that "while many students … might never utter a queer word in their classrooms, …[they] responded to me, to my body, and to a shared understanding that anti-homophobia pedagogy is significant to their lives" (p. 224). Is this nebulous response *enough*? Does it justify space and time devoted to GSDTE in teacher education programs? This experience can be thought of within Goldstein et al.'s (2007) safe, positive and queering moments framework which affirms and complicates "issues of intent and impact. It serves as a guide for teacher educators wanting to think more intentionally about the moments that may be produced or that may have emerged or that have been restricted during anti-homophobia … activities" (p. 197). In lieu of long-term effects or systemic change, using 'moments' to think through the impact of GSDTE validates the present doings of the teacher education classroom itself as a site of significance, rather than only focussing on the future classrooms of TCs.

'Good' GSDTE might happen without recourse to longitudinal classroom research and long-term K-12 pupil impact as benchmarks of success. Elsbree (2002) suggests disruptive pedagogies: individual acts that disrupt heteronormativity in teacher education classrooms despite being spontaneous, and that are less wedded to barometers like the palliation of homophobia and/or transphobia in schools. As argued in a previous section, however, GSDTE's primary

source of justification is the plight of LGBTQIA + students. We believe that GSDTE's reliance on this representation requires critiquing in order to make the field more responsive to ever-changing instantiations of gender and sexual diversity, and not only to static representations of gender and sexual minority subjects. GSDTE practitioners might be doing a disservice to emerging queernesses (in the sense of queer theory, not queer people) when we seek to make them 'easier' for TCs to find relevant: by domesticating them through appeals to empathy for the abstract queer or transgender youth in crisis. Rather, 'good' GSDTE might see TCs encountering and surviving a potentially traumatic encounter with queerness: with what is irresolutely other (Kumashiro, 2002; Schmidt et al., 2012). Crocco (2002) spoke with former students of her gender and sexuality-focused social studies course, and found a deep *desire* to integrate related content but that they only managed integration to varying and sometimes minimal degrees. Can new teachers' abiding *desire* to do something about gender and sexual diversity in their classrooms equal GSDTE 'success' (see also McEntarfer, 2016)? Or, was this a failure because these TCs have only minimally enacted what they learned?

4.3. Object: what (who?) is 'gender and sexual diversity'?

In this final section, we explore how 'gender and sexual diversity' are constructed in the reviewed literature as the object with which the field concerns itself. This includes discussion of what concepts are used to denote it, the extent to which it is like or unlike other things, and who is thought to be served by the field's work. In GSDTE's beginning (1980s), the prevailing object in its literature was individual teacher attitudes toward homosexuals. It was not until the 1990s that 'homophobia' began to appear widely in the reviewed literature as the larger phenomenon behind individual attitudes: a systemic oppression that teacher education could broadly mitigate by affecting TC practice in their future schools and not narrowly mitigate by changing TC attitudes (Adams & Marchesani, 1992; Williamson & Williams, 1990). Homophobia (and, far less so, transphobia) have become integrated into teacher education courses on equity, diversity and social justice issues in education (Gorski & Goodman, 2011; Jennings & Sherwin, 2008; Macgillivray & Jennings, 2008; Sherwin & Jennings, 2006). This seems to have happened via an insistence that gender and sexual minorities face oppressions as do other minoritized groups (e.g., Jennings & Sherwin, 2008; Mathison, 1998), or that gender and sexuality are like other domains of individual rights conferred in liberal democracies (e.g., Oesterreich, 2002; Petrovic, 1998). Some GSDTE commentators have gone so far as to claim that homophobia is "the new racism" (Zack et al., 2010, p. 106) or that there is no difference between the impact of racial and homophobic slurs (Heston, 2008; Miller, 1999).

Conversely, some GSDTE scholars have critiqued similarity claims for both their assumptions and its effects. Hyland (2010) worries about the assumption "that if prospective teachers have come to understand injustice in one area, they can apply that knowledge broadly to other forms of oppression," and is skeptical that "teachers with a predisposition to teaching for racial justice necessarily work for justice for other marginalized groups" (p. 386). Other GSDTE scholars worry about casting gender and sexual diversity as monolithic, and instead approach same as unstable and always-in-process aspects of social life particular to a context. Mcconaghy's (2004) pedagogical practice of mapping homophobias is also an insistence that homophobia must be deeply traced to its localized roots and uses in a particular community. Turning to both Deleuze and the psychoanalytic work of Pitt and Britzman (2003), Mcconaghy finds aspects of the rural Australian context indispensable to her teaching. With each new cohort, in each new place,

homophobia has a new cartography: "in the annual flows of student teachers in and out of the university classroom, …homophobia must be mapped, experienced and understood, again and again" (p. 78). Given that "pre-service teachers tend to rely on personal experiences and hearsay to form their opinions and biases around difference without a critical understanding of power relationships" (Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001, p. 123), Robinson and Ferfolja use a Foucauldian-informed pedagogy to emphasize "intersections of sexuality with other aspects of one's identity[;] for example, gender, race, and class, are emphasised, highlighting the importance of understanding that sexuality is never experienced in isolation from the whole subject" (p. 124).

Making the 'what' or object of GSDTE unstable, intersectional, or contextually contingent chafes against the GSDTE citation practice we critiqued before: decontextualized LGBTQIA + youth victimization statistics taking the place of a literature review. The above examples are uncommon in the reviewed literature. Rather, a certain subject-heaviness — i.e., turning 'gender and sexual diversity' into a concern for highly particular people — is overwhelmingly in evidence. As an illustration, even more popular than screening *It's Elementary* is the strategy of inviting LGBTQIA + guest speakers (see Table 1). The popularity of this strategy does not, however, entail its immunity from criticism. Mayo (2002) reminds us that guest speaker presentations are unpredictable (not necessarily a bad thing). Fifield and Swain (2002) worry that the invited LGBT student panel strategy in TE courses is additive and isolating. Instead of reifying "LGBT identifiers as fixed categories that mark particular bodies and lives … we should engage understandings of cultural diversity and personal identities as unfixed, multidimensional, historically and spatially contingent, and awash in power relations" (p. 186). As a gay teacher educator Fifield also worries that relying on LGBT guests involves using "the bodies of the panelists rather than my own; their pleasure, pain, and identities were at work and at risk in my classroom, while I sat among the 'us' and listened to the 'others'" (Fifield and Swain (2002)).

