



Context Matters

— RESEARCH GRANTS —

Equipping Pre-service Teachers to Champion Gender Equality in Uganda

Principle Investigator: Lydia Namatende-Sakwa (PhD)

Faculty of Education, Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Educational Media
Kyambogo University, Uganda

nsakwa@kyu.ac.ug

Co-Researchers:

Assoc. Prof. Betty Ezati (PhD)

College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University, Uganda

Betty.ezati@mak.ac.ug

Henry Kariisa (PhD)

College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University, Uganda

Henry.kariisa@mak.ac.ug

Stephen Ndawula (PhD)

Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Educational Media

Kyambogo University, Uganda

sndawula@kyu.ac.ug

Research Dates: June 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022

Executive Summary

Background: Scholarship localizes schools as significant, and, teachers as key agents in gender socialization of children through stereotypical beliefs that drive interactions with male and female students. It is therefore pertinent to prepare gender sensitive teachers to challenge gender discrimination and, empower students to subvert gender stereotypes. Yet, gender equality largely remains at the fringes within teacher education globally.

Purpose of the Study: This study aimed to establish the extent to which gender equality was integrated into teacher education programs in Uganda. Specifically, it assessed perceptions towards gender equality; documented gendered lived school experiences and established how gender equality was integrated into teacher education programs from perspectives of pre-service teachers, teacher educators and directorates of gender mainstreaming from Kyambogo and Makerere Universities in Uganda

Motivation: Our reflection on dynamics in Ugandan classrooms illuminated distinct gendered patterns also mirrored our textbook research, through the under-representation of females, assigned passive stereotypical roles. Further, a dominant thread within our scholarship is the gap in teachers' gender knowledge base, reflected through their roles in propagating and reinforcing stereotypes and norms. This study aimed to inform gender responsive teacher education programs in Uganda.

Methodology: Informed by Bourdieu's theory of cultural reproduction, the study took a quantitative cross-sectional survey and qualitative phenomenological design, to engage teacher education at Kyambogo and Makerere Universities—the largest teacher education institutions in Uganda. This collaboration provided broad and deep insights into the status of gender equality in teacher education programs in Uganda. The two institutions are pace setters in teacher education as their practices have significant impact on other institutions. This partnership is a great foundation towards enriching teacher education.

Findings: Traditional notions of gender roles, which shaped gendered patterns in subject choice, participation, learner styles and performance, largely informed gender perspectives. Secondly, pre-service teachers' lived experiences in schools illuminated gendered patterns in leadership, discipline, bullying, preferential treatment and sexual harassment. Finally, the paucity of gender equality within teacher education programs was illuminated through dearth in content, omission, time allocations and positioning. This was exacerbated by challenges including gender illiteracy; overloaded programs; negative attitudes; norms; paucity of female leaders and administrative support.

Recommendations: The evidence on traditional notions of gender roles, which shape inhibitive gendered patterns, should inform pre-service teacher education programs, to produce gender sensitive teachers to challenge gender stereotypes and empower students.

Pointers for Further Research: Future scholars should conduct observational studies on gendered classroom dynamics in order to plug gaps and document best practices.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Executive Summary | i |
| Chapter One: Introduction..... | 1 |
| Context of the Study | 1 |
| Bourdieu’s Theory on Cultural Reproduction..... | 3 |
| Chapter 2: Methodology | 4 |
| Research Design..... | 4 |
| Chapter 3: Findings of the Study | 7 |
| Perceptions towards Gender Equality | 7 |
| Pre-service Teacher Perceptions towards Gender Equality | 7 |
| Gender and Classroom Participation | 9 |
| Discipline..... | 10 |
| Teacher Educator Perceptions towards Gender Equality..... | 10 |
| Pre-Service Teachers’ Gendered Lived Experiences in School..... | 12 |
| Gender and Leadership | 12 |
| Gender and Discipline | 13 |
| Preferential Gendered Treatment..... | 13 |
| Sexual Harassment..... | 14 |
| Gender Equality and the Pre-service Teacher Education Program | 16 |
| The Integration of Gender Equality into Teacher Education Programs..... | 17 |
| Perspectives on Integrating Gender Equality into Teacher Education | 18 |
| Challenges of Integrating Gender into Teacher Education Programs..... | 21 |
| Summary | 23 |
| Chapter 4 Discussion of Findings..... | 25 |
| Perspectives towards Gender Equality | 25 |
| Understandings of Gender and Gender Equality | 25 |
| Gender Roles | 25 |
| Subject Preference and Performance | 26 |
| Pre-Service Teachers’ Gendered Lived Experiences in School..... | 26 |
| Leadership..... | 26 |
| Punishment | 26 |
| Preferential Gendered Treatment..... | 27 |
| Sexual Harassment..... | 27 |
| Gender Equality and the Pre-service Teacher Education Programs..... | 28 |
| Importance of Integrating Gender Equality | 29 |
| Modes for Integrating Gender Equality into Teacher Education | 29 |
| Challenges of Integrating Gender into the Teacher Education Programs | 30 |
| Chapter 5: Conclusions..... | 31 |
| Recommendations | 32 |
| About the Authors | 33 |
| References | 34 |
| Appendices | 37 |

Chapter One: Introduction

Research has enduringly demonstrated that teacher beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge about gender shape differential treatment of boys and girls (Ezati, 2007; Namatende-Sakwa, 2018; 2019). We focus on teacher education as an entry point to addressing gender equality because scholarship on gender socialization localizes schools as significant, and, teachers as key agents in the gender socialization of children (Alumutawa, 2005; Paechter, 2007). In the classroom, teachers transmit both knowledge in the formal and also the hidden curriculum comprising implicit gendered messages. However, teachers are often unaware of the stereotypical beliefs that drive their interactions with male and female students (Sanders, 2000). It is therefore pertinent that teachers are equipped to be sensitive to gender bias in order to challenge it and, empower their students to subvert gender stereotypes (Namatende-Sakwa, 2021). Skelton (2007) suggested that teacher training programs should be “places in which stereotypical beliefs and behaviors could be reflected on, challenged and questioned” (p. 680). Campbell and Sanders (1997) added that it is more effective to teach pre-service teachers about gender equality, rather than undo poor teaching using one-shot workshops.

Yet, despite decades of societal concern about inequities, gender equality as Sanders argued, “is still in its infancy in teacher education” (2002, p. 242). Moreover, attempts to integrate it have been problematized for downplaying gender given variant pressures on teacher training programs, consequently paying lip-service to gender equality (Skelton, 2007). Indeed, Mansaray (2011) problematized the dominant approach to teacher preparation as heavily focused on subject “knowledge base” and “appropriate” teaching methods, at the expense of core beliefs, values, and attitudes that shape teacher effectiveness. This has given gender equality “a tenuous and marginal position in a full and time-constrained teacher training curriculum” (Skelton, 2007, p. 676).

Context of the Study

This study was situated in Uganda, where like several African countries, limited attention has been paid to preparing teachers as regards addressing gender equality in schools (Namatende-Sakwa, 2019; Barton & Sakwa, 2012). As a developing country with diverse patriarchal cultures, women in Uganda have traditionally been constructed as subservient to men, as reflected through practices like bride price, polygamy, and intergenerational marriage (Bantebya & Keniston, 2006). These gender discrepancies, reinforced in the pervasive gendered division of labor in homes and work places, are reproduced in the gendered patterns in subject choice and performance (Longman & Sakwa, 2013).

This notwithstanding, the Government of Uganda has made some strides in mainstreaming gender into education. Gender quality in education is enshrined in the National Strategy for Girls’ Education (NSGE), a framework for narrowing the gender gap in education

particularly through promoting girls' education. This framework is aligned to several global commitments to eradicate gender inequalities in education, such as, The Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), Education For All (EFA) Goals, the Beijing Platform for Action (PFA), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI) amongst others.

At the national level, commitment to girls' education is reflected in the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995), which emphasizes that the rights to education for all Ugandans. The Constitution also emphasizes the imperative to redress social imbalances in favor of groups marginalized on the basis of gender, among other social categories. Indeed, the Affirmative Action policy was introduced in 1990 as an incentive to increase the number of female undergraduate entrants into public universities by adding an extra 1.5 points to all girls (Odaga, 2022). Further, the National Gender Policy (2007), a guiding framework for gender mainstreaming in Uganda, calls for action to address gender inequalities. Further, the Gender in Education Policy (2009) and the National Development Plan (NDP) (2010) provide frameworks for the implementation and monitoring of a gender sensitive and responsive education system in Uganda. Finally, the National Teacher Policy (2019), developed to professionalize the teaching profession, established measures to support the integration of cross cutting issues such as gender, ICT, education in emergencies, HIV/AIDS, environment and human rights into teacher development, teacher management and teaching practices. Therefore, this study, on equipping teachers to champion gender equality in schools in Uganda, is framed by a supportive policy environment.

Purpose of the Study

The study aimed to establish to what extent gender equality had been integrated into teacher education programs in Uganda. This was undertaken through eliciting information from pre-service teachers, teacher educators as well as the teacher education programs from two leading teacher education universities in Uganda.

Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following research objectives:

- i) Assess the perceptions of pre-service teachers towards gender equality.
- ii) Establish the perceptions of teacher educators in relation to gender equality.
- iii) Document pre-service teachers' gendered lived school experiences in school settings.
- iv) Establish how gender equality has been integrated into pre-service teacher education programs in Ugandan universities.

Bourdieu's Theory on Cultural Reproduction

This study is informed by Pierre Bourdieu's theory, which conceptualizes cultural reproduction as the generational transmission of cultural values, norms, and experience (Bourdieu, 2018). According to this theory, education, particularly schools, play a vital role in the reproduction of the dominant ideology and forms of knowledge (Nash, 1990). Schooling reproduces inequalities by espousing dominant groups through the use of their cultural capital including language, ideas, and knowledge in school's curriculum. This positions dominant groups for success thereby privileging them. This theory of cultural reproduction applies not only in reproduction of dominant class culture but in gender too as it reproduces patriarchal culture, which is the underlying cause of gender inequality.

Indeed, educational institutions transmit patriarchal values and norms through curriculum content and teaching practices, which reinforce traditional gender stereotypes and perpetuate gender roles (Asadullah, Amin, & Chaudhury, 2019; Telioussi, Zafiri, & Pliogou, 2020). The social basis of male domination is concealed through powerful ideological mechanisms, such as the naturalization of gender inequality, so that women experience their subordination and men their domination as inevitable and natural. Women and men are thus attributed roles, using dualistic concepts such public/private, active/passive, strong/weak, male/female/, masculine/feminine, which structure power and gender relations, legitimizing gender segregation and the subordination of women.

The socially constructed gender segregation, perceived as natural, is then incorporated into what Bourdieu calls "habitus"—that is in the cultural schemes for perception, thinking, classification, and action. In other words, both male and female internalize this schema as the latter contributes to their own subordination, reproducing the unequal gender relations. This form of dominance is what Bourdieu calls "symbolic violence", which is not based on physical force or coercion, but on an invisible form of power through which the dominated are socialized into doxa (Bourdieu, 1999).

This theory provided a lens to analyze and understand how pre-service teachers and teacher educators' perceptions and practices as regards gender equality were formed, taken up and/or reproduced in the field (School/classroom). We then produced recommendations to curb the re-production of patriarchal cultures, which perpetrate gender inequality in education.

Chapter 2: Methodology

We used a convergent mixed methods approach, with the quantitative survey used to provide broad perspectives around gender equality, while the qualitative approach was used to elicit deeper insights into the integration of gender equality into teacher education programs in Uganda.

Research Design

The research design entailed a quantitative cross-sectional survey to provide broader insights into gender equality and teacher education in Uganda. A phenomenological design elicited pre-service teachers' gendered lived experiences in school settings, and a case study design used to select the two cases (KyU and MaK).

Population and Sample

The study population comprised pre-service teachers, teacher educators and administrators from the directorates of gender mainstreaming from both from Makerere University (MaK) and Kyambogo University (KyU). The participants were stratified according to institution (MaK and KyU), program (science and arts) as well as sex (female and male) respondents. A sample of 959 pre-service teachers was determined using Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table of 1970. The sample for each university was determined using proportionate stratified sampling. Using purposive sampling, we also recruited 12 lecturers, 2 members from the directorates of gender mainstreaming and we analyzed 2 education programs as illustrated in Table 1.

