

Teaching Women's History

Breaking Barriers and Undoing Male Centrism in K-12 Social Studies

Kelsie Brook Eckert

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-75196-2 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-69311-8 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-47288-9 (ebk)

Chapter 3

Finding Time to Teach Diverse Women's Stories

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003472889-4

Funding for publishing this chapter open access was provided by Lamson Library at Plymouth State University.

3

Finding Time to Teach Diverse Women's Stories

The most common reason educators give for not including women in the curriculum is not having enough time. Although they may want to include women, they have yet to transition from desire to action, and they are trapped under the illusion that male-centrism is the main narrative all students must know. *Main for whom?* Taken literally, what those educators are saying is that the traditional history, one that is White and male-dominated, takes precedent.¹ They are saying that there is less to learn from the past lives and experiences of women. Women have been denied their history in ways different from other marginalized groups. Women are denied their history as if half of the humanity's existence and nuance is at the bottom of a long to-do list.

What teacher's, schools, or governments put in their course curriculum is an outline of their values as well as what they think students need to be prepared for in college, career, and civic life. The field of social studies in public schools rose from a desire to better integrate and educate the 28 million immigrants joining the American democracy during the Industrial Revolution.² Over time, women increasingly attended school beyond elementary grades, and yet the courses changed little to reflect this gender shift. In effect, girls were told that to succeed they needed to learn what men were learning. Yet girls were routinely denied access to colleges, denied jobs at firms despite having the same degrees as their male peers, and so on. Today, girls have caught up to their male peers, they even out-perform them in high school, college, and their early careers, but then something happens: children. The reality is that the workplace has not changed to embrace the highly qualified

adult women who are eager to put their skills to use. Perhaps if we changed the training, new leaders would find innovative ways to improve the workforce. More on this in Chapter 5.

What are we saying if we don't teach equally about half the population? Apparently, students don't need to be prepared for a world that is half female? Apparently, students don't need to research the ways that women have juggled college, career, and civic life? How does one manage a long to-do list? Ask experts on time management: they will tell you not to cut things until you first know how you are *currently* spending your time, which Chapter 2 showed is unconsciously somewhere far less than half about women. *Is there really no wiggle room?*

Sheroification Is Insufficient, Make Time

Background: I Remember Women

The American Revolution history course I took in my junior year of college best illustrates how male history dominated. The course did not broadly cover the events of the revolution; rather, it honed in on the people who most shaped our country during this period: Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and George Washington. For each of these men, we read a book by a male historian such as David McCullough. We were not invited to engage in a discussion of what qualifies someone to gain a place on the list of those who "most shaped our country," and we certainly were not awarded any alternatives to these few men. We did not read any primary accounts of these men, nor did we dive into any criticisms of them. The professor lectured for the entire term with no questions asked by students. It was evident that prominent people were certainly not women and also, notably, not BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and people of color), poor, or many other differentiating characteristics. This course was "heroification" at its finest.

Of these texts I read so long ago, these are some details I remember: Franklin abandoned his wife and child to go to France; Jefferson had children with an enslaved woman named Sally Hemings, and the consensual nature of this relationship is debated; Abigail Adams wrote letters to her husband while he was away; and women followed the Continental Army that Washington commanded to cook for and nurse the soldiers. I remember these things because I was clinging, as students do, to stories of people like me—in this case: women. This is what students who are denied an education do. Representation not just of women, but of women from diverse backgrounds, matters.

Decades later, now an educator, I've struggled with the challenge of having too many important things to teach and just not enough curricular time;

180 school days is not enough to teach all of US or World history. It's impossible. Obviously, educators pick and choose what they will include and what they will exclude, what they will leave for college, and what is knowable through pop culture.

I was teaching on January 6, 2021; you bet the lesson got tossed out that day. After George Floyd died, most of us redoubled our efforts to teach inclusive histories and critically examine the Black experience in our curriculum. I was teaching the day Russia invaded Ukraine; the next day we learned about the Holodomor and the long history between these two states. I taught world history when the film *Woman King* came out, so I used primary source material to critique the film. I was teaching the week Hamas attacked Israel; I'm sure you see the pattern. Teachers toss and reprioritize the curriculum as it becomes culturally relevant and timely. If there is a time in the history of the world to include women in the mainstream curriculum, it is now.

I love teaching World War II. I know more about World War II than I could possibly ever teach in a single course. One year in my secondary US History course, as I shifted from World War to Cold War, I wanted my students to examine the dichotomy of being a superpower: both a global protector and new-age imperialist. But the whole unit missed the mark because I had placed overemphasis on World War II and not enough on our long history of imperial wars. So, I backed up. Where was I putting my emphasis? What wasn't I covering enough? I looked at all the wars and decided to give each more equal emphasis. We spent just as much time on each of the Mexican, Philippine, and Spanish–American Wars as we did World Wars. After each, I paused and asked them to think about what US actions in that war said about the US and its foreign policy.

I shifted the compelling question for the course to be clear: is the US an imperial nation? Debatable? *Yes*. Important? *Yes*. Researchable? *Yes*. Enduring. *You bet*. I shifted, refocused. I didn't get to go into all the detail I could on World War II anymore. At the end, students had far more profound understandings of our history as a nation, and because we had been debating throughout the course, they had well-argued and different positions on the question. Clearer understandings happened because I moved away from the better-known aspects of the war to more focused instruction on crucial understandings, patterns, and questions. Students listened to speeches from Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S Truman stating plainly that they didn't want anything from the war but peace. We contrasted these claims with the expansion of US military bases during and after the war as well as traced Coca-Cola plants as an example of spreading economic imperialism. Students grappled with and weighed the evidence to form their own perspectives.

I haven't tossed D-Day. No. I teach it differently. I focus on the floating harbor, the landing craft, the aerial bombings: the technology that made Allied victory possible. I emphasize not the horrors of the Holocaust and mass murders of Chinese and Koreans but what was known and the slow action of the international community. I also emphasize heroism and sacrifice. The men who crossed the English Channel knew the predicted death toll. It's important for students to understand their risk, sacrifice, patriotism, and commitment to democratic freedoms.

A strong reflective practice hinges on teachers observing themselves, seeing what's working and what's not, and making changes. It's time we realize that what we are doing is not preparing students for workplaces and marriages that are more gender-equal. Our collective consciousness has shifted, our workplace is more diverse and increasingly female, and we need a curriculum that prepares students for that world. We need to reflect as a profession and reprioritize the history that's important.

Barrier: Too Much Content

Teachers agree that the social studies classroom is the place to talk about women and gender equity.³ When asked, most teachers claim they are comfortable talking about women and gender-related topics in class, but their rationale for why they don't actually do so illuminates the opposite. In Scheiner-Fisher's study in Florida schools, of the teachers who didn't teach women's history at all, half said it wasn't required, and the other half said there just wasn't enough time.⁴ In Chapter 6, we will examine the standards and other methods of understanding what is required in classrooms.

Scheiner-Fisher's study was affirmed by Martell and Steven's study of Massachusetts teachers. In theirs, a majority of teachers (66.1 percent) said they would teach more about gender if they had more time.⁵ One teacher said,

I wish there was more time. It feels like there's always enough time to oversimplify it (Women faced prejudices, then it got better. Gays faced prejudice, then it got better.), but I wish there was more time to REALLY teach it.⁶

If teachers don't make time, students are going into a world, half female, unprepared. The consequence of such limited time on gender resulted in another teacher saying, "I feel it is difficult to keep gender lessons from becoming boys against girls. I wish I had more curriculum support with this."⁷ If you watch state legislatures debates women's rights, Title IX, sexual assault, maternity leave and childcare policies, and abortion, it certainly

looks that way there too. Yet women are half of humanity. Women's freedom is human freedom. Women's access to health care is human access to health care. Teachers must play a role in dismantling this men-versus-women antagonism.

The problem of curricular time is not unique to the United States. A 2016 study in London by Bridget Lockyer and Abigail Tazzymant gave educators a forum to discuss their inclusion of women's history. Most expressed exasperation with the constraints on their curricular time. One educator in the London study said,

I think we do as much as we can crowbar in really. Because the unfortunate fact is that men have been the people in charge for the last... millennia, so if you're learning about political history the men are in charge.⁸

These answers reveal a different answer. Setting aside the bits of misogyny unconsciously present in these comments, if teachers aren't teaching women's perspectives because of time or a lack of requirement, they don't know that women *had* perspectives on the things they already teach. They don't understand that women were entrenched in the historical narrative. They don't know women's history, and they *certainly* aren't prepared to teach it.

In an effort to acknowledge women in a packed curriculum, many teachers reduce their coverage of women to "pop-up" history, where a woman figure, usually a radical, pops into the curriculum in a sometimes disconnected and random way. It's tokenism at its finest. It's random to the teacher, and it's random to the students. It fails to give that woman and her cause (it's usually a cause) context, and she becomes hard to remember because she isn't well woven into the story of the past.

Pop-Up History

James Loewen, author of *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, calls traditional history "heroification," or selecting people to put on a pedestal and honor.⁹ This process does not reveal the truth about history—events do not happen in a vacuum. Few leaders act alone. When male historians selected the heroes they wanted children to read about, they tended to select people who looked and reminded them of themselves. Loewen called heroification a "degenerative process" because it distorts the real lives, works, and effects of those historical figures.¹⁰ To really *see* our leaders is to understand that then, as now, they were not monolithic; they contained parts we like and parts we don't like. If we heroify them, it makes our current roundup of leaders difficult to cope with.

As a result of male heroification, women have been left out of the story. Women were there. Women existed. Women disagreed. Women were complicated. Women served and took bold action inside and outside the

post-Industrial Revolution “women’s sphere.” *Why don’t we learn about them?* There is something very male about highlighting exemplars and, in effect, putting them on a pedestal. This heroification results in ignoring collaborative efforts, marginalized groups, and parts of the hero’s character that might damage their hero status.