Does the mere act of bringing gender and sexual diversity content into teacher education constitute a coming out for a teacher educator? Robinson and Ferfolja (2001) observed early on that "it is often considered that one has to be gay or lesbian to express an interest in … or to be supportive of sexual differences" (p. 131). But can the queer and/or transgender teacher educator declare themself as part of a gender and sexual diversity-affirming pedagogy? For some, the answer is yes (Bresser, 2002; Casper et al., 1996; King & Brindley, 2002; Kitchen & Bellini, 2012a; Pendleton Jiménez, 2002; Sanlo, 2002; Sapp, 2001; Silin, 1999; Turnbull & Hilton, 2010; Turner, 2010; see also; Kitchen, 2014). Given that several studies have posited a link between knowing a non-heterosexual person and harbouring comparatively (within-sample) positive attitudes toward non-heterosexuality (see Elsbree & Wong, 2008; Sears, 1992), this seems a valid strategy as far as sexual diversity is concerned. Conversely, Britzman and Gilbert (2004) caution against an easy deployment of queer (or trans) embodied stories because the only correct response to the narrative provided by an out instructor or guest speaker is TCs expressing tolerance or empathy. In these moments, that there is only one lesson to be taken away from the encounter — often a variant of 'they are people, too' — may bracket the complexities of learning and do an injustice to the complexity of gender and sexuality, including of TCs themselves. Other scholars offer only a cautious endorsement of any pedagogical coming out. Grace (2006) and Grace and Benson (2000) uphold the learning potential of queer teacher and teacher educator life narratives, but survey several cautionary tales of reified identities, queer-straight binaries and the creation of unsafe classroom spaces that cannot, despite teacher educators coming out, support similar disclosures from queer TCs (see also Khayatt, 1999). Drawing on the

work of feminists of colour, Oesterreich (2002) disagrees that the classroom can be a safe space at all, for anyone. Rather, "as soon as I speak the word lesbian in the classroom, notions of safety ooze out under the crack in the door, and we are all left to negotiate the ambiguity of identities, ideologies, theories, and practices" (p. 292).

The deployment of particular bodies/subjects — whether the guest speaker or the teacher educator — as the objects of GSDTE can perhaps be enriched "if we focus less on the impact of coming out stories on the students who hear them and more on the process of telling stories and how they are constructed" (Goldstein et al., 2007, p. 190). And so, as we think about the what-become-who of gender and sexual diversity and how this is constructed in the reviewed literature, we wonder whether GSDTE requires gender and sexual minority people at all, whether as real-life bodies or textual representations. Can a GSDTE without recourse to representations of queer and/or transgender people be GSDTE?

5. Conclusion: the temporal lag of gender and sexual diversity in teacher education

As GSDTE practitioners we are interested in thinking about where our practices, concepts and strategies come from as well as where they might go in the future. To this end, our tone throughout this essay has often been retrospective. We comment on earlier GSDTE scholarship from a perspective on where things have gone since, and we speculate on the relationship between past and present. While time has marched on, there is no clear indication that older ideas and strategies are not relevant; things have not necessarily 'gotten better' across the board. Although Bresser (2002) found that TCs in her sample were more knowledgeable, less homophobic and more likely to participate in school-based interventions than populations previously studied using the same instruments (Koch, 2000; Maddux, 1989; Sears, 1992), Mudrey and Medina-Adams' (2006) results differed little from those obtained by Sears (1992) in his widely-cited study fourteen years earlier. Cosier and Sanders' (2007) three tips for GSDTE practitioners are similarly suggestive of the challenges many face ten years later, not just in American red states but also in Canadian publicly-funded Catholic schools (Callaghan, 2016; Callaghan, Esterhuizen, & Wierzbicki, 2017): "never let your emotions get the better of you," "be aware that everything you say can be monitored," and "stay strong and focused on the future" (Cosier & Sanders, 2007, pp. 28—29). Doing something about gender and sexual diversity in pre-service teacher education remains a fraught proposition, in many contexts. And as Horn et al. (2010) found in a survey of teacher educators from Illinois colleges, "most respondents noted their resources were out-dated and that their programs introduced LGBTQ issues via the icon of a tragic, wounded, and potentially suicidal student" (p. 73). There is, undoubtedly, much more work to be done.

That said, we hold open the possibility that 'across the board' is an unhelpful way to assess something like gender and sexual diversity integration in teacher education. As an inevitably representational project, GSDTE necessarily lags behind the always-unfolding of gender and sexuality. As discussed in the preceding section, the field tends to take up identified and identifiable gender and sexual minority subjects as its objects and beneficiaries even as queerness and transness march on, ever-changing. But queerness and transness are only uneasily arranged within identitarian structures, let alone within the curricula and structures of an institutionalized discipline like teacher education. In other words, it can be difficult to conceptualize 'preparing teachers for gender and sexual diversity' without thinking explicitly (or even exclusively) of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (etc.) students.

The strange project of GSDTE is to work in the present from the knowledge that the gender and sexual diversity encountered by our TCs may look nothing like what we offer them. For example, on the radar now amidst growing acceptance for long-term and monogamous same-sex partnerships, whether institutionalized as marriages or no, is a cleaving of queer and transgender interests. Among the causes are anti-capitalist and anti-homonormative (see Atkinson & DePalma, 2008a; Duggan, 2004) critiques of depoliticized and white-washed LGBTQIA + pride celebrations (see Brown, 2009). Such divisions are becoming more and more reflected in the fabric of everyday queer and/or transgender life, particularly in urban centres. Furthermore, a lack of discussion about transgender in the GSDTE literature is a last review finding we will highlight (exceptions, mostly from within the past five years, include Happel-Parkins & Esposito, 2015; Kearns et al., 2014, 2017; Kintner-Duffy et al., 2012; Mitton-Kukner et al., 2016; North, 2010; Oesterreich, 2002; O'Malley et al., 2009; and Parsons, 2015). 'Adding trans and stir' is not a useful way forward, either. Trans lives and narratives are increasingly diversifying away from any exclusive legibility afforded by medical models of transition alone; this may create problems for GSDTE as an intervention in teacher education that has historically privileged stable student-objects and beneficiaries. We may not presently be able to teach teacher candidates what they *definitively* need to know and do about transness given how transness is changing. More and more young people are coming out as non-binary – not belonging within either binary gender category – or gender-fluid – moving between gender categories – and the articulation of these identities is evolving. This is not to say that transness should not enter the TE curriculum, or that GSDTE can do nothing about transphobia. But taken together, our observations in the preceding sections — what counts, what is good, what-become-who is gender and sexual diversity — are an invitation to pause and not become overly-rigid in how our programs, curricula, policies or structures address or integrate the gender diversity on the transgender spectrum. Overall, it is critical that GSDTE practitioners find ways to hold open space for however and whoever gender and sexual diversity might be, but what might this holding-open look like in everyday practice with TCs if not a practice that begins and ends with legible LGBTQIA + subjects?

