Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientations in Curriculum

FREE

Boni Wozolek, Penn State University, Abington College

https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1445
Published online: 19 November 2020

Summary

Curriculum studies is a field that addresses the sociopolitical, historical, and cultural norms and values that impact the classrooms and corridors of schools and their interrelated systems of schooling. Questions of curricula, the formal (what is meant to be taught), the null (what is not taught), the enacted (what is learned through interactions), and the hidden (what is learned through cultural norms) are significant to curriculum studies and are entangled with local and less local histories, politics, and cultures. Sociocultural precepts such as race, gender, and sexual orientation are therefore enmeshed with these forms of curriculum. The study of how race, gender, and sexual orientation are related is therefore at once historical and contemporary in its significance. To understand the relationship between these ideas is to follow lines from Title IX, the Meriam Report, the exclusion of certain terms from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, redlining, and other significant national policies and practices that impact schools and the curriculum. Finally, while it may be easy to falsely split questions of race from questions of gender or sexual orientation, an attention to how intersectional identities impact the curriculum becomes especially significant to disrupting colonial, sexist, racist, homophobic, and transphobic norms and values that often render the female body as property of the cis-hetero patriarchy. Within these intersectional dialogues, curriculum studies scholars often find the important tools for dismantling and discussing normalized marginalization in schools and across systems of schooling as they touch and are touched by local and less local communities.

Keywords: queer theory, curriculum studies, critical race theory, critical feminisms, Indigenous studies, African American intellectual traditions

Introduction

The field of curriculum studies has longstanding dialogues that think deeply about questions of race (e.g., Gordon, 1997; Grant, 1973; Hughes & Berry, 2012; Watkins, 2001), gender (e.g., Grumet, 1988; Lather, 2010; Miller, 2005; Noddings, 1984; Stone & Boldt, 1994), sexual orientations (e.g., Kumashiro, 2002; Pinar, 1998; Thornton, 1998; Whitlock, 2010), and other sociocultural precepts as they engage and are entangled with systems of schooling. This is because it's not only the institution of education but what is learned, or, too often, what is forcibly unlearned (Tuck & Yang, 2012), within those institutions that is of central concern across the field of curriculum studies. As Anyon (1980) argues, schooling and its interrelated forms of curricula "contribute to the reproduction of … social relations" (p. 90). Anyon

continues by explaining that within this contribution “lies a theoretical meaning and social consequence of classroom practice” (p. 90). Curriculum studies is similarly centered on an attention to theoretical frameworks as they intersect with the sociopolitical, historical, and cultural consequences of classroom practices and broader systems of schooling. Knotted within the practices that impact the classrooms and corridors of school (Metz, 1978) are sociocultural precepts that deal with race, gender (with its multiple identities and expressions), sexual orientations, home language, ability, class, and the like.

Although there are many inroads to scholarship that attends to the forms of curriculum—enacted, formal, hidden, and null—this article will specifically focus on the historical relationships between race, genders, and sexual orientations as they intersect with schools. This focus is important for at least the following reasons. First, like most of the academy, marginalized people and groups have fought against white, straight, cis-hetero patriarchal norms to create space for oppressed voices within the field of curriculum studies (Cutts, Love, & Davis, 2013; Tate, 1994). A careful attention to the historical lines of presence and absence of these voices within the field is significant to understanding the contemporary context. Second, curriculum studies scholars have produced a body of strong scholarship that engages with sociopolitical critiques of schooling (e.g., Apple, 1996; Jackson, 1968; McLaren, 1989). Understanding how race, gender, and sexual orientations are imbricated within these dialogues is important to the disruption of normalized oppression that is iterative and recursive through schools and schooling. While the examination of how race, genders, and sexual orientations are entangled through intersectional lives is an incredibly significant topic, it is also important to remember that each of these areas of study could exist as their own separate disciplines. This means that while the article will cover the breadth of these topics, readers should consider this an entrée to the many facets that exist within and across each topic as they might be teased apart into separate ideas and areas of study. Although the factors that engage and maintain social reproduction are knotted within schools, systems of schooling, and communities (Nespor, 1997), the article will falsely split questions of race, gender, and sexual orientations to discuss the significant historical facets of these topics as they relate to the field of curriculum studies to better understand how they are nested and layered in contemporary scholarship and schools. After briefly exploring each construct separately, the article will turn to their intersections before concluding.