The response to heroification of male figures in the past is not sheroification. Women’s history must tell diverse women’s history in order to explain the depth and breadth of the female experience. Historian Rosalind Miles explained:

Early women’s history was devoted to combing the chronicles for queens, abbesses and learned women to set against the equivalent male figures of authority and ability, creating heroines in the mirror image of heroes... This pop-up... version of women’s history, though it had some value in asserting that women can be competent and powerful, had two weaknesses—it reinforced the false effect of male domination of history, since there were always many more male rulers and ‘geniuses’ than female; and it failed to address the reality of the majority of women’s lives who had neither the opportunity nor the appetite for such activities.¹¹

Another scholar, Nel Noddings, writing for *Theory and Practice*, critiqued the way women were being added to history textbooks. She explained that the outcomes were somewhat mixed, ranging from positive to absurd. She said that while women were included, it often took some imagination to understand why.¹² In many cases, no white man with such peripheral involvement in an issue would have been included—so why were these women? Although women appeared in illustrations, they were still absent from the written content around the image—illustrations were added of women to say women’s history was being taught, but it was less than tokenism.¹³

Women’s history, when presented as pop-up history, *sheroifies*, and the biases of the historian are on full display. The most common women taught in school include radical feminists like suffragists, not typical women. Noddings warned that including women in such a way makes an age-old error of measuring female success by a male standard.¹⁴ This approach “obscures contributions” made by women in fields ignored by the social studies curriculum.¹⁵ Noddings argued that women’s history should not adhere to traditional approaches, which merely highlights a handful of notable political or social figures as representative. In women’s history, these “notable” women do not exemplify the majority of women’s history. Their contributions seem like deviations from the norm in a society largely dominated by men.¹⁶

Many of the women who *do* make history class were radical in their time. As a result, they often advocated for rights and were embroiled in

politics—this has left us with the false idea that women's history is about a special interest group. Women are not an interest group—they are half of humanity! Women do not agree, are diverse, and have been present in one way or another throughout history. To better understand women, we need to hear multiple female perspectives.

In 1985, a woman named Alison Bechdel wrote a comic strip satirizing how few women in movies appear as major characters or appear to have lives. The immediate result was something nicknamed the Feminist Movie Test, or the Bechdel Test. Here it is: a film has to have at least two [named] women in it who talk to each other at some point about something besides a man.¹⁷ That's it: two women who exist and talk about stuff. The bar for feminism in film is barely off the ground, and yet, sadly, few films pass the test. Every one of my favorites failed miserably. The only film I show in my history courses that passes the test is *Iron Jawed Angels* (2004), a film about women's suffrage, a film I had never seen until I became a teacher.

This test helped raise awareness of gender discrimination in the industry and also created a rich national dialogue about the absence of women of substance in the media. If women barely exist in the films and don't have friends or meaningful conversations outside of men, what conclusions will people draw about women? It wouldn't be a stretch to suggest they might conclude that girls don't think about important things and are only interested in men.

Sadly, over a decade after Bechdel wrote her comic, little had changed. In most films, women still had token roles. In some, as the climax of the film occurred and the world burned around the characters, the female character came on scene to talk about her relationship with the male character or another domestic affair. Examining the list of the Best Picture winners from the Oscars spanning 1965 to 2003, Allan Johnson concluded,

Of the almost forty films, only four tell a story through the life of someone who is female—*Chicago*, *Out of Africa*, *Terms of Endearment*, and *The Sound of Music*—and only the middle two focus on a serious subject, the other two being musicals.¹⁸

He argued that this list was proof of the male-centered nature of patriarchal societies. In his analysis, he wrote:

If you want a story about heroism, moral courage, spiritual transformation, endurance, or any of the struggles that give human life its deepest meaning, men and masculinity are usually the terms in which you must see it. Male experience is what patriarchal culture uses to

represent human experience, even when it is women who most often live it. Films about single men taking care of children, for example, such as *Sleepless in Seattle*, have far more audience appeal than those focusing on women, even though women are much more likely to be single parents. And stories that focus on deep bonds of friendship—which men have a much tougher time forming than women do—are far more likely to focus on men than women.¹⁹

Watching your favorite show or film exposes you to some of the toxic stereotypes about women, most notably that they exist to serve men, don't have female friends, and don't have speaking roles.²⁰ These stereotypes are fueled by an industry dominated by male producers, directors, screenwriters, and agents. Hopefully, our students can distinguish those films from real life, but, sadly, the story of real life, or at least the way it's taught, would not pass the Bechdel Test.

Our traditional teaching of women's history has been satisfied to summarize women's contribution to world history with: *women were meanwhile serving in their traditional role of tending the home*. We have summarized an incredibly diverse half of humanity and, in effect, we have buried the stories of women who did not tend the home and we have devalued those who did—neither is acceptable or reflects much critical thought. *Could one do the same for all of men? "Men were meanwhile..." What is the end of the sentence?*

Women are equally diverse, opinionated, and different. To say *all women* were doing anything in unison fails to acknowledge women as human beings with innate differences. Miles wrote, "There could be as many histories as there are women to write them."²¹ Reducing women to what was traditionally valued not only is inaccurate for how many lived but, importantly, gives us an excuse not to acknowledge their contributions, which were greater than they are given credit for. Not all women were wives and mothers—and for those who were, those titles were not all that defined them.

Men have had millennia to craft the field of history, and women's history is only in its infancy. Mistakes will be made, perhaps overemphasis placed on some topics, and ill-fitting definitions developed, but we need more women and men to weigh in for us to find the proper points of emphasis and ways to include women.

Breaker: Inquiry and the Eckert Test

The Inquiry Model

In an effort to teach accurate facts about the past, critical thinking and analysis, empower students in the class, and teach the skills of historians and social

scientists, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) shifted toward a pedagogic approach called the inquiry model or the Inquiry Design Model (IDM). This move also made room for teachers to include more marginalized groups into the curriculum. In 2017, they adopted the C3 (College Career and Civic Life) framework for social studies education.²² This framework for inquiry introduced one of many approaches for doing inquiry in the classroom. Their approach has four dimensions, which are paraphrased here:

- ◆ (D1) ask compelling questions;
- ◆ (D2) use historical thinking skills to examine the question;
- ◆ (D3) synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the research; and
- ◆ (D4) take action with this learning.

The framework centers the students, centers questions, and should, in theory, get students to be curious, dive into source material to understand, and help them ask more sophisticated questions.

The C3 Framework has its critics, and its method of implementing the inquiry model is cumbersome, but it is a strong concept. From the right, critics worry about D4, where barely informed students are becoming activists. They worry that students don't have enough information or enough context and that the framework promotes activism over civil discussion.²³ Criticisms from the left interestingly include some of the same criticisms. One scholar pointed to the fact that the inquiries used by the C3 are preplanned, so new sources are predetermined and eliminate student voice.²⁴ He also critiqued the funders behind the framework, calling them too far right.

When I teach the inquiry model to my pre-service teachers, we read the critiques of the model. I turned whether to use the model into an inquiry itself. Almost always, the conclusion is not to disregard the model but to make it better: to slow it down, give proper context, allow for student selection of source materials beyond those provided, and appreciate the need for civil conversation as well as informed and appropriate activism.

The problem with many inquiries is that while some may include women, they don't center the experiences of women *enough* and thus give zero context to the experience of the woman whose ideas are shared. Take a lesson plan featured on C3 Teachers (the website for the NCSS) about the French Revolution. The question is an appropriate one: *Was the French Revolution revolutionary?* Students will quickly have to define "revolutionary." An adept student will then ask *for whom?* The person who created this inquiry included a number of wonderful primary sources, but only one that featured a woman: Olympe de Gouge. During the French Revolution, women were incredibly active. A woman led the charge on the Bastille. Women marched by the thousands to Versailles to demand bread from the king.²⁵ Women formed dozens

of political organizations to advocate for change in the early years of the revolution.²⁶ As France was ever more under attack from their neighbors, a group of women formed the Society of Revolutionary Republican Women and began calling for firmer foreign policies and the arming of women soldiers. The Reign of Terror began in September 1793, and political women became a focus. On October 30, 1793, Jean-Baptiste Amar proposed a decree that ceased and silenced all women's political clubs.²⁷ The decree passed with no discussion. What had been a period of vibrant women's involvement was quickly squashed.

Olympe de Gouge was just one of the many women whom students could discuss. She is, of course, the most radical, and, of course, she's the one who made history. This is the exact reason Dr. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich wrote, "Well-behaved women seldom make history."²⁸ De Gouge is important, though—she went the furthest, writing the piece they included in the inquiry: *The Declaration of the Rights of Woman and of the Female Citizen*, which advocated for full and equal rights for women in the new French society.²⁹ Her story is complicated, but like so many others, de Gouge was beheaded during the Reign of Terror for challenging the Republic to hold true to revolutionary ideas.³⁰ *She was beheaded*. Would students reading this inquiry know that? *No*. The document is presented out of context. The fate of the author is not provided. What a failure! The fact that she asked for equal rights and was beheaded shows how feminism is often met with violence—a function of the hierarchies which the patriarchy is fond of. On this theme, historian Janis MacDonald wrote about the importance of giving women's history proper context:

I hope... to encourage historians to view different dimensions of women's work and thought in context. Only then will we understand the scope of women's contributions to history as distinct from their appreciation of the limitations of the society in which they operated... In our efforts at rediscovering her story... we may be unconsciously building barriers against the possibilities of new understandings of the past contributions of women in history.

³¹A student could certainly read the document and conclude, "Wow! Women were demanding their rights as far back as 1791!" And that would be only half the story.

Historical inquiries in the classroom must not only ask questions that make central the thoughts of women but help students understand the context in which those women lived. Too often, the questions that are asked of students do little to include the diverse experiences of women and only highlight the de Gouges of the world. They also fail to show how society

responds to those women. The Republic banned women's political clubs and involvement. It's not enough to simply show what brave women wrote—we have to show what happened to them. If not, students will be left with the false idea that speaking up is easy. It's not. But women were brave and did it anyway. De Gouge, for example, never backed down and continued writing her critiques of the new republic from her jail cell. She and many other writing women were executed. She called on the crowd at her execution to avenge her.