Access to Participants

In order to access the respondents, we wrote letters to the Deans of the education at MaK and KyU who provided the contact details of the heads of department of sciences and arts departments. The heads of department provided access to student group platforms where we posted a call explaining the study and requesting for voluntary participation, to which several responded affirmatively. The members from the directorates of gender mainstreaming were recruited through researcher visits to the directorate offices, where we explained the study and requested for consent and voluntary participation.

Methods of Data Collection

The data was collected through surveys, in-depth interviews, documentary analysis as well as key informant interviews (see Table 1 for summary and Appendix I for details of participant characteristics).

The *survey* (Appendix II) conducted with 959 pre-service teachers elicited their perceptions, attitudes as well as their preparation in regard to gender equality.

In-depth interviews with 30 pre-service teachers (ages 20-24) (Appendix III) then followed, providing insights into gendered lived experiences in Ugandan school settings.

The *Documentary analysis* (Appendix IV) entailed a review of the teacher education programs, which established how gender equality was integrated therein.

Key informant interviews (Appendix V) with 15 teacher educators (ages 37-55) including heads of departments ensured, providing teacher educator perspectives.

Key informant interviews (Appendix VI) with 2 administrators from the directorates of gender mainstreaming elicited data on challenges and recommendations for integrating gender equality into teacher education.

Table 1: Summary of sample size and methods of data collection

| Participants | Characteristics | Method | Number (Qualitative) | Number (Quantitative) | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------|
| Pre-service teachers | -Students: 3 rd year -Disciplines: Arts and sciences -Sex: Female and male -Institutions: KyU and MaK | In-depth interviews Survey | 15 KyU 15 MaK Total: 30 | 509 KyU 450 Mak Total: 959 | 989 |
| Lecturers | -Position: 3 rd year lecturers -Disciplines: Arts, Sciences, Pedagogy, Foundations -Sex: Female and male -Institutions: KyU and Mak | Key informant interviews | 6 KyU 9 MaK Total: 15 | N/A | 12 |
| Directorate of gender mainstreaming | -Directorate administrators -MaK and KyU | Key informant interviews | 1 KyU 1 Mak Total: 2 | N/A | 02 |
| Teacher education program documents | -3 rd year programs (KyU; MaK) | Documentary analysis | 1 KyU 1 Mak Total: 2 programs | N/A | 2 |

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed following one case at a time (KyU followed by MaK). This enabled a deep understanding of each case at a time, as a complex social entity located in its own socio-historical situation. The first phase of the analysis focused on the survey data, which was coded and entered into a computer using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS Version 21). Frequencies and percentages for different items were determined and presented using tables and graphs. The second phase focused on the qualitative data from the documentary analysis, in-depth and key informant interviews, which were transcribed, coded and analyzed using thematic analysis to produce themes aligned to the study objectives. The third phase of the analysis involved a cross-case analysis (Stake, 2006), where we discussed the findings across the two cases in relation to existing research in the field, eliciting broader insights into perceptions, experiences and the integration of gender into teacher education within the two universities.

Validity and Reliability

The validity of the questionnaire focused on face validity, which was checked by an expert in the field of gender to ensure that the items were correctly worded and gender related. Reliability for the quantitative data (questionnaire) tool was determined by calculating Cronbach Alpha using SPSS. All the four sections had a calculated Cronbach's alpha of greater than the recommended value of 0.7.

Qualitative trustworthiness and credibility on the other hand was established through triangulation using multiple methods (survey, documentary analysis, in-depth interviews, key informant interviews), which corroborated findings across the cases. Secondly, peer debriefing from the researchers' colleagues provided an external check of the research process. Thirdly, through member checking, we shared data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions with participants from each category who validated the findings. Finally, we presented the report findings using a rich, thick description to allow readers to make decisions regarding trustworthiness and credibility of the findings.

Ethical Considerations

We first sought ethical approval from Infectious Diseases Institute-Research Ethics Committee (IDI-REC) before proceeding with the study. Voluntary participation and informed consent were established through explaining the study to each participant who then signed a consent form. The consent form guaranteed confidentiality of participant identities and, pseudonyms were used as a measure in this regard. All the participants were reimbursed twenty thousand Ugandan shillings (20,000/=) for transport and communication facilitation in line with the REC guidelines. We also observed COVID-19 standard operating procedures including wearing of masks, sanitization and social distancing during physical research interactions.

Chapter 3: Findings of the Study

This chapter comprises the findings of the study from the cases of Kyambogo University and Makerere University. The voices of the pre-service teachers (ages 37-55), teacher educators (ages 37-55) and directors of gender mainstreaming (ages 47-50) from KyU and MaK are heard throughout the section. We use pseudonyms to protect participants' privacy (see Appendix 1 for detailed information on respondents). It was important to capture both the gendered lived experiences of pre-service teachers in schools as well as the perspectives of their teachers in exploring this topic. This generated information reflecting a trajectory of gendered experiences and an inventory of perspectives which can be addressed in equipping teachers to champion gender equality through pre-service teacher education programs in Uganda.

The findings from KyU and MaK largely complement each other given the similarity in their characteristics as public, secular, urban-based universities. Therefore, future research focus on institutions of disparate characteristics promises to enrich the field.

This section provides insights into all the participants' perceptions towards gender equality; pre-service teachers' gendered lived experiences in Ugandan school contexts as well as all the participants' perspectives regarding the integration of gender equality into pre-service teacher education programs in Uganda.

Perceptions towards Gender Equality

We provide findings on perceptions towards gender equality, first from the pre-service teachers and then the teacher educators.

Pre-service Teacher Perceptions towards Gender Equality

Pre-service teacher perceptions on gender equality focus on their understandings of gender and gender equality, gender roles, performance and learner styles as well as discipline.

Understandings of Gender and Gender Equality

Gender was dominantly explained as a synonym for sex. Anita for example, explained it as “the state of being female or male.” However, for Dominique, gender is “the perspective people have on a certain sex.” According to this, gender is a construct attributed to a particular sex.

As regards understandings of gender equality, the majority of pre-service teachers from KyU (74.8%) and Mak (73.9%) agreed that it was about fairness between female and male. This is corroborated in the interviews, which equated gender equality to fairness as well as providing equal opportunities for males and females. As Eve explained, “like promoting fairness between males and females.” Grace affirmed this: “Gender equality is when the female and male are given equal opportunities.”

Gender Roles

The construction of men as heads of homes and breadwinners and women as nurturers was pervasive. As Irene explained, “girls are expected to do house chores...cooking, sweeping, hygiene...the males as bread winners.” Eve added: “I see them as family heads...leaders...protectors.” In reiterating this, Dominique asserted: “God created Eve to be an assistant or a helper to Adam and provide company to Adam...so the woman should be there for the man...support the man and of course raise the children.”

The choice to take on work outside the home even for educated women was curtailed by some men who did not allow them to work. Isaac pointed out this out: “in some homes, the man doesn’t want his wife to work and he tells her that ‘you stay at home for me I will work...’ So you just leave whatever you studied...just sit at home and cater for the children.”

The perception of the majority of participants on males as physically stronger (75.7%) and females more emotional (75.3%) is linked to perceived natural gender roles. As Andrew explained, “there are roles that are naturally for men and those for female.” Nurture, which requires emotionality and care, was attributed to women while economic roles and energy intensive activities attributed to men.

Further, the allocation of roles in the schools was largely informed by traditional gendered roles. Indeed, as Grace affirmed, girls are more likely to partake in roles such as sweeping and boys in roles such as slashing.

While gendered roles were also reflected in the leadership positions, in which males dominated as leaders in parliament and homes as providers, there is evidence of a gradual shift, attributed to education and access to equal opportunities as Andy explained: “Women can perform any role once trained...become leaders...professionals...doctors... the guild president is a woman.”

Performance and Learner Styles

As regards performance, particularly in the sciences, in KyU for example, the majority (77%) agreed that boys outperform girls. The prevalence of girls within humanities and arts was attributed to lower intellect. The pre-service teachers explained the low numbers of girls in sciences as girls ‘preferring simple subjects’, ‘being soft’ ‘not being technical’, ‘having low interest’. As Erisa explained, “you know ladies are soft...they are not so technical. They don’t want to put in a lot of effort.” As Andrew added, “with math...men are better...subjects like English ...are for women.” However, as Grace explained, there are exceptions: “where some girls perform really well in math but they are few.” Such girls, however, are derogatively masculinized through nicknames as Jan explained: “a girl who scores like 90 is a *bro*.”

The underperformance of girls was attributed to their inferiority complex as well parent's negative attitudes. Indeed, Dominique explained, "girls think that boys are far better than them...even the parents don't believe in their capability." The underperformance of girls was also attributed to claims that boys concentrated more and, had a tendency of distracting girls who gravitate towards excelling in the sciences. As Pam explained, "boys concentrate more...when they see a girl performing better in sciences, they have a way of confusing her such that she declines."

Teachers were also viewed as having a strong influence on efforts students expend into their education and subsequently their performance through their words, actions and inactions. As Gabriel explained: "Some teachers see potential in males than females...when a girl performs well, they will be like 'how can a girl perform better than you?'" This suggests that boys should outperform girls."

Further, the pervasive belief that boys are intellectually superior was illuminated as Andrew explained: "boys are naturally wiser than girls...girls tend to learn slower." Andy added to this criticizing girls' laziness and simple-mindedness, "they prefer the arts because most of them don't like hard life...they don't want to stress themselves to think deeply about certain things." Girls' underachievement was also attributed to the drive to get married while boys were invested in education to find work. As Dominique explained: "they [girls] want to get married but as a boy, you have to ask yourself that if I get married, I need a job. That's why we tend to seek education. We tend to aim higher."

However, some respondents disrupted narratives portraying males as intellectually superior. Indeed, as Grace affirmed, "if women are given equal ground, they can perform better...you can see many families headed by women really doing well." In re-affirming this, Peace explained that in fact girls are making progress in outperforming the boys.

Gender and Classroom Participation

In terms of classroom participation, the majority (67.9%) agreed that female students participate more. This notwithstanding, the narrative that boys outperform girls was pervasive. Boys were perceived as more active participants than girls during class activities. Erisa explained the passiveness of girls in class: "You know they are passive; they are receptive to each and everything you bring to the table...in class you may not find them active, asking questions."

Girls' low classroom participation was attributed shyness and lack of confidence. There were however views that participation in class could not be generalized because it depended on individuals. As Nina explained: "It's about the individuals themselves and

how they conduct themselves in public: Can they speak up and give an answer? It is not about gender...It's all about the individual.”



Figure 1: Pre-service teachers in a KyU lecture room

Figure 2: Pre-service teachers in MaK mathematics lecture

Discipline

As regards discipline, 52.9% of the respondents from KyU for example, disagreed that male students exhibit more indiscipline than female students during lectures, as compared to a significant minority of 47.2% who agreed. The latter perspective is corroborated in the interviews with pre-service teachers who perceived females as more disciplined than males. Dominique explained that in his school, more boys than girls got suspended for indiscipline. This was attributed to the ease of controlling girls as Grace stated, “you find ...it is easier for one to curve out or control females.”

Teacher Educator Perceptions towards Gender Equality

This section provides insights into teacher educators’ understandings of gender and gender equality; gender roles as well as gender and learner styles and achievement.

Understandings of Gender and Gender Equality

In explaining gender, Prof. Kasude referenced sex roles: “it is kind of the sex roles.” On the other hand, Dr. Loretta evoked the discourse of gender as a social construction: “it incorporates the social and cultural differences.”

Gender equality, on the other hand, was largely equated to gender balance as Dr. Dumba explained, “we consider both female and male ...we ensure that we balance.” Dr. Ogwal on the other hand related it to recognizing gender difference, asserting that roles should be allocated depending on differential gender abilities. Gender equality was also associated with equal opportunities as Dr. Munu asserted, “it is about equal opportunities for both female and male...we can also have midwives who are men.” Finally gender equality was associated with human rights and fairness as Dr. Loretta stated, “we need to ensure that there is fairness...respect of rights.”

Gender Roles

In relation to gender roles, some teacher educators reported that both men and women could perform any role except those biologically designed for each sex. As Prof. Makaru explained, “biological roles are specific to either female or male. For economic and social roles any gender can work.” On the other hand, some participants dominantly attributed the roles of care to women and provider to male. As Prof. Kasude explained, “taking care of children is biologically for women and providing basics like food, accommodation for men.” Dr. Sarayi added that men are also protectors: “men have their roles: if it means fighting for the country.”

