



Hipatia Press
www.hipatiapress.com



Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

<http://generos.hipatiapress.com>

Lest We Forget: Foundational Women for Historically and Socially Responsive Women

Lois M. Christensen, Maxie Pate Kohler & Jerry Aldridge¹

1) University of Alabama at Birmingham, United States of America.

Date of publication: February 25th, 2012

To cite this article: Christensen, L.M., Kohler, M.P., & Aldridge, J. (2012). Lest We Forget: Foundational Women For Historically and Social Responsive Women.

Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies, 1 (1), 28-47.

doi: 10.4471/generos.2012.02

To link this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4471/generos.2012.02>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The terms and conditions of use are related to the Open Journal System and to Creative Commons Non-Commercial and Non-Derivative License.

Lest We Forget: Foundational Women for Historically and Socially Responsive Women

Lois M. Christensen, Maxie Pate Kohler & Jerry Aldridge
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Abstract

Accredited teacher education programs include historical and educational psychological foundations. Noticeably missing are women's voices and theories in both disciplines. Explanations and descriptions of why they missing are imperative. Incorporating historically notable and influential women into foundations coursework is the focus of this article. This historical case study contributes to gender equity by providing distinguished, notable women researchers and theorists that have been marginalized in foundations literature. The featured women are integral to the canon of educational foundations and certainly deserve to be included in the 21st Century scholarship. Myriad other women are overlooked. These seven fundamental voices have been excluded from teacher education courses and courses that support them. Many of the women practiced educational social justice and were connected to men who were credited for their work. Others were simply disregarded. All warrant study; however, this article features the following progressive educators: Ella Flagg Young (1845 – 1918), Anna Julia Cooper (1858 – 1964), Lucy Sprague

Mitchell (1878 – 1967), and Charlotte Hawkins Brown (1883 – 1961). Also highlighted are three salient examples from the area of educational psychology, Sabina Spielrein (1884 – 1942), Diana Baumrind, (1927b) and Carol Gilligan (1936b).

Keywords: Women, marginalized, history, psychology

Introduction

Forty years ago the U.S. Congress passed Title IX. Title IX is a United States law passed in 1972 that required gender equity in academics, schools, or athletics. The educational amendment states that: **"No person in the U.S. shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal aid (1972)."** It was passed to safeguard advantages for women.

Higher education still faces obstacles that constrain women in numerous ways. Gender and racial discrimination exists. Especially in higher education, women continue to be silenced, sometimes rendering them to second-class citizenship. As Curtis (2011) posits, "when these high-achieving women students look around campus for faculty mentors and role models, what do they find? The answer by and large is that progress for women into the most prestigious (and well-paid) positions in academia has lagged far behind the advances experienced by women students" (p.1). Academia has assigned social conventions to women (West & Curtis, 2006). As scholars women are often perceived as not as capable (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Hart, 2006). Educators at every level continue to perpetuate these notions by settling for the status quo. When conversations take place or challenges occur to the status quo about how women are sidelined or experience sexism in academia, then women are often met with high charged words. Inequities dealt to

women as scholars and in rank and pay are intense issues (Curtis, 2011). If not, there wouldn't be a need to have journal articles, handbooks statements, particular days set aside, and legislation about topics surrounding gender equity.

Purpose of the Study

Countless women's educational theories and scholarship merit prestige in the canons of literature. Educational and psychological foundations literature would be more thorough if particular women's work, biographies, voices, and theoretical perspectives were incorporated as vital to teacher education, specifically to candidates in early childhood education, graduate students, and even to young learners.