Curriculum studies is unique among other forms of educational research in that scholars in the field regularly think across disciplines of education and other social sciences to deeply theorize what it means to learn in educational spaces and, in turn, how such spaces are entangled with local and less local communities. In terms of how normalized racism, homo- and transphobias, and sexism have been engendered and maintained, this interdisciplinary approach to teaching and learning is vital to understanding how schools are central in the reproduction of sociocultural and political ideas and ideals. Specifically, one facet of curriculum studies is the forms of curriculum. Rather than focusing solely on the formal, or official, curriculum (Apple, 1993)—what is also known as the intended lessons in schools that are often framed through textbooks and standardized lessons—curriculum theorists often unpack other forms of curriculum that are nested and layered in schools with the formal curriculum. This includes the null curriculum (Eisner, 1985), or what is not taught; the hidden curriculum (Anyon, 1980; Jackson, 1968), or the lessons that are learned through the culture

of schools, which is often hidden to those learning the lessons; and the enacted curriculum (Page, 1991), or what is learned through interactions (Schwab, 1969) between agents such as students, teachers, administrators, the building, and the curricula.

An example relevant to this entry would include any facet of race, genders, or sexual orientations. Specifically, consider a standard science course in the United States (e.g., the formal curriculum), which generally leaves out (e.g., the null curriculum) the accomplishments of women, queer communities, or Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC). When these lessons are left out of the formal curriculum, implicit and explicit messages are sent about the value of these marginalized groups. The culture of the school and its community are also impacted by these messages (e.g., the hidden curriculum). How the administration, teachers, students, and community members interact with each other is inextricably tied to what is learned and what is absent in the classroom (e.g., the enacted curriculum) in ways that are tied to the devaluing of people and groups through curricular places and spaces. While the following sections emphasize the historical implications of race, genders, and sexual orientations as they relate to schooling, the forms of curriculum are the underpinning to these historical turns. This is because, as curriculum theorists have noted (Apple, 1993; Gershon, 2017; Gordon, 1997), the forms of curriculum are always already entwined with sociohistorical outcomes.

Race and Curriculum

Curriculum studies, like most of education, remained a largely white field until the turn of the 21st century (Watkins, 2001). The identities, perspectives, voices, and scholarship of people of color tended to be absent from significant texts in ways that have been detrimental not only to the field but also in its broader implications in education.[1] While contemporary scholars are far more diverse in their personal identities and attention to questions of race throughout curriculum studies and across fields of education, there is also a strong case to be made that privileging identities over strong scholarship can be equally detrimental. The point here is not to be reductionist in terms of historical understandings but rather to critically engage in potentially corrective narratives.

The presence of mostly white, male narratives signals the presence of marginalization within the field. In this case, voices of color such as DuBois are often forgotten in favor of scholars such as Dewey. However, returning to the point about identity politics, it’s not that Dewey’s contribution should be absent from the curriculum, but rather that voices from the African American intellectual traditions, Indigenous individuals, and Latinx communities,[2] to name a few, should be more strongly represented in schools of education.

The absence of voices of color has been well documented within the field of curriculum studies (e.g., Au, 2012; Gaztambide-Fernández, 2006; Popkewitz, 2014; Watkins, 2001) and therefore will not be the focus in the remaining portion of this section. Instead, it will briefly focus on the histories of two groups—African Americans and Indigenous—to show how scholarly voices of color have had an impact on curriculum studies in its contemporary iterations. To be clear, a multiplicity of voices have contributed to curriculum studies. The decision to attend to the impact of these groups is not meant to exclude other significant groups, such as Asian or Latinx voices, that are also too often marginalized through systems

of schooling. The rationale is to think with and about histories of diaspora as they have been created by the United States' sociopolitical histories and as they are related to schools and systems of schooling.

African American Intellectual Traditions: Tracing Blackness in Schooling

Figure 1. The symbol associated with "Sankofa".

The word "sankofa," and its associated symbol (see Figure 1) of a bird flying forward with its head turned backward, is an Akan term that means "to go back and get it." The symbol is associated with the proverb "Se wo were fi na wosankofa a yenkyi," which translates to, "It is not wrong to go back for that which you have forgotten" (The Spirituals Project at the University of Denver, 2004). Grant, Brown, and Brown (2016) similarly describe the African American intellectual traditions in the United States as a process of reclaiming forgotten histories, especially in terms of schooling and the curriculum. Using Schomburg's (1925) article *The Negro Digs up His Past*, Grant et al. (2016) argue for a restoration of African American history that was forcibly forgotten within the African diaspora.