TCs themselves may not wait for teacher educators to deliberate on these questions and address their implications. Many scholars are preoccupied with the evolving circumstances of queer and/or transgender people who enter teacher education programs (Benson, 2008; Benson et al., 2014; Cosier, 2008; Curran & Crowhurst, 2007; Donahue, 2008; Evans, 1999; Hermann-Wilmarth & Bills, 2010; Nixon & Givens, 2004; Rofes, 2002; Sarmiento & Vasquez, 2010; Starr, 2002; Stiegler, 2008). But familiar ideas about queer and/or transgender TCs' needs or comfort may not continue to bear fruit, or may have unanticipated effects (Donahue, 2008), which is not altogether bad. There may be specialized skillsets that these candidates need, and which teacher education can provide, but which have not formerly 'counted' as the good work of GSDTE. Cosier (2008) suggests that

> teacher educators must prepare themselves to guide students with strategies that will help sustain a balance between integration and separation of public and private identities. Coursework on professional identity development needs to honor the tensions that arise among identities in order to prepare this 'post-gender' generation to successfully enter the teaching profession …. (p. 10)

That said, 'queer TCs' and/or 'transgender TCs' may bear little or no resemblance in the flesh to those anticipated in the GSDTE literature thus far. TCs who are non-binary and/or gender-fluid may particularly expose the temporal lag of GSDTE given the fairly static,

masculine *or* feminine transgender subject of popular imagination who may not confound binary norms of teacher appearance and/as 'professionalism.' Supporting queer and/or trans TCs — or TC queerness and/or transness, perhaps a different task altogether — in teacher education might call for drastically different actions and resources than those devoted to preparing TCs in general to welcome gender and sexual diversity in their own classrooms. But then again, it might not. After all, gender and sexual diversity are not restricted to particular non-heterosexual or non-cisgender people but extend to the affinities, practices and experiences of everyone. Regardless of TCs' gender identities, gender expressions, and sexual orientations, each brings a rich knowledge of gender and sexuality with them into their teacher education classes, even this knowledge has thus far been invisible as such. Schmidt et al. (2012) suggest that "perhaps, we have misrecognized the attributes our [TCs] bring. In doing so, the beginning and end points are too conservative. … our misrecognition affirms [TCs] as conventional, making it difficult to conceive of rich discussion oriented toward transformation" (p. 10). Conversely, we believe that powerful GSDTE strives to recognize and work from the gender and sexual diversity present in any teacher education classroom, regardless of whether any TC present is queer and/or transgender.

Lastly, we wonder what it might mean to think of GSDTE as *both* a marginal practice on the way to full integration in teacher education programs *and* an established gatekeeper in relation to the newness (Arendt, 2006) embodied by infinite coming generations of TCs, their relations to and ways of making meaning about gender and sexuality. Gender and sexual diversity might even unfold in our classrooms in ways that look or feel like the same old student resistance to our pedagogies, and we risk inscribing this 'resistance' with labels like 'homophobia' or 'transphobia' when in fact it is itself an expression of new forms of gender and sexual diversity presently unrecognizable to us. What purpose does it serve for GSDTE to situate TCs and not ourselves, our concepts, and our practices as 'conventional' or 'conservative?' In sharing findings and observations from our review, we invite GSDTE scholars and practitioners to reflect on what this field has been and has done, what has been found to 'count' as our work and our good work, who we think we are and who we think we serve, and what kinds of boundaries are drawn around this work, wherever we practice.

Funding sources

References

Adams, M., & Marchesani, L. S. (1992). Curricular innovations: Social diversity as course content. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* (52), 85–98, 1992.

Airton, L. (2009). From sexuality (gender) to gender (sexuality): The aims of anti-homophobia education. *Sex Education, 9*(2), 129–139.

Airton, L. (2013). Leave 'those kids' alone: On the conflation of school homophobia and suffering queers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 43*(5), 532–562.

Airton, L. (2014a). Hatred haunting hallways: Teacher education and the badness of homophobia(s). In E. J. Meyer, & D. Carlson (Eds.), *Gender and sexualities in education: A reader* (pp. 387–399). New York: Peter Lang.

Airton, L. (2014b). *Be(coming) the change you want to see in the world: Social justice teacher education as affective craft.* Doctoral dissertation. York University.

Anderson, G. L., & Herr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars: Is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities? *Educational Researcher, 28*(5), 12–40.

Arendt, H. (2006). In *Between past and future*. New York, NY: Penguin Classics. Rev. Ed.

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*(2), 237–261.

Atkinson, E., & DePalma, R. (2008a). Dangerous spaces: Constructing and contesting sexual identities in an online discussion forum. *Gender and Education, 20*(2), 183–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250701797192.

Atkinson, E., & DePalma, R. (2008b). Imagining the homonormative: Performative subversion in education for social justice. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 29*(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690701737333.

Baldwin, E.-A. S. (2002). *Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender equity issues: A study of preservice teachers' perceptions of current practices in teacher education.* Doctoral dissertation. Washington State University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3069631).

Barozzi, S. (2015). *Teacher training on gender and sexual identities in a Spanish context.* Doctoral dissertation. Universidad de Granada. Retrieved from https://hera.ugr.es/tesisugr/25961913.pdf.