Further, for respondents like Dr. Nightingale, roles are defined by society: “roles of male and female are defined by our society...it is up to you to follow what society dictates or you become a problem.” This highlights consequences for going against societal norms in crossing gender boundaries. The idea that gender roles are socially constructed is further explained in Dr. Dumba’s assertion which suggests fluidity rather than distinctness of gender roles: “You know things have changed...The female can do what male can...here at KyU we have both male and female heads of departments...student coordinators.” This suggests that females and males to take on roles traditionally relegated to the other.

In terms of leadership, teacher educators acknowledged the predominance of male student leaders, recognising however, that girls were more effective leaders, as Dr. Kaku explained, “they are patient with students and considerate in picking students’ course work and making reminders. Girl leaders are more pro- active.”

Gender and Learner Styles and Achievement

Gendered subject performance was cited in explaining learner style and achievement. As Dr. Sarayi explained, “boys tend to work harder than girls.” She added that boys dominantly take the lead within science classrooms: “boys come out clearly to lead but they are also groups of girls who lead but it’s more of male dominated.” Further, gendered subject preference was cited in demonstrating that boys’ preference for sciences and girls for the arts. As Dr. Nightingale explained, “in this university for example, most arts subjects are associated with the females and sciences with males.”

Additionally, gender differences also manifested in learning style with more active boys. As Dr. Ogwal explained: “boys tend to take on—like fire fighters—something comes and they want to get a solution whereas girls take their time to listen...So in class it will take time for girls to put up their hands and yet boys, before you finish a statement they have an answer.” However, similarities in learning and achievement were evident in the humanities as Dr. Dumba, “both male and female compete in the humanities and education.” Corroborating this, Dr. Loretta added, “as a teacher in the humanities, I have not found any clear difference between male and female.”

The gender differences in subject performance, preference and learner styles were attributed to the differential learning conditions such as social economic class, literacy of parent, and learner attributes. As Prof. Kasude explained: “there isn’t a big difference between boys’ and girls’ learning except for factors like ...a girl from a well-to-do family can do better than a boy from a low socioeconomic status...also children from educated parents, the girl may do better than the boy from illiterate parents.” Indeed, Prof. Yura asserted that participation in class depended on the character of the student with an outgoing student often putting up the hands to contribute to class discussions. Prof. Makairu re-affirmed this stating: “Children brought up in an open manner are not introverts and learn a lot.”

Summary

Overall, “gender” was explained using discourses of biological difference, and, as a social construction. “Gender equality” on the other hand, was associated with “gender balance”, “equal opportunities”, “fairness” and “human rights.” Further, traditional notions of gender roles, which relegate women to domestic and nurturing roles and men to provider, leader and protector roles, were attributed to stereotypical constructions of women as weaker and emotional, compared to the physically stronger men. The consequence of crossing gender boundaries was also hinted upon, as were the shifting gender roles. Further, the gendered learner styles, classroom participation, subject preference and performance polarized male as more intellectually superior, active, hardworking and science-oriented, and females as slower learners, lazier and arts-oriented. Girls who threatened the status quo by outperforming boys in the sciences risked derogatively masculinized name-calling as well as possible distraction by boys in order to derail them. Additionally, the under achievement of girls was attributed to their marriage aspirations, inferiority complex, parental and teachers’ negative attitudes, girls’ negative self-concept and lower intellect. However, this was disrupted by narratives, which attributed underachievement to conditions around social class, literacy of parents as well as learner upbringing and attributes rather than sex. Finally, as regards discipline, girls were perceived as generally more disciplined given the ease of controlling them.

Pre-Service Teachers’ Gendered Lived Experiences in School

Pre-service teacher gendered lived experiences were reflected through their narratives on leadership, discipline, preferential gendered treatment, and sexual harassment.

Gender and Leadership

The narrative of “male as leader” was pervasive in the respondents’ education trajectories. The position of head prefect was deemed male while the deputy/assistant deemed female. As Grace explained, “I was personally affected...the head prefect had to be a male, the chairperson male and...females were left out even with better qualities.” Jan shared a

similar experience in which her desire to become a prefect was thwarted by claims that she could only deputize a boy: “I wanted to head the language department as a prefect, but they said the head was to be a boy and the vice a girl...I felt bad.” This was reinforced at home where girls were also underrated as Jan explained that as a first-born child, she was given less power than her younger brother: “Even at home...I’m the first born...but they look at the boy as the head, the leader.”

Indeed, experiences of teachers frustrating leadership traits in girls were pervasive. Dominique’s sister, an ambitious girl, was subdued because of her sex: “she used to participate in debate...teachers started to see her in a bad way, saying she’s over acting, bragging...they started putting her down.” Further, leadership as relegated to male and female was associated with traditional gender roles. As Peter explained, “at home boys fetch water, split firewood and in school they are the leaders...girls are given chores like cooking at home. And in school, they are given leadership roles related to domestic roles like sanitary prefects.”

Gender and Discipline

In terms of discipline, the girls’ experiences revealed that girls were considered more disciplined and respectful than boys. As Turi explained, “to an extent girls are simpler for a teacher...boys can even box a teacher.” Girls’ discipline was attributed to societal expectations of propriety as well as their upbringing. As Rachel explained: “I think also the way they are raised matters...society expects girls to be more disciplined and submissive than the boys. Additionally, girls’ discipline was attributed to their nature as obedient compared to the big-headedness of boys. As Nina affirmed: “boys are bigheaded...if you tell them something they will not do it...girls are thought to be fearful in confronting certain issues.”

Indeed, gendered discipline was deployed with boys punished more severely than girls. Isaac explained that corporal punishment was deployed more severely on boys: “Whenever we were caned, the boys would suffer more. We would receive even twice the canes given to girls.” Boys were also subjected to more labor-intensive tasks as Andrew explained, “girls for example clean an office, boys slash, draw water, split firewood...So in terms of punishment, discrimination is in favor of the girls, given less harsh corporal punishment.”

Preferential Gendered Treatment

Affirmative action was problematized as discriminatory against male students in the school system. Andrew criticized the extra points awarded girls as an incentive to facilitate their entry into public universities: “there are some points reserved for girls yet they have been in the same classroom, under the same teachers.”

Further, the attention teachers provided girls in classrooms, including addressing their questions and providing feedback was decried as discriminatory. As Andrew explained, “girls are favored especially by male teachers...when a girl raises her hand, she will be chosen first and given more attention.” Additionally, feedback as the respondents opined is given preferentially with female students receiving more attention in a timely and polite manner. As Andrew affirmed, “during consultations, boys are answered rudely and in a brief manner.”

Bullying was yet another of the experiences illuminated pervasively especially by girls in mixed schools: “I faced challenges of the opposite sex bullying me—big boys, teasing me and causing me all sorts of discomfort.”

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment was problematized, although the majority 91.2% from Mak and 75.6% from KyU had never experienced it at the university. This notwithstanding, a significant minority (24.3%) at KyU had experienced it. Further, while a majority (46.4%) from KyU were aware of where to report it, a significant majority (45.2%) were unaware. As to whether lecturers had been the perpetrators of sexual harassment, the majority (75.0%) from KyU disagreed while a relatively significant minority (24.9%) agreed.

Indeed, “sex-for-marks,” a pervasive discourse in universities within Uganda was highlighted in some of the pre-service teacher narratives. As Pam from KyU explained, “Here at the University, most male teachers give students re-takes in the mode of using them...especially girls being harassed because of marks.” Jan shared the experience of a friend who had dropped out of medical school, opting for an education degree to escape sexual pressure from a lecturer: “a friend of mine quit medical school because a lecturer who always demanded for sex always failed her. That’s why she opted for education.” Indeed sex-for-marks was highlighted in the assertions of 54.7% from KyU and 33% from MaK who agreed that it was a common practice at the universities. Peace explained that a close female friend’s marks were first posted on the noticeboard as 48% and then changed to 85% after she got into a sexual relationship with the lecturer.

While lecturers have been perceived as perpetrators of sex-for-marks, some narratives illuminated that female students also perpetrated it. The behavior of female students as the majority (72.1%) from KyU for example affirmed, predisposed them to sexual harassment. Indeed, Grace shared an experience of one student who propositioned a male lecturer in order to receive additional marks to reach the pass mark for the examination: “the student got 48%...she asked the lecturer what she can offer him to give her the two marks to pass the course...The young male lectures also suffer sexual harassment by the female students. At the same time lady students also suffer sexual harassment from the elderly lecturers.” In yet another example, Evelyne shared the experience of a friend who attracted the

attention of one of her lecturers, whom she then started dating: “the girl always had some hints to examination questions.” This suggests that the lecturer gave this female student clues to questions in pending examinations.

Sexual harassment was also attributed to the laziness of some girls who choose to provide sexual favors rather than do their work as Andy explained: “instead of spending the night reading, they just go and make life simple—make the lecturer happy and then you score highly.” Erisa added, “You find such cases with lazy girls...but for someone who is hardworking, you earn marks according to your efforts.” Sexual harassment was attributed to the power relations between lecturers and their students. As Grace explained, some students have been compromised by lecturers who take advantage of the student’s vulnerabilities: “You find one telling the student to go to his office...you are told if you do not cooperate I have the power ...it’s we who play with the system but you have no power.” Turi shared the experience of a friend whose marks a lecturer attempted to withdraw on conditions that she provided sexual favors: “the doctor [lecturer] did not put her results on the list and when she went to his office, he tried to engage her sexually, but she reported and a whole battalion came and the girl got her results.”

Sexual harassment was not limited to happening between students and teacher educators, it was also reported to be a common concern among students. Nina explained her experience with another student who tried to force her into sex in exchange for food he had bought her: “I visited this guy with who w had become friends. After eating some food, the guy locked the room and he told me that because I had eaten his food, I had to engage in sex with him.”

The reporting of sexual harassment cases remained low as students feared to report. As Rachel explained, “Students fear...if you want to pass, you just let it go because if you report he will give you a retake.” Indeed, the fear in addition to lack of knowledge of reporting procedures and offices was confirmed in Gabriel’s narrative: “I say this from experience. They do not know the right offices to go to and sometimes they fear that when they report an offending lecturer, the lecturer will not allow them graduate...we have the post of sexual harassment officer within the Guild leadership but these haven’t done enough.” The narrative on paucity of knowledge as regards reporting is contradicted in the quantitative data which showed that up to 63.8% of the participants from MaK for example, knew where to report sexual harassment This notwithstanding a significant percentage confirm the gaps as regards reporting sexual harassment.

Victim shaming in the midst of sexual harassment scenarios, was part of the pre-service teachers’ experiences. Pam for example, explained that a catholic brother, whose place she and her friends used to iron their clothes, raped her: “I was in senior six towards my mock exams and we had a catholic brother who was one of my classmates...I used to iron from

bothers' place...he wanted sex with me...I was in his room and I had no option." When Pam reported the incident to the senior ladies at school, she was instead accused of having had an abortion and reprimanded for falsely accusing the brother: "I reported but then senior ladies brought out a fake story that I aborted...I wasn't given any expulsion but I felt out of place." Pam also missed her first set of mock exams as she had gone home during that crisis. The brother on the other was neither reprimanded nor his learning interrupted: "Yeah, he just continued. We finished senior six with him...He never apologized."

Online sexual harassment, especially using social media, was prevalent with a significant minority (40.2%) from KyU for example, in agreement that they had been harassed. Similarly, while the majority (50.7%) had not faced sexual harassment outside the university, a significant minority (49.3%) had experienced it.

Summary

The findings of the experiences of pre-service teachers from both universities illuminate the pervasiveness of narratives of male as leader, with positions of head prefect relegated to males and assistant prefect to females. Teachers aggravated matters through curtailing girls' leadership potentials in school, reinforced in homes where girls were also underrated as leaders. Bullying of girls in mixed sex schools, coupled with sexual harassment, particularly "sex-for-marks," in both universities, was a pervasive experience dominantly perpetuated by male lecturers, although in some instances, girls propositioned lecturers in order to receive high grades. This compromised lecturers, some of whom provided clues to examination questions to girls.

Sexual harassment was attributed to the power relations between students and lecturers, which predisposed the former to sexual harassment. Moreover, victim shaming pervaded sexual harassment scenarios, with male perpetrators getting away with abuse, given the minimal reporting attributed to fear of repercussions and limited knowledge as regards reporting procedures.