Requisite theories, information, and contributions by exceptional and deserved women educators have often been overlooked or sometimes attributed to men. This study casts a shrouded light upon only seven women, roughly around the turn of the past century and a couple just beyond, who led a progressive educational approach and worked as advocates for the public good. Everything they wrote about and worked toward is still relevant today. Furthermore, there was a subtle, and frequently a not so subtle, perception and/or attitude of social convention that women, especially women of color, were not scholarly enough, or essentially too incompetent to have shared the halls of academia, reducing their scholarly contributions as less important than their male counterparts. Wolpe's (1978) seminal work within the educational arena of social reproduction and assumptions illustrates how women's inequities are supported by school policies, and these documents play an ideological role in oppressing and subordinating women within the educational economy. The same sentiment is extended to women's intellectual theories, and again women of color often experience double jeopardy, which warrant significant contribution to educational and historical literature (Myers, 2002; Trotman, 1977; West & Curtis, 2006; Wilkinson, 2000).

Theoretical Framework

This study is based on feminist and critical theories. Forms of knowledge are more valued than others. Some dead, western, white male theorists are questioned in this study. Theoretical background data were gathered from existing literature by or about Gilligan (1982), Kincheloe (2008), Lascarides, & Hinitz, (2000), McLaren (2005), Wink (2010), and Wolfe (2000). Women featured in this study are prominent in their own right. Each educational leader warrants an equitable position for study in educational historical and psychological foundations in undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs, especially those focused on early childhood and elementary education with social justice and equity as preferred outcomes. Exceptional women educators were foundational then and relevant now, even while often their contributions have been attributed to men.

The following seven women deserve respect in foundational educational coursework grounding the nature of the teacher education learning. Perhaps, learning from flagrant injustices of excluding women scholars and avoiding mistakes of the past, educational editors will create a clearer vision to understand decisions reached today, and to a greater extent make equitable decisions tomorrow. Deserving women scholars from the past will be rewritten into the literature and women scholars of the present will be treated equitably.

Ella Flagg Young 1845 - 1918

Most teacher education students have never heard of Ella Flagg Young and most will not ever hear of her in their undergraduate or graduate professional education studies (Aldridge, 2009). Ms. Ella Flagg Young influenced the developing and expanding of John Dewey's publishing. She "was a teacher, principal, and superintendent in Chicago, taught at the University of Chicago, and was principal of the Chicago Normal School" (Wolfe, 2000, p. 183). Dewey often consulted with Young. Blount (2002) reported that many of Dewey's educational ideas actually were taken from Young. What Dewey lacked in experience with children, Ella Flagg Young possessed. She had the practical

experience as a teacher and administrator.

Dr. Young completed her Ph.D. at age 55. The University of Chicago Press immediately published her dissertation, *Isolation in the School* (1900), (Blount, 2002). These findings are as current as they were in 1900, due to similarities of *No Child Left Behind* (2001) and the rigidity of public school systems. According to Young, “students and teachers alike increasingly had been stripped of their capacity to make meaningful decisions about their daily conditions or their assigned tasks” (Blount, 2002, p. 171). Administrators made the decisions for those “who were lower in the increasingly hierarchical structure” (p. 171). Dr. Young believed that teachers and students should be allowed autonomy (Wolfe, 2000).

Dr. Young was the first woman superintendent of the Chicago City Schools and president of the National Education Association (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). Both were groundbreaking positions for women. On occasions the male dominated board of education sought to remove Ms. Flagg-Young from her superintendent position. “Clearly, the Chicago School Board included a number of members who either strongly preferred male candidates or who otherwise believed women should not hold such positions” (Blount, 2002, p. 167). Women came in solidarity to support her. Jane Addams, the social and political activist, from The Hull House in Chicago was one of her strongest supporters.

Historical and psychological foundations literature is not complete without Dr. Young’s contributions. Her voice and scholarship instructed John Dewey. Lest we forget, Dr. Young’s research and writings about schools, especially *Isolation in the School*, and her work as an administrator documented her scholarship and informed educators then, as it continues to do so now (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000).

Anna Julia Cooper 1858 – 1964

Anna J. Cooper grew up on a plantation as a slave child. It appeared as if the slave owner, Dr. Fabius Haywood, was probably her father (Pitts, 1999). As a young child, Anna J. Cooper attended school at the

Episcopal Church's parochial school. This early education was what most probably prepared her for college entrance. However as a newly freed slave at age eight, she started her education. Cooper's (1892) literary excellence is noted in her prominent feminist text, *Voice From the South*. According to Giles, (2006) Cooper lived what bell hooks, (1994) termed "engaged pedagogy."

