MARCUS B. WEAVER-HIGHTOWER & CHRISTINE SKELTON

GENDER AND EDUCATION: AN INTRODUCTION TO SOME LEADERS IN THE FIELD

The personal is political. It is a slogan that came to define feminist thought in the latter half of the 20th Century. Its provenance is not clear; Carol Hanisch is often given credit based on her 1970 article of that name, but even she says someone else said it first (Hanisch, 2006). Even so, the phrase "the personal is political" wonderfully summarizes an approach to feminist thought that relies on personal experience to problematize the workings of power and domination. The personal serves as a starting point for exploring the workings of power, a means of provoking activism in those who have experienced gendered oppression. For Hanisch and others, the phrase was used as a defense of women's consciousness raising groups of the 1960s and 70s, a rebuttal of the dismissive claim that these were simply "therapy." Others, like Canadian sociologist Dorothy E. Smith (e.g., 1987; Griffith & Smith, 2005), expanded that mantra to a basis for research methods, focusing on the lived experience of women—in Smith's case the "everyday world" of mothers who do much of the (unpaid) work of schooling children—as an entry into the social and structural problematics that shape and constrain women's lives.

"The personal is political" also defines the chief contribution of this book, *Leaders in Gender and Education: Intellectual Self-Portraits*. In this collection are the personal stories that underpin the political and intellectual lives of the scholars that both have defined (and *will* define) the study of gender in education around much of the world since the 1960s. Here these feminist and pro-feminist scholars tell the stories of how they became who they are, and they show how their intellectual and political stances have been shaped through their lives.[1]

We believe, as editors, that such personal stories are crucial to understanding the political nature of what we know and understand about gender and its impacts on education. If we take seriously the position that knowledge is socially constructed (e.g., Gergen, 1999) and that it is shot through with discourses and power relations (e.g., Foucault, 1972), then we must attend to the lived experiences—both of agency and of structures—of those who have constructed the scholarly fields we inhabit. Bob Lingard, in his essay for this volume, puts the point nicely:

> Recognising the nature of the sociological will help me overcome my own tentativeness about why anyone would be interested in my specific intellectual journey and positioning in respect of gender issues, specifically gender equity issues in education. The only interest I can imagine that readers might have in this narrative is my attempt to locate my educational and intellectual biography against changing structures and the effluxion of time.

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 1–13.
© 2013 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

In this book, then, are the *intellectual self-portraits*—series editor Leonard Waks's far finer and more fitting name than the prosaic term "autobiography"—penned by 16 scholars who have had significant impact on gender and education research. All of the authors were tasked to describe the field of gender and education as they entered it, explore their own bodies of work and key ideas in the context of their changing professional lives, and posit the main intellectual and institutional issues facing the field today. In doing so the contributors have given readers an unparalleled view on the field's history, their own personal journeys in- and outside of the academy, and a sense of what may be next for future generations of scholars—the unfinished business of our field.

NOTES ON SELECTION

Because this book seeks, on one hand, to assert one possible vision of the field of gender and education, and, on the other hand, to fete those who have made an impact on a field of knowledge, divulging how we selected contributors seems appropriate. We come with full awareness that had we chosen differently we might dramatically change how the field is presented to readers. All scholarly endeavors must set up boundaries, though, and here is how we did it.

Most importantly, the scholars in this book all work from (pro)feminist perspectives, representing many forms of feminisms (Skelton & Francis, 2009; Weiner, 1994). Many academics and non-academics alike publish on gender, certainly, but not all can be counted as feminist or pro-feminist. We have not, for example, sought contributions from antifeminist or masculinist writers, many of whom have authored widely read and highly lucrative "backlash blockbusters" (Mills, 2003), particularly since the explosion of interest in boys' education starting in the 1990s (Weaver-Hightower, 2003). These backlash authors are certainly part of the landscape of gender studies in education—many with tremendous influence on both policy and practice (Weaver-Hightower, 2008)—but relatively few have chosen to publish in peer-reviewed journals and other scholarly forums as have our contributors. More than this, though, we eschew non-feminist scholars because gender and education as a field owes its very existence to feminist activism and struggle—the struggle to obtain degrees, to get hired, to publish, to teach, to serve communities, to get tenure, to develop academic programs, to create journals, to hold conferences, to forge a coherent field, all within male-dominated institutions—and that feminist history we both honor and seek to learn from in this volume.