Additionally, online sexual harassment, especially using social media, was prevalent with a significant minority, especially girls as victims. Further, male gender discrimination was reflected in harsher punishments; affirmative action policy and differential attention teachers provided girls including addressing their questions and providing feedback.

Gender Equality and the Pre-service Teacher Education Program

The pre-service teacher education programs at KyU and Mak are three-years comprising courses categorized as professional studies, pedagogy/methods, and subject disciplines. This study specifically focused on the professional studies courses, also referred to as the "Foundations of Education" as these are core across all teacher education programs. We present insights into the integration of gender into teacher education programs,

perspectives as regards its integration as well as challenges of integrating it within the professional studies courses at KyU and MaK.

The Integration of Gender Equality into Teacher Education Programs

This section provides insights into the distribution of gender equality, mode of integration, time allocated, as well as position of gender equality into the teacher education programs in Uganda.

Distribution of Gender Equality

Aspects of gender equality were included in 5 of 15 professional studies courses in KyU and 4 out of 19 in MaK. Moreover, the distribution across semesters is questionable with the absence of gender equality in Semester 1 (Year 1) and the whole of Year 3 in KyU.

Further, gender equality as a subtopic was not broken down into relevant thematic areas as depicted in *Curriculum Implementation, Innovation and the Teacher*, a KyU course, where *gender mainstreaming*, which is an aspect of gender equality is not broken down (see italics):

The process of curriculum innovation: Situation analysis; program building; curriculum implementation, NCDC, UNEB, DEO; innovations in Uganda; vocationalisation, sustainable development, *gender mainstreaming*, peace building, technological schools **(05 hrs)**.

Further, gender equality is not included in the course objectives, titles, methods, assessment, or course descriptions, with the exception of one reference in one course description from MaK (*Teachers' Professional Ethics*) and in one course description from KyU (*Professional Skills and Career Development in Education* as follows (see italics in excerpt from the latter):

Brief Course Description: The course introduces the students to the concept of career as progress through life coupled with a means of making a living. Career also means a job or profession for which one is trained and carries the connotation of being exemplary or rendering exemplary service. Included are those study areas that are specific to work performance such as, skills and skills analysis, time management, action planning, and job ethics. However, there are areas of study included to give a societal context such as, life skills, the Ugandan child and children's rights, human rights, goal setting, networking, job search and interviews and *gender*.

Mode of Integration of Gender Equality

Gender equality does appear as sub-topic within some courses at both universities. At KyU, gender equality is included in *Communications Skills and Humanities; Curriculum Implementation, Innovation and the Teacher; General Methods and Educational Technology* as well as *Development Issues in Education* and *Professional Skills and Career*

Development. At MaK gender equality is integrated as a sub-topic in courses such as *Economics and Entrepreneurship Education; Teachers Professional Ethics; Guidance and Counselling and Philosophical Thoughts in Education and their Orientation to Teaching and Learning.*

Time Allotted to Gender Equality

The amount of time allocated to gender equality was shared with numerous other sub-topics. In KyU's *Curriculum Implementation, Innovation and the Teacher*, "Gender Mainstreaming" was allotted 5 hours with 9 other subtopics. Likewise, in KyU's *General Methods and Educational Technology*, "Gender Responsive Pedagogy" was allotted 2 hours together with 9 other subtopics. Similarly, in MaK's *Economics and Entrepreneurship Education*, "Education and Gender" was also assigned 4 hours alongside 8 other sub topics.

Positioning of Gender Equality

Gender issues are positioned at the tail end of the list of several sub-topics. In KyU's *Communication Skill and Humanities* for example, it is the 3rd last sub-topic; in *Curriculum Implementation, Innovation and the Teacher*, it is the 3rd last sub-topic; in *Development Issues in Education*, it is the 2nd last sub-topic; in *Professional Skills and Career Development in Education*, it is the last sub-topics; and in *General Methods and Educational Technology*, it is the 2nd last topic.

Perspectives on Integrating Gender Equality into Teacher Education

This section provides insights into KyU and Mak pre-service and teacher educator perspectives on integrating gender equality into their teacher education programs. Their perspectives are grouped by importance, modes of integration, and suggested content.

Importance of integrating gender equality

As to whether gender equality should be included in the teacher education program, a majority (91%) of students from KyU for example, agreed. Grace explained the benefits of integration: "Implementing gender equality amongst the learners...will impact the work place, churches, labor markets, to mention but a few." The importance of teaching gender equality was also attributed to pervasive gendered issues like gender-based violence and school dropout, especially faced by girls in Uganda. As Irene asserted, "It's important because learners are facing these challenges...increasing issues of gender-based violence, school dropout, teenage pregnancies."

The teacher educators also dominantly commended the integration of gender equality into teacher education. As Prof Kasude affirmed, "Obviously gender equality is good." Dr. Dumba reiterated: "Yes, it is very important." Indeed Dr. Ogwal added, "it is by exposing students to gender issues...that gender discrimination can be curbed."

While the teacher educators acknowledged the importance of integrating gender into teacher education, the majority of teacher educators from both universities did not take it into consideration when teaching their classes. As Dr. Dumba explained, “No. I don’t want to lie...I have never thought about it.” Similarly, Dr. Malika explained that he did not include it because he taught mathematics: “I do not put more consideration because I teach math.” This notwithstanding, some teacher educators took gender equality into consideration, in their practice and choice of language—albeit inadvertently. As Dr. Ogwal explained: “Yes gender comes up in my teaching—for example management of a calf—issues of who is going to handle when a calf for example kicks—so then you tell them that even if you are a woman, you can milk or even if you are a man, you can still help a cow to give birth.”

Mode of Integrating Gender Equality into Teacher Education

As to whether gender equality was integrated into their programs, the majority (54.5%) from KyU for example, disagreed while a significant minority (45%) agreed. Additionally, the majority (53.5%), from KyU thought that a separate course on gender equality did exist while a significant minority (46.5%) disagreed. As the interviews confirmed, gender equality has scarcely been integrated into teacher education in both universities. Indeed Dominique affirmed, “I hardly remember having any lecture specifically about it. It came up as a sub-topic, like in *Communication Skills*.”

Gender equality, as the pre-service teachers explained, was addressed indirectly. Andrew explained that in the course on *Professional Skills and Career Guidance*, pre-service teachers engaged with how to nurture relationships with the community, learners, and teachers. This according to Andrew, addressed issues of equality: “how are you going to treat students? Are you going to promote discrimination based on race, religion, income, or on performance, sex?” In affirming this, Grace explained that most of her first year courses emphasized fair treatment of students: “It [gender equality] was not taught directly...So you have to figure it out for yourself.”

In addressing how gender equality should be integrated into teacher education, some pre-service teachers and teacher educators advocated for it should be made compulsory for all to benefit. As Isaac of MaK suggested: “if you want people to be aware of it, then it should be a compulsory.” Similarly Dr. Dumba of KyU recommended gender equality should be made core course as a way of demonstrating its importance: “we should have it as a core...to show its importance.” Further as Grace added, the effect on students would be more potent as a core course: “it should stand on its own for vivid effect.”

Integration, in which gender equality is interweaved across the teacher education program, is yet another approach some pre-service teachers and teacher educators recommended for

including gender equality into teacher education. As Andrew explained, “Let it be integrated in other subjects.” Integration as Dr. Loretta added, would not only market the program but also fulfill the requirements of the equal opportunities commission to integrate gender across the dimensions of the university. In supporting integration, Dr. Ogwal added that it would ensure gender equality is associated with all the lecturers and disciplines: “When it is a core course, you hear people say ‘the person of gender has come’—now when the person is not around, gender does not feature. But if the person of soil talks about gender, and the person of crops talks about gender, the person of economics talks about gender, the person of extension talks about gender, then it is going to become a household name.”

Gender Equality and Assessment

As to whether gender was taken into consideration during assessment, the majority explained that it was not. Dr. Dumba explained that the assessment of school practice was guided by a rubric, which does not have a provision for gender issues: “We have one assessment form...there is no section on gender...in case of modification, I really support it.” This notwithstanding, the teacher educators recognized the importance of taking it into consideration during assessment of school practice. As Dr. Loretta affirmed: “I think in school practice it is necessary.”

As to whether gender responsiveness was assessed during school practice, the majority (53.2%) of pre-service from KyU agreed as compared to a significant minority (46.8%) who disagreed and/or were undecided. Additionally, in terms of the fairness of supervisors during school practice, the majority (56.3%) of students from KyU for example, disagreed while a significant minority (43.6%) agreed that lecturers were always fair.

Further, school practice, undertaken in the 2nd and 3rd year of the pre-service teacher education programs, did not make provision for assessing the gender responsiveness of a lesson. Indeed as Irene from KyU explained, the supervisors focused on content and method. This notwithstanding, the majority of the pre-service teachers explained that they were conscious about gender issues during school practice such as the use of appropriate language and promoting participation of both boys and girls during class activities. Andy explained, “When I’m teaching my students I must always be gender sensitive...I group my learners while taking note of gender.” Similarly, Esther from MaK for example, explained that “if you ask a question take responses from both sexes.”

Like pre-service teachers, teacher educators emphasized the need for fairness during assessment, which should go beyond gender boundaries. Prof. Makaru of MaK explained for example explained that marking is undertaken fairly regardless of sex: “Yes, we mark them equally.” Giving the same examinations to students was also perceived as fair. Dr. Olimu of MaK explained this affirming, “I give the same exam to everybody; test and

school practice supervision is done equally to everybody.” Further, the use of anonymous registration numbers was yet another way that the teacher educators ensured fairness and to avoid gender-biased assessment. Indeed, Prof. Yura of MaK explained, “No-our papers have no names—I don’t discriminate. We give marks according to the marking guide.”

Gender Equality and Training

While the teacher educators confirmed the importance of receiving formal gender training, none of them had participated in training. As Prof. Kasude explained, “For the formal training I think not much.” Similarly, Dr. Dumba explained that the closest to training he had received was a talk on Womens’ Day: “they invited Heads of Department and got a talk (laughs), but I have never attended any training in relation to gender.”

The importance of training of teacher educators on gender equality was highlighted. Dr. Ogwal explained that some international collaboration requires it as a standard consideration in their workings. As Dr. Ogwal explained: “We are designing a new program in horticulture in collaboration with our colleagues in Holland and they emphasized the aspect of gender.”

Challenges of Integrating Gender into Teacher Education Programs

Although pre-service teachers, teacher educators, and officials in the Gender Mainstreaming Directorates of MaK and KyU confirmed the importance of integrating gender into the teacher education, they identified challenges to successful implementation. These included an overloaded teacher education program, teacher educators’ inadequate knowledge and skills as well as the negative attitude of teacher educators as regards integrating gender equality into the programs.

Overloaded Pre-service Teacher Education Program

The overloaded pre-service teacher timetable was problematized, the pre-service teachers questioned how they could fit gender quality into their schedules. Indeed as Grace explained, “time is one of the challenges of the timetable.” In confirming this, Emma, a pre-service teacher, mentioned the adverse pressure any extra load would have on them: “there would be too much pressure ... due to increase in the course units.” Turi confirmed this alluding to the “chaos” this would create: “adding another course would be chaos.”

This is corroborated in the teacher educator responses. As Dr. Dumba explained, “National Council of Higher Education, of course will say that students are overloaded.” Dr. Munu added, “The teacher trainees are already over loaded...it will be too much.”

Inadequate Knowledge and Skills

The gap in competencies for integrating gender was perceived as a hindrance as Prof. Makaru asserted: “many people do not understand gender. Many think that when you talk about gender, you are trying to uplift the lady.” Dr. Dumba added, “I don’t know whether

we have technical people to teach gender issues.” The pre-service teachers corroborated this as Andy explained, “The people who are going to train the teacher trainees about gender don’t know about gender.” The official from the Directorate of Gender Mainstreaming reiterated this, pointing out the inadequacy as regards skills for integrating gender equality: “There is limited skills on how to integrate gender. Many say we do not know.”

While some teacher educators undertook some training on gender equality, it was inadequate in equipping them to integrate gender into teacher education. Dr. Malika explained, “I got some kinds of talks about it but...it was too short and inadequate.” Indeed, the pre-service teachers problematized the ways in which gender equality was integrated in the few courses that had a gender perspective. Mica noted “Yes, the challenge is that they won’t expound it the way it should really be...they pick out something and they say now let us do this and that but they don’t expound it so well.”