Barozzi, S., & Ojeda, J. R. G. (2014). Discussing sexual identities with pre-service primary school English language teachers from a Spanish context. *Perspectives in Education, 32*(3), 131–145.

Barozzi, S., & Ojeda, J. R. G. (2016). Sexual identities in EFL at primary school level: A pre-service teachers' perspective from Spain. *Porta Linguarum, 25*, 9–20. http://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero25/1%20Stefano.pdf.

Bateman, J. I. (1995). *A treatment strategy for changing preservice teachers' attitudes toward homosexuality* (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No, 9544400).

Bedford, T. (2002). Queer developments in teacher education: Addressing sexual diversity, homophobia, and heterosexism. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 133–142). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Benson, F. J. (2008). *Teacher educators' practice of queer-care: A necessary expansion of noddings' model of care* (Ph.D.). Montreal, QC: McGill University. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/docview/762381020/abstract/6B0A8AC8A6C8486DPQ/21.

Benson, F. J., Smith, N. G., & Flanagan, T. (2014). Easing the transition for queer student teachers from program to field: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Homosexuality, 61*(3), 382–398.

Berrill, D. P., & Martino, W. J. (2002). "Pedophiles and deviants": Exploring issues of sexuality, masculinity, and normalization in the lives of male teacher candidates. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 59–69). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bochenek, M., & Brown, A. (2001). *Hatred in the hallways: Discrimination and violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students in U.S. public schools.* New York: Human Rights Watch.

Bower, L. A., & Sature, A. L. (2011). Surpassing normal: Preparing teachers for diverse learners. *Action in Teacher Education, 33*(5–6), 416–431. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2011.626748.

Brant, C. A. R. (2014a). Reforming school reform: The need for addressing gender and sexuality issues in teacher preparation programs. In W. Sherman Newcomb, & K. Cumings Mansfield (Eds.), *Women interrupting, disrupting, and revolutionizing educational policy and practice* (pp. 109–124). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Brant, C. A. R. (2014b). *Pre-service teachers' perspectives on methods, pedagogy and self-efficacy as a part of their multicultural teacher education* (Ph.D.). United States – Ohio: The Ohio State University. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/docview/1646477795/abstract/434CE1220EB4454DPQ/14.

Bresser, P. J. (2002). *The impact of a homophobia unit on preservice teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Walden University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3036974).

Britzman, D. P. (1995). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. *Educational Theory, 45*(2), 151–165.

Britzman, D. P., & Gilbert, J. (2004). What will have been said about gayness in teacher education. *Teaching Education, 15*(1), 81–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621042000180004.

Brown, G. (2009). Thinking beyond homonormativity: Performative explorations of diverse gay economies. *Environment and Planning A, 41*(6), 1496–1510. https://doi.org/10.1068/a4162.

Butler, K. L. (1994). *Prospective teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and behavior regarding gay men and lesbians* (Research Report). Kent State University. Retrieved from ERIC (ED379251).

Callaghan, T. D. (2016). Religiosity. In N. M. Rodriguez, W. Martino, J. C. Ingrey, & E. Brockenbrough (Eds.), *Critical concepts in queer studies and education: An international guide for the twenty-first century* (pp. 341–349). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55425-3.

Callaghan, T. D., Esterhuizen, A., & Wierzbicki, Z. (2017). The Catholic closet: The pedagogy of language and resistance. In *Presentation to the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education.* Toronto, ON: (CATE) at Ryerson University.

Carpenter, V. M., & Lee, D. (2010). Teacher education and the hidden curriculum of heteronormativity. *Curriculum Matters, 6,* 99–119.

Casper, V., Cuffaro, H. K., Schultz, S., Silin, J. G., & Wickens, E. (1996). Toward a most thorough understanding of the world: Sexual orientation and early childhood. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(2), 271–293.

Chasnoff, D., & Cohen, H. (1996). *It's elementary: Talking about gay issues in school* [Video]. San Francisco: Women's Educational Media.

Clark, C. T. (2010a). Inquiring into ally work in teacher education: The possibilities and limitations of textual practice. In M. V. Blackburn, C. T. Clark, L. M. Kenney, & J. M. Smith (Eds.), *Acting out! Combating homophobia through teacher activism* (pp. 37–55). New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, C. T. (2010b). Preparing LGBTQ-allies and combating homophobia in a US

teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 704—713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.006.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). The outcomes question in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 527—546. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00012-9.

Conley, M. D. (2005). *Exposed pedagogy: Investigating LGBTQ issues in collaboration with preservice teachers*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Conley, M. D., & Colabucci, L. (2009). Researchers who surf: Riding the waves of analysis in self-study research. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 22*(4), 26—35.

Copenhaver-Johnson, J. F. (2010). Learning about heterosexism as a teacher educator: The resistant student as catalyst for change. In M. V. Blackburn, C. T. Clark, L. M. Kenney, & J. M. Smith (Eds.), *Acting out! Combating homophobia through teacher activism* (pp. 17—36). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cosier, K. (2008). Gender, queers and teaching identity: The private and public lives of Adrienne/Leo and the photographic journey of Rebecca Schmidt Kupietz. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 5*(3), 4—10. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650802162136.

Cosier, K., & Sanders, J. H., III (2007). Queering art teacher education. *International Journal of Art and Design Education, 26*(1), 21—30.

Covington, V. M. (2001). The need for a diversity component, specific to gay and lesbian students. In *Undergraduate teacher preparation programs according to selected eastern North Carolina educators*. United States – North Carolina: East Carolina University. Ed.D.

Crocco, M. S. (2002). Homophobic hallways: Is anyone listening? *Theory & Research in Social Education, 30*(2), 217—232. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2002.10473192.

Curran, G., Chiarolli, S., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2009). "The C words": Clitorises, childhood and challenging compulsory heterosexuality discourses with pre-service primary teachers. *Sex Education, 9*(2), 155—168. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681810902829539.

Curran, G., & Crowhurst, M. (2007). SPACE Queer Allies Network: An approach to actively support gender and sexual diversity at RMIT University's School of Education. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 4*(2), 36—43. https://doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2007.10411641.

Darvin, J. (2011). "I don't feel comfortable reading those books in my classroom": A qualitative study of the impact of cultural and political vignettes in a teacher education course. *The Teacher Educator, 46*(4), 274—298. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.604710.

