

2017

Gender and feminist scholarship: A dynamic theoretical framework living on the edges

Chara H. Bohan

Georgia State University, cbohan@gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bohan, Chara H., "Gender and feminist scholarship: A dynamic theoretical framework living on the edges" (2017). *Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications*. 116.
https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub/116

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

Gender and Feminist Scholarship in Social Studies Research
A Dynamic Theoretical Framework Living on the Edges

Chara Haeussler Bohan

Malala Yousafzai, a 15-year-old Pakistani girl who fought for educational opportunities for Muslim girls, was shot by the Taliban for her actions. In recognition of her work, she was co-awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2014. Ms. Yousafzai's book (2013), *I am Malala*, sheds light on issues of gender and education at a global level. In particular, her book informs readers about the challenges that young women living in patriarchal, traditional, and socially conservative societies face in terms of acquiring education. On the surface, Ms. Yousafzai's powerful message causes readers to consider the significant discrepancies that exist with respect to gender and education between various societies, whether they are traditional, repressive, moderate, progressive, enlightened, or a combination of classifications. But appearances can be deceiving. In western societies, where gender issues are ostensibly viewed as having been resolved, the term *postfeminist* is employed upon occasion to characterize a discourse of "unambiguous female success, where celebrations of 'presumptive' gender equity are taken as proof that meritocratic principles for attaining bourgeois success have worked" (Walkerdine & Ringrose, 2006, p. 33).

Careful analysis reveals, however, that in most contemporary societies, gender and education discrepancies remain noticeable concerns. In 2005, Harvard University President Larry Summers attributed the under-representation of female scientists at elite universities to deficiencies in the innate abilities of women (Hemel, 2005). Summers' remarks drew strong popular criticism and eventually he resigned from his position, but questions raised by his comments remained. How could the head of one of the most elite universities in the World question women's intellectual abilities in the field of science? Gender disparities of course have not been limited to education. Men continue to dominate the majority of political offices, technology and weaponry, and worldwide men's earned incomes are approximately 180% of women's (Connell, 2006, p. 27). In the Fortune 500 companies, just 4.6% of CEOs are women (Catalyst, 2015; Weiler, 2014). Moreover, women comprise only 10% of aerospace engineers (American Federation of Labor, [AFL], 2013). Thus, a gender gap by occupation continues and a wage gap persists that translates into significant differences in earnings over the course of a lifetime. After the 2014 congressional elections, just 19% of the United States Congress were women (Center for American Women and Politics, 2015; Weiler, 2014). Thus, women remain a minority in the U.S. political process making women less likely to be depicted in social studies curriculum and instruction.

Feminist Scholarship and Social Studies

Because women often are not at the forefront of the political, military, and business arenas, feminist scholarship in the realm of social studies education is correspondingly paltry. Indeed, research that employs gender and/or feminism as a theoretical framework in social studies education continues to reside on the edges. This phenomenon is evident from my review of recent gender and feminist scholarship in social studies education.

In this review a broad definition of “social studies,” including “social education” is employed. Various definitions of social studies education have existed over the course of the past two centuries, but often the term “social studies” is confined to the schoolhouse with antecedents in the curriculum developed by Thomas Jesse Jones at the Hampton Institute (Evans, 2004; Woynshner & Bohan, 2012). This approach to defining social studies, although including the content areas of history, geography, political science, economics, and the behavioral sciences, would omit education about democracy and citizenship in a variety of settings (Crocco, 1999). Furthermore, this definition does not include women who may have been barred from formal schooling for a host of reasons, such as race, socioeconomic status, marriage, pregnancy, or educational opportunity. Thus, I employ a broad definition of social education, but for the purposes of gathering research and keeping within the confines of space limitations, only journals, chapters, and books particular to social studies and social education are examined. For purposes of clarity in writing, only the term “social studies education” is utilized throughout the chapter, but it is intended to encompass a more comprehensive understanding of the field. The recent history of gender and social studies education research warrants a brief description. In 1991, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) sponsored the *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (Shaver, 1991). The *Handbook* comprises 53 chapters, yet the publication does not include a single chapter dedicated to feminist theory, gender or sexuality. At the time, gender was an emerging lens for social studies education research; however, Shaver did not believe it warranted distinct treatment. Five years later, the *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* included a chapter on equity challenges and gender was the focus of one of the four equity groups the authors selected for analysis (Kohl & Witty, 1996). When Linda Levstik and Cynthia Tyson edited the *Handbook of Research in Social Studies Education* in 2008, 17 years after the publication of Shaver's (1991) *Handbook*, Margaret Crocco contributed a chapter on gender and sexuality. In the ensuing years, there has been an expanding body of research on sexuality in social studies education and a separate chapter on sexuality and queer theory is included in the current volume (see Mayo, chapter 11). Thus, Christine Woynshner's (2012) chapter on gender entitled, “Gender and Social Studies: Are We There Yet?” in William Russell's *Contemporary Social Studies: An Essential Reader* and this current chapter on gender and feminist scholarship are among the earliest stand-alone chapters on gender in handbooks devoted exclusively to social studies education research.

Despite much popular attention to gender and education on a global level, as Malala Yousafzai's Nobel Peace Prize signals, gender research in social studies education in particular remains primarily on the margins. Moreover, other topics, such as technology, teacher education, pedagogies, multicultural education, civic education, and historical thinking, tend to garner more research attention in social studies education.

Terminologies, Methodology and Ideologies

While first-wave feminism awakened an interest in suffrage as well as granting access to women's and girls' education, second-wave feminism of the 1960s broadened the debate to include sexuality, reproductive rights, and protections in the workplace. Criticism of second-wave feminism is that the movement tended to create a monolithic single version of the female

experience (that tended to reflect the experiences of White, middle-class women in America). Recognizing that women and men do not all share the same experiences, the new gender research on femininities and masculinities in the plural reflects the shifting discourses around gender as they relate to education, race, class, and ethnicity (Walkerdine & Ringrose, 2006). For detailed essays on terminology with respect to gender studies, Catharine Stimpson and Gilbert Herdt's (2014) work, *Critical Terms for the Study of Gender*, includes chapters by pioneers in the field of women and gender.

In recent years, the field of women's studies has experienced a major paradigm shift involving basic definitions of terms. Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) helped draw popular attention to the modern women's movement. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, **sex** or national origin (see United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [USEEOC], 1964, bold added for emphasis). In 1964, the term "sex" was employed rather than "gender." By the 1970s, challenges to the term "sex" arose to confront implications that sex differences are biologically derived and that such differences are innate and immutable (Francis, 2006, pp. 7-14). Theorists who challenged the terminology of "sex" argued that gender identity is socially constructed, is connected to social learning and perception, and is viewed as shifting over time (McDermott & Hatemi, 2011). At the same time criticisms of the term "gender" have arisen. For example, MacInnes (1998) suggests that gender/sex will no longer be relevant categories and Paechter (2006) believes that the terms "gender" and "sex" suggest a dualism that does not reflect contemporary lived experience. New terms have been developed to reflect changing conceptions about the social constructions of gender. Thus, new social science research focusing on the terms "masculinities" and "femininities" reflects a growing understanding of the dynamic, diverse, fluid, and complex roles each possess.

The methodology employed in this chapter to gather contemporary research on gender and social studies education first focused on searching the main databases for Women's Studies (such as Women's Studies International, GenderWatch, LGBT Life). Two broader interdisciplinary databases, JSTOR and Project Muse, were also searched for the topic "social studies education." Education databases were searched as well, using truncation/ wild card symbols for the terms "femins*" and "gender*:" Using database searches did not yield tremendously fruitful results, as many research articles encompassing gender were not specific to social studies education in particular. However, this database search did assist in yielding updated information on gender and education, in general. The database search also revealed that gender is a more prevalent framework in other education arenas such as in the humanities and science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields.

In order to gather research more specific to social studies education, I commenced a complete search of titles since 2007 in the primary social studies education journals. As the purpose of this chapter is to examine new research in gender and social studies education undertaken since the publication of the previous handbook, a cutoff date of 2007 was selected. These journals include *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *Social Studies Research and Practice*, *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, *Journal of International*

Social Studies, *Journal of Social Science Education*, and practitioner journals *Social Education*, *Middle Level Learning*, *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, and *The Social Studies*. A small selection of statewide journals was reviewed, including the *Ohio Social Studies Review*, *Georgia Social Studies Journal*, and *California's Social Studies Review*. This selection process then led to a comprehensive review of all titles in the aforementioned journals from 2007 to the present.