Secondly, we wanted to equally represent scholars working from three regions: the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States, and Australia; these are the countries from which the vast majority of scholarship on gender issues written in English has been produced. We are aware, though, that much wonderful theoretical and practical research has been produced by scholars in and from other countries (see Connell, 2008)—indeed, some of the scholars herein originally hail from these countries and moved to our three focal regions. Moreover, many of the scholars

herein have worked, lived and researched outside of their country of origin, making them interconnected in ways that eschew the political boundaries of country.

Third, we wanted representation from scholars in different stages of their careers. While this illuminates something about faculty development and career stages, a more important historical understanding might be gained from this. As Yates (2008, p. 474) provocatively argues, “Becoming a feminist in the 1970s was different from becoming a feminist in the 1990s.” The experiences shared by our contributors support this point.

Fourth, we purposely chose scholars who were working at varied levels of education, including primary, secondary, higher, and adult education, whether within or beyond formal schooling. Primary and secondary school researchers are perhaps better represented in these pages, partly due to the more recent start of the sociology of higher education (Gumport, 2007) and partly due to our own personal backgrounds as editors. We believe, however, that looking to scholars across the sectors of schooling illuminates important dynamics of gender that change according to individuals’ developmental and institutional differences. Furthermore, scholars working on different sectors are privy to different conversations among their peers, and hearing about those insights can be illuminating to all readers.

Similarly, we sought scholars who explore differing aspects of gender and education, as well as those from differing theoretical, methodological, and rhetorical orientations. Within the collection are those who have at various times focused on femininity, masculinity, sexuality, social class, race, ethnicity, religion, high performers, low performers, teachers and professors, learners, administrators, policy, curriculum, pedagogy, special education, sports, romantic relationships, and on and on. Further, these scholars started in and/or inhabit sociology, anthropology, history, comparative and international education, educational policy studies, curriculum and instruction, research methods, and more. They use the theories and methods of qualitative research, quantitative research, discourse analysis, single-subject designs, longitudinal designs, postmodern theory, poststructural theory, neo-Marxism, critical theory, queer theory, critical race theory, and many more. The writing styles evident in the collection mirror the practices and fashions of these many disciplines and methods. We believe that these intellectual and disciplinary diversities have been an integral part of the strength and successes of gender and education as a field, and we worked hard to maintain a balance of these.

Putting together a collection like this also presents personal and political challenges, fraught as it is with the dangers of exclusion. As a number of the contributors confess, many (pro)feminist theorists flinch at the practice of foregrounding leaders and at leaving out allies; it goes against the egalitarian underpinnings of much feminist thought. Thus, we want to stress that we do not in any way suggest that these are the *only* or even *most* influential gender and education researchers. This is not an attempt to create a canon, and we certainly see gaps ourselves. Many will look at the table of contents and wonder why they or (if they are charitable) their friend or favorite theorist was not included. Many will also see that certain intersectional identities are not well represented. We ourselves are most disappointed that Black feminisms are not directly presented—though

issues of race, postcoloniality, and other key issues brought into our scholarly conversations by Black feminisms arise throughout. To readers concerned about these admittedly crucial issues, we should point out that many more scholars were asked to contribute than could. Some could not fit it into their schedules or the exigencies of their personal lives; some felt they were not worthy of inclusion; some never answered our invitation. Some of those who were never formally invited may have actually made the short list but were decided against because we were trying to balance the criteria listed above. We hope all who were unjustly left out will pardon us.

CHARTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER AND EDUCATION

For us editors, constructing a volume like this conjures fascinating “data” about the development of gender and education in Anglophone countries over the past half century. These 16 essays are like a collection of autoethnographies (Ellis & Bochner, 2003) more so than autobiographies, for all the contributors submit their personal backgrounds for scrutiny using the same social science and humanities lenses that they use in their research. The collation of these individual portraits, then, builds a larger ethnography of a group of scholars, advocates, and activists. By looking across the contributors’ individual stories—narratives of family, schooling, struggle, research, collaboration, protest, policymaking, teaching, politics, administration, and learning—readers discover the larger collective histories of feminisms that have shaped the foundational studies of education since the 1960s.

