

DOING GENDER IN SOCIAL STUDIES

by

MARDI JO SCHMEICHEL

(Under the Direction of Amy Parks)

ABSTRACT

Despite the significant progress American women have made in the last century, even a cursory exploration of women's political, economic, and cultural status, in comparison to men's, yields depressing results. Schools are uniquely situated to have an impact on gender inequity, both as spaces in which children develop a gender identity and where students can develop the capacity to understand, analyze, and respond to gender issues. Within PK-12 education, social studies teachers are responsible for supporting the development of the knowledge and critical thinking necessary to know the facts around gender inequity, to understand the historical context of asymmetrical gender relations, and to analyze the consequences. However, issues around women and gender within social studies PK-12 and teacher education have been largely ignored. The purpose of this research was to try to understand how normalized, problematic discourses about women are distilled within social studies and how they shape the attention that is paid to women and gender in this field. Using poststructural and feminist theories and methods, I analyzed the discourses present in social studies lesson plans and methods course syllabi to identify the way that work around women and gender gets done - or doesn't. The purpose of my text-based research was to both examine and contribute to the existing literature base describing the place and status of gender and women's issues in the field. In exploring the constructions of

women and gender in these discursive spaces, I seek to help researchers and teacher educators in the field recognize the variety of ways in which they can exercise power in order to work on the very serious problems that continue to confront women in the world.

INDEX WORDS: Gender, Women, Social Studies Education, Discourse, Poststructuralism, Feminism

DOING GENDER IN SOCIAL STUDIES

by

MARDI JO SCHMEICHEL

M Ed, University of Georgia, 2009

BA, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1992

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2012

© 2012

Mardi Jo Schmeichel

All Rights Reserved

DOING GENDER IN SOCIAL STUDIES

by

MARDI JO SCHMEICHEL

Major Professor: Amy Parks

Committee: Stephanie Jones
Hilary Conklin

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2012

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated, with love, to Patrick Winter, whose unwavering support, outlandish optimism, and feigned interest in discourse theories made this possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A mention on an acknowledgements page within a document that very few people are likely to read seems a wholly inadequate space to express the immense gratitude I have for those who have contributed in some way to the creation of this text. If I could, I would shout what follows from the mountaintops of every continent. Sadly, I am both afraid of heights and have a disdain for travel that developed after going to three education conferences in four weeks in the spring of 2011. Thus, the mountaintop idea is not going to happen. In other words, sorry this couldn't be more grand, friends.

Amy: The day I stumbled into your class will be a day for which I am forever grateful. I am so lucky to have one of the smartest people I've ever met guide my doctoral program: that you are also funny, kind, generous, and appreciate witches and magic were bonuses that I could never deserve. For the opportunities and the patient support you so graciously offered me, again and again, I am eternally indebted to you. Thank you for making my work better and for being so cool about it in the process.

Stephanie & Hilary: your guidance and suggestions have been instrumental to me as a scholar, but without your patience for me as a deeply flawed person, I would have folded on this whole Ph.D. experience very early in the process. Thank you for taking the time to talk to me when I barged into your office and for answering emails when I was desperate. Thanks also for the encouragement to send out my early work and for encouraging me to get over myself when I needed to hear it. Additionally, thank you for being teachers that I will spend a lifetime trying to emulate (not immolate, which is what the spell check suggested initially - that's a radically different way to show one's appreciation).

Hilary, Alex, and Joseph: Thanks for being a circle that could give me a jerk when I needed one. None of the rest of you had the gumption to be quite that racy in your dissertation

acknowledgement pages, so please give me some props - you all know that I am only interested in the cookie part of the oreo anyway. When I think back to this doc program, I'll think of you.

Thanks for the support, for the laughs, and for being there every single time I needed you.

Bettie St. Pierre, Ajay Sharma, and Jim Garrett had, in very different ways, a significant influence on what wound up in this dissertation. Thanks to each of you for being so smart and also incredibly generous to me. I am so grateful.

Thanks to Margaret Crocco, Carole Hahn, and Linda Levstik: three incredibly busy people who graciously agreed to be a part of this research and who made a novice researcher feel very comfortable asking pointed questions. Thank you for blazing a trail. Thanks also to Avner Segall, whose work pops up frequently in this text and who listened patiently to my descriptions of the project and gave valuable advice.

Meg Monaghan: you rock. I'm so very grateful our paths crossed. Thanks for talking to me about this research and encouraging me along the way.

And now, for some friends and family who are not likely to ever see this but who nonetheless deserve a public thanks...

To my younger brother, Lil' B.J., who made it possible to think that getting a Ph.D. was something I could do and to my older brother, Bradd, who is the only of my parent's children to not have a Ph.D. ☺

Speaking of Betty and Stan Schmeichel, thank you for your support during this process but also for all the decisions made when I was young that helped me see school as a very positive place. Additionally, thanks for sending me out in the world with a sense of confidence that was already

cemented by the time I realized it was baseless. Also, thank you to both of my grandmothers, M. Vivene Vequist Morrow and Inez Clark Schmeichel, whose lives I thought about a lot during the creation of this dissertation and who deserve to have their names in a published, Google-able document.

Lastly, I want to thank Vivian Tuttle and Lauren Heibner for fostering my love of social studies, and Steve Swidler at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the faculty, staff, and students at Arizona School for the Arts for challenging me to think about schools differently and for teaching me how to teach.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	16
3 POSTSTRUCTURAL POSTULATIONS ON DISCOURSE.....	44
4 "WOMEN MADE IT A HOME": BETTER THAN NOTHING REPRESENTATIONS OF WOMEN AND GENDER.....	73
5 SKIRTING AROUND CRITICAL, FEMINIST RATIONALES FOR ATTENDING TO WOMEN AND GENDER.....	100
6 COACHING GENDER WORK.....	130
7 THE GENDER APPARATUS IN SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER EDUCATION.....	155
8 I AM GENDER AND SO CAN YOU.....	197
REFERENCES	216
APPENDIX	
A RACE AND EQUITY IN THE SYLLABI	243

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Last year, I¹ attended the job talk of an Assistant Professor candidate for a social studies position here at UGA. This male candidate discussed a research project in which he examined preservice teachers' reactions to graphic novels used in his methods classroom. The candidate provided a list of the 8-10 novels he had used. During the question and answer period of the job talk, one of the faculty members in the audience asked the candidate if he had considered the genderedness of the graphic novels, their authors, or the student's reactions to the books. At one point in his answer, the candidate mentioned that some of his female students had mentioned that graphic novels were "the kind of thing my boyfriend reads" but eventually acknowledged that the role of gender in relation to this study of graphic novels and preservice teachers' willingness to use them in the classroom was not something he had

¹ My perspective on subjectivity and its place in the writing up of research is as follows: While acknowledging the importance of the particular embodied and discursive location of any researcher, I follow the lead of St. Pierre, (2011) in rejecting simplistic statements of subjectivity, in which a recitation of demographic identifiers is presumed to take care of the responsibility for reflexivity. Instead, here and throughout the dissertation, I've included stories from my life or drawn attention to my reactions as a way of helping readers build a deeper understanding of the perspective that has informed the writing of this text. This is my attempt to enact what St. Pierre has referred to as situating oneself in the research in a "writerly way". This also follows Stanley's (2004) description of feminist reflexivity in which the writer makes "available to readers as many of the analytical elements that contributed to the conclusions reached as possible" (p. 9) in order for "readers [to] 'see for themselves' how the analysis has been carried out and [and enabling them to] interrogate the researcher's interpretations through their own reading and analysis of the data" (pp. 9-10). This approach to addressing subjectivity, as opposed to a subjectivity statement, may potentially seem ironic, considering the repeated exhortations for attention to subjectivity in the pages that follow. I feel it's important to stress that the attention to subjectivity I'm arguing that social studies researchers take up would also transcend the recitation of demographic identifiers through the consideration of subjectivity in terms of an analysis of power relations. Alcoff (2009) captured this idea in the following statement: "One cannot simply look at the location of the speaker or her credentials to speak; nor can one look merely at the propositional content of the speech; one must also look at where the speech goes and what it does there" (p. 130).

considered. It would have been relatively easy and certainly appropriate for this researcher to have acknowledged the gender patterns around graphic novel use, but he appeared to have been authentically surprised by the suggestion that there might be some gender issues impacting students' reactions to the novels. Additionally, he seemed unruffled by or unaware of the accompanying implication that it might be his responsibility to attend to these issues.

During most of this job talk, I was plagued with the nagging awareness that what was happening right in front of me was part of the problem that my dissertation projection would seek to understand. I was not *surprised* that gender was not mentioned in the job talk. But how is it possible for me to be able to conceive of the absence of attention to gender as "just the way things are" in social studies? How have the rules around where gender fits and does not fit - where it should be mentioned and how - been established and maintained?

These questions, which were the driving force behind this research, reflect a different project from critiquing the candidate and the institution of social studies in general for not attending to gender. The gender and feminist work that has been done in social studies has been primarily focused on this critique. Most of the research focused specifically on women and social studies has assessed critically the ways in which women have been underrepresented in the curriculum (Crocco, 2001, 2006, 2008; Hahn et al., 1985; Hahn, Bernard-Powers, Crocco, & Woyshner, 2007), the lack of recognition regarding women's contributions to the field (Crocco & Davis, 1999, 2002) and the general absence of a feminist consciousness in the field (Crocco, 2004, Noddings, 2001b; Johnson & Serriere, 2009). My dissertation project aims to understand *how* the phenomenon these scholars have outlined has become possible. Through the research I conducted in my dissertation study, I was interested in exploring how the norms that make it possible to ignore gender or position the topic in particular ways have been established. By

examining the construction of the concept of gender and women within social studies education, I hope to illuminate the processes that led to the marginalization of women in the field, as well as open up new ways of thinking about how changing this situation might be possible.

"Living in a Post-Sexist Society: Or, Are Feminists Making A Big Deal Out Of Nothing?"²

Indeed, what is the big deal about gender anymore anyway? Don't I (and the xx-chromosomed people reading this dissertation) live a much different life than our mothers, and our mother's mothers, dreamed could be possible? The trail of the gender dis-privilege that feminists tell me has shaped my life is hard to sniff out. The high school guidance counselor who allowed me to drop chemistry and calculus? The college fraternity boys who asked why I was pursuing a BA in International Affairs instead of a M.R.S. degree (I had no idea what they was talking about. I thought a M.R.S. degree must be some academic program I hadn't heard of). The angry father of a student who came into my office when I was serving as a vice-principal, took one look at me (my first name came be deceptive!) and asked to speak to "someone in charge"? Insults? Certainly. But injuries?³ The relationship between these micro-events in my own life and systemic discrimination and oppression is difficult to detect, making it easy to question whether or not attention to gender equity is warranted. I can't point to a particular point in my own life in which I can say, definitively, that my life choices were circumscribed because of my gender. Are we feminists making a big deal out of nothing? Are we living in a post-sexist society?

When I take a step outside my own life, and take a look at broader trends around women and gender in our society and the world, it becomes a little easier to see some problematic patterns. For example, only 17 of the 100 members of the 112th Senate, were women (US

² Title adapted from a blog entry on <http://tigerbeatdown.com/2010/09/06/our-post-sexist-society-or-feminists-always-make-a-big-deal-out-of-nothing-part-134450009/>.

³ See Butler, 1997; Fraser, 2008

Senate, 2012). Although the presence of high-profile women like Hilary Rodham Clinton, Condaleeza Rice, Sarah Palin, and Nancy Pelosi can create the sense that women as a group have broken through the political glass ceiling, the reality is that the last election cycle marked a decline in the number of women running for the House and the number of women who were seated in the House. (Chappell, 2010). In fact, the U.S. ranks 78th among democratic nations in terms of the percentage of women serving in national legislative bodies (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2011). These statistics are a stark reminder that although women's political rights are significantly different than they were even 100 years ago, we have not achieved gender parity in our political system.

When it comes to the economy, and specifically, paid labor, the statistics indicate that women continue to lag behind men in terms of earnings. Statistics from the 2010 US Current Population survey (The wage gap, 2010) indicated that white women earn, on average, 81 cents to every a dollar a white man earns in annual earnings. African American women make 70 cents on that dollar and Hispanic women make 60 cents. Women will not attain high-level positions in equal numbers to men. There are just 12 women who serve as CEOs of Fortune 500 companies (Women CEOs, 2011). Boraas and Rodgers (2003) reported that "occupations that are predominately made up of females are still found to have lower average wages for both men and women" (p. 10). A Department of Education study conducted in 1996 found that within the teaching profession itself, "Male public school teachers earn between 10 to 13 percent more than females, on average" (Chambers & Bobbitt, 1996, p. 55). Although women have poured into labor markets all over the world in the last century, they lag behind men in terms of earnings and entry to the highest status occupations and professions.

In terms of culture, it is a very sad, sad, sad⁴ fact that the violence committed against women in the US is an everyday reality. One in four women report experiencing domestic violence in her lifetime (Domestic Violence Resource Center). Fifteen percent of American women have been victims of rape (Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network). Additionally, international statistics have indicated the relationship in the developing world between severe gender inequity and severe hunger problems. It is possible to link gender inequality directly to the global hunger index in order to show that extreme gender differences in educational attainment, political representation, and labor opportunities contribute directly to hunger in poor nations (Hausman, Tyson, and Zahidi, 2008).

Although I would not deny that there have been shifts, some progressive, in the ways that some American women can experience the world in the last century (the right to vote, increased autonomy over reproduction, and cultural acceptance of wearing pants come to mind), as the evidence I presented above indicates, it is as unreasonable to celebrate the existence of the post-sexist era as it is to point to President Obama's election as heralding the arrival of the post-racial era. These statistics are an indication that there are structural forces at work that inhibit life opportunities on the basis of gender.

⁴ As I was working on this dissertation, I had several opportunities to present the research as it was in progress, and on each occasion, I solicited feedback from the audience. At one event, I received some anonymous written feedback that noted my description of the violence against women in the U.S. as "sad" and asked me if that was the "tone you want to take". I had a visceral reaction to this comment because, first, yes, this was exactly the fucking tone I wanted to take and secondly, because I felt that the comment reflected the regulation of norms in academic discourse, and in particular, the affect of civility that has become normalized in feminist academic work (See Chapter 6). So I've added a couple of sads to this text in an attempt to *not* leave the "tone I want to take" in question. I've also dropped the F* bomb in this footnote as an homage to Bakhtin's (1984) carnivalesque integration of the sacred and profane that might "liberate from the prevailing point of view of the world, from conventions and established truths, from clichés, from all that is humdrum and universally accepted. This carnival spirit offers the chance to have a new outlook on the world, to realize the relative nature of all that exists, and to enter a completely new order of things" (p. 34). Is this a smart ass move? Yes. But it's a small step toward creating a subtle disruption to the civilized ways in which *women being beaten and raped* is supposed to be positioned in academic discourse (apparently). I appreciate the opportunity this anonymous comment provided for me to clarify my position on this.

Every once in awhile, however, gender issues come to the forefront of public conversations in a way that transcends what it is possible to think with statistics, making it easier to make the case that the way women are talked about in our culture remains a significant issue of concern. The recent debates and discussions about women's access to contraception in the new health care plan is just one of those kinds of issues. Visual images in the news that showed the absence of women from spaces ranging from a panel on the topic at a Congressional hearing to a Fox News panel serve as both symbolic and material reminders of asymmetrical gender relations in our culture. In the wake of the national debate about access to contraception, the consideration of women and gender in our culture has acquired renewed significance.

In particular, Rush Limbaugh's attack on Georgetown University Law student Sandra Fluke surfaced issues around gender that reveal that there are troubling discourses about women circulating and readily accessible in American culture. Fluke, who had been excluded from the Congressional panel mentioned above, was provided a separate opportunity to make a statement in support of the federal mandate for insurance to cover contraception costs. As a part of her appeal, she discussed the experiences of a fellow Georgetown student who had been unable to afford contraceptives to treat a medical condition, and had been denied insurance coverage because the Georgetown insurance plan did not include access to contraception (Fluke, 2012). In the days following her statement, Limbaugh called her a "slut" and said, "So, Ms. Fluke, and the rest of you feminazis, here's the deal. If we are going to pay for your contraceptives, and thus pay for you to have sex, we want something for it, and I'll tell you what it is. We want you to post the videos online so we can all watch" (Bassett & Bendery, 2012). These comments reveal not only a vitriol towards women in general, but also reflect the ease with which it is possible to position feminists - or women who speak up on behalf of other women - as Othered, abjected

subjects. This abjection was addressed in a comment from one blogger (Brady, 2012) who wrote,

Limbaugh is in the business of policing the boundaries between "us" and "them," of describing "them" in shameful terms which expel them from the public that "we" see ourselves as part of. The more bitter and contested this expulsion can be made to be, the more effectively he plays his role as culture warrior.

The abjection of feminism is a theme I explored specifically in Chapter 5, but for now, I want to point out that the same discourses that have shaped these discussions about women's healthcare, or made it possible for women and feminists to be made Other in such public discussions, shape my own life as well.

While the eruption of issues like who gets to make decisions about women's contraception or who can be abjected for taking a feminist stance can make the impact of gender very real, it can still be difficult to see how gender and inequitable gender forces play out in our day to day lives. The relationship between understanding micro-events of gendering in one's own life and the institutionalized and normalized gendering I have just outlined can be difficult to detect. This can be explained, in part, by Pillow's (2002) contention that the story we tell ourselves about gender is a:

construct we tend to accept as natural so that it operates hegemonically; who we are, what we expect, what we think we know is so dependent on binary categories of male and female that we often do not even think to question these categories nor do we even see them. (p. 11)

The relationship between structural inequality and my daily existence can be invisible because of the discourses that work to make the material differences between men and women's lives or the villainization of feminists seem "normal".

The invisible force of discourse was exactly what Foucault (1970/1981) was getting at when he argued that discourses appear to be "neither arbitrary nor modifiable nor institutional nor violent" (p. 54). Gender discourses regulate thinking and language in ways that make their exclusions and constraints invisible, even to those who are marginalized by them. Thinking about discourse this way makes it possible to understand how I could be unaware of "a particular network of powerful intellectual and disciplinary expectations" (Bové, 1995, p. 54) that shape my life. In order to think about why inequitable gender structures have persisted, both in social studies and in our culture more broadly, it is necessary to explore how gender inequality is reproduced through practices that are not necessarily overtly discriminatory, but rather are normalized in commonsense values and practices. The purpose of my dissertation project is to try to understand how these normalized discourses operating in our society are distilled within social studies education, and how they shape the attention that is paid to women and gender in this field.

Discursive spaces in Social Studies Education

In a provocative piece published in a Canadian social studies journal, Hurren (2002) described the discursive spaces in social studies education as the "spaces where we talk, teach, learn, write and read about social studies education" (para. 4) - the spaces in which social studies - and its gendering - gets "done". This broader space as a site of concern has informed my own thinking about where we might be able to turn attention to social studies in order to do some new and different gender work in the field. Gendering in social studies gets done in the curriculum,

of course, as my attention to lesson plans and teacher education curriculum in this dissertation acknowledges. However, Hurren's description of the gendering of discursive spaces in social studies helped me to add depth to the way I was thinking about the spaces in which teachers and students breathe life into the gender-focused content. So although my research is, like other research on women in social studies, focused on social studies texts, what I'm looking at here goes beyond asking whether or not women are present in the texts: instead, I sought to explore the ways women and gender have been positioned in the them and to ask what kind of gendering that positioning might produce.

Through an examination of some of the discursive spaces of social studies education, I also sought to identify the way that work around women and gender gets done - or doesn't - in an effort to come to a better understanding of how it has become possible for women and gender issues to be marginalized in the field and why it was conceivably 'ok' for our job talk candidate, and the many who have come before him, to ignore the issue of gender in social studies research. Building upon poststructural conceptions of discourses as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1969/1972, p. 49) my dissertation project explored several different discursive spaces in social studies education in order to ask *how* "the categories, the problems, the arguments, the themes, and the interests" (Andersen, 2003, p. xi) around gender and women of social studies education are constructed.

The texts produced in the discursive spaces of social studies matter because they influence and shape what social studies educators, researchers, and students can think about gender and women. Fairclough (2003) explained:

Texts...have causal effects - i.e. they bring about changes. Most immediately, texts can bring about changes in our knowledge (we can learn things from them), our beliefs, our

attitudes, values, and so forth. They also have longer-term causal effects - one might for instance argue that prolonged experience of advertising and other commercial texts contributes to shaping people's identities as 'consumers', or their gender identities (p. 8). Fairclough's argument that prolonged exposure to advertising plays a role in shaping people's gender identity makes it possible to think about how social studies teachers, scholars, and students' experiences as "consumers" of social studies texts can, over time, contribute to shaping what it is possible for them to see and think about gender within the field.

My analysis of the intersection of social studies discourse and those discourses circulating outside of the field appears frequently throughout this dissertation. But I think it's important to note that social studies education, as a community of practice, has a particular history in terms of addressing and ignoring gender. Members of the field have engaged in discursive practices and activities that have created, sustained, and challenged particular ways of doing things in social studies - "ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations" (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, p. 464) that have shaped current orientations toward women and gender in the discipline. By going back and forth between discourses around and about gender and women in our society and then the social studies community specifically, I hoped to contribute to a better understanding of how beliefs about gender and women came to be constructed and negotiated in this field in particular ways, making it possible for Crocco and her colleagues to have the complaints that they do, and for the importance of considering gender in this field to be a surprise to others.

This dissertation presents the results of my inquiry into the understandings, practices and representations of gender and women in social studies education. The intent of this research was to examine some existing approaches to addressing women and gender in social studies

education across PK-12 and teacher education contexts. Social studies educators and teacher educators are charged with complex tasks: because social studies draws upon multiple social science academic disciplines, it's "a dynamic, challenging field with competing perspectives about appropriate goals, and on-going conflict over the content of the curriculum"(Levstik & Tyson, p. *Handbook*, p. i). The most critical⁵ orientations in social studies would, at least on paper, contribute to the public good through education that could lead to understanding and changing unjust social structures. However, the capacity to do this work relies upon access to discourses that make it possible to see that the world could and should be different than it currently is. This dissertation aims to explore social studies resources that include attention to women and gender in order to understand what discourses are being made available in social studies education and what kinds of different understandings and orientations toward women and gender they could produce. Through this research, I seek to contribute to and further a discussion in social studies about how to engage students around issues of women and gender in ways that might work toward a more gender equitable society.

To do this, I've built upon, relied upon, and examined closely the work of other social studies scholars. Understanding the current take up of gender work in social studies and why it makes sense in the current context of PK-12 and teacher education required examining what had already been done. Despite this requirement, however, I felt a great deal of tension about this task every day I worked on this research. I have both professional and personal respect for all of

⁵ My use of the word critical here relies heavily on Segall's (2002) definition of the word as a signifier of discourses that "use critique as a conceptual and strategic tool to challenge the innocence of existing knowledge and knowing" (p. 11). A critical stance on teaching and learning incorporates a critical interpretation of curriculum, schooling, and society. This vision of critical social studies teaching (versions of which were outlined in a book edited by Ladson-Billings (2003) using Critical Race Theory and by Kumashio (2001) using poststructural theory) could be described broadly as an approach in which the teacher's critical orientation informs pedagogy and curriculum choices that might facilitate a similarly critical orientation toward the world among PK-12 students. As Segall & Gaudelli (2007) argued, "The idea of the critical is to expose the already social and political in [practices]" (p. 89).

the people who have done this work, and especially for those scholars who have made a focus on gender and women central to their research agendas. Through their work on gender, which has clearly been an uphill battle, they have made very important contributions and taken risks to do so. The pioneering work they've done to include attention to women and gender should be recognized and celebrated. Additionally, I have a deep admiration for the teacher educators whose syllabi I collected and the very difficult work they do. People in both of these groups have taken on challenges that I may not have had the courage to try without their model to follow.

Within my analysis, I used a variety of strategies to distance the texts from their authors because I wanted to call attention to the way the social studies *community* has produced particular norms around including women and gender: it's not my intent to critique individuals. Every actor with the field of social studies - including me - is implicated in reinscribing and sustaining particular ways of taking up women and gender. I understand, however, that there are real people behind each of these pieces of writing and that my close exploration of their work - and suggestions about how we as a field might do things differently - could appear to be a critique of them as individuals, despite my attempts to avoid giving that impression. I asked myself repeatedly if opening up their texts for questioning might cost more than it would yield.

In these moments, I turned again and again to Brown's (2005) discussion about the purpose and definition of critique. Building on Foucault's essay "What is Critique?", she invites us to "understand critique as a practice of affirming the text it contests" (p. 16). She argued that the "affirmation of the text through an insistent rereading seems to me the heart of the distinction between critique and its cousins - rejection, refutation, rebuttal and dismissal" (p. 16). In my "insistent reading" of the work that comprised the data in this dissertation, I sought to affirm its

value and importance while at the same time trying to understand some of the limits these texts were running up against. It's possible that readers, and in particular, the authors whose work I have addressed here, may feel that I was not up to the task of achieving both of these purposes at the same time in my analysis. At times, I felt I didn't have the skills to do this well either, but this was a risk I felt had to take in order to have a chance at addressing the depth of the problem at hand and to propose some changes that may work to change the status quo of attention to women in this field.

In general, this dissertation follows a relatively traditional format (surprise!). It begins with a literature review (Chapter 2) and a discussion of the theory I used to inform my research methods and analysis (Chapter 3). In order to address the research goals outlined in this introduction, and more specifically, in order to contribute to the conversations about gender equity in feminist, social studies, and teacher education communities, I engaged in two different research projects. I approached each with a reliance upon poststructural and feminist theory, but I used different methodologies to do the data collection and analysis, so instead of a separate, single methodology chapter, I've included a discussion of those strategies within the discussion of each project. In addition, I conducted interviews with three senior scholars in social studies in order to get an additional perspective of the challenges facing future gender in the field. Aspects of those interviews have been integrated into the concluding chapter. In the remaining sections of this introduction, I describe briefly both of the research projects I conducted and how they were presented in the dissertation.

The first project focused on social studies lesson plan articles published during the last decade that included attention to women and gender. Using discourse analysis, I sought to understand the way that women and gender were produced in those texts and to consider the how

teachers who picked up these lesson plans were being directed to attend to women and gender in their classrooms. The analysis of these lesson plans mushroomed into three different chapters. In the section titled "Prelude to a drought" I described the methodology and data collection strategies I used for the entire Gender Drought project and in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, I described my analysis of the lesson plans.

Chapter 4 addressed the way that women and gender were constructed and positioned as topics in the lesson plans. After presenting the analysis, I argued that there might be a connection between the rhetoric about the absence of women in social studies in the body of literature that has attended to women and gender in the field, and largely uncritical representation of women in the lesson plans. In Chapter 5, I looked at the rationales the authors presented to convince readers to implement their lesson plans. I described the different kinds of warrants I found and presented some suggestions about what may be inhibiting the inclusion of critical, feminist warrants for attending to women and gender in social studies. Chapter 6 is an examination of the ways in which the authors of the lesson plans presented the tasks they described and the support they offered, or did not offer, to assist teachers in implementing gender-equity-oriented and anti-oppressive activities in the lesson plans. Because there was almost no attention to *how* to teach women and gender, I looked outside of the lesson plans in the dataset at the ways in which teaching controversial issues have been described, and I made suggestions as to how scholars might model and support the consideration of subjectivity in social studies teaching and learning and acknowledge the ways in which power is produced in classroom interactions. As I shaped each of these chapters, I began thinking about them as speaking to different audiences. At this point, I'm considering sending Chapter 4 to a social

studies journal, Chapter 5 to a gender in education journal, and Chapter 6 to a teacher education publication.

In the next project, which is presented in Chapter 7, I focused specifically on social studies teacher education. In order to think about how teacher education shapes particular ways of attending to gender, I collected 39 social studies teacher education methods course syllabi from colleges of education across the country. After describing my collection process and the theoretical and methodological strategies I used in this research, I presented my analysis of the syllabi and argued that the lack of attention to equity and subjectivity in social studies methods course syllabi inhibits the likeliness that preservice teachers in these courses are being positioned to address women and gender in a substantive way. Additionally, I described the "crystallization" (Popkewitz, 2002) of social studies teaching present in these texts and contended that a healthy dose of ambiguity in teacher education could aid equity efforts.

Broadly, the goal of this text is to interrupt/disrupt/interrogate/challenge/open up/insert postie-verb-of-your-choice-here discourses around women and gender in social studies. The focus in this dissertation is on women but attention to other subjectivities seeped in as well, demonstrating Brown's (1997) assertion that "we are not fabricated as subjects in discrete units by [powers like gender, class, nationality and so forth]: they do not operate on and through us independently, or linearly, or cumulatively" (p. 86)⁶. Although the parameters of this project (time, length, sanity, etc.) constricted the amount of attention I paid to subjectivity and equity issues beyond gender, I tried to point to these other and equally compelling concerns when possible. Finally, I've examined some different discursive spaces in social studies in order to try

⁶ Brown contended that "one of the central problematics of feminist inquiry today" was "how to come to terms with the problem of the powers involved in the construction of subjects" because, "as so many feminist, postcolonial, queer, and critical race theorists have noted in recent years, it is impossible to extract the race from gender, or the gender from sexuality, or the masculinity from colonialism" (p. 86).

to show the pervasiveness of this particular orientation towards women and gender in the field, but also to demonstrate that achieving a change in how the field takes up gender doesn't require some kind of feminist revolution (although that might not hurt) but instead can happen through mini-revolutions in many different spaces within social studies education - spaces that we live and work and "do" social studies in everyday. In other words, I seek to help both researchers and teacher educators in the field recognize the variety of ways in which they can begin to exercise power in order to work on the very serious problems that continue to confront women in the world.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

3:30-4:45
Session 5-9 Paper Session
Centennial F

Chair: Murray Nelson

Discussant: *Need Volunteer*

Dissident Dykes and “Lesbo-Flexibles”: Civic identity development LGBTQ Youth.
Jillian Ford, Emory University.

LGBTQ youth in the U.S. grow up in a society where members of their community are denied full citizenship rights. This paper highlights findings from an empirical study of a Youth Council in a community center for LGBTQ youth. Implications for further research, teacher preparation, and community action are discussed.

Including Multiple Perspectives: Where does gender fit in?

Meg Monaghan, University of Georgia.

This study examines how preservice, secondary social studies teachers’ perceive gender equity in their personal and professional lives. The data for this paper explored participants’ rationales for including (or possibly excluding) multiple perspectives in the classroom in order to see if these rationales supported the inclusion of gendered perspectives.

A Dearth of Diverse Masculinities in the Social Studies.

Shaun Johnson, Towson University.

This presentation discusses new research on representations of masculinity in elementary social studies. An examination through a gendered lens of content analyses of textbooks and curriculum guides, observations of texts in use, and discussions with teachers will all lead to suggestions for integrating diverse depictions of masculinity in the classroom

Two Spirit Native Americans in the Social Studies Classroom: Lessons Learned from Translating Theory into Practice.

J.B. Mayo, University of Minnesota.

This paper highlights connections between research on Two Spirit Native Americans and standard social studies curriculum. It expands the field’s conception of multiple perspectives and diversity, while creating opportunities for nuanced understandings of gender expression that go beyond the male/female dichotomy currently accepted as the norm.

The information above was taken from the 2010 College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA) conference program. CUFA is the college faculty and graduate student group within the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), the professional organization of social studies educators. Of the 159 presentations scheduled, four of the five gender-specific presentations of the conference are listed in the session above.⁷ It is worthwhile noting that this session, Paper session 5-9, appears on the schedule as the last session on the last day – and at the time this conference schedule was sent out to participants, still needed someone to volunteer to

⁷ From what I was able to discern from the titles and abstracts.

serve as a discussant. Sadly, at the 2011 conference, there was no gender-specific session. Instead, there were four individual papers (out of over 150 papers and panels) focused on women and gender (including my own, which discussed research from this dissertation), spread across four different sessions⁸. If, as its website indicates, the purpose of CUFA is “to promote the common interest of social studies educators in research, teaching, and other scholarly activities” (College and University Faculty Assembly, 2010) what might this limited attention to gender at the CUFA conference tell us about the common interests of social studies educators?

“Limited attention” is a recurring theme throughout this literature review of the discourses around gender in social studies education.⁹ It recurs for several reasons. As the authors whose work I presented here indicates, there is just a lack of attention – in quantifiable terms - to the topic of gender, and of women, within this field. Whether the lens of analysis is applied to NCSS publications, or curriculum standards or social studies conference schedules, the situation is pretty clear: scholars in social studies are not talking about women and gender explicitly.

On the other hand, the recurrence of the ‘limited attention’ theme is also attributable to the fact that the people who *do* address gender and women in their research describe their work in terms of its marginalization. In other words, scholars working in gender and research talk about this type of work as being “limited”. Additionally, there are only a handful of scholars

⁸ I think it's worth noting that among these four sessions, three were solo presentations from people who were grad students - including me - and the other was presented jointly by two faculty members. All presenters were women. Although it might be perceived as hopeful that some of the people doing this work were grad students, and therefore may signal a new group of scholars who will attend to women and gender (an issue addressed throughout the interviews discussed in the conclusion), it could also be seen as a concern that there were no faculty members beyond the two I've noted, who attended to this issue at CUFA in 2011.

⁹ No, seriously, it's everywhere. Prepare yourselves.

who publish consistently about gender and women's issues.¹⁰ Because these scholars consistently invoked this discourse of marginalization in their own work, the theme is almost ubiquitous.

For the purposes of this literature review, I focused on research in major social studies publications in the last ten years, but the origin of explicit attention paid to gender and social studies work within the field is usually attributed to a piece by Tretwick, who wrote about the absence of women in textbooks in a *Social Education* article published in 1971.¹¹ Since that time, there has been a small cadre of women social studies scholars, and more recently, a few men, who have been calling for the field to make the changes necessary to include gender and women in a more systematic and critical way. I hope I am not ruining the excitement of reading this chapter by cutting right to the chase and telling you that these calls have been unsuccessful. In this chapter, after describing the methodology I used to locate the literature, I described each of the five categories I found useful as a way to classify and organize the literature on women and gender in social studies - citizenship, history (of women), global women, sexuality, and general overviews of the field. I then summarized the literature in each category.

Before moving on, however, I wanted to discuss briefly the difference between the way the textual data was treated in this chapter versus its treatment in the rest of my dissertation. In the process of writing this chapter, I read a lot of literature reviews to try to get a handle on this genre of writing. I realized that many authors use literature reviews as a vehicle to move through a topic in order to get to the other side: aspects of the literature are highlighted to buttress the relevance or validity of the research project that is the focus of the paper. For the purposes of

¹⁰ Margaret Smith Crocco (formerly of Teachers College, now Dean of the College of Education at the University of Iowa) is the most prolific scholar on gender in social studies: the rest of the gang includes Carole Hahn (Emory), Jane Bernard-Powers (San Francisco State), Christine Woyshner (Temple), and Linda Levstik (Kentucky).

¹¹ I feel compelled to note that the critiques and tone of Tretwick's 1971 article are remarkably similar to literature on this subject published almost 40 years later.

this dissertation, however, the texts about gender and women in social studies *were* my topic. Therefore, as I found and read the literature I collected for this chapter, I was also engaging in data collection for my dissertation research.

When I started reading this literature, the distinction between a literature review and data analysis was not clear¹². As I began collecting the archive of literature described in this chapter, I also began the work of thinking and writing about what would need to be explicated and theorized in my dissertation. When the page of notes I had taken on the literature hit 40, I had to remind myself that this chapter did not call for a discourse analysis, but a literature review. In other words, I realized that the focus here is on providing a critical summary of work in the field, rather than linking discussions of women and gender to broader discourses in the world. At that point, I took a look at the data I had collected and tried to conceptualize how I could present an overview of this research in a chapter that would support the research I presented in the dissertation, without getting too detailed at this point in your reading. So, in this chapter, I've tried to extricate my understanding of what the literature about women and gender in social studies was "about" from what I think it was "doing"¹³.

I'm conflicted about the resulting product. Based on my study of poststructural theories of discourse and language, I am not sure that separating these two characteristics of texts - what they are about and what they do - is possible or always fruitful. On the other hand, however, I am fully aware that a traditional literature review is often required in the publications that allow scholars to disseminate research to the largest number people, and therefore, I need to be able to

¹² St. Pierre (2011) argued that the distinctions we try to draw between literature reviews and the rest of our data and its analysis unnecessarily and problematically cloaks important aspects of our research processes.

¹³ The exception to this rule is that I did not include the lesson plan-type articles that came up in my ERIC search in this literature review. Because I paid such close attention to the lesson plans featuring attention to women and gender - and wrote three different chapters analyzing them - I have not included them here. This is, like this entire chapter, contradictory, as you will see that the literature I *did* include in this chapter was also drawn upon repeatedly and in different ways throughout the dissertation. I paid such close attention to the language in the lesson plans however, that it made describing what they were "about" here impossible for me.

do this kind of writing. Additionally, I am sensitive to the fact that in this dissertation, as well as in my research more broadly, I am presenting discussions of social studies education to people who may be unfamiliar with the literature base that I'm also using as data. An overview of the literature can be helpful and pedagogical for the reader. So, please read on with the caveat that the way the framework used in this chapter to classify, categorize, summarize, and present this literature did not emerge out of this data like a fossil just waiting to be discovered. I created and shaped it in ways that allowed me to make it do my bidding, which is, I would argue, the same thing that any scholar does when she writes a literature review.

Method

I began my search in the ERIC database: the descriptors I used were culled from the ERIC thesaurus by identifying all of the descriptors related to gender and social studies education. An ERIC descriptor search is always constrained by the "accuracy" with which descriptors have been assigned to a given piece of scholarship. The descriptors are assigned by the ERIC Lexicography staff, and as such, reflect their interpretation of what the piece is "about". There were articles in my search results that engaged with issues of gender or social studies only tangentially, and therefore, I did not include them in this review. Additionally, there were some articles *not* in the search results that I knew to be often cited pieces on gender in social studies education, which made it clear that I would not be able to rely solely upon the ERIC search to conduct my literature review. The holes in the ERIC database are inexplicable. For example, there are no citations for any *Social Education* articles published in 2002 or 2003. Therefore, I also looked at the references cited in the literature. I paid particular attention to the references cited in the major reviews of research on gender in social studies and added many of the sources from those literature reviews to my own reading list.

Although I did examine some British and Australian work on conceptions of gender and citizenship, for the most part I limited my review of the research to journals and books that discussed the American PK-12 educational system. Articles from the major NCSS publications, including *Theory and Research in Social Education*, which is geared toward college faculty, and *Social Education*, whose target audience is secondary-level practitioners, comprised the majority of the pieces I reviewed here. Additionally, I included a review of a number of book chapters from edited volumes. I think it is worth drawing attention to the fact that most of the work I reviewed in this paper is not empirical in nature, but conceptual and/or theoretical.¹⁴

What I did not do in this chapter was explore the discourses around gender in social studies that are *not* explicitly about gender and social studies. In other words, in this chapter, I did not examine literature that was not specifically identifiable as "about" gender. However, all discourses in social studies education, whether they are "about" gender or not, are about people, and because people do not live in the world in an un-gendered way, all discourses make a statement about gender. The experience of engaging in a review of literature "about" gender in social studies made it clear to me how important it will be to go outside the explicit literature on the topic in order to understand the silences and the way that gender discourse circulates in research that may appear on the surface to be 'gender neutral'. This broader analysis of the field will be important for developing a more complete understanding of the discourses around women and gender in social studies. For the purposes of limiting the scope of my dissertation project to what could be achieved in a year, however, the focus of the literature described in this

¹⁴ There are some quantitative studies that disaggregate social studies standardized tests and political and civic attitudes by gender (Barber & Torney-Purta, 2009; Callahan, Muller, & Schiller, 2008; Chapin, 2005; Epstein & Shiller, 2005), and some content analyses of the representation of gender in textbooks that are cited frequently (Clark, Allard, & Mahoney, 2004; Clark, Ayton, Frechette, & Keller, 2005). Although I think that the quantitative attention paid to gender and social studies, who does them, and what they produce, is worth exploring, it didn't make the cut for this chapter because of my specific focus on language and discourse.

chapter and in the rest of the dissertation was limited to texts that were about women and gender specifically.

Review of the literature

In the following sections, I discuss the literature about gender and social studies in each of the five categories I identified. Although there were other ways I could have categorized the literature in order to structure my discussion of the research in this field, these categories were useful to me in my efforts to think about the different types of discourses in social studies education and how gender and women as topics fit differently within each of them. Within my discussion of each category, I provide a brief introduction to the topic, and then present summaries of some of the gender-relevant publications related to the issue.

Citizenship.

In a recent issue of *Social Education*, editor Simpson (2010) declared, "The guiding light of social studies is education for citizenship" (p. 168). The responsibility of providing students with the skills and knowledge required for democratic citizenship is a task the field spends quite a bit of time and energy - and discursive space - considering. For example, in the 2010 CUFA conference program, 30% presentations referenced citizenship or civics in the title or abstract. In 2011, 29% of the sessions included attention to citizenship or civics in some way. Although much of the citizenship oriented scholarship has focused upon using the classroom to support and expand democratic thinking and habits, gender in social studies scholars have urged educators to consider critiquing citizenship and its exclusions in order to open up new avenues for discussing the experiences of marginalized groups, including women. Some of this work is described in the following section.

In her contribution to a collection of historical and contemporary essays on democracy, citizenship, and education titled *Educating the democratic mind*,¹⁵ Bernard-Powers (1996b) made her purpose clear by beginning with a critique of the other chapters of the book for their failure to consider "gender and minority concerns" (p. 288) in their discussions. Although she acknowledged that some of the essays were somewhat "gender friendly", she made a very pointed critique of one author in particular: "Gagnon...seems openly hostile to gender concerns, eschewing what he sees as partisan perspectives and the deprecation of liberal democratic values evident in some women's history materials" (p. 289).¹⁶ Bernard-Powers stated that her goal was to step outside the perspectives of texts like Gagnon's in order to propose that multicultural, feminist scholarship provided new possibilities for thinking about citizenship in education. She argued that prior to suffrage, women had found ways to participate in the public sphere outside of the formal political structure, like community organizations. Bernard-Powers contended that these activities pointed to an important tension that citizenship education should address: people who were excluded from recognized forms of civic participation often found ways to address their concerns and to make their voices heard. She argued that women's civic activities were just as valid and important to study as presidencies and congressional acts and could be addressed in social studies as a part of the effort to stem the silencing of young women that occurs in America culture. Citing the work of Gilligan (1982) Bernard-Powers justified her call for attention to gender in citizenship education by pointing to the negative impact of low self-esteem and self-confidence in adolescent girls. By highlighting a rich history of civic participation of women that was born out of discrimination, girls might see the potential strength of their gender.

¹⁵ The Cartesian mind/body split is alive and well!

¹⁶ The author to which she is referring is historian Paul Gagnon, whose essay in the book addressed the need for a core history and geography curriculum which would enable children to learn "the knowledge, values, and habits that will best and extend this previous inheritance [of the American democracy] (Gagnon, 1996, p. 261).

Bernard-Powers concluded that "(En)gendering citizenship education is fundamental... [to] transformative work" (p. 306). More recently, Ahmad (2006) argued that political scientists' traditional construction of citizenship created a gap between the private and public spheres that actively excluded women's community activities from being perceived as citizenship-oriented, an obsolete understanding of citizenship that must be replaced by efforts to achieve "civic equality" (p. 14).

In her gendered critique of the concept of citizenship, Crocco (2000) asked to what extent social studies has addressed the reality that citizenship in America has been "partial, exclusionary, and evolutionary" (p. 53). Crocco posited that the history of citizenship in America could be characterized as much by the exclusions it has propagated as by the freedoms it has opened up. Traces of the belief that there are fundamental, mirrored, differences between women and men, which Crocco asserted were responsible for the exclusion of women from citizenship prior to the twentieth century, can still be found in popular discourses in our culture. She argued that these beliefs "provide ideological cover for efforts to restrict women's lives" (p. 52).

Crocco stated that social studies education has not engaged with ideas that could critique the concept of citizenship and question the exclusions of large groups of people, including women. Similar exclusions can be seen in written histories of social studies that made women's contributions to the field invisible. Noting that although men were the leading theorists in the field, the vast majority of social studies practitioners have been women, Crocco argued that the absence of women from the histories of the field is inaccurate. However, women's absence from the histories of the field did illustrate the failure to establish "a sustained effort of development along feminist lines, [which was] due in part to the lack of a principled rationale providing a

framework for inclusion of women and minority groups through a reexamination of the foundational concept of citizenship" (p. 58). Although there was feminist theorizing in the field during the heydays of the feminist movement in the 1970s and 1980s, Crocco lamented that the "seeds planted during these decades have not grown into a systematic and comprehensive feminist critique of social studies" (p. 58).¹⁷

There are several examples of the use of poststructural theory in the citizenship category. Stone (1996) and Shiner (2001) used poststructural theory to analyze citizenship and challenge its unquestioned assumptions and underlying truths. Both authors posited that feminist theoretical frameworks could be very helpful in attempts to interrogate and disrupt the status quo of citizenship within social studies education. Cary (2006) enacted a similar disruption through her examination of the discourses around female juvenile delinquents versus "good girls" and "good citizens" in order to explain how some girls get excluded from the possibility of citizenship. There are also a group of feminist scholars in England and Australia who have used critical and poststructural theory to highlight the assumptions that support the construction of the citizen in school curriculum, and who explored how citizenship might be re-conceived from a feminist perspective (see, Arnot, 1997; Arnot & Dillabough, 1999, Burns, 2008).¹⁸

Women's History.