Living in France during this time was an English woman, Mary Wollstonecraft, perhaps the most famous feminist author of the Enlightenment period. She was inspired by the salons, political discussions, and the boldness with which women engaged in politics. She published her book to advocate for women's rights to education. When the Reign of Terror began, she fled France.

The Reign of Terror ended with the rise of Napoleon, a self-proclaimed emperor of France. He stabilized the violence in France, abolished feudalism, declared equality between men, and codified it into law. Unfortunately for women, what had been an ambiguous position in society was now solidified and traveled wherever Napoleon's armies conquered in Europe. These codes held French women's rights decades behind their peers in the United Kingdom and the United States. A proper inquiry related to French women's experiences of the Revolution is available on the Remedial Herstory Project's website.

The scary part of teaching with inquiry is that teachers may not know all the answers to the questions explored. Good. Push it back on the students. The teacher should transition from expert (which is a false title anyway since most of us are generalists) to facilitator. In this role, teachers model best practices for research methods and show students how to find *real* experts. Teachers transition from being a preacher in front of their class to a coach, supporting their students as they investigate questions. Webquests and project-based learning have long been staples of the social studies curriculum and are gateways for teachers to become practitioners of inquiry. Think of it this way: students who listen to the teacher-expert all class will learn day in and day out that the way toward knowing is through the teacher. When they graduate and are without a teacher-expert, they are lost. Inquiry is helping them be the master of their own education, which goes far beyond high school.

When it comes to better including women in curricular content, the inquiry model allows teachers to ask more inclusive questions and enter the second to last of Tetreault's phases: the Feminist Phase. Here, they can ask questions that include or center women. Here, they can ask questions on male-centric topics but include sources by or about women. Inquiry is the

ticket for inclusion. Teachers who are nervous about backlash in their community or school about bringing in more women's voices and topics can fall back on: "What? I'm just asking the question." It's best practice.

The Remedial Herstory Project and other organizations have worked to prepare ready-made inquiries for students that get students debating and discussing history. Inquiries like these guide students through the source materials, which is especially helpful for women's history when so few educators are trained to teach it. In these planned inquiries, documents are collected from archives, databases, and libraries and transcribed to grade level to help student comprehension. These inquiries can be a pathway to stronger inclusion of not just women but all marginalized groups. A teacher could pose a question to the class and include source material from five people from a variety of backgrounds, be that gender, racial, economic, or political, and let students grapple with the ideas presented.

There is ample debate among historians and social studies teachers about what makes up a good research question, but there is a difference between a thesis question and one that makes for good classroom inquiry. Questions for inquiry should ideally be DIRE: *debatable, important, researchable, and enduring*. Debates could range from topics that are literally debated in society and politics to topics where the debate is about nuance. Important topics mattered to the people in the past and affected the trajectory of history. Researchable means there are primary sources with which students can explore the answer. Finally, enduring means the answer continues to matter today. These four criteria force students to go through each of the four dimensions of the C3 Framework and demonstrate the skills of social scientists.

Historians caution teachers to be careful with the questions they pose, for "Not all questions are created equal, however."³² Writing in *Perspectives on History*, Whitney Barrigner, Lauren Brand, and Nicholas Kryczka argued that there is such thing as a bad question. They said:

Across diverse genres of social studies curriculum, forced choices between moral absolutes, abstract queries of ethical or civic concern, and overly fanciful counterfactuals appear more frequently than they should. Stark and uncomplicated question constructions speed the inquiry process straight to argument, reducing history to a series of positions that one must take and defend. If inquiry is to remain the banner under which history lessons are devised, teachers will need to distinguish good questions from bad ones.³³

They make clear that there are often good intentions behind the questions teachers pose that may fit that bill. I know I have posed those questions in my classes. When I have posed black-and-white questions, even here, my point

has been to help students see, through sources, that the answer isn't black and white; it's usually grey. If it wasn't grey, there wouldn't be a debate and nuance. The question itself matters, as does the depth which students explore the answers.

When I began to consciously add women to my curriculum, I started adding women's sources to the inquiries, or lessons, I already had. I took one lesson on two Black men who cofounded the NAACP but who disagreed on the best path toward Black liberation, and I added the iconic Ida B. Wells-Barnett, another NAACP cofounder. But the problem with this lesson was that I put Wells-Barnett in the position of speaking for all Black women, and there wasn't *women's* diversity. Men get to be diverse and have disagreements in history, but women who pop up in history content don't get that luxury nearly enough.

The Eckert Test

History curriculum serves little purpose if it does not reflect the reality of the world outside the classroom, one that is half female. Patti Lather wrote, "Given the variety of women's experience in relation to culture, class, race, sexual orientation, etc., there are multiple feminist standpoints."³⁴ I cannot agree more. Copying the model of the Bechdel Test, I created the Eckert Test because I was saddened by how many times I failed to bring a female perspective into my own lessons. The Eckert Test is how I hold myself accountable to a more comprehensive and diverse women's history. The test is this:

1. There are two women in the lesson.
2. Those two women have different opinions.
3. They represent different backgrounds: racial, sexual identity, ethnic, religious, generational, or economic.

Meeting the Eckert Test is possible in every era and region of both US and world history, even as far back as Mesopotamia. Lessons for every period and region of world history are available on the Remedial Herstory Project's website.

When we begin with the assumption that likely not all women agreed on a topic, we can often find more fascinating stories, historic controversies, and compelling classroom discussions. Students learn best when they are empowered to engage in these discussions and take historic examples that help us philosophically examine our own world—one in which controversy and polarization are seemingly everywhere, even among women. Since most teachers are somewhere between compensatory and bi-focal history and many have not found the path to women's diversity, we will break the Feminist phase down over the next few chapters and leave integrating these ideas for the end.

Find Women's Diversity

It's important to remember that it was predominantly white feminists who wrote the first draft of women's history, which biased the field, leaving out the voices of conservative, nonwhite, and lower-class women, among others. Tetreault therefore suggests that teachers examine the broader experiences of women.³⁵ Congruent with the truly inclusive definition of feminism, Tetreault called this stage "Feminist History," a phase where the diversity of women's experiences could be on full display. She said teachers should ask the following:

- ◆ What were most women doing at a particular time in history?
- ◆ What new categories need to be added to the study of history?
- ◆ What kinds of productive work, paid and unpaid, did women do and under what conditions?
- ◆ How did the variables of race, ethnicity, social class, marital status, and sexual preference affect women's experiences?
- ◆ How have women of different races and classes interacted throughout history?
- ◆ How did women develop a collective feminist consciousness of their distinct roles in the private and public spheres?
- ◆ Who were outstanding women who advocated a feminist transformation of the home and society?
- ◆ What are the appropriate ways of organizing or periodizing women's history?³⁶

Moving into this stage, away from compensatory and contribution history, opens up worlds of possibilities. When teachers ask women-centric questions and explore history by and about women, suddenly women's diversity becomes abundantly obvious, interesting, and complicated. I would even add questions like *How did class impact the productive work women did? How did women react to the feminism of the "outstanding" women?*

The American temperance movement, for example, has long been presented as a monolithic movement of like-minded women, if it's presented at all. Sometimes teachers jump to Prohibition and the Progressive era without mentioning the decades-long movement to achieve the abolition of alcohol, which entirely eliminates women's political role. Presented as belonging to an undifferentiated movement, these women had one goal—end alcoholism—and were united in this pursuit. But there are spectrums and layers to the women who joined this movement! Some women were deeply Christian and saw alcohol as sinful. Some were social reformers concerned about women's and children's welfare. Some felt the only way women could reform anything

was by having the vote. Others felt women should advocate for change through their men. Some saw alcoholism as a product of poverty. Others saw the compounding effects of racial trauma and wanted the movement to be more intersectional to address lynching.

My favorite example of the spectrum of temperance reformers is Carrie Nation, who famously took to smashing illegal bars in Kansas with a hatchet. Nation garnered a following of equally Christian radicals who simply wanted Kansas law enforcement to enforce the temperance laws. The Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), which Nation belonged to, supported her goals but disapproved of her methods.³⁷ The WCTU wasn't exactly sure how to respond to such a woman—stand by her sentiment but lament her methods?

The first president of the WCTU, Annie Wittenmyer, wanted to remain strictly focused on temperance work and not be distracted by suffrage or other causes. Frances Willard was a cofounder of the WCTU and succeeded Wittenmyer as president, pivoting the organization to adopt suffrage and a slew of other intersectional reform efforts, yet she didn't include any commentary or reform positions against lynching. So, Ida B. Wells-Barnett called her out on it.

Another great example of women's diversity can be found in the colonial era. Weetamoo was the leader of one of the tribes in the Wampanoag Confederacy and sister-in-law to the Great Sachem in the early years of English colonization in Massachusetts. When she came to power around 1660, the vast majority of Wampanoag had perished from disease. She married many times to form alliances, and when one of her husbands died in English custody, she called foul. Time passed and she remarried, but eventually things between the Wampanoag and the English became too tense, and her sister's husband, Metacom (called Philip by the English), went to war.³⁸

Weetamoo's various marriages throughout her life resulted in her commanding the allegiance of every major tribe in the Confederacy. Weetamoo had to decide whether to lead her people to war or try to negotiate. Her new husband sided with the English, but she sided with the Great Sachem: Metacom.³⁹ She dissolved the political marriage and turned those allied with her against the English.

Yet Weetamoo has been lost to many history books. The war between the Wampanoag and the English settlers was called King Philip's War after Metacom. The rare teacher who remembers to discuss the war typically forgets to mention her efforts to align the tribes of the Confederacy behind Metacom. Weetamoo alone stands as a woman caught in a man's world. Mary Rowlandson is perhaps the best primary source for knowing Weetamoo. She lived during King Philip's War. She was one of many English women who were captured and brought to Weetamoo as prisoners. Many captive

women's stories were recorded as anti-Native propaganda during this time. Rowlandson was held for 11 weeks. Years later, she published a book about her experience.