Cooper married young after she graduated from St. Augustine's normal school. However, her husband died two years later (Pitts, 1999). It was then that Cooper set her sight on attending Oberlin College, known as a fine, yet revolutionary college.

Cooper's teaching career began by teaching her mother to read (Smith, 1993). While studying at Oberlin College she refused to take the program for women and instead took a classic curriculum for men. She studied at Columbia for a PhD, and in the summers at the Sorbonne in Paris where she eventually earned a PhD.

Cooper taught science, mathematics, and Latin at the Preparatory High School for Colored Youth in Washington, D.C., The M Street School, (Dunbar High School). In 1902 Ms. Cooper became principal of the prestigious prep school. She kept this post for twelve years. While at the M Street School, she opened a day nursery and a kindergarten at a nearby L Street School.

At the 1876 Centennial Fair in Philadelphia, a Frobelian kindergarten was exhibited with at least seven other kindergarten exhibits (Lascardes & Hinitz, 2000; Wolfe, 2002). There, African American women had a floor for exhibitions. Dr. Anna J. Cooper spoke to a mostly white audience about the needs of African American women and children at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893. Members of the National Association of Colored Women's (Clubs) demonstrated varied skills to teach and set up Frobelian kindergartens for African American women and youngsters of poverty.

Cooper's (1892) literary excellence was noted and voiced as a radical feminist educator. She held a steadfast conviction that the intellect of women was equal to that of men. This unprecedented notion written by an African American educator in, *A Voice From the South* (Cooper, 1892) was a political stand on social justice during a historical era when impassioned scholarly arguments from women were uncommon especially women of color. Coverage of Cooper's

commitment to social and economic equality influenced the struggle to uplift African Americans to a just place in society (Smith, 1993). Cooper adamantly stated the firm conviction that Black women are divinely designed as moral, intuitive, spiritual, and nurturing (Tate, 1992).

Cooper's (1892) modern theories uplifted women educators and mostly women of color. Taking an unparalleled stand for people in oppression, in poverty, and marginalized, especially women and women of color, Cooper advocated for civil rights. This preceded the civil rights movement prior to the notion of social justice. Her lifespan witnessed the Civil War and the dawn of the civil rights movement in the 1960s.

Lucy Sprague Mitchell 1878 - 1967

John Dewey has been given credit as the father of progressive education (Cremin, 1961). But while John Dewey (1859-1952) was expanding his ideas about progressivism, Lucy Sprague Mitchell was immersed in the day-to-day implementation of a progressive pedagogy (Antler, 1987). After graduating first in her class at Radcliffe in 1900, Lucy became Dean of Women at the University of California, Berkeley. While at Berkeley, Lucy met and married Wesley Clair Mitchell. They later moved to New York City where she began "her in-depth study of children" (Wolfe, 2000, p. 356).

The Progressive Movement is most noted for the following schools: John Dewey's Lab School, The New School, as well as Marietta Johnson Organic School, The Play School (Caroline Pratt), and Bank Street School for Children. The Play School and John Dewey's Lab School each survived approximately eight years. The Marietta Johnson Organic School (McCorquodale, 2002), exists; however, the curriculum and implementation at the Marietta Johnson Organic School is decidedly different from its inception, as is the New School.

The Bank Street School for Children continues to be an ongoing school with the same progressive curriculum developed by Lucy Sprague Mitchell. In 1922, Lucy Sprague Mitchell and Caroline Pratt parted professional ways. Pratt changed the name of her Play School to

the City and Country School which is the name that it still holds today. Bank Street College and School for Children continues to focus on a multi-disciplinary curriculum with social studies, mainly geography, as the guide to learning. Her vision and ideals have extraordinarily endured over eighty plus years. The progressive educational philosophy remains tangible, evident, and indistinguishable.