Findings from the review reveal that feminist theory and gender are not prevalent frameworks for social studies education research. Multiculturalism, civic and democratic education, service-learning, and ESOL are more popularly researched topics. Second, it became evident that a select few researchers are trailblazers in the field of gender and social studies education research and continue to produce the bulk of the limited scholarship. The experienced scholars who consistently employ gender as a framework in their social studies education research include Jane Bernard-Powers, Margaret Crocco, Carole Hahn, Linda Levstik, and Christine Woyshner, to name a few. It appears that a new generation of feminist scholars is emerging, as well. Kay Chick, Sandra Schmidt, Mardi Schmeichel, and Kathryn Engebretson have produced recent scholarship with feminism and/or gender as a theoretical lens.

Dominant Ideologies in Contemporary Gender and Social Studies Education Research

Postpositivism, an umbrella term encompassing several theoretical frameworks such as postmodernism, post-structuralism, and postcolonialism, has become a dominant ideology in much education research of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Over the course of the latter-half of the 20th century, social studies education research has transitioned from a field dominated by quantitative analysis with a positivist framework (Shaver, 1991) to a field where qualitative analysis prevails (Levstik & Tyson, 2008). Postpositivists critique traditional positivistic scientific inquiry as value-laden and inherently subjective, despite the claims of science to objectivity. These critics note that determining "truths" is inherently subjective and influenced by the researchers' values (Bogdan & Bilden, 2007; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Silverman, 2010).

Because second- and third-wave feminism has influenced research in gender and social studies education, postpositivist critiques tend to prevail in this area of scholarship. Third-wave feminism arose in the 1990s in response to the perceived failures of second-wave feminism. Third-wave feminism broadened the base, providing recognition that women are of many ethnicities, cultures, nationalities, colors, and religions. Expanding the base of feminist research is essential to criticism of positivist research as widening the lens supports an awareness that positivist research is subjective in nature and limited to powerful elite. Michel Foucault (1972), a leading critic of positivism, emphasizes in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* the relationship between power and knowledge; he challenges historians' reliance on documentary evidence as a means to seek truth. Foucault suggests that language and discourse are a means to know, describe, and understand the forces that impact knowledge. In other words, language constitutes reality. More recently, feminist Foucauldian scholars Patti Lather (1991) and Betty St. Pierre (2000), emphasize the discursive and challenge hegemonic definitions of clarity. St. Pierre cautions that there are limits to discourse as other means of understanding may not be intelligible within the confines of language. In a recent article in *Theory & Research in Social Education* on

feminism and social studies, Mardi Schmeichel notes, "Discourses are material and productive forces which construct our reality and our conception of what our reality is" (2011, p. 13).

The influence of postpositivism and its concomitant emphasis on discourse has unleashed a major paradigm shift in feminist studies; theoretical understandings have moved from essentialist notions based on biological concepts of male and female to more inclusive considerations that examine gender from sociological and cultural perspectives (Weiler, 2014). Essentialism relies on the notion that men and women are born with different traits; these traits are viewed as essential. Lately, changes to the essentialist paradigm have developed. Views of gender have become more fluid and less stagnant. Historical notions of what it means to be male or female demonstrate that views of socially accepted gender behavior have shifted over time. Most recently, the transgender movement has helped to alter the terrain further.

To make sense of the recent scholarship in social studies education that employs gender as a theoretical framework, I referenced Margaret Crocco's (2008) chapter on gender and sexuality and Carole Hahn, Jane Bernard-Powers, Margaret Crocco and Christine Woysner's (2007) chapter on gender equity in the social studies in the *Handbook for Achieving Gender Equity through Education* to develop categories for understanding contemporary scholarship. Ultimately nine categories emerged to encompass recent research on the intersection of social studies education and gender, including: (1) teachers, social studies teacher education, and preservice teachers, (2) students, (3) curriculum and instruction, (4) textbooks, (5) standards and testing, (6) technology, (7) global studies, (8) contemporary and historic female social studies education leaders, and (9) masculinities. Throughout the chapter, international studies from outside of the U.S. have been included where appropriate.

Teachers, Social Studies Teacher Education, and Preservice Teachers

According to Stephen Thornton (2005) in *Teaching Social Studies that Matters*, teachers are curricular-instructional gatekeepers which means that teachers make educational decisions in the place where they count--the classroom. Thus, a study of gender and social studies education research appropriately begins with teachers. Who are the teachers? How do they view gender? As has been the case for the past century, women are more likely than men to teach and are more likely to have been educated to teach (National Center for Education Statistics [NCESJ, 2005). Today women constitute just under half the general workforce in the U.S., yet they comprise approximately 75% of the education workforce (AFL, 2013; National Education Association, 2008). More than 95% of kindergarten teachers are women, and 90% of special education teachers are women.

Daniel Lortie's (1975) classic work *Schoolteacher* lays the groundwork for a contemporary sociological understanding of teachers. In this text he explains the structure of teaching as an occupation, and finds recurrent themes of conservatism, individualism, and presentism. Lortie also examines teachers' sense of purpose and endemic uncertainties in their work, and teachers' attempts to balance these tensions between independence and dependence, autonomy and participation, and control and subordination. Gender differences are a miniscule component of Lortie's analysis. However, with respect to gender, Lortie find that a majority of

teachers, most of whom are women, expect their careers to be interrupted, for several reasons such as childbirth or relocation of a spouse. But career goals differ by gender, as a majority of male teachers have no intention of ending their careers as classroom teachers, while a vast majority of women think of teaching as terminal status. Thus, the men expect to earn a promotion within education or leave the field altogether, whereas the women plan to return to classroom teaching after a break in time and end their careers as teachers. Kathleen Weiler's (1988) *Women Teaching for Change: Gender, Class & Power* furthers the dialogue about women teachers by developing a critical theory of schooling that describes how gender is socially constructed. Patricia Carter's (2002) *Everybody's Paid but the Teacher* helps provide a historical analysis of how the teaching profession and the women's movement have brought about social changes such as suffrage, equal pay for equal work, elimination of marriage restrictions, and the fight for maternity rights.

Reports on the gender distribution of Advanced Placement (AP) teachers have produced mixed findings. In one study, Milewski and Gillie (2002) state the distribution by gender among all AP teachers was more or less equivalent. In another study, Paek, Ponte, Sigel, Braun, and Powers (2005) find that 63% of AP U.S. History teachers are males, similar to the ratio for all social studies teachers. A more recent study, however, suggests that the gender ratio of AP U.S. History teachers is essentially balanced with 50.5% female and 49.5% male (Glenn, 2012); implying that a higher percentage of female social studies teachers teach AP classes than males. Glenn's findings are credible and supported by contemporary research documenting a higher percentage of women in graduate school. Indeed, Milweski and Gillie's College Board study of the characteristics of AP teachers finds that most AP teachers hold master's degrees in the discipline in which they teach.

In social studies education, men comprise the majority of secondary social studies teachers. This gender imbalance in social studies teachers has resulted to some extent from federal legislation, including Title IX, which is a law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in any federal-funded education program or activity. The law's impact with respect to gender and education is significant. Title IX led to an increase in the school-based sports programs offered to women and caused an enlarged need for high school coaches (Conner, 2014; Hahn et al., 2007; Schmeichel, 2011). Indeed, as Table 1 indicates, only two fields in 2011-2012 in secondary education had a majority of male teachers; health and physical education teachers (63.5 % male) and social science teachers (63.4%). Ironically, the two fields are often connected (see Conner, 2014 for examination of the social studies teacher-coach phenomenon). Indeed, social studies teachers in comparison to other subject area disciplines, overwhelmingly are represented in the ranks of coaches. As more males coach sports and more social studies teachers are expected to coach, social studies as a field continues to include more men than women.

Table 1 Percentage of public school teachers of Grades 9-12, by field of main teaching assignment and selected demographic and educational characteristics: 2011-2012 (from NCEES, 2013)

<i>Selected demographic or educational characteristic</i>	<i>Field of main teaching assignment</i>											
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Arts and Music</i>	<i>English or Language Arts</i>	<i>Foreign languages</i>	<i>Health and physical education</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>Natural sciences</i>	<i>Social sciences</i>	<i>Special Education</i>	<i>Vocational</i>	<i>All others</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of teachers (in thousands)	1108 (32.76)	87.3 (4.85)	166 (7.03)	74 (4.18)	65.6 (3.47)	152.8 (6.67)	132.9 (5.35)	126.2 (5.35)	130.3 (10.33)	125.6 (5.49)	47.5 (3.92)	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Male	41.9 (0.66)	43.3 (2.45)	23.2 (1.73)	24.5 (2.38)	63.5 (2.62)	42.7 (1.88)	46.4 (2.16)	63.4 (1.79)	29 (2.10)	48.9 (1.99)	47.4 (3.75)	
Female	58.1 (0.66)	56.7 (2.45)	76.8 (1.73)	75.5 (2.38)	36.5 (2.62)	57.3 (1.88)	53.6 (2.16)	36.6 (1.79)	71.0 (2.10)	51.1 (1.99)	52.6 (3.75)	

Standard Error appears in parentheses

Despite the connection between gender, social studies education, and coaching, few research articles exist on teachers' opinions about teaching topics related to gender in the social studies classroom. Schafer (2007) conducted an observational study of one teacher's attempt to deliberately transform the U.S. History curriculum to intentionally include women. Not surprisingly, over the course of the study, the teacher faced many challenges to achieve her goal to show students that women were more than secondary characters in history. Future research might address questions about how men and women social studies teachers approach teaching topics related to gender in their classes.