As the academic space in which history instruction takes place in PK-12 education, it should perhaps come as no surprise that social studies educators produce a lot of texts about history. For the purposes of this literature review, I identified two different kinds of history that addressed gender in significant ways. The first part of this section described texts which argued

¹⁷ Crocco's concerns about the absence of women from the history of the field were addressed in two volumes she co-edited: *Bending the future to their will: Civic women, social education, and democracy* in 1999 and *Building a legacy: Women in Social Education* in 2002.

¹⁸ As usual, the Brits and the Australians are leading the way in this kind of work.

that women's history and women as a topic in history have been underrepresented. In the second part of this section, I presented some work that attended to the history of women in the field of social studies education, and in NCSS in particular.

Women' History as a topic.

Building on Bernard-Power's (1996b) call for the inclusion of women's civic activities in history curriculum, Woyshner (Knupfer & Woyshner, 2008; Woyshner, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2004a, 2004b) argued repeatedly that women found ways outside of formal civic participation to serve and improve their communities, including influencing the early social studies community civics project. She contended that women's roles in these types of community actions should not be overlooked and that the significant results these women accomplished should be situated within the context of the obstacles and discrimination they faced. Bair (2007) and Coughlin (2007) presented similar arguments in their historical accounts of the achievements of female social educators. Noddings (2001a) proposed that in addition to highlighting women's achievements in the public sphere, the valorization of women's roles as caregivers in the curriculum would shine a light on the important activities in which almost all women engage.

Some of the attention paid to women's history focused specifically on describing the achievements of African American women (Bair, 2008b; Christensen, 2005; van Hover, 2003). For example, through their analysis of three dissertations written by female, African American doctoral candidates during the mid-century, Crocco and Waite (2007) presented a profile of the complexity of the intersection of race, gender, and class in America. In particular, the authors emphasized the struggles the women faced in their efforts to negotiate a gendered and raced system that isolated them, and pointed to their perseverance despite the obstacles.

Levstik explored the effects of gender equitable teaching strategies (2001, 2009a) and gender differences in learning women's history (1999), and also studied elementary and middle school classrooms to learn what modes of instruction and content maximize the learning and engagement with women's history topics (Levstik & Groth, 2002). She also used research on students' historical thinking development to argue that women's history is well-suited to rigorous and serious study in the social studies classroom (Levstik, 2009b). In this instance, Levstik presented a three-part framework to support thinking historically¹⁹ about women's history: in-depth, teacher-supported investigations of women's historical experiences, the analysis of a variety of genres of women's history, and opportunities to link women's history with a consideration of the world in which students live. For example, Levstik stressed that using narratives in history courses, and in particular, student-generated narratives, has the potential to generate interest as well as historical thinking, and provides students with opportunities to consider a historical event from a perspective other than the wealthy, white, male victor. Narratives also offer students the opportunity to relate to the subject of the narrative on a personal level and introduces the concept of positionality in a very literal way. The use of these kinds of strategies, which Levstik described as "ordinary acts of courage" (2001, p. 209), make a space for the consideration of gender in the social studies classroom that doesn't currently exist.

The history of women in social education.

Building a legacy: Women in social education (Crocco & Davis, 2002), a volume of biographies of women social educators, is a response to those who did not see women's activities or contributions to the field as significant or worthy of inclusion in the retrospectives of the field written around the 75th anniversary of NCSS in 1996. In the Preface, Crocco (2002b) pointed to

¹⁹ Historical thinking promotes teaching students to think like historians and emphasizes the development of analytical and interpretive skills. As a pedagogical strategy, it stands in opposition to rote memorization of dates, names, and facts.

the absence of an analysis of women's significant contributions of the field in those histories, and stated that it was "dismaying" that "none of the authors of these historiographic works problematized, at least in print, the portrait they painted of a field seemingly dominated by men" (p. 9). *Building a legacy*, then, was a "corrective" (p. 147) to the histories that had excluded women.²⁰ By including *only* women in this issue, the purpose was to reverse the "collective amnesia" of the field regarding the important role that women played in social studies education. Crocco noted the difference between describing women as present versus visible:

It is clear that women have always been a presence in social studies. By contrast, "visibility" implies "one who sees" as well as "something to be seen." This word choice underscores our belief that a kind of intellectual fog, for which words such as "sexism" and "patriarchy" have been used, inhibited until quite recently the seeing of women as contributing agents to the social studies. (p. 9)

The book features brief two or three page biographies of 46 important women in social education. Crocco described the collection as a challenge to the perception that only men have achieved greatness and an effort to "transform our understanding of the nature, agents, and legacy of the social studies" (p. 12). The over 40 contributors to this volume include a wide range of social studies rock stars, including Jane Bernard-Powers, Linda Levstik, and Keith Barton, as well as scholars who have made a name for themselves outside of social studies, like Geneva Gay and Tyrone Howard. Recruiting such a large number of authors to contribute to the

²⁰ In the end notes, the authors of the NCSS histories to which she is referring are listed, including the co-editor of *Building a legacy*, O.L. Davis, as well as Walter Parker, and the editors of the special issue of *Social Education* dedicated to the 75th anniversary of NCSS, Ben Smith and J. Jesse Palmer.

volume could be interpreted as a tertiary strategy of compiling this volume: this focused at least 40 different authors' attention on women in social studies, at least for a while²¹.

In *Women and the social studies*, Crocco (2004) again turned the focus to NCSS. For this book chapter, Crocco researched the NCSS archives in order to understand the impact of feminism on the organization during the twentieth century. Using Lerner's definition of feminist consciousness as "the awareness of a group of its own oppression" (Lerner, 1993, p. 284, as cited in Crocco, p. 143), Crocco contended that to identify the presence of this consciousness in social studies, it was necessary to make inferences "about the motivating factors leading to activities that appear feminist in nature" (p. 144). These inferences allowed Crocco to not only describe the feminist activity present within NCSS, but also to contrast that activity with the "periods of virtual silence regarding women" (p. 144).

Despite the occasional presence of female leadership in NCSS, Crocco asserted that there was a silence on women within the organization from its inception in 1921 through the early 1970s, and as such, the presence of these female leaders cannot necessarily be attributed to a feminist consciousness. The apparent lack of feminist consciousness was perhaps best illuminated in 1954 NCSS president Dorothy MacLure Fraser Hemenway's statement in a 2000 interview that she did not recall any instance of gender discrimination in NCSS. Crocco explained Hemenway's perception of the status of women in the organization as a tacit acceptance of the social structure of the time. According to Crocco, it was not until the 1970s and the women's movement that there would be enough feminist consciousness in the

²¹ In fact, in my interview with Crocco, she told me that she felt the number of people who were "happy to write [the] short biographical pieces" that comprised this book "was definitely something that was a very positive response to my interest in bringing gender much more centrally into what was going on in Social Studies" (M. Crocco, personal communication, January 6, 2012)

organization "to put women's issues on the table as publicly acknowledged, legitimate concerns for social studies educators" (p. 148).

The shift, according to Crocco, could be seen by the establishment of the Committee on Social Justice for Women in 1971 (renamed the Advisory Committee on Sexism and Social Justice (ACSSJ) in 1976) and the adoption, in 1972, of a position statement on social justice for women. Crocco described the ACSSJ as the initiators of a variety of feminist activities during the 1970s, and noted that they were also responsible for reviewing submissions to NCSS publications for sexist language. The NCSS position statement advocated for equal legal protection for women, endorsed their educational and professional mobility, and encouraged change in "female socialization" which would enhance women's life opportunities (p. 150). Although the formation of a committee on sexism and the adoption of this position statement were indications of NCSS's acknowledgment of women's concerns, Crocco commented, "Whether the commitment of leadership to eradicating sexism in the organization was sufficiently deep or longstanding remains open to debate" (p. 150).

Addressing the entrenchment of the traditional, gendered curricular canon in social studies education and challenging "notions of significance in history" (p. 150) has been very difficult. Crocco asserted that despite the efforts of feminists and multiculturalists who worked during the 1970s to "unveil the normative assumptions" of the social studies curriculum in the pursuit of "knowledge transformation" (p. 151) during the 1980s, "activities reflecting feminist consciousness fell off rapidly in number within the organization" (p. 152). She hypothesized that this long rise and rapid fall of feminist activity in social studies could perhaps be attributable to the persistent paradox in education: so many women, so few feminists.

In a piece published in the *International Journal of Social Education*, Crocco (2003/2004) provided a very broad analysis of the treatment of culture, race, and gender across the history of social studies, and used her summary of the slight shifts in the discourse to argue that social progress occurs slowly. She used Applebee's conception of *curriculum of conversation* to frame her review of these issues, and to historically contextualize the shifts visible in social studies curriculum as shifts that were visible in society as well. Crocco noted, however, that it can take as long as thirty years for social shifts to show up in social studies, and lamented that new curricula do not often replace previous paradigms anyway.

Crocco also used the idea of positionality as a way to think about curriculum, arguing that "who taught, who led, who learned, and who wrote authoritative works in the field constitute differences that can make a difference to the practice of social studies" (p. 107). Progress toward the more complex and multi-layered approach to American history that adopting positionality would require, has, according to Crocco, met serious resistance. In this article, she attributed the resistance to the standards movement, which has supported a more traditional take on history. She also critiqued the NCSS standards and their limited attention to women. The emphasis on standards over the last two decades has constrained progress on gender by limiting flexibility and emphasizing traditional and male-oriented political and economic history.

Finally, Crocco noted that "one of the major disappointments for proponents of new ways of thinking about difference in the social studies came with publication of the *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* in 1991" (p. 115) which did not include a chapter on gender or sexuality.²² Describing the attention paid to feminism and poststructural theory paid in the *Handbook* as "only passing", she argued that the volume's static representation of the field was perhaps a reflection of the "editor's belief that change in the social studies has,

²² Crocco named the editor of that edition of the *Handbook*, James Shaver, in a footnote.

over time, amounted to little more than a few superficial and transitory ripples across a largely immobile body of water" (p. 115).²³

Global Women.

Global issues is an emerging field within social studies education and has been of particular interest to Crocco. The scholars working in this area have sought to provide ways to think about how the consideration of global issues can and should incorporate an examination of women's experiences. Global issues' focus on regions outside of the United States differs from the traditional World History component of social studies education in that it encourages a focus both on the developing world (as opposed to World History's traditional obsession with Europe) and also on examining current events, as situated within the historical and cultural context. Instead of explaining or reporting, much of the work in this area seeks to disrupt assumptions about the international Other, and to make our understanding of women in the world more complex (Crocco & Merryfield, 2003). In her work on this topic, Crocco repeatedly referenced the world changing events of 9/11 and the increased media attention paid to women in the Middle East as impetuses for all social studies educators to think seriously about how women outside of the United States are perceived.

Crocco, Perez, & Katz (2009) argued that social studies educators should not simplify women's issues in the Middle East as "religious issues," but instead, should take into account the cultural factors that impact women's lives. The authors took the position that the characterization of women's subjected status in the Middle East as religiously-based is problematic. By presenting information about the history and cultural practices of women in the Middle East, the authors attempted to disrupt assumptions about Islam. In the end, they argued that historically,

²³ Water metaphors are incredibly pervasive in Crocco's descriptions of the gender in social studies. This one was the most poetic.

women haven't been included in social studies curricula that address this region, and that this should be corrected. Providing additional resources for the reader, the authors urged educators to redress the imbalance.²⁴

Crocco's 2007 piece for *The Social Studies* on the world's women provided an overview of the United Nation's efforts to promote women's rights. Additionally, Crocco presented a comprehensive chart that identified social studies standards related to women's rights and human rights in each state. She used that review to support her argument that there is an absence of these topics from the social studies curriculum. Crocco provided some hypotheses regarding what prevents women's rights from being taken up in the curriculum, including NCLB, the generally conservative nature of the social studies curriculum, and the absence of attention to these topics in social studies teacher education, but encouraged educators to include human rights and women's rights, in spite of obstacles she described.

Crocco (2005, 2006a) also used her own experiences as a teacher educator to present a dilemma regarding the teaching of the novel, *Shabanu*,²⁵ in social studies classrooms. She described her use of the book in her course on women of the world, and asked readers to consider whether teaching a problematic book about women is better than nothing, especially in light of the general absence of attention paid to women and to women outside of the United States especially. In the end, is stereotyping better than invisibility? Crocco expressed her concern that some representations of women within the social studies sources readily available to educators and students can reinforce the negative stereotypes found in the media and elsewhere,

²⁴ The authors suggested in the last sentences of this article that a critique of the way women in the Middle East are portrayed in the media and in the curriculum could open the doors for a critique of the way that American women are portrayed in the media and in the curriculum.

²⁵ *Shabanu: Daughter of the wind* (Staples, 1989), is a fictional account of a Pakistani girl who, as a the result of family crisis, finds herself facing an arranged marriage with an older man. The book was written for the young adult audience.

instead of dispel them. Good gender work is difficult to do, she argued, but there are quality resources available to social studies educators who are inclined to address these issues in a critical way.

In 2003, *Social Education* published a special topic issue called *Women of the World*. Co-edited by Crocco and Merryfield, this issue sought to provide ways for practitioners to counter the stereotypical representation of global women as repressed and subjugated. Post-colonial theory was featured prominently in several articles in the issue. For example, Asher (2003) analyzed short pieces of writing from feminists, including Audrey Lorde, bell hooks, and Gloria Anzaldua from a postcolonial perspective to highlight the hybridity and fluidity of identities. Asher stated that her approach to addressing issues of race, class, gender, culture, and geography in her work as a teacher educator was to encourage her students to become reflective practitioners. The complex theoretical approach Asher used in this article sets it apart, in significant ways, from other feminist-oriented pieces in *Social Education* and elsewhere in the field.

Sexuality.

As may be evident by the brevity of this section in comparison with the others, sexuality is also a relatively recent field within social studies education. The preponderance of literature addressing sexuality in social studies is found in a special issue of *TRSE* published in 2002. Many of the authors in that issue, as well as in more recent publications,²⁶ explicitly connected sexuality with gender. Therefore, much of the sexuality work in social studies falls within the scope of this literature review.

In one of the pieces from the *TRSE* special issue, Levstik & Groth (2002) described their study of middle school students' conceptualization of the significance of women through a unit

²⁶ And outside the field as well, of course.

on the antebellum period in American history. The researchers found a tension between students' thinking about broad social issues and a peer system that shapes gender norms in a particular way. They argued the impact of the teaching strategies and content choices made in this study supported their contention that "teaching matters" (p. 250), and emphasized that it is possible for students to transfer their critiques of the social order from the classroom to the hallway.

On a similarly hopeful note, Bickmore (2002) also addressed the potential of social studies education to impact students' perceptions of the world. Acknowledging that school practices have often reinforced sexist and heterosexist norms, the author explored the ways in which social education can resist those norms through intervention, teaching, and restructuring, and in doing so, promote a richer version of democracy. The argument that social studies is the appropriate location for the consideration of sexuality in our society has been reinforced elsewhere (Martinson, 2007; Rogow & Haberland, 2005).

In her contribution to the 2002 *TRSE* special issue on sexuality, Crocco (2002a) posited that feminist ideology is implicated in concerns about sexuality because of the link between sexuality, sex roles, and homophobia. Because issues of sexual orientation include gendered norms, and because feminists care deeply about disrupting gendered expectations, sexuality and feminism are linked. With such limited attention paid to homosexuality in social studies, Crocco noted that the field is out of step with the bodies of scholarship that have addressed the issue. Unfortunately, the silence on homosexuality and homophobia "militates against the open, tolerant, and equitable nature of citizenship education" (p. 220) and condones behaviors toward homosexuals and women that "contribute to a climate of intolerance that is hard to square with the demands of citizenship education in a pluralistic democracy" (p. 221). The citizenship angle

Crocco adopted in this piece positioned social studies educators' reluctance to take a stance on this issue as incommensurate with both democracy and citizenship education. A similar approach was taken by Johnson & Serriere (2009), who argued for the adoption of a specific NCSS position statement on gender that would promote more flexible conceptions of gender and "better space" (p. 14) to teach democratic values.²⁷

Overviews of gender in social studies.

It is in within the chapters written to summarize the field of gender and social studies that the scholars of the field took their most critical stance. Whether the pieces were written for volumes outside the field or were published in books for the social studies community in particular, the theme of these chapters was consistent: women are not present in social studies education discourses. The overlapping and rotating authorship of these types of chapters may contribute to the consistency of the message. In any case, when given a platform to provide an overview of gender and social studies education work, the authors did two things consistently: they described what's wrong and then offered suggestions to fix it.

In her chapter for the second edition of the *Handbook of research in social studies education*, Crocco (2008) emphasized that the field has been remarkably impervious to discourses in humanities and the social sciences that have emerged since the linguistic turn, discourses that had the potential to deepen social studies' critical engagement with gender and sexuality.²⁸ And although Crocco pointed to the shift from the use of the term "sex" to "gender" as an example of

²⁷ In a recent issue of *TRSE*, Schmidt (2010) took issue with the way that GLBST topics have been presented in the discourse of social studies education. In her discourse analysis of the 2002 *TRSE* issue on homosexuality and the 2008 NCSS vision statement, Schmidt argued that the positioning of teaching GLBST issues as controversial and the reinscription of the heterosexual/homosexual binary supported existing assumptions about sexuality instead of disrupting them. Although her work does not explicitly address gender, I think it provides an interesting template for *how* gender discourses in social studies education might be critiqued for similarly problematic productions/reinscriptions.

²⁸ Crocco often describes social studies as a field which has not been impacted by outside discourses. Segall (2004) makes the same argument in his analysis of the field. The metaphors used in gender work to describe social studies as a field closed to outside influences/discourses/ideas are plentiful.

a sign of progress, she asked "what has this shift meant for research regarding gender and sexuality in social studies?" (p. 173). She noted that although "presumably" women in social studies were as concerned as women in other disciplines about women's issues, the women of the field have done very little gender work. Concluding that addressing women's issues was neither a standard practice or a sustained concern in social studies, Crocco did note that since the first edition of the handbook on research in social studies (Shaver, 1991) didn't have a chapter on gender, the presence of this chapter meant "it is probably safe to say that the field has made some progress" (p. 187).

The attention paid to women and gender in the curriculum, according to Crocco, is important to consider because of the curriculum's potential to normalize student's perceptions, and to send the message that women's work and accomplishments are of no value. This marginalized or absent attention to women in the curriculum is unnecessary, as "even within the context of political history, it is quite possible to infuse substantial content related to women and gender as long as one focuses on struggle and debate rather than simply on great (male) political leaders" (p. 180). What social studies needs, then, is to open itself to discourses outside of the field, and to use those insights to not only develop new tools to think about gender and sexuality, but to consider how the field has been shaped by these ideas.

In the second edition of the *Handbook for Achieving Gender Equity through Education*, a collection of essays across different disciplines and domains of education, Hahn, Bernard-Powers, Crocco & Woyshner (2007) began their analysis with the following claim: "The research synthesized here suggests that attention to gender in social studies has been partial, sporadic, and ebbing in recent years" (p. 335). This statement set the rest of their description of gender in the field within the context of absence. Arguing that a more complex presentation of

gender would contribute to a “transformation in education and society” (p. 335), the authors used the introduction to point toward the failure of social studies to address gender adequately. They noted that there have been few studies that have been “scientifically proven” to impact gender equity in classrooms, and that there has been “remarkably little empirical evidence” (p. 336) to indicate that field is more gender equitable. The authors ended the introduction by lamenting that “although some improvements have been made [since the last version of the *Handbook* in 1985]...problems remain” (p. 338). They hypothesized about some of the possible explanations for this state of affairs, including accountability and testing forces that have inhibited gender equity initiatives in the classroom, an emphasis on multiculturalism over gender, and the perception that the women’s movement had done its job, and that gender parity has been achieved. Despite these obstacles, there was some research done on gender and social studies since the 1985, and in the next section, the authors described that work as one of two types: ‘gender differences in testing and attitudes’ or ‘gender inequities in curriculum, textbooks, and instruction’.

The authors distinguished between research that reported gender inequities and the research that they described as seeking to foster gender equity through critique and/or “promising practices, context, and conditions” (p. 346) for change. In the second section of the review, then, the authors described the gender equity-fostering work and noted that they supplemented the empirical research with their own “descriptive, subjective, and anecdotal” commentary in order to provide “a more complete picture than the limited view that would emerge from empirical studies alone” (p. 346). This type of work was divided into the following categories: curriculum and instruction, that addressed the fields of history and geography education, as well as teacher education, and special projects, that included descriptions of the

National Women's History Project, formal and informal gender-equity networks within NCSS and CUFA.²⁹

Despite the existence of gender-equity advocates in the field, the authors were quick to remind readers that “the momentum around the reforms in gender equity in the social studies that were begun in the 1970s and 1980s...has stalled” (p. 350). The rest of the chapter detailed recommendations for change that might restart the reform engine. In the first three recommendations, the authors called for a more accurate representation of society through a substantial increase in the attention paid to gender (women and men) by curriculum developers in terms of other identity categories, such as class, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. In order to achieve this shift, the authors noted in their fourth recommendation that connections between college and PK-12 educators would need to be strengthened. The fifth and sixth recommendations built upon the improved relationships between social studies educators at all levels by calling for more gender focused scholar and practitioner research that would illuminate the barriers to gender equity in social studies.³⁰ The authors concluded their analysis with specific suggestions for policy (federal and state departments of education and NCSS), practice (textbooks and pedagogy) and (even more) research, which they asserted could result in achieving “equality and justice for all” (p. 353).

Between 1997 and 2008, E. Wayne Ross edited three separate editions of *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, practices, and possibilities*. These books presented essays from top social studies scholars on a variety of specific curriculum topics. The 1997 and 2001 editions of the book featured essays on gender and feminism by both Nel Noddings and Jane

²⁹ Which formally, included the now defunct sex-equity SIG in NCSS, and informally, the development of a network of University faculty who the authors claim are better prepared and able to initiate and support their students' interest and commitment to gender work than teacher educators working in the field twenty years ago.

³⁰ The suggested research areas included research on elementary social studies and gender, technology and gender, and the effects of gender-equitable teaching on student perceptions and achievement.

Bernard-Powers.³¹ In the 3rd edition, Crocco (2008) wrote the gender chapter. In the following section, I will outline the different approaches these three scholars took.

In her chapter, Noddings (2001b) described the influence of feminism on social studies curriculum as having occurred in two waves: one group of feminists has advocated for equal inclusion in a male defined world, while others had recently begun advocating for women to be recognized for work "that has gone unnoticed precisely because the standard of importance devalued it" (p. 165). She argued that the improvements achieved in the inclusion of women within the traditional canon are not the result of an awakening on the part of historians and curriculum makers, but rather, women are included because "important publications today must include women" (p. 164). Using the peace movement in the early twentieth century as an example, Noddings mused about whether content around this topic is excluded from the typical curriculum because peace is devalued or because peace is aligned with femininity. She contended that it is exactly these kinds of questions with which educators and students could be engaging in social studies, and that in the end, engagement with these questions is more important than the specific details about what gets taught.

Bernard-Powers (2001) took a different approach in her chapter by arguing that gender advocates may have attended to representation in textbooks, but that their understanding of the complexity of how gender plays out in the field needs to be deeper and more complex in order to make a difference in the lives of students. She drew attention to the loss of momentum the feminist movement experienced in social studies during the 1980s as an example of the complexity of gender dynamics in the field. Describing the impact of the feminist backlash, she pointed to people like Hirsch, Finn, and Ravitch as the type of cultural conservatives who

³¹ Although the position within the book, and therefore the page numbers, changed, Noddings' and Bernard-Powers texts were basically identical in the 1997 and 2001 editions. Their chapters appeared back to back in both editions.

hijacked the "social studies caravan" right out from under the noses of social studies scholars, and achieved a return to the traditional social studies canon through the implementation of standards that valorize the great (white) men of history. She lamented that these attacks on the field derailed the gains that feminists had achieved because "under those circumstances it was apparently difficult for many social studies leaders to see gender as anything but a distraction or a marginal concern" (p. 181).

Bernard-Powers focused her commentary on textbooks and content and argued that the gender coding that occurs in the social studies curriculum constrains girls' life choices and maintains uneven power balances between women and men. She pointed to the alienation of young people in America to support her position that "the time is ripe for curriculum transformation" (p. 194) and that attention to gender in the social studies classroom and curriculum is a means through which to both understand young people and impact their perceptions about women and men's roles.

Crocco (2008) conducted a kind of discourse analysis in Ross's latest edition of *The Social Studies Curriculum* and used Bacchi's "What's the problem" framework to describe gender in current social studies education scholarship. Crocco's interpretation of Bacchi's work led her to organize the chapters as a response to the following questions:

- What is the problem of gender represented to be within social education?
- What assumptions underlie this representation?
- What effects are produced by this representation? How are subjects constituted within it? What is likely to change? What is likely to stay the same? Who is likely to benefit from this representation?
- What is left unproblematic in this representation?
- How would responses differ if the problem were represented differently? (p. 175).

Crocco's response to the first question about the 'problem' of representation set the parameters for the rest of her responses: she described the problem of gender representation as one of absence,

and therefore, each of her responses to the subsequent questions in the list addressed various dimensions and consequences of the absence of women from the field's discourses.³² Although she did draw some attention to the scholars working in the area of women and global issues, she noted that "unfortunately, gender has not been a prominent emphasis in the global education literature of social studies. Moreover, the relatively low profile of global education generally within social education provides further cause for concern" (p. 179). As a field that has been both "slow to engage" (p. 181) in new theories, and one that has been under attack from conservatives, attention to women's issues in social studies has been difficult to secure and sustain. However, she argued, the persistence of women's inequality and the growing understanding of how that inequality contributes to many of the world's most insidious social problems requires social studies educators re-consider the attention paid to gender within the curriculum and make changes that will address twenty-first century challenges.

Concluding connections

As I mentioned in the introduction, the literature review I presented here is not a discourse analysis. But I wanted to show the connection between some of the observations I made while doing the work of compiling this literature review and how they connected to the dissertation project. First, I think it's worth noting that I did not read one piece of literature about gender and women in social studies that did not make some reference to the absences or marginalization of these topics from the field as problematic. No one was saying that gender and women in social studies has been adequately addressed, or that we need to cut back due to inundating surge of attention to these topics. In fact, reading all of these pieces at one time was

³² Although I would agree with Crocco about the inconsistent attention paid to gender and women in social studies, in this dissertation I have applied the kinds of questions she presented here to *her* work and the work of the gang. Crocco doesn't analyze her work, or that of her buddies, in order to respond to these questions and therein lies the fundamental difference between Crocco's discourse analysis in this chapter and what I have done in this dissertation.

pretty damn depressing: the picture painted is bleak. But once I pulled myself back from the cliff I was about to throw myself from,³³ I decided that the pervasiveness of absence *within* the descriptions of gender and social studies work was a particular kind of discursive strategy that may have unintended and problematic consequences within the field. I have explored this idea in Chapter 3. Additionally, as I have explored elsewhere (Schmeichel, 2011), the focus on recognition and identity politics within this literature, and the almost complete absence of structural critique, says something about the kind of feminist and critical work that is and is not being done in social studies. I further explored these ideas in Chapters 4 and 5. Finally, I think that this literature review provides plenty of grist for the mill in terms of considering who is talking about gender and social studies and where they are talking about it. This interest in how the discourses about the need to attend to women and gender social studies may be circulating (or not) in other social studies spaces, like teacher education, informed the research on teacher education syllabi, presented in Chapter 7.

³³ I've read *Twilight: New Moon* too many times for my own good.

CHAPTER 3

POSTSTRUCTURAL POSTULATIONS ON DISCOURSE³⁴

As I have noted already, most of the research focused specifically on women in social studies indicates that women have been sidelined. The kinds of marginalizations that have already been described are tangible and quantifiable. But these approaches can only take us so far. Through the research I conducted in my dissertation study, I was interested in contributing to our understanding of the problem by examining *how* this marginalization occurred. In order to do this, I turned to poststructural theory to think about the discourses present in social studies education and to examine the construction of the gender and women in the field. In this chapter, I outlined some of the theory that has informed this work.

What is a discourse, anyway?

"The world is not ready categorized by God or nature in ways that we are all forced to accept. It is constituted in one way or another as people talk it, write it and argue it" (Potter, 1996, p. 98).

Foucault, and the scholars who have taken up his work, see discourses not as groups of words or sets of signifiers which simply refer to or describe reality. Instead, discourses are perceived to "produce meaning and subjectivity, rather than reflecting them, [which] makes language and subjectivity ongoing sites of political struggle" (Weedon, 1999, p. 103). This poststructural conception of discourse, which is central in the work of Foucault (1969/1972), seeks to "reveal and describe" the work of language beyond its use as "signs to designate things" by examining the forces that discourses unleash upon our lives (p. 49). Scholars using a Foucauldian perspective position discourse as the mode through which we understand and move through the world. This idea is described by Lather (1991), who said, "Whatever 'the real' is, it is

³⁴ Portions of this chapter appeared in Schmeichel, 2011..

discursive" (p. 25). By this, she meant that what it is possible for us to think and know is made possible only through the discourses to which we have access. In other words, what it is possible for me to understand about what I see, feel, and do—the table upon which my laptop sits, the sunlight streaming through my window, the purring of the cat in the chair next to me, the urgency that compels me to ignore her and complete this chapter—are comprehensible to me through discourses that dictate how I think and behave. Our repeated iterations of discourses—about pets and dissertations, as well as discourses of gender, education, and social studies, to name a few—reinscribe and stabilize their meaning (Butler, 1990, 1993). Discourses are material and productive forces that construct our reality and our common sense notions of the way things are. Our reality, as Potter noted in the quote I used at the beginning of this section, is not handed to us from above, but is produced by the way we talk and write it.

Discourse analysis, then, is concerned with questions that focus on language events that enunciate the world into being. This focus is maintained not by asking questions *about* the field, but by asking questions about "the way questions are asked in the field" (Andersen, 2003, p. xi). That's a lot of use of the word 'question' in one sentence, but what I am trying to get at here is that I use the poststructural conception of discourse to disrupt the perception that the field is the way it is "just because". In order to do that in this dissertation, I tried to ask *how* "the categories, the problems, the arguments, the themes, and the interests" (Andersen, 2003, p. xi) around gender and women of social studies education emerged, not *what* they are. By asking how the discourse around and about gender and women in social studies education works, I sought to gain a better understanding of how it is that we came to be able to talk about women in social studies in the way that we do.

Truths.

Discourses not only shape what is possible to think: they also limit what is possible to think and say about ourselves and our world. St. Pierre (2000) posited “within the rules of discourse, it makes sense to say only certain things. Other statements and others' way of thinking remain unintelligible, outside the realm of possibility” (p. 485). In other words, discourses not only open the world to us, but also determine what is *impossible* to think and say. This occurs because the discourses within which we operate define what is “true” and “untrue”. So, for example, gender discourses that are based upon the “truth” that women are inherently less interested in history and politics than men exclude the possibility of perceiving an interest in history and politics as flexible, contextualized, and unrelated to one's gender. Through its exclusion, this alternate conception becomes unintelligible and untrue.

Foucault (1970/1981) highlighted the contingency of truths by describing discourses as shaped not by truth, but by a *will to truth*. In this sense, the truths that undergird and define a discourse are “not the dumb existence of a reality, nor the canonical use of vocabulary, but the ordering of objects” (p. 54). The underlying and assumptive truths of a discourse reveal its will, or the goal of the work the discourse seeks to achieve. In terms of the example given above, then, this would mean that the will to make true inherent gender differences in interest of history and politics produces a particular “ordering of objects” that serves a particular and material purpose, a purpose that would likely be disrupted by the introduction of the concept of women and men's interest in social studies as malleable and contingent.

Regimes of truth (Foucault, 1977/1980), which are discursively produced and are always particular to a time and place, function by determining what can be intelligible and desirable, but also by controlling what is considered subordinate, tangential, and impossible. There is the type

of discursive maintenance required to sustain a truth that positions attention to women and gender as not important enough to include in social studies or as existing outside of what “counts” for social studies teacher preparation, academia, and worthwhile scholarly pursuits. Through my dissertation, I worked to identify the regimes of truth that shaped certain kinds of attention to women in PK-12 and teacher education as *the* way that attention to women and gender is done within the field. After identifying them, I then tried to think beyond their commonsense and naturalness to understand what might be possible if we attended to women and gender differently in the field.

This theoretical stance required that I think about social studies education -- as well as the attention to women and gender within it -- as a construction produced by scholars, teachers, policy makers, etc, across different times and places. However, it was important to avoid assigning intentionality to specific actors within the social studies community or to ascribe blame for the marginalization of women in the field to a patriarchal, sexist wizard behind the curtain pulling the levers. Regimes of truth regulate thinking and language in ways that make exclusions and constraints invisible to those who participate in the discourse. An author, therefore, may be unaware that the forces regulating her speech are regulated from the outside or that the words she chooses to write reflect and produce "a material force, a capacity to constrain, to shape, to coerce, as well as to potentiate individual action" (Davies, 2003, p. xii).

Poststructuralists are interested in this hidden and regulative function of discourse, particularly for the potential to expose the contingency of truths and beliefs that may appear to be commonsensical or natural. But, discourses, and the truths with which they align, as Potter reminded us, are not fixed products created by the powers that be and delivered on a platter: individuals continually reinscribe and/or alter discourses within every speech event. Herein lies

the possibility for social change. Butler (1995) argued that we are discursively "produced within a given network of power/discourse which is open to resignification, redeployment, subversive citation from within, and interruption and inadvertent convergences with other such networks" (p. 135). So while discourses do indeed shape who we are, they also provide us with the tools, and access to other, potentially contradictory discourses, that would enable us to "negotiate new positions" (Davies, 2000, p. 105). The words and ways of thinking an author has available to her, therefore, are the product of a collective meaning-making process that is dynamic, fragmented, and potentially resistible.

Some poststructural theorists try to use the disruption of truths to illuminate their historicity and in doing so, they hope to open up new possibilities and strategies for resistance. Foucault (1970/1981) claimed that one of his goals was "to try to discover how [the] choice of truth, inside which we are caught but which we ceaselessly renew, was made – but also how it was repeated, renewed, and displaced" (p. 70). Foucault's interest then, was not a humanist pursuit of gaining a more accurate understanding or revelation of what is true, but coming to an understanding of how truths come to be perceived as true, the discursive technologies that make them possible, and how this understanding has the potential to disrupt those truths (Mills, 2004). The potential of my poststructural discourse analysis in social studies education is that it could disrupt the idea that the relegation of women's issues and concerns to the sidelines is an impartial reflection of reality, while simultaneously opening up new positions and ways to think about women and gender in the field.

Social studies education is in need of a disruption in terms of the way that women and gender are perceived. This reality smacked me in the face two years ago in my ESOC 2450 class. I had given the class an article that critiqued the traditional narrative within history

textbooks, and the exclusion of white women and all people of color from the story, and I had asked the students to discuss the author's arguments in the context of the Georgia state standards for secondary social studies courses. My hope was that they would be outraged that the attention paid to gender and people of color in the standards was pretty slim, but instead, some of them took up the position that the standards did indeed reflect the most important issues and topics that secondary students "need" to know. Not all of them took this position, however, which made for an interesting discussion. After one particularly lively exchange about the early American history standards, one of the students dropped this zinger: "Women just didn't do anything important during that time. That's just the way it is".

Indeed, the perception that women's position on the sidelines within the traditional history canon is "just the way it is", is incredibly pervasive. I recognized this on a personal level³⁵ when I had no words readily available with which to respond to that student³⁶. I, too, have been conditioned to think of women's contributions as appropriately relegated to the sidebar of the textbook with a picture and a nice little anecdote about some exceptional achievement. The purpose of this study was to examine how it has become possible to conceive of that student's statement as commonsense by trying to make the familiar strange (Foucault, 1970/1981). This requires the difficult work of trying to not accept what can feel like a "truth" at face value.

As a teacher, this student's statement exposed an orientation towards thinking about women that didn't sit well with me: it was my first inclination to not think very highly of him or his intellect. In that moment, however, I thought about being more compassionate (Conklin,

³⁵ Recognized again, I should say, because this is not only a lesson I can't refuse (Blake, 1998) but also a lesson that keeps on giving.

³⁶ This state of being unprepared for what might manifest in a classroom conversation about gender is an idea I explored further in Chapter 6.

2008) as well as about the need to understand that his comment was a reflection of the complex, particularized, and localized contexts (Jones & Enriquez, 2009) in which he had participated up to that point. In the next section, I described some of the poststructural theory that explains my position that this individualizing should be avoided.

The author.

"What difference does it make who is speaking?" (Foucault, 1994, p. 391)

Within poststructural theory, the disruption of the subject as unitary and knowing also disrupts the traditional idea that what an author says reflects solely a purposeful intent or expression of inner thought. As Foucault (1994) argued, "the author is not an indefinite source of significations that fill a work; the author does not precede the works" (p. 390). For this reason, Andersen (2003) asserted that Foucault was critical of "any textual analysis which professes to refer the text back to the authors or his intentions, concerns, unconscious, circumstances, and so on" (p. 10). The poststructural interest in a text, therefore, lies not within what the words reveal about the author's thinking or intended meaning. Instead, a text is useful as an artifact of what it was possible to say in a given time and place. In this view, the words, ideas, and constructions available to an author reveal the discourses operating and circulating in the communities in which she participates. An author's words, then, are not her own, but rather hail from the discourses that are available to her. Bakhtin (1981) captured this idea when he argued

in the makeup of almost every utterance spoken by a social person-from a brief response in a casual dialogue to major verbal-ideological works (literary, scholarly and others)-a significant number of words can be identified that are implicitly or explicitly admitted as someone else's....The utterance so conceived is a considerably more complex and

dynamic organism than it appears when construed simply as a thing that articulates the intention of the person uttering it, which is to see the utterance as a direct, single-voiced vehicle for expression. (pp. 354-55)

In this sense, what an author writes is deeply contextualized in a time and space, and is embedded within in an infinite discourse chain, within which that author's text is a response to previous dialogue and an invitation to future response (Bakhtin, 1986.). The author's interpretation and description of reality is never truly her own, because, as Bakhtin (1981) posited "in the space between the word and its object, another's word, another's accent intrudes" (p. 329).

I was interested in starting a conversation about the forces operating on social studies that may occur without a conscious awareness on the part of the speaker or author. As such, when I was reading the texts I analyzed for this research, I tried not to get inside the minds of the authors or to guess their motivations, but instead to "imagine the general condition of each text, the condition of both the space in which it is dispersed and the time in which it unfolds" (Foucault, 1994, p. 379). In order to align my analysis with this theoretical position, whenever possible, I tried to avoid using the phrase "the author"³⁷ in my descriptions of the texts that comprised the data³⁸. This was often difficult to do using appropriate syntax: as I struggled to

³⁷ This strategy and those that follow describe the way I tried to avoid naming the author when I was talking about the data. When, in the texts, I turned to theorists, and used their quotes and ideas to help me analyze the data, I did not try to avoid naming them.

³⁸ Even the seemingly straightforward act of noting the gender of an author is loaded with meanings and understandings that will exceed any attempt I can make to contain them. I ran into this issue when trying to decide, for example, how or if to acknowledge that 20 of the 24 first authors of the lesson plans described in Chapters 4,5,6 were women. I think the predominance of women contributors to lesson plans about women within this dataset does mean something, and is something the field needs to consider. However, I don't know anything about these women. In fact, I can identify most of them as women only because they have names that are traditionally female. That's not enough to go on in terms of exploring the way that gender impacted the process of writing these lesson plans. If I were to hypothesize about the way author gender contributed to predominance of female authored lesson plans, I would have little to draw on because I have no insight into the authors' lived experiences as gendered people or the way that their particular experiences as gendered people impacted the contexts in which these lesson plans were written. This is a limitation of textual research. The gender of these authors is, of course, shaped by social forces

find a way to describe the data without writing "The author suggested this" or "The author argued that", I was forced to think about the centrality of describing "who said it" to the very grammar of educational research. You will see that my attempts to not center the author in the analysis sometimes resulted in the attribution the action of the text to the text itself, meaning that in effect, I attributed actions to inanimate objects. That was intentional and appropriate, I would argue, within a theoretical orientation that positions texts as having the capacity to produce effect. In other instances, though, I failed to find language and grammar to make the text the actor, and I was forced to refer to the author. In these instances, I tried to use the generic label of "author" instead of naming the author specifically. Again, this was an intentional move to try to stay true to Bové's (1995) assertion that "The function of discourse and the realities it constructs are fundamentally anonymous" (p. 56).

Although poststructuralism disrupts the concept of the author, it doesn't seek to relieve authors of our responsibility for reinscribing problematic discourses. Poststructural theories, by attempting to loosen our connections to seeing ourselves as rational and agentful subjects, do change the site of responsibility and ethics in our actions. Instead of perceiving our responsibility as the act of making choices on the basis of a highly individualized, inner knowledge of a firm truth, Keenan (1997) asserted that, "It is when we do not know exactly what we should do, when the effects and conditions of our actions can longer be calculated, and when we have nowhere else to turn, not even back onto our "self", that we encounter something like

that impact the discourses they can access. But trying to make a connection between an individual author's contingent gender subjectivities and what they write is beyond the scope of textual research. As someone who seeks to make conceptions of gender more complex through her work, it would be problematic for me to assign meaning to the gender of the authors of the lesson plans based upon just knowing that 20 of them have names that are typically given to people who identify as women. Understanding how gender impacted the work of these authors or why most of the authors of lesson plans about women are women would be a different project - a worthwhile project, but not what I'm doing here. So, I'm pointing to the fact that 20 of the 24 authors of lesson plans about women were women, and I encourage the field to think about what that means, but I'm not analyzing it in this project.

responsibility" (p. 2). By distancing my analysis from the individual authors of texts described in this dissertation, my goal is to disrupt the community conditions that have informed the actions of all social studies researchers and scholars in order to increase the *collective* sense of responsibility we have for producing equity oriented work in this field.

Although poststructuralist discourse analysts often seek to avoid assigning the meaning of a speaker's statement, in practice³⁹, there is a very fine line between analyzing the discourse the speaker is accessing and assigning meaning to a speaker's statements. The humanist environment in which we live makes it very tempting to ascribe meaning and motivation to someone's words or actions. In fact, the ability to intuit *why* people say the things they do and act in specific ways is a valuable characteristic and skill to possess in this culture. However, for the purposes of my research, it is *only* by focusing on the appearance of statements, not in their hidden meaning, that we can begin to understand how a discourse works to shape things in the way that it does (Andersen, 2003). Threadgold (2000) articulated this perspective in his argument that

We should not 'burrow' into discourse looking for meanings. We should instead look for the external conditions of its existence, its appearance and its regularity. We should explore the conditions of its possibility. Just how is it possible to know that, to think that, to say that – these are the questions we should be asking. (p. 49)

By examining texts with the poststructural strategy of staying on the top of the data, and by focusing on an analysis of the texts' truths, claims, statements, and absences, instead of the authors' intentions or motivations, we gain an understanding of technologies regulating and producing the will to truth in that space, and gain an insight into the lived and negotiated boundaries demarcated by the discourse. Texts also provide us with artifacts of language

³⁹ At least in my practice.

practices and discourses that offer a glimpse of the terrain upon which social forces interact and compete for hegemony. The conception that discourses play out on a landscape allows us to ask "in what specific contexts, among which specific communities of people, and by what textual and social processes has meaning been acquired?" (Scott, 1988, p. 35). The answer to this question can reveal how actions and behavior were legitimized and how the texts constructed and conditioned knowledge (Segall, 2006). For the purposes of my study, keeping these *how* questions in mind throughout data collection and analysis was important.

What is a social studies discourse, anyway?

Foucault's work, upon which I relied heavily in my approach to this project, focused on the analyses of social processes/knowledge that exist on a grand scale, like sexuality and punishment. Although social studies education may not be of the same scope as those issues, what social studies has in common with these issues is that it has been constructed, by us, to serve certain purposes. Also, like sexuality and punishment, what social studies "is" changes: the current state of social studies education - its way of being - was not inevitable. Social studies hasn't always been this way, and hasn't always been talked and thought about the same way. My goal through this research, then, was to investigate how the discourse of gender and social studies have been invented and brought to life (Andersen, 2003) in a way that enables its articulation of the field. Additionally, by examining the micro-events in which it gets produced, I hoped to show that there are places within social studies where change can occur.

I tried to avoid representing social studies as a singular, static, unified, and/or closed entity, because of course it is impossible to represent the field as whole. I am not a scientist peering through a microscope at a social studies slide, and I attempted to avoid representing my analysis in that way. As a woman, a researcher, a social studies educator, and a participant in

this culture, I am as wrapped up in these discourses as anybody else, and my ability to read in to the discourses evident in social studies education, and to represent them in a way that resists dominant paradigms, was constrained by my own struggle to see past the normative assumptions that have shaped my view of the world, of social studies education, and of gender and feminism—the discursive truths that have constituted my reality. And of course, as Davies (2003) reminded us, "poststructural theory is itself a discourse" (p. xiii) which possesses its own will to truth and productive goals. This makes discursive work admittedly messy, partial and contingent, because "any attempt the [poststructural] researcher makes to tell what it is s/he sees/hears/smells/feels/believes/desires, is understood to produce no more than a possible reading" (p. 144). It is important to note here, however, that my goal was not to produce the truth, but to open up complicated new spaces to explore the gendering of social studies education and enhance our understanding of how it happens, in hopes that it might "generate possibilities for things to happen that are closed off by the epistemologies of certainty" (Stronach & McClure, 1997, p.5). Although this theoretical paradigm could be a risky move, especially within a research ecosystem in which positivist work rules, I am comforted by Lather's (1996) argument that "Refusing an untroubled realism, representation is practiced as a way to intervene, even while one's confidence is troubled" (p. 17). So, although there is no monolithic *thing* that "is" social studies, it is a construction, and is observable, even in partial and fragmented ways.