Lucy Sprague Mitchell believed children innately had a strong sense of place, so learning about their immediate environment and the “here and now” was the link to construct knowledge about history and geography. Relationships created awareness about the present so that children could easily connect it to the past. Interactions among people in the natural environment, particularly the richness of cultures in New York City, enabled children to learn about change (Antler, 1987). Interestingly, historical researchers presently subscribe to the same notion that children who make connections from the present to the past build a strong sense of historical understanding (Levstik & Barton, 2001).

Because Lucy Sprague Mitchell’s philosophical approach to education was strongly influenced by interaction, mentorship, and the ideas of Caroline Pratt, Elisabeth Irwin, and Jane Addams, she believed the strengths of the curriculum were inquiry-based, active, authentic, and experiential. Democratic life was associated with the community and beyond.

Two outgrowths of Bureau of Educational Experiments and The Bank Street School for Children are the City and Country School and The Little Red School House. They still exist in New York City today. However, the curriculum implementation, much like that of the Marietta Johnson Organic School, has changed dramatically, Pratt’s for the better. The former was Caroline Pratt’s school and the latter Elisabeth Irwin’s. Given that life is lived in a social context, Lucy Sprague Mitchell believed that early childhood education should mirror the same. At Bank Street School for Children, education began with the child’s world. Children learned how life in the “here and now” connected to global places and people.

Mitchell was a forerunner in curriculum development and qualitative research. She taught and lived critical pedagogy. Much of Dewey’s

work should actually be attributed to progressive women educators such as Lucy Sprague Mitchell's Bank Street School for Children and College of Education. Mitchell's commitment to educational social justice was that of a renaissance professor. Unfortunately, Dr. Lucy Sprague Mitchell's work was over shadowed by John Dewey's work.

Charlotte Hawkins Brown, 1883 – 1961

Ms. Charlotte Hawkins Brown graduated from Massachusetts State Normal School and founded Palmer Memorial Institute in Sedalia, N.C., with monetary assistance from Alice Palmer. She started with a run-down church, and she built an accredited school with fourteen modern buildings. It was there she dedicated her life to educating and changing the lives of over 2,000 African American students in a quality, segregated setting. Palmer Memorial Institute (PMI) became a prominent preparatory school. Under her guidance, the curriculum programs supported exchanges with schools for Caucasian women. PMI curriculum encouraged racial harmony and pluralistic interaction. Some major donors were Alice Freeman Parker, Madame C.J. Walker and Julius Rosenwald. Circle of contacts included Mary McLeod Bethune, Eleanor Roosevelt, W.E.B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, Susan B. Anthony, and Booker T. Washington. Brown was in the company of greats. Although, lest we forget, Rosenwald's gave his money to keep African Americans "in their place" (Anderson, 1988).

Beyond being a champion for education, Dr. Hawkins Brown was civically active and tirelessly worked for social justice. She was truly socially responsive in every respect. She served as the Vice President for the National Association for Colored Women, and she was active in the Urban League. On one occasion in North Carolina, years before coffee shop sit-ins in the 1960's, Charlotte Hawkins Brown entered a coffee shop and purposefully told the waiter, " I am a Black American, and I want a cup of coffee." She was served. Charlotte Hawkins Brown promoted social, educational, and economic growth for all, to the point of encouraging home ownership for African Americans. Dr. Hawkins Brown worked conscientiously to build up African Americans and their standard of living throughout the long trials of the Jim Crow years.

Charlotte Hawkins Brown was a staunch anti-lynching advocate and member of Southern Women Against Lynching (SWAL). She addressed the group, The Women's Interracial Conference in Memphis, TN outlining ways to undermine Jim Crow, always trying to improve race relations in the south. Both inter-racial groups of women saw the injustice of exploiting the "so called" rape of White women as a way to lynch African American men. The group of integrated women together denounced White supremacists' manipulative semantics to lynch African American men.