Paucity of Resources

The inadequacy in both financial and material resources was seen as a potential challenge to integrating gender into the teacher education programs in both universities. This is illuminated in Andy’s assertion, “Then the funds as well. They need some money to run the program—the reading materials.” Indeed, the official from the Directorate of Gender mainstreaming decried the dearth of funds to support the training of teacher educators to integrate gender equality into teacher education. She stated, “As a unit we are expected to train but we are not able to. Our budget is not adequate. Previously we, had Carnegie funding which enabled us to train some staff but this is not adequate. Training has to be continuous and not a one-off.”

Negative Attitude of Teacher Educators

Societal attitudes towards gender equality were highlighted as deterrents to engaging gender issues. Dr. Sarayi pointed out the engrained cultural norms as obstacles to embracing gender equality: “our traditional cultures deter embracing gender equality.” Turi confirmed this stating, “the challenge would be our culture that follows us to the classroom...like a woman doesn’t have a right to do this; no, a woman doesn’t have the capacity to do this...The problem will be the cultural forces.”

The perspective that gender issues are overemphasized and/or exaggerated was illuminated in some teacher educators’ narratives. Dr. Olimu for example, decried the focus on inequality, which he did not perceive as an issue within teacher education: “If there is any inequality, it’s not making any significant impact on teacher education.”

The focus on girls in was also problematized as inhibitive to embracing the gender equality agenda. As Dr. Munu explained, “People advocating for gender equity are only advocating for the girl child not boy child.” This provoked resistance.

Inadequate Administrative Support

The inadequate administrative support, attributable to ignorance as regards the place of gender quality within education programs has been an impediment to mainstreaming it. As Dr. Karungi from the Gender Mainstreaming Directorate (KyU) explained, “we had a meeting in which management pointed out that pushing for gender integration into university programs was not my role and yet the policy that mandates us to do it.”

The prioritization of other aspects in the allocation of resources by the administration has left gender mainstreaming on the sidelines in the hierarchy of competing concerns. As Dr. Karungi explained, “managers are looking at ICT, quality assurance, instructional development.” This lack of prioritization is depicted in the ways the administration overlooks gender issues: “They never mention gender equality anywhere even when KyU’s Gender Mainstreaming Division led countrywide, they never reported about it.”

The lack of commitment to gender issues is further depicted in management’s response to proposal from the Directorate of Gender Mainstreaming at KyU: “the first response was that this gender proposal...I don’t think we can commit to it, the money or the proposed activities.” Moreover, even during presentations gender matters are not given time for deliberations: “And when it comes to presentations, I am continuously reminded that its time up within seven minutes of a 20 minute presentation.” In the end, the policies like the one on sexual harassment, which Dr. Karungi has proposed, was sidelined to be incorporated as a section into the human resources policy. As a member from management explained: “the legal adviser says we have these things already in the human resource manual so we cannot have an independent policy...so it was lost like that. “

Limited Female Gender Champions

The paucity of female leaders within institutions of higher learning has inhibited the promotion of female interests. Indeed, Prof. Kasude, from KyU, attributed the inadequate facilities for female students to the limited number of women in both academic and non-academic leadership roles at the university: “some facilities do not favor female students...most managers are male...deliberate attempts must be made to encourage female leaders...to be part of this managerial and really advocate.”

Summary

Using an integrated approach, aspects of gender equality were included as sub-topics in the professional studies courses. Additionally, gender equality was omitted in some semesters. Moreover, gender equality issues came at the end of a long list of other sub-topics, which highlights the lack of priority. Gender equality was also omitted in course titles, objectives,

descriptions, methods and assessment. Further as a sub-topic amongst several, the amount of time allotted to gender equality was minimal, raising questions as regards depth and breadth of engagement. Both pre-service teachers as well as teacher educators emphasized the importance of integrating it into their program. This would equip them address the numerous gendered issues in the society including gender based violence, school dropout, teenage pregnancies. While there were suggestions to make it a compulsory course in order to increase its preeminence and efficacy, others wanted it integrated within the courses, in order to make the programs more marketable and fulfill the requirements of the equal opportunities commission. As regards suggested content for a course on gender equality, suggestions included sexual harassment; gender equality as a concept; causes, effects and solutions to gender discrimination; gendered subject preference and performance; gender neutral language and stereotypes; gendered challenges such as pregnancy and menstruation and gender equality in relation to other markers of identity such as class and disability. Both KyU and Mak teacher educators and pre service teachers recognize that gender equality has been overlooked in instruction, in assessment and in school practice. Further, while the teacher educators confirmed the importance of receiving formal gender training, none of them had received any training. This has put them at a disadvantage in undertaking collaborative work with other institutions that emphasize gender equality. The challenges of integrating gender equality were illuminated and include: inadequately trained teacher educators; overloaded program; negative societal attitudes; inhibitive cultural norms; paucity of female leaders and/or role models; and inadequate administrative support.

Chapter 4 Discussion of Findings

In this section, we use a cross-case analysis to discuss key findings from Kyambogo (KyU) and Makerere University (MaK). We provide insights into perspectives on gender and gender equality; pre-service teacher gendered lived experiences in pre-university and university school settings as well as perspectives on the integration of gender equality into teacher education programs in Uganda.

Perspectives towards Gender Equality

Pre-service teacher and teacher educator perspectives towards gender equality illuminated their understandings of gender and gender equality, gender roles, subject preference and performance as well as discipline.

Understandings of Gender and Gender Equality

The predominant use of the term “gender” as “a synonym for sex” (Udry, 1994, p. 561) as evident in this study has been problematized for its connotations of dichotomy and difference, which inform gender discrimination. Connell (2008) proposed that gender is defined as “the way human society deals with human bodies and the many consequences of that ‘dealing’ in our personal lives and our collective fate” (p. 10). This suggests that gender comprises socially constructed characteristics, norms, behaviors and roles associated with female and male, disrupting normative understanding of gender as biological, which perpetuate gender discrimination.

Further, the pervasive association of gender equality with “gender balance”, “equal opportunities”, “fairness” and “human rights”, have been illuminated in previous research (Foulds, 2014; Smyth, 2007). Foulds (2014) criticized how words related to gender equality have become buzzwords, which “assume shared meanings”(p. 654). Indeed, Davies (1989) argues, that while the majority of teachers might advocate gender equitable treatment of students, exactly what that means in practice is variable. As Butler adds, “we can say as a universal that women and men ought to be treated equally, but...what equality will prove to be will differ radically from context to context” (Salih & Butler, 2004, p. 339). Therefore, it is imperative that terms like “gender equality” are clearly defined to inform the operationalization within teacher education programs.

Gender Roles

The traditional perception of male as physically strong breadwinners, and female as physically weak, emotional nurturers, as produced in this study is illuminated in previous research (Namatende-Sakwa, 2018; Sunderland, 2004). Such discourses inform the gendered division of labor, relegating roles of care traditionally overlooked as “proper” work to softer more emotional females, while the responsibility for paid work is relegated to men considered more competitive, brave and ambitious (Namatende-Sakwa, 2018). Such traditional gender norms, internalized by teachers and teacher educators, should be

challenged within teacher education in order to mitigate their debilitating consequences, allowing female and male to cross traditional gender boundaries.

Subject Preference and Performance

The gendered subject preference and performance reflected in dominant perceptions about girls' "natural" inclination toward the arts and boys toward the sciences has been pervasively documented (Hazari, Tai, & Sadler, 2007; Sakwa & Longman, 2013). Female under-achievement in the sciences according to both pre-service teachers and teacher educators, was attributed to inferiority complex, parental negative attitudes, intellectual inferiority, female aspirations for marriage, roles of care as well as deliberate attempts by boys to thwart female science potential. These factors largely suggest that female under-achievement in the sciences is related to inhibitive norms and attitudes. While previous studies trouble the connection between female under-performance and intellectual inferiority, they corroborate the current study in attributing female under-achievement in the sciences to socio-cultural rather than innate factors (Elu, 2018; Ochwa-Echel, 2011). Indeed, scholars advocate a shift to positive attitudes of teachers, parents and peers as well as accessible science pedagogy to bolster female science uptake and achievement (Jammula, 2015; Namatende-Sakwa, 2019). Further, male peers' deliberate disruption of female science potential has been attributed gender role boundary maintenance. As Rudman and Fairchild (2004) explain, the tendency to sabotage counter stereotypical behavior facilitates gender conformity, which should be addressed in teacher education to normalize gender role fluidity.

Pre-Service Teachers' Gendered Lived Experiences in School

Pre-service teachers' gendered lived experiences were reflected through their narratives on leadership, discipline, preferential gendered treatment and sexual harassment.

Leadership

The narrative of male as leader, reproduced in both universities corroborates the pervasive institutionalization of leadership as a male preserve (Bush & Glover, 2016; Coffey & Delamont, 2000), including Uganda (Sperandio & Kagoda, 2010). Further, the thwarting of female leadership traits by teachers, which has the effect of frustrating female leadership aspirations, confirms Das' (2009) assertion "that females who are 'too assertive' threaten the gender hierarchy" (as cited McLaughlin, Uggen, & Blackstone, 2012, p. 627). This might explain why some teachers deployed power in double measures, to "discipline" deviant female students in order to reinstate traditional hierarchical gender relations where male students dominated leadership in the schools.

Punishment

The gendered deployment of punishment in schools, with distinct forms for male and female students as illuminated in the pre-service teachers' reflections, was based on perceptions of male as physically stronger, and, females as weaker and as such deserving

of less harsh punishments. These gendered punishment patterns have been documented in research, with boys more likely than girls to be subjected to corporal punishment in schools (Hunter & Morrell, 2021) and homes (Mehlhausen-Hassoen, 2019). Corporal punishment in schools has been categorized as a form of gender based violence that normalizes and shapes aggressive male behavior, which can be perpetuated in adulthood (Breen, Daniels, & Tomlinson, 2015; Vusumzi & Shumba., 2013). The role of schools as sites in the construction of violent masculinities is amplified in this scholarship.

Preferential Gendered Treatment

The affirmative action policy, which awards extra points as an incentive for females to access to public universities (Onsango, 2009) was problematized as discriminative against boys, given the reportedly unfair advantage given to girls. This resonates with criticisms of affirmative action for legitimizing reverse discrimination against men and boys (Morley et al., 2006). The policy as some argue perpetrates the idea that women are inferior and as such, males must be restrained in some way in order to compete with them (Sabiti, 2010). Indeed, some women have been stigmatized on this basis (Morley, 2006).

Further, also decried was the preferential attention and feedback teachers provided girls. These findings contradict the substantial body of research on classroom interactions in general, which has revealed teachers' differential treatment of boys in terms of questioning, attention, turn taking and feedback (Ayodeji, 2010; Negovan, Raci, & Vlad, 2010). This notwithstanding, much of the scholarship in the West (e.g. Australia, England, North America) shows a shift with more positive teacher attitudes, expectations and attention provided girls than boys (Driessen & Van Langen, 2013; Kehler, 2012). Nonetheless, studies illuminate the role of education in amplifying rather than challenging societal stereotypes to create a gender equitable learning environments.

Finally, the pervasive bullying deployed by boys towards girls especially in mixed schools, corroborates previous research affirming that boys are largely the perpetrators of bullying in schools, even though they tend to be more frequently victims than girls, who are, on the other hand, generally greater victims when it comes to online bullying (Smith, López-Castro, Robinson, & Görzig, 2019). These findings substantiate research on single and mixed schools, which found that the latter, generally provide conditions to reproduce hierarchical gendered arrangements (Jackson, 2010; Rujumba, 2012).

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment, a pervasive experience at both universities, has been documented as prevalent in higher institutions of learning globally (Mafa & Simango, 2021; Ncube, 2019). "Sex-for-marks" particularly, was highlighted in pre-service teacher narratives, as lecturers awarded higher marks in exchange for sexual favors or provided clues to examination questions to female students with whom they were sexually intimate. Previous studies have

documented this as “thigh-for-marks” (Mafa & Simango, 2021) and/or “sexually transmitted marks” (Ncube, 2019), within several institutions of higher learning in Africa (Gaba, 2010; Imonikhe, Aluede, & Idogho, 2012).

This study also corroborates findings which show male lecturers as primary perpetrators of sexual harassment, and female students also, as active agents in perpetrating it (Ncube, 2019). This notwithstanding, the power relations between lecturers and their students were problematized for the pervasive sexual harassment in the universities. Indeed as Morley’s (2011) study in Ghanaian and Tanzanian universities revealed, the hierarchical and gendered power relations within universities have normalized sexual harassment providing male entitlement to demand sex from female students in return for grades.