Using Grant et al.'s (2016) definition, this section will also define African American intellectual traditions as "timeless ideas, philosophies, and pedagogies that questioned, theorized, and addressed the long-standing issues of Black life (e.g., culture, experiences) in schools and society" (p. 2). It is important to note that within these traditions there are voices that remained largely unheard until their legacy was recognized at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries. These marginalized perspectives mainly came from Black women such as Anna Julia Cooper, Mary McLeod Bethune, Eva Dykes, Georgiana Simpson, and Sadie Mossell Alexander, to name a few. However, regardless of their historical absence, these voices still represent "timeless ideas, philosophies, and pedagogies … that questioned, theorized, and addressed" (Grant, Brown, and Brown, 2016, p. 2) issues that impacted Black communities and students across the United States.

A return to what was lost is particularly important because, as scholars such as Cooper (1892), DuBois (1903), and Locke (1925) argue, slavery engendered a double consciousness (DuBois, 1903) that blocked "true social or self-understanding" (Locke, 1925, p. 631) and created identities predicated on what Winfield (2007) calls "collective memories." Collective memories, Winfield argues, "are the ways by which social ideologies persist" (p. 14). Sociocultural norms and values have engendered and maintained a social amnesia of African

American histories in general, but it is an amnesia that is specifically and intentionally imbricated within the curricula of schooling (Bethune, 1939; Watkins, 2001; Winfield, 2007; Woodson, 1933).

To understand the entanglements of Blackness and fields such as curriculum studies is to understand how collective memories historically rendered Black perspectives absent from places of learning. Contemporary curriculum studies scholars have taken up the charge to reclaim, relearn, and reconnect African American educational histories in several important ways. First, there has been an impetus toward the inclusion of several voices that were historically excluded from the field of curriculum studies and more broadly education (e.g., Au, Brown, & Calderón, 2016; Kim & Jung, 2019; Love, 2019). Returning to Herbert Spencer's (1859) query that is significant to curriculum studies, "What knowledge is of most worth?," curriculum studies scholars have engaged with scholarship from the African American intellectual traditions as they relate not only to the historical underpinnings of the field but also to the sociopolitical contexts that undergird the contemporary contexts (e.g., Berry & Stovall, 2013; Cutts et al., 2013; Gershon, 2017; Grant et al., 2016; Rosiek & Kinslow, 2015). In other words, while Anna Julia Cooper would not have identified with a field that was codified in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Pacheco, 2012), her work, which focused on how African American women learn, and what they learn in schools, has become significant to the field as it increasingly focuses on questions of race (e.g., Au, 2012; Baszile, Edwards, & Guillory, 2016; Gershon, 2017; Wozolek, 2018).

Second, eugenicists in the United States had answered Spencer's question about the worth of knowledge by systematically and systemically removing African American voices from schools through standardized testing, segregated schools, and tracking (Popkewitz, 2011; Winfield, 2007). In the 1990s, curriculum studies scholars began to note not just the absence of voices but how the curriculum itself is a racialized text (e.g., Castenell & Pinar, 1993; Gordon, 1997; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; Slattery, 1995). While Black scholars did not have a strong foothold in academic circles at the time, the work of reading the curriculum through questions of race was done mainly through Black perspectives and intellectual traditions.

Finally, curriculum studies scholars have used the Black experience in schools to think about the forms of curriculum—formal, enacted, hidden, and null—and how Black youth are impacted by sociocultural exclusion in texts, classrooms, and corridors (e.g., Apple, 1996; Jackson, 1968). This is particularly significant as this analysis can serve as a disruption to normalized racist and racialized curricula in schools.

Indigenous Narratives: Decolonizing Schooling

"They Came, They Saw, They Named, They Claimed"

(Smith, 1999, p. 80)

Educational inquiry, like most forms of research, is "inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism" (Smith, 1999, p. 1). The schools that are researched under such scholarly discourses are similarly knotted in colonized norms and values (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008; Tuck & Yang, 2012). This section will discuss the imbricated nature of post- and decolonial discourses as they are related to education and the curriculum. Although the focus of this article is on schooling in the United States specifically and, more broadly, North

America, it is important to note that, on the one hand, the use of “indigeneity” in a broad sense can flatten Indigenous traditions. On the other hand, it is important to recognize that there are similar yet different conversations around the globe that focus on colonization, Indigenous oppression, and education. In other words, the erasure of Indigenous identities that is prevalent in and across North American schools and systems of schooling is pervasive around the world. However, the focus here on the United States also stands as an example of a nation where, although residential schools are no longer common, the negative treatment and oppression of Indigenous communities continues rather unapologetically.