In October of 1920, Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, as a staunch anti-segregationist and accomplished and renowned speaker, challenged White supremacists and the Jim Crow practice of lynching. She addressed The Women's Interracial Conference in Memphis, TN, and delineated ways to undermine Jim Crow and try to improve race relations in the south. She introduced the notion that it was necessary for White women to control their men. This was clearly a theme in the campaign against lynching in her 1920 address. As the last speaker at the conference, Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown recounted her journey to the conference. It was a tale filled with devastating humiliation about how twelve white men accosted her on the train in the sleeper section where there was plenty of room and gave her the ultimatum to either leave the sleeper coach or get off the train. She stayed on the train and was ushered by the twelve white men into the day coach for the "colored people." Just so she could be present at the conference as a featured speaker, she accepted this public humiliation. Charlotte Hawkins Brown was one tough educator, activist, and role model, then and now. No curriculum is thorough without her story.

Sabina Spielrein, (1884 – 1942)

The content of psychological foundations courses is often filled with the contributions of dead white men (Aldridge & Goldman, 2007). Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, Jean Piaget, and Lev Vygotsky are usually among them. However, there was one woman who knew each of these intimately and contributed to their research and theories of

development.

First of all, who was Sabina Spielrein? Sabina Spielrein was Carl Jung's first patient at Burgholzli Psychiatric Clinic where he treated her for hysteria (Kerr, 1993). Once Sabina Spielrein's condition improved "to the extent that in June of 1905, she was released from the institution and began to study medicine in Zurich" (Maehler, 2006, p. 7). Her relationship with Jung eventually resulted in an affair (Kerr, 1993). Both Spielrein and Jung corresponded with Freud about their relationship. Because of this correspondence, Freud wrote about the dangers of the doctor/patient relationship (Maehler, 2006). Jung's early theories, especially with regard to hysteria, were formed by his relationship, both professional and personal, with Spielrein (Marton, 2002). Spielrein eventually studied to become a medical doctor and a psychoanalyst.

Spielrein also knew and worked closely with Piaget and Vygotsky. "Spielrein was one of the first psychoanalysts who showed an interest in child language. She was Piaget's psychoanalyst in 1920. In 1923, she presented a paper at the Congress of Psychoanalysis in Berlin, also attended by Piaget" (Santiago-Delefosse & Delefosse, 2002, p. 723). During the time, Piaget worked with Spielrein. Interestingly, his research involved child language and thought (Piaget, 1923). After Spielrein returned to her Russian homeland in 1923, Piaget's research and writing shifted from language to moral development. There is little doubt that Spielrein remodeled Piaget's views on child language and thought.

By 1923, Dr. Spielrein joined the Russian Psychoanalytic Society "which had recently been created by Luria and of which Vygotsky was also a member" (Santiago-Delefosse & Delefosse, 2002, p. 723). Vygotsky, like Piaget, was influenced by Spielrein's research on child language, and many of Vygotsky's writings on child language coincided with Sabina's return to Russia. "It appears that both Piaget and Vygotsky were influenced by her pioneering work, each of them in unique ways. Her work may therefore be the 'missing link' between Piaget and Vygotsky, thus contributing to a better understanding of those epistemological issues involved in the authors' debates concerning child language, thought, and socialization. Neither author

has acknowledged his debt to Dr. Spielrein” (Santiago-Delefosse & Delefosse, 2002, p. 723). Most educators and psychologists are familiar with the works of Jung, Freud, Piaget, and Vygotsky, however, this is not the case concerning the contributions of Dr. Sabina Spielrein.

Dr. Sabina Spielrein should be included in the psychological foundations of education literature because of her unique theory of child thought and language. Her life was ended by Nazi infiltration into Russia. It is a tragedy that she is not included at all in educational literature. While numerous texts compare Piaget and Vygotsky, very few connected them through their mutual colleague, Dr. Sabina Spielrein. Santiago-Delefosse and Delefosse (2002) concluded that “...although Spielrein’s work is rarely quoted, it has inspired several important lines of thought in psychology and language sciences (not only Piaget and Vygotsky, but Freud, Jakobson and Leontiev as well)” (p. 724).