Intertextuality.

Of course, social studies education is not entirely responsible for constructing itself the way it has. In social studies education, the impact of external forces on curriculum is clearly evident. There is no absence of attention paid to the broader social forces that have determined what gets into social studies textbooks and standards (Apple, 2000; Kornfeld, 2005; Leming,

Ellington, Porter, & Fordham, 2003; Singer, 2005). However, the discursive forces that have shaped the research in the field have not been adequately explicated. In other words, my dissertation seeks to identify the discourses that have shaped what it is that we as educational researchers in the social studies are observing and commenting upon in relation to gender and women.

Foucault argued that no text "exists by itself, it is always in relation of support and dependence vis-à-vis other [texts]; it is a point in a network - it contains a system of indications that point, explicitly or implicitly to...other texts" (1994, p. 398). Schools are places that are created and constrained by forces that exceed the bureaucracies in which they exist: schools, for example, are subordinate to forces that exceed the policies of school boards, district offices, and state and federal departments of education. Schools are very much impacted by discourses about "the child" that come from sources outside those exclusively concerned with the PK-12 classroom. Discourses about gender, which may not be directly related to schooling, certainly impact the construction of what schools are and do. They have normalizing effects on many aspects of our lives, because they have a "universal reign...and each individual, wherever he may find himself [sic], subject to it his body, his gestures, his behavior, his aptitudes, his achievements" (Foucault, 1975/1995, p. 304). Therefore, my analysis of social studies education also included attention to broader societal discourses like neoliberalism and the rejection of feminism, forces I argued have shaped the field and constrained attention to women and gender.

Operationalizing women and gender

Throughout the dissertation, I argued that there are particular constructions of women and gender within social studies education literature. I am not looking at the lived experience of

being constructed as a woman in social studies, but rather the textual construction of women as a problem or idea within the field. Although not physically enacted, these textual constructions are still processes that position embodied women and men in particular ways, and shape the subject positions that women and men can fulfill. The texts of social studies education *gender* the discipline (Butler, 1990, 1993).

As Crocco (2008) noted, the use of the word *gender*, instead of *sex*, acknowledges the "variability and even ambiguity rather than universality and constancy" of a gender identity (p. 174). In these ways, *gender* is used to indicate the contingency of a female or male identity that had previously been considered as fixed. However, *gender*, as a critical term, can be used to signal that men do not embody the transcendental and universal experience. Feminists who focus on *gender*, instead of exclusively upon women, "recast the issue of women's relative identity as equally an issue for men, who, upon ceasing to be mankind, become, precisely, men" (Jehlen, 1995, p. 265).

In my work, I used both "women" and "gender" in an effort to signal my interest in women's issues while at the same time acknowledging that women and men are socially invented, and their identities mutually constructive. I use the word *woman* as a reference to the kind of socially constructed identity that, as Weatherall (2002, p. 138) described, is not essentialist in that it describes something that people "are", but in terms of an identity that is "progressively and dynamically achieved through the discursive practices that individuals engage in". *Gender*, as it is generally used, signals a reference to women and men as socially constructed in a way that the word "*sex*" does not. Butler's (1990, 1993) concept of *gender* performativity, in particular, undercut the idea that femininity and masculinity emanated from biology: instead, Butler proposed that gendered ways of being are achieved through the

reiterative and citational practices that produce and sustain the gender binary. In other words, we perform gender, and in doing so, reinscribe what it means to be female or male in ways that keep the boundaries between each performance distinct. In this sense, the use of the word gender can draw attention to not only the socially constructed nature of feminine and masculine performances, but the interrelated and mutually defining aspects of women's and men's experiences.

Using the terms women and gender together is a discursive move that attempted to foreground the complexity of gendered subject positions, and tried to acknowledge that gender is "constituted within a wide range of often competing and conflicting discourses and are effects of both power and resistance" (Weedon, 1999, p. 102). Building on Derrida's (1976) concept of *différance* - which stresses the temporality of the effort to fix meaning - in this dissertation I've repeatedly deployed an overdetermined subjectivity category - woman - in order to work within a feminist political project that seeks to "do" something around gender while at the same time leaving space for the deconstruction of the very idea of what it means to be woman. Using "women" and "gender" together, over and over again, may not be an adequate tool for this task, but through its repetition and occasional awkwardness, I hoped to disrupt the ease with which the word "woman" can be read.

Being gendered and gendering are the processes of attributing gender role norms to a situation, event, or context, based upon assumptions of what women and men are and do. This means that the gendering of social studies shapes the options available to girls and women, and well as boys and men. As MacLure (2003) argued "Discourses not only circumscribe what it is possible to say, know, and do, but also establish what kind of person one is entitled/obliged to

'be' " (p. 176). Texts can work to gender people in ways that contribute to real and material differences in opportunities, status, etc.

The kind of discursive gendering I explored in this dissertation was often nuanced. But because social studies educators possess the power to legitimate certain ways of seeing the world to their students, even if only a small percentage of what social studies teachers say and do are things that students will perceive as true, what happens in social studies matters. And therefore, what gets printed, or not, in the publications associated with the field matters. The ways that we describe lessons that include women matters. The ways in which our preservice teachers get introduced to the profession matters. As Fairclough & Wodak (1997) argued, "every instance of language use makes its own small contribution to reproducing and/or transforming society and culture...That is the power of discourse; that is why it is worth struggling over" (p. 273). What we do and say and can think about the field is woven into a discourse tapestry that in the big picture, makes it possible for the world to be a pretty good place for some, often at the expense of others. In that sense, the discourses of social studies are worth struggling over.

Prelude to the Gender Drought: Modes of Inquiry

Despite the significant progress American women have made in the last century, even a cursory exploration of women's political, economic, and cultural status, in comparison to men's, yields depressing results. In terms of addressing gender inequity, schools are uniquely situated to have an impact, both as spaces in which children develop a gender identity and where students can develop the capacity to understand, analyze, and respond to gender issues. Within PK-12 education, social studies teachers are responsible for supporting the development of the knowledge and critical thinking necessary to know the facts around gender inequity, to understand the historical context of asymmetrical gender relations, and to analyze the

consequences. However, issues around women and gender within social studies PK-12 and teacher education have been largely ignored.

The handful of scholars who work on issues related to women and gender in social studies education have argued that women have been underrepresented in the field in (Crocco, 2001, 2004, 2006, 2008; Hahn, Bernard-Powers, Crocco, & Woyshner, 2007; Hahn et al., 1985; Noddings, 2001b). These scholars have contended that attention needs to be paid to these topics within the content of the social studies K-12 and teacher education curriculum because the discussion of those topics in our classrooms, or the lack thereof, has an impact on the way our students think about society and the world. The implication is clear: the absence of attention to women and gender in the field of social studies is unacceptable.

However, the absence persists. As a field, social studies has been unresponsive to calls to attend to women and gender more broadly as valid topics or issues of concern in curriculum, teacher education, and research about social studies. How is it possible for a field like social studies—a discipline based upon the examination of culture, society, and power – to sustain a refusal to engage with issues of gender? This question has provided the foundation of my dissertation work. But in deciding how to go about considering this question, I took a different course than most of the feminist work in the field. Taking to heart Lather's (1991) call that "uncovering the particularity and contingency of our knowledge and practices is at the core of whatever generative advances we might make" as well as McLeod's (2008) suggestion that in order to look forward, perhaps those of us concerned about feminism and education "need also to look back, to look more historically at how ideas have formed" (p. 19), I decided to examine the attention that *has* been paid to women and gender in social studies.

I used the word drought in the title of this project because it communicates several different ideas. First, droughts are of course catastrophic to those who are impacted by them and I believe, as most of the gender scholars in social studies have stated, that the absence of attention to women and gender in social studies education has big consequences for us. However some droughts and the negative effects they have upon people are a part of a chain reaction that is sometimes compounded by human behavior. Because critical work calling for attention to women and gender is a productive project that normalizes a particular way of thinking about gender in the field, I think it is worth considering how this work in social studies may have actually contributed to the gender drought in the field.

As with most research projects, the impetus to do this research is very personal to me and was generated by my experiences as a woman, a student, a teacher educator, and a feminist studying and working in social studies education. Additionally, as a scholar who is at the beginning of what I hope will be a long career in this line of work, I needed to think about *how* the attention to women and gender present in social studies was working. The particular focus of this paper are the lesson plans published in social studies education literature in the last decade that have promoted attention to women and gender. I argue that there are connections to be made between the way scholars construct a hypothetical pedagogical event and the normative assumptions that have shaped a particular way of thinking about how attention to women in the gender in the classroom can be "done". It is important to clarify that my analysis of the gender work that has been done in the field is not intended as a critique, but rather an attempt to examine the taken-for-granted assumptions that have mediated meaning in this work, in hopes that this might enable us to stumble toward some new innovations.

Discourse at work

Building upon poststructural conceptions of discourses as "material in the sense that it is located in institutions and practices which define difference and shape the material world, including bodies" (Weedon, 1999, p. 103) in this chapter I explored how gender and women have been constructed and maintained as topics in social studies scholarship. Discourse analysis is not a new methodology in either feminist work or education research. But instead of examining spoken language, which is the more common focus of discourse analysts, I was interested in analyzing the discourse present in academic scholarship and texts. Spoken language and writing, as MacLure (2003) argued, are both fabrications that are hopelessly entangled with rhetoric; like speech, written texts "assemble and deploy the objects and phenomena to which they seem to refer" (p. 81). From this perspective, texts are always more than just words printed on a page: instead, they are constituted by and reconstitute the symbolic systems people use to construct meanings and produce and circulate power in particular ways (Burr, 2003). Discourse analysis, then, focuses on language events within texts that enunciate particular versions of the world into being: the purpose of this work is to disrupt the perception that our current reality is inevitable. Within this project, I used poststructural theories about discourse to open up texts for questioning, to see what versions of the world they produced, and to understand the particular ways in which gender and women have been constructed in social studies.

As I noted in the introduction, Hurren (2002) described the discursive spaces of social studies as the "spaces where we talk, teach, learn, write and read about social studies education" (para. 4). It is within these spaces that social studies - and its gendering - gets "done". The texts produced in social studies education research influence and shape what educators and scholars can think about gender and women because social studies "as a site of research constructs and

conditions knowledge" (Segall, 2004, p. 168). Texts have effects - they can impact what we know and what we believe (Fairclough, 2003). Social studies teachers and scholars are consumers of social studies texts that attend to gender in ways normalize particular modes of seeing and thinking about gender within social studies.

The conceptions of gender constructed in social studies are informed by the discourses about gender that exist in our culture. But social studies education, as a community of practice (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992), has a particular history in terms of addressing and ignoring gender. This means that social studies has particular ways of talking and thinking about teaching women and gender. As Bakhtin (1981, p. 293) stated, "All words have a 'taste' of the profession...each word tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life." For this paper, I turned my attention to social studies lesson plans about women in order to consider what kind of gender work was being done in those textual spaces. By looking specifically at the socially charged tastes of these topics within lesson plans, I wanted to think about what the attention to women and gender in these spaces was producing.

Discourse Analysis as a Method

I used methods of Foucauldian discourse analysis (Andersen, 2003; Davies, 2003; Foucault, 1975/1995; MacLure, 2003; Mills, 2004; Prior, 2003) to understand how scholars in social studies education have shaped the discourses around gender and women that are present and to ask how these topics are framed and positioned within the broader field of social studies. Poststructural discourse analysis is concerned with shifting research questions "from being to becoming" (Andersen, 2003, p. xi). In the following three chapters of the dissertation, this work was achieved not so much by summarizing what the texts I reviewed were *about*, but by considering how they functioned and what kind of work they were doing (Prior, 2003). My goal

was to unravel the common sense at work and to spot the joining up and stitching together that made a text intelligible (MacLure, 2003). In her description of discourse analysis, MacLure argued,

The hardest thing to see in any text is that which poses itself as natural and unquestionable. So a first step towards opening up any text would be to watch and wait for something - often a little, seemingly inconsequential thing - that somehow catches your attention, puzzles you. (p. 82-23)

The practice of watching and waiting for something was very challenging, especially in my reading of gender in social studies work, because I am a member of the social studies community of practice and the tastes that these texts produce are very familiar to me. In order to try to understand what these texts were up to and how they worked though, it was necessary to try to think about the texts as *not* innocent and to try to problematize and unravel what they were arguing *for* and how they were doing it. I engaged in an analysis of the texts that, according to MacLure required two nearly incompatible things:

First, [analysis] needs to stick close to the details of particular texts....worrying away at the word-y fabric out of which arguments are woven. But, secondly, analysis is also a matter of moving *away* from the details of a specific text - of moving back and forwards through other texts, of other times, to try to glimpse the vastly bigger fabric of intertextual associations within which each particular text is suspended. (p. 23)

In other words, this particular way of analyzing a text requires paying very close attention to the language being used, as well as a consideration of the broader social, cultural, and political contexts that shape how the reading of that language can and might take place. What results is the kind of consideration of a sentence or choice of words in a piece that might give its authors

nightmares. But the goal of this close reading is not to expose an error, to intuit the "real" meaning of a text, or to accuse a writer of not saying things in the right way. Instead, the purpose is to try to gain a better understanding of *how* what is said about our social problems—in this case, gender inequity—is shaped by particular paradigms in which we all participate (myself included), and in turn, shapes possible responses and positionings by those who read the text.

All texts are written for the purpose of doing something (Bakhtin, 1981) so in this sense, the texts written about the inclusion of women and gender in social studies are not vastly different from research pieces about historical empathy or facilitating democratic discussions. But the kind of ideas drawn upon in gender work, and the kind social change that gender work seeks to work toward, are of a different scale and scope than research focused on facilitating good discussions. They call upon the consideration of practices, beliefs, and norms that not only shape our day to day and minute to minute interactions, but that are at the core of what makes us human. As Butler (1993) argued, "[A]s a strategy of survival within compulsory systems, gender is a performance with clearly punitive consequences. Discrete genders are part of what 'humanizes' individuals within contemporary culture; indeed, we regularly punish those who fail to do their gender right" (p. 190). And as such, the status quo at work here, the forces that persist to shape gender norms and relationships in asymmetrical ways across places, regions, and states and across historical periods (notwithstanding the rather marvelous resistance and agency many women, in many different places, and at many different times, have managed to carve out) are incredibly pervasive. None of us can stand outside of the norms about gender that shape our lives, our communities, and our world, and commentate on them as an objective observer. Building on this understanding of the complexity of gender, then, I contend that addressing gender in social studies, particularly in ways that would work toward gender equity, requires a

different kind of attention than we pay to something like teaching the functions of the electoral college or how to conduct a Socratic seminar.

Gender discourses are incredibly powerful, but they are not all powerful: pointing to their pervasiveness is not intended to communicate that we don't have the agency to chip away at the foundations of practices and thinking that result in oppressive interactions⁴⁰. The aim of the research presented in the next three chapters is to think about the characteristics of gender work in social studies education, and in particular, in the lesson plans promoting this kind of work, to analyze the strategies that have been engaged, and to consider where these strategies can take us and where they may not be able to go. In doing so, I'm working toward considering some new options that might "amplify the possibilities that are open to us in our present" (Rose, 1999, p. 3).

In this chapter, I've use the terms "gender", "women" and "social studies education" as a type of short-hand to reference the divergent discursive spaces they signify. In particular, and as discussed in Chapter 3, I have paired the words "gender" and women" together, despite the clunkiness it creates for me as a writer and for you as a reader, in order to make my use of these terms more complex. This move is made in an attempt to address Kumashiro's (2001) concern that it is problematic to speak about identities in ways that "mask the already-privileged status of certain identities to count as authentic, only certain ones to matter when learning about what it means to be of that group" (p. 5). The texts to which I will refer in these chapters use the word "woman" as if it's meaning was fixed and in doing so, reinscribe and privilege a particular version of what it means to be a part of that group. In other words, the way that "women" is used in these lesson plans is essentializing: instead of playing with the term, or using it in a way that acknowledges the diversity of experiences that can be categorized as belonging to women, the

⁴⁰ In fact, pointing to their hegemonic pervasiveness essentializes and reinscribes the binaries on which they rely, which can be incredibly counterproductive (Gibson-Graham, 2006)..

word is used in ways that masks difference. I have tried to use "women" and "gender" together through this dissertation to both remind myself and to signal to the reader that what it means to be a woman is never fixed, but is only a part of a complex and dynamic gender system that provides a framework from which the word "woman" can never be completely extricated. The use of the words together is a rhetorical device that has been important to me as I try to continually disrupt the notion that the word "woman" could ever mean just one thing.

Discursive data: Modes of inquiry

For this project, my goal was to identify articles published in social studies education journals that were lesson-plan oriented articles and described ways of attending to gender and women as topics in a social studies classroom. There were several reasons for using descriptive, lesson-plan oriented articles for this analysis. First, descriptive lesson plans require a translation from the abstract to the practical, which I felt would be a fertile space for identifying the kind of language and practices scholars use to make a connection between a gender-equity orientation and activities that are seen as beneficial for students. Additionally, journal articles do not provide enough space to describe every step the teachers and students must take to enact the proposed lesson: hence, the omissions might communicate unspoken assumptions and commonsensical understandings of what teachers and students know, believe, and will do. I also wanted to understand what practitioners looking for ways to incorporate gender would find, and I wanted to think about what would materialize if the directions in one of these articles were followed. Finally, and not unimportantly, focusing specifically on lesson plans produced a manageable dataset: there needed to be sufficient texts to compare, while the total number of texts to review, considering the close reading required in discourse analysis, needed to be feasible. I focused specifically on lesson plans published since 2000 because I am interested in

examining our recent thinking about gender, rather than describing some problematic past we can imagine we have progressed beyond.

Because of its search capabilities and prominence in the field of education research, I choose ERIC as the search engine through which to collect data. The first step in collecting the data was to build an ERIC search that would capture journal articles that addressed gender and described lesson plans. To do this, I used ERIC descriptors, which are terms assigned by the ERIC Lexicography staff that label the major topics of an ERIC document. In order to develop a list of ERIC descriptors related to instruction that was likely to capture lesson plan oriented pieces, I looked at all of the lesson plan-type articles published in *Social Education* in one year, 2008, and collected every descriptor assigned to those articles that was related to instruction. There were 26 descriptors in my instruction list, that included terms like "Learning Activities", "Simulation" and "Primary Sources". To construct the gender list, I used the ERIC Thesaurus function to identify any descriptors that related to gender. Interestingly, neither "gender", "women", or "men" were descriptors in ERIC: the Thesaurus suggested "sex", "females", and "males" instead. My search included those terms, as well as descriptors like "Gender Bias", "Feminism", and "Sex Role". There were 29 gender related descriptors. After building the descriptor list, the next step was to run the instruction and gender searches separately and then combine the lists to identify the number of articles about these topics, first at the broadest level of educational research and then within social studies education literature. The table below illustrates the results of the searches conducted using the entire ERIC database of academic journal articles published since 2000:

Table 1

Number of ERIC articles in academic journals published since 2000

Descriptor List	Total # of Articles
Instruction	38,657
Gender	24,349
Instruction & Gender	1,670

Identifying the presence of the lesson plan articles about gender in social studies education literature was a challenge. Although "social studies" is an ERIC search descriptor, not all articles in social studies education are assigned that descriptor by ERIC lexicographers. Therefore, it was necessary to search within specific social studies education journals to locate the articles for which I was looking. I identified seven publications that were searchable in ERIC and associated with social studies education, including each of the NCSS publications (*Social Education*, *Social Studies & the Young Learner*, *Middle Level Learner* and *Theory and Research in Social Education*), and *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *The Social Studies*, and *International Journal of Social Education*. Of course, there is work in social studies that is published outside of these journals, but because my goal was to understand what was being written about these topics within the community, my search was limited to publications that were specifically geared toward social studies educators.

The search became more complex when I realized that (at least during the period in which I was searching for data) ERIC did not contain any information about articles published in *Social Education* in 2002 or 2003, *Social Studies and the Young Learner* in from 2001 to 2003, *Theory and Research in Social Education* in 2001, and any record of *Middle Level Learner* articles beyond two issues published in 2000. Therefore, I looked at each of those issues individually in order to identify any articles that were likely to have been assigned descriptors pertaining to instruction and/or gender. The following table illustrates the results of the search

conducted within the seven social studies journals used for this project. These numbers were drawn primarily from the ERIC search, but also include my analysis of the journals from the years that have been omitted in ERIC. The results that include a combination of ERIC data and counts generated by me are shaded.

Table 2

Articles published since 2000

Journal	All articles	# of Articles with Instruction descriptors	# of articles with Gender descriptors	# of articles with at least one Instruction & Gender descriptor	# of Lesson Plan articles included in this study
Social Education	601	409	40 ⁴¹	15	11
Journal of Social Studies Research	75	48	1	0	0
Social Studies and the Young Learner	230	155	6	2 ⁴²	1
The Social Studies	469	299	16	9	5
Middle Level Learner	155	131	7 ⁴³	6	6
Theory & Research in Social Education	202	117	16	2	0
International Journal of Social Education	106	43	3	1	1
Total	1838	1202	89	35	24 ⁴⁴

⁴¹ Including 12 articles published in the 2003 special issue titled "Women of the World"

⁴² One *Social Studies and the Young Learner* article that appeared in the search was not available to me in print or electronically. It was titled "History mystery: A documents based lesson women's rights" and written by Andrea Libresco in 2000.

⁴³ Including four articles in the 2011 special issue titled "Alice Paul and Women's Suffrage".

⁴⁴ This count includes two articles written by the same author (Kohlmeier, 2004, 2005) that would appear to draw on the data from one research project. There were many similar and overlapping ideas and topics in these articles. The 2004 article was published in *Social Education*, and the 2005 article in *The International Journal of Social Education*. Despite the similarity of these two articles, I've included both versions of this research in these counts in order to accurately represent the footprint of articles on gender and women these publications.

I read each of the 34 articles containing at least one instruction and gender descriptor in order to identify the lesson plan articles among them. There were multiple ways to categorize these articles, but as I read them, I was looking specifically for articles that both described student and teacher activities specifically, and that focused on gender, women's history, or women's issues in a significant way. Some articles provided readers with historical accounts of women's activities or experiences but did not describe detailed ways that teachers might use this information with students in a classroom. Although these articles also contribute to the ways that women and gender are constructed as topics in the field, they were not included in this analysis.

After reading each of the articles labeled with a descriptor from the instruction and gender lists, I identified 24 that were both focused on gender and or women and that included specific descriptions or instructions for teacher and student activity. These 24 articles comprise the dataset used for the analysis in the Gender Drought project. I read each of these texts at least three times. As I read, I made notes in the margins, drew arrows, underlined important phrases, and asked imaginary questions of the authors as I tried to push beyond the common sense of the lessons that were being described and tried to analyze how they were working and what they were producing. During these readings, I repeatedly circled back to other literature in social studies research that has described the place of gender and women in the field, feminist theory, and MacLure's (2003) work on discourse research, in order to keep one eye on the close details of the text and the other eye on the broader social discourses that shape certain ways of thinking about women and gender.

The authors of the lesson plans I analyzed mobilized different ways of thinking about incorporating attention to women, women's history, and gender into social studies, but it's important to note that my intent in this research was not to highlight what any particular person

said, wrote, thought, or meant, or as Foucault (1994) warned against, to point the finger at an author. From a poststructural position, the things we can say and do as individuals are made possible and regulated by much broader discourse communities in which we all participate, and therefore, we are all implicated in the problematic ways that gender gets talked about in our culture, in our local communities, and in social studies education research. My purpose then, was not to think about this research in the context of the work of one individual, but rather, it was to consider these lesson plans as one kind of possible product of the discourses available to scholars promoting women and gender as topics in social studies. Each of the next three chapters explores a different aspect of the lesson plan project. In the next chapter, I begin by analyzing the representations of women and gender in the dataset. The following chapter explores the rationales given for implementing these lessons. The third chapter examines the particular tools or strategies for teaching suggested (or not) in the 24 lessons.

CHAPTER 4

"WOMEN MADE IT A HOME": BETTER THAN NOTHING REPRESENTATIONS OF WOMEN AND GENDER

In this chapter, I analyzed the lesson plans in the dataset that presented "real women" in some way: in other words, each of these lessons included descriptions of individual women and their experiences. The act of describing individual women, whether in these lessons or in any other social studies content, always produces particular representations of women and gender, and encourages students to think about women in specific way. Therefore, my intent in this chapter was not to argue that women and what it is possible to think about them are produced through their representation in social studies - that was a given - but to understand *how* the women were represented and produced in these lessons. Among the 24 lesson plans in the dataset, I found 14 that included explicit references to individual women. By this I mean that in each of these 14 lessons, women were referred to not (only) as an abstract group, but in individual terms⁴⁵.

Looking at how individual women were represented across these lesson plans was important because references to individuals often emphasize particular characteristics, orientations, or experiences that can reveal something about the unspoken conceptions of gender that make that person recognizable to the reader. In a history text that includes attention to Eleanor Roosevelt, for example, she could be positioned as the wife of FDR, a social activist or as a possible lesbian (among other subject positions). Describing her as a wife creates a different

⁴⁵ Of course, putting these articles either into an "about individual women" or "about women as a group" category was not a cut and dry process. Someone else doing the same task could produce different results. Because my purpose in this analysis was to understand how women were represented in lesson plans, the articles included in this chapter all included descriptions of women that were rich enough to analyze in terms of the subject positions they produced. If it was on the borderline, I included it.

kind of subject position for her than does emphasizing her career as an activist or considering the possibility that she had a female lover: each of these subject positions produces her in a different way and makes different things possible. Examining the way that specific women are positioned in a text is an important step beyond the question of whether or not women are present: instead, the focus is on how they are present and what, in this case, the inclusion of women in these lesson plans was making it possible for students to think about women and gender. Some may assume that any attention to women works toward gender equity. Because of the way in which women were included in these lessons, however, I argue that most of these plans both reflect and contribute to some of the obstacles to achieving gender equity through social studies content.

"Women made it a home"

The first lesson I analyzed, which is based on the history of the Jamestown colony, is described as an opportunity for learners to "take an active role in examining history from women's perspectives" (Bair, Williams, and Fralinger, 2008, p. 176). Students were to be given "character cards", included in the appendix, with the name and biographical information of a female Jamestown settler, including information regarding why the woman settled in the new world. Among the six character cards presented, only two of the women expressed the "choice" to come to America: their motivations were described as looking for adventure and looking for a husband. The other four characters described on the cards did not have a choice: one woman noted that it was her husband that chose to come to Jamestown, one was a servant who had to follow her mistress, one was kidnapped, and the last was a slave. The next step of this lesson was for students to share the information on their cards, and then as a class summarize the reasons that women came to the colony. According to the authors (p. 176), responses from the students should include the following:

- better marriage opportunities due to a shortage of men in England;
- the higher ratio of men to women in Jamestown (which meant that women could be selective)
- the chance for improved economic situations
- cleaner environment
- sense of adventure in the New World
- more rights for women in the New World; and
- being kidnapped or forced to go

The next step of the lesson was the creation of a "recruitment poster" in which students would consider the abovementioned discussion to create a historically accurate, visually appealing, and creative advertisement "aimed at enticing British women to make the voyage to Jamestown" (p. 176). After the students shared their posters, the teacher was to engage the students in a discussion about which recruiting tactics were most effective. Then, the teacher should encourage students to "view the colony of Jamestown from a women's perspective in this time period. The teacher closes the discussion by describing the many roles that women played in Jamestown once they arrived. Both men and women contributed to making Jamestown a colony, but women made it a home" (p. 176).

This particular activity encourages students to consider women's experiences but does so outside of a consideration of the gender system operating during this time period, as evidenced by the absence of instructions or guidelines for why teachers may want to or should engage students in a discussion about why issues of marriage, mate selectivity, routes to improved economic situations, servitude, and of course, kidnapping and enslavement would have been salient issues for certain groups of women during this time period. The disconnect between a recruitment poster activity and the reality that some women were kidnapped or enslaved and forced to go to Jamestown is not addressed explicitly in the lesson description. Arguably, the

reality that some women were powerless against being forced to leave their family and homes would seem to be the kind of historical knowledge that could ignite an interesting and meaningful conversation with and among students about what views about women would be necessary to make this practice seem reasonable, as well as to compare and contrast the experiences of these European women with the women and men from other parts of the world who were forced to become Americans. However, the positive advertising focus of the recruitment poster undercuts the horror of the experience of being kidnapped or enslaved and distances students from exposure to the kind of violence that took place. This, in effect, distances students from thinking about the kinds of oppression women experienced, as well as the ways they resisted it through feminist political action and solidarity building through what would become the American women's movement.

Additionally, the comment that "women made it a home" could be seen as making what happened to these women "ok". It normalizes the "natural" place of women in the home made possible by a still implicit understanding in our culture that homemaking is what women do and not what men do not do. The comment inhibits the recognition of the way women may have resisted the constraints of their homemaking roles and obscures their capacity to be resentful of their circumscribed lot in life. It reifies the perception that it was (and is) women's responsibility to be homemakers without considering where this arrangement came from, why the responsibility to attend to the home was assigned on the basis of a gendered division of labor, and the inequality of this division (Scott, 1988).

The presentation of everyday women in colonial Jamestown and the consideration of how and why they got there has the potential to make this time period come alive for students in a way that a more traditional approach to Jamestown history, with an emphasis on the "facts" -

the names of the ships, when they left England, and when they arrived - could not begin to approach. But *how* stories about women in the home and in history are told is equally if not more important than the details about women's' experiences that make it into the stories (Henry, 2011). In particular, the ways in which women are positioned differently than men can have important discursive consequences. Weedon (1997, p. 12) addressed this when she argued,

While the right to be different without being seen as inferior is a key theme of present-day feminist thought, historically it has more often than not led to legitimation of separate spheres for women and men. The effect of privileging certain ideas of difference - for example women's natural and intrinsic mothering nature - has been to limit women's value, whatever the individual circumstances, to discourses of motherhood with which most women did not fully or even partially identify

In a different kind of argument about the problematic reinscriptions of women's difference, Gibson-Graham (2006) contended that celebrating women's difference from men by valorizing feminized spaces such as homemaking may be an effort by feminists to reverse women's oppression, but "in doing so, [feminists] accept the boundaries of difference and separation designated by the discourses of capitalism and binary gender" (p. 80). Each of these arguments raises important concerns about the seemingly benign statement that the women of Jamestown made the colony a home.

My purpose is not to critique attention to the home in history or attention to women's work within it but to ask how these stories about women might be more critical and be addressed in a way that would open the space for thinking about gender equity, now and then. I would argue that a focus on the arrangements that led to the arrival of women in the colony and their activities there might also include a set of critical questions. For example, Levstik (2001)

suggested that questions like, "What social, economic, and political purposes do these arrangements serve? Who is marginalized in this context? Who has power?" (p. 202), can accompany investigations of domestic life in history. Without these kinds of questions, the patriarchal system that made these women's demeaning experiences and differential treatment from men possible is either hidden or not relevant.

Teaching a history lesson about women in this historical context - with an explicit emphasis on women who were forced to leave their homes against their will as well as attention to women's work with home - without addressing gender as a system at work in determining women's options and salient concerns, is a missed opportunity. These types of student activities may reflect a way of including women in the curriculum, but to stop there actually perpetuates problematic ways of thinking about women and avoids engaging students in a discussion of how gender systems in the past, as well as gender systems today, shape certain possibilities and close down others. Without acknowledging that gender relations play out within systems that are contextual, local and historical, students engaging these activities would be left to map their modern understanding of women and women's role onto the past. And without even an attempt to contextualize the differences between women now and women "then" is to run the risk of reinscribing problematic notions about women's roles and women's place in society. Work that promotes attention to women might not look like it is an obstacle to the goals of attending to women and gender in social studies, but as this lesson plan demonstrates, it can be.

Heroines

Other lessons also presented learning opportunities about women without situating their achievements or experiences within the gendered contexts in which they lived (Pahl, 2007). For example, an article in *Social Studies and the Young Learner* featured a series of interesting

lessons that positioned Helen Keller and Annie Sullivan as heroes; however, there was no acknowledgement that they were women, or that positioning Keller and Sullivan as heroes would be a way to draw attention to women who have accomplished exceptional things or have overcome gendered obstacles. The word "woman" or "women" does not appear in the article at all. The only reference to gender comes in a footnote that states, "We use the word "hero" as a gender-neutral description. The term "heroine" appears in many historical documents" (Morin & Bernheim, 2005, p. 27). This lesson plan *does* include activities that would encourage students to think about people with disabilities - activities that encourage students to consider what it means to live as a deaf and blind person, and to think about their interactions with students who have disabilities. But the opportunity to encourage students to consider what it meant to live as women during this time, and the obstacles both Keller and Sullivan faced because of their gender, or what the difference between hero and heroine signifies, or why the usage of the term changed, was not taken advantage of here.

Lesson plans in this dataset featuring heroic women without explicitly acknowledging their femaleness or encouraging students to situate the women's accomplishments within gender systems that had made their achievements exceptional support the contention that "just to include women heroines [perpetuates] the often silent and hidden operations of gender in shaping historical analysis" (Hendry, 2011, p. 14). These articles were assigned "females" as a descriptor in ERIC but are exemplary of the kind of attention to women in social studies that is "about women" because it happens to include women, not because it acknowledges or explores what it means to be a women in particular gendered social, political, economic, or historical contexts. By comparison, for example, lesson plan articles "about" George Washington are not labeled with a "males" descriptor. Of course, the authors of this piece are not responsible for the

assignment of ERIC descriptors: as I mentioned in the Prelude, this is done by the ERIC lexicography staff. But articles like this one might give the impression that some attention to women is being given in the field and that teachers who use these activities are attending women and gender. Although these pieces do include references and descriptions of women, they do so outside of the context of considering women's experiences within systems of gender that circumscribe lives on the basis of a gendered identity.

Another lesson plan in the dataset about exceptional women did address gender explicitly, but did so in a way that reinscribed some problematic notions. This was a two-page article about the inception of women's basketball, published in *Middle Level Learning*. It recounted the story of Senda Berenson, who has been described as the mother of women's basketball, and her fear that women playing basketball would develop "dangerous nervous tendencies and would reduce their feminine qualities" (Levy, 2011, p. 11). The article explains how Berenson modified the rules of the game to accommodate those concerns. Furthermore, it's noted that there was widespread resistance to women's involvement in basketball for reasons such as the potential for "eroding sacred concepts of womanhood", but how these protests were overcome or countered was not addressed beyond the statement that "women's involvement in the sports was here to stay" (p. 11). The description of Berenson's contribution to women's basketball concluded by noting that in 1911, she married an English professor (his full name was included) and then retired from coaching. The final statement of the text reads that "Basketball is a game of judgment, self-control, cooperation, teamwork, speed, and physical fitness. Those are characteristics that can be found and developed in both women and men. It just took a while for some people to realize that" (p. 11).

Unlike the other lesson plans about exceptional women, this lesson plan draws attention to some challenges that women faced - because they were women - during this time, but it doesn't work actively to question the challenges they faced, like the idea of a "sacred concept of womanhood". Additionally, it doesn't give specific details about how women interested in sport advocated for themselves, in spite of the gender norms they were pushing against and defying. In this account, these obstacles were just resolved somehow: in particular, the comment that "it just took a while for some people to realize that" erases the work of many women who took great risks to normalize the idea that women could play sports.

The questions for students attached to the article address a wide array of issues and offer some contradictory positions for students to take up. For example, one question asks students to consider what Berenson's concerns about the strenuousness of basketball for women said about her views of women. This clearly invited students to question the problematic notions about women that went unquestioned in the text. But another question asks students to compare views about women and men's sports in 1900 and today: after coming to a conclusion about whether these differences still exist and whether or not there should be different rules and expectations for women and men's sports, the students are to "compose a letter to the editor of a newspaper in the voice of a supporter or opponent of women's sport in 1900" (p. 12). A student who writes a robust editorial against women's involvement in sports has been invited through this activity to have problematic understandings about women and men's differences confirmed and validated. This is an example of a lesson plan that might be a "two steps forward, one step back" effort to include women in a social studies class: it included attention to women as well as gender structures and obstacles, but women's efforts to create change were almost entirely erased and

there were sanctioned spaces for students to actively confirm problematic understandings of women's difference.

Masking power in primary documents

In this section, I'll describe four articles that were based on the use of primary documents and that obscure attention to power and patriarchy in historical events. The first lesson plan used primary documents created by three women in different places and historical periods⁴⁶. In this case, these women were acknowledged to *be* women, but the students' exploration of their life experiences occurs, again, outside of consideration of gender. As such, this lesson provided another example of the way that gender can be ignored in history lessons that are about women, a characteristic present throughout the dataset, but particularly evident when the focus of the lesson plan was on the development of social studies skills. In this article (Kohlmeier, 2004), the focus of the lesson is on using primary documents in history: the use of three documents produced by women is described as providing the secondary benefit of giving students a "multiple-perspectives view of history".

In the article's description of the primary documents (which included letters written by a German woman to her husband in the 1500s, excerpts from an interview of a Russian peasant woman who lived through the Bolshevik revolution, and excerpts from the memoirs of a woman who was a child during the Chinese Cultural Revolution) there were examples of issues in which thinking about the gender of the document's authors would have been relevant. For example, the Russian peasant described the women's responsibilities to reap and thresh grain day and night,

⁴⁶ As noted in my discussion of data in the prelude, two versions of this research, written by the same author, came up in my search: the one I'm describing here, published in *Social Education* and another article that appears to be based on the same data, published in the *International Journal of Social Education* in 2005. A third, article, which also seemed to draw upon the same data, appeared in *Theory and Research in Social Education* in 2006. The *TRSE* article did not come up in my search, however, because it was not lesson-plan oriented. Because *Social Education* is a more prominent and widely disseminated publication than the *International Journal of Social Education*, I analyzed the 2004 *Social Education* version of the article in this chapter. The article published in *IJSE* does make slightly different moves around women and gender but didn't warrant a separate analysis.

and the manager's refusal to allow the women to stop working to attend to their children. The Chinese woman described her experiences in participating in the public chastisement of her aunt, who was criticized for being too concerned with her clothes and her makeup to be a good communist. Each of these brief examples is pregnant with the potential to focus on gender and gender roles in shaping these women's experiences, but the only specific reference to the students' engagement with issues of gender comes in the notation that the students found the German woman's letters to her husband interesting because "it demonstrated her role in business and challenged my student's understanding of the place of women in the Renaissance" (p. 473). The author concluded that this activity allowed the students to recognize "that the political, economic, and cultural events of a time period affected *people* in very personal ways" (p. 476), but the absence of attention to the specific intersections of gender and historical events in these primary documents (which were clearly present) indicated that these activities did not engage students in the consideration of how political, economic, and cultural events in history affected *women* specifically.

The purpose of this article was to present a framework for the a three-step approach for helping students interpret historical documents that could be used with any content. Although the lesson plan included an assignment that asked students to think about the lives of women in the Renaissance, the focus of this assignment was for students to evaluate the evidence in the primary document and to reflect on the experience of doing historical inquiry in this lesson. The other handout provided in the article was titled, "Reading Guide for Historical Documents" and included a flow chart historians might use in their research: the flow chart contained no relationship to the primary documents described in the article or to investigating women's history, but instead was a generic form that asked student to engage in tasks like identifying the

type of document provided and listing three to five facts included in the document that enriched understanding. That the model lesson plan on which this article was based used primary documents created by women was made almost entirely irrelevant through the presentation of directions that ignored both the particularly gendered experiences of these women and what students would be able to glean about women and gender in history by interacting with these primary documents or potentially, other primary document written by women. The focus on the technical process of teaching children to use primary documents obscured the potentially critical examination of the women's experiences and lives in different places and times that this lesson plan could have made available to teachers.

Another primary document lesson that fell short of attending to power and engaging students in a discussion about who has it, who doesn't, and why, appeared in *Middle Level Learner*. The lesson included excerpts from primary documents written by women who lived in the (American) thirteen colonies. The readings describe in some detail the different living conditions of wealthy women, female slaves, and recent female immigrants. The general introduction to the assignment - which provided some background on the time period - details the rights women did not have, including the right to own property, earn wages or divorce. Within this introduction, it's noted that during this time, men were responsible for being "tender and loving" toward their wives, and it's pointed out that despite women's lack of access to legal rights, "it seems that a fair share of the marriages were happy ones" (Connor, 2000, p. 12). The last sentence of the introduction notes that "major changes in the rights of women followed only after suffrage was achieved in 1920" (p. 12)⁴⁷.

⁴⁷ I want to note the passivity in the statement that suffrage was achieved, as if it was handed down from above and didn't have any human action behind it. The absence of actors is a problem throughout much of the social studies curriculum that deals with oppression and it's also present here.

The set of discussion questions for middle and high school students included with the introductory texts and the primary document excerpts don't hint at engaging students in a critical consideration of why women's lives were this way or what made their asymmetrical relationships with men possible; nor does it probe for a deeper understanding of why women in different groups (slaves, immigrants, and wealthy white women) had such different living conditions. The references to happy marriages works actively to obscure men as responsible for circumscribing women's lives and can contribute to students' understandings that women didn't have any rights because "that was just the way things were". It constrains the possibility of picturing these women as unhappy or unsatisfied with their unequal status. Furthermore, it cloaks men's responsibility in circumscribing women's rights because without considering why women didn't have any rights. Levstik (2000) has argued that when curriculum emphasizes the cheerful, "students and teachers are deprived of an important mechanism whereby they might understand their own lives as having historical context(s), and they are given no help in understanding the continuation of inequities and injustice in their (or others') society" (p. 290). By attending to inequity in an unquestioned way, this article was another example of the way women and men can be described and positioned in history lessons in a way that masks the patriarchal oppression at work (Commeyras & Alvermann, 1996).

The final article described in this section, a brief document-based lesson about Belva Lockwood, the first woman admitted to the US Supreme Court Bar (Potter, 2002), also stops short of addressing patriarchy explicitly. Patriarchy, and the men who worked against this woman's efforts to secure rights for women attorneys, are largely invisible actors in this description. For example, the excerpts presented from the legal arguments of the male judges who ruled against her early efforts to gain entry to the bar reflect objections that are situated in

terms of the existing law, making their objection to her inclusion based upon statute, not upon their (or any other individual's) conceptions of women. While patriarchy was not addressed, what was foregrounded in this text were Lockwood's individual efforts and the efforts of several men who assisted her⁴⁸. This in effect makes her struggle a very individual journey against a nameless and faceless oppressor, aided by powerful male advocates. Additionally, like many other lessons in the dataset, the questions provided at the end of the text don't ask students to consider the gender system in place or to relate this historical event to the present.

Critical representations

While the lessons I've described above depict women in ways that de-contextualized their experiences from gender, there were lessons in the dataset that demonstrated ways of attending to women and gender in social studies that might engage students in a deeper and more complex, critical engagement with the topics. Interestingly two focus specifically on Latina women and culture. The first is a lesson describing an oral history project the focused on the life histories of Latinas (Huerta& Flemmer, 2001). This lesson plan promotes the use of oral history with students and included extended excerpts from a sample oral history study the authors conducted, which focused on Latina women. The excerpts from the oral histories from the study participants included statements from the participants like the following: "I'm not sure if I was overlooked for jobs at AT&T because I was a woman or a Latina. It's hard not to look at the CEOs and high level and not see one minority or one female. You have to wonder" (p. 7). In the concluding paragraph of the article, teachers are encouraged to share the stories of the women with students in order to show that "Latinas cannot be seen as solely people of color, but as women, because as women [they] are affected by the expectations set forth by both identities" (p. 8). While calling attention to these complex intersection of race, gender, and class, this lesson

⁴⁸ And of course information about who she married and when.

plan included content about critical issues around women's experiences, and asked students to consider the common challenges that women face and as well as the gendered, racial, or religious prejudice they have either witnessed or experienced themselves.

Also addressing Latinas, but from a different perspective, was an article (Rierson & Duty, 2003) featured in the 2003 *Social Education* special issue on "Women of the world", that described Friere's concept of conscientizacao, or critical consciousness, and presented brief life stories from four Latin American women. The purpose of the activity was to "educate students about the victories against oppression of Latina American women...and second, to help students understand the process by which these individuals attained personal empowerment and conscientizacao" (p. 33). After having students read the stories, which focus prominently on class oppression, teachers are encouraged to ask students to identify any connections they have to the life stories of these women and to think about how these women's struggles for social justice might impact their own lives. This is intended to promote thinking about self-empowerment and to help a student see that instead of merely inhabiting life, "she could drive it, and in the process, deconstruct the sense of powerless that many of our students endure" (p. 36). Both of these activities situated the stories of real women firmly within the context of gendered, raced, and classed subjectivities, and centered these aspects of these women's life experiences as the *focus* of the social studies activities. As such, these two lessons are markedly different from most in the dataset.