Further, the study confirms previous studies which illuminate the limited reporting around sexual offenses (Omonijo, Uche, Nwadiafor, & Rotimi, 2013) as attributed to fear of failure, unclear reporting systems, laxity from authorities in dealing with the cases, and the stigma and shame that is transferred on to the victims (Mafa & Simango, 2021). Indeed, as demonstrated in this study, sexual harassment was largely blamed on female students’ behavior, which reportedly put them at risk. Victim shaming was as such a potential consequence of reporting sexual harassment.

Gender Equality and the Pre-service Teacher Education Programs

The limited inclusion of gender equality in teacher education as demonstrated in the cases of this study has been illuminated in teacher education globally (Kreitz-Sandberg & Lahelma 2021; Lahelma & Tainio, 2019). In citing several studies conducted in the United States, Sanders (2002) shows that coverage of gender equality in teacher education is minimal at best, and concludes by positing gender equity as a missing discourse in teacher education reform. In her reflection on lessons she has learned in 22 years of working with teachers and girls, Sanders explains that “Teacher education commonly addresses disability issues, multicultural concerns and increasingly socio-economic issues as well, but gender is typically nowhere to be found” (2005, p. 5).

Further, “sandwiching” gender with a series of other subtopics such as poverty, unemployment, and corruption in a time-constrained timetable as demonstrated in these cases, has been problematized. O’Brien (1984) (as cited in Coffey & Acker, 1991) for example, argues that gender loses priority when it is “commatized” (meaning positioned alongside or within) other courses in the curriculum. It becomes, as well put by Sanders, “‘a sidebar’ for students to the ‘real’ work of education” (2002, p. 243). Indeed, the limited time allotted to gender equality topics within the teacher education programs, suggests time constraints are likely to hamper the engagement with pertinent pedagogical gender issues. Moreover, because the courses on gender equality were not broken down, the content for

teaching about gender equality as well as how to prepare pre-service teachers for engaging with gender equality in the classroom remained unclear.

While pre service teachers' learning outcomes are linked to course objectives (Pang et al., 2006 cited in Sultana & Lazim, 2011), the course objectives, outcomes, methodology and assessment within the university programs, overlooked gender equality. This suggests that it was not a primary concern within the program. Further, the positioning of gender equality at the foot of a myriad of sub-topics aggravated its precariousness within the hierarchy of concerns within teacher education.

Importance of Integrating Gender Equality

These findings from both pre-service teachers and lecturers, affirmed the importance of integrating gender equality into teacher education. This is consistent with scholarship emphasizing the importance of gender equality in teacher education as a way to counter negative and far reaching implications of gender inequities in society (Mansaray, 2011; Sultana & Lazim, 2011).

The benefits of gender equality in teacher education as illuminated in this study included the potential to disrupt gender stereotypes, curb gender discrimination and address pervasive gendered issues. This is supported by a substantial body of research linking teacher attitudes to gender differentiated practices in school, which shape students' gender role perceptions, subsequent behaviours and performance (Ayodeji, 2010; Murray, Waas, & Murray, 2008).

Modes for Integrating Gender Equality into Teacher Education

This study corroborates dominant research, which confirms that teachers agree that gender equality should be integrated into teacher education (Campbell & Sanders, 1997; Poole & Isaacs, 1993). However, like in this study, there is incongruence on the modes of integrating it into teacher education. Sanders (1997) suggests the use of semester-long core/autonomous courses for pre-service teachers to attain real change in their attitudes and beliefs. Campbell and Sanders' (1997) on the other hand, recommend that gender equality is integrated rather than taught as a core and/or autonomous course. This idea is problematized by Coffey and Delamont (2000), affirming that "permeation" is too often a euphemism for doing nothing. Indeed, Poole and Isaacs (1993) problematize the integration for sidelining gender equality as one-off topics. This is taken up by Sikes (1991) expressing discomfort with one-off lectures, as students need time and support to critically engage with their own positions.

This integration-autonomy debate illuminated in this study, was also "highly politicized in early stages of Gender Studies as a discipline" (Braidotti, 2003, p. 28, as cited in ATHENA, 2010). According to ATHENA (2010, p. 27), "the integrationists aim at including

Women's Studies into existing curricula...the autonomists, on the other hand, believe...in the specificity of women-based knowledge." The European Network of Gender Studies "agreed to disagree—both autonomous and integrated programs work together" (ATHENA, 2010, p. 28).

Challenges of Integrating Gender into the Teacher Education Programs

This study plugs gaps in the literature, which scarcely engages the challenges of integrating gender equality into teacher education. The challenges elicited from this study include limited training of the human and financial resources, overloaded timetables, negatives attitudes, limited female leadership and inadequate administrative support.

The immense "push" for pre-service and in-service teachers to be prepared in ways that challenge gender regimes is based on assumptions that teacher educators have the requisite capacity. This is re-echoed in O'Sullivan's assertion that "our knowledge about the teacher educator and his/her preparation is very poor and it is an under-researched area" (2010, p. 10, p. 377). Further, as Malagren & Weiner (2010) affirm, there has been little work on how teacher educators can intervene to mitigate sexist beliefs and practices of pre-service teachers. This study confirms scholarship on the limited training of teacher educators to prepare pre-service teachers in mainstreaming gender into their classrooms.

The attitudes towards gender equality in some narratives are reflected in previous research (Freedman, 2009; Ropers-Huilman, 2009). While some students in Lather's study associated gender related studies to "lesbian, man-hating" (1991, p. 126), those in Ropers-Huilman's study associated it with words like "lesbians" and "bitchy" (2009, p. 50). Further, Freedman mentioned that most of her students "associated the term with an unpleasant militancy and refused to accept the label 'feminist' even if they believed in the liberal goals of the movement" (2009, p. 118). Additionally, feminist classes have been described as unsafe (Fisher, 2001; Lather, 1991), and "feminism itself as out-of-date" (Fisher, 2001, p. 1), and feminists faulted for being "too political" (Fisher, 2001, p. 2).

Chapter 5: Conclusions

Informed by Bourdieu's theory of cultural reproduction, this convergent mixed methods study provided insights into the pre-service teacher and teacher educator perspectives about gender and gender equality; pre-service teachers' gender lived experiences in schools as well as perspectives on the integration of gender into teacher education.

Perceptions towards Gender and Gender Equality

The dominant understanding of gender roles, which relegate women to domestic and nurturing roles and men to provider, leader and protector roles are problematic as regards informing perceptions of male as intellectually superior, active, hardworking and science-oriented, and females as slower, lazier and arts-oriented. Such attitudes, internalized by teachers and students shape debilitating gendered patterns in learner style, participation, subject preference and performance. The under achievement of girls was attributed to such attitudes coupled with their own marriage aspirations, inferiority complex, parental and girls' negative self concept, which should be addressed in teacher education programs which disrupt gender norms, empowering students to exploit their potential unhampered by gender boundaries.

Pre-Service Teachers' Gendered Lived Experiences in School

The pre-service teacher's gendered lived experiences reflected discrimination against girls as reflected in leadership as a male preserve; sexual harassment, particularly "sex-for-marks" attributed to student-lecturer power relations and characterized by victim shaming and inadequate reporting mechanisms. Secondly, the differential treatment against boys in the form of corporal punishment, affirmative action and preferential attention to girls in the classroom reflected discriminative practices against boys.

Gender Equality and Teacher Education Programs

The paucity of gender equality within teacher education programs was illuminated through dearth in content, omission, time allocations and positioning, all of which illuminated the marginal position of gender equality within the teacher education programs. Moreover, gender equality was largely excluded within instruction and assessment, including school practice. This notwithstanding, the initiative towards integration was applauded, illuminating the potential benefits and providing possible content. The contention as regards integrating it as a core course (autonomous model) or as an integrated course (integration model), is resolvable through taking up the two models in order to reap benefits from both thereby increasing the preeminence and efficacy of gender equality courses within teacher education. Finally, the possible challenges to integration of gender equality were illuminated including the limited gender competences of teacher educators; overloaded teacher education programs; negative attitudes; inhibitive cultural norms;

paucity of female leaders as well as inadequate administrative support and commitment to gender mainstreaming initiatives.

Recommendations

- Terms such as “gender equality” should be contextually conceptualized and traditional gender norms, which inform gendered patterns challenged within teacher education to mitigate debilitating consequences, which inhibit crossing of traditional gender boundaries.
- Develop both core and integrated courses/programs on gender equality that include gender responsive pedagogies but also address sexual harassment, gender discrimination, intersectionality, gendered subject preference, gender-neutral language as well as gendered challenges such as pregnancy, menstruation.
- Re-imagine Affirmative action policy to address male and female encumbrances based on markers of identity including sex, disability and social economic class. This would address claims of reverse discrimination.
- Institutionalize zero tolerance as regards sexual harassment, using anti-sexual harassment policies, providing reporting mechanisms and structures, challenging victim shaming and blame, as well as punishing perpetrators using extreme inhibitive measures.
- Garner the support of university administration through sensitization on the importance of gender equality for teacher education, and, mobilize financial resources to support the operationalization of gender equality within teacher education programs including training of teacher educators, sensitization of pre-service teachers, development and implementation of courses.

About the Authors



Lydia Namatende-Sakwa (PhD) is a lecturer and Coordinator Postgraduate Programs in the School of Education at Kyambogo University in Uganda. She holds a Doctorate in Curriculum and Teaching from Teachers College, Columbia University in the USA. She has published widely within a qualitative, post-structural framework in areas of gender, curriculum, and teacher education.



Betty Akullu Ezati (PhD) is an Associate Professor of Education. She holds a PhD in education from Makerere University in Uganda. She is a former Dean, School of Education Makerere University and currently Chairs the taskforce assigned to set up the Uganda National Institute of Teacher Education as a degree awarding institution. She has participated in various international, national and institutional-level education-related consultancies and, published widely in internationally referred journals.



Henry Ampeire Kariisa (PhD) is a lecturer in the Department of Science, Technical and Vocational Education, College of Education and External Studies, at Makerere University Uganda. He holds a PhD in Education from Veer Narmad South Gujarat in India. His research interests are in the areas of textbooks in mathematics education, ICT in education, professional development of mathematics teachers, mathematics self-efficacy, and mathematics teaching self-efficacy and STEM.



Stephen Ndawula (PhD) is a Senior Lecturer at the School of Education, Kyambogo University in Uganda. He holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Education (Educational Technology). He is former Director of ODeL, and currently the Head, Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy & Educational Media at Kyambogo University. He is a scholar with an extensive research trajectory in higher education. He has participated in various international and national conferences and, published widely in referred journals.

References

- Asadullah, M. N., Amin, S., & Chaudhury, N. (2019). Support for gender stereotypes: does madrasah education matter. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 55(1), 39-56.
- Ayodeji, I. (2010). Gender-stereotypes belief and practices in the classroom: The Nigerian post-primary school teachers'. *Global Journal of Human social Science*, 10(4), 29-38.
- Bourdieu, P. (Ed.) (2018). *Cultural reproduction and social reproduction.*: Routledge.
- Breen, A., Daniels, K., & Tomlinson, M. (2015). Children's experiences of corporal punishment: A qualitative study in an urban township of South Africa. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 48, 131-139, 48, 131-139.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2016). School leadership and management in South Africa: Findings from a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30, 211-231.
- Campbell, P., & Sanders, J. (1997). Uninformed but interested: Findings of a national survey on gender equity in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(1), 69-75.
- Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2000). *Feminism and the classroom teacher: Research, praxis and pedagogy.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Coffey, A. J., & Acker, S. (1991). Girlies on the warpath: Addressing gender in initial teacher education. *Gender and Education*, 3(3).
- Connell, R. W. (2008). *Gender* (2 ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Davies, B. (1989). The discursive production of the male/female dualism in school settings. *Oxford Review of Education*, 229-241.
- Driessen, G., & Van Langen, A. (2013). Gender differences in primary and secondary education: Are girls really outperforming boys? *International Review of Education*, 59(1), 67-86.
- Elu, J. (2018). Gender and science education in Sub-saharan Africa *Journal of African Development*, 20, 91-96.
- Foulds, K. (2014). Buzzwords at play: gender, education, and political participation in Kenya. *Gender & Education*, 26(6), 653-671.
- Freedman, E. B. (2009). Small group pedagogy: Consciousness-raising in conservative times. In R. D. Crabtree, D. A. Sapp, & A. C. Licon (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy: Looking back to move forward* (pp. 117-137). Baltimore, Maryland, USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gaba, S. (2010). Sexual harassment in Nigeria Tertiary Institutions. *The Psychologist*, 5(8), 319-321.
- Hazari, Z., Tai, R., & Sadler, P. (2007). Gender differences in introductory university physics performance: The influence of high school physics preparation and affective factors. *Science Education*, 91, 847- 876.
- Hunter, M., & Morrell, R. (2021). Corporal punishment and gender equality: regimes of care and rights in South African schools. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 30(3), 344-357.
- Imonikhe, J., Aluede, V. O., & Idogho, P. (2012). A survey of teacher and Students perception of Sexual harassment in tertiary institutions of Edo State Nigeria. *Journal of Asian Social Science*, 8(1), 268 - 273, 8(1), 268-273.
- Jackson, J. (2010). Dangerous presumptions: " How single-sex schooling reifies false notions of sex, gender and sexuality. *Gender and Education*, 22(2), 227-238.
- Jammula, D. C. (2015). *Feminist physics education: Deconstructed physics and students' multiple subjectivities.* (Doctor of Philosophy), Columbia University.
- Kehler, M. D. (2012). *Who will "save the boys"?(Re) examining a panic for underachieving boys.* Routledge.
- Kreitz-Sandberg, S., & Lahelma, E. (2021). Global Demands – Local Practices : Working towards Including Gender Equality in Teacher Education in Finland and Sweden. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 5(1), 50-68.