Carol Gilligan, 1936b

Carol Gilligan’s unique departure from Lawrence Kohlberg’s theory of moral development should also be included to balance the masculine and feminine views of morality in the psychological foundations. Before Gilligan’s research, Kohlberg interpreted his own research in favor of males. “In Kohlberg’s research, females appeared inferior to males in advancing up Kohlberg’s hierarchy of moral-reasoning stages” (Thomas, 2005, p. 447). However, “Gilligan concluded that males and females express their thoughts about morality in ‘different voices’—the males in terms of equal-handed justice and rights, and the females in terms of people’s feelings of compassion in social relationships” (Thomas, 2005, p. 447).

Kohlberg’s theory of moral development in the psychological foundations was seminal work. However, his work was completed on a “male only” population. Carol Gilligan’s theory of moral development complemented Kohlberg’s theory. Because Kohlberg’s participants were male only she argued that his theory was based on cognitive reasoning. Gilligan thought the difference could be understood by the

fact that Kohlberg only included males in his study. Gilligan illustrated the difference between the ethics of care and that of rights and justice. Her perception of ethics was interdependent with a conception of the self and its relation to others. The "different voices" were that views of the self between men and women are not the same. The male view accentuates separateness. Women tend to stress characteristics of connectedness and relatedness to others differing from Kohlberg's narrow view. Perhaps this difference may be due to social conventions and expectations of genders of the time.

The "ethic of care" is a notion that explains interaction of one's identity, which is commonly related to women. It consists of connectedness to others. From Gilligan's perspective the "ethic of care" predominantly focuses upon responsibility-within-relationships. Nurturing relationships and ethical issues that are to be seen as problems within relationships and only can be adequately solved within the relationship itself. Of course, Gilligan's participants and groups were heterogeneous.

Gilligan changed the face of moral development. Her interpretation of Kohlberg's work and her own ideas inspired additional research at the Harvard Center for the Study of Gender, Education, and Human Development (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan, Ward, & Taylor, 1988). R. Murray Thomas (2005) concluded, "by the early years of the twenty-first century, Carol Gilligan had established herself as an imposing feminist voice in the field of moral development" (p. 452). Gilligan's work is vital to educational psychological and educational foundations coursework as a balance to that of Kohlberg's. Gilligan's scholarship absolutely warrants identical treatment in educational literature and the teaching of it.

Diana Baumrind, 1927b

When conceptualizing Baumrind's (1967) child rearing styles on a continuum, the permissive and authoritarian styles would be on either end of the continuum. The authoritative style would be in the middle. According to Baumrind (1972) women reared in families that

attempted to utilize patterns of authoritative parenting appeared to direct children's behavior to develop more issue-oriented attitudes. Families' behaviors that guide children through authoritative processes are verbal, give and take, reason and offer choices. Families that value authoritative measures help children develop self-will and disciplined consideration. Authoritative approaches affirm children's interests and set standards for behavior yet offer children autonomy to develop skills of reasoning and consensus building. Achieving goals are reached through development of the child's interests (Baumrind, 1972).

When considering important aspects of how humans relate, children's environmental contexts influence their perceptions and attitudes. Whether children experience authoritarian, authoritative, or permissive transactions within home environments, their social notions are internalized and shaped affecting social competence, moral development, moral reasoning, perspective taking, and power relationships. These crucial aspects of relational styles for young children influence how they interact with peers and their later beliefs about citizenship and democracy (Sunal, 1990; Walker, (2009).

The work of Baumrind (1972) has to be incorporated into philosophical and educational foundations that support teacher education. To be able to envision the connections of home interactions, teacher candidates and teachers, we hope all educators will create an environment based within a community where authoritative characteristics prevail.

Methods and Questions

This historical multi-case study followed these questions.

1. How have seven women's educational voices been excluded in educational historical and psychological foundations and methods coursework?
2. How have these women been excluded from the dominant educational canon?
3. How can teacher educators include women's contributions?
4. Who has been given credit for these women's contributions?