We can hardly even *partially* tell the histories of multiple countries over half a century given the limitations of this short introduction (for fuller views see, e.g., Skelton & Francis, 2009; Weiler & David, 2008). And, naturally, the development of feminism (and, later, pro-feminism) in education research has both obvious and subtle differences across the countries surveyed. Context matters a great deal, as the contributors illustrate through their own intellectual, political, and personal trajectories. Yet there are similarities in gender and education research across the world, so some general outlines of the history of the field might aid readers’ understanding of the essays to come.

The formal study of gender and education—that is, the development of courses, certificates and degrees, departments, programs, journals and conferences—got its start in the early 1970s. Yet concern about gender in education had been going on for well over two centuries by then, spawned early in the European Enlightenment as education became imbricated with the hopes of democratic citizenship (Freedman, 2002, Chapter 3). Early debates were on the suitability of females to be formally educated—usually questioning their physical abilities—and, later, on whether they could be educated in the same classrooms as males. While such debates happened in all the countries represented in this volume, the American physician Edward Clarke perhaps best illustrates the 19th century view. His *Sex in Education, or, A Fair Chance for Girls* (1873) worried that girls’ “catamenial functions” (their reproductive capabilities) would be harmed by being put on the

same educational schedule as boys, a "persistent" model. Girls, he opined, should instead practice a schedule of "periodicity" that would see them learning—separately from males, of course—for only three weeks a month (see also Spender, 1987). Despite such arguments, coeducation and the general participation of girls in basic schooling and in higher education continued to steadily increase—as often for logistical and economic reasons as for equity's sake—across the century following.

Increasing enrollment and coeducation, of course, do not mean that education was becoming equitable for males and females (and even less so when racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic intersectionalities are considered). By the advent of second-wave feminist examination of education in the 1960s and 70s, schools still presented very different experiences to males and females. Explicit segregation defined formal schooling, in both curricular offerings (e.g., shop class *vs.* home economics; general *vs.* advanced math; segregated physical education) and in extracurricular activities. The "hidden curriculum" (Jackson, 1968; Lobban, 1975) of gender, too—from what and who were left out of lessons, who was called on in class and how, who was disciplined and how, and even how students interacted in the lunchroom or the playground (e.g., Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Thorne, 1993)—structured the realities and possibilities of schooling for students and educators.

As the new field of women's studies grew alongside second-wave feminist movements around the world in the late 1960s and early 1970s (e.g., Boxer, 1998), educational inequalities received increasing attention. Feminist thinking on education grew rapidly in the 1970s and cross-pollinated globally with the publication of pioneering books and reports uncovering sexism in schools. In Australia there was the commonwealth government report *Girls, Schools and Society* (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1975), which led to a series of policies for girls' schooling (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, pp. 45-52). In England, Byrne (1978) and Deem (1978) wrote influentially about the issues women faced in education. And in the United States, Sadker and Frazier (1973) illuminated what sexism was doing to girls in the nation's schools, while others had begun to show how textbooks presented girls with limiting sex roles (e.g., Women on Words and Images, 1972).

The early years of the academic study of gender and education were characterized by struggle for acceptance of gender as a legitimate field, striving for policy and practice impact through women's movement activism, and efforts to establish the field's empirical and theoretical foundations. Indeed, these features make gender and education strikingly different from many other foundations of education (apart from multicultural and race studies); the history of education, curriculum studies, and others, by contrast, had a longer record, a more established reputation, and a deeper empirical basis on which to draw.

By the 1980s, feminist education studies as a field was hitting a stride. Books and journal articles were appearing at an impressive pace, and the topic of women and girls in education was represented in the formal curriculum of higher education. In schools across North America and the British Commonwealth, formal policy and informal teacher activism were taking on the sexism and patriarchal

structuring of schools and universities. "Difference feminism"—typified by works like Carol Gilligan's *In a Different Voice* (1982), which laid out arguments for the difference rather than inferiority of women's moral and intellectual development—began to vie for theoretical purchase and practical application with more dominant liberal feminist notions of equality of opportunity. That is, liberal feminist-inspired programs for girls in schools might present as role models women who were taking up traditionally male occupations; difference feminism, on the other hand, encouraged the formation of interventions like girls' science clubs, where "girls' ways" (in an essentialized sense) of doing science could be validated.