Furthermore, a paucity of research exists on achieving gender equity in the general teaching workforce, much less the social studies teaching workforce. Relevant questions for future research might focus on inducting more men into the general teaching profession and exploring why men continue to hold a disproportionate number of administrative roles in education (principals, superintendents, etc.). In one English study, researchers suggest that "school equal opportunity statements widely ignore the under-representation of women in school managerial positions" (Moreau, Osgood, & Halsall, 2008, p. 553). Furthermore, researchers realize that administrators' discourses did not fundamentally challenge the position of women in society, thus school policies and practices could not necessarily advance gender equality.

In Monaghan's (2009) dissertation study of six social studies preservice teachers, she reveals that the participants did not find gender equity to be particularly relevant to their professional or personal lives. Despite such beliefs, the preservice teachers note the importance of gender influences in the social studies classroom as well as the existence of contemporary gender bias. Participants remark that evidence of women's inferior status includes inequities such as wage gaps, female objectification in the media, and male-dominated school administrations. Finally, all participants held negative impressions of the word "feminism." Monaghan completed her research at the University of Connecticut; certainly this study warrants replication in other locations in order to increase sample size and augment findings with respect to gender and social studies teachers.

Students

Certainly, preK-12 students reside at the heart of the social studies curriculum, but only a few studies since 2007 focus on how students are included in research studies exploring social studies education and gender. Carole Hahn and Laura Quaynor (2012) report that no gender differences in student civic knowledge have been found in recent years in the U.S. Before 1995, boys and young men tended to perform better on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) civics and history tests, but such differences no longer exist (see section on "Standards and Testing" below). However, gender differences appear with respect to some civic attitudes. For example, female students are more likely to report they trust governmental institutions and to support government funding for social services such as education and healthcare (Hahn & Quaynor, 2012). In addition, gender differences exist with respect to civic engagement; a higher percentage of young women report engagement in community service. While researchers

identify gender differences with respect to certain aspects of civic education, causal explanations for these variances remain unidentified. Outside of the U.S., differences with respect to gender and civic education persist in some countries. In recent decades, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) has conducted several ongoing comprehensive large-scale studies across 38 countries to investigate how students are prepared to undertake their role as citizens. The authors of the research project, the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), published detailed findings in various stages of the study over time. Eighth grade is the target population in the study. Significant variations exist in students' civic knowledge between and within countries. With respect to gender, girls demonstrate significantly higher civic knowledge skills than boys (average difference 22 scale points) in most countries (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2009).

Considerable research has been conducted outside of social studies education in particular, for example, in educational psychology, to understand how gender impacts the performance of girls and boys in schools. Kessels, Heyder, Latsch and Hannover (2014), locate several variables that influence gender differences as they relate to academic engagement. For example, in testing performance, boys tend to outperform girls in mathematics and science yet show weaker competency in reading (p. 221). This body of research on student performance might be repurposed for social studies education research. For example, understanding how student performance in subdisciplines that are more mathematically oriented (e.g., economics) compared to those that are more verbally oriented (e.g., history) may shed light on gendered differences. To date, gendered differences in Advanced Placement testing do illuminate issues related to gender and student performance (see section on "Standards & Testing" below). In countries where students are tracked by ability, Kessels et al. (2014) find that girls tend to be over-represented in higher tracks and boys tend to be over-represented in lower tracks. The authors attribute the differences to motivation. These international researchers advise that to alleviate gender differences in educational outcomes, a further understanding of how academic choices are affected by gender is warranted.

Several other factors beyond motivation and related to gender have been shown to impact student success in the social studies. In a meta-analysis of gender differences and school success, Spinath, Eckerl and Steinmayr (2014) investigate the roles of students' intelligence and personality in addition to motivation. Operating from the hypothesis that in countries with equal access to educational opportunities, girls outperform boys, the researchers sought to determine the factors that accounted for such differences. While factors varied from inconsequential to strong Spinath et al. find that girls are moderately better adapted to current school environments. Reasons include stronger verbal intelligence, higher levels of agreeableness, as well as stronger self-discipline and motivation. The authors argue that verbal intelligence is critical in discussion-oriented classrooms, and social studies falls within this categorization. Thus, researchers recommend change to specific aspects of school environments in order to reduce educational inequalities for boys.

With respect to gender and competition in educational settings, researchers Booth and Nolen (2012) conducted an experiment of 260 students from both single-sex and coeducational

schools in England. The researchers discovered that girls from the single-sex schools chose to compete similarly to the boys, thus suggesting that gender differences with respect to competitive behavior might reflect *social learning* rather than inherited gender traits (italics added for emphasis). In a study about school delinquency and social bonds, researchers found that for males, who are more likely to adopt "jock identities," a commitment to sports activities tends to increase school delinquency (Hart & Mueller, 2013, p. 128). Therefore, the recommendation is to encourage sports coaches (and social studies teachers rank second to physical education teachers in terms of percentages of coaches) to participate in early intervention programs as part of a strategy to reduce student delinquency.

A body of quantitative research studies from international contexts has determined that gender has little impact on student attitudes about multicultural education and other social studies content. For example, Salako, Eze, and Adu (2013) studied the effects of cooperative learning on 126 Nigerian middle school students' attitudes towards multicultural education concepts; they report gender has no effect on students' academic achievement. In a Turkish study of 601 fourth through seventh grade students' opinions about the content of social studies, gender also has been found to have no significant impact. Rather, other factors, such as grade level, father's educational status, and a student's attachment to the importance of social studies do have a marked impact (Saglam & Malbelegi, 2012). In another Turkish study (Ciftci, 2013) of 665 seventh grade students, a positive relationship exists between students' attitudes towards social studies and their perceptions of democracy. Yet, no difference has been uncovered in terms of gender. Notably, these studies relied exclusively on quantitative research methodological frameworks, employing t-tests and null hypotheses; these studies did not have sample sizes large enough to support generalizability.

Curriculum and Instruction

With respect to gender, several factors have impacted curriculum and instruction in social studies education in the U.S. These factors include increased attention to Women's History Month in March and the concomitant proliferation of lesson ideas in the social studies literature (print and online) as well as greater consideration to diverse and underrepresented groups through both the formal and cultural curriculum (Wineburg & Monte-Sano, 2008). Since the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002, standards and assessment have dramatically narrowed the curriculum and created pressure to cover content (Au, 2009; Grant, 2005, 2006; Marshall, Jacot, & Gamble, 2015; Salinas, 2006). Although standards and assessment have dramatically narrowed the content taught, Women's History Month provides a time in the school calendar where teachers can shift the focus more explicitly to women's roles and contributions. Certainly, the merits of devoting a single month to women (similar to Black History Month in February) are debatable; critics note that such events signal that women and Blacks are additive (and therefore not as important) and justify devoting the remaining months of the school year to White men's history. Supporters believe that it is important to focus on groups that would otherwise be left out of the curriculum. With respect to Women's History Month, a significant portion of the research is practitioner-oriented literature that deals with curriculum and that can be categorized as

additive pieces in women's history (Bennett & Williams, 2014; Cushman, 2014; Montgomery; Christie, & Staudt, 2014). These additive pieces in women's history largely focus on United States history and on famous American women. Researchers have conducted far fewer studies to measure the impact of a gender-inclusive social studies curriculum on student learning or student affective outcomes.

Recent literature on incorporating women's history or gender into the social studies curriculum is robust for all grade levels-elementary, middle, and secondary education. But, as Woyshner (2012) notes in her chapter, considerations of gender and the social studies curriculum have endured a bumpy road. Attention to gender diminished overall, in part due to the increased emphasis on standards in the wake of NCLB, to decreased funding for female students' issues, and to an overall sense that "full attention to gender in the social studies has been achieved" (Woyshner, 2012, p. 262). While print and online resources for teaching about women have flourished in recent times, there is a dearth of research studies that evaluate the impact of these resources.