Data

The following data were utilized in this narrative study:

1. History of Early Childhood (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000) and Wolfe (2002), along with journal articles in both the historical and psychological foundations of education from 1900-2009.
2. An interview with scholars who focus on women's contributions on foundations of education (including Hinitz, 2010).
3. Comparisons of the works of Dewey, Piaget, Freud, Jung, and Vygotsky, and study of the contributions of Baumrind, Brown, Gilligan, Spielrein, Sprague-Mitchell and Young.

Findings

Findings are separated into three sections: 1) why women are marginalized, 2) contributions to educational historical foundations and psychological foundations, and 3) how teacher education methods are underpinned by the contributions of Young, Cooper, Brown, Sprague-Mitchell, Spielrein, Gilligan, and Baumrind.

Why

The women presented here should be among the first to have a more prominent place in educational coursework and the hundreds of deserving women not mentioned here should soon follow in the canon of literature, especially the women of color. Women's scholarship continues to be marginalized in the historical and psychological foundations of education that support teacher education. In graduate programs, the aforementioned women can be studied on their own merits as educators, theorists, and as civic and socially responsive women who worked determinedly for social justice.

Contributions

The entirety of educational foundations would be more thorough,

inclusive, and equitable if educators were to embrace educators and scholars of both genders that traversed history. Perhaps, first both genders should be included into the literature. These seven women forged an unforgettable educational path for the future of early childhood and elementary education and its leaders. Through adulthood, for people in poverty, immigrants, and through to the scope of teachers and teacher educators via new theories, educational methods, psychological, moral and philosophical fields, it is imperative that the study of women from the past would be required. The myriad and hidden contributions they made are still being mined. But what educators and researchers do know has to be published and disseminated now. The seven women incorporated in this article were all contributors to the educational profession. Each woman forged new paths. Now is the time for their accomplishments and scholarship to be incorporated into the canon of educational foundations literature.

How

Taking action and being transformational by including these seven phenomenal educators for social and educational responsiveness, each woman, intentionally engaged in guiding others, from education to committed social justice have to be studied. Think about teacher education programs with particular role models to guide and provide insight for teacher candidates, teachers, and educators to ground practice in social responsiveness and for the public good through commitment to issues and taking personal authority to reach beyond gender conventions (Rogers, 2006). The result was a transformed society. Despite all of these achievements and scholarship of these noteworthy women, how is it that white men still dominate the literature that underlies the foundations of education?

These seven women's equitable place among the historical and psychological foundations of education has yet to be fully actualized. While research and theories of virtually hundreds of women deserve to be part of the canon of educational foundations, here are seven exemplar women's scholarship who were socially responsive and who unquestionably should be included in introductory courses in

education that continues to sustain teacher education. Social action was an enduring charge for each of the seven stellar Mothers of Education. If only teacher education theory and practice that supports social justice were fairly amended to accept these women's historical and credible scholarship, then the educational literature could be equitably transformed. The evident focus on particular theorists to the exclusion of women has persisted long enough. As Lucy Sprague Mitchell (1934) foreshadowed and reminded us, "Pioneers, if they are to survive, need more than an empty country to move into. They need to explore the new territory for strategic situations, for natural resources; they need tools for overcoming obstacles. They need to take the old and adapt it to the new. Educational pioneers need the same" (p. 105).

Present educators have to be the ambassadors for educational pioneer women who overcame tremendous obstacles. They have to take the old and wise and adapt it. The educational foundational literature has to be transformed, lest we conveniently forget.