Rowlandson and Weetamoo are fascinating to include because they are two women who were on opposite sides of the bloodiest war in US history (per capita) and disagreed. Rowlandson complained that Weetamoo didn't give her enough to eat. Weetamoo was in charge of a massive war effort in a time of scarcity, Rowlandson's hunger was the least of her worries.⁴⁰ Rowlandson was ransomed home, while Weetamoo died during the war. She drowned while crossing a river during the war. Her decapitated head was brought back as a trophy, and when the imprisoned Wampanoag saw it, they wailed in agony over the death of their leader.

Women have differing and diverse perspectives that bring history to life. Without Weetamoo, the teaching of "King Philip's War" is false. It would be like teaching the American Revolution without Alexander Hamilton. Without women's diversity and Mary Rowlandson, women's history becomes monolithic and bland. *With* women's diversity, women's history becomes *juicy* and students love it! Teach juicy history.

Blueprint: The F Word

I'm going to use a dirty word: feminism. Studies show that teachers who identify as feminists are more likely to teach women's history. One study concluded,

There is evidence that social studies teachers' beliefs on gender influence not only what they see as the purpose of high school sociology classes, but also the time they spend on gender issues in their curriculum... Although sociology teachers may be more aware of the role of gender and sexism in society, due to the course content, this study showed that some sociology teachers might still take a gender-blind perspective.⁴¹

In another study by the same researchers, they found that feminist teachers shared common practices in their classrooms, including the following:

- ◆ Being skeptical of the representation of gender in traditional textbooks and seeking out supplemental materials that better represented women
- ◆ Being aware of the participation rates of male and female students in class discussions and making efforts to ensure that female students' voices were heard

- ◆ Making connections between past oppression of women and current events to engage students and promote their interest in gender issues
- ◆ Taking initiatives beyond the classroom to support and empower female students.⁴²

How the teachers came to their approaches was driven by their personal life experiences.⁴³ Each of the participants felt marginalized in some way, perhaps because of their race, gender, or life experiences. Marginalization played a significant role in aligning their ideology with feminism. For example, Alex, a biracial man who participated in their study, felt like an outsider and wanted to change the educational experience for students who were like himself. Tina grew up in a male-dominated community and experienced sexism, which led her to teach about gender equity. Liz faced sexism in her previous career and wanted to break stereotypes about assertive women. These personal experiences shaped their teaching philosophies and fueled their passion for feminism. The teachers' beliefs influenced their lessons and teaching practices.

The notion that one has to personally experience marginalization to have enough empathy with the female experience and feminism to teach about these subjects would make me laugh if it wasn't so sad and horrifying: I do not have to identify as a men-ist to teach about men in my curriculum, yet it seems that one has to personally experience oppression and explicitly value the improvement of women's rights and equality in order to acknowledge that half of the population is worthy of critical study. To motivate educators to reprioritize and make space for women in their course content, feminism must become more appealing. We must talk about the F word.

Pragmatically, for my purposes, since almost 60 percent of secondary social studies teachers are men and the gender gap is worse at the college level, men in particular must embrace feminism if women's topics and history are ever going to be taught in schools. Men must identify with the need to advance the lives and rights of women. But this is harder than it sounds because the status of men in society is not great.

So many times when I discuss the status of women in society, I hear the rebuttal, "but the male suicide rate." My response is always, "I am concerned about that, too." This debate tactic is called "switch tracking," where you dismiss the point made about one track or idea and jump to a completely different topic. The effect is that neither issue is really discussed. One stumbles into a logical fallacy which argues that since men commit suicide at higher rates, the pay gap just doesn't exist? No. Those are two different topics. When discussing gender issues, we must resist the desire to switch tracks. Both are true and concerning. Gender equality is not a one-way street. One can be

concerned about girls and women as well as the status of boys and men. Society can hold two concerns at the same time: teachers can too.

More social studies teachers need to identify as feminists, and they need to understand that they can and should *also* care about boys and men. Further, feminist ideas and solutions benefit many of the problems facing men, like suicide. The problem is not the ideas but the politicizing of the F word. To articulate this breaker, I'm going to break down feminism, how men benefit, why men should be feminists, and lastly (and perhaps confusingly) what studies show and why I think we should stop using the F word.

What Is Feminism?

People have debated feminism for decades. So, here's what I mean by feminism: bringing an end to sexism.⁴⁴ It's not about ending men, it's about ending norms, structures, and systems that disadvantage and exploit women. The word "féminisme" was first used by French socialist philosopher Charles Fourier in the 1830s; it wasn't added to the *Oxford English Dictionary* until 1894.⁴⁵ Women before or immediately after that would not likely have used the term to describe themselves, especially because there was less intersectionality between movements.

Feminism made significant progress in combating sexism and patriarchal norms in the mid-twentieth century. Title IX in particular has completely changed the landscape for women. It was arguably the most effective piece of legislation to create equalities that protected both men and women. That progress came because of the activism of feminists.⁴⁶

The forces working against feminism have done a number on progress in the last 30 years, claiming that feminism is hurting men, when the reality is the exact opposite. Studies have shown that young people are turned off from feminism but also that their understanding of feminism is misled. In a study, eighth-graders described feminists as "women who think men aren't equal."⁴⁷ Scholars concluded that "students uniformly agreed that the term 'feminist' was a problematic and often uncomfortable label... 'It means you hate men,' at least one student in all but one group said."⁴⁸ Teachers in the study too were found distancing themselves from those they deemed "women's libbers."⁴⁹ This shows the effect of conservative backlash against feminism in the last several decades.

Everyone should be a feminist. Shouldn't we want equal opportunities for our sons and daughters? It should be shameful to not be a feminist, but the forces working against the feminist movement in promotion of outdated and oppressive traditional gender roles have been working hard. In the current climate, feminism can be a powerful force.⁵⁰ Feminism offers tools to understand inequalities between the sexes and resist oppressive systems that

impact both men and women. Feminism prompts us to question how these systems shape our realities and challenge women and men's marginalization. Teaching women's history is important for feminism. We cannot tell women they are equal in society and then also say that people like them aren't worthy of historical study. We must all be feminists, anti-sexists.

How Do Men Benefit from Feminism?

Men benefit from feminism because it allows them to break out of social boxes that most men don't fit in anyway, boxes that hold men back financially, romantically, and socially. What is the box? The patriarchy. The patriarchy is not men, it's a social system. Allan G. Johnson, a sociologist and author of *The Gender Knot: Unraveling our Patriarchal Legacy*, argues, "Patriarchy is a kind of society, and a society is more than a collection of people. As such, 'patriarchy' doesn't refer to me or any other man or collection of men, but to a kind of society in which men *and* women participate."⁵¹ As such, feminism is an alternative system: not one where women dominate men, but where hierarchies perpetuated by the patriarchal system are dismantled and men and women are more equal and free. Removed from the boxes that the patriarchy stuffs men into, the majority of men will benefit from such a system, but they need direction.

Many people don't know the full definition of misogyny. They end their understanding with "hatred of women." But misogyny is also weaponized against men, or "men perceived as effeminate."⁵² Men hide qualities they deem too feminine, like their emotions, certain tastes, and preferences because they are so often associated or marketed to women. Misogyny prevents men from living a full life and being true to themselves. I have many manly friends who work in schools. Some held other "manly" jobs before they worked in schools, or they work as contractors in the summer for some extra cash. Teaching, coaching, counseling, nursing, and other jobs men do in schools have been seen as "women's work" to some people. I'll never forget the look of defeat on the face of one of my colleagues when an irate mother stormed into his office and said that *because* he was a wrestling coach, he was a pedophile. Beyond being illogical, she was weaponizing misogyny against him. I imagine other men who work in schools have had similar experiences.

Rigid definitions of masculinity and the emphasis on non-emotional stoicism have fueled a male suicide rate that should concern everyone. In 2021, the suicide rate among US males in 2021 was approximately four times higher than the rate among females.⁵³ Repurposing my own phrasing, men are half of the population but nearly 80 percent of suicides. This rate has been steadily climbing for the last two decades. It is not feminism that created a rising male

suicide rate, it is the insistence on an old definition of manhood that does not serve the modern man coupled with a natural tendency toward impulsivity. Feminism is not a zero-sum game. Asking for rights does not take away rights from men.

Asking for women to be included in the curriculum, though perhaps nuanced, isn't different. It may mean minimizing some men, but it also allows for the adding of others. I've loved the men women's history has introduced me to. Deep study into Susan B. Anthony gave Frederick Douglass more depth and introduced me to her father, a champion for women's education, and Henry R. Seldon, her lawyer who passionately defended her in court. Those men give boys examples of how men can support women.

The patriarchal norm enforces a hegemonic masculinity where men dominate not only women but other men. This is a system that serves few and simultaneously traps men in a constant fear of a masculinity crisis. It's also a total scam for men of lower classes. Men who are not powerful themselves are dominated by other men, but they still feel a certain connection to the patriarchal norm of dominance because it rewards their social position over women, regardless of a woman's class dominance over them. This helps explain why a construction worker—it's a stereotype yet too often true—may feel entitled as a man to sexually harass a well-dressed professional woman who is his class superior as she passes by. The scam is that both the construction worker and the woman are subordinate to other men within the system. The same scam was used to empower poor whites as slave catchers in Antebellum America. Rather than seeing how their conditions and those of the enslaved were similar, poor white men relished their little bit of power and helped oppress those who were only just below them in status. The patriarchy feeds lower-class men scraps rather than real power. The patriarchal system not only suppresses lower-class men but marginalizes male minority groups based on their races and sexual orientations. Men not at the top of the hierarchy are left with few resources to manage their anxieties and stressors. The liberation of women benefits men because it fights against the same forces oppressing the vast majority of men.

Why Must Male Teachers Join Feminism?