One of the most explicitly critical lesson plans in the dataset is also one of the shortest, with only three pages worth of pictures and texts. This article, also from 2003 *Social Education* special issue, described ways that teachers could use literature "to integrate the ideas and experiences of African women into our curricula" for the purpose of providing a view of African

women that might transcend their stereotypical depiction as "poor, abused, exotic, or victim[ized]" (Doughty, p. 17). One of the novels described in the article was noted for its "themes of agency, work, gender roles, and marriage" and in one activity, teachers are encouraged to draw on these themes by asking students to act out the roles of the main characters in order to "explore the 'proper' place for women [and to] debate the issues from a variety of perspectives" (p. 18). For another novel, teachers are instructed to engage students in an activity that will enable them to "look closely at who exerts power over the lives of the women characters" (p. 19). This kind of acknowledgement of power, as well as the use of words like "reassess", "challenge" and "complicate" throughout these instructions for teachers, signals this brief article's orientation towards a critical way of including attention to women in social studies⁴⁹⁵⁰. As such, this article was also an exception within the dataset.

In another lesson, a thematic approach was used to describe how attention to women can be integrated into a single unit or across an entire course. One theme, titled Women's work, included activities designed to give students some insight into - among other things - Lowell Mill girls' reflections on "the regulation of their social and moral conduct by the men who ran the

⁴⁹ An analysis of the fact that the three most critical articles in this subsection of the dataset focused on women of color who immigrated from or live within formerly colonized nations is beyond the parameters of this chapter, but must be noted.

⁵⁰ Two other articles (Woyshner, 2006; Carter, 2011) could have been included in this Critical Representations section as examples of lessons that positioned individual women in critical ways, in comparison to the rest of the lessons in the dataset. However, for several reasons, I've chosen not to describe them here. First, the Woyshner article is not as clearly "about" individual women as the other articles described in this chapter. Secondly, I've featured and analyzed these two articles in terms of other, somewhat problematic attributes in Chapters 5 & 6. That one article can "do" different and contradictory things around gender aligns with my theoretical position, of course. And when this chapter turns into a free-standing article, I plan to include attention to these two articles as examples of more critical representations of women, when compared to the rest of the dataset. Within one document like a dissertation, however - at least the way I set it up - it was difficult to figure out how to address effectively. While, on one hand, discussing these articles in each chapter might have demonstrated the different and contradictory discourses upon which any one article draws in order to make sense and do its work, it would also have been incredibly repetitive, and perhaps would have drawn too much focus to the specific work of these two authors. It was a significant tension in the writing up of this analysis. I tried to address it through including this kind of a footnote, but also in drawing attention to the critical attributes of these two lesson plans as I also pointed to some of their other limits in other chapters.

mill" (Sincero & Woyshner, 2003, p. 219). The exploration of this theme highlighted text written by one former mill girl turned labor reformer who wrote that she working on behalf of the interests of those "who are not willing to see our sex made into living machines to do the bidding of the incorporated aristocrats and reduced to a sum for their bodily services hardly sufficient to keep soul and body together" (p. 220). Another theme highlighted in this article focuses specifically on women's social movements and described activities for student to explore the ways that women's organization have contributed to social and political change. These examples provide glimpses of critical orientations that could frame investigations of women's experiences in a history course. The purpose described for including these types of lesson builds on questions proposed by Gerda Lerner to encourage students to discover "Where and who are the missing women?" and to produce history to "see through the eyes of women and ordered by the values which they define" (as quoted in Sincero & Woyshner, 2003, p. 225).

This request that students focus on thinking about history through the eyes of women is an important and needed contribution to history content in social studies, but it is counter to a more critical orientation toward history, which Segall (2002), building on Willensky (1998), contended "is not only about adding those who have been missing in the story of the past, but about a way of interrogating their exclusion when (and even as) they are included" (p. 127). This lesson plan included some elements from the missing stories about women that could prompt a interrogation of women's exclusion, but does not extend teacher and student thinking to highlight the important consideration of why women had to fight for political change, why they had to fight for labor reform, and why these topics have not been made central in the social studies curriculum. These additional questions, and the process of engaging students in an interrogation

of women's exclusion, could have added important and critical elements to the tasks described in this article.

The Legacy of Marginalization as a rhetorical strategy

Whether the attention to women and gender was critical or not or somewhere in between, these lessons reveal how difficult it can be to incorporate attention to women in the classroom in ways that work toward gender equity. An author of one of the history lessons has written elsewhere about her experiences in working in a research project with the teachers who were the co-authors of the piece, and she described her intention to avoid the "add and stir" approach, as well as her concerns that the lessons the group developed had not transformed the curriculum "in a substantial way" (Bair, 2008a, p. 88). She detailed her attempts to bridge theory and practice in the project but also described the tension created in the teachers' response that "a radical departure from tradition" would not work (p. 88). Ultimately, while the researcher was left wondering how the group could have "done a better job in our efforts to bridge theory and practice", the teacher involved in the project was feeling "quite positive about the amount of women's history she was able to incorporate and believed that her students were exposed to far more than they had been in the past" (p. 89).

The underlying idea expressed by this teacher is that just getting women into the curriculum, even in the "add and stir" form, can be interpreted as a positive achievement: in other words, it's better than nothing. In the next section, I point to some rhetoric within the social studies literature that has promoted attention to women in gender that might be opening up the space for this "better than nothing" approach to be reasonable.

Unintended consequences of the present/absent binary.

The concept of “limited attention” is used repeatedly (e.g., Crocco, 2002, 2003-2004; Crocco, Perez & Katz, 2009; Levstik & Groth, 2002; Woyshner, 2006) as a discursive device throughout the larger body of literature that promotes attention to women and gender in social studies education. It recurs for several reasons. First, there *is* a lack of attention – in quantifiable terms - to topics of gender and women within this field. When scholars writing about gender and women in social studies have measured the attention paid to the topic in publications (Crocco, 2002; Hahn, et al., 2007; Hahn et al., 1985); curriculum and standards (Clark et al, 2005; Clark, Allard, & Mahoney, 2004; Crocco, 2007); or within the field in general (Crocco, 2008; Bernard-Powers, 2001; Noddings, 2001b), the position is pretty clear: the field is not talking about women and gender explicitly. On the other hand, the recurrence of the "limited attention" device is also attributable to the fact that the people who *do* address gender and women in the pieces cited above describe the topics of women and gender in terms of their marginalization. In other words, scholars working on gender within social studies constantly point to the limited attention to women and gender and describe this as being a problem.

The attention to women is described as "slight" (Crocco, 2008, p. 173), "marginal" (Crocco, 2006, p. 178), "peripheral" (Bernard-Powers, 1996a, p. 4), "minimal" (Crocco, 2007, p. 257), "partial, sporadic, and ebbing" (Hahn et al., 2007, p. 335) or by this author as "sparse, erratic, and inconsistent" (Schmeichel, 2011, p. 11). The gender equity movement in the field is described in terms of a seed that has "not grown" (Crocco, 2008, p. 58) and as having a momentum that "has stalled" (Hahn et al., 2007, p. 350). Social studies is described as a field that is "closed" to teaching about women (Crocco, 2007, p. 261). There is no question that these

assessments of the field are accurate. My question is what effect might this persistent reference to marginalization produce?

The pervasive and consistent description of the "truth" that attention to gender and women in the field is absent is a particular kind of discursive strategy that may have unintended consequences. For example, the way absence is used with words like "minimal" invokes a quantity metaphor indicating that women and men are not represented in equal amounts in the field of social studies; the reasonable response to the imbalance is to get women represented. One of the possible consequences of the *women as absent* construction in the broader body of work about women in social studies, then, is that it may position any kind of attention to women as an improvement. In other words, discourses that position a topic "absent" may promote an orientation towards including women in the curriculum in ways that are "better than nothing". The consistent presence of this construction in social studies research texts could inhibit efforts to attend to women and gender in more critical ways in the field by equating efforts to just "get women in there" to efforts that promote gender equity. By extension, this gives the impression that by teaching Helen Keller and Annie Sullivan's stories— even without mentioning they were women or considering their achievements in relation to attitudes about women during the time periods in which they lived—one has attended to the gender imbalance.

Although the discussion of women's absence from the curriculum was not pervasive within the lesson plan articles I reviewed (see Chapter 5 for a more complex discussion), it is pervasive in the other literature promoting attention to women and gender in social studies published in the last decade. Some of this literature does include arguments that advocate for women to be attended to in a critical ways, as for example, the citations I've included from Levstik in this chapter indicate. But lining the references to absence up next to each other and using discourse

analysis to think about what they were doing makes it possible to see how the citations of women's absence could create the kind of discursive inertia that makes possible the idea that any kind of attention paid to women in social studies is an improvement on the status quo. Including women and gender in social studies education in ways that might impact social and cultural perceptions about gender, however, requires incorporating the topics into classrooms without creating *more* obstacles to gender equity.

My point is not to critique those authors who have identified women's absence from the field or to call for an end to acknowledging the ways that social studies as a field has failed to address these issues adequately. Obviously, this is a necessary component of the cultural and political action required to make the field responsible for attending to gender. I think it is worthwhile, however, to also consider the pervasive attention to the absence in the broader literature about women in social studies and how that discursive device prepares the ground for authors, reviewers, and editors to see any kind of work about women as attending to a problem. Without providing specific ways in which teachers might capitalize on this topic to encourage all students to think about how asymmetrical gender power relations impact their own lives, the classroom, the school, and the world beyond it, and how their action or inaction on these power relations impacts the situation, these lesson plans lack an important critical punch. In an editorial for the 1996 gender-focused special issue of *TRSE*, Jane Bernard-Powers wrote

Social studies education has been and continues to be vulnerable to the criticism that while it professes to represent and value social justice and diversity, its leaders and tests have failed to address injustice. Omission and neglect of gender as a significant dimension of human experience and identity serves to miseducate generations of young people. It is a silent coercion of considerable magnitude. (p. 5-6, emphasis added)

The majority of these lessons, while referencing women, stop short of addressing social justice and attending to gender as a significant dimension of human experience. Their presence in the literature might even create the impression that doing these kinds of lessons "is" attending to women and gender in social studies - that teaching a lesson that includes references to humans that are women is the equivalent of doing equity work; not necessarily because the authors claim it is, but because work that seeks to incorporate women (or people of color or gay people or poor people) can be assumed to be equity/social justice/multicultural work, no matter what, simply because it is not "about" wealthy, white, heterosexual men. The silent coercion of which Bernard-Powers speaks, however, is not interrupted by just mentioning women. Changing things "requires more than simple inclusion" (Levstik & Grothe, 2002, p. 236).

Similarly, in *Disturbing Practice*, Segall (2002) questioned "whether incorporating content about and by women and Other as singular educative focus is sufficient to rectify the inequalities"(p. 113). As I indicated earlier in this chapter, Segall argued that instead of merely achieving inclusion, it is necessary to engage in what Aronowitz & Giroux (1991) called a "sustained critique" (as quoted in Segall, 2002, p. 126) of the practices that have systemically excluded knowledge of the Other from the canon. This occurs, in part, by acknowledging that the exclusion of the Other -- in this case, women -- from the traditional narrative has not been innocent. The lesson plans explored in this project may have included knowledge of women in the social studies curriculum, but they stopped well short of the kind of sustained critique of systemic exclusion of which Aronowitz, Giroux, and Segall speak. In the process, these lesson plans have positioned attention to gender in social studies in certain ways, and have positioned students to know things about gender that exclude a consideration of structures of power and oppression. Additionally, there was exoneration at work in these texts that would make men

innocent bystanders to the oppression women experienced. Lastly, by failing to engage a consideration of women experiences in the past with gender relations today, these lessons "pertained to other women, other Other, not those in today's classrooms being subjected to similar, though often more subtle, forms of subjugation and discrimination" (Segall, 2002, p. 133). This is a critical omission in work that would seek to include attention to women in gender in ways that might work toward gender equity.

While a small number of these lesson plans did describe teacher and student activities that would - to different degrees - place attention to women in social studies within a context that would encourage students to consider historical (and sometimes even current) gender inequities in our culture, most of these lesson plans opted for softer, and less challenging versions of how women and gender could be presented in social studies education. But in order for social studies to be a space in which gender equity might be promoted, more critical approaches to including women and gender in social studies are needed to emphasize that the relationship between historical or contemporary political, social and economic conditions for women are rooted in systems of power beyond their direct control.

However, some burning questions still remain: Why isn't attention to social structures more pervasive in these lesson plans? Why is attention to women in social studies characterized by a shifting away from the challenging, potentially difficult, but very important exploration of systemic political, economic, and cultural processes that shape gender relationships in asymmetrical ways? Why has the rhetoric to include attention to women in social studies produced the kind of attention to women in these lesson plans that avoids uncomfortable explorations of women's status in society? I want to conclude this chapter with a brief discussion of two factors that might constrain the critical inclusion of women in social studies lesson plans

and discuss future implications for those of use concerned with integrating more critical content and women into social studies classrooms.

As I have discussed elsewhere (Schmeichel, 2011), I suspect that neoliberalism has constrained the ways that critical discourses have been taken up in social studies, in education, and in our society more generally. Although an investigation of the impact of neoliberalism on these spaces is outside the scope of this dissertation⁵¹, Fraser's ideas about the confluence of feminism and neoliberalism are worth revisiting briefly here in order to explain the idea that this unholy alliance may have impacted the lesson plans in my study. In her 2009 piece titled, "Feminism, capitalism, and the cunning of history", Fraser argued that the contemporary emphasis on cultural recognition, both within the feminist movement and the Left in general, occurred because critical movements have been co-opted by neoliberalism. Because of neoliberalism, Fraser argued, what had in the 1970s been a feminist movement with a balanced interest in a cultural, political, and economic transformation, the current feminist movement focuses almost exclusively on identity and recognition, concerns that Fraser equates (albeit inexplicitly) with third wave feminisms and their focus on differences among women on the basis of sexuality, race, location, etc. As a result of this focus on identity, cultural changes have been achieved, but economic and political structures remain largely unchanged. How does neoliberalism play out in the lesson plans, you ask? Arguably, that the majority of the lesson plans in this dataset fell short of acknowledging political, and economics systems, perhaps in favor of just "recognizing" women by inclusion, would seem to support the conclusion that this data, like the data I described in my exploration of *Social Education* in the 1980s, indicates the

⁵¹ The investigation of the neoliberal impact on all of these spaces would be outside the scope of what one could do in a lifetime, of course, but stay tuned to my future work for further explorations of the impact of neoliberalism on social studies (potential Schmeichel, 2013, 2014, 2015 and beyond!)

presence of a kind of feminist work in which recognition has been decoupled from the economic and political aspects of the feminism.

The complexity of understanding both neoliberalism and feminism provides quite a nice segue to my second point, which is to argue that the avoidance of a significant engagement with theory in social studies education research has contributed to the particular ways that "doing" gender and women in lesson plans was shaped. I am not the first person to lament the absence of critical discourses from social studies. There are far smarter and more accomplished education scholars who have argued that the absence of critical orientations in social studies PK-12 spaces is not only a missed opportunity, but contributes to ongoing social inequity. Several of the authors invited to respond to the collection of "postie" chapters compiled in Segall, Heilman, and Cherryholmes' book, unfortunately titled "Social Studies: The next generation", addressed the problematic lack of engagement with theory in social studies. For example, Kincheloe (2006) argued that "Critical social studies educators must understand and be able to make use of multiple theoretical discourses and an evolving notion of criticality" or risk "placing themselves in danger of being washed away in the riptide of history" (p. 212). Additionally, in her response Crocco (2006b) wrote, "I now suspect that the low profile of theory within social studies may have been a contributing factor explaining feminism's difficulties" (p. 232). She explained the relationship between the lack of theory and failure to infuse social studies with feminism by arguing that the value of the critical theories used in the book was that they "all share an agenda that aims at using scholarship for social change. These theories provide frameworks for critiquing the world - past and present - and tools for dismantling the status quo in order to build alternative ways of seeing, being, and acting for their constituents" (p. 233). These kinds of tools are necessary for dismantling the status quo in social studies. Without the pervasive use of these

kinds of theories in social studies, scholars have struggled to make significant changes in the kinds of traditional teaching and research we produce and promote. Crocco warned, however, that "[i]n avoiding accusations of irrelevance, those doing postmodernist social studies can learn much from the mistakes of the feminists" (p. 235). In particular, Crocco recognized that she might have "paid greater attention to the lack of engagement with theory by many social studies researchers, the failure of feminists to translate their concerns into arguments that speak broadly to teachers and teacher educators, and the conservative nature of the social studies enterprise overall" (p. 235) in her own work to promote feminism and women and gender in education.

These three issues - lack of theory, translation of theory in ways that speak to people, and the conservatism of social studies - have significant implications for future work in attending to women and gender in social studies in ways that would work toward gender equity. The bodies of work by Crocco and the other scholars researching in gender and social studies make it very clear that feminist and gender discourses are not present in this field. An engagement with critical theories - the ones used in this dissertation and many different kinds - seems to be an important step towards beginning the kinds of conversations that could open up the spaces for critical orientations toward gender and women to be included more consistently.

As someone who tends to walk into a conversation with my critical guns ready-to-fire⁵², however, it's important for me, and for others like me, to understand that plunging forward with the critical theory banner, without the recognition that these conversations need to occur in ways that people will respond to would not seem to increase the likelihood that these efforts will be successful. Yes, we need critical theory in social studies to understand why social studies is the way it is and what is happening in social studies spaces. As St. Pierre (2011) has said, without theory in our research "we have nothing much to think with during analysis except normalized

⁵² Nice war metaphor, huh? They're hard to avoid!

discourses that seldom explain the way things are" (p. 614). In addition to theory, though, our research also needs the kind of nuanced and compelling writing and scholarship that will position theory and critical orientations in social studies as necessary, desirable, and achievable. This is a daunting task, but as Patti Lather (2007) stated, "the turn that matters in this moment of the post is away from abstract philosophizing and toward concrete efforts to put the theory to work" (p. 157). Creating and using the kinds of discourses that can reach scholars and teachers and that can help us do the work of loosening our ties to the norms of what social studies "is" and how attending to women and gender is "done" in our field is not just a matter of using theory, but of using it efficaciously to promote equity and a more just world.

CHAPTER 5

SKIRTING AROUND CRITICAL, FEMINIST RATIONALES FOR ATTENDING TO WOMEN AND GENDER

"Even when we are conveying information to someone, we are also trying to do other things as well. In fact, for all their emphasis on information, we [can] see that this is true as well of academic disciplines" (Gee, 2011, p. 43).

In this chapter, my examination of the lesson plan dataset focused specifically on the rationales used by authors to justify the implementation of the activities they proposed. In particular, I was interested in understanding how the authors intended to motivate the teacher reading the lesson and how the teacher of the lesson was positioned in terms of their ability to act on gender inequity. As the quote above from Gee indicates, this investigation begins with the understanding that texts "try to do things" above and beyond what may appear to be their purpose on the surface. So, although these lesson plans were clearly "about" conveying information about content or the implementation of a particular teaching strategy, I also wanted to see what other kinds of things they were doing. It was my hope that understanding the discursive techniques used to motivate the reader to do the lesson plans presented in these texts might shed some light on why these topics have been excluded. As I read the rationales for the lesson plans, which were typically embedded in the first several paragraphs of each article, I used the following questions to guide my analysis:

- What arguments are deployed to justify these lesson plans?
- Through what devices is the reader/teacher motivated to enact them?

- What can the choices made to convince readers to do these lessons tell us about the discourses about women and gender that are available to and acceptable within the social studies community?

These questions rely on Prior's (2003) assertion that documents should be considered not as stable, static artifacts but "in terms of fields, frames and networks of action" (p. 2). The purpose of this investigation is to consider the fields and frames used by the lesson plan authors to motivate the reader to choose their lesson plans. No matter how straightforward or neutral the lesson plans may appear to be, they are enmeshed in a discursive network that uses and reinscribes a particular way of talking about women and gender, and more specifically for the purposes of this chapter, a particular way of talking about *why* women and gender should be addressed in the social studies classroom. The way that these topics are promoted has a constitutive force: the rationales used to encourage teachers to do this work promotes a set of possible orientations toward the task while shutting down others. Following Geertz's (1988, p. 68) statement that "the way of saying is the what of saying", I sought to understand how the way these lesson plans were promoted and rationalized as being worthwhile and what that might tell us about discursive networks available and not available to researchers in social studies.

The way an author introduces a lesson has the potential to impact the reader's motivation and desire to do the lesson: one of the ways desire can be produced is to link a particular subject position the reader wants to occupy with the enactment of the described lesson. For example, a lesson plan that promotes exciting and attention-getting teaching strategies can position the teacher who enacts these strategies as someone *who can and does do something about* low student engagement and bored students. The subject position offered through the rationale to enact the lesson plan has the potential to shape the reader as an actor who can do certain things

and has certain agency. The subject position offered to the reader -- in this example, the teacher who engages students through fun activities -- doesn't guarantee the result, but it does orient the reader to think about themselves as having the agency to work to enact the specific goal of engaging students. The link between the subject position offered through the lesson plan and the likelihood that it is a desirable subject position is an important one. If, to use the same example, a teacher does *not* desire to be a teacher who engages students, she or he is unlikely to be motivated to enact the activities linked to that subject position in the lesson plan rationale. In other words, authors must find ways to create the kind of desire to enact a lesson plan that aligns with the kind of teacher the reader wants to be. In this study, I was interested in thinking about how readers/teachers of these lesson plans might be positioned in terms of being actors with agency to work against gender inequity and how the authors did or not invoke the desire to be someone who acts against inequity to the enactment of the lesson. I wanted to understand how the lesson plans created a desire to do the lesson and whether or not they empowered the readers to see themselves as capable of contributing to gender equity through the lesson: to do this, I read each article (again!) looking specifically for any reasons given for enacting the lesson.

In the following pages, I describe and analyze the rationales used in the lesson plans, providing some specific examples from the data as well as a general description of the entire set of lesson plans. I then return to the broader research literature published about women and gender in social studies education, and specifically Crocco's work, in order to connect the rationales present in or absent from the lesson plans with the kinds of reasons that have been proposed to explain the enduring exclusion of women and gender as topics and concerns in social studies education. Based on the absence of critical and feminist rationales and affects

from the lesson plan dataset, I then propose three additional factors that may have contributed, and that continue to contribute, to the absence of women and gender from social studies education: the abjection of the feminist subject position, and the civility of academic discourse and neoliberal forces that make that abjection seem normal.

Skirting lesson plans

One lesson plan, geared directly to practitioners through its placement in *Social Education* (the NCSS publication for PK-12 social studies educators), avoids many of the problematic assumptions about women that characterized the lesson plans discussed in the previous chapter. This article, titled "Picturing women: gender, images, and representation in social studies" provided specific suggestions and resources for teachers to incorporate a "visual literacy" exercise into a class. Through the use of images of women from the mid-19th century, the goal was to raise questions "about gender identity, and how it has been culturally constructed in images, artifacts, and photographs" (Woyshner, 2006, p. 358). The description of this activity provided multiple ways for teachers to engage students in a consideration of the ways women are depicted in historical images and how those depictions produce particular gender norms that both reflect and determine how women and men can be and how they interact with each other. The article provided a series of thought-provoking questions for teachers to use with their students - questions that rely on assumptions that gender is not an outward expression of an biological determinism, but rather is flexible, fluid, and historically contingent. As such, the instructions for teachers outlined here are significantly different from the rather un-critical and potentially problematically re-inscriptive activities found in many of the other lesson plans in the dataset. Instead of allowing students to rely upon traditional and circumscribed notions of women, the

activities described in this lesson would engage students in task that would challenge unquestioned ideas about women and gender.

On the other hand, this article is similar to the majority of the lesson plans in the dataset in that it provides a weak rationale for why this work needs to be done. Additionally, it sets the execution of this lesson in a rather unproblematic scenario in which teachers would have an interest or commitment to implementing these activities. In the introductory paragraph, the author notes that although there has been an increase in the number of images of women in history textbooks, there has been little attention "to how women are represented" (p. 358). The justification for the implementation of the activities described in this article is couched in the following terms: "Young people are bombarded with media images at every turn; therefore, it is important to teach them to consider how women and girls are visually represented" (p. 358). In the conclusion, the author states that the activities in the article

are offered as a starting point for a much richer social studies curriculum in which representations of women are considered, examined, and then critiqued. For those who believe that teaching toward gender equity in social studies classroom is "old hat", I offer a caveat - current research on this matter has found that along with social studies, gender has been overlooked in recent years under the initiatives of No Child Left Behind. Thus, raising awareness of gender and women in history remains as important today as ever. We cannot begin to achieve gender equity, nor can we prepare citizens, until we teach our young people about how women and girls have been represented in the media, history, and artifacts. Gender identity is tied to the context in which we were raised. Once young people recognize this, they will be in a better position to think critically about gender as a

cultural construct and the ways that literature, historical artifacts, and media shape various aspects of identity. (emphasis added, p. 362)

Although I would certainly agree with the need to teach visual literacy skills and the value of considering the ways in which women are depicted in images within history textbooks, my concern is that the justification presented here does not adequately meet the challenge that lies within any attempt to encourage social studies educators to enact these kinds of activities and to engage students in a consideration of subjectivity. My goal is not to imply that lessons like this one lack value or that they should not show up in places like *Social Education*. However, I do question the way in which this lesson is described as being valuable and want to propose the possibility that by failing to address head-on the critical and imperative need for this work, as well as to acknowledge the resistance that teachers might face in encouraging students to question gender identity, the set-up for this lesson plan assumed that teachers *want* to do this kind of work. Furthermore, this type of warrant for attending to gender can create the impression that the promotion of gender work is being done (somewhere and by someone), and therefore, there is no need to make an argument for it to be done. Instead, we need only give teachers the tools and strategies to overcome the recently imposed constraints of NCLB and get them back on the track for what they know they need to do and have accepted the responsibility for doing in terms of attending to gender in the social studies classroom.

The latter kind of assumption has the potential to be productive in certain kinds of ways: by describing these lesson plans in ways that make it "normal" and not necessarily exceptional to be addressing women's issues and the consideration of gender roles as topics in a social studies class, teachers who are not engaging in these kinds of activities may question their own practice, and may be compelled to see a need to incorporate these kinds of topics in order to fulfill this

norm. Presenting these kinds of critical and gender-focused activities as normal could be productive, and would rely upon unproblematic and potentially de-politicized rationales for the work, like those presented in this piece, in order to be effective. In other words, by avoiding an overtly political, or even radical, rationale for using lessons that would encourage students to think about gender roles, teachers are not put on the defensive. The neutral language plays into presenting the implementation as a kind of common sense. Indeed, embedding the idea that teaching toward gender-equity is for some an "old hat" endeavor, subtly normalizes a particular kind of social studies teaching performance that might compel the teacher who is *not* teaching toward gender equity to rethink her practice: if this is "old hat", and I'm not doing it all, then I better get on this!

In light of the overwhelming evidence that women and gender continue to be excluded as topics in social studies, however, I would argue that the single reference to gender equity in this paragraph justifying the implementation of this lesson plan is too subtle to be effective⁵³. The subtlety creates the potential to acquit social studies teachers from seeing themselves as personally implicated in the exclusion of women from the curriculum and would excuse them from adopting these activities if attention to gender and women were not "their deal", or in other words, did not reflect their interest, their inclination, did not align with their knowledge base or did not align with their understanding of an acceptable and normal gender and/or social studies teaching performance. The absence of a convincing argument for why this work should be done and why a social studies teacher is implicated and responsible for this work might give the

⁵³ The way in which achieving gender equity is linked directly with citizenship preparation in this sentence is also worth noting, as it gives the reader the option of connecting this lesson plan with gender equity - or if that's not your concern, then citizenship education, which is, as I discussed in the literature review chapter, perceived to be the central purpose of social studies education. Linking the idea of teaching for gender equity - which we know is not a pervasive focus in social studies - with citizenship education -- which we know is a pervasive focus -- is a particular move. I would argue that it is an attempt to make attention to women in this lesson more palatable. It might be a crafty move. My concern is about what makes such a move necessary.

impression that there is an option to "choose" to attend to women in history or not⁵⁴. Why teachers would want to engage in this work and what engaging in these lessons might achieve is not addressed sufficiently to compel a teacher to incorporate working toward gender equity into their rationale for teaching social studies.

As I read and re-read each lesson plan, I looked carefully for language that conveyed an explanation of why attending to women was worthwhile. Within the rest of the dataset, the value of teaching about women was described as offsetting the deficit of attention to women in the curriculum, (Bair, Williams, & Fralinger, 2008; Hickey & Kolterman, 2006), catching up with the attention to women's history in postsecondary studies (Sincero & Woyshner, 2003), complexifying perceptions of women in other parts of the world (Doughty, 2003), and making social studies more relevant and interesting to students (Karnes, 2000). In several lesson plans, the rationale for enacting the activities described is not addressed explicitly at all (Carter, 2011; Lapham, 2011; Potter, 2002). In other lesson plans, technical rationales were foregrounded as the primary reason that teachers should enact the proposed lesson, positioning the attention to women in these as neutral content through which to work on specific social studies skills like using primary source materials (Connor, 2000) to provide a multiple-perspective view (Kohlmeier, 2004, 2005).

The foregrounding of technical education concepts over content is particularly evident in an article titled "Unveiling the Hijab" (Langdorf & Pagan, 2005). In this article, the word "women" is only used once in the first 1500 words of this article. What is foregrounded as basis of the proposed activities described in this article is the enactment of constructivist learning theories and pedagogical content knowledge in the facilitation of a history learning experience

⁵⁴ This choice does, of course, exist, and social studies teachers are choosing not to attend to women and gender most of the time.

that focused on the following question: "What is the meaning of the hijab?" (p. 172). The description of the lesson does include one reference to students' observations that the hijab was a "symbol of sexism" (p. 175), but how teachers should or could translate a discussion about the hijab to a discussion about sexism in general, or more specifically, gender roles within Islam, in Iran or France (the countries within which the consideration of wearing the hijab was discussed), or the United States, was not described. Although the hijab is a topic loaded with potential for a meaningful discussion of gender roles and oppression and resistance (both by choosing to wear and not wear in particular contexts), this lesson does not directly or explicitly describe this activity as a way to engage students in the consideration of gender systems or inequality. Instead, the explicit purpose of the article is to demonstrate how constructivist learning theories are engaged in learning about history.

In another lesson plan, which focuses on suffrage, the lesson plan rationale is described as follows: "Studying the history of suffrage fosters an appreciation for right and responsibility to vote, and the power of that civic act. Moreover, it helps students develop a more complete understanding of the dedication necessary to achieve social and political change" (Carter, 2011, p. M4). Note that the words woman and gender are not mentioned at all in this rationale: instead, an appeal to civic responsibility is foregrounded. Although the second sentence clearly acknowledges the movement under study (as a reminder - women's suffrage) was a social and political movement, the purpose of studying this movement is not tied directly to women, and therefore, it's not made imperative that students develop a more complete understanding of *women's* dedication to achieving suffrage for themselves or why this social and political change

was necessary⁵⁵, which in effect spayed the concept of gender inequity from the rationale for this lesson.

Although most of the lesson plans I reviewed lacked a critical rationale for including women and gender in social studies classrooms, there were several exceptions. For example, in the introduction to a short article that provided a list of fictional stories that could be used to teach about women and social justice, a clear relationship is established between attending to women in social studies curricula and acknowledging women's inequity, arguing that "studying the connections between social justice and women's political struggles for equity can engage teachers and students both academically and personally", and that using literature in social studies can show that "women have successfully challenged poverty, homelessness, institutional racism, illiteracy, domestic violence, and other social ills" (Tyson & Johnson, 2003, p. 54). By making this connection between curriculum and gender equity, and in particular, women's agency in addressing the oppression they have faced, the rationale for enacting the lesson plan provided in this lesson positioned the teacher reading it as someone who can act to respond to gender inequity by implementing the author's suggestions. However, the motivation for taking this position is not explicit: why teachers should want to engage in classroom work that would

⁵⁵ The language used in the rationale for this activity is interesting on several other levels as well. First, it appears within a formally constructed lesson plan, which breaks out the elements of the lesson plans in sections including, in the following order: Length of lesson, materials, lesson rationale, Standards and learning expectations, and procedures. The formal layout of this lesson plan mimics what teachers might be expected to submit to a curriculum coordinator/administrator or the format preservice teachers might be required to use for an assignment. As such, that the language used in the rationale does not include women specifically says something about what social studies can be "about" in these formal documents. Secondly, this lesson plan has embedded within it interesting and compelling descriptions of the abuse and imprisonment that Alice Paul endured in her work to promote suffrage, and a timeline that includes information about other radical suffragette efforts, setting the stage for a critical lesson about women's political action that could lead to a much more radical lesson than the rationale would indicate. However, the handout for the assignment that accompanies this lesson plan is a sheet with blank lines that asks student to report on one of the events on the timeline by describing what happened and explaining its significance. And while the radical potential of this lesson is unsatisfyingly unfulfilled with this assignment, the limp rationale for the lesson plan has probably been achieved.

address women's struggles for agency is not acknowledged. As such, it is assumed that this work is something that teachers would just want to do.

A 2002 article connecting gender and Geography perhaps came closer to integrating both the creation of a desire to attend to gender in the classroom and offering the reader the subject position of someone who can act on inequity through the proposed lesson. I think it is important to note here that the most explicit attention to women's oppression found in any lesson plan occurs within a lesson plan rooted in Geography. This article begins by contending that a focus on the standards makes it easy to "lose sight" of "difficult" issues. The authors then ask "How often do [teachers] identify gender inequity as a world problem, worthy of attention social studies classes?" (Richburg, Nelson, Tochtermann, 2002, p. 23). The purpose of this lesson was to respond to the lack of attention to these topics in order to "create awareness of the gender and development inequities women face in the world today" through an inquiry, problem based activity (p. 23). Thus, the gender equity focus of the lesson is foregrounded explicitly as the rationale, and was positioned discursively as more important than the development of a particular skill. It's noted that "teachers may not realize how serious the gender gap is" (p. 23), and in response to this absence of knowledge, proceed to provide statistics indicating that women earn less than 10% of the world's income, hold 1% of chief executive positions in the world, and represent 70% of the world's poor. But the rationale for why attention to women is important doesn't stop here: arguing that statistics don't tell the whole story, the authors quote an Amnesty International report that states: "Every year, vast number of women and young girls are mutilated, battered to death, burned alive, raped, trafficked for domestic or sexual purposes primarily because they are female" (Women's Rights Project 1995)" (p. 23). All of this appears within the first three paragraphs.

This type of a rationale for attention to women and gender in social studies provided a contrast to the other rationales present in this literature. This approach does a different kind of work to set up why teachers should engage in these topics and implicates teacher directly (but gently, through the implication that standards make it difficult to focus on what's really important) in the field's failure to attend to gender. There's no skirting around the issue, so to speak, in this introduction. The use of statistics that point to women's unequal economic status, for example, would make it difficult for a reader to argue that women and men have equal life opportunities. Arguably, the authors could have stopped there. But by also describing the physical and sexual violence to which women are subjected "because they are female", the authors take another step in both generating a compelling reason for doing this lesson and implicating the reader as someone who has a moral responsibility to do something about it. If the reader objects to the treatment of women described by the authors, a sense of desire to do something about it can be created: in doing so, the authors offer a particular subject position to the reader as someone who both objects to the oppression of women and is someone who can do something about it by "creating awareness" of this problem through this lesson.

Although, as I have noted above, there are some exceptions, as a whole the lesson plans in this dataset reflect a normative commitment to attend to women in the classroom in ways that de-emphasize critique: in general, the lesson plans do not call upon discourses of gender equity to motivate the reader/teacher to enact the lesson. Instead, the rationales for implementing these lesson plans rely on easy-to-swallow warrants like "making sure that women are included" and focusing on social studies skills or citizenship through lessons that just happen to include women. These lesson plans do not call upon discourses of gender equity to motivate, nor do they directly relate doing these lesson plans with doing something about gender inequality. Reading

these lesson plans back-to-back, again and again, led me to conclude that language that would mark the presence of critical discourses were largely absent in these lesson plans.

But these lesson plans included 149 pages of text, making it difficult for me to wrap my head around all of the language at one time. So in order to test the validity of the impression I had about the absence of critical language, I identified three words that are commonly found in critical and feminist literature to promote gender equality: sexism, feminist, and feminism. In a text that advocates for gender equity, words like these would mark the problem at hand as well as the political position against it. Using Adobe, I conducted searches for these three words in each of the 24 lesson plans in the dataset. The word "sexism" occurred in only three of the 24 different lesson plans I reviewed: in only one (Tyson & Johnson) is the term positioned as part of the rationale for engaging in the activities the authors describe in the article. The word "feminist" appears 11 times, but only once in a text, in the lesson plan about Alice Paul and other "early feminists" (Carter, 2011). Each of its other 10 appearances are in reference lists or in in-text citations of book titles. Similarly "feminism" appears in three references or in-text book references, but only once in the text as an idea (Crocco & Cramer, 2005).

The definitions of labels like sexism, feminism, and feminist are contested, and therefore, the presence of these terms would not be a definitive marker of what a text "means". However, the *absence* of these terms from the lesson plans is conspicuous and could be pointing to the general absence of a critical, social justice, or equity rationale for the implementation of social studies lessons that are about women. The absence of these specific words might indicate a refusal of, or the lack of access to, more critical discourses available to authors writing about women and gender. It may signal a rejection of discursive strategies related to these discourses

to advocate for attention to women and gender in social studies. Additionally, it may indicate a refusal of or aversion to the gender equity-advocate subject position.

I think there are several consequences of an absence of explicit linkages between these lessons and critical gender work. First, I think it is possible that the critical vacuum present in these lesson plans may actually contribute to the continued lack of interest and attention to women and gender in social studies. As I have described, these lesson plans don't create the kind of desire that would compel a reader/teacher not already motivated to implement women and gender-focused lesson plans to use these lessons, at least for the purposes of attending to gender inequity. Lessons like these, and the rationales used to promote them, are unlikely to make a significant dent on the deafening silence on women and gender in the field. Secondly, I think that these lesson plans don't work against the absence of women and gender in social studies because they do not offer the teacher/reader the subject position of someone who has the agency to do something about gender inequity. Only the geography lesson plan and the brief article about using fiction to teach for social justice explicitly provided readers/teachers with a way to see themselves as people who could do something to counter gender inequity and only the geography lesson described the problem of gender in a significant and graphic enough way so as to engage the moral sensibilities of readers. Although I think the creation of this subject position often goes hand in hand with creating the desire to take the position up, I think it's worth noting that teachers who would implement most of these lessons were not given the chance to see themselves as someone who both cares about and can do something about gender. Given the limited attention to women present in social studies lesson plans, the absence of these two discursive strategies seem to me to be missed opportunities.

This absence of critique or direct references to gender inequity caught my attention and piqued my interest. The critical arguments for including women and gender in social studies -- the assertion that we live in a sexist society and that feminism and feminists are actively at work to change this reality -- would seem to me to be salient issues in lesson plans that promote attention to women and gender in a field that has not only ignored these topics, but also has been described as a "boy's club" (Levstik, personal communication, January 6, 2012). If, as Crocco (2008) mused, "presumably many women in social studies shared concerns with other academic women about equity, discrimination, and inclusion" (p. 172), why was a more critical tone not present in these lesson plans? Building on Grant and Wieczorek's (2000, p. 924) assertion that "[a]bsences and presences are not produced in a vacuum, but connect to social, cultural and historical currents that can be traced and analyzed to see how they affect present practices" my question was why language that would serve as a marker of this more critical discourse was absent from this work. Why is it that words like sexism and feminism are absent from these lesson plans in terms of what students should study or why teachers should be engaging in lesson plans to attend to gender equity?

In remaining sections of the this chapter, I examined what may be keeping this kind of language out of social studies education. First, I looked to the literature on women and gender in social studies education and examined the already identified issues that have been used to explain why women and gender have been marginalized in social studies. I then analyzed what has been marginalized in those explanations - namely, the broader anti-feminism discourses in our culture - and I turned to feminist and linguistic theories to consider how the rejection of feminism might be impacting the discourse in these lesson plans. In particular, I focused on

neoliberalism and academic civility as forces that contribute to and reflect the rejection of feminism.

Obstacles to feminist discourse in social studies

In order to understand the absence of critical feminist discourses from the lesson plans, I once again turned back to the larger body of literature describing the lack of attention to women and gender in social studies education. Among the authors who have contributed to this body of work, Crocco has been particularly consistent in presenting explanations of why the topic has not been attended to. Therefore, as a part of my analysis, I reviewed each of the pieces (articles and book chapters) she has written since 2000 and extracted the explanations she presented about the absence of women and gender. I put all of the explanations into a long list and started grouping similar ideas together on the basis of factors related to 1) social studies as a field, 2) education as a discipline, or 3) society in general. In the section that follows, I described and provided examples of each of these categorizations.

Social studies as a field.

The explanations related to the field of social studies education are the most numerous and pervasive within Crocco's work. Of particular concern is the absence of women from the social studies standards (Crocco, 2007) which diminishes the likelihood that women would be included in the curriculum. That the social studies curriculum focuses on political rather than social history (2008) contributes to the lack of value placed on women's issues/knowledge/history in the field (2006) and also contributes to an absence of materials for teaching about women (2007). Crocco also pointed to the overall conservatism of the field (2007, 2008), "lingering patriarchal, sexist attitudes" (2006, p. 181), and the pressure exerted on the field by right wing critics (2006) as factors that explain the lack of attention to women and gender.

Additionally, Crocco considered the epistemological standpoints in the field and how this impacts attention to women. For example, she noted that gender research done in the field reflected "feminist concerns prior to the linguistic turn" and questioned whether "the lack of attention to gender and sexuality [in social studies has] been due to the lack of overall interests in postmodernism in the field?" (2008, p. 175). She argued that the field has been "slow to engage" new theories, which perhaps has made it more vulnerable to mandates that don't encourage engagement with women's issues (2006, p. 181) and pointed to research preparation within social studies that does not prepare scholars to attend to gender (2008).

Education as a discipline.

In terms of the broader issues in education as a discipline, Crocco points to the impact of NCLB (2006, 2007) and high stakes testing in general (Crocco & Cramer, 2005). This idea was also supported in the lesson plan described in this section, which noted that "gender has been overlooked in recent years under the initiatives of No Child Left Behind" (Woyshner, 2006, p. 362). Other aspects of education as a field that have hindered attention to women and gender is the attention to race and culture over gender (Crocco, 2008) and the lack of attention to women's issues in education generally (Crocco, 2002).

Society.

Within Crocco's work in the last decade, references to the broader social issues inhibiting attention to women and gender -- forces that transcend both education and social studies specifically -- received the least frequent references among her body of work. These explanations are present in only three of the 17 texts she published on the topics of women and gender. They include the assumption that problems related to gender inequity have been resolved (2006, 2007), "the politics of representation" (2008, p. 175), the "contemporary

conservative mood in the United States (2008, p. 176) and the persistence of gender inequities "inside as well as outside the academy" (p. 176).

What's missing?

All of the factors Crocco identified are surely contributing to the continuing marginalization of these topics in social studies education. I would argue, however, that the thin attention paid to the broader social forces impacting the absence of attention to women and gender in social studies education is an indication that these forces have not been adequately theorized in previous attempts to explain the state of affairs in this field. All texts are inextricably suspended within what MacLure described as a "vastly bigger fabric" (2003, p. 23). And although as she noted, "[t]here is still a widespread conviction that serious enterprises such as education...are, or should be free from this kind of entanglement with rhetoric" (p. 6-7), the entanglement of lesson plans promoting attention to women and gender with the broader discourses around women and gender in our culture, is unavoidable. Foucault (1988) argued that "the fundamental point of anchorage of [power] relationships, even if they are embodied and crystallized in an institution, is to be found outside the institution" (p. 222). Therefore, although social studies education has its own way of resisting attention to women and gender in the field, the power relationships that make the absence possible comes not from the field itself, but instead, is made possible by forces outside of it.

Feminism is not an option

The particular tone of the rationales I outlined in last decade of lesson plans reviewed above, as well as the absence of terms like sexism and feminism from these lesson plans point to some *discursive* forces that may be inhibiting the attention paid to women and gender in social studies. For example, there appear to be discursive constraints inhibiting the adoption of an

overtly feminist subject position in the promotion of lesson plans that include women and gender. The avoidance of terms like feminism and sexism, as well as the avoidance of an explicitly critical tone in all but two of the lesson plans reviewed in this project might be attributable to the desire to avoid being identified as a feminist. The reasons that authors may want to avoid be labeled a feminist are numerous. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003, p. 230) asserted that "The risks have to do with being put in a social category that is widely disparaged and characterized in very restrictive and often quite negative ways". This negative perception of feminists as a group would certainly appear to be an obstacle for researchers who consider taking up feminist positions in their work.

The feminist subject position has been described as problematic in research projects that have been conducted specifically in social studies. For example, the 8th grade participants in one study (Levstik & Grothe, 2002) described feminists as "women who think men aren't equal...the ones who shave their heads, they hate men so much" (p. 244) and who see men as "pigs". The students articulated that "[b]eing labeled feminist meant risking being labeled lesbian" (p. 248) and that the term "feminist" was a weapon that the students felt could, and had been used against other students (p. 248). According to Levstik and Grothe, "students uniformly agreed that the term 'feminist' was a problematic and often uncomfortable label. 'It can be an insult,' [one of the participants] explained. 'It means you hate men,' at least one student in all but one group said" (p. 249). They noted that the perception of being anti-male was "a dangerous stance among adolescent girls who spent so much energy on attracting male attention" (Levstik & Grothe, 2002, p. 245).