Davis, D. E., & Kellinger, J. J. (2014). Teacher educators using encounter stories. *Qualitative Report, 19*(5), 1—18.

Dedeoglu, H., Ulusoy, M., & Lamme, L. L. (2012). Turkish preservice peachers' perceptions of children's picture books reflecting LGBT-related issues. *The Journal of Educational Research, 105*(4), 256—263. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2011.627398.

Donahue, D. M. (2008). Rethinking silence as support: Normalizing lesbian and gay teacher identities through models and conversations in student teaching. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 4*(4), 73—95. https://doi.org/10.1300/J367v04n04_06.

Duggan, L. (2004). *The twilight of equality: Neoliberalism, cultural politics, and the attack on democracy*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Dykes, F. (2010). Transcending rainbow flags and pride parades: Preparing special education preservice educators to work with gay and lesbian youth. *SRATE Journal, 19*(2), 36—43.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989). Lesbians and gay men on campus: Visibility, empowerment, and educational leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(3), 124—142. https://doi.org/10.1080/01619568909538652.

Elsbree, A. R. (2002). *Disruptive pedagogies: How teacher educators make sense of their efforts to disrupt homophobia*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3049305).

Elsbree, A. R., & Wong, P. (2008). The Laramie Project as a homophobic disruption: How the play impacts pre-service teachers' preparation to create anti-homophobic schools. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 4*(4), 97—117. https://doi.org/10.1300/J367v04n04_07.

Evans, K. (1999). When queer and teacher meet. In *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling* (pp. 237—246). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Eyre, L. (1993). Compulsory heterosexuality in a university classroom. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de L'education, 18*(3), 273—284.

Ferfolja, T., & Robinson, K. H. (2004). Why anti-homophobia education in teacher education? Perspectives from Australian teacher educators. *Teaching Education, 15*(1), 9—25. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621042000179961.

Fifield, S., & Swain, H. (Lee) (2002). Heteronormativity and common sense in science (teacher) education. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 177—189). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fischer, T. R. (1982). *A study of educators' attitudes toward homosexuality*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Virginia. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8228619).

Foy, J. K. (2014). *Understanding sexual prejudice among Midwestern pre-service and in-service teachers*. Ph.D. United States – Kansas: Kansas State University. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/docview/1654778718/abstract/867E19C5B0274666PQ/21

Gard, M. (2002). What do we do in physical education? In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 43—58). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Geasler, M. J., Croteau, J. M., Heineman, C. J., & Edlund, C. J. (1995). A qualitative study of student change following lesbian/gay/bisexual speaker panel presentations. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(5), 483—492.

Goldstein, T. (1997). Unlearning homophobia through a pedagogy of anonymity. *Teaching Education, 9*(1), 115—124. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621970090120.

Goldstein, T. (2004). Performed ethnography for anti-homophobia teacher education: Linking research to teaching. *Canadian Online Journal of Queer Studies in Education, 1*(1). Retrieved from https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/25145/1/upload.pdf.

Goldstein, T., Russell, V., & Daley, A. (2007). Safe, positive and queering moments in teaching education and schooling: A conceptual framework. *Teaching Education, 18*(3), 183—199. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210701533035.

Gorski, P. C., Davis, S. N., & Reiter, A. (2013). An examination of the (in)visibility of sexual orientation, heterosexism, homophobia, and other LGBTQ concerns in U.S. multicultural teacher education coursework. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 10*(3), 224—248. https://doi.org/https://doi.org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/10.1080/19361653.2013.798986.

Gorski, P. C., & Goodman, R. D. (2011). Is there a "hierarchy of oppression" in US multicultural teacher education coursework? *Action in Teacher Education, 33*(5—6), 455—475.

Grace, A. P. (2006). Writing the queer self: Using autobiography to mediate inclusive teacher education in Canada. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(7), 826—834. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.026.

Grace, A. P., & Benson, F. J. (2000). Using autobiographical queer life narratives of teachers to connect personal, political and pedagogical spaces. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 4*(2), 89—109. https://doi.org/10.1080/136031100284830.

Grace, A. P., & Wells, K. (2006). The quest for a queer inclusive cultural ethics: Setting directions for teachers' preservice and continuing professional development. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, (112), 51—61, 2006 https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.236.

Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403—422). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Gutierez-Schmich, T., & Heffernan, J. (2016). Public pedagogy. In N. Rodriguez, W. Martino, J. Ingrey, & E. Brockenbrough (Eds.), *Critical concepts in queer studies and education. queer studies and education* (pp. 239—248). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, H. R. (2006). Teach to reach: Addressing lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth issues in the classroom. *The New Educator, 2*(2), 149—157. https://doi.org/10.1080/15476880600657124.

Hansen, L. E. (2015). Encouraging pre-service teachers to address issues of sexual orientation in their classrooms: Walking the walk and talking the talk. *Multicultural Education, 22*(2), 51—55.

Happel-Parkins, A., & Esposito, J. (2015). Using popular culture texts in the classroom to interrogate issues of gender transgression related bullying. *Educational Studies, 51*(1), 3—16.

Hermann-Wilmarth, J. M. (2007). Full inclusion: Understanding the role of gay and lesbian texts and films in teacher education classrooms. *Language Arts, 84*(4), 347.

Hermann-Wilmarth, J. M. (2010). More than book talks: Preservice teacher dialogue after reading gay and lesbian children's literature. *Language Arts, 87*(3), 188—198.

Hermann-Wilmarth, J. M., & Bills, P. (2010). Identity shifts: Queering teacher education research. *The Teacher Educator, 45*(4), 257—272. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2010.508324.

Heston, M. L. (2008). Professional change through personal growth: Tools for reframing relationships with students and colleagues. In M. L. Heston, D. L. Tidwell, K. K. East, & L. M. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Pathways to change in teacher education: Dialogue, diversity and self-study. Proceedings for the 7th international conference on self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 173—176). Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa.

Horn, S. S., Konkol, P., McInerney, K., Meiners, E. R., North, C. E., Nuñez, I., … Sullivan, S. (2010). Visibility matters: Policy work as activism in teacher education. *Issues in Teacher Education, 19*(2), 65—80.