Men must join feminism not just to integrate women and gender history and issues into the mainstream social studies curriculum but also to practically aid men in understanding, defining, and strengthening an improved vision of manhood fit for a modern world. Old models of masculinity were arguably necessary when we physically fought one another for resources and land, where one's family and the honor of your wife were threatened by other men, but that is not the 21st-century world we are living in. It's time for manhood

to evolve, keeping the same heroism and risk-taking that are characteristic of males but using a model defined by abundance, not scarcity.

High school boys have already been conditioned in the hierarchy of the patriarchy. They have an idea of what it is to “be a man” and it’s limited due to their maturity, yes, but also by what the culture of the patriarchy feeds them. I’ve observed boys who tough it out only to fail. I’ve also seen boys exploit maternal figures, like teachers, in their life in a version of learned helplessness which causes them to fail. These norms aren’t helping boys; they are struggling and failing all around us.

The most vocal supporters of boys and men on these issues are not feminists but those who blame feminism and want to return women to a state of abject dependence. Women will not go back to the Dark Ages. This is not a viable policy solution. Further, supporting men should be central to conversations about gendered impacts. Where gender inequality exists and women are given privileges denied to men, feminists should be the first to point this out, not the sexists. Instead, too often, feminists stay silent and let the voices that want to advance men at the expense of women lead the way. This holds not only men back but women, which circularly hurts men, who are often partnered with women.

Feminism has improved women’s status considerably, and that has put men used to unearned privileges or surviving on scraps of dominance in a seeming state of shock. Even though women are not oppressing men, the shift from unearned privilege to a state closer to equity feels like oppression for them.⁵⁴ Studies show that “relative deprivation” or the feeling that your group is doing worse than it used to creates “outgroup prejudice.”⁵⁵ This explains why those concerned about boys and men, or the challenges facing men, struggle to see how those issues are tangential to those impacting women. Things are harder than they used to be for men, but to advocate for backward trends is to show unmerited preference for men *over* women. Instead, society must continue to champion progress for women *and* offer men new solutions, new social scripts, and new models of masculinity.

One of the biggest places boys need our help is in schools where feminine qualities, skill sets, and neuro-capabilities thrive. Girls are 14 percentage points more likely to be school-ready by kindergarten because of the way girls’ brains mature more quickly.⁵⁶ This advantage widens the gap through elementary school, where girls outperform male peers on standardized exams across many subject areas.⁵⁷ Girls outperform boys in high school across most areas of measuring performance, dominating class ranks and earning an average grade of an A across subjects, while male grades average a B.⁵⁸ In recent years, women in the US earned 57 percent of college degrees across all subjects, a pattern replicated around the world.⁵⁹

Richard Reeves, a Senior Analyst at the Brookings Institute, believes these data are evidence that schools are structurally biased toward girls. Prior to Title IX, men were 13 percentage points more likely to go to college. Since then, it has swung in the complete opposite direction, with girls 15 percentage more likely to attend.⁶⁰ Black and poor boys are the most at risk and least receptive to traditional policy interventions aimed to improve learning outcomes. Studies of implicit bias, criminal sentencing, and even cultural issues around masculinity show how much Black men are uniquely stigmatized, Reeves said. He referred to data showing a wider gender gap between Black boys and girls than White ones. The gap between girls and boys widens the further down the socioeconomic ladder one goes. By almost every measure of disadvantage, boys are doing worse than their female counterparts.⁶¹ Middle- and upper-class parents, he surmised, have the resources and the knowledge to help their boys overcome their disadvantages.

Policies should be designed to do what these wealthier families are doing to help their boys already. Reeves proposes redshirting, or delaying, all boys in K–12 schools for one year.⁶² Research has shown girls' prefrontal cortexes develop earlier than those of boys, giving them impulse control earlier, which in turn helps them to do better in school. So, holding boys back one year would allow them to be the developmental equals of girls in their classes and perform better overall.

Other solutions that Reeves proposes to *men's problems* are the exact policies that feminists have been advocating for decades! Men and women should cease seeking traditional partners as the social conditions that made those relationships function no longer exist. Further, men should be encouraged to go into fields like health care and teaching currently dominated by women workers, social studies education being the only exception. He suggested promoting boys-only scholarships like those to encourage girls to go into STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields, but instead to encourage men into what Reeves calls "pink collar" or HEAL fields: health, education, administration, and literacy.

Divorce rates skyrocketed during the feminist movement of the mid-twentieth century. Why? Because a society where women are not dependent on men as providers means that men have to provide family value beyond income. They need to be emotionally available, caregivers, and life partners, but there are few models for this version of masculinity. They need to share in domestic duties and contribute to parenting children.⁶³ Feminism has allowed women to have diverse expressions of their femininity: they can work or not, they can play sports or not, they can wear pants or not. Women have many identities: daughter, wife, mother, employee, volunteer, coach, and friend. Men too often identify with their job. When one's entire identity

is contained in a single area, problems in that area have high impact.⁶⁴ When women struggle at work, they can fall back on their roles as mothers. For men, there has not been this kind of widespread change.

Despite huge changes for women, men's roles have stayed largely the same in the last half-century. This is not the fault of feminism, but the so-called men-ists who want to support men by holding to a version of manhood that harms the vast majority of men. Society can hold two ideas at the same time. Feminism has improved the conditions of women, and men need help finding their feet in a world where women don't *need them* but want them. Unfortunately, the loudest voices for men's issues have come from the dark corners of the internet and political spheres, not feminists. Social media phenomena like Andrew Tate and scholars like Jordan Peterson purport to support men but offer few positive solutions other than cheering them back into the box. Instead, they use their position to promote misogyny. The problems facing men have solutions that don't hurt women's progress. These men cannot hold two ideas at the same time: that men need help and so do women. It's not black and white. This is not a zero-sum game. Some of what they tell their mostly male audience is helpful and empowering. Tate teaches his millions of followers to take hold of their destiny and be accountable. In the case of Peterson, the ideas are often grounded in sound psychological studies. But in both cases, those nuggets of good messaging are buried behind backward, sexist, and misogynist messaging that is trumpeted either for clickbait or because that too holds their appeal. Although I am alarmed by *what* they say, I'm more often alarmed by *how* they say it: aggressively and angrily. They are the antithesis of the stoic, non-emotional, masculine: posturing falsely, weakly.

What will happen if male teachers don't? Tate got the attention of teachers early because school-aged boys found him online and were parroting his ideas in classrooms. Tate is openly hateful toward women, appearing shirtless in his videos and teaching a young generation of boys how to be "men" by offering boys the old box of masculinity. This includes coercing girls into having sex with them, faking intimacy to convince girls to be videotaped doing sexually explicit things, and committing sexual violence.⁶⁵ On webcams and social media, Tate built an empire, charging his audience for online classes that gave them the tools to emulate him. Unfortunately, this advice is geared toward a world that no longer exists. Owing to his behavior and regular run-ins with the law, he was removed from mainstream paths to fame, now most social media platforms have banned him, and he was arrested in Romania in late 2022 on allegations of rape and human trafficking.⁶⁶ But *this* is where the next generation is turning for a model of masculinity because adult role models have failed.

Kids are desperate for guidance on women, gender, and sexuality, and if they don't find it through mainstream outlets like school, they will look for it elsewhere, and men like Tate are eager to fill the gap and monetize it. Interviewed by *Education Week*, a teacher from Texas said,

The younger boys, they're so impressionable. They're definitely at an age where they're trying to figure out, what does it mean to be a man? What kind of man will I become? It seems like the whole Andrew Tate thing captures them.⁶⁷

In Hawaii, another teacher said, "There's been a huge increase in rape jokes that the boys are making... I've been teaching for 17 years, and that's not really a topic that comes up, especially in a joking matter."⁶⁸ These teachers are not alone. Tate is forcing us to have these conversations. Education should be timely and relevant and prepare students for a world where Tates exist.

Male teachers and role models play an important role in countering Tate's limited thinking. Jake White, a male teacher in London, published an article in *Newsweek*. He said, "Tate has flipped the narrative around sexual assault, so many young male students are saying things like: 'Well what about these innocent men who haven't actually raped someone, but are in the public eye so are targeted by women who want money.'"⁶⁹ This idea is perpetrated by the right to stoke a fear of women: misogyny. White and his colleagues started by handling student comments one at a time, but the volume continued to increase. So he and his colleagues, Jack Glass and Tom Wiltshire, decided to do a school-wide assembly to talk about masculinity. They told students, "We want to show you the other side of what it means to be a man. To be kind and compassionate to everyone."⁷⁰ He said he could see the shift in student expression in the assembly as the male teachers spoke out about this. Boys want to be good men. Teachers need to show them how.

While Tate is on teachers' radar, Peterson scares me more because he is a polished, former Harvard professor and psychologist who propounds basically the same ideas. Where Tate discussed accountability, Peterson says that most of his patients need to "grow the hell up, accept some responsibility, live an honorable life."⁷¹ This is probably a good message for some people, but similarly it's the gateway to pretty demeaning messaging about women.

According to Peterson's worldview, masculinity represents order, while femininity represents chaos, the same ancient idea that Confucius promoted with yin and yang. Peterson likes ancient messaging and traditional ideas. He suggests that an excessive presence of femininity is a new problem, and his solution is to return men to positions of power over women. If we knew women's history, we would all roll our eyes because that argument is

millennia old. He points to his male-centric history to argue that men held positions of power due to their merit, not privilege. He is also not a historian. He said, "The people who hold that our culture is an oppressive patriarchy, they don't want to admit that the current hierarchy might be predicated on competence."⁷² Some women's history would do him good.