- Lahelma, E., & Tainio, L. (2019). The long mission towards gender equality in teacher education. *Reflections from a national project in Finland Nordic Studies in Education*, 39, 69-84.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Mafa, I., & Simango, T. (2021). Exploring the “Thigh-for-Marks” Phenomenon Among Public Universities in Zimbabwe. *J. Hum. Rights Soc. Work*.
- Malmgren, G., & Weiner, G. (2010). Disturbing boundaries in teacher education: Gender and the ‘F’ word-feminism. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5, 237-255.
- McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review*, 77(4), 625-647.
- Mehlhausen-Hassoan, D. (2019). Gender-specific differences in corporal punishment and children’s perceptions of their mothers’ and fathers’ parenting. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-24.
- Morley, L. (2006). Hidden transcripts: The micropolitics of gender in commonwealth universities. *WomenStudies International Forum*, 29, 543-551.
- Morley, L. (2011). Sex, grades and power in higher education in Ghana and Tanzania. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(1), 101-115.
- Morley, L., Gunawardena, C., Kwesiga, J., Lihamba, A., Odejide, A., Shackelton, L., & Sorhaindo, A. (2006). *Gender Equity in Commonwealth Higher Education: An Examination of Sustainable Interventions in Selected Commonwealth Universities*. Retrieved from London:
- Murray, C., Waas, G. A., & Murray, K. M. (2008). Child race and gender as moderators of the association between teacher–child relationships and school adjustment. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(6), 562-578.
- Namatende-Sakwa, L. (2018). The construction of gender in Ugandan English textbooks: A focus on gendered discourses. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 26(4), 609-629.
doi:10.1080/14681366.2018.1436583
- Namatende-Sakwa, L. (2019). Networked texts: Discourse, power and gender neutrality in Ugandan physics textbooks. *NaGender and Education*, 31(3), 362-376.
- Namatende-Sakwa, L. (2021). Are Progressive Texts Necessarily Disruptive? Investigating Teacher Engagement with Gendered Textbooks in Ugandan Classrooms. *Teachers College Record*, 123(1).
- Nash, R. (1990). Bourdieu on education and social and cultural reproduction. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11(4), 431-447.
- Ncube, M. (2019). Exploring the prevalence of the sexually transmitted marks phenomenon in higher education institutions
. *S. Afr. J Sci.*, 115(11/12), 1-7.
- Negovan, V., Raci, A., & Vlad, M. (2010). Gender and school – related experience differences in students’ perception of teacher interpersonal behavior in the classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5(0), 1731-1740. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.356
- O’Sullivan, M. C. (2010). Educating the teacher educator. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30, 377-387.
- Ochwa-Echel, J. (2011). Exploring the Gender Gap in Computer Science Education in Uganda. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, 3(2), 273-292.
- Odaga, G. (2022). Affirmative Action and Women in Uganda’s Public University Education. *High Educ Policy*, 35(1), 1-18.
- Omonijo, D. O., Uche, O. C. O., Nwadiafor, K. L., & Rotimi, O. A. (2013). A Study of Sexual Harassment in Three Selected Private Faith-Based Universities, Ogun-State, South-West Nigeria. *Open Journal of Social Science Research*, 1(9), 250-263.

- Onsango, J. (2009). Affirmative action, gender equity and university admissions- Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. *London Review of Education*, 7, 71-81.
- Poole, M., & Isaacs, D. (1993). The gender agenda in teacher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 14(3), 275-284.
- Ropers-Huilman, B. (2009). Scholarship on the other side: Power and caring in feminist education. In R. D. Crabtree, D. A. Sapp, & A. C. Licona (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy: Looking back to move forward* (pp. 40-58). Baltimore, Maryland, USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to Counterstereotypic Behavior: The Role of Backlash in Cultural Stereotype Maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 157-178.
- Rujumba, K. (2012, March 29). Many question value of single-gender schools. *Pittsburg Post Gazette*.
- Sabiti, B. (2010, 13th April 2010). Women's cause is undermined. *New Vision*. Retrieved from <http://www.newvision.co.ug/PA/8/21/716088>
- Sakwa, L., & Longman, C. (2013). Government policy on science education in Uganda: A glass ceiling to women's access to higher education. In W. J. Khamasi, C. Longman, & M. vanHaegendoren (Eds.), *Gender practices and challenges: A call for accountability* (pp. 20-29). Moi University, Eldoret: Moi University Press.
- Salih, S., & Butler, J. (2004). *The Judith Butler Reader*. Hoboken NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sanders, J. (1997). Teacher education and gender equity. *Eric Digest*, 93.
- Sanders, J. (2002). Something is missing from teacher education: Attention to two genders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(3), 241-244.
- Sikes, P. J. (1991). "Nature took its course"? Student teachers and gender awareness. *Gender & Education*, 3(2), 145-162.
- Smith, P. K., López-Castro, L., Robinson, S., & Görzig, A. (2019). Consistency of gender differences in bullying in cross-cultural surveys. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 45, 33-40.
- Smyth, I. (2007). Talking of Gender: Words and Meanings in Development Organisations. *Development in Practice*, 17(4-5), 582-588.
- Sperandio, J., & Kagoda, M. A. (2010). Women teacher's aspirations to school leadership in Uganda. *International journal of educational management*, 24(1), 22-33.
- Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, U.S. A: The Guilford Press.
- Sultana, A. M., & Lazim, A. S. (2011). Gender studies in teacher education: An empirical research. *Asian Social Science*, 7(12), 168-174.
- Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered Discourses*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Telioussi, V., Zafiri, M., & Pliogou, V. (2020). Occupation and gender stereotypes in primary school: The case of the english language coursebooks in Greek primary schools. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(4), 1135-1148.
- Udry, J. R. (1994). The nature of gender. *Demography*, 31(4), 651-673.
- Vusumzi, N. N., & Shumba, A. (2013). The nature, causes and effects of school violence in South African high schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(3), 1-15.

Appendices

Appendix I: Bio data of participants of the study

Pre-service teachers of the study

| Pseudonyms | University | age | Sex | Subject combination | Year of study |
|------------|------------|-----|--------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Pam | Kyambogo | | Female | Geography/RS. | 2 |
| Irene | Kyambogo | | Female | Biology/Chemistry | 3 |
| Evelyn | Kyambogo | | Female | Economics, Physical Education | 3 |
| Jan | Kyambogo | | Female | English/Literature | 2 |
| Dominic | Kyambogo | | Male | History and Religious Studies | 2 |
| Paula | Kyambogo | | Female | Literature/English. | 3 |
| Peter | Kyambogo | | Male | Art and industrial design | 2 |
| Grace | Kyambogo | | Female | | 3 |
| Andrew | Kyambogo | | Male | History& Religious Studies | 2 |
| Anita | Kyambogo | | Female | Chemistry and Math | 2 |
| Tugume | Makerere | 20 | Male | Kiswahili and History | 3 |
| Hakim | Makerere | 21 | Male | Luganda & Religious Studies | 3 |
| Isaac | Makerere | 24 | Male | Physics and mathematics | 3 |
| Esther | Makerere | 20 | Female | Geography, economics | 3 |
| Magula | Makerere | 20 | Female | Physics and Chemistry | 3 |
| Emma | Makerere | 22 | Male | Geography Economics | 3 |
| Daphine | Makerere | 23 | Female | Biology and Chemistry | 3 |
| Nyafwono | Makerere | 21 | Female | Math and Physics | 3 |
| Butsina | Makerere | 22 | Female | History and Religious Studies | 3 |
| Rachel | Makerere | 23 | Female | Biology and Chemistry | 3 |
| Andy | Makerere | 20 | Male | Geography & Economics | 3 |
| Erisa | Makerere | 23 | Male | Mathematics & Physics | 3 |
| Gabula | Makerere | 24 | Male | Geography & Religious Studies | 3 |
| Nakato | Makerere | 22 | Female | English & literature | 3 |
| Malala | Makerere | 21 | Female | French & History | 3 |

Teacher educators and staff from the Directorates of Gender Mainstreaming

| Pseudonyms | University | age | Sex | Position | Years in univ. |
|--------------|------------|-----|--------|----------------------|----------------|
| Dr Ogwal | Kyambogo | 37 | Male | Head of Department | 16 years |
| Knighingale | Kyambogo | 45 | Male | Head of Department | 19 years |
| Liz | Kyambogo | 52 | Female | Dean | 20 years |
| Dr Sarayi | Kyambogo | 40 | Female | Lecturer | 10 years |
| Dr. Dan | Kyambogo | 38 | Male | Head of Department | 17 years |
| Prof Yusuf | Kyambogo | 55 | Male | Head of Department | 20 years |
| Dr. Karungi | Kyambogo | 50 | Female | Gender Mainstreaming | 6 years |
| Prof Makairu | Makerere | 48 | Male | Dean | 23 years |
| Dr. Maliaka | Makerere | 39 | Female | Lecturer | 16 years |

| | | | | | |
|------------|----------|----|--------|----------------------|----------|
| Dr. Muna | Makerere | 37 | Male | Lecturer | 12 years |
| Dr. Olimu | Makerere | 53 | Male | Head of Department | 27 years |
| Prof. Yura | Makerere | 55 | Male | Lecturer | 28 years |
| Dr. Wunai | Makerere | 42 | Male | Lecturer | 18 years |
| Dr. Kaku | Makerere | 40 | Male | Lecturer | 13 years |
| Dr. Dora | Makerere | 38 | Female | Lecturer | 17 years |
| Dr. Esther | Makerere | 47 | Female | Gender Mainstreaming | 11 years |

Appendix II: Questionnaire for Pre-service Teachers

Dear Pre-service Teacher,

Thank you for making time to complete the questionnaire for the study titled “**Equipping Pre-service Teachers to Champion Gender Equity in Uganda**”. The study will inform teacher education programs as regard gender equality, in order to strengthen educational opportunities for girls in Uganda. This is a collaborative study between the Faculty of Education at Kyambogo University (KyU) and the College of Education and External Studies at Makerere University (MaK). We pledge to keep your responses in this questionnaire strictly confidential and anonymous.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Gender: Female Male
 2. Age: Below 20 20 -24 25-29 30-34 35 and above
 3. Name of your university (Use a tick)

| | | |
|----|----------|--|
| 1. | Kyambogo | |
| 2. | Makerere | |

4. Course registered for your teacher education

| | | |
|----|------------|--|
| 1. | BSc (Educ) | |
| 2. | BA (Educ) | |

5. Which of the following best describes your family background?

| | |
|---|--|
| Dual parenting (both mother and father) | |
| Single mother | |
| Single father | |
| Guardian | |
| Any other (Specify) | |

6. Who is responsible for your university expenses?

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Both mother and father | |
| Only mother | |
| Only father | |
| Guardian | |
| Any other (Specify) | |

7. Which of the following best describes the educational background of your parents/guardians?

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Did not go to school | |
| Certificate | |
| Diploma | |
| Bachelor’s Degree | |
| Post graduate | |
| Any other (specify) | |

SECTION B: PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS GENDER EQUALITY

We would like you to indicate your level of agreement with the following items related to gender equality.