These beliefs about feminism and feminists are also found in social studies research that focused on teachers. In her discussion of a study with preservice and inservice teachers, Levstik

described a conversation about suffrage in which "some adults strongly identified with women in the women's movement, others were just as adamant in not doing so" (Levstik, 2000, p. 289). She noted that, in particular, "Some of the younger women distanced themselves from those they perceived as 'women's libbers.' One of the most vocal of this group explained, 'I'm just not a big women's lib type of person...and....there's so many more like me'....Across discussion groups, opinions varied from complete agreement on the importance of women in history to ambivalence and, occasionally, outright hostility (Levstik, 2001, p. 197). Social studies preservice teachers in a study conducted by Monaghan (2009) described feminists as being perceived as people "who tend to kind of hate men", who see "men as the cause of all of your problems" and who are "crazy" (p. 150-151). She found that the participants in her study perceived feminists as "annoying, polarizing, radical, lesbian, man-haters" (p. 151), and concluded that it easy to see why even those people in her study who identified with feminist goals went to lengths to avoid self-identifying or being labeled as a feminist.

The tropes about feminists present in this social studies research reflect the always already antifeminist discourses circulating in our culture. The comments made by the participants in the studies noted above seem to support Tomlinson's (2010, p. 1) assertion that "One never encounters the feminist's argument for the first time because it comes already discredited". This cultural aversion to feminism, and particularly the association of feminist women's with rejection of men, has important consequences for those who would take up a feminist subject position. As Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (p. 230-231) argued:

Even those who recognize that many (perhaps even most) feminists are quite different from the sometimes monstrous creatures of the stereotype may (with some justification) fear that others not so enlightened will take the feminist label at its most negative...They

may refrain from openly expressing or acting on feminist beliefs because being categorized as a feminist seems so "uncool" (and for many, so potentially dangerous for their success on the heterosexual market).

As I have discussed throughout the earlier chapters of this dissertation, the forces that shape discourses about women and feminism outside of education also shape the discourses within it. It seems likely, then, that the widespread and pervasive aversion to feminism in our culture is likely to also be shaping what can and cannot be said in these lesson plans. When thinking about why scholars (or teacher or students) have not taken up a feminist subject position, it is important that we not "disembled the individual from the social" (Dillabough, McLeod, & Mills, 2008, p. 307) by positioning people as actors who are free from the discourses that inhibit the adoption of a feminist and anti-sexist stance. The feminist subject position - and the critical orientation towards the promotion of women and gender in social studies classrooms that can come along with it -- may not be a position that is readily available to social studies scholars. In fact, instead of what might be interpreted as a critical, feminist tone, the approach to promoting attention to women and gender taken by the authors of the lesson plans was characterized by a tone of civility, a type of academic discourse I described in the next section.

Civility

Tomlinson's (2010) feminist discussion of civil affect in academic writing was particularly helpful in analyzing the lesson plan rationales and theorizing the absence of an explicitly critical or feminist motivation for enacting the described activities. First, in her discussion of the ways in which the affect of a text works to create its authority broadly in academic writing, Tomlinson argued that in academic texts, a tone of civility and politeness is normalized as appropriate, stating, "Texts are evaluated as if they were stand-ins for restrained,

face-to-face conversations conducted according to the norms of white middle-class social interactions. In such a view, 'Raised voices,' blunt terms, and confrontive claims violate standards of textual manners" (p. 60). There are specific parameters that constrain the tone that an argument to include women can take, as standards of civility are dictated by much broader discourses than just those found within academia or in social studies. How attention might be drawn to gender inequality, and an author's responsibility for attending to it, is a tricky discursive business, because, Tomlinson noted, "for some readers, simply being put on notice that unpleasant social problems remain an ongoing feature of many people's lives may appear dismaying, disagreeable, divisive" (p. 60). The impetus to adopt a civil tone in one's advocating for attention to women and gender, in order to avoid the appearance of impoliteness or confrontation, then, is one possible explanation for why these lesson plan rationales have been written in the way I have described. Lesson plans that described the rationale for attending to these topics through polite references to getting women included and catching up with women's studies and women's history at the postsecondary level, as well as those lesson plans not acknowledging gender at all in the rationale, might reflect an impulse to do promote gender work politely. As I described earlier in this chapter, even the Geography lesson plan (Richburg, Nelson, & Tochtermann, 2002, p. 23), which provided the most critical tone of any article in the dataset, opened with the following statement, "With teachers focusing on teaching to standards and preparing for achievement tests, they may easily lose sight of the glaring global problems that need to be addressed in social studies classes" (p. 23) and then went on to say "teachers may not realize how serious the gender gap is" (p. 23). This gives teachers a polite invitation to take

themselves off the hook for not addressing global issues around women and gender in the past and for not "knowing" about gender inequities.⁵⁶

The problem with this adherence to civility, Tomlinson argued, in the practice of attending to feminist or other political issues, is that it exchanges etiquette for ethics: choosing to err on the side of politeness foregrounds the affect of a text over the substantive critique upon which the argument is being made. Tomlinson contended "Rather than being 'impartial', such conventions serve entrenched interests by encouraging aggrieved parties to give up part of their bargaining power -- their emotional force and its consequences -- *prior to negotiation*" (p. 60). The sacrifice of emotion for the appearance of politeness insulates both the author and the reader from their shared accountability for an inequitable society, failing to harness the power of textual arguments to compel us to think about ourselves and our lives in relation to others.

This polite rationale for addressing gender in the lesson plans, I argue, makes it possible for teachers to ignore the topic, or to not engage with it in critical ways, because it falls short of implicating the reader/teacher (and all of us) in the maintenance of gender inequity. In terms of social studies education in particular, Levstik has noted that "this tendency to omit or oversimplify in order to be polite seriously misrepresents complex issues, including the struggles

⁵⁶ In putting "knowing" in quotations marks, I'm tying into notions of "knowing" and "not knowing" that emanate from psychoanalytic theory. In particular, I'm relying on Felman's (1982) assertion, that "Ignorance...is not a passive state of absence-a simple lack of information: it is in an active dynamic of negation, an active refusal of information...Ignorance, in other words is nothing other than a *desire to ignore*: its nature is less cognitive than performative, as in the case of Sophocles' nuanced representation of the ignorance of Oedipus, it is not a simple lack of information but the incapacity-or the refusal-to acknowledge *one's own implication* in the information" (p. 31). Knowing is in quotation marks here because I would contend that ignorance about gender inequity is not a lack of information, but rather a resistance to knowing. How, using a very simplistic example, would it be possible to "not know" about gender inequity in American culture when one "knows" that there has never been a woman president? Both poststructural and psychoanalytic theories lend themselves to interpreting these spaces of "not knowing" as productive sites for inquiry. In fact, Felman asserted that Freud's "truly revolutionary" pedagogical discovery is that "*ignorance itself can teach us something-become itself instructive*" (p. 31). In this sense, the spaces in which we actively resist knowing, which I'm pointing to in this case through language that excuses teachers for not knowing about a gender gap, present opportunities for considering our complicity in knowledge and ignorance. I'm arguing that the polite language used in this statement is an exoneration from "knowing" about gender inequity and that this is a particular kind of rhetorical move - or technology - with consequences worth considering. Some of these consequences are outlined and described in the rest of the chapter.

for women's rights" (Levstik, 1997-1998, p. 26) and that by substituting a "cult of politeness" for social critique, "the social studies classroom emphasizes the obvious, cheerful, and stereotypical and obscures the ways in which structures of class, race, and national power, as well as gender, constrain groups and individuals" (Levstik, 2001, p. 196-197). In order to disrupt the gender status quo through social studies curriculum in ways that student will notice, she argued, requires an account of gender in ways that "are more than benevolently inclusive" (p. Levstik, 1997-1998, p. 27)

What is conveyed when authors continue producing work advocating for attention to women and gender, or any other marginalized group, in civil and polite ways? I think it's important to note that the persistence of this tradition of civility has consequences for researchers and advocates who, in an effort to achieve textual vehemence, adopt a more critical affect in their writing. Continued adherence to textual norms of politeness "authorizes readers to treat writers [who are] perceived as angry as if they were obstreperous children, to ignore their arguments, to resist their emotional and moral force, to evade confrontation...in effect, to say, 'You need to calm down before I listen to you' " (Tomlinson, p. 60). In other words, the persistent reinscription of the civil affect in academic writing insures that a more critical tone remains outside the set of choices available to those who have something to say about gender and inequity and also wish to have their work accepted and published. In this sense, adhering to norms of civil academic discourse has effects far beyond those experienced directly by a single author: it sustains a tradition that makes it difficult for those attempting to deploy other affective techniques to be heard.

Neoliberalism

Finally, I argue that is also worth considering how neoliberalism impacts the rejection of feminism. Harvey (2005) described neoliberalism as a political-economic force that promotes practices and interactions based on the understanding that human well-being can best be achieved by securing and protecting individual freedoms. The consequence of the veneration and promotion of individual freedom is that, "each individual is held responsible and accountable for his or her actions and well-being....Individual success or failure are interpreted in terms of entrepreneurial virtues or personal failings...rather than being attributed to any systemic property" (p. 65-66). Neoliberalism is a dominant discourse in our times, impacting not only our political and economic behavior, but many other aspects of our way of living in the world. As such, it impacts social studies education as well.

Neoliberalism, may, for example, constrain the adoption of a feminist subject position that could attempt to advocate for attention to women and gender in social studies. As Baker (2005) argued, the relationship between neoliberal ideas of meritocracy and personal responsibility for success and feminists' arguments for gender equity, are incongruent. The perception that women enjoy more "choices" and "freedoms" than women in previous generations, which are rights central to neoliberal thought, can cloak structural inequality, and lead people to perceive that the gaps between women and men, say, for example, in political representation, are the result of the different choices women and men have made. The pervasive influence of neoliberalism on our daily lives individualizes success, as well as disadvantages and adversity, in ways that mask the influence of any forces beyond our own agency and our own choices. Feminism, although diverse and dispersed, is a political and theoretical project that opposes forces that contribute to the systemic oppression of women around the world. But the

need for these politics can appear superfluous in a world in which individuals are perceived to be at the reigns of their own destiny. Additionally, feminism, because of its focus on women's unequal status, can be perceived to connect women to oppression (and deficiency or weakness) for reasons that lie outside their control. This connection contradicts neoliberal thought, which constructs people as free and rational agents limited only by their own imagination and determination.

To embrace feminism and to occupy the feminist subject position requires the acknowledgement that there are forces at work beyond those we can direct individually. The impetus to resist being positioned as a feminist, therefore, may also occur because some women choose to self-identify as people who are entirely free to shape their own lives. It is understandably empowering to see oneself as limited only by hard work and imagination: there is a great lure to accept this belief as a commonsense assumption. When it comes to teaching with this kind of commonsense, Kumashiro argued (2001),

Perhaps we desire teaching and learning in ways that affirm and confirm our sense that what we have come to believe is normal or commonsense in society is really the way things are and are supposed to be....perhaps we resist anti-oppressive practices because they trouble how we think and feel about not only the Other, but also ourselves. (p. 5)

Our conditioning to resist structural explanations for gender imbalances makes it very difficult to use critical, feminist language to promote attention to gender and women in our culture. In order to move forward, it will be important to consider and understand the ways in which neoliberalism has constructed commonsense norms that create obstacles to attending to women and gender in social studies in a critical way.

Counter-arguments and Conclusion

"How can we transform our curricula at all levels of the formal educational system using feminist scholarship and knowledge in climates that are hostile?" (Bernard-Powers, 1996a, p. 2)

Through my analysis of the rationales presented in these lesson plans, I have attempted to argue that the reasons the authors presented for implementing them lacked a critical punch, and that the absence of this punch may contribute to the continued marginalization of women and gender as topics in social studies education. In order to understand this absence, I reviewed Crocco's explanations for the lack of attention to women and gender and found that broader discursive forces contributing to women and gender as marginalized topics had been under-theorized in social studies. I then presented some additional explanations for the absence of a critical tone from the lesson plans about women in the dataset. In an effort to supplement and add more complexity to our understanding of how these topics have been marginalized as topics in social studies education, the rejection of feminism -- reflected in norms of civility in academic discourse and shaped by neoliberal discourses -- were proposed as additions to the list of obstacles to promoting women and gender in social studies.

As I was constructing this analysis, however, I found myself asking whether attention to women and gender in social studies *has* to be contextualized in critical ways in order to work toward gender equity and if inequity always *has* to be highlighted or foregrounded for this work to be critical? I then stumbled across the following quote from social studies historian Ron Evans (2010) in his discussion of what constrains critical work in education. He noted that people who do this work:

are often quite strident⁵⁷ in their rhetoric...Unfortunately such dogmatic posturing, while understandable and linked to a sense of moral outrage, tends to alienate some, if not

⁵⁷ It would be interesting to do some analysis in education rhetoric to see how often the term strident is linked directly to feminism and women.

many, students, teachers, and administrators. Fortunately, there are many alternative ways to make critical commentaries...A skilled teacher, much like a skilled politician, can sometimes get students and colleagues to consider difficult issues and perspectives, not be using critical perspectives like a club and figuratively hitting over the head, but by quietly posing them as alternatives. (p. 243)

What Evans is talking about here is closely related to what I have described in this section, both in terms of the role of affect in academic writing and the forces that create particular norms and inhibit more critical tones. His argument is supported by Tomlinson's (2010) observation that for feminists, textual vehemence is "a tool that is useful for some purposes but counterproductive for others...Finding the right tool for the job is often the work required of feminists at the scene of the argument" (p. 63). Evans and Tomlinson's statements also resonated with the input I sought out from other teacher educators about the dilemma of enacting critical work in ways that students will respond to. This tension has been the central concern in my experiences as a teacher. In my own work as a high school teacher and as a teacher educator, I certainly cannot claim to have mastered the art of doing critical work that facilitates the questioning of foundational assumptions in ways that don't shut students down. In fact, like my critiques of these lesson plans, I think I more often than not have landed on the side of being a facilitator of polite, civil, and not very explicitly feminist learning experiences. For that reason, I think that Levstik's (2001, p. 197) observation that "as the products of these classrooms themselves, teachers avoid topics that make them uncomfortable or that they think will disturb their students...their tendency is to display women in relatively minor, nonthreatening ways...and

avoid discussion of social inequities and oppression" could easily describe the treatment of gender in many of my own classroom meetings⁵⁸.

So while I stand by my assertion that the rationales presented in these lesson plans are not critical enough, and that this absence of critique inhibits their potential for impacting gender inequity in any meaningful way, it is important that I also stress that I understand that doing critical gender work is an incredibly nuanced enterprise that is unlikely to be successfully prescribed in a mass-produced lesson plan written by authors who can only guess about the contexts in which these lesson plans will be played out. This does not, however, let any of us off the hook. As Tomlinson also said, "textual choices to create rhetorical force have political and ideological consequences" (p. 57). The idea of using vehemence as a tool in the effort to get women and gender into social studies in ways that work against gender inequity is a topic with which I believe we need to engage in social studies. In general, the lesson plans in this dataset lack the kind of vehemence to be productive in motivating teachers to do these lessons or to see themselves as actors in the struggle against gender inequity. I am not suggesting the smackdown (Bridges-Rhodes, 2011; Hughes-Decatur, 2011; Schmeichel, in press) approach is the only appropriate alternative, although, arguably, there is no evidence that this is an approach that has been attempted and failed in social studies. These lesson plans indicated that advocates for attending to women and gender in social studies education are a long, long way from the strident and dogmatic rhetoric that Evans refers to. Because of the discursive constraints that I have

⁵⁸ Garrett (2011) addressed avoidance in depth when he used psychoanalytic theories to understand preservice teachers' traumatic encounter with race issues in their viewing of *When the levees broke*. His work analyzed the ways in which the participants resisted engaging with difficult knowledge. Garrett contended that we need a new modality for thinking about these avoidances as pedagogical moments, one that "might help those of use working with preservice teachers understand our experiences around teaching difficult topics in ways that call productive attention to the affective relationships that individuals have with social knowledge" (p. 343). Although his focus was on race, this work might not only inform thinking about the challenges of addressing difficult knowledge around gender in teacher education, but also provides some theoretical resources on which we might draw.

described in this section, however, it would be foolhardy to ignore the need for strategy, and perhaps even stealth, in order to avoid a backlash.

The first step for me, then, is to better understand and more fully acknowledge some of the discursive forces that have inhibited critique in my work as a researcher and scholar so that I can, in Foucault's (2007) words, practice "the art of not being governed so much" (p. 45) and to access the more efficacious discursive technologies available to me as a researcher and a teacher. If, as Foucault (1983, p. 224) asserted, "[t]he exercise of power...endows itself with processes which are more or less adjusted to the situation", my goal is to disrupt the power that sustains asymmetrical gender relations by disrupting the ease with which we, as gender-equity advocates, adjust ourselves to the situation in social studies, both in terms of the continued marginalization of women and gender and the norms around how we talk and write about these topics. Although she wasn't relying upon Foucault to make her argument (and might not appreciate my attempt to link her work with his), I think this is exactly what Levstik (2001, p. 209) was encouraging all of us do in the following quote:

Transforming the social studies when gender, race, class, and ethnicity continue to divide our society and our schools requires courage on the part of educators. It means pursuing a goal for which they may be little support, persisting despite others' disinterest or hostility...and repeating the process over and over again, until it becomes an ordinary part of teaching practice.

CHAPTER 6

COACHING⁵⁹ GENDER WORK

"Leaving the children alone to their own devices means that they will reproduce those positions in those discourses with which they are familiar, and are thus not open to scrutiny and transformation. Neither the children nor the teacher can change without the production of different discourses in which to read their actions, and to produce different actions and different subjectivities" (Walkerdine, 1990, Schoolgirl Fictions, p. 9).

"There is little evidence that U.S. teachers (or any substantial part of the American public) are prepared to help students participate in the type of debate [which would challenge cultural views]" (Levstik, 2000, p. 285).

The quotes used to begin this section point to two issues impacting the success of women and gender-focused work in the social studies classroom. First, the quote from Walkerdine is a reminder that our understanding of the world is mired in the discourses that are already available to us. Students, of course, do not come into the social studies classrooms as blank slates waiting to be written upon. Although there may indeed be a "first time" an individual learns about a historical event like the signing of the declaration of independence, or learns about a geographical concept like the equator, students' learning about their subjectivities precedes their experience in the classroom. As Davies (2003) described in her brilliant treatise on gender and young children, children learn to understand their gender and the gender of others through multiple discourses about gender that shape particular ways of seeing themselves and others. The gender practices through which even young children position themselves as male or female "provide the vehicle through which others will recognise that positioning as legitimate, as meaningful, as providing the right to claim personhood" (p. 13). Students of any age, then, come to the classroom with very specific and very important understandings of the discourses about

⁵⁹ Using the word coach was very intentional. Among other things, it foreshadows my future work on coaches and social studies.

gender is and what girls and boys can be, as do their teachers. The understanding of these discourses and the adherence to certain performances related to them are key for social acceptance.

It's important to remember, then, that students who encounter a lesson plan "about" women and gender in a social studies classroom are bringing to that lesson a complex knowledge of the gender discourses in which they are already mired. Those discourses act as both a resource and a limit: they make some understandings possible while at the same time constraining others. Without intervention, or what Walkerdine describes as the "production of different discourses", the understandings that teachers and students will reproduce during a class "about" women and gender is likely to be very similar to the discourses about women and gender they had when they walked into the classroom. It's also important to remember that the challenging of some gender norms in some instances can be akin to challenging what some people use to see themselves and others as human. In this sense, when addressing issues of gender, there is a quite a bit at stake for both teachers and students.

The second quote used at the beginning of this chapter points to a general skepticism about teachers' capacity to implement successfully the kinds of lessons that have the potential to challenge cultural views. Although the preparation of teachers (or lack thereof) to create classrooms that are conducive to productive and non-oppressive considerations of gender is the primary focus of the next chapter, I think it's worth noting here that the kind of work that feminists and gender-equity advocates would like to see happening in the classroom requires not only desire and the capacity to see one self as an agent, but requires a great deal of skill as well. But, as Levstik and others (Crocco, 2008, 2007; Crocco & Cramer, 2005; Hahn et al., 2007) have

noted, there is no evidence to suggest that social studies teachers are being routinely prepared to engage students effectively in a consideration of broad social issues, including gender.

My interest and concern about the anticipation and support present in these lesson plans comes directly from my own experience as a teacher educator and my work with a student teacher who was attempting to implement a gender focused lesson plan in his own class. In my last semester of serving as a field instructor for social studies student teachers, I worked with one person who was really an exemplary student teacher in every way. Smart, creative, engaging, this student seemed to be able to effortlessly transform the most mundane social studies standard into something meaningful and critical. He was really one of the best teachers I have ever seen in action. When, in anticipation of an upcoming observation visit, he sent me his lesson plans, you can imagine my unabashed joy when I discovered that he was planning a discussion about the ways female political candidates were portrayed in the media during the 2008 presidential election. He planned to implement a silent discussion⁶⁰ and had a good set of provoking quotes to get students to think about the problematic ways that Palin and Clinton had been represented and described. I thought the lesson, as designed, was fantastic and I was looking forward to getting to see these students have a light bulb go off when they were able to see the pattern of sexist and demeaning quotes that my student teacher had pulled together.

What I didn't anticipate adequately was that some of these students would *agree* with these sexist statements. As the students engaged in the silent discussion, moving from station to station responding to the quotes and then to each others' responses, the student teacher and I circulated as well. My eyes must have been the size of saucers: I know his were. To be fair, not

⁶⁰ This method, which the student teacher learned from me, and which I stole directly from Hilary Conklin, involved placing written prompts on 4 or 5 large piece of blank paper around the room. The students are directed to respond to the prompts by writing on the paper, and then are asked to respond to their peers' responses, and so on and so on. Thus, the discussion is silent.

all of students jumped on the sexism bandwagon, but many did, and actually took the rhetoric up several more notches, perhaps most notably in the comment from one student who wrote that if Hilary Clinton couldn't keep a man, how could she be president? As the silent discussion concluded and I went back to my seat, I remember thinking that my student teacher's job of facilitating the debriefing discussion that was to follow -- during which the students would summarize and discuss the written comments made during the discussion -- was going to be more difficult than I had anticipated.

But when it came time to address the more negative and sexist comments that had been written on the discussion sheets, my student teacher didn't take them up - he glossed over them and kept moving forward. As this was happening, I became aware of a pit gnawing away in my stomach and a sinking feeling that some very problematic things had been said here and that these ideas were not going to be challenged. In the conversation that followed the class period, I asked him about it and what he was thinking when leading the debriefing session. His response was that he had been scrambling to come up with something but was unsure about how to challenge those problematic statements. He didn't know what to say.

This experience reflects my own failure to adequately anticipate the discourses about gender that students bring with them to the classroom as well as the support that teachers need to facilitate the kinds of classrooms discussions about gender that have a chance of *not* reinscribing problematic ideas about women and gender. In retrospect, I can see that I should have and could have prepared my student teacher more adequately to engage students in a discussion of these topics that challenged rather than confirmed some of their ideas about women in politics. Not only did I assume that students would object to the sexism in the media quotes, but when I realized that they didn't, I assumed that this teacher would know what to do. The consequence of

my oversight was that not only did these students have some problematic ideas reinscribed through this activity, but that my student teacher experienced it as a "failure" as well. His panic about what to do and his feelings of being unprepared to handle this divisive topic has potentially made him less inclined to take on these topics in the future.⁶¹

As a direct result of my own experiences with this student teacher, and specifically, what I did not anticipate, I decided that one of my analyses of the dataset needed to address what these lesson plans assumed and anticipated about the students and teachers implementing these lessons. Through analyzing the discourse present in the plans, I sought to identify answers to the following question:

- What support for the reader/teacher had been provided in terms of anticipating how the students would react and what the teacher would need to consider in order to facilitate the lesson in ways that would not reinforce problematic assumptions about gender?

In this chapter, I described several specific lesson plans and then described the dataset more broadly, in order to analyze the attention paid to student reaction and teacher preparation. The specific lesson plans featured in this chapter included topics and activities that were particularly conducive to the possibility of generating some problematic and perhaps controversial issues around gender identities.

⁶¹ It's important that social studies researchers and practitioners acknowledge and address these moments of panic -- not knowing what to do -- in research and publications for teachers. This is true in terms of content and activities which address gender, but also in relation to other topics in which students and teachers bring complex and polemical understandings of divisive topics with them into the classroom. As a colleague pointed out after hearing this story, teacher questions like "What makes it okay to say that about someone?" or "Where does that idea come from?" could have turned this panicked teacher moment into a productive discussion. It is imperative that teacher educators and practitioners have access to conversations about the kind of pedagogical strategies and suggestions for dealing with those "I can't believe I just heard/read that" moments.

Gender swapping in social studies

Intended to provide teachers with a lesson focused on visual literacy, the first article I analyzed provided the reader/teacher with multiple images of women and men in the late 19th century and includes detailed suggestions for ways to engage students in the consideration of gender identity during that time. The excerpt reproduced below is from the last page of the article (Woyshner, 2006, p. 362, emphasis added):

Finally, to show the students how gender is so central to our understanding of ourselves in history, have them switch the genders of the characters. That is, they should imagine the male figures to be female and the female figure in the center to be male. (And, yes, the man in the middle is wearing a crinoline!) What do they think about a man wearing a crinoline? How does that disrupt students' understanding of what it meant -and what it means-to be male or female? Would this ever have been possible? Why or why not? How do they feel about switching the genders? Discuss with students how this switching of genders seems unusual and *even abnormal* and what this means in regard to our expectations. This final exercise helps students see how our notions of what it means to be male and female are socially and culturally constructed.

Although I can appreciate the ways in which this aspect of the activity and the questions outlined might encourage students to think about "what it means to be male or female", this section of the activity and the way in which it is described is potentially problematic in several ways. Schmidt (2011) recently called attention to the ways in social studies work has produced some gender identities as normal and others as exceptional, and in this activity, the drawing of attention to the male dressed in crinoline (with an exclamation mark for emphasis) as well as the encouragement

for teachers to discuss with their students what is "unusual and even abnormal" about a man dressing as a woman, is an activity that reifies gender norms instead of disrupting them.

Furthermore, I would argue that in this lesson plan, there is an embedded assumption that teachers and students have the capacity and experience to talk about these issues in ways which would be either productive or anti-oppressive. Because there is not an acknowledgement that teachers would need to approach these issues with their students in ways that would work towards anti-oppressive discussions, it assumed that teachers and students already know how to talk about these issues. For example, there is no preparation here for how teachers might handle the conversation that would ensue after encouraging students to think about gender switching. In my own experience with adolescents and adults who have been exposed to visual images or discussions about women dressing and/or living as men and vice versa, I've seen reactions ranging from nose-crinkling to full-on disgust: often, the stronger reactions are punctuated with out-loud comments, name calling, and hateful, offensive speech. The comment that students might be encouraged to consider how they feel "about switching genders" (p. 362) brings to mind, for example, the reaction to Chaz Bono's 2011 appearance on *Dancing with the Stars*, and in particular, an opinion piece from the Fox News website (that circulated among some Facebook "friends" of mine) titled, "Don't Let Your Kids Watch Chaz Bono On 'Dancing With the Stars'" (Ablow, 2011). I think the recent public reaction - some of which was incredibly negative - around the participation of a transgender person on a popular television show is indicative of the potential of a wide range of opinions around the gender switching question included in these instructions: the absence of advice or guidelines for teachers to engage students in these kinds of conversations, however, reveals the assumption that social studies teachers will know how to either avoid anti-oppressive interactions or to handle them when they arise. The

incomplete presentation of this activity could be setting up a teacher to fail, reinscribe problematic notions about "normal" women's and men's roles, make vulnerable students whose adherence to gender norms is in question among their peers and lead a well-meaning teacher into the kind of disastrous classroom discussion that would convince them to never engage in conversations about gender identity again. The absence of a discussion about the challenges teachers might face in attempting to engage in this conversation, what they might do to make it effective and as non-oppressive as possible, and the kind of scaffolding work that would be required to result in a productive discussion of gender identity belies an assumption about what the teacher implementing this activity believes, knows, is prepared for, and is capable of doing in order for this discussion to be a productive one.

Despite what it may look and sound like, my point here is not to dissuade researchers from providing descriptions of lessons that would engage students in activities that enable them to consider, discuss, and debate issues of gender. Rather, I want to encourage us to think about *how* we are promoting these activities, how we might promote them more effectively and how we can support teachers in doing this work in ways that will result in productive and anti-oppressive classroom discussions. Doing this requires, I argue, an acknowledgement of the discourses around gender and women circulating in our culture, and how these discourses are likely to inhibit *or* impact any attempt to address these issues in a social studies classroom.

Anticipations and assumptions in lesson plans about women and gender

Although I pointed to the absence of anticipation in my description of the previous lesson, it's important to note that there is not a total lack of anticipation of student response in most of these lesson plans. However, the kind of anticipation present speaks to the technical and practice oriented aspects of social studies education, rather than an acknowledgement of the

discourses about women and gender that are likely to be brought into any of the classroom discussions that would result from the implementation of the lesson plans as described. For example, in the instructions present in one lesson plan article, teachers are encouraged to "brainstorm names of women in history", and it's noted that the goal of this exercise is "for students to notice how few women come to mind, though it would be a pleasant surprise to find a class that can list many notable women in history" (Sincero & Woysnher, 2003, p. 1). This anticipation of historical knowledge or lack of it (a central component of history education) is the limit of what has been anticipated here regarding students' prior knowledge and thinking about women. What is absent, for example, is an acknowledgement of the *other* kinds of ideas about women and gender that students will bring with them to the classroom, such as beliefs about appropriate roles and performances for people based on their identifiable gender. Although the point of having the students brainstorm notable women in history is for them to notice how few women they can name, it's possible that neither students or teachers who would engage in this exercise may find it particularly problematic for a small number of women to be identified. In terms of introducing gender into the classroom, it's not sufficient to consider only students' knowledge of women's history when planning (or preparing teachers to plan for) activities. Students' and teachers' understanding and thinking about gender, and their capacity to discuss it must be taken into consideration as well.

Although literature about practicing and preservice teachers indicates the absence of an interest in or orientation toward equity and social justice work (see Hollins & Gurzman, 2005), the majority of the lesson plans which described gender-focused activities in social studies make assumptions about the gender equity-orientation of students, teachers, and teacher educators. For example, in one lesson plan describing the value of using poetry with elementary and middle

school students to promote social-justice oriented social studies, the author lists different poems that are described as pieces that "portray women's challenges to racial and gender inequality" (McCall, 2004, p. 175). The author describes practices teachers can use to encourage children "to explain what they learned from the poems and what led to their interpretations", and then to "have them focus on the issues raised in the poems and their relevance to social studies and students' lives" (p. 175) by asking students to consider what rights were being fought for and how issues of equality affect students' lives. The author concludes her description of this particular activity by stating, "During the discussion, the teacher may add his or her own ideas, guarding against those ideas receiving more attention than other students' views" (p. 175).

The description of this exercise reflects the kinds of assumptions about learners and their orientation *toward* gender equity present throughout much of the literature. The author *does* anticipate that the students' initial response about what they learned from the poems may not result in issues related to social studies and their lives, as evidenced by the secondary instructions for teachers to address these issues directly after students' initial conversation through specific questions about equity. But the author does not anticipate resistance, as evidenced by the absence of instruction of how a teacher might engage with resistance and respond in ways that are productive and promote social justice. How a teacher should respond to, for example, to students' ideas about the irrelevance of gender equity in today's society, or doubts about women's capabilities in relation to men, for example, are not anticipated. The assumption, then, is either that these ideas about gender will not be expressed, or that a teacher possesses the capacity to respond to these ideas, and that therefore, there is no need to go into detail about what to do. In the introduction, the author acknowledges that "my students' individual experiences, as well as their gender, social class, and culture, influence their responses to poetry and other reading and

their participation in discussions"(p. 172) and that she asks her students "to consider the social issues in their readings, even if they prefer to ignore them" (p. 173). But the absence of any anticipation of resistance in the description of these activities rests on the assumption that teachers and students would be on the same page in terms of the need for and value of gender equity.

Furthermore, the comment that "a teacher may add his or her own ideas" with the caveat that the teacher should be "guarding against those ideas receiving more attention to other students' views" (p. 175) reflects a concern for the technical execution of a good discussion to the exclusion of a consideration of the complexity of what a discussion about gender equity can entail, which is another characteristic present throughout much of the literature. If, for example, the students in the classroom discuss the ways in which the poetry encouraged them to reflect on how girls are treated unfairly, is the teacher, following these instructions, to play the devil's advocate and encourage students to reconsider this position? And if the poems prompt students to argue that girls aren't treated unfairly, but in fact have advantages in classrooms, are seen as the class pets, etc., how should this teacher respond? What is the best way to encourage students to consider the structural inequities that girls and women face, without discouraging girls or empowering boys? The lesson plan may encourage the teacher to open up a discussion that could be difficult to implement in anti-oppressive ways, but the directions available in this lesson plan don't provide any hints about how she would navigate it.

Counterexamples

Among the 24 lesson plans in the dataset, there were two articles that provided specific suggestions or guidelines for what teachers should consider when implementing the described lessons. One of these articles was a discussion of the ways in which teachers can use literature

to teach "women and social justice" (Tyson & Hinton-Johnson, p. 54). After listing books teachers might consider using in social studies classes, the article offered guidelines for teaching about women and social justice, including providing ground rules for participation in discussion, taking the time to help student develop historical and political understandings of sexism and to "encourage personal understanding of how these problems affect the daily lives of women" (Tyson & Johnson, p. 56). In addition, teachers were advised to engage students in the identification of a local or national gender issue related to issues presented in the literature, noting that "a greater understanding of the connections between social justice and women's struggles for equity has the capacity to motivate teachers and students in the face of numerous challenges" (p. 55). These suggestions reflect an acknowledgement that teachers implementing this lesson need to acknowledge issues broader than the technical implementation of the described activities in order to facilitate a lesson that creates the possibility for students to link social studies to gender inequity and their own lives.

Another article (Crocco & Cramer, 2005) also provided suggestions for implementing anti-oppressive gender-focused activities. After describing their experiences implementing gender-focused WebQuests in a preservice teacher course, the authors presented twelve principles they encourage teachers to consider when implementing WebQuests on women's issues in their own classrooms. While some of these principles focus specifically on implementing successful WebQuests (for example, a suggestion that teachers "chunk" the assignment to make it manageable), resembling the focus on technical aspects of instruction that I noted in many of the lesson plans I reviewed, the list also includes principles that address directly how to include gender and women in the classroom in non-oppressive ways, including the following suggestions (p. 147):

1. Avoid essentialism. That is, acknowledge that women are not all alike; do not stereotype women.
2. Be sensitive to issues of cultural relativism, promoting the understanding that different cultures deal differently with gender roles.
3. Focus on perspective taking and create a tolerance for ambiguity in considering social issues...
10. Select bias-free websites that do not themselves perpetuate gender stereotypes through loaded language or imagery. Subject all websites to careful scrutiny.

That only two of the lessons in the dataset address student assumptions and teacher facilitation skills is, I argue, perplexing. I think it points to the relatively unproblematic and straight forward way in which gender and women are present in social studies education, when present at all. In example after example, the inclusion of women and gender as topics is often treated as if they are just like any other concept we work with in social studies - that's it's just a matter of making sure they are included. As I argued in the introduction to this section, however, these topics are not like others in social studies: taking up issues of gender is fundamentally more complicated than describing the different responsibilities of the branches of government, for example.

It's not there has be no attention paid to the challenges of doing good gender work in social studies. In her short introduction to the 1996 special issue on women in *Theory and Research in Social Education*, Bernard-Powers describes the this work as "far more complex than simply including women, identifying biases, and guaranteeing access to class discussion" (1996a, p. 2). For example, in one piece Levstik (2001, p. 194) contended that

As just about anyone who lives or works with adolescents is well aware, young people enter the classroom with an array of images, myths, and theories about gender already in place. These ideas are shaped by cultural, familial, and personal definitions of masculinity and femininity as well as by institutional practices. As a result, adolescents face the task of ignoring, rejecting, or reconciling widely varying perspectives on gender....their attitudes reflect the complexity of their own experiences.

Levstik (2000, 2001; Levstik & Grothe, 2002) acknowledged the complicated contexts in which gender work has to be enacted in several of her pieces but after making this statement, she typically moved on to her more specific focus on the different ways that these perspectives impact students' ideas about women in political roles and their historical understanding. What I am interested in understanding are the divergent ideas that students and teachers bring with them to the classroom and how that affects efforts to attend to gender and women as topics in critical ways. Considering the paucity of attention paid to women and gender (and identity/subjectivity in general) in social studies, it shouldn't come as a surprise that research addressing this issues has not been done. I argue that until we have a better understanding of how students are likely to react to critical work on women and gender, it will be difficult to promote learning activities that might possibly produce the kind of "different discourses" to which Walkerdine was referring.

Controversial Issues

Because only two of the lessons in the dataset attended in particular ways to the challenges teachers might face in implementing critical lessons, it was necessary to look outside the dataset to examine some of the ways the field of social studies *has* paid attention to and given instruction about how to teach a particular topic. While there has not been specific attention paid to how to teach women and gender, there has been attention paid within social studies to the implementation of what is often referred to as controversial issue discussion⁶², which can overlap with the kind of attention paid to women and gender, as, for example, in the visual literacy activity I described above. As a part of my effort to locate social studies research that addressed teaching women and gender in the classroom, I stumbled upon a chapter in a book about

⁶² I feel compelled to use the word controversial here because it is so prevalent in the literature that seeks to encourage teachers to engage students in conversations about "controversial topics" (e.g., Journell & Buchanan, 2012, Kuthe, 2011; Yeager, & Humphries, 2011). But I think that the labeling of a topic as controversial is incredibly problematic in that it reaffirms and reinscribes the topic as a "controversy" without questioning how, why, and if the issue is controversial in the first place.

teaching controversial issues that included a description of a student discussion on affirmative action, a topic I thought was likely to include some reference to gender. In the next section, I describe the book and what I found in that chapter, as well as another representative resource on teaching controversial issues, and then point the absence of attention to subjectivity in this spaces as a problem in research seeks to describe "how to teach" controversial issues.

The central claim of a book titled "Controversies in the classroom", was "that the purposeful inclusion of controversial political issues in the school curriculum, done wisely and well, illustrates a core component of a functioning democratic community" (Hess, 2009, p. 5). This book breaks down the discussion of controversy in a classroom, from identifying what a controversy is to different ways to run the discussion, and as such, it clearly supports teachers capacity to facilitate the type of classroom discussions that might challenge assumptions and perspectives in meaningful ways. Furthermore, the detailed descriptions of teachers' strategies and decision making in implementing these kinds of discussions provides important blueprints for their successful replication elsewhere. This book took what often feels like the elusive qualities of what constitutes a successful discussion and laid them bare for analysis: as such, the book makes a very important contribution to thinking about how social studies teachers can take up these topics successfully. What I want to point to here was the absence of a consideration of teacher and student subjectivity as factors in controversial issue discussions. Although classrooms are described in the opening chapter of the book, as "complicated social spaces experienced differentially by different students" (p. 33), the consideration of that difference seems to be extracted from the book's descriptions of successful and unsuccessful controversial discussions.

Consider, for example the discussion of the "town-hall" strategy for facilitating discussions on controversial issues. In the case study serving as an exemplar of this type of discussion, the controversial topic being discussed was affirmative action. In the description of the discussion, the teacher is identifiable as a woman because of her name, which is a common woman's name, but the gender (and race) breakdown of the students, or the specific speakers, is never made explicit. Some of the comments about gender and race discrimination that the students made are presented, but not analyzed. For example, the gender of neither the student described as saying that a fire department hiring women may be putting people's lives a risk or another who countered that female applicants at a local fire department had achieved the highest scores on required test but had been discriminated against (presumably because they had not been hired), was noted. The students specific comments are provided in the context of demonstrating the ways in which students "[c]ontributed statements that contextualized the initiative within broader tensions, such as equality v. merit, and equality v. safety" (p. 59) and one gets the sense that these specific details were being shared to show the moves the students might make in a discussion. This means, at least in this instance, that what the students were saying and what insights their comments might give us about students complex thinking about gender are not important.

What is important is the method and the facilitation of the discussion. For example, in the final summary of the town-hall type discussion, in which affirmative action, or the students' thinking about equity, fairness, justice, is not referenced at all. Instead, the analysis described the teacher's moves during the discussion, including the technical aspects of running a discussion, the ways this teacher prepared the students and showed restraint during their discussion, asking questions at just the right time. These are the aspects of the conversation that

are broken down and analyzed so that the reader can see what led to a successful discussion about a controversial issue.

A controversial issues discussion about affirmative action has a great potential to engage students in a consideration of gender inequity and to give them an opportunity to grapple with how a society should or should not respond. But by describing this lesson outside of this context, the attention paid to women and gender in this discussion becomes another example of the way that these topics are treated as if the subjectivities of the students learning them and the teachers teaching them are superfluous to the pedagogical event. Obviously, the purpose of this book was not to explore students' understandings of gender, but the focus on the technical execution of a discussion, in the absence of a consideration or even an acknowledgement of the ways in which student subjectivities might impact, derail, enliven, or disrupt a discussion on affirmative action or any other issue, is a missed opportunity.

This is not to say that understanding the moves in a discussion of a controversial event are unimportant. But to extract student subjectivities from the description of the discussion - for example, at the most surface level, to exclude an acknowledgment of the gender of the speakers and to exclude the consideration of how that may have impacted the flow and quality of the discussion, as well as the teacher's decision to intervene or not - seems to extract a consideration of subjectivity from the practice of facilitating the discussion. In doing so, it separates who students and teachers are from what they say and do. The attention paid to teaching teachers how to facilitate student engagement with controversial issues, through the stripping away of student and teacher subjectivity, is not only a missed opportunity in terms of thinking in more complex ways about how gender (and race and class and sexuality and religion and abledness)

impacts events in the classroom, but sends a message to readers that the consideration of these issues is irrelevant to the implementation of the discussion.

Another typical treatment of how to teach controversial issues can be found in a recent book chapter on using film to teach controversial issue (Marcus, Metzger, Paxton, & Stoddard, 2010)⁶³. This chapter is a case study dealing with the controversial⁶⁴ issue of race and described "how one teacher promotes open and powerful discussions of race and racial conflict in his diverse classroom" (p. 113) through a unit on *The Jazz Singer* in a social studies courses titled "History through film and music". The presentation of the case includes an extensive outline of the unit plan, specific references to all of the media that was used in the unit, and detailed descriptions of the day to day execution of the unit. This case is a rich, 21-page resource describing the teacher's implementation of the unit and some description of how the students responded. The lessons and activities described would enable teacher and students to engage with very complex issues around race and gender in American culture, such as the role of race in modern culture, race relations in history, and the development of racial identity. It would really be a quite helpful tool for any teacher interested in replicating this particular unit on *The Jazz Singer* or any other movie.

The school in which the class was taught was described in the introduction to the chapter as mirroring the state's diversity "in terms of student backgrounds, socioeconomic status, and second language learners. Approximately 20% of the student population is African American and 14% is Latino/a, 39% of the students receive free and reduced lunch" (p. 115). The class upon which the case study focused was described as "diverse in terms of race/ethnicity, mirroring the school's population" (p. 116). However, there is only one instance of the

⁶³ Teaching history with film. Using film to teach about controversial issues (113-134).

⁶⁴ see previous footnote about controversy

description of the student reactions, comments, or discussions across this unit when the race of the students of is acknowledged.

In this instance, the students were having a conversation about Eddie Murphy's depiction of African American women in the film *Norbit*, and the comedy of Shirley Q. Liquor, a white man who uses blackface to portray an African American woman. The students' discussion of the intent behind the comedians' depiction of African American women was described in some length. It's noted that the students began relating these issues to their own lives, and that both an Asian student (whose gender was identifiable through the use of "he" in the description) and an African American student commented on in-racial-group language and interactions, and contrasted these interactions with language that would be considered offensive if coming from whites. The conclusion of the description of this discussion noted that some of the students were emotional and agitated: the last sentence stated that at the end of the class, one female African American student was overheard to say "I can't listen, I can't handle it" (p. 127).

This represented the only instance in which the race of the students was incorporated into the description of their comments and discussions. So, for example, in the (albeit brief) descriptions of student discussions about the definition of race and culture, whether or not the use of blackface in *The Jazz Singer* was intended to be harmful, and their feelings about their own identities, the race of the students contributing to the discussion is not mentioned. I think it's also important to note that the gender of the students in the discussion described above-- which began with a conversation about Murphy and Liquor's depiction of African American women -- is only explicitly referenced in the description of one female student who stated that she couldn't handle the discussion about in-group language. Additionally, the race of the teacher, Mr. Clark, is not acknowledged at any point in the chapter.