Postcolonial and/or/versus decolonial

Postcolonial dialogues have a longstanding history across fields (e.g., Bhabha, 1994; Chakrabarty, 2000; Fanon, 1961; Said, 1978; Spivak, 1988). Postcolonial scholarship focuses on the politics of knowledge and identities that come from colonization. This includes ideas such as the generation and iterations of knowledge that are central to the colonized groups and how Western knowledges were used to subjugate the colonized (Laurie, Stark, & Walker, 2019). In education, scholars have used this theory as a means to critique neoliberal practices in education (Andreotti, 2011), to build inclusive teaching practices (Burney, 2012), and as a means to (re)read curriculum from a postcolonial position (Carter, 2004; Kanu, 2011). Postcolonial literatures have been significant in the disruption of the inequities in schooling that are produced by colonial encounters (Andreotti, 2011).

Often—but not always—building off the threads woven by postcolonial theorists, decolonial theory is concerned with “confronting, challenging, and undoing the dominative and assimilative force of colonialism as a historical and contemporary process … and the Eurocentrism that underwrites it” (de Lissovoy, 2010, p. 280). The mid- to late 1990s marked a significant shift, when these colonial norms and values began to be explored and interrupted across fields through decolonial theory (e.g., Lopez, 1998; Pérez, 1999). In the United States, this movement was predominantly developed by scholars attending to Chicano/@/x (e.g., Anzaldúa, 2015; Espinoza, 1999; Moraga, 2011; Pérez, 1999) and Indigenous (e.g., Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Grande, 2004; Wilson, 2004) issues.

In schools, both post- and decolonial theories have been used to reconsider and disrupt colonial histories that have normalized marginalization in the systems of schooling and the interrelated curriculum (Andreotti, 2011). For example, as scholars such as Rains and Swisher (1999) and Sabzalian (2019) have argued, the curriculum has been, and continues to be, colonized in terms of the exclusion of Indigenous voices and perspectives. This includes ideas presented through standardized understandings of citizenship and civic duty within the formal and null curricula (Sabzalian, 2019). These disruptions are critical within the field for at least the following reasons. First, the dismantling of what was known as Indian Residential Schools did not occur until 1928, when the Meriam Report was published by the Department of the Interior in the United States. The Meriam Report was the result of a 26-state survey that evaluated the living conditions of Indian Reservations across the United States. The results of this report called for the abolishment of a European American-only curriculum and called for Native Americans to be educated near their homes. However, these schools were still

prominent until the late 1970s (Iceland & Weinberg, 2002; McBeth, 1983). The disruption of the norms and values that proliferated from these schools through post- and decolonial theories was a project that began in the late 1980s and gained speed in the 1990s.

Second, with the passage of legislation in the United States such as the Every Student Succeeds Act, which passed in 2015, and its predecessor, No Child Left Behind, which passed in 2002, projects that reject and refuse (Simpson, 2014) the ideological cleansing that occurs through a standardized curriculum that engenders and maintains Eurocentric ideals becomes all the more significant (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008). Scholars that focus on Indigenous youth are therefore enmeshed with the curricula and curriculum studies as they seek to decolonize everyday knowledges that pervade systems of schooling across the United States.

In contemporary curriculum studies, there continues to be a critique that not only includes decolonizing the curriculum but also thinks about the pedagogy of colonized schooling all together. Scholars continue to think deeply about the curriculum as it impacts Indigenous communities, normalized governmental control over education and Indigenous communities, and the impact of schooling on language and culture (McKinley & Smith, 2019). This is important because, as scholars continue to push back on colonized systems of schooling that impact students across layers of scale and identities, envisioning education and the curriculum through an emancipatory lens focused on Indigenous views of teaching and learning is important to refusing normalized oppressive ways of being, knowing, and doing in schools.

While questions of race as it relates to curriculum could be more generously discussed with more space, this article now turns to questions of sexual orientations and genders as they are interrelated with curriculum. It should be noted, however, that both sexual orientation and gender have been related to questions of race, especially as decolonial and critical race literatures began to focus on the feminist critique in the mid-1990s. This was also when de Lauretis (1991) coined the term “queer theory,” opening up educational research to both the feminist and queer critiques of race as they are entangled with gender and sexual orientations.

Sexual Orientation, Gender, and Curriculum

The fields of education, like most academic disciplines, remained largely controlled by the cis-hetero patriarchy until the mid-1980s. This turn in demographics and scholars who focused on feminist and/or queer issues coincided with the burgeoning of theoretical frameworks that rejected traditional ideologies (e.g., critical race theory, critical feminist geography, queer theory, Chicano/@ studies). This move shifted not only how the researcher/scholar is understood in relationship to the youth being studied in schools but also how the researcher’s narrative is central to the academy’s way of being, knowing, and doing (Mayo, 2014; Stryker & Whittle, 2006; Whitlock, 2013).