Yet more evidence of gender and education's growing cohesion and legitimacy as a field arrived in 1989 with the first issue of *Gender and Education*, the field's signal journal, founded by editor June Purvis, now Emeritus Professor at the University of Plymouth. While many other venues have published gender and education research (and continue to), the appearance and reputation of this journal, along with the formal creation of the Gender and Education Association in 2002, has given form and at least some direction to the field. Some evidence can be seen in the fact that several contributors and one of the editors of this volume either have been or now are editors of the journal: Skelton, Francis, Epstein, and McLeod.

The early 1990s saw a tremendous resurgence of interest in gender and education, particularly in the United States. Starting with 1992's publication and media frenzy around the American Association of University Women's report *How Schools Shortchange Girls,* academic attention and practitioner efforts refocused on the continuing problems of girls' educational outcomes, their curricular representation, and—the newest moral panic—their self-esteem. A slew of popular books captured the imaginations of the general public and professionals throughout the nation (e.g., Orenstein, 1994; Pipher, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1994), leading eventually to a renewed federal policymaking focus on girls, especially the Women's Educational Equity Act renewal in 1994.

For the rest of the world, especially in England and Australia, the mid- to late-1990s, and stretching into the 2000s, is perhaps most characterized by the rise of debates about *boys'* education. Public concern about boys' poorer literacy, grave social ills, more frequent dropping out of school, more frequent disciplining, higher rates of special education, and more, captured much media and policymaker time as well as government and school resources. In the United States, much of this was driven by popular press books on boys as endangered, diametrically different from girls, or as victims of feminism (e.g, Gurian, 1998, 2001; Pollack, 1998; Sommers, 2000; Tyre, 2008; from Australia, see Biddulph, 1998). In Australia, there was even a national inquiry that resulted in a report, *Boys: Getting It Right* (Australian House of Representatives, 2002), which laid out a conservative, recuperative masculinity politics (Lingard & Douglas, 1999) that would guide the use of millions of dollars of new funds for boys' education (Weaver-Hightower, 2008). While other countries might not have invested so heavily (see essays from Martino, Kehler, & Weaver-Hightower, 2009), clearly boys issues have dominated the last fifteen years of attention in gender and education, leading to a "boy turn" in

research and practice (Weaver-Hightower, 2003) as (pro)feminists have been forced to answer crisis rhetorics about boys. Masculinity studies across the disciplines rose, in part, from this heightened interest in boys, and educational scholars have been major contributors to masculinity studies writ large (e.g., Connell, 1995, 2000; Kimmel, 2008; see also Adams & Savran, 2002).

When viewed as (an admittedly cartoonish) summary, gender and education might seem more coherent and inevitable as a field than one might reasonably claim. Yet gender and education has been marked from the beginning by both internal and external challenges.

From early on, critiques originating from within have helped to shape the feminist educational project's theoretical, empirical, and methodological progress. Marxist and neo-Marxist feminists insisted that capitalism be foregrounded as a primary source of women's oppression, for capitalism animated patriarchy in fundamental ways (Barrett, 1980). These scholars drew attention to the unique difficulties faced by working-class girls as they moved through the educational pipeline (e.g., McRobbie, 1978). Black feminism—what Alice Walker (1983) called "womanist" thought—also challenged the largely white, middle-class bias of most feminist philosophy and activism. Pointing out the white supremacist underpinnings of patriarchal relations and critiquing the separatist impulse of some radical feminists, Black feminism has pushed for increased attention on the oppressions of girls of color and those in postcolonial contexts (e.g., Amos & Parmar, 1984; Carby, 1982). Later focus on Black boys and men (e.g., Cuyjet & associates, 2006; Davis, 2005; Fashola, 2005; Ferguson, 2000; Noguera, 2008; Sewell, 1997) is similarly indebted to Black feminist work. Queer theory, finally—a later-given name for longstanding work on sexuality and gay, lesbian, and transgender issues—has had a profound impact on gender and education research. Using the work of Butler (1990, 1993, 2004), Halberstam (1998) and many others, queer theory has challenged the very categories scholars use—"gender," "male," "female," and all the categories of "sexual orientation"—as well as their normative implications. The homophobia, heterosexism, and transphobia that underpin schooling were brought to light with the benefit of such theoretical and empirical work (e.g., Epstein & Johnson, 1998; Friend, 1993; Jennings, 1994; Kissen, 1996; Loutzenheiser, 1996; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; Pascoe, 2007).