Gender and Elementary Social Studies Curriculum

At the elementary level, considerable research has reported that diminished time is devoted to social studies in general due to the increasing emphasis on reading, writing, and mathematics in the wake of standardized assessments (Bisland, 2012; DeChano-Cook, 2012; Porter, 2010; Williams & Maloyed, 2013). However, there is a fairly substantial body of practitioner-oriented work that provides teachers with strategies for incorporating a study of women's history and gender in the classroom. Most notable is the January/February 2014 issue of *Social Studies and the Young Learner* which is devoted to Women's History Month. Five articles feature ideas for incorporating women and gender into the curriculum. The articles provide strategies for teaching about women, including locating resources and developing new approaches to pedagogy. For example, Montgomery, Christie and Staudt (2014) write about using a cooperative biographical approach as a means for student research and civic action. One of the authors, elementary teacher Jessica Staudt, gave students materials on historically significant change agents Amelia Bloomer, Maya Angelou, Carrie Chapman Catt, Ida B. Wells, and Jane Addams as a starting point for research. These projects segued into an assignment in which students were asked to write letters to local female political leaders. Bennett and Williams (2014) provide a guide and resource list for the use of images of women. The resources include links to the National Women's History Museum, the Women and Social Movement's website, the National First Ladies' Library, and the Library of Congress, Images of Women during the Civil War webpage. Mary Cushman (2014) offers lesson ideas on Juliette Low, founder of the Girls Scouts, using a notable social studies trade book that features Law's life. Sarah Philpott (2014) discusses a book group research project she conducted where students read the American Girl series, thus learning women's history through historical fiction. Gilberto Lara and Maria Leija (2014) describe how elementary teachers can discuss gender roles through the story of *Max: The Stubborn Little Wolf*. Max is unusual wolf who wants to be a florist rather than a hunter like his father. Collectively, with the

exception of the Lara and Leija article, this special issue is representative of the additive approach to incorporating gender in the elementary social studies curriculum.

Gender and the Middle Grades Social Studies Curriculum

Middle Level Learning (MLL) also featured a special issue in 2011 to honor Women's History Month with similar articles advocating for the inclusion of gender in social studies content and curriculum. These articles include background information about the American women's movement as well as strategies for teaching about the topic in the middle grades classroom. Catherine Carter (2011) provides a brief history of the Second Generation of suffragists in "Raise up your cloth!" She also offers an "Objection and Answer to Women's Voting" activity created by Jenni Wei that teachers could complete quickly in class. Former NCSS President Tedd Levy (2011) contributes a piece on the historical origins of women's basketball. *MLL* editor Steven Lapham presents a timeline of educational opportunity brought about by legislation such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of 1972. In a later issue of *MLL*, Scott Roberts (2013) authors an article on county names and historical women. Roberts finds that only 2% of U.S. counties are named after women, thus he devised a historical inquiry lesson plan for students to explore the 13 U.S. counties that were named in honor of women for their own accomplishments (not simply women who were married to significant males). Again, these articles seem to be fairly representative of the additive approach to gender in the social studies curriculum.

Gender and the High School Social Studies Curriculum

In the secondary level, several journals have advocated for the inclusion of women's history in the classroom and have published lesson plan ideas on how to incorporate women into the social studies curriculum (see, for example, Bair, Williams, & Fralinger, 2008; Monk, 2004; Risinger, 2013). Several recent books including, *Clio in the Classroom* (Berkin, Crocco, & Winslow, 2009); *Teaching Women's History Through Literature* (Chick, 2008); *Through Women's Eyes* (DuBois & Dumenil, 2012); and *Gender in the Classroom* (Sadker & Silber, 2007), provide resources for teachers who seek to engage students in learning about women's history and gender.

Research about Social Studies Curriculum and Gender

In a special issue of *Theory & Research in Social Education*, Segall (2013) calls for more critical discourse in social studies education research, especially with respect to gender and race, as these paradigms are performative, socially constructed with respect to power and domination, and often "othered" (e.g., these concepts often occupy the sidebar of the main narrative in social studies textbooks). Schmeichel (2014) answers Segall's call using discourse analysis methodologies to explore recently published social studies lesson plans. Schmeichel finds problematic discourses about gender norms such as avoidance of power and patriarchy and failure to address inequity issues. Similarly, Schmidt (2012) determines that the presentation of women in history textbooks since Trecker's (1971) study has substantially improved, yet she discovers the traditional concept of woman had been normalized in the curriculum. Ultimately

Schmidt's research demonstrates that the 19th-century notion of the "Cult of True Womanhood," which excludes poor women and women of color, continues to be reified in the history curriculum. According to Schmidt:

Feminist writers have proposed changing the lens through which we make determinations about what constitutes history [and the new lens] will change who and what constitute that history. This claim holds great promise for altering the history curriculum and producing a curriculum.

Wineburg and Monte-Sana's (2008) research in the *Journal of American History* provides empirical evidence about the manner in which the representation of women in American history impacts student understanding of history. They conducted an investigation to analyze whether changes in curriculum materials "made a dent in popular historical consciousness" (p. 2). Approximately 2,000 11th and 12th grade public high school students across the 50 states were asked to nominate 10 figures they believed "mattered most" in American history--the list was to be divided into two sections, A and B. Students could not include U.S. presidents or presidents' wives and in part B they were required to list famous American women. Wineburg and Monte-Sano note in the limitations of the study that the instructions "obviously inflated the number of women listed" (p. 6) but nonetheless the authors note surprise that two African American women garnered such a large percentage of students' votes. Wineburg and Monte-Sano later repeated the experiment with 2,000 adults age 45 and older. The students' final lists reveal a "changing pantheon of American heroes" (p. 1). The top 10 for the students are 1. Martin Luther King, Jr. 2. Rosa Parks 3. Harriet Tubman 4. Susan B. Anthony 5. Benjamin Franklin 6. Amelia Earhart 7. Oprah Winfrey 8. Marilyn Monroe 9. Thomas Edison and 10. Albert Einstein. The adult top 10 list includes the same individuals with the exception that Betsy Ross and Henry Ford are named rather than Marilyn Monroe and Albert Einstein. The authors find it notable that the top three famous Americans are African Americans, and second and third place are Black women. Contrary to expected findings, the adults' final lists did not differ significantly from the students' lists. These results indicate that the narrative of American history includes a different cast of characters from a similar study conducted in the 1970s and 1980s (Frisch, 1989) in which Betsy Ross and Paul Revere occupy top spots. Wineburg and Monte-Sana's study provides some proof that African Americans and women are now more prominent in the national narrative perhaps due to increased attention to issues related to civil rights and gender in the social studies curriculum.

Collectively, these studies provide direction for future research with respect to how Women are represented in the social studies curriculum. Not only is it important to continue to critically interrogate representations of women in social studies lesson plans and textbooks, social studies researchers need to learn more about how these portrayals delimit student understanding of history.

Textbooks

The social studies textbook has perhaps the greatest impact on the social studies curriculum so it is significant that women historically have been underrepresented in textbooks (see Tetreault, 1986; Trecker, 1971). Today, a small group of famous women are repeatedly referenced in social studies textbooks and trade books (such as Harriet Tubman, Susan Anthony, Eleanor Roosevelt, Helen Keller, and Rosa Parks, see Bickford & Rich, 2014). Kay Chick (2006) examined K-12 American history textbooks for gender balance and discovered that significantly more males than females are found in all grade levels, both in content and illustrations. These differences are significant at the .001 level (thus a 99.9% chance the findings are true). While social studies methods texts provide more attention to gender than other content areas, a content analysis of social studies methods books reveals only 2.5% of the content space is devoted to gender (Zittleman & Sadker, 2003).

When women are included in social studies texts, they may be misrepresented or portrayed as occupying traditionally familiar gender roles. For example, in a study of children's trade books (Bickford & Rich, 2014) featuring three famous American women, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rosa Parks, and Helen Keller, researchers find various forms of historical misrepresentations and omissions. For instance, Helen Keller's socioeconomic background, as well as her accomplishments in later life, frequently are omitted. The economic marginalization of African Americans such as Rosa Parks also is left out of most children's texts. According to Bickford and Rich, the omission causes historic misrepresentation (other African Americans' contributions to the movement are neglected) which contributes to exceptionalism, heroification, and presentism. A gender-based analysis of the notable trade books for intermediate grades, also finds many more males than females represented (Chick & Corle, 2012). Schocker and Woynshner (2013) conducted a content analysis of images in an African American history textbook as well as two U.S. history textbooks and report that African American women are significantly underrepresented in both kinds of textbooks. When famous women are depicted in history texts, they are often featured in stereotypical roles related to domesticity. The lives of ordinary women who traditionally occupy a private sphere are conspicuously absent (Noddings, 2001).

Brugar, Halvorsen, and Hernandez (2014) leverage textbook analysis as a learning activity in a fourth grade classroom. Working alongside their teacher, the students analyzed the number of women and men in their textbook. The class discovered that men comprised 90% of the entries and women comprised a mere 10% of the entries. After a class discussion, students wrote to the publisher and asked the company to, "put more women in the book" (p. 31).