Hyland, N. (2010). Intersections of race and sexuality in a teacher education course. *Teaching Education, 21*(4), 385—401. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2010.495769.

Jennings, T. (2007). Addressing diversity in US teacher preparation programs: A survey of elementary and secondary programs' priorities and challenges from across the United States of America. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(8), 1258—1271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.004.

Jennings, T. (2015). Teaching transgressive representations of LGBTQ people in educator preparation: Is conformity required for inclusion? *The Educational Forum, 79*(4), 451—458. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2015.1068420.

Jennings, T., & Sherwin, G. (2008). Sexual orientation topics in elementary teacher preparation programs in the USA. *Teaching Education, 19*(4), 261—278. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210802436328.

Kearns, L.-L., Mitton-Kukner, J., & Tompkins, J. (2014). LGBTQ awareness and allies: Building capacity in a Bachelor of Education program. *Canadian Journal of Education, 37*(4), 1—26.

Kearns, L.-L., Mitton-Kukner, J., & Tompkins, J. (2017). Transphobia and cisgender privilege: Pre-service teachers recognizing and challenging gender rigidity in

schools. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de L'éducation, 40*(1), 1–27.

Khayatt, D. (1999). Sex and pedagogy: Performing sexualities in the classroom. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 5*(1), 107–113. https://doi.org/10.1215/10642684-5-1-107.

King, J. R., & Brindley, R. (2002). Teacher educators and the multicultural closet: The impact of gay and lesbian content on an undergraduate teacher education seminar. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 201–214). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kintner-Duffy, V. L., Vardell, R., Lower, J. K., & Cassidy, D. J. (2012). "The changers and the changed": Preparing early childhood teachers to work with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender families. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 33*(3), 208.

Kissen, R. M. (1993). Listening to gay and lesbian teenagers. *Teaching Education, 5*(2), 57–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621930050205.

Kissen, R. M. (2002). *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers to encounter sexual diversity in the classroom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kitchen, J. (2014). Inqueeries into self-study: Queering the gaze on teacher educator identity and practice. In M. Taylor, & L. Coia (Eds.), *Gender, feminism, and queer theory in the self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 128–141). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kitchen, J., & Bellini, C. (2012a). Addressing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) issues in teacher education: Teacher candidates' perceptions. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 58*(3), 444–460.

Kitchen, J., & Bellini, C. (2012b). Making it better for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students through teacher education: A collaborative self-study. *Studying Teacher Education, 8*(3), 209.

Klein, N. A., & Markowitz, L. (2009). "Rewind and replay:" Changing teachers' heterosexist language to create an inclusive classroom environment. *American Journal of Health Education, 40*(6), 329–332.

Kluth, P., & Colleary, K. P. (2002). "Talking about inclusion like it's for everyone": Sexual diversity and the inclusive schooling movement. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 105–118). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Koch, C. A. (2000). *Attitudes, knowledge, and anticipated behaviors of preservice teachers toward individuals with different sexual orientations*. Doctoral dissertation. George Washington University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9973038).

Koerner, M. E., & Hulsebosch, P. (1996). Preparing teachers to work with children of gay and lesbian parents. *Journal of Teacher Education, 47*(5), 347–354.

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.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and anti-oppressive pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2004). Uncertain beginnings: Learning to teach paradoxically. *Theory Into Practice, 43*(2), 111–115. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4302_3.

Kuzmic, J. J. (2014). Disturbing masculinities: Epistemology, outlaw emotions, and the gendered self in self-study research. In M. Taylor, & L. Coia (Eds.), *Gender, feminism, and queer theory in the self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 77–92). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. Banks, & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 747–759). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Larrabee, T. G., & Kim, Y. (2010). Preservice elementary teachers' perceptions of family: Considering future instruction on lesbian- and gay-headed families. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 24*(4), 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2010.510085.

Lather, P. (2004). This is your father's paradigm: Government intrusion and the case of qualitative research in education. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(1), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403256154.

Lee, D., & Carpenter, V. M. (2015). "What would you like me to do? Lie to you?" Teacher education responsibilities to LGBTI students. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(2), 169–180.

Letts, W. (2002). Revisioning multiculturalism in teacher education: Isn't it queer?. In *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 119–131). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lipkin, A. (2002). The challenges of gay topics in teacher education: Politics, content, and pedagogy. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 13–27). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Macgillivray, I. K., & Jennings, T. (2008). A content analysis exploring lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender topics in foundations of education textbooks. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(2), 170–188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107313160.

MacIntosh, L. B. (2007). Does anyone have a Band-Aid? Anti- homophobia discourses and pedagogical impossibilities. *Educational Studies, 41*(1), 33–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131940701308874.

Maddux, J. A. (1989). *The homophobic attitudes of preservice teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Cincinnati. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8822798).

Maney, D. W., & Cain, R. E. (1997). Preservice elementary teachers' attitudes toward gay and lesbian parenting. *Journal of School Health, 67*(6), 236–242. https://doi.

org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.1997.tb06313.x.

Martino, W. J., & Berrill, D. (2007). Dangerous pedagogies: Addressing issues of sexuality, masculinity and schooling with male pre-service teacher education students. In K. G. Davison, & B. Frank (Eds.), *Masculinity and schooling: International practices and perspectives* (pp. 13–34). London, ON: Althouse Press.

Mason, K. (2010). From preservice teacher to trusted adult: Sexual orientation and gender variance in an online YAL book club. *ALAN, 38*(1). n. p https://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/ALAN/v38n1/mason.html.

Mathison, C. (1998). The invisible minority: Preparing teachers to meet the needs of gay and lesbian youth. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(2), 151–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487198049002008.

Mayo, C. (2002). Education by association: The shortcomings of discourses of privacy and civility in anti-homophobia education. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 81–90). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mcconaghy, C. (2004). On cartographies of anti-homophobia in teacher education (and the crisis of witnessing rural student teacher refusals). *Teaching Education, 15*(1), 63–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621042000179998.

McDermott, R. J., & Marty, P. J. (1983). Teacher education in human sexuality: Design for improvement. *The Teacher Educator, 18*(4), 2–10.