As feminist scholars began to create space for their voices in the 1980s, queer scholars and scholars who focused on queer issues often used these spaces as a place to be heard against cis-hetero patriarchal norms and values (e.g., Allen, 2016; hooks, 1989; Lather, 1986; Lorde, 1984). While this is significant, it is important to remember that despite women and queer people finding space in the academy, people of color were still largely left out from these

spaces. The proliferation of queer voices of color in educational research in general and curriculum studies in particular from the turn of the 21st century can be understood as a product of the strengthening foothold of critical theoretical frameworks such as critical race theory and queer theory, as well as an attention to identity that spurred a need to “diversify” the academy (hooks, 1989; Toldson, 2011).

In the context of schools, Title IX was a pivotal educational policy that was passed in 1972 and prohibited discrimination based on sex, which was significant to the daily lives of girls (Blumenthal, 2005) and has become a point of contention in the fight for equity for trans and gender non-conforming students in contemporary schooling (Robbins & Helfenbein, 2018). This is because Obama era protections of trans youth under Title IX were rolled back under the Trump administration. As a result of normalized homo- and transphobia, along with receding government-sanctioned protections, queer youth in schools are still suffering from high rates of suicide and acts of self-harm (Wozolek, Wootton, & Demlow, 2016). This is important because despite the push for gender-based equity, queer youth have still been largely left out of educational policies that will protect them socially, emotionally, and physically.

For queer youth, and the scholars that think about queerness in school, it is important to remember that the term “homosexuality” was not removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) until 1973, and that “gender identity disorder” was still a classification until 2013 (Shapiro & Powell, 2017). Further, national policies such as the military’s “Don’t ask, don’t tell” practices weren’t repealed until 2011, and the attack on transgender service people under the Trump administration has continued in 2019. These timelines are important because while there were clear policies to protect cisgender, straight girls, the fight to be seen as a person rather than a disorder or, as DuBois (1903) might argue, as a problem, has continued for members of the LGBTQ+ community. As of 2020, there were few federal protections for LGBTQ+ youth in schools.

As scholars such as Michael Apple (2004), bell hooks (1989), Lynda Stone and Gail Bolt (1994), Tom Popkewitz (2014), Therese Quinn and Erica Meiners (2009), and William Watkins (2001), to name a few, have discussed, these educational policies deeply impact the forms of curriculum and are therefore imbricated with curriculum studies. For example, in the formal curriculum, both queer and feminist scholars have noted the exclusion of their voices across texts and lessons in the classroom (Lather, 2010; Thornton, 1998). Such oppressions were noted across the other forms of curriculum—enacted, hidden, and null—as well as scholars in the early 2000s attended more closely to the multiple ways that fe-male and queer identities were marginalized (e.g., Coffey & Delamont, 2002; Gilbert, 2006; Sears, 2005; Watson, 2005).

Despite Title IX, the stability of gender-based equity has continued in contemporary schools and systems of schooling. This can be seen in the gender pay gap (DiPrete & Buchmann, 2013), national debates over women’s health as it relates to sex education (Casemore, 2010), and educational gaps in subjects such as science (Quinn & Cooc, 2015). This is significant to note because as the hidden curriculum continues to subjugate girls as “less than,” the constant and consistent rape culture that devalues the fe-male body, as discussed in the #MeToo movement, will continue without further attention to how the forms of curriculum normalize the fe-male body as a sexual object (Hill, 2016; McCaughey & Cermele, 2017).

It is important to note that such normalization of the fe-male body as sexualized is not a conversation solely for the cisgender community. As Smith (2015) argues, the lack of dialogue about trans bodies in sex education has normalized a hidden curriculum of transphobia. As the rate of sexual assault for transwomen in general and transwomen of color in particular continues to rise globally, the forms of curriculum become resonant in the fight to stop violence against transwomen.

Intersectional Conclusions

The previous sections have focused on the historical factors that are significant to how and what one learns in schools. These histories are important because they are central to understanding how curricular decisions for the formal curriculum were made (e.g., the decision to learn about African Americans only through the enslavement of people or through civil rights rather than as an integral and important part of society). One lens that educational theorists, including curriculum scholars, have used to disrupt these norms has been to think about marginalized people through their intersectional identities. While this entry has falsely split questions of race from gender and sexual orientation, there is significance in attending to intersectionality.