When men are portrayed in social studies textbooks, they are depicted as engaging in physical activity, fighting in battles, leading political office, or demonstrating aggressive behaviors (Chick & Corle, 2012). In a dissertation study that employs an androcentric gauge (which measures masculine interests or masculine points of view) to analyze mandated social studies textbooks in Canada, Bradford (2008) finds that far more men are present in official social studies knowledge. Similarly, in a study of 10th grade textbooks in Pakistan, findings indicate that the textbooks suffer from "gender disparity in presentation, gender role identity and

assignment" (Khan & Sultana, 2012). In a Turkish study comparing social studies textbooks and prospective teachers' choice of heroes or heroines, the researchers determine that 97.4% of the heroes found are male and 2.6% are female (Yazici & Asian, 2011). These studies suggest the need for comparative studies of gender disparity in international social studies textbooks. This type of research might better enable us to understand the manner in which the larger sociopolitical context impacts the representation of women in social studies textbooks.

Standards and Testing

Since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act, the field of social studies in the U.S. has had a tenuous relationship with the standards movement. Although all states have adopted social studies curriculum standards, not all states require a high-stakes social studies exam. In states that do implement an exam, passing it is often not required for promotion to the next grade level. Some me states have moved to an end-of-course requirement in specific content areas such as U.S. History and Economics, and passing these tests is necessary in some states to earn a high school diploma. The Common Core initiative was launched in 2009 as a means to standardize the curriculum on a national level. Social Studies/History standards are subsumed under the Common Core, English Language Arts/Literacy standards. As a result, social studies is largely marginalized in school curriculum.

Despite the lack of attention to the social studies in national standards, NCSS has its own set of standards, the 10 thematic strands (NCSS, 2010). In 2013, NCSS published new standards, called *The College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards: Guidance for Enhancing the Rigor of K-12 Civics, Economics, Geography, and History*. The C3 Framework is currently in the process of being rolled out to educators. At the same time, all states have their own social studies standards.

While much has been written about social studies standards (e.g., Au, 2009; Grant, 2005, Grant, 2006; Marshall, Jacot & Gamble, 2015; Salinas, 2006), more could be done to conduct gender-based analyses of these standards to understand the way in which women are depicted. For example, Crocco (2007, 2011) analyzes the treatment of women's rights as a human right within the 50 state social studies curriculum standards and finds variation across state standards; but in general she discovers that human rights education has been clouded by an emphasis on high-stakes testing (Crocco, 2007, pp. 260-261). Furthermore, Crocco (2011) finds weak name recognition for female world leaders among preservice social studies teachers. Based upon these findings, Crocco (2011) provides several recommendations for making gender a priority in world history curricula and notes several resources available to educators. Most recently, Engebretson (2014) investigates the revised NCSS standards in terms of gendered discourses. She finds two discourses prevail: first, "gender imbalance" with a narrow view of masculinity and second, "gender-free." Perhaps more importantly she uncovers a hidden discourse in which women are not given equitable representation in the curriculum standards, leading to the perception that women are not valued as historical actors.

Interestingly, when I explored national assessment data for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the SAT (formerly called the Scholastic Aptitude Test), and the

Advanced Placement Exams (AP), I found no major gender differences in student achievement, except in Mathematics and math-dominant fields such as Economics. For example, the NAEP is currently administered in four social studies content areas: Economics, Civics, Geography, and U.S. History. Of these four content areas, the 2010- 2012 data only reveal a gender gap in Economics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). There are no statistically significant gender differences in the nation's report card for Civics, Geography, and U.S. History. Given the fact that women outperform men in reading/language arts, and men outperform women in mathematics/science, the NAEP data for gender and social studies content generally is consistent with prior years of data on gender and testing.

SAT scores are relevant in terms of social studies disciplines, as Economics is more math-oriented and the other disciplines in the field are more dependent on reading and writing skills. For the SAT, 2014 scores reveal little difference by gender for critical reading and writing tests, but a 31-point higher differential in the mean score for males on the math examination.

For the AP examination, a 2014 program summary report indicates that significantly more males complete the two economics AP tests, while more females complete the three history, two government/political science and one geography AP examination. The College Board issued many reports with respect to gender-based performance differences in the AP examinations in the 1990s and early 2000s. The last report located, however, was conducted in 2002; thus indicating that gender-based performance differences apparently are no longer a concern for the College Board (Buck, Kostin, & Morgan, 2002). In the 2002 report on gender, the College Board finds that for U.S. History multiple choice items, measures of male and female performance are significantly correlated with item content. In an analysis of five subject areas (including U.S. History, European History, Biology, Microeconomics, and Macroeconomics), on the free-response questions, the College Board also finds male and female performance differences that are significantly correlated with item content (Buck, Kostin, & Morgan, 2002). For the past 10 years, the College Board has issued an annual report to the nation; the 2014 report provides considerable disaggregated data, particularly with respect to race and ethnicity, as well as data by U.S. state. None of the information, however, in the recent report provides information on AP scores with respect to gender (College Board, 2014a, 2014b), Future research in the social studies might continue this line of inquiry to determine whether there are gender disparities in achievement in the social studies and, if so, determine why.

Technology

Web-based

Many websites have been developed by well-known publishers to facilitate teacher knowledge with respect to notable women in American history. Websites are important to understand the larger agenda with respect to gender and social studies education as they have proliferated in the

21st century. Certainly, research with respect to the integration of gender, social studies education and technology is in its infancy. Notable websites include for example:

- Education World's "Women's History Month Lesson Plans and Activities" www.educationworld.com/a_special/women_history_lesson_plan.shtml;
- Educating Jane.com's www.educatingjane.com/Women/womenLP.htm;
- About Education's <http://womenshistory.about.com/od/essentials/>;
- Scholastic's teacher.scholastic.com/activities/women/notable.htm

Clearly, a need exists for more research on the relationship between technology, social studies, and gender. In 2008, a team of researchers led by Margaret Crocco sought to explore this relationship. The team uncovered more than 50 publications dealing with gender and technology, and more than 80 dealing with social studies and technology; but just five dealing with gender, technology, and social studies in even a cursory manner (Crocco, Cramer, & Meier, 2008). The team sought to reframe the way researchers look at the gendered technology gap. Rather than viewing female use of technology in social studies as a "gap" or a "problem" to be eliminated, the researchers focus on the different ways that males and females utilize technology in social studies.

The current picture is not much different from what Crocco's team learned. In a 2011 article, researchers explored 100 websites of feminist organizations in Canada (Irving & English, 2011). The researchers found innumerable missed opportunities to share knowledge and engage in community-based learning. In an investigation of teaching materials used in social studies lessons collected from 160 teachers (87 female and 73 male) published in the *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, researchers locate statistically significant differences in the usage of printed materials and method based upon the teacher's gender (Saglam, 2011).

Recently, Tina Heafner (2014) presented the results of a research study on gender and technology integration in social studies at the College and University Faculty Assembly of NCSS. From her qualitative study of 12 teachers (7 male and 5 female; all identified as tech-savvy), Heafner discovers that the females exhibit lower confidence than the males, despite having similar skill sets. She also determines that male and female teachers have different visions of how to use technology to teach social studies. Clearly, much more research needs to be conducted on the intersection of technology, social studies, and gender. Preliminary research shows a shift from a deficit paradigm to one that celebrates diverse skills.

Feature Films

Within the social studies, researchers have explored the impact of the role of film to teach about the women's movement. Since film can serve as an important means to analyze popular culture and the stereotypical or atypical manners in which women are portrayed, Marcus and Monaghan (2009) conducted a study with 46 students to evaluate how student understanding of the women's movement is impacted by the film *Iron Jawed Angels*. The researchers discovered important differences in how male and female students respond to the film. For instance, male students

more so than female students, uncover new knowledge about the women's suffrage movement. This finding corroborates Wineburg's (2001) assertion that in girls' minds women in history are blurry figures, but in boys' minds they are invisible. In addition, *Iron Jawed Angels* depicts strong female protagonists and provides students with increased awareness of alternative perspectives in historical narratives. In two other studies (Justice, 2014; Scheiner-Fisher & Russell, 2012) researchers describe how films portray issues of gender equity. Referencing the Bechel Test, an instrument developed to assist educators in determining if a film promotes gender equality (i.e., the presence of a strong female character), Justice evaluates how Disney's fairytale view of gender has matured over the course of the 20th and 21st centuries.