McEntarfer, H. K. (2013). *"I saw myself as neutral in some ways, and then them as other things": Narrative and positioning in a teacher education course focused on gender and sexuality*. Ph.D. United States – New York: State University of New York at Buffalo. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/docview/1317041747/abstract/11C66204FEEE46ABPQ/94

McEntarfer, H. K. (2016). *Navigating gender and sexuality in the classroom: Narrative insights from students and educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Milburn, W., & Palladino, J. (2012). Preservice teachers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions of LGBTQ bullying intervention. *AABSS Journal, 16*, 86–100.

Miller, H. M. (1999). Teaching and learning about cultural diversity: Swimming with the sharks. *The Reading Teacher, 52*(6), 632–634.

Mills, M. (2004). Male teachers, homophobia, misogyny and teacher education. *Teaching Education, 15*(1), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621042000179970.

Mitton-Kukner, J., Kearns, L.-L., & Tompkins, J. (2016). Pre-service educators and anti-oppressive pedagogy: Interrupting and challenging LGBTQ oppression in schools. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(1), 20–34.

Moisio, O.-P. (2009). What it means to be a stranger to oneself. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 41*(5), 490–506. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00386.x.

Morgan, D. J. (2003). *Knowledge and attitudes of preservice teachers towards students who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered*. Doctoral dissertation. University of North Texas. Retrieved from http://digital.library.unt.edu.

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. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v51n04_04.

Mulhern, M., & Martinez, G. (1999). Confronting homophobia in a multicultural teacher education course. In *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling* (pp. 247–256). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Murray, O. J. (2011). In *"Outing" queer issues in teacher preparation programs: How pre-service teachers experience sexual and gender diversity in their field placements*. USA: Portland State University, Oregon. Ed.D.

Murray, O. J. (2015). *Queer inclusion in teacher education: Bridging theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Namaste, V. (2011). *Sex change, social change: Reflections on identity, institutions, and imperialism*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Nixon, D., & Givens, N. (2004). "Miss, you"re so gay.' Queer stories from trainee teachers. *Sex Education, 4*(3), 217–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/1468181042000243321.

North, C. E. (2010). Threading stitches to approach gender identity, sexual identity, and difference. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*(3), 375–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2010.491415.

Oesterreich, H. (2002). "Outing" social justice: Transforming civic education within the challenges of heteronormativity, heterosexism, and homophobia. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 30*(2), 287–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2002.10473196.

O'Malley, M., Hoyt, M., & Slattery, P. (2009). Teaching gender and sexuality diversity in foundations of education courses in the US. *Teaching Education, 20*(2), 95–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210902730505.

Parsons, L. T. (2015). Learning from preservice teachers' responses to trans-themed young adult literature: Improving personal practice in teacher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 1–15*.

Pendleton Jiménez, K. (2002). Can of worms: A queer TA in teacher ed. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 215–225). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Petrovic, J. E. (1998). The democratic sieve in teacher education: Confronting heterosexism. *Educational Foundations, 12*, 43–56.

Petrovic, J. E., & Rosiek, J. (2003). Disrupting the heteronormative subjectivities of Christian pre-service teachers: A Deweyan prolegomenon. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 36*(2), 161–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680303509.

Phillips, D. K., & Larson, M. L. (2012). Preservice teachers respond to And Tango makes three: deconstructing disciplinary power and the heteronormative in teacher education. *Gender and Education, 24*(2), 159–175. https://doi.org/10.

1080/09540253.2011.602333.

Pitt, A., & Britzman, D. (2003). Speculations on qualities of difficult knowledge in teaching and learning: an experiment in psychoanalytic research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(6), 755–776. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001632135.

Raha, N. (2017). Transfeminine brokenness, radical transfeminism. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 116*(3), 632–646.

Rasmussen, M. L., Mitchell, J., & Harwood, V. (2007). The queer story of "The Heterosexual Questionnaire.". In *In Queering straight teachers: Discourse and identity in education* (pp. 95–114). New York: Peter Lang.

Richardson, E. (2008). Using a film to challenge heteronormativity: South African teachers "get real" in working with LGB youth. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 5*(2), 63. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650802092416.

Richardson, J., Parnell, P., & Cole, H. (2005). *And Tango makes three.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers.

Riggs, A. D. (2001). *The impact of a combined cognitive-affective intervention on pre-service teacher's attitudes, knowledge and anticipated professional behaviors regarding homosexuality and Gay and Lesbian issues.* Doctoral dissertation. University of Florida. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3027581).

Riggs, A. D., Rosenthal, A. R., & Smith-Bonahue, A. (2011). 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. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(1), 201–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.002.

Robinson, K. H., & Ferfolja, T. (2001). "What are we doing this for?" Dealing with lesbian and gay issues in teacher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(1), 121–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690020030828.

Robinson, K. H., & Ferfolja, T. (2002). A reflection of resistance. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 14*(2), 55–64. https://doi.org/10.1300/J041v14n02_05.

Robinson, K. H., & Ferfolja, T. (2008). Playing it up, playing it down, playing it safe: Queering teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(4), 846–858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.11.004.

Rofes, E. (1995). Queers, education schools, and sex panics. In *Presented at the annual meeting of American educational research association, san Francisco.* Retrieved from ERIC (ED383270).

Rofes, E. (2002). "I was afraid he would label me gay if I stood up for gays": The experience of lesbian and gay elementary education credential candidates at a rural state university. In *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 191–200). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sadowski, M. (2010). Core values and the identity-supportive classroom: Setting LGBTQ issues within wider frameworks for preservice educators. *Issues in Teacher Education, 19*(2), 53–63.

Sanlo, R. (2002). Campus dyke meets teacher education: A marriage made in social justice heaven. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 235–248). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sapp, J. (2001). Self-knowing as social justice: The impact of a gay professor on ending homophobia in education. *Encounter: Education for Meaning and Social Justice, 14*(4), 17–28.

Sarmiento, L. E., & Vasquez, S. A. (2010). Abriendo puertas (opening doors) through writing. *The Teacher Educator, 45*(4), 273–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2010.508307.

Schieble, M. (2012). A critical discourse analysis of teachers' views on LGBT literature. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 33*(2), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.620758.