As is well known across educational and activist contexts, the term “intersectionality” as coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) is a legal call to attend to the overlaps in identities that, when missed, are often most harmful to Black women. It is important to recall that Crenshaw began her dialogue on intersectional identities to address questions of domestic violence and rape in order to present a multifaceted approach to theorizing and disrupting aggressions that regularly impact those who have multiple, marginalized identities. This is significant because several scholars have noted that schools tend to metaphorically choke away the ways of being, knowing, and doing of marginalized people and groups, particularly across lines of race, genders, and sexual orientations (e.g., Agosto, 2014; Baszile et al., 2016; Berry, 2014; Grande, 2004; Woodson, 1933). Attending to intersectional dialogues in education refuses and resists White, cis-hetero patriarchal norms and values by recognizing and respecting people as their full selves rather than expecting students and community members to “choose race over gender or vice versa, [leaving people to] divide an identity where both make [them] whole” (Matias, 2016, p. 72). This false split marginalizes, for example, a transwoman of color across the forms of curriculum and, when absent from the formal, is played out through interactions and embedded in the culture of the hidden and enacted curricula. Intersectional dialogues in education have been significant in that they can unpack the narratives of youth, their parents/guardians, and surrounding communities and help scholars and K–12 educators alike to (re)conceptualize how schooling might function in the interests of equity and access across questions of race, genders, and sexual orientations. In addition to the points raised previously, and especially as it is commensurate with curriculum studies, intersectional dialogues have been helpful in stressing the politically grounded nature of BIPOC in general and, specifically, Black women’s pedagogies as a refusal of oppressive norms. As theorists such as Bethune (1939), Cooper (1892), Quinn and Meiners (2009), and Mayo (2014), to name a few, have articulated, oppression that starts in the classroom all too often leaks from schools and becomes ingrained in local and less local sociopolitical norms and values. The study of the knotted nature between sociocultural precepts as they relate to curriculum is significant not

just in its relationship to the schoolhouse but also in roots that are maintained in the communities that they touch and that are touched by the everyday experiences of students in school.

Acknowledgments

My deepest gratitude to my curriculum studies and educational foundations family for their continued scholarly support.

References

Agosto, V. (2014). Scripted curriculum: What movies teach about dis/ability and Black males. *Teachers College Record*, *116*(4), 1–24.

Allen, J. S. (2016). Black/queer rhizomatics. In E. P. Johnson (Ed.), *No tea, no shade: New writings in black queer studies* (pp. 27–47). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, *162*(1), 67–92.

Anzaldúa, G. E. (2015). *Light in the dark/Luz en los oscuro: Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality*. Edited by A. Keating. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Apple, M. W. (1993). The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense? *Teachers College Record*, *95*(2), 222–241.

Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Au, W. (2012). *Critical curriculum studies: Education, consciousness, and the politics of knowing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Au, W., Brown, A. L., & Calderón, D. (2016). *Reclaiming the multicultural roots of US curriculum: Communities of color and official knowledge in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Baszile, D. T., Edwards, K. T., & Guillory, N. A. (Eds.). (2016). *Race, gender, and curriculum theorizing: Working in womanish ways*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.

Berry, T. R. (2014). Internationalization, internalization, and intersectionality of identity: A critical race feminist re-images curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *30*(1), 4–14.

Berry, T. R., & Stovall, D. O. (2013). Trayvon Martin and the curriculum of tragedy: Critical race lessons for education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(4), 587–602.

Bethune, M. M. (1939). What does American democracy mean to me? In K. Ellis & S. Smith (Eds.), *Say it plain: Live recordings of the 20th century's great African-American speeches* <http://americanradioworks.publicradio.org/features/sayitplain/transcript.html>.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Blumenthal, K. (2005). *Let me play: The story of Title IX; The law that changed the future of girls in America*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Burney, S. (2012). *Pedagogy of the other: Edward Said, postcolonial theory, and strategies for critique*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Carter, L. (2004). Thinking differently about cultural diversity: Using postcolonial theory to (re) read science education. *Science Education*, *88*(6), 819–836.

Casemore, B. (2010). Free association in sex education: Understanding sexuality as the flow of thought in conversation and curriculum. *Sex Education*, *10*(3), 309–324.

Castenell L. A., Jr., & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding curriculum as a racial text: Representations of identity and difference in education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2002). *Feminism and the classroom teacher: Research, praxis, pedagogy*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cooper, A. J. (1892). *A voice from the south (by a Black woman from the south)*. Xenia, OH: Aldine.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *8*(1), 139–167.

Cutts, Q. M., Love, B. L., & Davis, C. L. (2013). Being uprooted: Autobiographical reflections of learning in the [new] south. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *28*(3), 57–72.

de Lauretis, T. (1991). Queer theory: Lesbian and gay sexualities. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, *3*(2), iii–xviii.

De Lissovoy, N. (2010). Decolonial pedagogy and the ethics of the global. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *31*(3), 279–293.

Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of critical indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

DiPrete, T. A., & Buchmann, C. (2013). *The rise of women: The growing gender gap in education and what it means for American schools*. Thousand Oakes, CA: SAGE.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. Chicago, IL: McClurgand.