Asking why the race of the discussion participants was only included in the description of this particular interaction about in-group language -- and why the gender of the African American student who appeared to be overwhelmed by the discussion was the only explicit labeling of a participant's gender in the entire chapter -- poses some interesting questions about how and when race and gender become relevant in our writing up of classroom interactions and what the selective attention to these subjectivities produces. For the purposes of this chapter, however, I want to focus specifically on the very limited attention to subjectivity that this excerpt provided for thinking about how we might teach controversial issues in a classroom. The authors of the chapter acknowledge the complexity of teaching issues of race, particularly in the context of a classroom described as diverse. They quoted the teacher as saying that race was "a most touchy issue in the district right now and on most people's minds" and that he felt that race was "a fairly dangerous topic" (p. 130). This signals clearly to the reader that discussing race is a complex enterprise. In their description of the case, they also noted that the teacher "created and maintained a safe and supportive classroom environment" (p. 129) and that he had "anticipated students' potential responses to the topic" (p. 130)⁶⁵. But how the teacher used his understanding of the subjectivities of the students in the class to inform his pedagogical practice to do these things is not clear. The absence of any insight into how the teacher specifically considered subjectivity to approach this unit on the "touchy issue" of race in effect cloaks the role of

⁶⁵ It's noted that the teacher worried about the potential emotional reaction of one student in particular: because he was worried that she "might get upset" (p. 130) he contacted the parents of the student prior to the unit to discuss his concerns. This student is identifiable as a female through the use of the pronouns she and her, but the race of the student was not acknowledged here. What is unspoken is what it was about this unit that might be potentially upsetting, but the implication is that it was the explicit discussion of race that might provoke the emotional reaction of this student. This is just so damn loaded that it can't be taken on adequately in a footnote, but for now I want to point out that this speaks to the political and social that is so present in learning that it almost invisible. Think a student might get upset with a class topic? Sure, call the parents beforehand. But where is the interrogation of why this topic is upsetting and how this student is positioned by this topic in ways that may invoke her emotional reaction? And why does the emotional reaction need to be guarded against or restrained by the students' family? Whose purposes does that serve? Who gets to have an emotional reaction to a topic and what are the consequences of being positioned as someone (the one student in the class - who just happens to be a girl) who has an emotional reaction to "controversial issues"? Ok, that's it for now.

considering subjectivity in the teacher's decisions and moves to create a safe classroom or anticipate student response - and makes the issue of teacher and student race irrelevant to the consideration of how this unit played out in the classroom. A teacher using this case as a template for a similar study on race in their own classroom would find a very detailed step-by-step description of how to build a multi-day unit, break up the activities into a do-able chunks, and use resources effectively to prompt student thinking, discussion, and writing about the topic. However, they would not explicitly prompted or compelled to think about how their own race and gender or the race and gender of their students would be relevant to the work they would be trying to do through these activities.

When subjectivity is made irrelevant to descriptions of interactions in learning environments, as scholars we fail to acknowledge and understand the ways that power and power relations are shaping what happens in our classrooms (Parks & Schmeichel, 2012), which in effect depoliticizes educational practices by masking the relationship between the production of knowledge and social inequalities (Bryan & Bracken, 2011). Additionally, we deny teachers the opportunity to consider how their own subjectivities and those of their students may impact their attempts to implement discussions about issues like affirmative action or media representations of race or gender roles -- or any other topic -- in their own classrooms. As I have discussed above, this can set both teacher and students up for oppressive interactions and result in disastrous social studies experiences.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ In her analysis of the marginalization of attention to race - or what she called de-racialization - in social studies teacher education books, Gay, (2003) asserted that in terms of identifying any attention to techniques addressing issues of race, "the results were consistently negative across all of the books reviewed" (p. 123). She concluded, "Excluding race and racism from social studies methods textbooks places prospective teachers in an untenable position. They are expected to do something in their own classrooms that they have not been sufficiently prepared to do. Even more telling is the message the absence conveys...By not dealing with it directly, substantively, and significantly with issues of race and racism methods textbook authors are sending this message strongly and clearly to readers" (p. 145). I assert that the same argument can be applied to gender.

The issue in both of these descriptions of controversial issues discussions lies in the exclusion of attention to subjectivity, reflected in the unspoken assumption that the authors need not go into detail or even acknowledge the way that subjectivity might have impacted the cases they were describing, because it's either irrelevant or because the teacher will know what to do. What does this exclusion assume about the understandings and capacities teachers have to facilitate these kinds of conversations? As the Levstik (2000) quote that began this chapter noted, there is little evidence to suggest that teachers already know how to do this kind of work well. Leaving subjectivity out of the discussion compounds the obstacles to helping teachers learn how to be more effective in implementing these kinds of activities because it doesn't compel them (or us) to anticipate the issues of subjectivity that will undoubtedly impact any discussion about a controversial issue.

This is not to say that the impact of subjectivity on a discussion of controversial issues could ever be predicted because, of course, each classroom, and each minute of the class, is a moving, local, and contingent environment in which to run a discussion. But to not even acknowledge it at all sets the teacher up to fail, cloaks the role of power and privilege in the learning environment, and lulls social studies educators into a sense that these subjectivities *should not matter*. Scholars are setting the tone for this ignorance about the impact of subjectivity on classrooms and activities through our silence on these topics in our descriptions of case studies and presentations of lesson plans.

Conclusion

Aside from gaining some new facts and improving skills, working toward gender equity through the inclusion of attention to women in social studies involves the adoption of a particular orientation towards thinking about gender. This orientation may clash with students' and

teachers' current understandings of gender relationships. In order to have any chance of promoting gender equitable ways of thinking about women, we must acknowledge the understandings of gender that people will bring with them to an activity that includes attention to women and gender. This means that in our writing of lesson plans for teachers, as well as in our work with preservice teachers, we need to engage in a consideration of how attempts to include women and gender in social studies classrooms are likely to be received and by anticipating the obstacles that might arise.

Additionally, it's important to acknowledge subjectivity in our work to prepare teachers to facilitate gender work in social studies. Who the teacher is and who the students are does matter. And although it's not possible to pin down subjectivities in ways that are predictive or prescriptive, this doesn't mean that we can ignore the need to actively encourage educators to do the work of considering and interrogating the ways in which their subjectivities and those of their students are likely to impact what happens in their classrooms. Part of scholars' responsibility on this front is to engage in the difficult work of acknowledging and incorporating subjectivities into the write up of our research. Descriptions of classroom discussions, for example, should not be devoid of subjectivity detail. In terms of the anecdote I described in the beginning of the chapter, then, my subjectivities, those of the students teacher, and those of the students in the classroom, are all incredibly important to understanding what happened in that space. The dynamics of race, gender, and class (just for a start) in that space were not secondary to what was learned, how it was learned, and what that learning produced .

Writing up our research in a way that does not tie participants down to specific identities is incredibly difficult. But not attending to subjectivities in our discussions of our participants literally erases forces like gender, race and class -- and the power dynamics attached to these

subjectivities -- from the setting. And this either prevents or excuses us from considering the way that these subjectivities are relevant to not only teaching and learning, but in our day-to-day experiences. Fischman, 2000, encouraged education researchers to

approach the data collected in the field as indications not only of economical and ideological confrontations, political struggles, but also bodily manifestations and discursive practices that are not predestined to reproduce the scripts that larger structures of authority and privilege seem to dictate for the individuals (p. 14).

Attending to the rich complexity of subjectivities in our research sites, in ways that disrupt pre-existing and overdetermined scripts, relies upon an acknowledgement and understanding of what power produces and constrains. This kind of work has the potential to contribute to more equitable classrooms, schools, and communities.

The attention to subjectivity in both poststructural and feminist theory could be utilized in social studies to add this important layer of analysis to research in the field. As Weiler (2008) has argued recently

feminist educational theorists have been able to employ poststructural ideas that incorporate an understanding of power and privilege and to address larger economic and social forces acting upon individuals. I would argue that seeing subjectivity through this lens has led to a more complex reading of personal narratives and the discourses of power that subjects negotiate and that these new readings can lead to progressive action in the world. (p. 504-505)

In order to engage in social studies progressively in ways that work toward equity and social justice, we have to pay at least as much attention to subjectivities as we do to the content and pedagogy we use (Stearns, 2000). Without out this kind of attention, borrowing from

Walkerdine quote that started this chapter, researchers don't have much of chance to produce different actions and subjectivities.

CHAPTER 7

THE GENDER APPARATUS IN SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER EDUCATION

"What is clear is that teacher education apparently fails to provide effective and sustained challenges to the dominant discourse. The discourses of teacher education are pervasive in formulating traditional ('ungendered') teacher ideologies. Sustained commitments to, for example, child-centered learning, political neutrality and professionalism, often unmarked by concomitant commitments to opposing systematic injustices and inequality, may impede attempts at reform" (Coffey & Delamont, 2000, p. 83).

In this chapter I explored a component of the social studies teacher education apparatus -- the methods course syllabi -- and examined how it may be contributing to the phenomenon that Coffey & Delamont described in the quote above. I stumbled across the concept of the *apparatus* in Segall's (2002) book about teacher education. In the introduction of the book, Segall described his interest in "how teachers' ways of being are dependent, in part, on student teachers' ways of becoming as they go through and are constructed by the apparatus of teacher education" (pp. 6-7). Both Segall's book, which is an exploration of a social studies teacher education methods course (which I will describe further in the next section of the chapter), and this idea of the *apparatus* were very important to my own thinking about this chapter.

Foucault described the apparatus as an "ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions...-in short, the said as much as the unsaid" (1977/1980, p. 194). Expanding on this idea, Andersen (2003) framed Foucault's study of the *apparatisation* of discourses as the identification of the technologies, rites of passage, decisions, practical arrangements, etc. as processes that work together to reproduce and sustain a strategic logic and permeate the mechanisms that shape our everyday practices. As I explored the theory of the apparatus, I found this idea of how a set of experiences can work together -- through an ensemble

of practices and processes -- to shape particular ways of thinking, to be a useful and productive way of thinking about how teacher education works⁶⁷.

As I have discussed and reiterated in the previous chapters, I am interested in understanding how attention to women and gender has been excluded from social studies education. Although scholars working in the area of women and gender in social studies have noted that there is little to no attention to these topics in teacher education (Bernard-Powers, 1995; Crocco, 2007, 2008; Hahn, Bernard-Powers, Crocco & Woyshner, 2007), there were no studies I could find that substantiated this assessment. There has been work done to explore the role of gender in teacher education more broadly (e.g. Fischman, 2000; Zittleman & Sadker, 2002), but very little attention has been paid to the topic in research on social studies teacher education. For this reason, and because the social studies teacher education apparatus is one of the processes that works to "reproduce and sustain" the logic of excluding attention to women and gender in this field, it seemed fitting to turn my attention to the practices of teacher education to add depth to my consideration of how the exclusion of women is done in social studies.

Using Foucault's concept of the apparatus, this chapter is based on the premise that as a collection of practices, the institution of teacher education is not a pre-existing or freestanding

⁶⁷ To give an illustration of the what the idea of an apparatus makes possible in the attempt to theorize the everyday world of teacher education, consider this little ditty about a department meeting, shared with me by a member of a social studies teacher education program: in a discussion of the different social science courses which would "count" as fulfilling the requirements, one of the faculty members commented on the need to limit the options available to social studies education majors, and noted that if the policy was left too open ended, "Someone could take women's studies and have that count that towards their social studies degree". I would argue that the positioning of Womens Studies as a unacceptable choice of coursework for social studies education majors is an example of the maintenance of a gender apparatus in teacher education that contributes to the particular way in which issues around women and gender in the field are taken up or not. This type of regulation of the kind of attention to gender that is possible or impossible in social studies teacher education is subtle: it does not require those who are resistant to more critical orientations in the field to storm the administration building with pitchforks and torches, demanding that Women's Studies be excluded from "what counts" in social studies teacher education. Instead, this move is just one cog among many moving parts in the teacher education apparatus, working in concert with many other similarly small and (perhaps) seemingly insignificant cogs and processes and whirring of the machine, that functions to marginalize the attention to women and gender in this field.

entity that can be read as a neutral site. Teacher education is shaped and informed by the same discourses that regulate the rest of our lives. As participants in teacher education, students and teacher educators engage in specific activities and emphasize particular priorities that establish and maintain values and ways of thinking about the field, about students, about ourselves, and about the world. Our everyday teacher education practices have consequences. Just as texts are sources for reinscription of power relations as well as resistance, organizations are "enabling and productive sites, as well as constraining and disciplining ones" (Iedema & Wodak, 1999, p. 12). By examining social studies method course syllabi and positioning them as a particular type of technology within teacher education organizations -- a text that shapes and frames what is important and valuable in social studies teacher education -- I seek to identify the ways in which the gender apparatus in social studies functions, through these syllabi, to maintain an orientation toward gender equity and attention to gender in the field that sustains their marginalization.

This is a lengthy chapter, and I want to take some space here to outline the format I used. In the section below, I described two pieces of scholarship (Segall, 2002; Gorski, 2009) that directly informed my study. I also discussed some of the limitations of a project that focused on syllabi and presented an extensive description of the strategies I used to construct the dataset. In order to do this research, I used two different approaches to analyze the syllabi. First, I used a linguistic analysis tool called TextSTAT, which allowed me to explore the use of specific words throughout the entire syllabi dataset. I searched for words that might signal the presence of certain discourses and examined how they were used in context in order to think about the kind of social studies teacher that these syllabi produced. This analysis of word frequency and use is presented in this chapter after an explanation of the theoretical position that supports this methodology. In the final section of the analysis, I also explored several representative passages

from the syllabi texts to substantiate my argument that the presentation of a set of fixed, knowable social studies practices is problematic in equity oriented work.

Disturbing practice

Because Segall's (2002) book, based on his research of a social studies teacher education program, was so influential to this chapter, I wanted to describe his project in some detail. Based upon the premise that the social studies teacher education apparatus relies upon a set of assumptions, values, and practices that occur more frequently than others in social studies education, Segall's book "examine[d] how particular versions and visions of education, teaching, and learning are made possible in preservice education and what they, in turn, make possible for students learning to teach" (p. 4). Through a multi-pronged, two-year long research project, focused on six preservice teachers and their methods instructor, Segall observed teacher education and practicum classrooms, analyzed syllabi, and conducted multiple interviews to understand what and how preservice teachers were learning about social studies teaching. The central focus of one of the chapters of his book, titled *Gender and Multiculturalism: Additives, Sedatives, or Pedagogical Alternatives* focused specifically on the following question: How and to what extent are issues of diversity and equity addressed in teacher preparation? (p. 106).

Although Segall's book was -- in its entirety -- very important to my own thinking about social studies, poststructural research, and teaching, this chapter was particularly relevant to my dissertation project. In this chapter, which focused specifically on the social studies methods course, Segall presented excerpts from his conversations with preservice teachers about the ways that issues of gender and multiculturalism had been addressed in their class. He stated that the participants were unanimous in their responses that issues of gender and multiculturalism "played no explicit role in the social studies method course itself" and the students appeared to

be indifferent "as to how (or whether) issues of difference were incorporated into a methods course preparing them to teach others" (p. 116). Noting that the words *difference*, *gender*, and *multiculturalism* were never used in the 30 meetings of the methods course under study, he said "Granted, simply invoking these terms guarantees little. Excluding them entirely, however, necessarily gives some indication as to their value, or lack thereof" (p. 117). Segall argued that the exclusion of attention to these topics in a methods course communicated to the students enrolled in the class "that gender and multiculturalism are not part of, or not relevant to, basic social studies instruction" (p. 118).

Building on Gay (1986), Segall argued that attention to difference (which he described in this particular passage as, "multiculturalism, gender, race, class, and sexual orientation") in the social studies teacher education program he studied was relegated to the required foundations course. "Courses focusing on pedagogy, on the other hand, were mostly silent about difference" (p. 114). Although he contended that the students were cognizant of and receptive to the idea that they needed to *know* about difference, knowledge of the other was "less relevant in relation to what a teacher actually needs to *do*" (p. 22).

In addition to demonstrating that issues of difference were not addressed in the social studies methods course through his questioning of the participants in his study, he also described other spaces within the teacher education program that were devoid of attention to difference. For example, in a required course on pedagogy, in which lectures seminars, case studies, and readings assignments focused on traditional topics of teacher education like "the role of the teacher, instructional planning, teacher strategies, assessment and evaluation, and classroom management", difference was not addressed: "Difference seemed to have no relevance...to prospective teachers' planning, teaching strategies, assessment and evaluation, or classroom

management. Those all stood above and beyond issues of difference, never affecting or being affected by them" (p. 115). And although another required course on pedagogy, titled *Issues in Social Studies Education*, did include attention to gender and multiculturalism, Segall noted that these topics were addressed primarily through an emphasis on including content about the marginalized Other into the existing curriculum canon. He concluded,

What emerges, then, is a structure whereby issues of difference were engaged primarily in foundations or "content" courses...while being excluded from the program's two main courses on pedagogy...[therefore, the content courses] did not provide prospective teachers [with] a pedagogy of how to engage issues of gender and multiculturalism in the classroom or how to engage a classroom or a curriculum with and through them. (p. 115)

This structure, he argued, "suggests that diversity is (and thus can be) divorced from pedagogy and pedagogy from diversity" (p. 115).

As you will see as you read on, Segall's discussion of gender and difference in a social studies methods course framed many of the questions I have asked in this chapter. First, his work asserted that what happens in a social studies methods course communicates to preservice teachers "what counts" in social studies education: the importance of the methods class -- in terms of what it communicates symbolically and literally in terms of what social studies teaching and learning is, was a central assumption in my research. Additionally, his contention that the absence of certain words from social studies teacher education spaces says *something* informed my choice in this chapter to examine the presence and absence of words in social studies methods syllabi. Lastly, Segall's arguments that the social studies teacher education courses he studied were places in which difference was almost irrelevant were important to the ways in which I conceived of approaching this research. Because I am interested in how issues around

women and gender inequity have been made almost irrelevant to social studies education, Segall's discussions about the exclusion of difference from the consideration of pedagogy -- and his descriptions about how that marginalization was achieved -- provided a framework for me to use as I examined the syllabi in my project.

Syllabi research can get published!

In addition to Segall's work in social studies teacher education and Foucault's concept of the apparatus, my work in this chapter is also informed by a study on multicultural course syllabi, conducted by Paul Gorski and published in *Teaching and teacher education* in 2009. In this article, Gorski's project was an analysis of syllabi collected from 45 multicultural education courses. Synthesizing frameworks for multicultural education created by Jenks et al. (2001), Grant and Sleeter (2006) and McLaren (1994) that place multicultural understandings in hierarchical categories ranging (generally) from *celebration* to *critical*, Gorski evaluated the course description and goal section of each of the syllabi, and categorized each text as falling on one place on the scale. Although, among other differences, I did not analyze the texts in my study in terms of a framework, Gorski's description of data collection and analysis, as well as his description of his findings and his use of textual examples to support his assertions, were important to me as I thought I about how I might begin the research I describe in this chapter. Additionally, (and not unimportantly) as the title of this section indicated, the fact that this kind of a research project could get published in a top-tier teacher education journal spurred me on when I doubted the value of this kind of a project.

Limitations

There are several limitations of examining course syllabi that are important to discuss from the outset. The most obvious, perhaps, is the potential for a gap between the written

syllabus and the enacted educational experience, to which the syllabus may only be related tangentially. In my own teacher education work, for example, at the end of a semester I have sometimes looked back on the original syllabus and found it to be almost unrecognizable from what actually occurred in terms of readings, assignments, and course objectives. It's important to note, however, that within this project, I am not making a claim about what did or did not happen in the courses from which I've collected syllabi. I trust that each of those spaces was much more dynamic, rich, and interesting than what could have ever possibly been represented in a course syllabus. Instead, the purpose of my analysis was to make an argument about what was and was not in the syllabi themselves - not because the syllabi can tell us exactly what happened in those classes, but because the syllabi can give us at least some insight into what was possible in those classes, and what ideas, practices, and goals were important enough to include in a plan for a social studies methods class. As Hammerness et al. (2005) contended in their review of teacher education, "Preparation programs deliberately and inadvertently reinforce the development of different kinds of teaching identities...Though not always explicitly considered, this aspect of preparation is critically important as the identities teachers develop shape...what obligations they see as intrinsic to their role (p. 384). Seeking what is deliberately and inadvertently reinforced in social studies teacher education - what is being made possible and important - is worth considering, especially for those of us who hope to encourage preservice teachers to see a commitment to equity as intrinsic to their roles as social studies teachers.

One of the biggest contributions that poststructural theory has made to qualitative research, in my opinion, is to aid us in asking some different kind of questions about schools and teaching and the ways we research those spaces. Andersen (2003) contended that poststructural theory, and in particular, Foucault's work, compels us to shift our questions from "being to

becoming" (p. xi). Applying this idea to my own research, and in this particular case, teacher education, means shifting the research questions from what is being done in teacher education classes to *how* social studies teacher education is making certain ideas possible and impossible. It means shifting the concern about what is happening to teacher education to challenging the norms in social studies teacher education. This is done by questioning the (unquestioned) status of social studies norms as "good" or "appropriate" or "right". This kind of research asks: what are our teacher education practices doing? How do they work? How have they become the "norm" in our field? What are they keeping us from thinking and doing?

As I have tried to do throughout this dissertation, I asked these questions not in an attempt to interpret the motivation of the authors of these syllabi, but in terms of what the syllabi themselves produce. Rose (1999) captured this idea when he argued that:

power relations and ethical imperatives put in play...need to be examined in their own terms. Against interpretation, then, I advocate superficiality, an empiricism of the surface, of identifying the differences in what is said, how it is said, and what allows it to be said and to have an effectivity. (p. 57)

This means that instead of trying to dive beneath the surface of the syllabi, I tried to stay on the surface of the texts and to think about their effects, which may or may not reflect what their authors intended. My goal in examining these syllabi was to consider how the syllabi themselves *contribute* to the normalization of practices and patterns in social studies education that constitute and reproduce existing systems that exclude gender and ways of thinking about students and teachers in all of their complex subject positions.

There is no amount of analysis that could reveal the 'truth' about what happened in the teacher education spaces that were connected with the syllabi I analyzed. No qualitative research

strategy, despite how rigorously applied, is going to solve this problem for us. Since the interpretive turn, we have no methodological or analytical tools that will insure that our analysis is "right". Any work research in teacher education, or any other kind of human activity, then, is merely an articulation (LaTour, 2004) about the spaces we research, not an accurate representation or a statement of truth about what happened within them. My choice to focus exclusively on the syllabi is not intended to be a definitive account of those courses. Indeed, instead of closing the door of definitiveness, my fervent wish is to use this research to open more doors and more spaces for us to engage in conversations about what is happening in those classes and why. Like Gorski (2009), however, I argue that these syllabi can tell us something about the teacher education classes and programs from which they emanated, no matter how different they are from the courses that were enacted. By asking *how* these syllabi make sense and what norms around social studies teaching and learning they reflect and reinscribe, they tell us something about how the normalized practices of social studies teaching are codified in teacher education syllabi. Course descriptions, mission statements, even assignments - they all construct preservice teachers as a certain kind of future teacher subject, and in doing so, tell us quite a lot about what social studies teacher education valorizes in social studies teaching.

As I have argued elsewhere in this dissertation, texts have effects (Fairclough, 2003). Texts are not the only component of teacher education that have effects, of course, but they are a part of the apparatus that have shaped the field in ways that have excluded the consideration of gender, as well as other equity related issues, in social studies teaching, learning, and curriculum. The syllabus as a text can only tell us part of the story about what happens in teacher education spaces: they reference just one knot on a complicated, ever-shifting, and interwoven discursive fabric. But they are texts. And as MacLure (2003) has reminded me again and again, all texts

are fabrications. "There is writing" (2003, p. 88) in a syllabus, and therefore, even the most seemingly straightforward and matter of fact syllabus -- through its description of the course or a lesson plan assignment -- deploys and assembles particular ways of seeing the world and of seeing social studies learning and teaching.

Content Analysis & Data Analysis

Building on poststructural ideas of discourse as a regulating force of what is possible and impossible, I conducted a content analysis of social studies methods syllabi collected from 39 teacher education programs across the country. Schwandt (2007) described content analysis as a method of comparing, contrasting and categorizing the data in texts. Although this kind of research has historically been associated with quantitative strategies -- such as counting specific words -- Marshall and Rossman (2006) described contemporary content analysis strategies "as a method for describing and interpreting the artifacts of a society or group" (p. 108). My own approach to content analysis was informed by Prior's (2003) book, titled *Using documents in social research*. In this description of using texts as data, Prior uses poststructural theories from Derrida and Foucault, among others, to frame the reading and interpretation of documents as contextual, contingent, and partial. For example, he encouraged researchers to avoid thinking about texts as stable and pre-determined, and instead, to consider them in terms of "networks of action" (p. 2). This poststructural approach to content analysis, which encourages uncertainty while also emphasizing the power of text, was well-suited to my interest in how methods syllabi might work toward reinscribing some ideas about social studies while dismissing others.

Creating the dataset.

Building on Prior's (2003) directive to textual analysts that "the reasons for including and excluding cases ought to be defined in advance of any study. It is simply not good enough to select cases that fit an hypothesis, and to ignore those that do not" (p. 150), prior (☺) to selection I established the following criteria for the syllabi to be collected in this study:

- 1) Must be a syllabus for a course with a primary focus on teaching social studies.
- 2) Syllabus must contain a description of the course.
- 3) Syllabus must be for a course taught since 2005

The purpose of the first two criteria were to insure that the syllabi included in the dataset would provide enough detail to be analyzed for what they could tell us about social studies methods instruction. The focus on syllabi published since 2005 was intended to insure that these syllabi would represent what is happening in social studies currently, not what has happened in the past⁶⁸.

Bringing Mad Google Skills to Academe: A Positive Alternative to Stalking.

In order to cast the widest net, or in qualitative speak, to select "a small sample with great diversity" (Patton, 1990, p. 172), I kept my search open to syllabi from undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as methods courses directed at teaching at any PK-12 grade level. The majority of the syllabi I collected were identified through a Google search. Keeping in mind my goal to collect a diverse set of syllabi in terms of geographical location and school type, I used the phrase "Social studies methods" (in quotation marks) to begin my search. Adding

⁶⁸ I did, however, include one syllabus not meeting all of these criteria. This was a course titled, "Diversity and social studies curriculum", taught at Teachers College. Although this course was not a traditional methods course, I included it because it did focus on social studies teaching, as evidenced, for example, by a major course assignment that required the development of a lesson plan. In addition, I included this syllabi because I'm interested in using this research project to open up a conversation about preparing teachers differently than we have in the past. In order to do things we differently, we perhaps need atypical examples of courses that might help think about social studies methods courses differently. A social studies course that focuses on social studies teaching and learning and diversity doesn't look the same as the other methods syllabi included in this dataset, but if we're going to do things differently, things can't look the same.

words like "syllabus" and "course expectations" and "semester", when searching within college and university websites, I was able to locate syllabi from diverse schools and geographical locations. Only syllabi that did not meet my pre-established criteria for inclusion were eliminated.

I searched very broadly for any syllabi that fit the above criteria, but because I was particularly interested in including syllabi from every geographical region in the United States, I used U.S. Census region categories to attempt to find syllabi from schools in each of the four regions of the United States it designates. In other words, I looked at this map from time to time and did searches within regions from which I had fewer sample syllabi. The table below indicates the distribution of institutions across each Census region.

Table 3

Syllabi across U.S. Census regions

Northeast	Midwest	South	West
4	15	13	8

I was also interested in including syllabi from instructors/scholars who are highly regarded within the field of social studies education or who work in well-known social studies programs in their Colleges of Education. Sadly, there is not a list titled "Best social studies education programs in the country". However, the annual *U.S. News and World Report* (Best Education Schools, 2012) does rank graduate programs in Education, so I used their list of top ten ranked elementary and secondary education programs as a basis to insure that there were syllabi from leading education programs universities in my dataset. Table 4 shows the 2011-2012 USNWR Rankings.

Table 4

US News and World Report Best Education Schools 2011-2012

Elementary Education		Secondary Teacher Education	
Rank	School	Rank	School
1	Michigan State University	1	Michigan State University
2	Teachers College	2	Stanford University
3	University of Wisconsin-Madison	3	University of Wisconsin-Madison
4	Vanderbilt University	4	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
5	University of Washington	5	University of Georgia
6	University of Georgia	6	University of Illinois-Champaign
7	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	7	Teachers College
8	Indiana University-Bloomington	8	Ohio State University
9	Stanford University	9	University of Washington
10	University of Illinois-Champaign	10	Indiana University-Bloomington

Finding online syllabi from those schools ranked top ten in elementary and secondary education programs was challenging. I searched each of the schools' websites individually but was only able to retrieve online syllabi from the University of Georgia, the University of Michigan, and Stanford. In order to fulfill my desire to include an adequate number of syllabi from leading Colleges of Education in my sample, I used contacts and acquaintances to acquire several elementary and secondary syllabi from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Michigan State University and the diversity course syllabus from Teachers College. The seven syllabi I acquired through solicitation represent 18% of the total number of syllabi in the dataset.

In an effort to include sample syllabi for students across the PK-12 education setting, I included syllabi from any type of social studies methods course that was aimed at preparing teachers at any PK-12 level. Table 5 below provides information about the distribution of syllabi by grade level preparation.

Table 5⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Not every syllabi included specific information about the grade level for which teachers were being prepared, which makes sense as the students in these classes were likely to know why they were enrolled in the class. In cases

Syllabi by grade level preparation

Elementary Pre-K-5 or 6	Elementary-Middle 4-9	Middle-Secondary 6-12	PK-12
14	3	23	1

In addition to including elementary, middle and secondary programs, I also wanted to make sure I had a sample that included different types of schools. Taking heed of Conklin's (2009) suggestion that the context in which the teacher education program is delivered (research institution, liberal arts college, etc.) can impact the learning experience, I used the classification designations established by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>) to insure that my dataset would include schools of different sizes (large, medium, small), public and private schools, and the basic Carnegie classification, which categorizes institutions as either research schools (very high research activity, high research activity, and research) or institutions that focus primarily on teaching (referred to by Carnegie as masters and baccalaureate-focused schools). Tables 4-6 represent the distribution of syllabi on the basis of institution size, public or private governance, and basic Carnegie classification.

Table 6

Syllabi by Institution Size

Large (> 10,000 full-time students)	Medium (3,000-10,000)	Small (1,000 - 3,000)	Very Small (<1,000)
33	2	4	1

where the grade level information was not explicit, I looked more deeply into the syllabus for clues. For example, one elementary syllabus was identified as being intended for K-6 preservice teachers through the reading list, which dealt exclusively with elementary social studies topics, articles, books, and concerns.

Table 7

Syllabi by public/private governance

Public	Private
27	13

Table 8

Syllabi by Basic Carnegie Classification

Very High Research Activity	High Research Activity	Research	Masters	Baccalaureate
21	7	2	8	2

There are a total of 39 syllabi in the dataset: there are more than one syllabi from the following schools: Indiana/Purdue University, Michigan State University, Stanford, University of Georgia, University of Michigan, University of Texas, and University of Wisconsin-Madison. In tables 1-6, each syllabus was included once. This means, for example, that the two syllabi included from the University of Georgia were counted twice toward the large, public, and very high research activity totals.

Before describing the process I went through to select syllabi for the dataset, I feel it's important to note that in the description and analysis of these syllabi, I have not used the names of the instructors in the citations. The decision was informed largely by my theoretical commitment to poststructural conceptions of discourse. As I have noted earlier in this dissertation, Foucault (1994) argued that the author accesses discourses that proceed what she or he or writes and therefore, a single subject can't be positioned as the originator of a particular idea. As I described in Chapter 3, Bakhtin (1981) contended that "in the makeup of almost every

utterance spoken by a social person...a significant number of words can be identified that are implicitly or explicitly admitted as someone else's....The utterance so conceived is a considerably more complex and dynamic organism than it appears when construed simply as a thing that articulates the intention of the person uttering it (pp. 354-55). In many ways, actually, these syllabi are a literal example of this idea from Bakhtin, as the tradition of passing on syllabi from instructor to instructor, and the quite liberal borrowing of syllabi text that occurs in academia, has not only been an aspect of my own teacher education experience but is, I believe, quite well spread. In any case, my theoretical commitment disrupts the possibility any one person "authored" these syllabi. Therefore, in this chapter and in the bibliography, I cited the syllabi by the names of the institutions from which they emanated.

Sampling Method: Constructing and deconstructing.

The benefit of this type of purposeful random sampling -- in which the focus is on creating a small but diverse dataset -- is that the size contributes to the production of detailed description of the data, while the diversity of the dataset creates the possibility of identifying "shared patterns that cut across cases and derive their significance from having emerged out of heterogeneity" (Patton, 1990, p. 172). Within the qualitative research world, this kind of sampling strategy is valuable for its credibility because of its randomness (i.e., I did not select syllabi with prior knowledge of what would be in them) and it reduces the possibility that only certain cases were chosen for study. The weakness of the strategy, however, is that it is not representative and not generalizable.

As may be detectable from the distancing moves I am making here -- with phrases like "in the qualitative world" -- I have some issues with these kinds of positivistic assessments of different qualitative research techniques that would seem to make some sampling strategies more

likely to get us closer to the "truth" than others. The caveat that Patton (1990) provides in his description of sampling techniques - in which he noted that purposeful sampling is credible, but not representative or generalizable -- is particularly interesting to me. I may tell you that because of my sampling strategy and its limitations, my (forthcoming) analysis of the syllabi should not be interpreted as representative of all of social studies teacher education, but I can't help think that, in the absence of a detailed investigation of all of the other social studies teacher education research out there, you are likely to generalize my findings onto the whole field. To believe that authors can prevent the reader from generalizing simply by warning that the sample is not representative seems to stand in the face of what is known about how persuasive and authoritative the written word can be.

So why did I include of this, you ask? First, I wanted to demonstrate that I could do this kind of sampling description. Secondly, although I may not completely buy into these kinds of (what I suspect are) positivistic descriptions of data collections, I do believe in the importance of rigor. In my data collection strategies, rigor can be defined as a search for data that is systematic, thorough, and reflects a commitment to my theoretical perspective, which compels me to trouble the commonsense of the decisions made in process of data collection. St. Pierre (2011) captured this kind of idea about rigor in her most recent contribution to the *Handbook of Qualitative Research*: "By rigor, I mean the demanding work of freeing oneself from the constraints of existing structures" (p. 620). Defined this way, rigor, and what it looked like in the data collection process, is more difficult to describe. The preceding description of the actions I took to create this dataset is intended, therefore, not to provide the foundation for the "truth" of the analysis that will follow, but to provide some insight into the rigor of the process through

which the syllabi were collected and what shaped my decisions as I spent one very long Friday night trolling the internet for syllabi.

My purpose in constructing the dataset (because it was indeed constructed through my conscious and unconscious choices) was to collect a set of syllabi that were diverse enough to inhibit any suspicion that what I found in these samples was possible only because of what part of the country they came from, what kinds of schools they were from, or for which grade-level preservice teachers they were intended. In other words, I was trying to head off the nay-sayers by including syllabi from enough different contexts to deny the possibility that what I have to say about them can be dismissed on the basis that they were isolated or idiosyncratic examples of what is happening in social studies teacher education classrooms right now. Every decision made in the data collection process was made with that purpose in mind.

The case of the closet positivist: Word counts as data

I think that the concern about both the possibilities and limitations of what syllabi can tell us about social studies teacher education is worth revisiting before I begin describing the appearance of particular words in the social studies syllabi, which is the first category of data I'm going to explore in this chapter. Of course, the presence of particular words in a syllabus, whether considered in terms of numerical data or in a close reading of the kind of work they are doing, tells us nothing about the use or avoidance of particular words in the actual social studies teacher education classes that were related to these syllabi. A syllabi replete with references to social justice, for example, tells us very little about the pervasiveness of social justice ideals in the enacted teacher education course. By contrast, I think it is also important to note, the absence of equity-oriented language in a syllabi does not indicate the total absence of an equity orientation in the classroom with which the syllabi it was associated. As Gorski (2009) pointed

out in his discussion of multicultural education course syllabi, "it is reasonable to believe...that some professors or instructors consciously used depoliticized language⁷⁰ in course descriptions, despite their intention to engage deeply politicized frames once their students were before them" (p. 309). Gorski noted that he had engaged in exactly that kind of activity in his teacher education work and I have as well. So, again, I want to stress that what appears in the syllabi does not close the door on what might have possibly happened in these teacher education spaces.

As I argued above, however, what appears in these syllabi does tell us something about what is acceptable, what is official, and what is being made normal through the frequency (or lack of frequency) of its appearance in social studies method course syllabi. The words used in these texts provided cues, traces and recurrent linguistic features that could indicate a particular discourse is at work (Sunderland, 2004) in the social studies community of practice (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992). Therefore, to exclude syllabi from a consideration of the discourse of social studies education -- because what happens when a teacher educator closes the classroom door and starts teaching class might be different than what is prescribed in the syllabi -- would exclude a potentially rich resource that can tell us something about what is important enough to claim and frame in the field's official and most public spaces.

This really hit home for me this semester while listening to a colleague talk about an experience he had while teaching a masters level social studies methods class. While discussing the three assigned readings for the week, a male student pointed to the fact that all of the articles had been authored by women and asked, "Did you do this on purpose?". The faculty member, also male, was surprised by the inquiry, and responded with what I think was a very insightful question: "What lesson would that have been intended to teach had it been as you think it was?". In recounting the story to me, he said that they responded that they weren't sure, but that it

⁷⁰ See discussion of civility in Chapter 5!

"seemed like something he'd do to see if they noticed". This faculty member pointed out to me that these weren't the only female authors assigned during the semester but I think it's worth noting in this story that the assignment of women authors is something that caught this male student's attention and was interpreted, potentially, as some specific kind of move. It's an example of the ways that syllabus-related decisions can be read by students, or by researchers, as lessons that we teach.

Welcome to TextSTAT.

I used textual analysis software called TextSTAT to identify and count the words used in the syllabi. This was done by copying and pasting all of syllabi into a single text document and then uploading that document into the TextSTAT program, which allowed me to generate a list of every word that appears in the dataset as well as frequency count of each word. There were 10,764 unique words in the data and the software made it possible to place them in a distribution array of their frequency rank from 1 to 4811. "The" is the word that occurred most frequently within the dataset: it appeared exactly 4800 times⁷¹.

Although access to this information about texts is pretty cool, at least in my opinion, what TextSTAT cannot do is explain the significance of the abundant or sparse appearance of particular words in the text. In order to consider what the frequency of particular words might tell us about the norms of social studies teacher education, it was necessary to think about the use of these words as markers of particular discourses. TextSTAT is not sophisticated enough to

⁷¹ A perhaps more interesting example of what this software can do is a just a brief discussion of the presence of words related to the disciplines that comprise social studies and their frequency in the syllabi: "history" appears in the corpus 343 times and is ranked 44th in overall frequency, while the next most frequently occurring word naming a social studies discipline -- "geography" -- occurred only 51 times, and is ranked 334th. Of course, this is complicated by the fact that the occurrence of a word like "civics" could mark either a reference to the discipline that might alternatively be labeled "political science" or "government", so it's difficult to compare the references to disciplines in the data in a straightforward way. But that's not what I'm interested in anyway, of course. If you are reading to the last sentence of every footnote, you probably know that already, so I apologize for stating the obvious but applaud you for your thoroughness.

infer meaning from the use of the words or to identify the nuances of language that make it possible for words to be intelligible. The advantage of looking at the numerical frequency of certain words, however, is that it allows researchers to transcend the *feeling* that certain words keep popping up or that certain words are missing. Because I was working with a relatively sizable textual dataset, the TextSTAT software made it possible to move beyond the suspicion that certain discursive markers were there or not: instead, I directed my efforts to looking at how specific words were used and considering the cumulative impact of particular terms on social studies discourse.

In the analysis that follows, then, I used a couple of different strategies. First, I chose some words that were markers of particular discourses, and then analyzed them within TextSTAT results as a kind of brute data (St. Pierre, 2011⁷²). Counting the number of times a word appears in the text is not a strategy that is typically used in poststructural research. The problem with brute data, according to St. Pierre is that the analysis of it can treat words as if they are "transparent, neutral, independent of theory" (p. 621), a troubling positivistic practice that characterizes much of qualitative research and certainly doesn't align with other poststructural research methods. Treating words as having a transparent meaning is problematic, she argued, because "words are always thinkable, sayable, and writeable...only in particular grids of intelligibility" (p. 621). My task, then, in order to remain aligned with my theoretical commitments, was to understand the work that the words were doing (and to keep my predilection for the positivist assurance of "truth-by-numbers" firmly in the closet, where it belongs). In order to do this, I conducted close readings of the texts surrounding the words and tried to understand the grids of intelligibility in which they appeared. In other words, I used

⁷² I cite St. Pierre here because this is where I got the word to describe this kind of data, not because she endorses the use of the brute data. Read on for more information about this.

TextSTAT to generate some numbers about the data and to help me in locating where the words were used in the text, but my responsibility as a poststructural researcher was to avoid representing or describing the numbers in ways that positioned them as "transparent, neutral, [or] independent of theory". So while using TextSTAT was different than the discourse analysis methods I used in previous chapters, the close reading of the texts and my effort to try to think about how they made sense and what they produced was very similar to the analysis I used for the lesson plans in Chapters 4-6. In the next section, I describe some of the brute TextSTAT data around the most commonly occurring words in the dataset, as well as the occurrences of the words *gender*, *difference*, and *women*. (I also analyzed of the presence of *race*, *multiculturalism*, and *equity*: this analysis is included in the appendix). I also provide a description and analysis of the contexts in which those words appeared.

Gender...and difference

Because the focus of this dissertation is, in case you didn't know, the discourse around gender and women in social studies education, I began the search by searching for those two words. Building on Segall's (2002) discussion of the absence of "difference" from the teacher education program he researched, I also looked at the use of that word. The word form "gender" (including genders and gendered) occurred in the corpus 15 times, which ranks 1223rd in usage within the dataset, appearing the same number of times as words like "immediately", "Madison", and "software". Gender appears in 11 of the 39, or 28%, of the syllabi. In order to understand the context in which the word used, I examined the text around each occurrence of the word. Among the 15 instances that gender appears, it is used twice in reference to an institutional policy on harassment. References to assignments that require students to identify demographic

information about populations they are studying include two instances of gender, as it was one of the categories students were responsible for listing in the assignment.

The most common usage (n=5) of the word gender is related to instances in which it used in a list of professional expectations or in reference to an institution's mission. In each of these kinds of uses, the word gender appears in a laundry list of other identity markers for which preservice teachers are responsible for keeping in mind. For example, the syllabus from Pacific University (2011) states that preservice teachers need to "[c]ommunicate in a professional manner that demonstrates sensitivity to differences in age, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, gender, and ability" (p. 2). The attention to "differences" in this way, is worth examining further here, not only in the context of this specific syllabus, but because this kind of list and the way it attends to differences was common throughout the syllabi (although gender was not always included). Additionally, it is relevant because although the search for the word "difference" yielded 18 occurrences (ranking 892nd in frequency), only three of those instances could be described (generously) as using the word in a way that refers to differences among people in terms of broad social categories like race, class or gender (including the instance I've described above). Therefore, in order to think about how "difference" is addressed in these syllabi, the analysis will have to exceed the use of the word itself to think about how difference is produced around other discursive markers.

First, I propose that the kind of subject produced in this "be sensitive" instruction can come to be known through the consideration of the binaries upon which the list draws. In other words, does a class filled with students who are non-traditionally aged, who don't speak English as a first language, and who are physically challenged, for example, need to be reminded to be sensitive to Others who share these subjectivities? In general, discourses in our culture that

instruct us to be sensitive (or tolerant) to Others are not generally directed within-group. So, through this list of differences, the people to whom this statement was directed begin to become visible - this is an instruction for the prototypical young adult, White, monolingual, and abled preservice student. From this perspective, the inclusion of gender is interesting. As the majority of preservice teachers and teachers are women, the instruction to be sensitive to gender differences could be perceived as out of place: "women" are typically the side of the gender binary that people (men) are instructed to be sensitive to. The inclusion of gender in this list could mean all kinds of things. Perhaps this class draws a lot of male students. Perhaps "gender" just sounds right in terms of the normalized discourses of what is supposed to be included on a list like this, an observation that brings into question the differences not included on this list (sexual orientation, religion, class, etc.). Are students not required to be sensitive who those who are "different" in this way?

My second observation about this statement is that the direction to "be sensitive" may appear to be as a straightforward, but it actually cloaks a number of questions that are highly relevant to teachers: What does it mean to be "sensitive" to these kind of differences? How does this sensitivity benefit the recipients? The teacher? And finally, why is this sensitivity necessary? What is it about people in these groups that requires attention and sensitivity to their differences? The absence of attention to these components of the enactment of sensitivity is important: it could indicate the glibness with which this instruction is given or, following the argument I made in Chapter 6, belies an assumption that preservice teachers already know all of the answers to these questions, as well as the strategies for being sensitive to people in these different groups in the appropriate ways.

Additionally, what does it mean for this sensitivity to difference to be linked to professionalism? As Coffey and Delamont (2000, p. 85) argued, "On a simple level, being 'professional' can be taken to mean doing one's job competently. However, it also has connotations of detachment and neutrality, being uncontroversial, apolitical". They further questioned the political nature of the term by noting that "some have argued that [professionalism] also carries connotations of being masculine" and that "the identification of gender equality...with fringe social and political movements (like feminism!) may also mean that occupations that consider themselves 'professions' will be reluctant to actively embrace and action such a goal" (p. 85). In this sense, then, the linking of professional behavior with sensitivities towards differences could mark it as part of an apolitical discourse about interacting with the Other: the lack of attention to the contexts of difference and what difference difference makes, both in this statement about sensitivity and across the syllabi in general, would appear to mark attention to difference as neutral and uncontroversial, although of course it is not.

In the rest of the dataset, the use of word gender in critical ways that might possibly be related to thinking about gender as a category of analysis (Scott, 1986) or as a topic for discussion, occurs five times. First, it appeared in the title of two assigned readings (among hundreds of listed readings) that might lend themselves to thinking about gender as a category of analysis. One reading is Crocco's 2001 piece titled "The missing discourse on gender and sexuality in the social studies". This reading was assigned in the diversity in social studies course at Teacher's College, where Crocco was on the faculty. The second reference to gender in a title appeared in the UGA elementary education syllabus in an assigned reading called "Fighting for American manhood: How gender politics provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars" (Hoganson, 1998). This book, written by a historian, relates the

causes of these wars to shifting understandings of manliness. There were no descriptions of how these pieces of literature were used in the course, however. The presence of the word "gender" in course-related content appears three times: gender and gender identity were the focal topics during one week in the Teachers College class (which, as a reminder, had an emphasis on diversity), and once in a list of topics to be addressed in one of the Michigan State (2010) syllabi: "Placing social issues into the curriculum" a case study in globalization, gender, and HIV/AIDS" (p. 2).