Answer options:

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|-------------|------------|----------------------|
| Strongly Agree= SA | Agree=A | Undecided=U | Disagree=D | Strongly Disagree=SD |
|--------------------|---------|-------------|------------|----------------------|

| No. | Item | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|------|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1.1 | Gender equality is about a focus on females only. | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Gender equality is about a focus on both females and males. | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Male lecturers teach better than female lecturers. | | | | | |
| 1.4 | Male students perform better in the sciences than female students. | | | | | |
| 1.5 | Female students participate more than male students in lectures. | | | | | |
| 1.6 | Females are more emotional than male. | | | | | |
| 1.7 | Males are physically stronger than female. | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Males are more undisciplined than females. | | | | | |
| 1.9 | Female students' behavior puts them at risk of sexual harassment. | | | | | |
| 1.10 | Female students are to blame for sexual harassment encounters. | | | | | |

SECTION C: GENDERED LIVED EXPERIENCES

We would like you to indicate your level of agreement with the following items related to gender equality.

Answer options:

| | | | | |
|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Never=N | Rarely=R | Sometimes=S | Often=O | Always=A |
|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|

| No. | Item | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |
|-----|--|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|
| 2.1 | Lecturers choose both female and male students during the lesson. | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Lecturers group students in consideration of gender differences during coursework. | | | | | |
| 2.3 | Lecturers use gender stereotypes in examples during lectures. | | | | | |
| 2.4 | Lecturers use of sexist comments during lectures. | | | | | |
| 2.5 | Female students participate more than male students during my lectures. | | | | | |
| 2.6 | Male students exhibit more indiscipline than female students during my lectures. | | | | | |
| 2.7 | There are more male than female lecturers in my faculty. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|--|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|
| 2.8 | The sitting arrangement inhibits my participation in lectures. | | | | | |
| 2.9 | Class coordinators/leaders are mainly female students. | | | | | |
| 2.10 | Shelf heights in the classrooms/labs/libraries inhibit my access to materials/books. | | | | | |
| 2.11 | Both male and female students have equal access to university ICT infrastructure. | | | | | |
| No. | Item | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| 2.12 | Male students have more ICT skills than female students. | | | | | |
| 2.13 | Social media like whatsapp has previously been used to sexually harass me. | | | | | |
| 2.14 | During school practice lecturers were fair in supervising both the female and male students. | | | | | |
| 2.15 | Sex for marks is a common practice in my faculty. | | | | | |
| 2.16 | I have experienced sexual harassment in exchange for marks. | | | | | |
| 2.17 | I have experienced sexual harassment by lecturers. | | | | | |
| 2.18 | I have experienced sexual harassment at the university. | | | | | |
| 2.19 | I have experienced sexual harassment outside the university. | | | | | |
| 2.20 | The university provides relevant reproductive health services for female students. | | | | | |

SECTION D: INTEGRATION

We would like you to indicate your level agreement to the following as related to how gender is integrated into your teacher education program, and other activities in your university.

Answer options:

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|-------------|------------|----------------------|
| Strongly Agree= SA | Agree=A | Undecided=U | Disagree=D | Strongly Disagree=SD |
|--------------------|---------|-------------|------------|----------------------|

| No. | Item | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|-----|---|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| 3.1 | I am aware of the roles of the Gender-Mainstreaming Directorate at my university. | | | | | |
| 3.2 | I am aware about where to report sexual harassment. | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Gender equality is a topic my courses. | | | | | |
| 3.4 | Gender equality is a course on its own. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3.5 | Gender equality is assessed during school practice. | | | | | |
| 3.6 | Orientation takes gender issues into consideration. | | | | | |
| 3.7 | Female students are given special orientation to address their specific concerns. | | | | | |
| 3.8 | Gender equality is emphasized through posters within the faculty | | | | | |
| 3.9 | Every department in my university has a gender focal person. | | | | | |
| 3.10 | Gender equality should be included in our curriculum. | | | | | |

Thank you for taking some of your valuable time to fill out this questionnaire. In case of any inquiry please contact: 0776921593/0772680303 or henryampeire@yahoo.com

Appendix III: In depth Interview Guide for Pre-service Teachers in Universities

Introduction

The study aims at establishing the current teaching and learning practices in relation to promotion of gender equality among pre-service teachers. It is hoped that the study will show the current practices and the gaps in the promotion of gender equality in the preparation of pre-service teachers. We are collecting data from pre-service teachers from faculties of education in Kyambogo and Makerere universities. You have been selected as one of the participants. The information you provide will be anonymous, kept confidential and used only for the purpose of this study.

Biodata

Sex: ___ Institution: _____ Year of study: _____ Subject combination: _____

| No. | Objective | Questions | Probes |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 1. | Assess the perceptions of pre-service teachers in relation to gender equality. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your understanding of gender? What about gender equality? 2. What do you see as roles for male and female in society? 3. What are differences/similarities between boys and girls in terms of learning? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Gender roles; stereotypes -Beliefs about performance, learner styles, discipline, subject preferences, organization, participation, domination, effort, character, motivation, attitudes |
| 2. | Document pre-service teachers' gendered lived experiences in school settings. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Tell me your experience of gender from the time you started school. 5. Following your experiences, how would you recommend gender inequality is mitigated? And/or equality reinforced? 6. Did you take gender equality into consideration in teaching during school practice? Why (and how)/why not? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Discrimination; gender norms -Challenges/obstacles -Support structures/enablers -Sexual harassment; sex for marks -Mitigation strategies for gender discrimination -Best practices in gender equality reinforcement - Recommendations for gender equality |

Appendix IV: Documentary Analysis Guide

Introduction

We are collecting data on how schools/faculties of education are equipping pre-services teachers to champion gender equality. This instrument will be used to collect data on the courses to illuminate whether (and how) gender equality has been integrated into pre-service teacher education programs.

Demographic information

Course title: _____

Year and semester it is taught: _____

Institution: _____

Discipline (i.e. Arts/Sciences?): _____

Other: _____

In what ways is gender in/equality represented in the pre-service teacher education program?

Some guiding questions:

- Is gender present? (Title? Brief description? Objectives? Outcomes? Assessment? Etc.
- Is there a stand-alone course on gender?
 - Is it core?
 - Is it an elective?
 - Is it integrated?
- Is it broken down?
- How much time is it given?
- Where is it positioned e.g. as one of the last courses?
- Are there courses in which is *should* appear?

| No. | Aspect | Description | Comment/Reflection/Questions/ Recommendation |
|-----|-------------------------|-------------|---|
| 1. | Course title | | |
| 2. | Course description | | |
| 3. | Course objectives | | |
| 4. | Learning outcomes | | |
| 5. | Detailed course outline | | |
| 6. | Mode of delivery | | |

| | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|
| 7. | Assessment | | |
| 8. | Other | | |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 3. | Establish whether gender equality has been integrated into pre-service teacher education programs in Ugandan universities. | <p>7. Do you think gender equality is important for teacher education? Explain.</p> <p>8. Is it integrated into your teacher education program/courses? If so, how? If not, why not?</p> <p>9. In what ways (if at all) would you recommend it be integrated?</p> <p>10. What do you foresee as the challenges to integrating it? -How can these challenges be mitigated?</p> <p>11. Have you received any training as regards gender equality? If so, in what ways? -What aspects were covered? -What were the training gaps?</p> <p>12. What aspects of gender equality should be included in teacher education? Why?</p> | <p>-Importance of gender equality -Rationale for integration</p> <p>-Content, materials, activities, assessment, group work, school practice -Core, elective, integrated, other</p> |
| 4. | Any other comments/ Information | 13. Is there any information you would like to share as regards promoting gender equality in schools? | |

Appendix V: Key Informant Interview Guide (Teacher Educators)

Introduction

The study aims at establishing the current teaching and learning practices in relation to promotion of gender equality among pre-service teachers. It is hoped that the study will show the current practices and the gaps in the promotion of gender equality in the preparation of pre-service teachers. We are collecting data from pre-service teachers from faculties of education in Kyambogo and Makerere universities. You have been selected as one of the participants. The information you provide will be anonymous, kept confidential and used only for the purpose of this study.

Biodata

Sex: _____

Institution: _____

Position (s): _____

Length of service as teacher educator: _____

Subject combination: _____

| No. | Objective | Questions | Probes |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 1. | Assess the perceptions of pre-service teachers in relation to gender equality. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your understanding of gender? What about gender equality? 2. What do you see as roles for male and female in society? 3. What are differences/similarities between males and females in terms of learning? | <p>-Knowledge/understandings of the concepts; gender roles; stereotypes</p> <p>-Beliefs about performance, learner styles, discipline, subject preferences, organization, participation, domination, effort, characters, motivation, attitudes</p> |

| | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|
| <p>2.</p> | <p>Establish whether gender equality has been integrated into pre-service teacher education programs in Ugandan universities.</p> | <p>4. Do you think gender equality is important for teacher education? Explain.</p> <p>5. Do you take gender equality into consideration in teaching pre-service teachers? Why? And how? If no, why not?</p> <p>6. Is gender equality integrated into the teacher education program/courses? If so, how? If not, why not?</p> <p>7. Is gender equality taken into consideration during assessment? Explain.</p> <p>8. In what ways (if at all) would you recommend it be integrated?</p> <p>9. What do you foresee as the challenges to integrating it? -How can these challenges be mitigated?</p> <p>10. Have you received any training as regards gender equality? In so, in what ways? -What aspects were covered? -What were the gaps? -What should be included in your training?</p> <p>11. What aspects of gender equality should be included in teacher education? Why?</p> <p>12. What challenges do you think the university would face in integrating gender in the curriculum? -How can the challenges be overcome?</p> | <p>-Choosing activities, teaching aids, materials, content, group work.</p> <p>-Integrated as an elective, core, embedded, other</p> <p>-School practice, exams, course work</p> <p>-Core? Elective? Both core and elective? Embedded?</p> <p>-Workshops, seminars, reading</p> |
| <p>3.</p> | <p>Any other information</p> | <p>13. Is there any information you would like to share about promoting gender equality through pre-service teacher education?</p> | |

Appendix VI: Key Informant Interview Guide (Gender mainstreaming Directorate)
Introduction

The study aims at establishing the current teaching and learning practices in relation to promotion of gender equality among pre-service teachers. It is hoped that the study will show the current practices and the gaps in the promotion of gender equality in the preparation of pre-service teachers. We are collecting data from pre-service teachers from faculties of education in Kyambogo and Makerere universities. You have been selected as one of the participants. The information you provide will be anonymous, kept confidential and used only for the purpose of this study.

Biodata

Sex: _____

Institution: _____

Position (s): _____

Length of service as teacher educator: _____

| No. | Objective | Questions | Probes |
|-----|--|---|---|
| 1. | Assess the perceptions of pre-service teachers in relation to gender equality. | 1. What is your understanding of gender? What about gender equality? 2. What do you see as roles for male and female in society? 3. What are differences/similarities between males and females in terms of learning? | -Knowledge/understandings of the concepts; gender roles; stereotypes -Beliefs about performance, learner styles, discipline, subject preferences, organization, participation, domination, effort, characters, motivation, attitudes |
| 2. | Establish whether gender equality has been integrated into pre-service teacher education programs in Ugandan universities. | 4. Do you think gender equality is important for teacher education? Explain. 5. Do you take gender equality into consideration in teaching pre-service teachers? Why? And how? If no, why not? 6. Is gender equality integrated into the teacher education program/courses? If so, how? If not, why not? 7. Is gender equality taken into consideration during assessment? Explain. 8. In what ways (if at all) would you recommend it be integrated? 9. What do you foresee as the challenges to integrating it? -How can these challenges be mitigated? | -Choosing activities, teaching aids, materials, content, group work. -Integrated as an elective, core, embedded, other -School practice, exams, course work -Core? Elective? Both core and elective? Embedded? |

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | <p>10. Have you received any training as regards gender equality? In so, in what ways? -What aspects were covered? -What were the gaps? -What should be included in your training?</p> <p>11. What aspects of gender equality should be included in teacher education? Why?</p> <p>12. What challenges do you think the university would face in integrating gender in the curriculum? -How can the challenges be overcome?</p> | -Workshops, seminars, reading |
| 3. | Any other information | 13. Is there any information you would like to share about promoting gender equality through pre-service teacher education? | |