Eisner, E. (1985). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Espinoza, D. (1999). Chicanas in the US: Multiple identities. *Feminist Collections*, *21*(1), 6.

Fanon, F. (1961). *The wretched of the earth*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2006). Regarding race: The necessary browning of our curriculum and pedagogy public project. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *3*(1), 60–65.

Gershon, W. S. (2017). *Curriculum and students in classrooms: Everyday urban education in an era of standardization*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Gilbert, J. (2006). “Let us say yes to what turns up”: Education as hospitality. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *4*(1), 25–34.

Gordon, B. M. (1997). Curriculum, policy, and African American cultural knowledge: Challenges and possibilities for the year 2000 and beyond. *Educational Policy*, *11*(2), 227–242.

Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Grant, C. A. (1973). Black studies materials do make a difference. *Journal of Educational Research*, *66*(9), 400–404.

Grant, C. A., Brown, K. D., & Brown, A. L. (2016). *Black intellectual thought in education: The missing traditions of Anna Julia Cooper, Carter G. Woodson, and Alain LeRoy Locke*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Hill, A. (2016). SlutWalk as perifeminist response to rape logic: The politics of reclaiming a name. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *13*(1), 23–39.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hughes, S. A., & Berry, T. R. (2012). *The evolving significance of race: Living, learning, and teaching*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Iceland, J., & Weinberg, D. H. (2002). *Racial and ethnic residential segregation in the United States 1980–2000*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Census.

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

Kanu, Y. (2011). *Integrating Aboriginal perspectives into the school curriculum: Purposes, possibilities, and challenges*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Kim, Y. C., & Jung, J. H. (2019). *Shadow education as worldwide curriculum studies*. New York, NY: Springer International.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (2008). Indigenous knowledges in education: Complexities, dangers, and profound benefits. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *The handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 135–156). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and antioppressive pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, *17*(4), 63–84.

Lather, P. (2010). Response to Jennifer Gilbert: The double trouble of passing on curriculum studies. In E. Malewski (Ed.), *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 73–77). New York, NY: Routledge.

Laurie, T., Stark, H., & Walker, B. (2019). Critical approaches to continental philosophy: Intellectual community, disciplinary identity, and the politics of inclusion. *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy*, *30*(1), 1–17.

Locke, A. (1925). Enter the new negro. *The Survey*, 631–634.

Lopez, G. R. (1998). Reflections on epistemology and standpoint theories: A response to “A maori approach to creating knowledge.” *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*, 225–231.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. New York, NY: Ten Speed Press.

Love, B. L. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

McBeth, S. J. (1983). Indian boarding schools and ethnic identity: An example from the southern plains tribes of Oklahoma. *Plains Anthropologist*, *28*(100), 119–128.

McCaughey, M., & Cermele, J. (2017). Changing the hidden curriculum of campus rape prevention and education: Women’s self-defense as a key protective factor for a public health model of prevention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *18*(3), 287–302.

McKinley, E. A., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2019). *Handbook of Indigenous education*. Singapore: Springer.

McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Matias, C. E. (2016). Shadowboxing whiteness inside teacher education: Critical race activism to the race–gender degree. In D. T. Baszile, K. T. Edwards, & N. A. Guillory (Eds.), *Race, gender, and curriculum theorizing: Working in womanish ways* (pp. 71–86). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Mayo, C. (2007). Intersectionality and queer youth. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *4*(2), 67–71.

Mayo, C. (2014). *LGBTQ youth and education: Policies and practices*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Metz, M. H. (1978). *Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Miller, J. L. (2005). *Sounds of silence breaking: Women, autobiography, curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Moraga, C. (2011). *A Xicana codex of changing consciousness: Writings, 2000–2010*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Nespor, J. (1997). *Tangled up in school: Politics, space, bodies and signs in the educational process*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethical moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pacheco, J. A. (2012). Curriculum studies: What is the field today? *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (JAAACS)*, *8*(1), 1–18.

Page, R. (1991). *Lower-track classrooms: A curricular and cultural perspective*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Pérez, E. (1999). *The decolonial imaginary: Writing Chicanas into history*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1998). *Queer theory in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). Chapter 15: Understanding curriculum; A postscript for the next generation. *Counterpoints*, *17*, 847–868.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2011). Curriculum history, schooling and the history of the present. *History of Education*, *40*(1), 1–19.

Popkewitz, T. S. (Ed.). (2014). *The "reason" of schooling: Historicizing curriculum studies, pedagogy, and teacher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Quinn, D. M., & Cooc, N. (2015). Science achievement gaps by gender and race/ethnicity in elementary and middle school: Trends and predictors. *Educational Researcher*, *44*(6), 336–346.