The only reference to gender as a subjectivity appeared in a different Michigan State (2009) syllabus, in which the instructor, in describing his orientation towards teaching, provided a list of different experiences and forces that have shaped him as a teacher. Among these experiences are his "experience as a gendered, raced, classed, national and other-categorized person". He then asked "*What aspects of your life shape the ways in which you approach teaching?*" (p. 2). This question, which invited students (at least rhetorically) to consider the ways in that their gender subjectivity (among other subjectivities) might shape their approach to teaching, is the only use of the word gender that positions the teacher educator and students in ways that makes gender relevant to teaching social studies. The foregrounding of this statement about subjectivity within the course description, and the invitation for students to consider the ways in which their own subjectivities might impact their teaching, created a markedly different approach to describing a course than was found in the rest of the syllabi. As McWilliam (1994) described, "the use of the term 'subjectivity' is highly significant for educational researchers because it signals a shift from understanding "persons" as coherent, rational, and unitary individuals to understanding them as fragmented, contradictory, and multiple "'subjects' " (p. 26). Although the focus in this reference to subjectivity in this syllabus is not on equity, this kind of

discursive marker does signal the opening of the space for students to consider the ways in which these subjective positions shape the experiences and options available to different people, and in doing so, opens the door to thinking about preparing to be social studies teachers in a different way.

Women.

The word "woman" does not occur in the text at all, but the word "women" appears seven times, which ranks 1780th in frequency. As a point of comparison "women" appears the same number of times as the word "eye" (as in make eye contact, read with a keen eye, etc.) within the corpus. The seven occurrences of word appear in 6 of the 39 syllabi (15%) included in the dataset. In a process similar to my exploration of "gender", I looked at each context in which the word was used, but in this case, each of the uses was different and therefore, it wasn't possible to establish categories. For example, in one instance of the word women, which appeared in the Brigham Young-Hawaii syllabus, it's used in reference to the dress code for preservice teachers: "The current dress code has been clearly interpreted in an address to the women on campus by Sister Wheelwright, wife to the President of BYUH" (p. 12).⁷³ This was the only reference to women that referenced dress.

The word appears twice in reference to an assigned reading for a methods class at Stanford (2010a) -- "Montgomery Bus Boycott and the Women Who Started It" (Robinson, 2001). It appears in another syllabus in a resource list of professional societies, in which the National Women's History Project website site address was included. It's used in a quote from Friere that appears at the beginning of one of the University of Texas syllabi -- "[education] becomes the practice of freedom the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality". Additionally, it also appears in one question - within a list of 40

⁷³ This is my favorite sentence in the dataset.

questions - that preservice teachers were assigned to ask a secondary student as a part of an interview: "Who are the three most historically significant women in history? Why?" (University of Kentucky, 2008, p. 8).⁷⁴

Finally, "women" appears in the course description of the Piedmont College syllabus (2009), in which the instructor states: "The major concentration will be content selection, lesson and unit planning, teaching methods, materials, and evaluation strategies. You will also increase your knowledge of American history, particularly regarding women and minorities who may have been underrepresented in history" (p. 1). Interestingly, a commitment to a focus on either women or people of color was not identifiable in the rest of this seven page syllabus, beyond the inclusion of *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (Banks, 2003) on the course bibliography and a focus on topics of diversity and reducing prejudice during the second week of the course. There are no other explicit indications about how gender would have been addressed.

For someone interested in the ways in which the marginalization of women, gender, and difference has been sustained by the social studies field, the very limited appearance of the words in these 39 syllabi is perhaps a story in itself. But by paying even closer attention to how those words were used in context, the potential for attention to these topics in social studies education methods courses is even less hopeful. For example, in a generous categorization of the words women or gender that appear in (single) reading assignments (Stanford 2010a; Teachers College, 2007; University of Georgia, 2007) course topics (Michigan State University, 2010; Piedmont College; Teachers College), or references to subjectivity (Michigan State University, 2009) as examples of sites in which the syllabi opened the space for some potential for gender to be

⁷⁴ In the description of the interview activity, it's noted that the interview assignment was originally developed by Levstik & Barton. Considering Levstik's career-long interest in gender, it's not surprising that this question would show up in an assignment she had a hand in developing.

discussed in critical and equity-oriented ways, I found only (mostly fleeting) examples to cite in only 6 of 39 syllabi.

So if attention to these issues is not present in the syllabi, then what is there? What are we telling out students that social studies is "about"? In the next section, I described Popkewitz's (2002) concept of the crystallization of knowledge, and then use that idea to analyze statements from two different syllabi that were representative of the of stories told about teaching practices and diversity in the dataset. In the conclusion, I noted some exceptions and posed some questions that the field needs to examine further in the future in order to make moves toward equity.

Enough about absence: Present discourses in social studies methods courses

In his discussion of the transformation of the disciplines into school subjects, Popkewitz (2002) argued that a kind of transformation, which he calls an alchemy, occurs. In this process, the disciplines are changed into "school subjects [that] are organized in relation to the expectations related to the school timetable, conceptions of childhood, and organization theories of teaching" (p. 262). After examining these syllabi, and being awed by their remarkable similarity to each other⁷⁵, I would argue that a similar alchemy occurs as the knowledge of the PK-12 classroom moves into the teacher education classroom. Just as an academic discipline like history is transformed into a PK-12 school subject around the expectations of school and child that Popkewitz described, the topics of teaching in a PK-12 classroom are similarly organized in relation to the expectations related to a college timetable, conceptions of preservice teachers, and theories of teaching preservice teachers. This transformation produces a type of

⁷⁵ Which brings to mind a question McWilliam (1994) asked in her book on teacher education: "Could the needs of pre-service teachers really be so predictable, given the diversity of personal life histories and the uncertainty about future clientele and work places?" (p. 48).

"crystallization of knowledge" (p. 262) that treats not only PK-12 social studies content, but the *teaching* of PK-12 social studies as a set of as secure, fixed pedagogical propositions.

While Popkewitz (2002) contended that "the linguistic quality of the words - *bodies*, *content*, *content coverage*, or *conceptual knowledge* -- treat disciplines as inert, unchanging, and unambiguous things that children learn" (p. 264), in this section, I argue that the linguistic quality of the words frequently present in these social studies syllabi - words like *lesson* (519 times, ranked 26th), *plan* (358 times, ranked 42nd), or *standards* (290 times, 53rd)-- treat the teaching practices of social studies, as well as the teachers teaching it and the students "learning" it, as inert, unchanging, and unambiguous. The ubiquitous-ness of these words in the texts are a marker of these discourses and I could complete a process similar to that described in the first half of the chapter and talk about the frequency of words related to the unambiguous presentation of social studies to conclude this chapter. However, in the next section of this chapter, I presented two more extended examples of unambiguousness in the syllabi. The purpose of this move is two-fold: first, it provides a brief glimpse into what it looks like when we *do* pay attention to a particular idea in social studies methods course syllabi and secondly, it illuminates the ways in which teaching and students become crystallized in methods coursework and in concepts of social studies teaching and learning more broadly.

Best Practice

The following excerpt from one secondary methods syllabus course description is the kind of sentence that could be found in almost any of other syllabi in the dataset:

The course is a practical teaching methods and curriculum course -- you will immediately begin working to apply its "best practices" -- and it emphasizes ways of reflecting on

these practices in order to understand and revise them, and to invent others. (Wisconsin, 2010a, p. 1)

I suspect that this kind of language will seem familiar to most educators who have either written or read an education course syllabus. I argue, however, that what seems like a straightforward and generic sentence about what a methods class is about can be examined more closely to consider what norms are produced and sustained through this course description. In particular, the specific focus on "best practices"⁷⁶, in the excerpt above as well as in the rest of these syllabi, warrants further attention.

The section of the syllabi titled, "Learning "best practice" lesson structures and developing lessons that use them", details the methods to be revisited or introduced in the course, including Socratic Seminars, Public Issues Discussions, Structured Academic Controversy, and Concept Formation. It also described an assignment in the class around two "best practices": for this task, the students were instructed to choose one of these "best practice" methods to investigate, view the modeling of the method, then read about it, develop their own lesson plans to implement it, and finally, teach it in their practicum classroom. The written aspect of the assignment asks students to briefly describe the lesson, explain their rationale "for why it is important for students to learn this content/skill" (p. 2), outline the lesson learning objectives, list materials, provide assessments and identify how the lesson will be adapted for ELL students and students on IEPs.

This description of a lesson plan assignment, although more detailed than many, is representative of the kind of planning assignments I found in almost every syllabi. It leads students through the traditional steps of translating a "best practice" method learned in a teacher

⁷⁶ I've used quotations marks around the phrase "best practice" purposively throughout the description of this syllabus first because that's how it was used the first time in this text and also because I want to challenge the idea that there is such a thing.

education environment to one that can be implemented in a PK-12 classroom. The thoroughness with which the process and assignment is described in this syllabus is exemplary in terms of tracing something that happens in a teacher education classroom directly to a practice that can occur in a high school classroom. The purposeful use of methods in a college course and the explicit framework for guiding preservice teachers through the process of applying the same practice in a secondary classroom is indeed a practical linkage between the university and the "real world".

That the methods listed here are positioned, unquestioningly, as "best practice", is what I want to trouble here. First, what does the term "best practice" convey? McWilliam (1994) argued that "what is important in official discourse is to occupy the high moral ground by colonizing "good" terminology - e.g., competence, quality, excellence....Critique of any stated position or policy is, by implication, dubious when it apparently refuses such patently good choices" (p. 18). Building on this idea, I question what space this list of best practices creates for the challenging of these practices, not just in terms of how they might be tweaked for 8th graders versus seniors, but in terms of what and who they produce? How does the presentation of a list of best practices contribute to the agency of preservice teachers to think about how these very methods might actually foreclose or constrain the classroom interactions that they would seek to facilitate? Furthermore, does the foregrounding of "best practices" obscure the important work of considering specific purposes or goals for social studies? Best practices in which circumstances, for which teachers, and for which students? Best practices based on which ideology of the purposes of teaching and learning?

Positioning these methods as best practice crystallizes them in a way that constrains the option to open up these methods for critique - instead, it presents these methods as the "inert,

unchanging, and unambiguous" best methods available to teacher educators and to the students. Of course, shortcomings of these methods and discussions of the contexts in which they would be more or less successful were, I would imagine, taken up in this teacher education classroom as a part of the modeling and reflecting process. In fact, in the directions for the last stage of this assignment, the preservice teachers are told to "critically reflect on how it worked, and then prepare the final revised plan, accompanying student artifacts, and an entry slip for your portfolio" (p. 2). Although this is a very familiar instruction for the final step of a lesson plan assignment, I believe that it points to the normalization of a particularly thin kind of reflection in teaching practice which is focused on the practice itself -- reflection that would seem to be almost completely detached from those who experienced it and what it made impossible or possible for them.

Additionally, I would argue that the linear presentation of a series of simplistic steps that a teacher moves through learning how to implement a method - read about it, watch it, enact it, revise it and hand it in with some artifacts - lends itself to the assessment of teachers on the enactment of the practice in ways that could be "standardized and controlled, monitored and checked" (Coffey & Delamont, 2000, p. 80)⁷⁷. Teaching methods this way would indeed seem to reinforce the idea that the proficient mastery of methods can supersede any other factors that would determine how it works in any given classroom, playing into discourses about teachers and teaching quality that McWilliam (1994) described (prophetically) over 15 years ago as "increasingly articulated through new technocratic and bureaucratic vocabularies that [leave] many assumptions about teaching and learning unexamined" (p. 9).

⁷⁷ This kind of regulation is "discipline" as Foucault (1975/1995) described it in *Discipline and Punish* and also intersects with the kind of governmentality propagated by neoliberalism, as described by Rose (1999)

It is important, for several reasons, to note that in this lesson plan assignment, students were instructed to detail the ways their "best practice" lessons were adapted for English learners and students on IEPs. First, that students who are labeled ELL or have an IEP are some of the most surveilled students in a school - in terms of extensive record keeping and assessment - is not just coincidental to my argument about the relationship between best practices and the avenues it creates for monitoring teachers. Secondly, though, I want to point out that there was no direction for the students to consider any other student subjectivities and how they impacted either the planning or implementation of the lesson. This is not to say, of course, that the particular concerns of ELL students or those students on IEPs are unimportant. Of course they are, and in fact this assignment was one of the few I found in any syllabi that drew specific attention to either of these categories of students. What I want to argue, however, is that these are not the *only* categories to which to encourage preservice teachers to consider and attend. The absence of a requirement that students interrogate the impact of broader subjectivities (like for example, gender, race, class, sexuality, religion, nationality, abledness) in their implementation of the prescribed practices, produces a *flattening* of the classroom: by this, I mean that it drains the very three-dimensional reality of the classrooms in which these activities were implemented, in all their complexity, nuance, and temporality, into a very flat representation of what occurred, where only the assessable "best practice" method remains visible.

Social Studies for All Students.

In this excerpt from a course description (Michigan, 2006, p. 1), some attention to students' difference was acknowledged:

Stop for a second and think about the complications involved in making history and the social studies accessible to *all students*. For example, think about the variety and range

of content in history, political science [etc.]. And, then think about the variety and range of students we teach - adolescents who enter our classrooms with different backgrounds, experiences, desires, abilities, intentions, and needs. Then think about all the different ways we might design instruction and I think you can see how teaching social studies is filled with complicated choices, challenges, dilemmas and instructional problems.

(emphasis added)

However, by framing students' "variety and range" in terms of "background, experiences, desires, abilities, intentions and needs" (p. 1) race, class, and gender and the structural processes that create some of those differences in background, experiences, etc., are masked. Although this description of social studies teaching and students presents the diversity of both the social sciences and students as a double whammy, I contend that that it produces another double whammy: this description attends to student diversity in a way that crystallizes difference in terms of the individual⁷⁸ (as indicated by the very individualized concepts of experience, desire, and ability, for example) and therefore resists embedding these differences in an inequitable society. Additionally, the need to respond to student diversity is positioned as a "challenge, dilemma and problem". The binary upon which this draws is that if students were just more like us or all the same, teaching social studies would be easier.

The diversity of students is referred to only one other place in the description of the three teaching problems that frame the work in the course: "How can developing teachers make social studies content accessible to all students?" (p. 1, emphasis added). Who "all students" are, or how content might be made accessible to different groups of students, is not addressed in the rest of this eight page syllabus. For example, issues of diversity or diverse students are not alluded to in any of the 20 stated course objectives, in the 14 "Central Concepts " of the course (which does

⁷⁸ The atomization of individuals is often interpreted as a characteristic of neoliberalism (Rose, 1999).

include terms like instructional coherence, backward design, assessment & evaluation), or in any of the session topics, or subtopics, in the week-to-week schedule. In her analysis of a standards document in mathematics education, Parks (2007, p. 3) demonstrated that although the term "all students" appeared in the section of a standards document that attended explicitly to equity -- i.e. "all students should have access to an excellent and equitable mathematic program" -- the phrase "all students" was not used in reference to standards that related to the mastery of mathematics content. In this syllabus, as well as in the vast majority of the other syllabi in this study, the appearance of references to diversity was very similar: a reference to diversity or social justice often appeared in vague references to a mission or philosophy statement or as one item in a list of broad statements about the purpose of the course, but it was absent in references to the actual teaching of social studies and what preservice teachers were going to learn. References to diversity were, by and large, presented without any acknowledgement of relationship between diversity and the how and what students learn.

This is not to say that the specific needs of a diverse student population or what diversity means were *not* discussed in this class (or in the others that only briefly addressed difference or didn't address it at all). But the attention paid to diversity in the syllabus -- in the reference about the ways it complicates teacher choices and the brief, seemingly obligatory reference to making content accessible to all students - was not expanded on or explained and seems almost entirely unrelated to what is described in the rest of the syllabus. This kind of attention to diversity or subjectivity as a kind of lip service to what must be said and as divorced from the actual doing of social studies - either in our description of it in relation to describing what social studies is in a syllabi or from the activities in which we engage students in class -- signals the same kind of separation between teaching and thinking about the Other that Segall described in his research of

a teacher education classroom in Canada. Additionally, it fixes difference in terms of individualized experiences “without problematizing the meaning of these issues in relation to how power is produced” (Lenz Taguchi, 2005, p. 252). This is problematic in terms of thinking about how social studies education and teacher education might become sites where equity issues, gender or otherwise, are foregrounded. If our discussion of student difference ignores power and the inequitable social structures that distribute it unequally, how do we engage preservice teachers in the consideration of the ways that equity and power might play out in their own social studies teaching and with their own students? If, pedagogy, as discussed by Lather, (1991, p. 15), “focuses attention on the conditions and means through which knowledge is produced”, what conditions and means of knowledge production are we *not* asking students to attend to when we fail to require them to think about themselves and who they are teaching and how that impacts any lesson?

Exceptional Exceptions.

Of course, as with every other point I've tried to make about the unanimity of these syllabi, there were a few exceptions. For example, in stark contrast to a number of syllabi which clearly situated the methods class as “practical”, one syllabi drew upon the practice/theory binary to situate the purpose of the course: “Let me say one thing from the beginning: I believe in theory...I believe teachers have a responsibility to be deeply aware of their own pedagogy and its impact on students” (St. Joseph's, 2009, p. 1). Further in the description, the instructor stated, “At no point will I give you a raft of activities that may or may not work” (p. 2). Also within the course description is the contention that “it's impossible to deliver a perfect class every day”(p. 1). I think that these ideas, centered in the syllabi's course description, provide a alternative orientation toward a methods course than those I've described above. The foregrounding of

theory, the acknowledgement of the need to consider the impact of pedagogy on students, and the acknowledgement of the un-achievability of perfect class on a daily basis, are three characteristics of this course description that made it significantly different from the others in the dataset. Although other aspects of this syllabus, like the description of a lesson plan assignment, were similar to what appeared in many of these courses, this course description sends a different signal to the reader than the syllabi that indicate that the purpose of the course is to familiarize the students with "best practices" in social studies. It troubles the idea of the achievement of a "best practice" from the onset. It also unabashedly centers theory as relevant to teaching. In the same way that I argued that the unambiguous presentation of "best practices" in the Wisconsin syllabus foreclosed questioning them, this syllabus forecloses, to some extent, the role of theory. Although students in teacher education communities have many resources upon which to draw to resist the centering of theory over practice, this attempt to reverse the practice/theory binary is a type of discursive technique that is trying to access a different discourse about what social studies teaching and learning should be.

Similarly, one Michigan State syllabi (2009) also makes explicit moves to disrupt some methods course norms. In this text, the instructor noted that "I don't necessarily expect that we will agree upon what good teaching looks like" (p. 2). Further in the course description, the approach to teaching strategies is discussed explicitly: "While [instructional techniques] may seem like the most important part of the course to you -- indeed, you may equate instructional techniques with teaching at this point in your career -- you will see that here, too, there is some ambiguity. Teaching always happens within circumstances that are determined by events on several levels" including national policy as well as "the children who are in our classrooms" (emphasis added, p. 3). These un-crystallizing statements, I believe, represent a significant and

noteworthy shift from the discourse about practice and students circulating in the rest of the dataset. They speak to Kumashiro's (2001) assertion that:

Students are never exactly who we think they are, they never come from exactly where we think they do, and they never respond exactly as expected...an anti-oppressive education that expects crisis for both student and teacher may need to create a space in the curricula where students can enter and work through crisis in ways unforeseeable by the teacher. Unfortunately, what happens in classrooms is often not crisis, and not change, but rather, repetition and comfort. (p. 8)

The *absence* of ambiguity from syllabi that list best practice or in descriptions of the monolithic-ness of diversity is troublesome if Kumashiro's comments about what an anti-oppressive education would require are to be taken seriously. Lesson plan assignments that require students to plot out either a hypothetical learning experience or record a real one "need space for the unpredictable and uncontrollable things that always get in the way of knowing our students and achieving our objectives" (Kumashiro, p. 10), but as I have tried to document in this brief section of the chapter, there would appear to be a serial aversion to unpredictability or uncontrollability in most of these syllabi and the way we explain social studies teaching within them. In other words, the alchemy we as teacher educators have used to translate what we know about schools and children and teaching and the world into the syllabus -- the translation that creates the scaffolding for a teacher education class -- seems to have stripped away the ambiguity from each of these domains.

Conclusion

How might ambiguity be acknowledged in social studies teacher education in ways that would work toward thinking about social studies teaching in a more complex way, or as

McWilliam (1994) described, "to provide the conditions for a mutual examination of the many inconsistencies and contradictions in versions of teacher work generated over time and from one individual to another" (p. 110)? As I have argued elsewhere in this dissertation, poststructural theory, with its focus on contingency and partialness, has something valuable to offer the field. Particularly relevant to this chapter is the poststructural orientation towards questioning what seems normal, which in this case might mean questioning the particular orientation towards social studies teaching practice as a set of skills or "repertoire" that can be mastered, and the common sense with which this idea was communicated across these methods syllabi. As Kumashiro (2001) noted, poststructural theories have the potential to urge us "to look beyond the repetition of commonsense and tradition that often helps perpetuate multiple forms of oppression in schools and society" (p. 11).

Additionally, attention in social studies to poststructural theories about subjectivity would aid greatly the complexity with which we describe teaching and learning, whether in the language we use in the syllabi or the language we use in teacher education classrooms. Building on Gay's (2003) research about the absence from race in social studies teacher education method texts and her assertion that "it is difficult to [imagine] the reasons that authors of [social studies teacher education methods] textbooks might provide for giving such little attention to race and racism in their constructions of social studies education" (p. 145), I would argue that we all need to ask ourselves how the lack of attention to any subjectivity has become normalized in social studies teacher education discourses. The content and curriculum of social studies provides a rich context for these ideas to be addressed. In our field, we can not only talk with preservice teacher about how to engage issues of student difference in the classroom, but we can also talk about teaching social studies with and through these differences (Segall, 2002) because "power,

representation, identity, and voice - are not only pertinent to social education and research conducted in it, but are fundamental to (and always inherent in) both" (Segall, 2004, p. 161).

But without at least some attention to subjectivity and the will to provide a rich context in which to consider the production of difference and power, it's difficult to see how the field might engage equity in efficacious ways in teacher education.

The syllabi I've described in this chapter tell a story to our preservice teachers about what social studies teaching is and what they should be concerned about it in the teaching of it.

Although, as I discussed in the first half of the chapter, there is an absence of the kind of words that would explicitly acknowledge power, the story we are telling them is indeed imbued with power. This idea was captured by Segall & Gaudelli (2007), who in their description of teacher education spaces, argued that "It's not the that the social and political are not there - they are so much there that their existence, indeed prevalence, is what makes them seem natural, neutral, apolitical, and social" (p. 89). In order to start telling a different story in teacher education -- one that has the "concomitant commitments to opposing systematic injustices and inequality" of which Coffey & Delamont spoke in the opening quote -- we can no longer languish in the comfort afforded by ignoring the role of power in the story we are telling preservice teachers about what social studies teaching is.

CHAPTER 8

I AM GENDER AND SO CAN YOU

The kinds of discursive devices I've described in this dissertation are subtle. The ways in which they might work against gender equity are not clear cut or entirely self-evident. In their description of onus placed on feminists to reveal a patriarchal regime, Gibson-Graham (2006) described techniques of dominance as

practices and conditions [that] were often subtle rather than blatant, slippery rather than firm, invisible as well as visible, or visible only from particular locations. It was no simple matter to "reveal" their existence, tangled as they were...[in] the always different contexts that produced the specificity of their forms of existence. (p. 10)

In other words, the kind of language that regulates particular ways of thinking about addressing gender and excluding others, in social studies as well as our broader discursive communities, do not always announce themselves with the kind of smoking-gun presence that leaves an easy-to-follow trail. The way we talk about gender or the absence of our attention to it could look different depending on the angle from which you examine it. My intent through this research was to consider the presence of nuanced discursive devices, like the uncomplicated attention to women in lesson plans or the absence of a critical framework in syllabi, across different social studies spaces in order to create more angles from which to consider the ways that women and gender have been marginalized in the field. In addition, I wanted to expand upon the ongoing work that has critiqued the limited attention to women and gender in social studies by highlighting some previously unconsidered, but fundamental, obstacles. As I discussed in my

analysis of the factors that Crocco presented to explain the absence of attention to women in social studies in

Chapter 5, there are surely structural forces impeding attention to gender in this field. But there are discursive obstacles as well: obstacles detectable in the ways that women and gender are talked and written about in the field.

These obstacles pop up in all sorts of social studies spaces. At AERA this year, for example, there were several examples of discursive obstacles that I feel are worthy to share. The first incident occurred at a Research in Social Studies SIG paper session. The presenter was proceeding through his paper and the accompanying PowerPoint in a typical fashion: describing the problem and outlining the research methodology and context. But when he got to the theoretical slides: he looked at the slides, and then looked at the audience, and said "You can trust me on the theory, right?" and then proceeded to skip over the theory slides and begin discussing his research findings. After I heard him say this, I looked around the room to see if there was any reaction. There wasn't any that I could detect. And indeed, this may not have seemed important to others in that moment. But I'm talking about it here in order to argue that the descriptions of our theoretical positions are not the slides that should be skipped over in a presentation of research. As I argued in Chapters 4,6, and 7, and will address again in this conclusion, theory that might help us think differently and more critically about what is happening in social studies does matter: following St. Pierre (2011), without theory, it's difficult to see how we might produce different discourses about social studies, as well as different actions and different subjectivities for social studies teachers and students. This presenter wasn't discussing women or gender or equity, but the ease with which it was possible to skip over the

theory in the context of any kind of research was made possible by the lack of a role that theory plays in the field in general. Although this anecdote may appear to be unrelated to equity, I would argue that this discursive event represents an obstacle to equity oriented work, because working toward equity requires that theory be taken seriously by everybody, not just by those for whom critical equity work is central.

The second and more problematic AERA story was recounted to me by a colleague. During a conversation about the creation of common content standards for social studies education, a senior scholar in the field asked what kinds of history, geography, etc would be present in the standards. Noting there are multiple types of history, geography, etc., this individual asked if feminist thought, postcolonial thought, and so forth would be present in the standards as the type of history education we support. The response to this inquiry was along the lines of "If you're looking for postcolonialism and feminism and all of that stuff in the standards, you can forget it. We're trying to get these to be supported by teachers and they won't go for that stuff." Someone sitting near my colleague responded affirmatively to this speaker, saying to a companion "All that feminist and racial shit doesn't belong in social studies. Nobody wants it."

Unpacking the multiple things happening in this anecdote is beyond the scope of this concluding chapter. But I am sharing the story as an example of the kinds of obstacles that have inhibited and will continue to inhibit a critical orientation toward equity in social studies education. These kinds of obstacles are slipperier than structural obstacles, easier to rationalize away or to interpret as the idiosyncratic, aberrant acts of individuals. But both of these stories are related directly to the analysis I've conducted in my dissertation research projects: these ways

of thinking and talking about theory and about the role of critical theory in social studies are all a part of a discursive fabric that has marginalized women and gender in the field⁷⁹.

That the 24 lesson plans in my gender drought analyses represent just 1% of the total number of articles published since 2000 in the seven social studies-focused journals I reviewed for this study is problematic in its own right. So is the fact that the word "women" only appears 7 times in the 39 syllabi I reviewed. Both of these realities are indicators of how little attention has been paid to the subject. One possible response to these statistics may be to question whether the limited attention to women and gender in either of these spaces could have the kind of discursive impact that justifies an analysis. But for those of us who are committed to continuing to pursue and promote gender equity through social studies education, a different response would be to consider how we might maximize the limited attention that is paid to these topics by infusing a critical and complex consideration of gender and women's lives into any piece that makes it onto the printed page. That responsibility falls not only to those of us who have made gender issues central to our work, but is an accountability the entire field shares. Arguably, anyone who publishes a lesson plan that is about people or a methods course syllabi is implicated. By looking at these texts up close, I hoped to show that the discourse used in social studies is a technology to which we all have access and can work toward changing. This means disrupting the taken-for-granted "tastes" (Bakhtin, 1981) of social studies and attempting to engage the community in thinking about how each of us might do things differently. In saying that, however, I acknowledge that as a social studies teacher who addressed women in thin ways

⁷⁹ Ironically, feminist poststructural theory, which as McWilliam (1994, p. 14) described focuses "on the politicized and politicizing nature of the talk that abounds in any site on which versions of relevance/appropriateness struggle for legitimacy" is particularly well suited, I argue, to understanding how attention to women and gender and feminism have struggled to gain legitimacy in the field. But the continued exclusion of critical theory in the field actual sustains the status quo that makes it possible for these theories to be openly dismissed as relevant to the field. Such a vicious cycle!

in my own secondary classes, as a teacher educator who has not addressed gender adequately in college coursework, and a scholar who has already contributed to re-inscriptive discourses about women's absence, I am absolutely and entirely enmeshed in each of the problematic discursive spaces and practices I have critiqued.

So what am I and others who care about these issues to do? As Burr (2003, p. 124) contended, "we can work towards change firstly by becoming more aware of the positions we are being offered and that we offer to others in our interaction with them. We can devise strategies for how unacceptable positions might be resisted and positions in alternative discourses taken up". I have attempted to show throughout this analysis that the gender-equity-oriented positions currently being made available to us through social studies are unacceptable. In order to think more deeply about what we need to do to devise some alternative discourses about women and gender in social studies, I've chosen to use the conclusion as a space to turn to the interviews I conducted with three senior scholars in social studies - Margaret Crocco, Carole Hahn, and Linda Levstik - and to intertwine their comments about the field and the future with my own. As you know from having read every single word of this dissertation so far, these three women have made significant contributions to the literature that has been written about women and gender in social studies education. I conducted brief interviews with each of them to try to understand the experience of doing this kind of work and to glean their ideas about how the field might move forward.

I want to draw on these interviews to help me weave together some of the major themes of my dissertation as well as to make connections between my own work and the broader field, both currently and in relation to the gender scholars who have come before me. In particular, I want to think about what might be necessary to prepare future scholars to do the kind of critical

gender-work that I advocate for throughout the dissertation, as well as the role that building a community of like-minded scholars might play in efforts to change the current discourses around women and gender. I end the chapter by arguing that in order to overcome the obstacles to doing gender work that I've described throughout my dissertation, it is important that we pay serious attention to subjectivity across the discursive spaces of social studies. Finally, I make specific recommendations for scholarship and teacher education.

In my conversations with these senior scholars, I was hoping to understand the choices and experiences that contributed to their focus on topics related to women and gender. In light of the small number of people who have worked on these topics, it seemed important to identify what led them to these interests. I believe that their responses to these questions have implications for thinking about the future of gender equity work in the field in terms of the preparation of social studies scholars for equity-oriented work.

Preparation

As I've discussed throughout this dissertation, we need theory in social studies in order to disrupt the status quo of attending to women and gender in the field. In this research, I've tried to demonstrate how critical theoretical positions made available through feminism and poststructuralism can be used to reveal the discourses about gender in the field and to show some of the limits of our current strategies. There are, of course, many other theoretical paths available to researchers who seek to open up the field to thinking about women and gender. When I asked Crocco how she got started working on gender, she pointed to her personal interest and experiences, but also to her study of anthropology and early career experiences with Women Studies and equity projects as important factors in her choice to study gender. Crocco, who has a Ph.D. in American Civilization and had previously taught both college and high school

American history, described being hired for the social studies education position at Teachers College, and stated that "I really started to take a very close look at social studies and the way it was being taught both at TC and otherwise and it was really shocking" in terms of the lack of attention to gender (M. Crocco, personal communication, January 6, 2012). She said it was at that point she decided she would build on her background in Women's history to establish a research agenda that focused on diversity. In her discussion of the reaction her gender work received from colleagues, Crocco asserted that some people outside of education assumed that the attention paid to the topics she has taken up, like Women's history, have spread everywhere, but she argued that "education [is] largely self-contained. Maybe not hermetically sealed, but...self-contained and self-referential. And I saw my job as bringing into the social studies questions about gender or race or sexuality that had simply not been taken up as they should by the field of social studies"⁸⁰.

For Levstik, the genesis of her interest in gender was deeply embedded in what she referred to as the "cultural tectonics" in place during her graduate career:

The cultural plates started shifting, where all the expectations for what you could be as a women that would have been my mother's generation are shifting around and the kind of expectations that my daughter's generation have weren't in place yet, so there was this space where it was sometimes hard to keep your footing in deciding what you wanted to do and what would be good for you and for the people you were connected to. Gender was a big issue and it fascinated me to think about how kids might make sense out of

⁸⁰ This comment was particularly interesting to me, as I had noted throughout my study of Crocco's work that she regularly used closed container metaphors to describe social studies as a field which has not been impacted by outside discourses. It occurred so frequently that within my data, I had adopted the habit of marking those references as *social studies is an impervious rock*. Segall (2004) makes the same argument in his analysis of the field.

that--much less how teachers might do so. (L. Levstik, personal communication, January 6, 2012)

In addition to an interest in gender that emanated from her own political interests, Levstik noted that part of her capacity for incorporating gender into her work came from her background in literacy. She stated, that "[i]n literacy studies, too, gender was a very big deal, and since part of my background was literacy studies, I always had that research at hand". That Crocco and Levstik both pointed to their background in areas outside of social studies education as contributing to the path that brought them to their interest in gender, as well as the academic preparation to do research about it, is, I believe, significant. Interestingly, the issue of preparation was also relevant in Hahn, although for the different reasons. She noted that her lack of background in feminist theory propelled her to move on and write and research about topics other than gender, stating that she started researching other topics "When it became clear to me that there was a whole field of feminist theory [that] I didn't really know about. I expected other people to come along and be doing things" (C. Hahn, personal communication, January 17, 2012). Unfortunately, as she noted, these other people - with backgrounds in feminist theory - never came along.

These comments about the preparation to do gender work in social studies - and in particular how preparation in areas outside of social studies presented an impetus for Crocco, a set of resources for Levstik, and a constraint for Hahn - are important to consider in terms of thinking about how gender work in the field might be moved forward. Segall (2004) contended that social studies' engagement with critical discourses - and the kinds of challenges to common sense and norms they offer - has been marginal and sporadic. As described in Chapter 4, Crocco (2006) has also pointed to the "low profile of theory within social studies" (p. 252) as a factor

impeding attention to women and gender in the field. Through my examination of lesson plans and syllabi, I've attempted to demonstrate that what is happening in these discursive spaces indicates that we need theories that can open up spaces for us to think differently about the field and equity in more critical and direct ways. Feminist theories offer one of a countless number of entrees into desperately needed new spaces in social studies, and as Hahn pointed out, it's imperative that scholars begin to access the theoretical treasure trove that is feminist theory to support their gender-focused work. But as Crocco and Levstik described, their preparation in disciplines outside of social studies education also proved to be a key factor in the inclusion of women and gender in their research trajectories. I think it's very important to think about how social studies education doctoral programs are preparing people, or not, for the kind of engagement with theory that would be required to start thinking about equity differently in this field.

Community

In addition to feminist and other theories, though, it seems critical that those of us working toward gender equity - as well as other equities - in social studies, come together. The importance of community was a theme upon which each of the interviewees commented. Hahn discussed the importance of the "friendships around common interests" (January 17, 2012) that emerged in her relationships with others in social studies and on her campus, and how critical these relationships were to moving their gender equity work forward. This aspect of her experience was something about which she said: "It's just a piece I think can't be captured by citations and analyzing, that's been a real bonus". Crocco noted that if "you can find those allies in the work that you do, then you have a better chance of proceeding with work that will find a place in the CUFA program" (January 6, 2012). She described how important it had been to

meet Levstik and Hahn early in her career, and how meeting those women "had allowed for some safe conversations about the state of the organization, about the state of the field". When I asked Levstik if she had any advice for junior scholars in social studies who want to research gender, she responded "Well, first of all, it would be nice to have colleagues" (January 6, 2012). She went on to say, "I think you need a community, you need other people that you can talk to about your work so that you aren't asking your questions or figuring out your methods in isolation". Considering the limited attention that has been paid to gender in recent years at CUFA, as indicated my discussion in Chapter 2, there doesn't seem to be an emergent critical mass of social studies scholars who have an interest in these topics. Hahn expressed particular bafflement with this, noting that "I would have expected there to have been lots". But Levstik commented that, although having others upon whom to bounce your ideas is important, "even if there is not a cast of thousands out there who want to do the same kind of work doesn't mean that you can't do really good research".

And what might this really good research about women and gender look like in social studies? I think Crocco captured something important when she said that scholars working in this area need to proceed with their work by speaking "to contemporary issues in a way that brings other who don't self-identify as feminist scholars into an appreciation of what a feminist analysis for example could contribute to the issues at question" (January 6, 2012). In terms of community, I think this statement addresses the need to present feminist analyses in ways that could broaden the base of scholars in the field who could begin to identify feminist theory as a resource for their own work⁸¹. But as I argued in Chapter 5, what is needed in social studies is

⁸¹ Although I have repeatedly tried to distance authors in my analysis of the data used in this research, I'm going to suspend that policy momentarily here to point out that the authors of lesson plans I reviewed were, by and large, not members of the "gang" I identified in the literature review as being the most prominent contributors to research on women and gender in social studies. In other words, most of the lesson plans were written by authors who have *not*

not just the banner of feminism, or any other theory, but the kind of skillful writing and argumentation that can incorporate theory in ways that convince others of its value. I used excerpts from the interviews to discuss this idea further in the next section.

Pursuing a gender research agenda in social studies

The tone of future work seems important to consider. Most of the lesson plans and syllabi I reviewed in my research could be characterized as lacking a critical orientation, as evidenced, for example, by the lack of overt references in gender inequality and the polite tone with which equity was addressed. And while I described the impact of the rejection of feminism and neoliberalism as factors that might partially explain the lack of a critical punch in social studies, I also acknowledged that gender work that has a chance of avoiding a backlash requires, instead of the guns-a-blazing approach, nuanced and compelling arguments that work against the perception of stridency of which Evans (2010) spoke and while at the same time, uses textual vehemence in ways that harness the power of the text, which Tomlinson (2010) described.

When I asked Hahn if she had ever been concerned that she would be perceived as angry in her attempt to promote attention to women and gender, she reflected that she had not worried much about it, although she noted that early in her career, "I might have been more deliberate about -- I think orally, in meetings there have been times when I deliberately thought, keep your voice low, don't sound high. Sound low and rational" (January 17, 2012). When I asked how her gender work had been received, Crocco recalled that in the early part of her career "all of the CUFA chairs were men...remember of course, I was a new professor and kind of the point of going to these meetings was to meet people and impress them, not start attacking the field"

published a number of pieces about women. But their work does indicate that there have been at least a couple of dozen people (mostly women) in the last decade who have been interested enough in the topic to publish on it, which is perhaps a hopeful sign that there are people out there who might be open to using a feminist theoretical position to inform their work.

(January 6, 2012). She also noted there was an "old adage my dad used to say, you get a lot more with honey than vinegar...I think that is reality. I know that there have been moments over the years where perhaps I wasn't as forceful because I just simply didn't want to have a battle or call somebody out on something". She expanded on this idea later in the interview, commenting that she felt that she had to be "very careful about how I say something...I think the point is that in these kinds of circumstances, you want to be persuasive, you want to gain allies".

When I asked Levstik if she thought the avoidance of being identified as a feminist impacted people's decisions to avoid addressing gender in their research or not, she commented that "I think it may make some women, or men for that matter, feel like they would be sidelined, that you know the big work that gets people up on the stage wouldn't be there, that there wouldn't be as many people to talk to" (January 6, 2012). She noted that it was hard to remember what it was like to be new in the field but concluded:

I think when you're on the outside looking in and you're looking for a door, it doesn't look like gender is the door that would necessarily get you to the center of things...if you were looking for a way to get noticed, it probably wouldn't look real good. That doesn't mean it's not a possible path to visibility—there are people who've gone before you-- but it isn't that there's so many people that they've laid a nice clear path for you.

Crocco argued that social and political context of the work had played an important role in scholars' reluctance to take up gender and women in their work because pursuing this research could be perceived as "problematic to one's long term prospects for getting tenure. I don't think that that is the case, but I would concede that in certain environments, it might be problematic [to pursue] a line of inquiry that was focused on issues of gender".

I think each of these comments point to the complexity of deploying successful gender scholarship and enticing others to engage in this work. Although the world of academia is fraught with many complicated power issues, researching equity -- with the explicit intent to compel others to engage it them as well -- adds another layer of intricacy to the endeavor of getting published and getting tenure, and requires a nuanced approach. Understanding the real and embodied constraints that people feel in their attempts to promote equity -- the need to lower one's voice or to choose honey over vinegar -- or the riskiness of taking up these topics and still getting "noticed" for your work, are important to acknowledge upfront. I think that the absence of a critical feminist position in the warrants for gender work in most of the lesson plans I described in Chapter 5 reflect the very same challenges that Hahn, Crocco, and Levstik described.

As I have indicated throughout the dissertation, the regulation of attention to women and gender in social studies (or any other equity topic for that matter) does not require guards posted at the entrance of CUFA conferences with "No feminists allowed" signs. The disciplining of the discipline, and the maintenance of a particular status quo, is not only achieved through the exclusion of these topics by organizations like school boards or textbook designers, but is also achieved in the kind of micro-events that Crocco and Hahn described - such as being aware of their tone of voice or being careful of how they said something. It happens in the individual decisions to choose a research topic other than gender in order to better one's chances to get noticed in the field. It happens in the exclusion of critical warrants for implementing a lesson plan about gender, or in the absence of attention to women and gender in a methods class. Although the interactions of power and knowledge in these small spaces may be difficult to recognize, this is where the gate-keeping happens. And while it is imperative to understand the

constraints that have made the marginalization of women and gender and other equity issues a reality in social studies, it is also critical to push against them by putting them out there in the light of day and asking others to consider the ways in which these small decisions contribute to the equity void in the field.

The challenge that equity scholars in social studies face is considerable. This is a field about which Ladson-Billings (2003) had the following to say:

I am sad to report that at the college and university level, social studies education remains as frozen in its old paradigms as it was in the late 1960s. The governance, research agenda, knowledge production, and demographics of college level teaching in social studies education look very much like it looked more than 30 years ago when I was preparing to teach. Of course, some faculty have included "diversity" topics in their syllabi but much of it remains the same. Social Studies educators continue to debate the definition of social studies. They continue to argue over the need for single discipline study versus integrated social sciences. They continue to fight about depth versus coverage. They pay almost no attention to their complete failure to nurture a new cadre of social studies educators who can move up past these old debates" (p. 5)

I've reproduced this lengthy quote for several reasons. First, because she used the word sad, which is a "norms of accepted discourse" issue I addressed in my introduction. Secondly, this is a really succinct statement about what is going on in the field and the depth and breadth of the resistance to change: it addresses many of the same concerns I've expressed throughout my dissertation. Lastly, and not unimportantly, this is Gloria Ladson-Billings saying this about the field. And while this quote came from an essay that described the reasons that Ladson-Billings has chosen to distance herself from the field of social studies (justifiably, I think), I'm going to

use her statement as a springboard to re-visit some of the suggestions for change within social studies research and teacher education that I've described throughout my dissertation.

Subjectivity & Equity

One of the themes I want to touch on again before concluding is subjectivity. I'm concerned that the lack of attention to subjectivity in social studies, as I documented in both the lesson plans and the syllabi, could signal a pervasive commitment to *not* dealing with difference in social studies. If social studies is to become a more critical and relevant space, and a field capable of making a contribution to equity, this is a characteristic of our research and teacher education preparation that must change. Why? Let me explain.

If asymmetrical gender relations contribute to structural power imbalances that have contributed to, for example, the limited representation of women in American politics, or the appalling violence against women in our culture, they have to be acknowledged. Within social studies education, then, what it means to be a woman or a man or a girl or a boy, in history, or in government, is not an aspect of power relations that can be ignored. For example, in research that includes human beings, gender is always at play: it shapes our interactions with participants and participants interactions with each other, even when it may not always be the most salient aspect of a given exchange. And although attempts to pin down subjectivity are difficult and laced with compounding issues of power and reinscription, our responsibility to engage in this hard work can't be ignored. This is true not only because ignoring gender and other subjectivities masks the power at work in a context, but also because it strips our descriptions of the rich, close-up and complicated contexts of schools or teacher education that could help us think more deeply about what is happening in those spaces.

Attending to subjectivity in ways that work toward equity goes beyond listing demographic identifiers and it looks different in different research contexts. For example, in textual research, attention to subjectivity can be demonstrated through the consideration of the subject positions that are accessed, ignored, and produced through the text. In classroom research, attention to subjectivity might be evident through an acknowledgement and consideration of the ways in which the participants' subject positions impacted the topic under study (even if subjectivity and power are not the focus of the study). In quantitative research, attention to subjectivity could be seen through the inclusion and analysis of subjectivities as variables. Each of these approaches is partial and falls well short of attending to the complexity of understanding subjectivity in the spaces of our research. But gaining even a partial understanding the ways in which power circulates in education aids efforts to counter the inequity embedded within educational institutions and processes.