Gender and Global Studies

World Geography, Global Studies, and/or World History are a part of most U.S. states' social studies curriculum requirements, so an important avenue of research is to explore the intersection of teaching about issues of women and gender in a global setting. For example, Malala Yousafzai's book has helped to bring attention to global gender and educational concerns, with a particular focus on the Middle East. Her personal narrative of fighting for young women's education in Pakistan, and ultimately being shot by Islamic extremists in 2012 on a school bus, speaks to a worldwide audience about the discrimination women face with respect to education in certain societies. In a 2012 issue of *Social Education* that focuses on human rights, Rina Bousalis writes about the paradox Iranian women confront in their society. While Iranian women exceed the number of men graduating from Iranian universities--107 women for every 100 men; a vast improvement from 1991 when 40 women enrolled for every 100 men--these women face repression and marginalization from a traditionalist Islamist dictatorship that restricts women's rights with respect to inheritance, divorce, dress code political involvement, and child custody (Bousalis, 2012). Focusing on the three major religions in the Middle East--Judaism, Christianity, and Islam--Crocco, Pervez and Katz (2009) provide insight about women in the region and how faith shapes the contours of their lives. In other studies, researchers explore the effects of rapid increases in gender parity in primary schools in Bangladesh and Malawi (Chisamya, Dajaeghere, Kendall, & Khan, 2012). Unfortunately, the increases in educational opportunities for women in these countries did not transform the inequitable gender relations they experience in society, local communities, and homes. In an exploration of gender and the social sciences in Australia, Curthoys (2014) finds a growing alliance of gender studies and cultural studies. She argues it is important to understand why women relate that it remains difficult to achieve parity with men in particular disciplines (e.g. economics) and why strong gender differences remain.

Wiesner-Hanks (2007) discusses that few social studies education journals address the intersection of gender and world history because world history instruction has been traditionally dominated by stories of great states and long-distance trade that include little room for women. World history has also been dominated by the presumption that women occupy the private sphere of the family and not the public world of politics and the economy.

Several recently edited books address gender and education from a global level, and include descriptions from countries across continents (e.g. Fennell & Arnot, 2008; Gross, Davies, & Diab, 2013; Maslak, 2008; Tembon & Fort, 2008). Yet, few of these international compilations focused on gender and education do so from the perspective of social studies education. Carole Hahn's work on international civic education research stands as a strong counterexample to this assertion. Yet, Hahn (2010) in her recent publication on comparative civic education research states that more research on the relationship of gender and feminism in civic education is needed. *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy* (Arthur, Davies, & Hahn, 2008) is an important resource for educators interested in global civic education, and in this handbook Jane Bernard-Powers authors a chapter on feminism and gender in education for citizenship and democracy. Bernard-Powers notes that "the variance between the political, social and economic circumstances of women are vast and significant and they create complexity in the discussion of gender and feminism in relation to democracy, citizenship and education," (2008, p. 314). Indeed, she states that despite these complexities, the sharing of resources between feminists and citizenship educators has "the potential to move gender and feminism out of the margins and into the 'texts' of the field" (italics added for emphasis, 2008, p. 324).

Contemporary and Historic Female Social Studies Education Leaders

Much of the early feminist social studies education work follows a "contributions model" where scholars detail the contributions of little-known female social educators (e.g., Antler, 1987; Bohan, 2004; Crocco & Davis, 1999; Sadovnik & Semel, 2002; Woyshner & Gelfond, 1998). This approach to researching contemporary and historic female social education leaders continues in more recent research, including Bair's (2008) description of the pioneering work of Nannie Helen Burroughs; Rousmaniere's (2005) detailing of Margaret Haley's leadership as a citizen educator; Van Ingen's (2014) focus on Sarah McComb's efforts to address old-age income for single women teachers; Durst's (2010) writing about the women behind Dewey's laboratory school; Smyth and Bourne's (2006) edited book on several women educators from a historic perspective; Cusick's (2005) work on seven eminent American educators featuring Jane Addams, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Dorothy Day; Woyshner's (2009) scholarship focusing on the PTA, race and civic engagement; and Martin's (2011) edited work on women educational leaders including chapters on historic women leaders from Radcliffe, feminist classrooms, women leaders as superintendents, and teacher leaders working for social justice. Clearly, research on women social education leaders has blossomed in the wake of second and third generation feminist scholarship. While many women leaders have been uncovered, more work remains to be done in this area, especially in light of the fact that women are a majority of the workforce in education.

Masculinities

The shift from the term "sex" to "gender" opened the door for research on masculinity. Nonetheless, a paucity of research on the intersection of masculinities and social studies

education exists. In describing the genesis of masculinity, MacInnes (1998) remarks that men have lost a great deal of power over women and, realizes that they, too, constitute a gender. MacInnes rejects the idea that masculinity exists as a character trait of individuals. Offering a different perspective, Mayo (2007) finds that gay male teachers feel compelled by social and political forces to conform to expected norms of "masculine" and "male behaviors" (p. 447). This "hegemonic masculinity" that Mayo (2007, pp. 459-460) describes means that the gay male teachers believe they need to talk with a deep voice, avoid a certain kind of walk, demonstrate aggressive, assertive and competitive behaviors, and certainly check any flamboyant behavior at the schoolhouse door.

A small but increasing amount of educational research focuses on males and masculinities. For example, in one article Lundy-Wagner and Gasman (2011) shift their research focus to men--noting gender issues traditionally center on women--as they reconsider Black male students at historically Black colleges and universities. In another example of masculinities-oriented research and the social perception of what constitutes appropriate male behavior, the international *Journal of Inclusive Education* features an article, "'You're not a teacher, you're a man': the need for greater focus on gender studies in teacher education" (Cushman, 2012). Cushman interviewed primary school teachers across three countries: the United Kingdom, Sweden, and New Zealand. He finds that both men and women teacher education students require comprehensive gender studies if they are going to be able to deconstruct traditional stereotypes and contribute to social justice (a prominent theme in social studies education). A 2011 special issue of *The Journal of Men's Studies*, features scholarship on men in education and the disproportionate lack of male teachers. In an article in this special issue on a "genderful pedagogy" and the teaching of masculinity, Johnson and Weber (2011) contend that an active construction of masculinity can be integrated through a pedagogy of plurality and inclusiveness. Educator, filmmaker and author Jackson Katz centers his work on violence, media, and masculinities. He has created several documentaries on the representations of men and women in popular culture, and his Mentors in Violence Prevention model (MVP) emphasizes changing societal norms of femininity and masculinity as critical to violence prevention.

Strikingly, with the exception of Mayo's (2007) work on gay male teachers, almost none of the research on masculinities in education focuses on social studies education in particular. This lack of research is a truly missed opportunity, as social studies is one of two fields in secondary education where men constitute the majority of teachers. In addition, with a preponderance of male coaches in a majority of American high school social studies departments, the field is ripe for exploration of how masculinities are constructed and realized in the content area.

Conclusion

Gender and feminist scholarship continues to reside on the margins of social studies education research. A small but dedicated group, linked by "bonds of sisterhood," continues to produce high quality scholarship in this area (Bair, 2008; Bernard-Powers, 2008; Chick, 2006; Chick & Corle 2012; Crocco, 2007, 2008, 2011; Engebretson, 2014; Hahn, 2010; Hahn & Quaynor, 2012; Levstik & Tyson, 2008; Schmeichel, 2011, 2014; Schmidt, 2012; Schocker, 2014; Weiler, 2014;

Woyshner, 2009, 2012). The scholarship is focused in varying degrees on teachers, students, curriculum and instruction, textbooks, standards and testing, technology, global studies, masculinities, and historic and present female social studies education leaders. More research needs to be conducted, however, especially in the area of the intersection of gender, social studies education, and standards and testing, technology, and masculinities. In light of the December 2015 passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which supplants NCLB, new avenues for research on standards and testing with respect to gender and social studies education exist on the horizon. Perhaps, a special issue of *Theory & Research in Social Education* should be dedicated to gender and feminist scholarship in social studies education, from a ground-up approach of exploring how these constructs are realized in actual classrooms. Although gender and feminist scholarship may have, "come a long way" the road ahead is rocky and uneven, and, "we certainly are well on our way, but unfortunately are not close to arriving just yet" (Woyshner, 2012, p. 272).

Certainly, the connection between gender and social studies education research should reach a broader audience. A review of *Teachers College Record* articles from 2008 to 2014 yielded six articles on gender, but none specific to social studies education in particular. Another review focusing on titles from 2008 to 2015 in the *Journal of Curriculum Studies (JCS)* led to only one article on men's and women's work in the role of school principal. None of these recent JCS articles consider gender and social studies education. Such paltry numbers suggest that considerably more research needs to be conducted in the area of gender and social studies education. The field of secondary social studies remains the only academic content area where men constitute the majority of teachers, thus the discipline might produce thought-provoking perspectives on the role of gender. Undoubtedly, the role of masculinities would play an important avenue for investigation given the fact that social studies teachers represent the second highest percentage of athletic coaches—just behind kinesiology and health educators. Surely, increased research in social studies education viewed through the lens of gender would honor Malala Yousafzai and her struggle to gain educational opportunities for women worldwide.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Graduate Research Assistant, Rhonda Webb, who provided invaluable help locating, gathering, and compiling the references. Appreciation is also extended to Christopher Moore for reviewing a draft and making the table readable. Thanks are also extended to the anonymous reviewers who offered remarkably helpful editorial suggestions. Finally, gratitude must be extended to my husband who read a draft, offered suggestions, and continued to support me in my questioning of gender norms in society.