Quinn, T., & Meiners, E. R. (2009). *Flaunt it! Queers organizing for public education and justice*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Rains, F. V., & Swisher, K. G. (1999). Authentic voices: Advice for incorporating American Indians and Alaska Natives in the elementary school curriculum. *Social Education*, *63*(1), 46–50.

Robbins, K., & Helfenbein, R. J. (2018). Gendered bathrooms, critical geography, and the lived experience of schools. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *15*(3), 1–15.

Rosiek, J., & Kinslow, K. (2015). *Resegregation as curriculum: The meaning of the new racial segregation in US public schools*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sabzalian, L. (2019). The tensions between Indigenous sovereignty and multicultural citizenship education: Toward an anticolonial approach to civic education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *47*(3), 311–346.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Schomburg, A. A. (1925). The Negro digs up his past. *The Survey*, 670–672.

Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review*, *78*(1), 1–24.

Sears, J. T. (Ed.). (2005). *Gay, lesbian, and transgender issues in education: Programs, policies, and practices*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Shapiro, S., & Powell, T. (2017). Medical intervention and LGBT people: A brief history. In K. L. Eckstrand & J. Potter (Eds.), *Trauma, resilience, and health promotion in LGBT patients* (pp. 15–23). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Slattery, P. (1995). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era: Teaching and learning in an age of accountability*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Smith, B. (2015). The existence of a hidden curriculum in sex and relationships education in secondary schools. *British Education Studies Association Journals*, *1*(1), 42–55.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Zed Books.

Spencer, H. (1859). What knowledge is of most worth? *Westminster Review*, *16*(1), 21–46.

The Spirituals Project at the University of Denver. (2004). *African tradition, proverbs, and sankofa <https://web.archive.org/web/20110420131901/http://ctl.du.edu/spirituals/literature/sankofa.cfm>*.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the subaltern speak?* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Stone, L., & Boldt, G. M. (Eds.). (1994). *The education feminism reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Stryker, S., & Whittle, S. (Eds.). (2006). *The transgender studies reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Tate, W. F. (1994). From inner city to ivory tower: Does my voice matter in the academy? *Urban Education*, *29*(3), 245–269.

Thornton, S. J. (1998). Silence on gays and lesbians in social studies curriculum. In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (pp. 364–367). New York, NY: Routledge.

Toldson, I. A. (2011). Editor’s comments: Diversifying the United States’ teaching force; Where are we now? Where do we need to go? How do we get there? *Journal of Negro Education*, *83*(3), 183–186.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1–40.

Watkins, W. H. (2001). *The white architects of black education: Ideology and power in America 1865–1954*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Watson, G. (2005). The hidden curriculum in schools: Implications for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth. *Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research*, *21*.

Whitlock, R. U. (2010). Getting queer: Teacher education, gender studies, and the cross-disciplinary quest for queer pedagogies. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *19*(2), 81–104.

Whitlock, R. U. (Ed.). (2013). *Queer South rising: Voices of a contested place*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Press.

Wilson, W. A. (2004). Introduction: Indigenous knowledge recovery is indigenous empowerment. *American Indian Quarterly*, *28*(3/4), 359–372.

Winfield, A. G. (2007). *Eugenics and education in America: Institutionalized racism and the implications of history, ideology, and memory*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, DC: Associated Publishers.

Wozolek, B. (2018). The mothership connection: Utopian funk from Bethune and beyond. *Urban Review*, *50*(5), 836–856.

Wozolek, B., Wootton, L., & Demlow, A. (2016). The school-to-coffin pipeline: Queer youth, suicide and resilience of spirit. *Cultural Studies↔Critical Methodologies*, *17*(5), 392–398.

Notes

1. The term “people of color” is used here as an inclusive term to think about the marginalization of Black and Brown individuals and groups in and across fields. However, it is important to note that this term has been used to unintentionally overlook the absence of specific groups and identities in general, as is the case with Black women in academia, a group whose voices still remain largely underrepresented and disenfranchised throughout academic dialogues. While this term is used here to talk about marginalization based on race in general terms, particular populations will be discussed as they are resonant to the overall article.

2. The term “Latinx” is used here to keep with contemporary disruptions of cisgender normativity in the United States and, more broadly, around the globe. However, it is significant to acknowledge that even in the inclusivity of this term is the possible exclusion of people who identify with one or more of the iterations of Latino/Latina/Latin@/et cetera. The term is used here to be inclusive with the understanding that it is important to be mindful of any person’s need to identify in ways that are most aligned with their own positionality.