Schmidt, S. J., Chang, S., Carolan-Silva, A., Lockhart, J., & Anagnostopoulos, D. (2012). Recognition, responsibility, and risk: Pre-service teachers' framing and reframing of lesbian, gay, and bisexual social justice issues. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(8), 1175–1184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.07.002.

Sears, J. T. (1992). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal feelings related to professional beliefs? In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curricula* (pp. 29–79). New York: Harrington Park Press.

Shaw, P., Sharp, C., McDonald, S., Mitchell, J., Mayer, D., & Darling, L. F. (2003). Broadening Conceptions of Curriculum for Young People: Reports from three student-teachers on exchange. *Teaching Education, 14*(1), 83–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210309386.

Shedlock, N. S. (2013). *Teaching teachers on the topic of GLBT issues: The current condition of teacher education programs.* Psy.D. Dissertation. Alfred University.

Sherwin, G., & Jennings, T. (2006). Feared, forgotten, or forbidden: Sexual orientation topics in secondary teacher preparation programs in the USA. *Teaching Education, 17*(3), 207–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210600849664.

Silin, J. G. (1999). Teaching as a gay man: Pedagogical resistance or public spectacle? *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 5*(1), 95–106. https://doi.org/10.1215/10642684-5-1-95.

Simone, G. (2002). Getting to the heart of teaching for diversity. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 143–157). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Staley, S., & Leonardi, B. (2016). Leaning in to discomfort: Preparing literacy teachers for gender and sexual diversity. *Research in the Teaching of English, 51*(2), 209–229.

Starr. (2002). How my teacher education program failed. In R. M. Kissen (Ed.), *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* (pp. 163–167). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stiegler, S. (2008). Queer youth as teachers: Dismantling silence of queer issues in a teacher preparation program committed to social justice. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 5*(4), 116–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650802223227.

Sumara, D. J. (2008). Small differences matter: Interrupting certainty about identity in teacher education. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 4*(4), 39–58. https://doi.org/10.1300/J367v04n04_04.

Sumara, D. J., Davis, B., & Iftody, T. (2006). Normalizing literary responses in the teacher education classroom. *Changing English, 13*(1), 55–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/13586840500523497.

Swartz, P. C. (2003a). Bridging multicultural education: Bringing sexual orientation into the children's and young adult literature classrooms. *Radical Teacher, (66),* 11–16.

Swartz, P. C. (2003b). It's elementary in Appalachia. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 1*(1), 51–71. https://doi.org/10.1300/J367v01n01_04.

Sykes, H., & Goldstein, T. (2004). From performed to performing ethnography: Translating life history research into anti-homophobia curriculum for a teacher education program. *Teaching Education, 15*(1), 41–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621042000179989.

Szalacha, L. A. (2004). Educating teachers on LGBTQ issues. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 1*(4), 67–79. https://doi.org/10.1300/J367v01n04_07.

Talburt, S., & Rasmussen, M. L. (2010). 'After-queer' tendencies in queer research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 23*(1), 1–14.

Taylor, P. (2001). Good news and bad news: A comparison of teacher educators' and preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity issues. In *Presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research association, Seattle. Retrieved from ERIC (ED454216).*

Taylor, C. (2002). Beyond empathy. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 6*(3–4), 219–234. https://doi.org/10.1300/J155v06n03_18.

Taylor, C. (2004). Queering teacher education: Failures of empathy and their uses. *Inter-Cultural Studies, 4*(1), 19–31.

Taylor, M., & Coia, L. (Eds.). (2014a). *Gender, feminism, and queer theory in the self-study of teacher education practices.* Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Taylor, M., & Coia, L. (2014b). Addressing gender, feminism, and queer theory through self-study of teacher education practices: A literature review. In M. Taylor, & L. Coia (Eds.), *Gender, feminism, and queer theory in the self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 11–29). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Todd, S. (2008). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism.* Paradigm Publishers.

Turnbull, M., & Hilton, T. (2010). Infusing some queer into teacher education. *Education Canada, 50*(5), 18–22.

Turner, S. L. (2010). Undressing as normal: The impact of coming out in class. *The Teacher Educator, 45*(4), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2010.508316.

Vavrus, M. (2009). Sexuality, schooling, and teacher identity formation: A critical pedagogy for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(3), 383–390. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.002.

Whitlock, R. U. (2010). Getting queer: Teacher education, gender studies, and the cross-disciplinary quest for queer pedagogies. *Issues in Teacher Education, 19*(2), 81–104.

Wickens, C. M., & Sandlin, J. A. (2010). Homophobia and heterosexism in a college of education: A culture of fear, a culture of silence. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 23*(6), 651–670. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390903551035.

Williamson, K. M., & Williams, J. A. (1990). Promoting equity awareness in the preparation of physical education students. *Teaching Education, 3*(1), 117–123.

Wilson, E. (1998). Educator training in homosexual/bisexual youth issues: Research issues and methods. In *Presented at the annual meeting of the American association of colleges for teacher education, New Orleans, LA.* Retrieved from ERIC (ED418082).

Wolfe, R. B. (2006). Choosing to include gay issues in early childhood teacher preparation coursework: One professor's journey. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 27*(2), 195–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/10901020600675174.

Woodruff, J. (2014). Is the closet door still closed in 2014?. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database In D. Dissertation (Ed.), *A CIPP model program evaluation of preservice diversity training regarding LGBT issues.* The University of Alabama (UMI No. 3620197).

Young, A. J., & Middleton, M. J. (1999). "It never occurred to me that I might have a gay student in my K-12 classroom": An investigation of the treatment of sexual orientation issues in teacher education programming. In *Presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research association, Montreal, QC.* Retrieved from ERIC (ED432559).

Zack, J., Mannheim, A., & Alfano, M. (2010). "I didn't know what to say…" : Four archetypal responses to homophobic rhetoric in the classroom. *High School Journal, 93*(3), 98–110. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.0.0047.

Zacko-Smith, J. D., & Pritchy Smith, G. (2010). Recognizing and utilizing queer pedagogy: A call for teacher education to reconsider the knowledge base on sexual orientation for teacher education programs. *Multicultural Education, 18*(1), 2–9.

Zavalkoff, A. (2002). Teaching the teachers. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 6*(3–4), 243–253. https://doi.org/10.1300/J155v06n03_20.