References

- Aldridge, J.; Christensen, L. M.; Cowles, M.; & Kohler, M. (2009). Where are the women? Integrating female voices into the historical and psychological foundations of education. *Southeastern Teacher Education Journal*, 2 (3), pp.139-146.
- Baumrind, D. (1972). Each according to her ability. *The School Review, Women and Education*, 80 (2), pp. 161-197.
- Baumrind, D. & Black, A., (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls, *Child Development*, 38 pp. 291- 327.
- Beatty, B. (1995). *Preschool education in America: The culture of the young children from the colonial era to the present*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Christensen, L. M. (2010). Bending the golden rule. *Social Studies Research and Practice* (online journal <http://www.socstrp.org/>), 5(1) 173-176.
- Christensen, L. M. (2008). Lucy Sprague Mitchell's perspectives on social education meet social justice. *Social Justice Feature*,

- Social Studies Research and Practice*, 4 (3) (online journal <http://www.socstrp.org/>).
- Christensen, L. M. (2006). Using art to teach history to young learners. *Social Education*, 70(5), 312 – 35.
- Christensen, L. M. (2005). Women who passed the torch of freedom. *The Social Studies*. 96(3), 99-104.
- Cooper, A. J. (1892). *A Voice from the South*. Introduction by Mary Helen Washington, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Curtis, J. W. (2011). *Persistent inequity: Gender and academic employment*. Retrieved November 7, 2011 from http://www.aauw.org/learn/research/upload/NewVoicesPayEquity_JohnCurtis.pdf
- Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hart, J. (2006). Women and feminism in higher education scholarship: An analysis of three core journals. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 40-61.
- Hutchinson, L. D. (1981). *Anna J. Cooper: A voice from the South*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Lascarides, V. C., & Hinitz, B. F. (2000). *History of early childhood education*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Levstik, L., & Barton, K. (2001). *Doing history-investigating with children in elementary and middle schools*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kincheloe, J. (1999). *Rethinking intelligence: Confronting psychological assumptions about teaching and learning*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (2006). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- McCorquodale, G. J. (2002). *Progressive views on literacy instruction at the Marietta Johnson School of Organic Education at Fairhope, Alabama: Echoes of the past heard in the present*. (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama at Birmingham, 2002).

- Mitchell, L. S. (1934, January). *Progressive Education* v.11. pp. 97-105
- Myers, L. W. (2002). *A broken silence: Voices of African-American women in the academy*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Rogers, C. (2006). *Teachers College Record*, 108 (7), pp. 1266-1295.
- Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How schools cheat girls*. New York: Touchstone.
- Smith, J. C. (1993). *Notable Black American women*, (ed.), Detroit: Gale Research.
- Spodek, B. (1973). *Early childhood education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Spodek, B. (1986). *Today's kindergarten: Exploring the knowledge base, expanding the curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Spodek, B. (1991). *Educationally appropriate kindergarten practices*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Sunal, C. V. (1991). The influence of the home on social studies. In James P. Shaver's, (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning*. New York: Macmillan. pp. 290 – 299.
- Sunal, C.S., & Haas, M.E. (2008). *Social Studies for the elementary and middle grades: A constructivist approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tate, C. (1992). *Domestic allegories of political desire: The Black heroine's text at the turn of the century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trotman, F. K. (1977). Race, IQ, and the middle-class. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69(3), 266-273.
- Walker, J. M. T. (2009). Authoritative classroom management: How control and nurturance work together. *Theory Into Practice*, 48, pp. 122- 129.
- West M. & Curtis, J. W. (2006). *AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006*. Retrieved, December 10, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/research/geneq2006.htm>
- Wilkinson, D. (2000). Rethinking the concept of "minority": Task of social scientists and practitioners. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 17(1), 115.

- Wink, J. (2010). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world* (4rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfe, J. (2000). *Learning from the past*. Mayerthorpe, Alberta, Canada: Piney Branch Press.
- Wolpe, A. (1978). Education and the sexual division of labour. In A. Kuhn and A. Wolpe's (Eds.) *Feminism and materialism*. Boston: Routledge.

Lois M. Christensen is Professor of Early Childhood/Elementary Education, School of Education, University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Maxie Pate Kohler is Professor in the Department of Human Studies, University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Jerry Aldridge is Professor Emertus of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Contact Address: Direct correspondence to the authors at School of Education, University of Alabama at Birmingham, 901 South 13th Street Birmingham, AL 35294-1250. E-mail addresses: lmchrist@uab.edu