References

- American Federation of Labor, Department for Professional Employees. (2013). *Women in the professional workforce*. Retrieved from <http://dpeaflcio.org/professionals/professionals-in-the-workplace/women-in-the-professional-and-technical-labor-force>
- Antler, J. (1987). *Lucy Sprague Mitchell: The making of a modern woman*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Arthur, J., Davies, I., & Hahn, C. (2008). *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Au, W (2009). Social studies, social justice: W(h)ither the social studies in high-stakes testing? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 43-58.
- Bair, S. D. (2008). Educating black girls in the early 20th century: The pioneering work of Nannie Helen Burroughs (1879-1961). *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 36(1), 9-35.
- Bair, S. D., 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.
- Bennett, L. B., & Williams, F. J. (2014). Using images of women in American history. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 26(3), 15-18.
- Berkin, C., Crocco, M. S., & Winslow, B. (2009). *Clio in the classroom: A guide for teaching US Women's history*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bernard-Powers, J. (2008). Feminism and gender in education for citizenship and democracy. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 314-328). Los Angeles, SAGE.
- Bickford, J. H., & Rich, C. W. (2014). Trade books' historical representation of Eleanor Roosevelt, Rosa Parks, and Helen Keller. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 9(1), 18-65.
- Bisland, B. M. (2012). The marginalization of social studies in the elementary grades: An overview. In W. B. Russell (Ed.), *Contemporary social studies: An essential reader* (pp. 173-191). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Bilden, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Bohan, C.H. (2004). *Go to the sources: Lucy Maynard Salmon and the teaching of history*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Booth, A., & Nolen, P. (2012). Choosing to compete: How different are girls and boys? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 81, 542-555.
- Bousalis, R. (2012). Iranian women: Between education and repression. *Social Education* 76(5), 255-257.
- Bradford, K. J. (2008). *An androcentric gauge: Portrayals of gender relations in elementary social studies knowledge*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. NR39247)
- Brugar, K., Halvorsen, A., & Hernandez, S. (2014). Where are the women? A classroom inquiry into social studies textbooks. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 26(3), 28-31.
- Buck, G., Kostin, I., & Morgan, R. (2002). *Examining the relationship of content to gender based performance differences in Advanced Placement exams*. New York, NY: The College Board.

- Carter, C. M. (2011). Raise up your cloth! The woman suffrage movement's second generation: *Middle Level Learning*, 40, 2-10.
- Carter, P. A. (2002). *Everybody's paid but the teacher: The teaching profession and the women's movement*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Catalyst. (2015, April 3). *Women CEOs of the S&P 500*. New York, NY: Catalyst. <http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-ceos-sp-500>
- Center for American Women and Politics. (2015). *Facts: Congress*. <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu>
- Chick, K. A. (2006). Gender balance in K-12 American history textbooks. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 1(3), 284-290.
- Chick, K. A. (2008). *Teaching women's history through literature*. Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Chick, K. A., & Corle, S. (2012). A gender analysis of NCSS notable trade books for the intermediate grades. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 7(2), 1-13.
- Chisamya, G., Dajaeghere, J., Kendall, N., & Khan, M. A. (2012). Gender and education for all: Progress and problems in achieving gender equity. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(6), 743-751.
- Ciftci, S. (2013). The relationships between students' attitudes towards social studies and their perceptions of democracy. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(3), 77-83.
- College Board, Advanced Placement Program (2014a). *Program Summary Report*. Retrieved from <http://research.collegeboard.org/programs/ap/data/participation/ap-2014>
- College Board, Advanced Placement Program (2014b). *The 10th annual AP report to the nation*. Retrieved from <http://media.collegeboard.com/digitalServices/pdf/ap/rtn/10th-annual/10th-annual-ap-report-to-the-nation-single-page.pdf>
- Common Core State Standards. (n.d.). *Read the standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/read-the-standards>
- Connell, R. W. (2006). Understanding men: Gender sociology and the new international research on masculinities. In C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Gender and Education* (pp. 18-30). London, UK: SAGE.
- Conner, C. J. (2014). *Acknowledging the elephant in the room: A multiple-case study exploring the experiences of social studies teacher-coaches*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/theses>
- Crocco, M. S. (1999). Introduction. In M. S. Crocco & O. L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *Bending the future to their will: Civic women, social education, and democracy* (pp. 1-16). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Crocco, M. S. (2007). Speaking truth to power: Women's rights as human rights. *The Social Studies*, 98, 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. (2011). Teaching about women in world history. *The Social Studies*, 102, 18-24.
- Crocco, M. S., Cramer, J., & Meier, E. B. (2008). (Never) Mind the gap! Gender equity in social studies research on technology in the twenty first century. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, 2(1), 19-36.
- Crocco, M. S., & Davis Jr., O. L. (Eds.). 1999. *Bending the future to their will: Civic women, social education, and democracy* (pp. 1-16). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Crocco, M. S., Pervez, N., & Katz, M. (2009). At the crossroads of the world: Women of the Middle East. *The Social Studies*, 100(3), 107 -114.
- Curthoys, A. (2014). Gender and the social sciences: Field of study or form of inequality. *Australian Feminist Studies* 29(80), 115-120.
- Cushman, M. (2014). Scouting out a progressive role model: Here come the Girl Scouts! *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 26(3), 19-21.
- Cushman, P. (2012). You're not a teacher, you're a man: The need for greater focus on gender studies in teacher education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(8), 775- 790.
- Cusick, P.A. (2005). *A passion for learning: The education of seven eminent Americans*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- DeChano-Cook, L. M. (2012). Social studies and grade level content expectations in Michigan. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 36(2), 168-189.
- DuBois, E. C., & Dumenil, L. (2012). *Through women's eyes: An American history*. Boston, MA: Bedford St. Martin's.
- Durst, A. (2010). *Women educators in the Progressive Era: The women behind Dewey's Laboratory School*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Engbretson, K. (2014). Another missed opportunity: Gender in the national curriculum standards for social studies. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 9(3), 21-34.
- Evans, R. W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fennell, S. & Arnott, M. (2008). *Gender education and equality in a global context: Conceptual frameworks and policy perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London, UK: Tavistock.

- Francis, B. (2006). The nature of gender. In C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of gender and education* (pp. 7-17). London, UK: SAGE.
- Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York, NY: Dell.
- Frisch, M. (1989, March). American history and the structures of collective memory: A modest exercise in empirical iconography. *Journal of American History*, 75, 1130-55.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Glenn, J. E. (2012). *Teacher characteristics and practices and student performance on Advanced Placement examinations*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1037817237)
- Grant, S. G. (2005). More journey than end. In E. A. Yeager & O.L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *Wise social studies teaching in an age of high-stakes testing* (pp. 117-130). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Grant, S. G. (2006). Research on history tests. In S. G. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history* (pp. 29- 56). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Gross, Z., Davies, L., & Diab, A. (2013). *Gender, religion and education in a chaotic postmodern world*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Hahn C. L. (2010). Comparative civic education research: What we know and what we need to know. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 6(1), 5-23.
- Hahn, C. L., Bernard-Powers, J., Crocco, M. C., & Woysner, C. (2007). Gender equity in social studies. In S.S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving gender equity through education* (pp. 335-358). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hahn, C. L., & Quaynor, L. (2012). Gender & civic education. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (pp. 942-950). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Hart & Mueller, C. E. (2013). School delinquency and social bond factors: Exploring gendered differences among a national sample of 10th graders. *Psychology in Schools*, 50(2), 116- 133.
- Heafner, T.L. (2014, November). *Gender and technology integration in secondary social studies*. Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of College and University Faculty Assembly, Boston, MA.
- Hemel, D. J. (2005, January). Summers' comments on women and science draw ire. *The Harvard Crimson*. Retrieved from <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2005/1/14/summers-comments-on-women-and-science>
- Irving, C. J., & English, L. M. (2011). Community in cyberspace: Gender, social movement learning, and the Internet. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 61(3), 262-278.
- Johnson, S. P., & Weber, B. R. (2011). Toward a genderful pedagogy and the teaching of masculinity, *Journal of Men's Studies*, 19(2), 138-158.