Other significant challenges to feminism in education have remained or emerged in recent years. This is certainly not a complete list, but a few points are particularly worth mentioning. The boys' education debates have been a significant challenge, again taking significant attention and resources, and often in ways that promote a backlash against girls rather than a nuanced examination of the neediest boys (e.g., Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Arnot, David, & Weiner, 1999; Epstein, Elwood, Hey, & Maw, 1998; Francis, 2000; Lingard, Mills, & Weaver-Hightower, 2012; Martino et al., 2009; Mills, 2003; Titus, 2004). While a challenge, boys' education issues have not completely stopped work on girls' continuing concerns. Science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), particularly, still garners much research and many grants, as girls continue to have lower participation and

worse outcomes in these fields (Ceci & Williams, 2010; U.S. Department of Education Gender Equity Expert Panel, 2001). Even more, though, a look at the tables of contents of major journals in the sociology of education and other foundational fields reassures one that diverse focuses on girls continues apace.

Shifts in theorizing gender have also created tensions, particularly poststructuralist and postmodern turns in gender theories beginning in the mid-1980s and continuing today. The questioning of categories inherent in these epistemological standpoints has, for instance, created rifts between feminists engaging in policy creation (an intrinsically normative activity) and those "post-" positions deeply skeptical of engagement with policy and the state (see also Yates, this volume). In return, earlier feminists lament the withdrawal from activism and engagement with schools represented in mainly theoretical projects.

Feminist educationalists have also struggled both theoretically and materially with the ascendancy of *neoliberalism*—the ideology "that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey, 2005, Introduction, para. 3). The state in neoliberal ideology must stay out of the way except to protect markets or to create private markets out of currently state-regulated institutions and resources. Thus schools and universities have come under the threat of market forces (league tables, vouchers, and the creation of academies in England or charter schools in the United States), and the state has scaled back funding and regulation to supposedly allow for the "entrepreneurial impulses" of local actors to innovate educational reform.

Neoliberalism has posed two major challenges to (pro)feminist work in education. First, often the regulation removed from local schools includes progressive reforms like gender equity; conservative views of gender are thus sometimes installed in schools under the cover of "local control." In Australia, for instance, the recasting of the national gender equity framework following the boys' education inquiry sought significant leniency for schools to create their own policies "in collaboration with their communities," leaving it up to chance whether local communities would create equity-focused policies (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, pp. 113-123). The second challenge arising from neoliberalism's rise involves its identity politics, for neoliberalism asks individuals to internalize personal responsibility (as *homo economicus*) for all successes and failures, stripping away notions of social contracts and state responsibility for the welfare of citizens. As Francis (2006) has argued, such positioning puts the blame for underachievement and lack of educational outcomes on individual boys and girls not being "worthy" of the investments made in them, so the continued failures and social ills of the working class and students of color prompt funding to get withdrawn or increasingly tied to accountability measures. For those working to improve the education of various genders and sexualities, this presents clear and present resource and rhetorical challenges. Though it wasn't part of their prompt, nearly all the contributors to this volume take up neoliberalism's challenges in their essays.

LOOKING FORWARD

Despite the many challenges that (pro)feminism in education faces, many reasons for hope remain. As one of us has pointed out elsewhere (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, Coda), there is hope to be found in the facts of the case in gender and education: there are progressive potentials in some boys' education reforms; much work continues on girls; gender concerns grow and recede (witness the early 1990s in the United States); and a base of political support still exists for gender equity in all the included countries. Yet there are even more reasons for hope to be found in the pages that follow.

As part of their prompt, the authors of this collection were asked to look forward for the field. In many essays, a cautious optimism shows through. Yet the reason to pay attention to these voices is not their positivity; these voices are *leaders* perhaps primarily because they are not afraid to critique the status quo or the revered tales of the past. Each, in her or his own way, challenges feminisms to change, to think more deeply, to better explain themselves, and to be more active in the worlds outside of the academy. It is Kenway's sense of being "naughty." It is Francis' refusal of "nice." It is Lather taking on a new topic to "work against myself" and to "bring some complication to my more critical, feminist eye." It is McLeod's suspicion of the essentializing force of gender inclusivity. The leaders in the foundations of our discipline force us to grapple with the unknown, the unpopular, the inconvenient, and the heretical. As Yates puts it in her essay, though, "It is not comfortable to write about negative side effects of agendas one supports…. But I see it as … the necessary situatedness of work in this area, and that taking up issues of gender in the context of schooling is an ongoing 'conversation' rather than a search for a single model or skeleton key." For us editors, then, hope resides in the critiques made herein, for constructive criticism betrays a love of purpose and confidence in what can be.