He feels a sort of gendered anxiety and loss, which he uses to fuel his rhetoric. He said, "The masculine spirit is under assault."⁷³ Feminism is attacking the hierarchies and systems that have promoted men at the expense of women's autonomy and liberty. Peterson is not a visionary. He is unable to see a way forward that supports both men and women, and he champions backward movement toward male hierarchy over women as the solution to male problems. He believes that humans are wired for hierarchy. To support his arguments, Peterson relies heavily on the influence of biology, which he sees as a type of fate predicting gendered behavior.⁷⁴ He frequently references ancient myths, invoking tales of witches, biblical allegories, and ancient traditions.⁷⁵

He's dangerous because he twists data to support his skewed worldview. For example, he uses studies that show women are twice as likely as men to reproduce to show women's dominance over men and then argue that men need marriage to ground them. Studies show that where men outnumber women or men have fewer marriage prospects, there are higher rates of crime. Under China's one-child policy, for example, in addition to rising rates of female infanticide, violent crime rates doubled as the majority-male population aged.⁷⁶ This biological tendency is nuanced and can be curbed by social policy. Marriage certainly benefits men in a variety of ways, but he believes that male violence is the effect of not having romantic or sexual partners. He thinks social policy should be designed to ensure men are married. I don't disagree that men need to be active in family life, but as a cure for male violence women need to be sacrificed to these men? It's not what he's saying, but *how* he proposes to achieve it: "The cure for [male violence] is enforced monogamy. That's actually why monogamy emerges," he says.⁷⁷ He flatly believes that forcing women into marriages is a rational solution. To him, women hold all the power in relationships and without "enforced monogamy" would only choose men of higher status, abandoning less socially successful men. Again, this is not a zero-sum game. Challenges facing men should not be resolved by trapping women, literally, in marriages. That *is* in its very essence the definition of misogyny: preference for men *over* women. Society instead must ask: how can we help both men *and* women?

Old models and rhetoric are not helping men. Reeves says, "Without the clear direction and social incentives of the old provider-protector model of manhood, many men are left rudderless, underpowered, drifting."⁷⁸

People like Tate and Peterson are the old “Custodians of the Patriarchy” fighting to maintain their dominance as others work to reimagine the system.⁷⁹ Testosterone, like estrogen, has profound impacts on our lives and development. Yet for boys, testosterone-fueled masculinity has been something to punish. A mostly female teaching force has tried to temper toxic masculinity instead of teaching masculinity. Reeves adds that there is “a desperate need for some positive, male-specific guidance, which is now missing in mainstream culture.”⁸⁰

One challenge that feminists, me included, have struggled to articulate is that these traps of masculinity, sometimes called “toxic” masculinity, do not mean that masculinity itself is bad. In fact, quite the opposite. The qualities of masculinity should be cherished. These include decisiveness, rationality, control, toughness, coolness under pressure, strength, competitiveness, logic, forcefulness, autonomy, self-sufficiency, and emotional regulation.⁸¹ We need to coach young men to harness these qualities in service of their communities, not at the expense of various members of the community, including women.

Feminism, advocacy for gender equality, helps boys. Like girls, boys need a new narrative and model for their role in society. The answer is not backward toward oppression, but forward. But we must welcome these conversations into our classrooms. We have had decades to discuss and debate women’s new roles, keeping the bits we liked about the old (empathy, compassion, etc.) and tossing what we don’t (weakness, dependence, etc.). Now we need to do it in our schools and give young people direction. We need to help hold the social fabric together, families together, through a new view of womanhood and manhood. There will inevitably be debates about solutions, but we can’t solve the problem if we aren’t having the conversation and preparing young people.

There are so many people talking about gender in the world, but it’s chaotic, toxic, and fueled by political rhetoric. Students need trusted adult role models trained in discussing controversial pedagogy and gender studies to talk about gender issues in schools. There, in a rigorous academic setting, studies can be presented, causality examined, and students can form their own conclusions.

Finally, I’m a purist when I read Title IX. This section of the Civil Rights Law of 1972 prohibits sex-based discrimination in schools and education programs receiving federal funding. How can we honestly look at a curriculum that is 5 percent or even 20 percent centered on male experiences and say it isn’t discriminatory? That is the essence of discriminating: discerning, separating women out, biased toward men, prejudiced against the female experience. All those issues are caked in the present coverage of women’s lives in primary and secondary classrooms. Teachers must teach women’s history to

give women equal educational opportunity and the chance to know their history, and if we are to get all social studies teachers on board, we are talking about mostly men.

Should Teachers Use the F Word?

Gender is greater than any other social condition in its impact on human life, expression, and experience.⁸² It impacts men and women equally, daily, individually, and intimately. So why aren't we teaching it? Should teachers use the F word? A teacher could try to teach women's history in a substantive way, but how will that help her if her students complain about her feminism and biases? Will her administration have her back? Can she defend herself using state standards and textbooks as a reference? Will her students still test well on subject exams? Is the community ready to look our historical biases and sexism in the eye?

In 2022, four scholars did two experiments to test male responses to people who "challenge or legitimize societal gender inequality." Their conclusion was mixed and rather confusing:

Men respond more negatively toward women who challenge, compared to legitimize, the gender hierarchy. Conversely, men respond more negatively toward men, compared to women, who legitimize the gender hierarchy on an explicit level. It thus can be beneficial for women to legitimize the gender hierarchy and, in fact, they seem to "get away with it," while for men this is socially undesirable. Although legitimizing the gender hierarchy might have personal benefits for women, it results in maintaining the gender hierarchy... While challenging the gender hierarchy comes with a cost for women personally, it can have great impact to effectively elicit social change by activating men to pursue gender equality.⁸³

In other words, for women it's better to stay silent on gender inequities to protect friendships, but practically they benefit from feminism. For men, promoting women's status in society helps them. So should teachers use the F word? It depends on their gender and the gender of the people they are talking to.

Outside of the classroom, activists have studied the best ways to market feminism to a male audience and bring them on board with pro-feminist perspectives. One study examined the aftermath of the #MeToo Movement in China. A Chinese woman died from arson burns inflicted by her male partner. This invigorated dialogues about women's rights all over social media, especially a popular app called WeChat where scholars studied commentary in the

public accounts. Studying these discourses, scholars found that men were more persuaded by ideas that centered women's humanity, and the universality of freedom, rather than this being a "women's issue". The scholars explained,

Human interest was the most frequently used frame by all types of WPA [WeChat public accounts] authors (79.8%). Without touching political controversy, human interest became the safest means of persuasion, through which social media influencers intended to arouse emotions applicable to all human beings, such as empathy, caring, and outrage, by illustrating women's specific sufferings.⁸⁴

So if that is what is palatable, is that not what teachers should do? Teach women's history from within the frame of universally agreed upon human needs and values? Essentially, the answer is stop using the F word. Instead, use inclusion. Instead, point out that women's exclusion is inaccurate history.

Some scholars have pointed out that this is "skirting" around feminism to make it more digestible. I wonder if the end justifies the means? Mardi Schmeichel examined published lesson plans and articles used in social studies curriculum about women. In her study, she found that while women and divisive ideas were discussed, there was an almost complete absence of controversial vocabulary. In the 16 lesson plans that met the selection criteria, only one explicitly stated that the purpose was to promote gender equality.⁸⁵ The majority (8) justified the inclusion of women's history by offering a technical focus like examining primary sources. Five aimed to "offset" the lack of focus on women, which Schmeichel didn't consider an explicitly feminist purpose (Table 3.1).⁸⁶

She also selected 33 articles published in social studies journals and magazines with at least one descriptor about both instruction and gender. She wanted to find articles that were essentially describing lesson plans or activities for students that centered on gender. She then evaluated them for the

Table 3.1 Mardi Schmeichel Finds That Most Teachers Skirt around Feminism In Their Expressed Purposes For Their Lessons on Women

Purpose of the Lesson	Total
Technical focus	8
Offsetting deficit of attention to women in curriculum	5
Working toward gender equity	2
No rationale	1

Source: Eckert's table with data from Mardi Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 2015, 43(1), 7.

“degree” to which they emphasized women’s history or women’s issues. In 33 articles, she said, “there are no references to gender bias, feminism, patriarchy, or sexism in these articles. The word ‘feminist’ appears twice but only in references. In one instance, it is within the title of a book about Alice Paul, and in the other, it is embedded within a citation of a publication produced by the Feminist Press publishing house.”⁸⁷ Schmeichel found and worries that the teachers are shying away from critical feminist discussions. This article about suffrage, for example, was framed as promoting civic values rather than women’s agency against the patriarchy. Aren’t both true? She writes:

[T]he absence of these terms from the lesson plans is conspicuous. Although there may be a range of ways to work against gender inequity without using the words ‘feminism’ or ‘sexism,’ for example, the use of these words, as well as the feminist label, and the invitation to a critical stance they offer, does matter. Their absence points to the work of politics, power, and identification and leads us to question the connection between the absence of these terms and the lack of attention in the lesson plans to systemic political, economic, and cultural structures and potentially uncomfortable explorations of women’s status in society. These concerns, which reflect feminist arguments for including women in curriculum, would seem to be salient in lesson plans that promote attention to women in a field that has largely ignored these topics. Yet these ideas are not present in the texts.

⁸⁸Ultimately, getting students to see, question, and evaluate gender in their own contexts is the goal. Are teachers failing if they don’t address them?

In the UK, Richard Stopford also studied the challenges of what he called “teaching feminism.” He wrote that

[F]or some students, learning about feminism can be a confounding, confusing and hostile experience. While likely true, it is too quick and obvious to point out that this is because the student is, in some way or other, committed against feminism. After all, one can learn something and yet disagree with it.⁸⁹

Schools open students to ideas and points of view that are new to them, and they may not agree with all of them. But feminism in particular poses particular challenges because, as he puts it, “feminist claims can clash with students’ sense of self and world.”⁹⁰

From my own experience of teaching in a conservative school district, I know teachers are trying to subtly insert conversations about gender without

politicizing the classroom. In many cases, they are not ready to take on the F word. I may be copping out here, but I think, at least initially, this is an okay step in the phases of implementing women and gender studies into social studies curriculum. Teachers are skirting around it because they are in the trenches of political discourse. Scholars and professors of women's studies and women's history often speak from privileged positions at universities where they have academic freedom and/or disconnect it from the realities of public schools. Having taught in rural public schools, I know firsthand how challenging it is to teach with feminist pedagogies and ideologies. Sadly, when I dropped the F word, I felt the ideas were better received.