Differences - and their effects on power relations and gender dynamics - do matter. As Levstik (2001, p. 191) argued, "Deprived of regular and systematic opportunities to study how gender and gendered relationships play out in an interdependent world, students are less than prepared to make informed and reasoned decisions for the good of a decidedly gendered public". The lack of attention to gender in our research of classroom activities, like historical thinking activities or classroom discussions, are also missed opportunities for thinking about the way that social studies education contributes to, or may work against, the kind of gendering which has contributed to the persistent marginalization of women and girls. As I have argued repeatedly, the way that we think about gender gets shaped in all sorts of different spaces and ways: classroom-based research could provide an important source of information about the micro-events that occur in those spaces, in students interactions with each other, with teachers, and with

content, that might provide some insight into how social studies experiences are contributing to perceptions of gender that we may not want to reinforce and as well as how those reinscriptions might be disrupted.

I want to stress that although this dissertation is about gender, taking a stance for the inclusion of subjectivity has implications that extend beyond gender. Substantial attention to subjectivity offers new tools and new implications for other equity issues and contributes to a consideration of the ways that bodies, cultures, and ways of being have been excluded from our approaches to teaching and learning in social studies education. Attention to subjectivity has the potential to impact the way we construct lesson plans for classrooms and how we support teachers in a way that a list of best practices could never address. Attending to gender by itself is not something I'm advocating for in this dissertation. As McWilliam contended, "For the contemporary educational researcher, research that successfully engages with *difference* must be research that engages with some of the multiple, active, and dynamic subjectivities of the research participants" (1994, p. 27)⁸².

In terms of teacher education specifically, I propose that social studies educators - myself included - need to take the following statement from Zeichner (2009) to heart: "Despite the origins of educational inequality outside of education, those of us in teacher education have to make choices that either put us on the side of working to change the situation or on the side of helping to maintain it. We cannot remain neutral" (p. 55). Although, as Hurren (2002, para 3)

⁸² I have attempted to demonstrate that, in terms of promoting gender equity through social studies, the absence of subjectivity has presented an obstacle to implementing critical work about women, but there are bigger questions that also must be addressed. These include: What can attention to subjectivity in social studies research, teaching, and learning open for us? How might it enhance efforts to make social studies classrooms more engaging and meaningful places? How does it contribute to a more critical orientation in social studies education - one that would make issues of power more explicit? I include these questions in an attempt to not appear to present attention to subjectivity as the answer to all of our problems. Attending to subjectivity indeed brings with it a new set of dilemmas.

argued "In the discursive spaces given over to the construction of social studies education, a linear arrangement and presentation of ideas is the expectation and the norm", we need to disrupt the story we tell teacher education students about social studies. This can be done by foregrounding ambiguity and unknowability through the consistent description of teaching and learning as events that are embedded in the social and political spaces in which they take place and brought to life by the social and political actors who roam those spaces. We can call "attention to the power relations within which knowledge is produced" (McWilliam, 1994, p. 57), and promote the explicit attention to those power relations as a central focus for thinking about the social studies that "gets" learned in PK-12 classrooms. For me, the attention to power does not mean ignoring methods in a methods course. Placing the burden on teachers to address these complicated issues without guidance "for what teachers could actually do to facilitate change" was described by Gore (1993, p. 5) as a "partial and hollow discourse". Instead, I advocate teaching methods with a generous side of critical interrogation about what the methods produce and what subject positions they might offer different students. As Zeichner (2009) said quite eloquently, "all teaching issues have both technical and moral dimensions that must be considered simultaneously" (p. 55). The integration of both of these dimensions of teaching must be foregrounded in our teacher education work.

Concluding caveats

Some may question the appropriateness or "timeliness" (Brown, 2005) of this work and ask why, as someone who seeks to promote attention to gender in social studies, I would invest time, energy, and dissertation hours in analyzing to the work of the handful of people who have given any attention to women in our field. I understand this concern and approached this project with a healthy amount of trepidation. Before and during this process, and perhaps even more so

in the moments that the project is coming to an end, I have been very concerned about the readers' perception that I am diminishing the important contributions of the work I've analyzed and critiqued. In response, however, I turn to the following argument from Lather (2007, p. 1):

If feminist work is not to become routinized . . . it must interrogate the enabling limits of its own practices . . . This is a sort of 'faithful transgression' that is not so much self-correction as negotiation with complexity where feminist practice is 'always already rewriting itself' . . . The goal is a generative undoing of a certain orthodoxy that is a necessary part of feminism making itself coherent and authoritative. Displacing fixed critical spaces enacted in earlier practices to which we are indebted, we move toward an 'iterative productivity' . . . that is open to permanent dynamism.

Indeed, I think this self-reflexive tradition within feminist work is one of its most compelling and attractive attributes. And in the spirit of moving toward the iterative productivity and permanent dynamism of which Lather speaks, I welcome the ways that readers of this research, both now and in the future, will interrogate its limits. My account of what is happening in the doing of gender in social studies is not the definitive account, but I hope it will be provocative enough to spark some new conversations about women and gender within the spaces in which it will be disseminated. Lastly, I hope that it encourages readers to see that they have the agency to "negotiate new positions" (Davies, 2000, p. 105) in the multiple discursive spaces in which they do their work as scholars and teachers and that readers might discover ways in which they may be governed a little less (Foucault, 2007) by problematic gender discourses.

REFERENCES

- Ablow, K. (2011). Don't let your kids watch Chaz Bono on 'Dancing With the Stars'. *Fox News Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/09/02/dont-let-your-kids-watch-chaz-bono-on-dancing-with-stars/#ixzz1psUfb8dU>
- Ahmad, I. (2006). Teaching government in social studies: Political scientists' contributions to citizenship education. *Social Studies*, 97(1), 8-15.
- Alcoff, L. (2009). The problem of speaking for others. In (A. Jackson & L. Mazzei, Eds.), *Voice in qualitative inquiry: Challenging conventional, interpretive, and critical conceptions in qualitative research* (117-135). New York, NY: Routledge.
- American University (2008). *Education 540: Secondary social studies methods*. Retrieved from http://aladinrc.wrlc.org/bitstream/1961/8276/1/EDU%20540-002%26005%20Secondary%20Social%20Studies%20Methods_James%20%28Jim%29%20Percoco%2811%29.pdf
- Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Andersen, N. Å. (2003). *Discursive analytical strategies : Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Arnot, M. (1997). "Gendered citizenry": New feminist perspectives on education and citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(3), 275-95.
- Arnot, M., & Dillabough, J. (1999). Feminist politics and democratic values in education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(2), 159-189.
- Asher, N. (2003). At the intersections: A postcolonialist woman of color considers western feminism. *Social Education*, 67(11), 47-51.

- Bair, S. (2007). Citizenship for the common good: The contributions of Mary Ritter Beard (1876-1958). *International Journal of Social Education*, 21(2), 1-17.
- Bair, S. (2008a). Integrating women's history in social studies: Lesson learned from a college/school partnership. *Social studies research and practice*, 3(1), 80-96.
- Bair, S. (2008b). Educating black girls in the early 20th century: The pioneering work of Nannie Helen Burroughs (1879-1961). *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 36(1), 9-35.
- Bair, S., Williams, L. & Fralinger, M. (2008). Integrating women's history into an early American history course: Three lesson ideas. *The Social Studies*, 99(4), 174-180.
- Baker, J. (2005). *The politics of choice: Difficult freedoms for young women in later modernity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales, UK.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination : Four essays* (C. Emerson, M. Holquist Trans.). (pp. 259-422). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barber, C. & Torney-Purta, J. (2009). Gender differences in political efficacy and attitudes toward women's rights as influenced by national and school contexts: Analysis from the IEA civic education study. In (D. Baker & A. Wiseman, Eds.), *Gender, equality, and education from international and comparative perspectives* (pp. 357-394). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.
- Bassett, L. & Bendery, J. (2012, March). Rush Limbaugh: I'll buy Georgetown women 'As much aspirin to put between their knees as they want'. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/01/rush-limbaugh-sandrafluke_n_1313891.html

- Bakhtin, M. M., Holquist, M., & Emerson, C. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (1st ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Berkin, C., Crocco, M., & Winslow, B. (Eds.). (2009). *Clio in the classroom*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Bernard-Powers, J. (1995). Out of the cameos and into the conversation: Gender, social studies and curriculum transformation. In (J. Gaskell & J. Willinsky, Eds.), *Gender in/forms curriculum: From enrichment to transformation* (pp. 191-209). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Bernard-Powers, J. (1996a). Engendering social studies: Perspectives, texts, and teaching. *Theory and research in social education*, 24(1), 2-7.
- Bernard-Powers, J. (1996b). The "woman question" in citizenship education. In W. Parker (Ed.), *Educating the democratic mind* (pp. 287-308). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bernard-Powers, J. (2001). Gender in the social studies curriculum. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (2nd ed., pp. 177-197). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Best Education Schools (2012). *US news and world report*. Retrieved from <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-education-schools/teacher-education-rankings>
- Bickmore, K. (2002). How might social education resist heterosexism? Facing the impact of gender and sexual ideology on citizenship. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(2), 198-216.

- Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., & Standish, P. (1998). Giving someone a lesson. In N. Blake (Ed.), *Thinking again : Education after postmodernism* (pp. 117-152). Westport, CT.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Boraas, S. & Rodger, W. (2003, March). How does gender play a role in the earnings gap? An update. *Monthly Labor Review Online*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2003/03/art2full.pdf>
- Bové, P. A. (1995). Discourse. In F. Lentricchia, & T. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Critical terms for literary study* (pp. 50-65). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Brady, A. (2012, March 3). The deep resentment of having to think about it: Rush Limbaugh and Sandra Fluke. Retrieved from <http://zunguzungu.wordpress.com/2012/03/03/the-deep-resentment-of-having-to-think-about-it-rush-limbaugh-and-sandra-fluke/>
- Bridges-Rhoads, S. (2011). *Pursuing responsibility: Writing and citing poststructural qualitative inquiry, social justice, and Christianity* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- Brigham Young University-Hawaii (2011). *Multicultural education, the Constitution, and social studies for the elementary teacher*. Retrieved from <http://soe.byuh.edu/sites/soe.byuh.edu/files/ELED%20380.pdf>
- Bryan, A. & Bracken, M. (2011). *Learning to read the world? Teaching and learning about global citizenship and international development in post-primary schools*. Limerick, IRL: Irish Aid.
- Brown, W. (1997). The impossibility of Women's studies. *Differences*, 9, (3), 79-101.
- Brown, W. (2005). *Edgework: Critical essays on knowledge and politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Brown, W. (2006). *Regulating aversion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Burns, K. (2008). (Re)imagining the global, rethinking gender in education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 29(3), 343-357. doi:10.1080/01596300802259111
- Burr, V. (Ed.). (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies That Matter*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1995). For a careful reading. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Feminist contentions: A philosophical exchange* (pp. 127-144). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1998). *Excitable speech*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- California State University-Sacramento/University of California Davis (2006). *Social studies methods EDU 308*. Retrieved from <http://www.csus.edu/indiv/p/pfeiferj/edte305/308collSyl.htm>
- Callahan, R. M., Muller, C., & Schiller, K. S. (2008). Preparing for citizenship: Immigrant high school students' curriculum and socialization. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 36(2), 6-31.
- Carter, C. (2011). Raise up your cloth! The woman suffrage movement's second generation. *Middle Level Learning*, 40, M2-M7.
- Cary, L. J. (2006). Within and against citizenship: Bad girls in deviant subject positions. In A. Segall, E. Heilman & C. Cherryholmes (Eds.), *Social studies - the next generation: Researching in the postmodern* (pp. 47-60). New York: Peter Lang.
- Chambers, J. & Bobbitt, S. (1996). The patterns of teacher compensation: NCEs 95-829. Washington, DC: Department of Education.

- Chapin, J. R. (2005). Voting and community volunteer participation of 1988 eighth grade social studies students 12 years later. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 33(2), 200-217.
- Chappell, B. (2010, November 3). Number of women in congress set to drop, ending 30-year trend. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2010/11/03/131050732/number-of-women-in-congress-set-to-drop-ending-30-year-trend>
- Christensen, L. M. (2005). Women who passed the torch of freedom. *Social Studies*, 96(3), 99-104.
- Clark, R., Allard, J., & Mahoney, T. (2004). How much of the sky? Women in American high school history textbooks from the 1960s, 1980s and 1990s. *Social Education*, 68(1), 57-62.
- Clark, R., Ayton, K., Frechette, N., & Keller, P. J. (2005). Women of the world, re-write! Women in American world history high school textbooks from the 1960s, 1980s, and 1990s. *Social Education*, 69(1), 41-45.
- Coffey, A. & Delamont, S. (2000). *Feminism and the classroom teacher: Research, praxis, and pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge/Falmer.
- College and University Faculty Assembly. (2010). *About CUFA*. Retrieved from http://www.ncsscufa.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&layout=blog&id=21&Itemid=53.
- Commeyras, M. & Alvermann, D. (1996). Reading about women in world history textbooks from one feminist perspective. *Gender and Education*, 8(1), 31-48.
- Connor, M. (2000). Revolutionary women: Portraits of life in the thirteen colonies. *Social Education*, 61 (1), 12-15.

- Coughlin, M. (2007). Women and history: Outside the academy. *History Teacher*, 40(4), 471-479.
- Conklin, H. G. (2008). Modeling compassion in critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(4), 652-674.
- Conklin, H.G. (2009). Purposes, practices, and sites: A comparative case of two pathways into middle school teachers. *American educational research journal*, 46(2), 463-500.
- Crocco, M. S. (2000). Women, citizenship, and the social studies. *Educational Forum*, 65(1), 52-59.
- Crocco, M. S. (2001). The missing discourse about gender and sexuality in the social studies. *Theory into Practice*, 40(1), 65-71.
- Crocco, M. S. (2002a). Homophobic hallways: Is anyone listening? *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(2), 217-232.
- Crocco, M. S. (2002b). Preface. In M. S. Crocco, & O. L. Davis (Eds.), *Building a legacy: Women in social education, 1784-1984*. (pp. 9-12). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Crocco, M. S. (2003/2004). Dealing with difference in the social studies: A historical perspective. *International Journal of Social Education*, 18(2), 106-120.
- Crocco, M. S. (2004). Women and the social studies: The long rise and rapid fall of feminist activity in the National Council of the Social Studies. In C. Woyshner, J. Watras & M. S. Crocco (Eds.), *Social education in the 20th century* (pp. 142-159). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Crocco, M. S. (2005). Teaching "Shabanu": The challenges of using world literature in the US social studies classroom. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(5), 561-582.

- Crocco, M. S. (2006a). Caught between invisibility and stereotyping: Teaching the novel "Shabanu". *Social Education*, 70(4), 178-182.
- Crocco, M.S. (2006b). The invisible hand of theory in social studies education. In (A. Segall, E. Heilman, & C. Cherryholmes, Eds.), *Social studies: The next generation* (pp. 231-236). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Crocco, M. S. (2007). Speaking truth to power: Women's rights as human rights. *Social Studies*, 98(6), 257-269.
- Crocco, M. S. (2008). Gender and sexuality in the social studies. In L. S. Levstik, & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 172-196). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Crocco, M. S., & Cramer, J. (2005). Women, Webquests, and controversial issues in the social studies. *Social Education*, 69(3), 143-149.
- Crocco, M. S., & Davis, O. L., (1999). *"Bending the future to their will": Civic women, social education, and democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Crocco, M. S., & Davis, O. L., J. (2002). *Building a legacy: Women in social education, 1784-1984*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Crocco, M. S., & Merryfield, M. (2003). Editor's notebook. *Social Education*, 67(1), 5.
- Crocco, M. S., Perez, N., & Katz, M. (2009). At the crossroads of the world: Women of the middle east. *Social Studies*, 100(3), 107-114.
- Davies, B. (2003). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales : Preschool children and gender*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press
- Davies, B. (2000). *A body of writing: 1990-1999*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*. (G. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967).
- Dillabough, J., McLeod, J., Mills, M. (2008). In search of allies and others: 'troubling' gender and education. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 29(3), 301-310.
- Domestic Violence Resource Center (n.d.). *Domestic Violence Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.dvrc-or.org/domestic/violence/resources/C61/>
- Doughty, J. (2003). Integrating literature to teach about women of west Africa. *Social education* 97(1), 17-21.
- Eckert, P. & McConell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21, 461-490.
- Epstein, T., & Shiller, J. (2005). Perspective matters: Social identity and the teaching and learning of national history. *Social Education*, 69(4), 201-204.
- Evans, R. (2010). The (unfulfilled) promise of critical pedagogy. In (S. Totten & J. Pedersen, Eds.), *Research in curriculum and instruction: Teaching and studying social issues*, (pp. 233-250). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London, U.K.: Sage.
- Felman, S. (1982). Psychoanalysis and Education: Teaching terminable and interminable. *Yale French Studies*, 63, 21-44.
- Fischman, G. (2000). *Imagining teachers: Rethinking gender dynamics in teacher education*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Fluke, S. (2012). *Statement*. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/images/Politics/statement-Congress-letterhead-2nd%20hearing.pdf>
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (A.M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969).
- Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In (D. Bouchard, Ed.). *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press. (Original work published 1971)
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972–1977*(pp. 109-133). New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1977)
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text : A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 48-78). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1970).
- Foucault, M. (1988). The concern for truth: An interview with François Ewald. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). In (L. Kritzman, Ed.), *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings, 1977-1984*, (pp. 255-270). London, UK: Routledge. (Original work published 1984).
- Foucault, M. (1994c). What is an author? In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault* (pp. 377-391). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish : The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975).

- Foucault, M. (2007). What is critique? In (S. Lotringer & L. Hochroth, Eds.), *The politics of truth* (2nd ed., pp. 41-82). New York, NY: Semiotext(e).
- Fraser, N. (2008). *Adding insult to injury: Nancy Fraser debates her critiques*. London, UK: Verso.
- Frederickson, M. (2004). Surveying gender: Another look at the way we teach United States history. *History Teacher*, 37(4), 476-484.
- Gagnon, P. (1996). History's role in civic education: The precondition for political intelligence. In W. Parker (Ed.), *Educating the democratic mind* (pp. 241-262). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Garrett, H. J. (2011). The routing and re-routing of difficult knowledge: Social studies teachers encounter *When the Levees Broke*. *Theory and research in social education*, 39(3), 320-347.
- Gay, G. (2003). Deracialization in social studies teacher education textbooks. In (G. Ladson-Billings, Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (123-148). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Geertz, C. (1988) *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice : Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006). *The end of capitalism (as we knew it)* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gorski, P. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and teacher education*, 25, 309-318.

- George Mason University (2010). *EDCI 561.001: Teaching social studies in the secondary school*. Retrieved from http://cehd.gmu.edu/assets/docs/syllabi/2011/syllabus_13411.pdf
- Green Mountain College (2005). *EDU 2081: Elementary Social Studies Methods*. Retrieved from http://campus.greenmtn.edu/syllabi/pdf/EDU2081_F05_damicom.pdf
- Hahn, C., Bernard-Powers, J., Hunter, L., Groves, S., MacGregor, M., & Scott, K. (1985). Sex equity in social studies. In S. S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving sex equity through education* (pp. 280-297). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University
- Hahn, C. L., Bernard-Powers, J., Crocco, M. S., & Woyshner, C. (2007). Gender equity in social studies. In S. S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving gender equity through education* (2nd ed., pp. 335-357). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J., Berliner, D., Cochran-Smith, M., McDonald, M. & Zeichner, K. (2005). How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. (pp. 358-389). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hausman, R., Tyson, L., & Zahidi, S. (2008). *The global gender gap report*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum. Retrieved from <http://www.weforum.org/pdf/gendergap/report2008.pdf>
- Henry, P. (2011). *Engendered curriculum history*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the curriculum: The democratic power of discussion*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Hickey, M. G., & Kolterman, D. L. (2006). Special women in my life: Strategies for writing women into the social studies curriculum. *Social Education*, 70(4), 190-196.
- Hoganson, K. (1998). *Fighting for American manhood: How gender politics provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hollins, E. & Guzman, M. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In (M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner, Eds.), *Studying teacher education*, (pp. 477-548). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Huerta, G. & Flemmer, L. (2001). Latina women speak: Using oral histories in the social studies curriculum. *Social Education*, 65(5). Retrieved from <http://publications.socialstudies.org/se/6505/650502.html>
- Hughes-Decatur, H. (2011). *Phenomenal bodies, phenomenal girls: How young adolescent girls experience being enough in their bodies* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- Hurren, W. (2002). Gender issues within the discursive spaces of social studies education. *Canadian Social Studies*, 36(3). Retrieved from http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css/Css_36_3/ARdiscursive_spaces.html
- Illinois State University (2006). *Social studies methods 258*. Retrieved from [www.sharepoint.ilstu.edu/COE/cisyllabi/Archived%20Syllabi/2006%20\(4\)%20Fall/258-006_gillan.doc](http://www.sharepoint.ilstu.edu/COE/cisyllabi/Archived%20Syllabi/2006%20(4)%20Fall/258-006_gillan.doc)
- Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (2009a). *EDUC E325: Social studies in the elementary schools*. Retrieved from education.indiana.edu/tabid/13862/Default.aspx?fid=888

- Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (2009b). *EDUC M442: Teaching secondary social studies*. Retrieved from: [Http:// education.indiana.edu/tabid/13862/Default.aspx?fid=902](http://education.indiana.edu/tabid/13862/Default.aspx?fid=902)
- Inter-Parliamentary Union (2011). *Women in parliaments*. Retrieved from <http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm#2>
- Jäger, S. & Maier, F. (2002). Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In (R. Wodak, Ed.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 34-61) London, UK: Sage.
- Jehlen, M. (1995). Gender. In F. Lentricchia, & T. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Critical terms for literary study* (pp. 263-173). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Johnson, S., & Serriere, S. (2009). *Moving beyond 'add women and stir'*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies, Atlanta, GA.
- Jones, S., & Enriquez, G. (2009). Engaging the intellectual and the moral in critical literacy education: The four-year journeys of two teachers from teacher education to classroom practice. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(2), 145-168.
- Journell, W. & Buchanan, L. (2012). Making politics palatable: Using television drama in high school civics and government classes. *The social studies*, 103(1), 1-11.
- Karnes, M. (2000). Girls can be president: Generating interesting in an inclusive history. *Middle level learning*, 1, 5-8.
- Keenan, T. (1997). *Fables of responsibility*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Knupfer, A. M., & Woyshner, C. A. (2008). *The educational work of women's organizations, 1890-1960*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kohlmeier, J. (2004). Experiencing world history through the eyes of ordinary women. *Social Education*, 68(7), 470-477.
- Kohlmeier, J. (2005). The power of a woman's story: A three-step approach to historical significance in high school world history. *International Journal of Social Education*, 20(1), 64-75.
- Kornfeld, J. (2005). Framing the conversation: Social studies education and the neoconservative agenda. *Social Studies*, 96(4)
- Kreydatus, B. (2008). Confronting the "bra-burners": Teaching radical feminism with a case study. *History Teacher*, 41(4), 489-504.
- Kuthe, A. (2011). Teaching the war on terror: Tackling controversial issues in a New York City public high school. *The social studies*, 102(4), 160-163.
- Kumashiro, K. (2001). "Posts" perspectives on anti-oppressive education in social studies, English, Mathematics, and science classrooms. *Educational Researcher*, 30 (3), 3-12.
- Landorf, H. & Pagan, L. (2005). Unveiling the *hijab*. *The social studies*, 96(4), 171-177.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (Ed.). (2003). *Critical Race Theory perspectives in the social studies*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Lies my teacher still tells: Developing a critical race perspective toward the social studies. In (G. Ladson-Billings, Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (1-11). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Lapham, S. (2011). Women's sports? Thank the Civil Rights Act of 1964. *Middle level learning*, 40, p. M15.

- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lather, P. (1996). Troubling clarity: The politics of accessible language. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 525-545.
- Lather, P. (2007, April). *(Post)critical feminist methodology: Getting lost*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Lather, P. (2007). *Getting lost: Feminist efforts toward a double(d) science*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Leming, J., Ellington, L., Porter, K., & Fordham, T. B. (2003). *Where did social studies go wrong?* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Lenz-Taguchi, H. (2005). Getting personal: How early childhood teacher education troubles students' and teacher educators' identities regarding subjectivity and feminism. *Contemporary issues in Early Childhood*, 6, (3), 244-255.
- Levstik, L. S. (1997/1998, Winter). Early adolescents' understanding of the historical significance of women's rights. *International Journal of Social Education*, 12(2), 19-34
- Levstik, L. (2000). Articulating the silences: Teachers' and adolescents' conceptions of historical significance. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas & S. Wineburg, (Eds.). *Knowing, Teaching, & Learning, History* (pp. 284-305). New York, NY: New York University.
- Levstik, L. (2001). Daily acts of ordinary courage: Gender-equitable practice in the social studies classroom. In P. O'Reilly, E. M. Penn & K. B. DeMarrais (Eds.), *Educating young adolescent girls* (pp. 189-211). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

- Levstik, L. (2009a). "Well-behaved women rarely make history": Gendered teaching and learning in and about history. *International Journal of Historical Learning*, 8(1), 120-139.
- Levstik, L. (2009b). What educational research says about teaching and learning women's history. In C. Berkin, M. Crocco & B. Winslow (Eds.), *Clio in the classroom* (pp. 281-295). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Levstik, L. & Groth, J. (2002). "Scary thing, being an eighth grader:" exploring gender and sexuality in a middle school U.S. history unit. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(2), 233-254.
- Levy, T. (2011). Game changer: Women's basketball and equal opportunity. *Middle level learner*, 40, M11-M14.
- MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Marcus, A., Metzger, M., Paxton, R. & Stoddard, J. (2010). *Teaching history with film: Strategies for secondary social studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mary Baldwin College (2010). *IN 603S: Inquiry in social science*. Retrieved from https://mymbc.mbc.edu/syllabi/GTE%20Syllabi/2010Fall/Waddell_A_IN_603_S.doc
- Martinson, D. L. (2007). Sex, pornography, and the mass media: How should social studies teachers respond? *Social Studies*, 98(2), 43-47.
- McCall, A. (2004). Using poetry in the social studies classroom to teach about cultural diversity and social justice. *The social studies*, 95(4), 172-176.

- McLeod, J. (2008). *Legacies of poststructural feminism in education*. Paper presented at Australian Association for Research in Education, Brisbane, Australia.
- McWilliam, E. (1994). *In broken images: Feminist tales for a different teacher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Merryfield, M., & Subedi, B. (2003). A global education framework for teaching about the world's women. *Social Education*, 61(1), 10-15.
- Michigan State University (2009). *Teaching social studies to diverse learners*.
- Michigan State University (2010). *TE865: Teaching and learning K-12 social studies*.
- Michigan State University (2007). *Reflection and inquiry in teaching practice*.
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Monaghan, M. (2009). *Preservice, secondary social studies teachers' perceptions of gender equity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Morin, K. & Bernheim, R. (2005). Who can be a hero? Helen Keller, Annie Sullivan, and discovering strength of character. *Social studies and the young learner*, 17(4), 17-30.
- Noddings, N. (2001a). The care tradition: Beyond "add women and stir.". *Theory into Practice*, 40(1), 29-34.
- Noddings, N. (2001b). Social studies and feminism. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (2nd ed., pp. 163-175). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Northern Kentucky University (2009). *EDU 331: Secondary social studies methods*. Retrieved from http://nku.edu/~education/ncate/syllabi/socialstudies/dallmer_syllabi_Edu_331_002_Fall09-1.pdf

- Pacific University (2011). *Teaching social studies in middle and high school*. Retrieved from http://wordpress.ed.pacificu.edu/educ551/files/2011/08/EDUC551_Syllabus2.pdf
- Pahl, R. (2007). Sailing to Jamestown, 1606-7: Five classroom activities. *The social studies*, 98(3), 83-87.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA:Sage.
- Parks, A. N. (2007). *Discursive possibilities: Re-imagining reform and equity in elementary mathematics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Michigan State University, Lansing, MI.
- Parks, A.N. (2009). Doomsday devise: Rethinking the deployment of the "achievement gap" in equity arguments. *For the learning of mathematics*, 29(1), 14-19.
- Parks, A. N. & Schmeichel, M. (2012). Obstacles to Addressing Race and Ethnicity in the Mathematics Education Literature. *Journal of Research in Mathematics Education*.43(3), 258-252.
- Pennsylvania State University (2008). *Teaching social studies in elementary grades*. Retrieved from www.personal.psu.edu/scs22/blogs/social_studies_in_the_elementary_classroom/SSED430W_Syllabus_Fall08_steph
- Piedmont College (2009). *EDUC 634: Social studies methods*. http://www.piedmont.edu/Education/SOEweb/Syllabi/Specific_Syllabi/EDUC%20634%20MKibler%20FA%2009.pdf
- Pillow, W. (2002). Gender matters. *New directions for evaluation*, 91, Winter, 9-26.
- Popkewitz, T. (2002). How the alchemy makes the inquiry, evidence, and exclusion. *Journal of teacher education*, 53(2), 262-267.

- Potter, L. (2002). A bill to relieve certain legal disabilities of women. *Social Education*, 66(2), 117-120.
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality : Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Prior, L. (2003). *Using documents in social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rape, Abuse, & Incenst National Network. *Who are the victims?* Retrieved from <http://www.rainn.org/get-information/statistics/sexual-assault-victims>
- Richburg, R., Nelson, B. & Tochtermann, S. (2002). Gender inequity: A world geography lesson plan. *The social studies*, 93(1), 23-30.
- Rierson, S. & Duty, L. (2003). Conscientizacao: Latina women, American students, and empowerment in the social studies classroom. *Social education*, 67(1),33-37.
- Robinson, J. (1987). *The Montgomery bus boycott and the women who started it: The memoir of Jo An Gibson Robison*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.
- Rogow, D., & Haberland, N. (2005). Sexuality and relationships education: Toward a social studies approach. *Sex Education: Sexuality, Society and Learning*, 5(4), 333-344.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmeichel, M. (2011). Feminism, neoliberalism, and social studies. *Theory and research in social education*, 39(1), 6-31.
- Schmeichel, M. (2012) Good teaching? Tracing the emergence of culturally relevant teaching as an equity strategy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 44(2), 211-231.

- Schmeichel, M. (in press). Check it before you wreck it: Power in field instruction. In A. Cuenca, (Ed.), *Supervising Student Teachers: Issues, Perspectives, and Directions for Field-Based Teacher Education*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Schmidt, S. (2010). Queering social studies: The role of social studies in normalizing citizens and sexuality in the common good. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 38(3), 314-335.
- Scott, J.W. (1988). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference. *Feminist Studies*, 14(1), 33-50.
- Scott, J.W. (1986). Gender: A useful category of historical analysis. *The American Historical Review*, 91(5), 1053-1075.
- Segall, A. (2002). *Disturbing practice: Reading teacher education as text*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Segall, A. (2004). Social studies and the discourses of postmodernity. In C. Woyshner, J. Watras & M. S. Crocco (Eds.), *Social education in the twentieth century* (pp. 160-175). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Segall, A. (2006). Critical social studies: Where do we go from here? In A. Segall, E. Heilman & C. Cherryholmes (Eds.), *Social studies - the next generation: Re-searching in the postmodern* (pp. 247-250). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Segall, A. & Gaudelli, W. (2007). Reflecting socially on social issues in a social studies methods course. *Teaching Education*, 18(1), 77-92.
- Shaver, J. (Ed.). (1991). *Handbook on Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning*. New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Shinew, D. (2001). Disrupt, transgress and invent possibilities. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(3), 488-516.

- Simpson, M. (2010). Editor's notebook. *Social Education*, 74(4), 168-169.
- Sincero, P., & Woyshner, C. (2003). Writing women into the curriculum. *Social Education*, 67(4), 218-226.
- Singer, A. (2005). Strange bedfellows: The contradictory goals of the coalition making war on social studies. *Social Studies*, 96(5), p. 199-206.
- Sparacino, E. (2004). An online bibliography of resources for the study of woman suffrage. *History Teacher*, 37(2), 229-238.
- Stanford University (2008). *Social studies methods for elementary school: Education 228H*. Retrieved from <https://coursework.stanford.edu/access/content/attachment/124efd7b-8b2a-4ff5-00fa-67aa1d3feca2/Educ228H.Syllabus.Spring2008.BScarloss.doc>
- Stanford University (2010a). *ED 268A: Teaching history/social science*. Retrieved from https://suse-step.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/educ268a_2010.pdf
- Stanford University (2010b) *ED 268B: Teaching history/social science*. Retrieved from https://suse-step.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/educ268b_2010.pdf
- Stanford University (2011). *ED268C: Teaching history/social science*. Retrieved from https://suse-step.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/educ268b_2011.pdf
- Stanley, L. (2004). A methodological toolkit for feminist research: Analytical reflexivity, accountable knowledge, moral epistemology and being 'A child of our time'. In (H. Piper and I. Stonach, Eds.), *Educational research: Difference and diversity* (3-29). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- St. Joseph's University (2009). *Practical issues in secondary social studies education*. Retrieved from <http://www.mrclapper.com/teaching/Secondary%20Social%20Studies%20Methods%20Course%20Final%20S2009.pdf>

- St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(5), 477-515.
- St. Pierre, E. (2011). Post qualitative Research: The critique and the coming after. In (N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (611-625). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Staples, S. (1989). *Shabanu: Daughter of the wind*. New York, NY: Laurel Leaf.
- Stearns, P. (2000). Student identities and World History teaching. *The history teacher*, 33(2), 185-192.
- Stewart, L. (2006). Celebrating the life and legacy of Rosa Parks. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 19(1), 23-26.
- Stone, L. (1996). Feminist political theory: Contributions to a conception of citizenship. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 24(1), 36-53.
- Stronach, I., & MacLure, M. (1997). *Educational research undone : The postmodern embrace*. Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press.
- Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered discourses*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Teachers College, Columbia University. (2007). *A&HW 5035: Diversity and social studies curriculum*.
- The wage gap, by gender and race. In *Infoplease*. Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0882775.html>
- Threadgold, T. (2000). Poststructuralism and discourse analysis. In C. Poynton, & A. Lee (Eds.), *Culture & text : Discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies* (pp. 40-58). Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Tomlinson, B. (2010). *Feminism and affect at the scene of the argument: Beyond the trope of the angry feminist*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Tretwick, J. (1971). Women in U.S. history high school textbooks. *Social Education*, 35(3), 249-260, 338.
- Tyson, C. & Hinton-Johnson, K. (2003). Once upon a time: Teaching about women and social justice through literature. *Social education*, 67(1), 54-57.
- U.S. Senate (2012). *Women in the Senate*. Retrieved from <http://www.senate.gov/reference/Index/Women.htm>
- University of Florida (2011). *Secondary school social studies methods and assessment*. Retrieved from <http://education.ufl.edu/coe-syllabi/Fall-2011-SSE6133-2011-07-12-11-13-39.pdf>
- University of Georgia (2007). *ESOC 3420: Teaching social studies in elementary school*. Retrieved from http://archive.coe.uga.edu/syllabus/esoc/ESOC%203420_Cluster%20B_Hekimoglu_F07.pdf
- University of Georgia (2008). *ESOC 4360: Methods of teaching social science in secondary schools*. Retrieved from http://archive.coe.uga.edu/syllabus/esoc/ESOC_4360_ButlerB_FA08.pdf
- University of Kentucky (2008). *EDC 632: Social studies pedagogy in secondary school*. Retrieved from www.uky.edu/~kswan2/syllabi/syllabus_632_fall2008%20copy.doc
- University of Memphis (2009). *ICL 7652/8652: Middle/Secondary social studies methods*. Retrieved from http://memphis.edu/icl/pdf/ICL7652_8652.pdf
- University of Michigan (2006). *Teaching social studies in the secondary school: ED 432*. Retrieved from http://soe.umich.edu/files/EDUC_432_mcarthur_F.pdf

University of Michigan (2007) *Education 432: Teaching history and social studies in secondary schools*. Retrieved from <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/brettlevy/files/432.doc>

University of Michigan (2008) *Education 431: Teaching social studies in the elementary school*. Retrieved from <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/brettlevy/files/431.doc>

University of Missouri-Kansas City (2010). *Special methods in social studies*. Retrieved from education.umkc.edu/documents/fetch/32

University of Nevada-Las Vegas (2007). *Teaching elementary social studies*. Retrieved from <http://coe.nevada.edu/ckeeler/ssm/Syllabus.html>

University of North Florida (2006). *Social studies methods for elementary students*. Retrieved from: <http://www.unf.edu/~ccarter/SSE3313.html>

University of Northern Iowa (2009). *Teaching elementary social studies*. Retrieved from: <http://www.uni.edu/icss/164/sp09/index.html>

University of Texas (2009a). *EDC 370S: Secondary social studies methods*. Retrieved from http://www.edb.utexas.edu/education/faculty/syllabi/ci/9330_EDC370S_BLEVINS,B.pdf

University of Texas B (2009b) *EDC 3508/6508: Secondary social studies methods*. Retrieved from http://www.edb.utexas.edu/education/faculty/syllabi/ci/9095_EDC350S_BROWN,A.pdf

University of Wisconsin (2010a). *Advanced practices in the teaching of social studies*.

University of Wisconsin (2010b). *C&I 371: Teaching social studies in elementary and middle schools*.

University of Wisconsin (2011). *C&I 371: Teaching social studies in elementary and middle schools*.

- van Hover, S. (2003). Deborah Partridge Wolfe and education for democracy. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 31(1), 105-131.
- Washington, E. & Humphries, E. (2011). A social studies teacher's sense making of controversial issues discussion of race in a predominantly white, rural high school classroom. *Theory and research in social education*, 39(1), 92-114.
- Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, language and discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Weedon, C. (1999). *Feminism, theory, and the politics of difference*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Wei, J. (2011). Winning the vote for women: Objection and answer. *Middle level learning*, 40, M8-M10.
- Weiler, K. (2008). The feminist imagination and educational research. *Discourse: Studies in cultural politics of education*, 29(4), 499-507.
- Willensky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Women CEOs (2011, May 23). *CNNMoney*. Retrieved from <http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2011/womenceos/>
- Woyshner, C. (2002a). Teaching the women's club movement in united states history. *Social Studies*, 93(1), 11-17.
- Woyshner, C. (2002b). Political history as women's history: Toward a more inclusive curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(3), 354-380.
- Woyshner, C. (2003). Gender, race, and national PTA: Civic engagement and public education, 1890-1930. *Teachers College Record*, 105(3), 520-544.

- Woyshner, C. (2004a). Women's associations and the origins of the social studies: Volunteers, professionals, and the community civics curriculum, 1890-1920. *International Journal of Social Education*, 18(2), 15-26.
- Woyshner, C. (2004b). Preparation for the duties of life: Women reformers and the functional curriculum, 1893-1918. *Educational Foundations*, 18(3-4), 25-44.
- Woyshner, C. (2006). Picturing women: Gender, images, and representation in social studies. *Social Education*, 70(6), 358-362.
- Youdell, D. (2010). Queer outings: Uncomfortable stories about the subjects of post-structural school ethnography. *International journal of qualitative studies in education*, 23(1), 87-100.
- Zeichner, K. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zittleman, K. & Sadker, D. (2002). Gender bias in teacher education texts: New (and old) lessons. *Journal of teacher education*, 53, (168-180).

APPENDIX

RACE AND EQUITY IN THE SYLLABI

After coming to the troubling conclusion that women, gender, and difference were almost entirely absent from these social studies methods course syllabi, I took a step back and tried to think more deeply about the problem of focusing on these two words to identify an equity orientation in the field. In particular, I thought about the argument that Crocco and others have made (Crocco 2004, 2006, 2008; Hahn, Bernard-Powers, Crocco & Woyshner, 2007) that the motivation to attend women and gender in social studies may have been undermined by what was perceived as a more pressing need to attend to race and multiculturalism. Therefore, I decided to explore the use of these words. Additionally, I expanded my search to also include the word "equity" to see if the attention paid to that issue might signal the presence of other critical or equity discourses that could be extended to attention to gender. This exploration did not align coherently the rest of the discussion in this chapter, but I've included it here in case of interest.

Race

What I found in my search for "race" surprised even jaded, cynical old me. Race -- or a derivative of the word -- appears just 10 times in the syllabi, at a frequency ranking of 1402nd. In fact, it appears in many of the same places I've already described that gender appears: references to assignments that require students to identify demographic information about schools or communities, institutional philosophies or professional expectations, in the Teachers

College syllabus as a topic of several weeks of class, in the Michigan State instructor's subjectivity statement, and surprise of all surprises, in the title of two required readings in the syllabi from the University of Georgia. That's it! In an educational ecosystem in which discourses dominating both education research and public discourse swirl around NCLB, the achievement gap, and failing schools and teachers, which all revolve, in some capacity, around the educational experiences of children of color (for further discussion of both the relationship between and the pervasiveness of these topics in education research, see Parks, 2007, 2009; Schmeichel, 2012) the word race appears in these syllabi only 10 times, across syllabi from only three different institutions: Michigan State, the University of Georgia, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Although it exceeds the parameters of this project, I think it's important to point to the absence of the use of the word means for social studies teacher education and K-12 education and how we can conceive of teaching social studies content and students without explicitly using the word race consistently. In reference to this project, however, the fact that race and gender occurred a similarly infrequent number of times in the syllabi indicated that one was not supplanting the other as the primary focus of a critical discourse.

Multicultural

The search for "multicultural" and "multiculturalism" yielded more results. There were 48 instances in which it appeared in the syllabi, giving some credence to the before-mentioned explanations in the literature on women and gender in social studies that have attributed the marginalization of those topics, in part, to the more prevalent focus on multiculturalism. The ways in which these words are used, however, is very similar to the kinds of ways that the word "gender" was used: references to multiculturalism were most frequently found in the title of a

reading, or in a general mission or philosophy statement touting a commitment to a multicultural classroom or society. There were also instances of the word in reference to a lesson plan assignment. As an example of this kind of usage, students at Illinois State (2006, p. 6) were required to develop a unit plan that included "a multicultural issue activity".

The search did produce a more critical reference to the word multicultural in two syllabi. The first was in a syllabus from the University of Texas (2009b), where it showed up in one of the six course goals and objectives. When examined within the context of the entire statement, the presence of "multicultural" in this excerpt from that syllabus reveals a critical orientation toward social studies, most obviously because the word critical precedes it:

5) Commitment to diversity and culturally responsive teaching: The unrelenting effort to become reflective of our own positionality and approaches to diverse classroom settings by integrating culturally relevant curricula and pedagogy into our understanding of effective teaching. As educators, we remain committed to reflective practices that examine linguistic, cultural and academic diversity through a more critical multicultural lens. Our abilities to examine our own teaching and responsibilities to all children remain a driving force in our continued growth as teachers. (p. 2)

Similarly, the syllabi from the elementary social studies methods courses at the University of Wisconsin include references to multicultural education within statements that could be interpreted as reflecting a critical orientation toward social studies teaching and learning. The following excerpt appears in both syllabi (2010b, 2011), where the instructors included a "refresher" of the written mission of the Wisconsin elementary education program:

to provide an intellectually challenging professional program that promotes social justice through multicultural education and critical reflection. This entails educating teacher leaders who:

- Are well educated in academic content and dedicated to continued learning;
- Recognize the powers, limits, and controversies of particular disciplines;
- Understand that identity shapes all thinking and action: their own, their students' and that of all those connected to schooling
- Know that institutions like school have the potential to both perpetuate inequities and effect change in society. (2011, p. 2)

Both of these instances of the word multicultural are embedded in contexts that would appear to signal an orientation towards a critical examination of the role of culture in society, schools, and in social studies. However, I think it's important to note that these specific instances and claims about what was important are the only places in these syllabi in which this critical orientation was present. While some of the reading assignments within these two syllabi, for example, lean toward the more critical end of social studies education, including Loewen in the Texas (2009a, 2009b) syllabus and Zinn in the Wisconsin (2010b, 2011) syllabi, the overwhelming focus of both of these courses would seem to be on what Segall (2002) referred to as the technical aspects of social studies teaching and learning: planning and organization. So while these particular instances of the word multicultural, when examined in context, would seem to point towards a focus on critique and positionality, there is insufficient evidence in the rest of the documents to indicate a robust engagement with these ideas. Although these instances might have signaled an exception to how the word multicultural typically appeared in these syllabi, upon closer

inspection, they are actually similar in terms of appearing to pay merely lip service to the concept.

Equity

There were 12 hits for "equity" across 10 different syllabi. That's the same number of occurrences as words like "socratic" "tape" and "Hirsch" (as in E.D. Hirsch). Because using the word equity in education would seem to acknowledge the existence of inequity in a way that the mere presence of a word like race, gender, and multicultural does not, it is perhaps not surprising that when I went into the syllabi to examine the context in which the word was situated, I found a pattern of usage that was different than the use of the other words I had searched. While the use of "equity" is certainly not pervasive in the syllabi, it is more typically situated in broad statements of what social studies teaching and learning is "for". For example, it appears in statements indicating that goals of the course include developing the capacity to "[d]esign curricula which support equity, social justice, and a global world view" (Pacific, 2011, p. 1) and that curriculum and pedagogy theory and practices will be examined, for among other things, their "contribution to equity and social justice issues in history education" (American, 2008, p. 1). So while in some instances, "equity" is situated in lists of concepts like inquiry and civic responsibility as "themes that will be highlighted", in other places, as this quote from a Michigan State (2010, p. 1) syllabus demonstrates, the idea of equity is more robust: the instructor notes that one of the goals of the course is "to think deeply about what it means to be a social studies teacher, how our jobs in education are inherently political, and the ways in which our work in public education can affect social change toward greater equity and justice". Although there were a few examples of the usage of "equity" that might be interpreted as revealing a particular orientation toward thinking about social studies in terms of its equity potential - which, by

extension, could be seen as spaces in which ideas around gender equity could be engaged - these examples were still few and far between.