Hope also shines through the looking backward in the essays—the historical perspective they give—for things have indeed changed tremendously from when many of the contributors began their own schooling, entered teaching, or started training educators. One cannot but marvel, from this vantage point, at the value and efficacy of (pro)feminist work. It has been profoundly impactful on how education is practiced at all levels, from early childhood to adult education. From the language teachers use ("man" and "he" as universal are disappearing) to their curriculum materials, from enrollment figures to bachelor's degrees awarded, from sports opportunities to career opportunities, few other social justice movements in education have been as successful as second-wave feminism. This progress might not have seemed so evident at the time, but these backward glances—a periodic stocktaking—inspire confidence that the field can adapt to changed circumstances and make more progress in the future.

NOTE

[1] Though not unproblematic to do so (Carr, 2000), throughout this book we make a distinction between *feminist* and *pro-feminist* by sex. *Feminist* we reserve for women and *pro-feminist* for men.

For the sake of economy, when referring to both we will use *(pro)feminist*. Conceptually, however, one should avoid collapsing feminism and pro-feminism. As Lingard and Douglas (1999) show, *pro-feminism* (sans the parentheticals; see Lingard's essay, this volume) has the following characteristics:

> Pro-feminism sees the need to change men and masculinities, as well as masculinist social structures, while recognizing the hidden injuries of gender for many men and boys. Pro-feminists also support feminist reform agendas in education and more broadly, and at the same time recognize the structural inequalities of the current societal gender order, and of the gender regime within educational systems. Thus a relational conception of gender is assumed and the notion that a focus on boys in schooling of necessity requires a turning away from a concern with the education of girls is vehemently rejected. (p. 4)

While many feminists have increasingly come to share these perspectives, we believe it to be politically important to distinguish women as more oppressed by the larger gender order and therefore more invested in its reform.

REFERENCES

Adams, R., & Savran, D. (Eds.). (2002). *The masculinity studies reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ailwood, J., & Lingard, R. (2001). The endgame for national girls' schooling policies in Australia? *Australian Journal of Education, 45*(1), 9-22.

American Association of University Women. (1992). *How schools shortchange girls.* New York: Marlowe & Company.

Amos, V. & Parmar, P. (1984). Challenging imperial feminism, *Feminist Review*, *17*(1), 3-19.

Arnot, M., David, M., & Weiner, G. (1999). *Closing the gender gap: Postwar education and social change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Australian House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Training. (2002). *Boys: Getting it right. Report on the inquiry into the education of boys.* Canberra, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/edt/eofb/index.htm

Barrett, M. (1980). *Women's oppression today: Problems in Marxist feminist analysis*. London: Verso.

Biddulph, S. (1998). *Raising boys: Why boys are different—And how to help them become happy and well-balanced men*. Sydney, Australia: Finch Publishing.

Boxer, M. J. (1998). *When women ask the questions: Creating women's studies in America*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York, NY: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.

Byrne, E. (1978). *Women and education*. London: Tavistock.

Carby, H. (1982) White woman listen! Black feminism and the boundaries of sisterhood. In Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The empire strikes back* (pp. 212-235)*.* Hutchinson: London.

Carr, B. (2000). Same as it never was: Masculinity and identification in feminism. In N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at school* (pp. 323-342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ceci, S. J., & Williams, W. M. (2010). *The mathematics of sex: How biology and society conspire to limit talented women and girls*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, E. H. (1873). *Sex in education, or, A fair chance for girls* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Commonwealth Schools Commission. (1975). *Girls, school & society: Report by a study group to the Schools Commission*. Canberra, Australia.

Connell, R. (2008). *Southern theory: Social science and the global dynamics of knowledge*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cuyjet, M. J., & associates (Eds.). (2006). *African American men in college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, J. E. (2005). Early schooling and academic achievement of African American males. In O. S. Fashola (Ed.), *Educating African American males: Voices from the field* (pp. 129-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Deem, R. (1978). *Women and schooling*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2003). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2nd ed., pp. 199-258). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V., & Maw, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Failing boys?: Issues in gender and achievement*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling sexualities*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Fashola, O. S. (Ed.). (2005). *Educating African American males: Voices from the field*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of Black masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Francis, B. (2000). *Boys, girls, and achievement: Addressing the classroom issues*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Francis, B. (2006). Heroes or zeroes? The discursive positioning of “underachieving boys” in English neo-liberal education policy. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(2), 187-200.