But teachers should have Schmeichel in the back of their head when she says,

In P-12 and social studies teacher education practice, the silence on feminism is deafening. The women's and feminist movement and the explosion of scholarship in women's and gender studies in the rest of academia have had very little impact on the traditional social studies curriculum in the United States.⁹¹

She's not wrong. I will explore this further in Chapter 5, but we aren't there yet.

Resources for Feminist History

Recommended Reading: Books About Feminism and Women's Publications

Not all feminist writing is written for the public. In fact, a lot of it is written for a scholarly audience already accustomed to certain terminology. Sometimes that space can be an echo chamber. I was thrilled when I read *Feminism is for Everybody* by bell hooks (she purposefully leaves her name lowercase to emphasize her ideas). To me, she made feminism approachable and included women and men of all classes in the struggle while breaking down complex topics.

It's also incredibly helpful to stay current on women's issues and ideas. Subscribing to a women's news outlet will help you take that perspective. Consider *The Lilly*, the *Washington Post's* women's publication, *Ms. Magazine*, *the 19th*, or get news summarized for you by *The Skim*. These are just a few of the news outlets that produce news and information about the world from a women's lens with women figures at the center of it. Reading from these sources, bringing their authors and contributors into your repertoire of perspectives to consider, will help you better include half of the world. Tackling the barriers that persist for women today means staying current with the world as it impacts and is impacted by women.

Sample Inquiry: Should Social Reform Movements, Like Temperance, Be Intersectional?

Most Americans would fail a basic test of the temperance movement, including perhaps the most important fact: that this was the largest, most successful movement in US women's history. Teaching the temperance movement is often done poorly. Few teachers I've encountered, let alone Americans, can name any of the major players in the movement. Teachers often fail to explore the nuances and debates *between* women about laws, enforcement, and intersectionality. Centering the people, not prohibition, brings the story to life. When those people are centered, the "moral crusade" is no longer monolithic and women's diversity is on full display. This is juicy history. When an opportunity exists for women's voices to be heard and read, and their diversity acknowledged, *shouldn't we be capitalizing on it?*

The WCTU thrived in a time before women had the right to vote. Women and their allies had to puzzle through how to use their power as citizens, women, and mothers to draw attention to drunkenness and its impact on women as well as productive and domestic life. The WCTU had epic debates: Should they also endorse suffrage? Or would suffrage distract from the issue they cared most about?

While the WCTU eventually decided to endorse suffrage under the leadership of Frances Willard, she was unwilling to back other intersectional issues.⁹² Ida B. Wells-Barnett, an avid reformer, anti-lynching advocate, and journalist, asked Willard to take an anti-lynching position, but she refused. The two took to the press.⁹³ Eventually, under mounting pressure, the WCTU made statements against lynching, but the damage was done. Neither Willard nor Wells-Barnett redacted their earlier comments.

The intersectionality of reform movements gives students context for the complexity of reform efforts and the pattern of division by people who should be allies. It also gives students examples of women like Willard who are remarkable leaders and heroes but complex, flawed, and wrong in other respects. Students need to see more examples of women being complicated to understand the real complicated women in their lives today. And how amazing is it that we can examine these issues using quotes and sources from the women themselves?!

To reach the feminist stage of history, teachers need to include the ideas, lives, and experiences of women outside the radical women who so often dominate history classes. Finding the experiences of non-feminist and poor women can help make this interesting. Teachers can also look at how the layers of race and sexuality impact people's perspectives. The following inquiry reexamines the overarching white narrative and asks questions to highlight women's diversity. It was built using an outstanding online guide from the Frances Willard Museum that is also worth exploring. It is downloadable on the Remedial Herstory Project's website.

Should social reform movements, like temperance, be intersectional?

Intersectional means the interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender. Temperance was largely a reform movement for women; should it also take a stand for issues of white violence effecting the Black community? In this inquiry, students will examine contrasting primary source accounts and form their own conclusions on whether temperance reform should have been intersectional. And was lynching an issue that temperance reformers should consider speaking out on? This inquiry will also expose students to harmful stereotypes from the late 1800s about Black men. Students will expose the claim that Black men were a threat to white women in the South.

Document A: Frances Willard "Do Everything"

Frances Willard was the second president of the WCTU and a vocal supporter of entwining women's suffrage and temperance reform. During her tenure, she made the temperance movement the most powerful women's political movement of the period.

"When we began the delicate, difficult, and dangerous operation of dissecting out the alcohol nerve from the body politic, we did not realize the intricacy of the undertaking nor the distances that must be traversed by the scalpel of investigation and research... The "Do Everything Policy" was not of our choosing but is an evolution as inevitable as any traced by the naturalist or described by the historian... A one-sided movement makes one-sided advocates. Virtues, like hounds, hunt in packs... An all-round movement can only be carried forward by all-round advocates; a scientific age requires the study of every subject in its correlations. It was once supposed that light, heat, and electricity were wholly separate entities; it is now believed and practically proved that they are but different modes of motion. Standing in the valley we look up and think we see an isolated mountain; climbing to its top we see that it is but one member of a range of mountains many of them of well-nigh equal altitude."

Willard, Frances. Address before the Second Biennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Twentieth Annual Convention of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union. London: White Ribbon Publishing Co., 1893.

Source

1. Who is the source of this document and what position are they in?

Document

2. What does the author mean by "do everything"?
3. What does the author mean by "all-round"?

Analysis

4. What sorts of things do you think would be helpful in achieving these goals?
5. Would an intersectional effort fall under her vision of "Doing Everything?"

Document B: Ida B. Wells

Willard's "Do Everything" policy required some persuasion to include issues that most affected Black people in the South, namely lynching. Despite claiming that she had "not an atom of race prejudice" because her family were abolitionists, Willard stated, "We ought to have put an educational test upon that ballot from the first. The Anglo-Saxon race will never submit to be dominated by the Negro so long as his aptitude reaches no higher than the personal liberty of the saloon." After these remarks were published, Ida B. Wells, a fellow temperance reformer and a fierce anti-lynching advocate and suffragist, called foul.

All things considered, our race is probably not more intemperate than other races. By reason, though, of poverty, ignorance, and consequent degradation as a mass, we are behind in general advancement...

Miss Francis E. Willard, president of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union, lately told the world that the center of power of the race is the saloon; that white men for this reason are afraid to leave their homes; that the Negro in the late prohibition campaign, sold his vote for twenty-five cents, etc.

"Miss Willard's statements possess the small pro rata of truth of all such sweeping statements. It is well known that the Negro's greatest injury is done to himself."

Wells-Barnett. "Temperance and Race Progress." AME Church Review. Last modified 1891. Retrieved from <https://scalar.usc.edu/works/willard-and-wells/ida-b-wells-temperance?path=timeline>.

Source

6. Who is the source of this document and what position are they in?

Document

7. Why is the author critical of Willard?
8. In the context of temperance reform, what does she mean by "the Negro's greatest injury is done to himself"?
9. Does this disagreement move the temperance movement forward? Explain.

Analysis

10. What do you think would be the best way for Willard to respond to this critique?

Document C: Ida B. Wells

Wells traveled in Europe giving speeches that publicly called out Willard and others for doing nothing about lynching.

"I find wherever I go that we are deprived the expression of condemnation such hangings and burnings deserve, because the world believes negro men are despoilers of the virtue of white women. ... Unfortunately for the negro race and for themselves, Miss Frances E. Willard and Bishops Fitzgerald and Haygood have published utterances in confirmation of this slander."

Wells, Ida B. Alfreda M. Duster, Ed. Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Analysis

11. What do you think would be the best way for Willard to respond to this critique?

Document D: Frances Willard

Willard encourages the WCTU to pass an anti-lynching resolution, but the word lynching is removed from it after pushback by white southern members of the WCTU. Wells did not stop criticizing her in the press. Willard and her friends defended their characters against Wells's attacks. Wells accused them of caring more about their reputations than the plight of Black people. At subsequent annual convention, Willard proposed a new anti-lynching resolution. This was her letter to the WCTU leadership encouraging this resolution. Does she seem to care about lynching or her reputation?

I feel sure it will do much to silence the absurd outcry against us that is made by those who have heard only one side of the question and hence have received an entirely false impression concerning the attitude of the W.C.T. U. You know, dear friend, of the difficulty in which I have been placed by those most unjust controversy and I feel sure that you will do all in your power to help secure the unanimous adoption of the resolution. Let me say that it is my earnest hope to make a trip through the South in company with Lady Henry Somerset as soon as possible. Just when I cannot say but it is more on my mind than any other one line of work in "my own my native land."

Frances Willard responds to Ida B. Wells and proposes a draft resolution against lynching for the WCTU. Retrieved from <https://scalar.usc.edu/works/willard-and-wells/letter-from-frances-willard-july-3-1895-2>.

Analysis

12. Does she seem to care about lynching or her reputation?

Overall, do you think the temperance movement should have been intersectional and include an anti-lynching position, or does that deter from their overall aims?