- Justice, B. (2014). Maleficent reborn: Disney's fairytale view of gender reaches puberty. *Social Education*, 78(4), 194-198.
- Kessels, U., Heyder, A., Latsch, M., & Hannover, B. (2014). How gender differences in academic engagement relate to students' gender identity, *Educational Research*, 56(2), 220-229.
- Khan, Q., & Sultana, N. (2012). Transformative education, school textbooks and gender. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 109-115.
- Kohl, P. L., & Witty, E. P. (1996). Equity challenges. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 837-866). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Lara, G. P., & Leija, M. G. (2014). Discussing gender roles and equality by reading Max: The Stubborn Little Wolf. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 27(2), 22-25.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within/in the postmodern*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Levstik, L., & Tyson, C. (2008). *Handbook of research in social studies education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Levy, T. (2011). Game changer: Women's basketball and equal opportunity. *Middle Level Learning*, 40, 11-14.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lundy-Wagner, V., & Gasman, M. (2011). When gender issues are not just about women: Reconsidering male students at historically black colleges and universities. *Teachers College Record*, 113(5), 934-968.
- MacInnes, J. (1998). *The end of masculinity*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Marcus, A. S., & Monaghan, M. (2009). Tasting the fluoride: The potential of feature film to enhance the instruction of the women's movement. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 4(1), 13-30.
- Marshall, P.L., Jacot, A. L., & Gamble, A. F. (2015). How elementary teachers imagine social studies in an age of teacher assessments. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 10(2), 1-13.
- Martin, J. L. (2011). *Women as leaders in education: Succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Maslak, M.A. (2008). *The structure and agency of women's education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mayo, J. B. (2007). Negotiating sexual orientation and classroom practice(s) at school. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 35(3), 447-464.
- McDermott, R., & Hatemi, P. K. (2011). Distinguishing sex and gender. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 44(1), 89-92.

- Milewski, G. B., & Gillie, J.M. (2002). *What are the characteristics of AP teachers? An examination of survey research* (Research Report No. 2002-10). Retrieved from The College Board website: <https://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2012/7/researchreport-2002-10-characteristics-ap-teachers-examination-survey-results.pdf>
- Monaghan, M. M. (2009). *Preservice, secondary social studies teachers' perceptions of gender equity*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 304872395)
- Monk, J. (2004). Women, gender, and the histories of American geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94(1), 1-22.
- Montgomery, S. E., Christie, E. M., & Staudt, J. (2014). Rethinking Women's History Month to inspire civic action. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 26(3), 10-14.
- Moreau, M., Osgood, J., & Halsall, A. (2008). Equal opportunities policies in English schools: Towards greater gender equality in the teaching workforce? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15(6), 553-578.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *Elementary/secondary school teaching among recent college graduates: 1994 and 2001*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/200516l.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *National assessment for educational progress: The nation's report card*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.nationsreportcard.gov>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/mobile>
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2010). *National standards for social studies: A framework for teaching, learning, and assessment*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *The college, career & civic life: C3 framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 Civics, Economics, Geography, and History*. Silver Spring, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://media.collegeboard.com/digitalservices/pdf/ap/rtn/10th-annual/10th-annual-ap-report-to-the-nation-single-page.pdf>
- National Education Association. (2008). *Rankings and estimates: Rankings of the states 2008 and estimates of school statistics 2009*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/09rankings.pdf>
- Noddings, N. (2001). The care tradition: Beyond "add women and stir." *Theory Into Practice*, 40(1), 29-34.
- Paechter, C. (2006). Reconceptualizing the gendered body: Learning and constructing masculinities and femininities in school. *Gender and Education*, 18, 121-135.

- Paek, P. L., Ponte, E., Sigel, I., Braun, H., & Powers, D. (2005). *A portrait of advanced placement teachers' practices* (Research Report No. 2005-7, ETS RR-05-09). Retrieved from The College Board website: <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-05-09.pdf>
- Philpott, S. L. (2014). Girls like us: Looking at history through the American Girl series. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 26(3), 24-27.
- Porter, P. (2010). Where are the boys? *Social Studies Review*, 49(1), 69-71.
- Risinger, C. F. (2013). The amazing Nellie Bly: Teaching about women in United States history. *Social Education*, 77(1), 42-43.
- Roberts, S. L. (2013). Women of action and county names: Mary Musgrove County--Why not? *Middle Level Learning*, 48, 12-16.
- Rou snlani ere, K. (2005). *Citizen teacher: The life and leadership of Margaret Haley*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sadker, D., & Silber, E. S. (2007). *Gender in the classroom: Foundations, skills, methods, and strategies across the curriculum*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sadovnik, A.R., & Semel, S. F. (2002). *Founding mothers and others: Women educational leaders during the progressive era*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Saglam, H. I. (2011). An investigation on teaching materials used in social studies lessons. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(1), 36-44.
- Saglam, H. I., & Malbelegi , F. (2012). A study of primary school students' opinions about the content of social studies through certain variables. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(3), 738-751.
- Salako, E., Eze, I. R., Adu, E. O. (2013). Effects of cooperative learning on junior secondary school students' knowledge and attitudes to multicultural education concepts in social studies. *Education*, 133(3), 303 - 309.
- Salinas, C. (2006). Teaching in a high-stake testing setting. In S. G. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history* (pp. 177- 193). Greenwich: Information Age.
- Schafer, C. M. (2007). *A deliberate reconstruction and reconfiguring of women in history: One teacher's attempt at transforming a U.S. history curriculum*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/theses/>
- Scheiner-Fisher, C., & Russell, W B. (2012). Using historical films to promote gender equity in the history curriculum. *The Social Studies*, 103, 221-225.
- Schmeichel, M. (2011). Feminism, neoliberalism, and social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 39(1), 6- 30.
- Schmeichel, M. (2014). Women made it a home: Representations of women in social studies. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 9(3), 233-249.

- Schmidt, S. J. (2012). Am I a woman? The normalisation of woman in U.S. history. *Gender and Education*, 24(7), 707-724.
- Schocker, J. B. (2014). A case for using images to teach women's history. *The History Teacher*, 47(3), 421-450.
- Schocker, J. B., & Woynshner, C. (2013). Representing African American women in U.S. history textbooks. *The Social Studies*, 104, 23-31.
- Schulz, W, Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2009). *Initial findings from the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. Retrieved from http://www.iea.nl/iccs_2009.html
- Segall, A. (2013). Revitalizing critical discourses in social education: Opportunities for a more complexified (un)knowing. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 41, 476-493.
- Shaver, J. (1991). *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Silverman, D. (2010). *Doing qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Smyth, E. M., & Bourne, P. (2006). *Women teaching, women learning: Historical perspectives*. Toronto, ON: Inanna.
- Spinath, B., Eckert, C., & Steinmayr, R. (2014). Gender differences in school success: What are the roles of students' intelligence, personality and motivation? *Educational Research*, 56(2), 230-243.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(5), 477-515.
- Stimpson, C.R., & Herdt, G. (2014). *Critical terms for the study of gender*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tembon, M., & Fort, L. (2008). *Girls' education in the 21st century: Gender equality, empowerment, and economic growth*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Tetreault, M. T. (1986). Integrating women's history: The case of United States history high school textbooks. *The History Teacher*, 19(2), 211-62.
- Thornton, S. J. (2005). *Teaching social studies that matters: Curriculum for active learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Trecker, J. L. (1971). Women in US history high school textbooks. *Social Education*, 35, 249- 260.
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1964). Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Pub. L. 88-352, U.S. Code, Vol. 42, section 2000e. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/titlevii.cfm>

- Van Ingen, L. (2014). One can't live on air: Sarah McComb on the problem of old-age income for single women teachers, 1870s-1930. *History of Education Quarterly*, 54 (2), 172-196.
- Walkerdille, V., & Ringrose, J. (2006). Femininities: Reclassifying upward mobility and the neo-liberal subject. In C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of gender and education* (pp. 31-46). London, UK: SAGE.
- Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class & power*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Weiler, K. (2014, November). *Gender, social studies, education: In pursuit of intersectionality*. Paper presented at the meeting of National Council of the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly, Boston, MA.
- Wiesner-Hanks, M. (2007). World history and the history of women, gender, & sexuality. *Journal of World History*, 18(1), 53-67.
- Williams, J. K., & Maloyed, C. L. (2013). Much ado about Texas: Civics in the social studies curriculum. *The History Teacher*, 47(1), 25-40.
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Wineburg, S., & Monte-Sano, C. (2008). "Famous Americans": The changing pantheon of American heroes. *Journal of American History*, 94(4), 1186-1202.
- Woyshner, C. (2009). *The national PTA, race, and civic engagement, 1897-1970*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Woyshner, C. (2012). Gender and social studies: Are we there yet? In W. B. Russell (Ed.), *Contemporary social studies: An essential reader* (pp. 261-276), Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Woyshner, C., & Bohan, C. H. (2012). *Histories of social studies and race: 1865-2000*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Woyshner, C., & Gelfond, H. S. (1998). *Minding women: Reshaping the educational realm*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Yazici, S., & Aslan, M. (2011). Using heroes as role models in values education: A comparison between social studies textbooks and prospective teachers' choice of hero or heroines. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(4), 2184-2188.
- Yousafzai, M. (with Lamb, C.). (2013). *I am Malala: The girl who stood up for education and was shot by the Taliban*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.
- Zittleman, K., & Sadker, D. (2003). Teacher education textbooks: The unfinished gender revolution. *Educational Leadership*, 60(4), 59-63.