Frazier, N., & Sadker, M. (1973). *Sexism in school and society*. New York: Harper & Row.

Freedman, E. B. (2002). *No turning back: The history of feminism and the future of women*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Friend, R. A. (1993). Choices, not closets: Heterosexism and homophobia in schools. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools* (pp. 209-235). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gergen, K. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. London: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women’s development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Griffith, A. I., & Smith, D. E. (2005). *Mothering for schooling*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Gumport, P. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gurian, M. (1998). *A fine young man: What parents, mentors, and educators can do to shape adolescent boys into exceptional men*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Gurian, M. (2001). *Boys and girls learn differently! A guide for teachers and parents*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hanisch, C. (2006). The personal is political. Retrieved October 1, 2012, from http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PersonalisPol.pdf.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt.

Jennings, K. (1994). *One teacher in 10: Gay and lesbian educators tell their stories*. Boston, MA: Alison.

Kimmel, M. S. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: Harper.

Kissen, R. M. (1996). *The last closet: The real lives of lesbian and gay teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lingard, B., & Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging feminisms: Pro-feminism, backlashes, and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Lingard, B., Mills, M., & Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2012). Interrogating recuperative masculinity politics in schooling. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(4), 407-421.

Lobban, G. (1975). Sex roles in reading schemes, *Educational Review*, *27*(3): 202-10.

Loutzenheiser, L. W. (1996). How schools play "Smear the Queer." *Feminist Teacher, 10*(2), 59-64.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities, and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Martino, W., Kehler, M., & Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (Eds.). (2009). *The problem with boys' education: Beyond the backlash*. New York: Routledge.

Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). *So what's a boy? Addressing issues of masculinity and schooling*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

McRobbie, A. (1978). Working class girls and the culture of femininity. In Women's Studies Group (Ed.), *Women take issue: Aspects of women's subordination* (pp. 96-108). London: Hutchinson & Co.

Mills, M. (2003). Shaping the boys' agenda: The backlash blockbusters. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 7*(1), 57-73.

Noguera, P. A. (2008). *The trouble with Black boys: And other reflections on race, equity, and the future of public education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Orenstein, P. (1994). *School girls: Young women, self-esteem, and the confidence gap*. New York: Anchor Books.

Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls*. New York: Grosset/Putnam.

Pollack, W. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York: Random House.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls*. New York: Touchstone.

Sewell, T. (1997). *Black masculinities and schooling: How Black boys survive modern schooling*. Staffordshire, England: Trentham Books.

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2009). *Feminism and "the schooling scandal."* London, England: Routledge.

Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Sommers, C. H. (2000). *The war against boys: How misguided feminism is harming our young men*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Spender, D. (Ed.). (1987). *The education papers: Women's quest for equality in Britain 1850-1912*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Titus, J. J. (2004). Boy trouble: Rhetorical framing of boys' underachievement. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 25*(2), 145-169.

Tyre, P. (2008). *The trouble with boys: A surprising report card on our sons, their problems at school, and what parents and educators must do*. New York: Crown Publishers.

U. S. Department of Education Gender Equity Expert Panel. (2001). *Exemplary and promising gender equity programs* (Report No. ORAD 2001-1000). Jessup, Maryland.

Walker, A. (1983). *In search of our mothers' gardens: Womanist prose*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(4), 471-498.

Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2008). *The politics of policy in boys' education: Getting boys "right."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weiler, K., & David, M. (Eds.). (2008). The personal and the political: Second-wave feminism and educational research [Special issue]. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(4).

Weiner, G. (1994). *Feminisms in education: An introduction*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Women on Words and Images. (1972). *Dick and Jane as victims: Sex stereotyping in children's readers*. Princeton, NJ: Women on Words and Images.

Yates, L. (2008). Revisiting feminism and Australian education: Who speaks? What questions? What contexts? What impact? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(4), 471-481.

Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower
Associate Professor, Educational Foundations and Research
University of North Dakota

Christine Skelton
Professor of Gender Equality in Education
University of Birmingham