Notes

- 1 Martell and Stevens, "Perceptions of Teaching Race and Gender: Results of a Survey of Social Studies Teachers," 284.
- 2 Margaret Smith Crocco, "The Missing Discourse About Gender and Sexuality in the Social Studies," *Theory Into Practice: Rethinking the Social Studies*, Vol 40, No. 1, February 2001, 66.
- 3 Martell and Stevens, "Perceptions of Teaching Race and Gender: Results of a Survey of Social Studies Teachers," 280.
- 4 Scheiner-Fisher, "The Inclusion of Women's History In The Secondary Social Studies Classroom," 42.
- 5 66.2 gave the same excuse for teaching about race.
- 6 Martell and Stevens, "Perceptions of Teaching Race and Gender: Results of a Survey of Social Studies Teachers," 283.
- 7 Martell and Stevens, "Perceptions of Teaching Race and Gender: Results of a Survey of Social Studies Teachers," 283.
- 8 Bridget Lockyer and Abigail Tazzymant, "'Victims of History': challenging students' perceptions of women in history," *Teaching History* (165): 8 Historical Association 2016 0040-0610, 12.
- 9 Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, 9.
- 10 Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, 9–10.
- 11 Miles, *Women's History of the World*, 12.
- 12 Noddings, "The Care Tradition: Beyond 'Add Women and Stir'" 29.
- 13 Noddings, "The Care Tradition: Beyond 'Add Women and Stir'" 29.
- 14 Noddings, "The Care Tradition: Beyond 'Add Women and Stir'" 30.
- 15 Noddings, "The Care Tradition: Beyond 'Add Women and Stir'" 30.
- 16 Noddings, "The Care Tradition: Beyond 'Add Women and Stir'" 30.
- 17 Alison Bechdel, "Bechdel Test," Bechdel Test, n.d., <https://bechdeltest.com/>
- 18 Johnson, *The Gender Knot*, 10.
- 19 Johnson, *The Gender Knot*, 5.
- 20 Jocelyn Nichole Murphy, "The role of women in film: Supporting the men -- An analysis of how culture influences the changing discourse on gender representations in film" (2015). *Journalism Undergraduate Honors Theses*, 2, <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/jouruht/>
- 21 Miles, *The Women's History of the World*, 15.
- 22 The National Council for the Social Studies, *The College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for the Social Studies*, (Silver Spring, MD: NCSS, 2017) retrieved from <https://www.socialstudies.org/sites/default/files/c3/c3-framework-for-social-studies-rev0617.pdf>

- 23 Robert Pondiscio, "The Not-So Great Society," *Heritage*, April 15, 2020, <https://www.heritage.org/curricula-resource-initiative/research/the-not-so-great-society>
- 24 Alan Singer, "How the NCSS Sold Out Social Studies and History," *History News Network*, December 16, 2014, <https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/157845>
- 25 Harrison W. Mark, "Women's March on Versailles," *World History Encyclopedia*, June 28, 2022. https://www.worldhistory.org/Women's_March_on_Versailles/
- 26 Hollie McDonald, "Social Politics of Seventeenth Century London Coffee Houses: An Exploration of Class and Gender" Honors Projects, 2013, 208, <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/honorsprojects/208>
- 27 "Discussion of Women's Political Clubs and Their Suppression, 29–30 October 1793." LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY: EXPLORING THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. <https://revolution.chnm.org/d/294>
- 28 Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *Well-Behaved Women Seldom Make History*, 1st Ed (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), xiii.
- 29 Kathleen Kuiper, "Olympe de Gouges," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, October 30, 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Olympe-de-Gouges>
- 30 Rosalind Miles, *Women's History of the Modern World: how radicals, rebels, and every woman revolutionized the last 200 years* (New York : William Morrow, 2021), 22.
- 31 MacDonald, "The Need for Contextual ReVision," 214.
- 32 Whitney Barrigner, Lauren Brand, and Nichloas Kryczka, "No such thing as a bad question?" *Perspectives on History*, Vol. 61: 6, September 2023, 28.
- 33 Whitney Barrigner, Lauren Brand, and Nichloas Kryczka, "No such thing as a bad question?" *Perspectives on History*, Vol. 61: 6, September 2023, 28.
- 34 Patti Lather, "Critical frames in educational research: Feminist and post-structural perspectives," *Theory into Practice*, 1992, 31(2), 87–99.
- 35 Tetreault, "Integrating Women's History," 216.
- 36 More on this in Chapter Six.
- 37 Kansas Historical Society, "Carrie Nation" *Kansas Historical Society, Kansapedia*, August 2017, <https://www.kshs.org/kansapedia/carry-nation/15502>
- 38 Women and the American Story, "Life Story: Weetamoo (c.1635-1676)," *New York Historical Society*, October 16, 2020, <https://wams.nyhistory.org/early-encounters/english-colonies/weetamoo/>
- 39 Lisa Brooks, *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip's War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1z27jbr>, 169.

- 40 Brooks, *Our Beloved Kin*, 255.
- 41 Kaylene M. Stevens and Christopher C. Martell, An avenue for challenging sexism: Examining the high school sociology classroom, *Journal of Social Science Education*, 15(1), 2016, 70.
- 42 Stevens and Martell, "Feminist Social Studies Teachers," 8.
- 43 Stevens and Martell, "Feminist Social Studies Teachers," 8.
- 44 bell hooks, *Feminism is for Everybody* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000), viii.
- 45 Karen Offen, "On the French origin of the words feminism and feminist," *Gender Issues*. 8 (1988). 45-46. 10.1007/BF02685596.
- 46 Mardi Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 2015, 43(1), 2.
- 47 L. S. Levstik and J. Groth, "Scary thing, being an eighth grader": Exploring gender and sexuality in a middle school U.S. history unit." *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 30, 2002, 244. doi:10.1080/00933104.2002.10473193.
- 48 Levstik and Groth, "Scary thing, being an eighth grader," 249.
- 49 Levstik and Groth, "Scary thing, being an eighth grader," 197.
- 50 Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," 2.
- 51 Johnson, *The Gender Knot*, 5.
- 52 Margaret Smith Crocco, "The missing discourse about gender and sexuality in the social studies," *Theory into Practice*, 40(1), February 2001, 65.
- 53 CDC, "Suicide Data and Statistics," Center for Disease Control, May 11, 2023, <https://www.cdc.gov/suicide/suicide-data-statistics.html>.
- 54 Gordon Hodson, Megan Earle, and Maureen A. Craig, "Privilege lost: How dominant groups react to shifts in cultural primacy and power," *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 2022 25:3, 628.
- 55 Hodson, Earle, and Craig, "Privilege lost," 628.
- 56 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 5.
- 57 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 5.
- 58 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 6-7.
- 59 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 11.
- 60 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 7.
- 61 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 51.
- 62 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 135.
- 63 Eve Rodsky, *Fair Play: Fair Play: A Game-Changing Solution for When You Have Too Much to Do (and More Life to Live)*, (New York: Putnam and Sons, 2021).
- 64 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 32.

- 65 EJ Dickson, Adam Rawnsley, and Stefania Matache, "Andrew Tate Built an Empire on Bullshit: Here's the real story," *The Rolling Stone*, March 15, 2023, <https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-features/andrew-tate-empire-real-story-1234696706/>
- 66 Jenny Gross, "Andrew Tate Is Released From Jail and Placed Under House Arrest," *The New York Times*, April 3, 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/04/03/world/europe/andrew-tate-house-arrest-romania.html?login=smartlock&auth=login-smartlock>
- 67 Madeline Will, "Misogynist Influencer Andrew Tate Has Captured Boys' Attention. What Teachers Need to Know," *Education Week*, February 2, 2023, <https://www.edweek.org/leadership/misogynist-influencer-andrew-tate-has-captured-boys-attention-what-teachers-need-to-know/2023/02>
- 68 Madeline Will, "Misogynist Influencer Andrew Tate Has Captured Boys' Attention. What Teachers Need to Know."
- 69 Jake White, "I'm a Teacher. Andrew Tate Is Dangerous, So I'm Doing Something About it," *Newsweek*, February 28, 2023, <https://www.newsweek.com/andrew-tate-teacher-school-misogyny-1783709>
- 70 White, "I'm a Teacher."
- 71 Nellie Bowles, "Jordan Peterson, Custodian of the Patriarchy: He says there's a crisis in masculinity. Why won't women — all these wives and witches — just behave?" *New York Times*, May 18, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/18/style/jordan-peterson-12-rules-for-life.html>
- 72 Bowles, "Jordan Peterson, Custodian of the Patriarchy."
- 73 Bowles, "Jordan Peterson, Custodian of the Patriarchy."
- 74 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 123.
- 75 Bowles, "Jordan Peterson, Custodian of the Patriarchy."
- 76 Reeves, *Of Boys and Men*, 91.
- 77 Bowles, "Jordan Peterson, Custodian of the Patriarchy."
- 78 Richard V. Reeves, "Andrew Tate and the Wests Lost Boys," *Unheard*. October 30, 2022. <https://unherd.com/2022/10/andrew-tate-and-the-wests-lost-boys/>
- 79 Bowles, "Jordan Peterson, Custodian of the Patriarchy."
- 80 Richard V. Reeves, "Andrew Tate and the Wests Lost Boys," *Unheard*. October 30, 2022. <https://unherd.com/2022/10/andrew-tate-and-the-wests-lost-boys/>
- 81 Johnson, *The Gender Knot*, 7.
- 82 Robert Strayer and E. Nelson, *Ways Of The World*, 3rd ed (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2016).
- 83 Ilona Dömen, Daan Scheepers, Belle Derks, and Ruth Van Veelen, "It's a man's world, right? How women's opinions about gender inequality

- affect physiological responses in men," *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 25:721.2022. 10.1177/13684302211042669.
- 84 Xinying Yang, Hongfeng Qiu, and Ranran Zhu, "Bargaining with patriarchy or converting men into pro-feminists: social-mediated frame alignment in feminist connective activism," *Feminist Media Studies*, 12, 2022. 10.1080/14680777.2022.2075909.
- 85 Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," 7.
- 86 Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," 7.
- 87 Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," 13.
- 88 Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," 13–14.
- 89 Richard Stopford, "Teaching feminism: Problems of critical claims and student certainty," *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 2020, Vol. 46(10), 1204.
- 90 Stopford, "Teaching feminism," 1204.
- 91 Schmeichel, "Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies," 3.
- 92 Frances Willard House Museum, "Introduction," Truth-Telling: Frances Willard and Ida B. Wells, n.d. <https://scalar.usc.edu/works/willard-and-wells/introduction?path=index>
- 93 Frances Willard House Museum, "The WCTU and Lynching, 1893," Truth-Telling: Frances Willard and Ida B. Wells, n.d. <https://scalar.usc.edu/works/willard-and-wells/1893-wctu-anti-lynching-resolution?path=timeline>