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Abstract

Teachers bring parts of themselves, among them, gender, age, and race into the classroom. In addition to the routine stress of teaching, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people have the added stress of managing the expression of their sexual orientation in the classroom. This study explores the ways in which my own identity as a lesbian influenced my beliefs about teaching, my “pre-active” curricular-instructional decision-making, and my “interactive” curricular-instructional decision-making (Jackson, 1966). A self-study methodology is used to explore these relationships. Data sources include journaling, lesson plan artifacts, student work samples, photographs of my classroom, an observation and critical conversation from a critical friend. An autobiographical sketch and statement of beliefs about teaching and learning also informs the study. Janna Jackson’s (2007) stages of coming out, along with Elliot Eisner’s (1985) explicit, implicit, and null curriculum provide the analytical frame.

The results show that as I went through Janna Jackson’s (2007) phases of coming out, my beliefs about teaching and learning through the tools, resources, and classroom environment change to reflect that stage. For instance, once I was out in my classroom, there was more LGBT décor in my class. The findings also indicate my lesbian identity affects the explicit and null more than the implicit curricular-instructional decision-making during the “pre-active” stage of teaching. My lesbian identity affected the implicit and null curriculum more than the explicit curricular-instructional decision-making during the “interactive” stage of teaching. Overall, these findings suggest my lesbian identity and teacher identity are deeply entangled.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Statement of Problem

Teachers are tasked with a large number of responsibilities --- from lesson planning, to managing student behavior, to attending professional development, to learning new evaluation systems, to caring for students’ well-being, to actually teaching. Social studies teachers in particular, also have the task of creating responsible citizens. Being a responsible citizen not only means being knowledgeable about government, but also being able to work well with people of diverse backgrounds (NCSS, 2010). Social studies teachers can engage youth in dialogues about equality and fairness through the curriculum, identifying opportunities to ask questions and introduce material that prompts students to examine and reflect.

Handling all those responsibilities, and more, can be stressful for teachers. For lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) teachers there is an added stress of what I will call “managing their identity,” which will be explained below, while at work and work-related functions. LGBT social studies educators must navigate their teacher responsibilities, their identity, and the internal conflict created by teaching about various groups’ fights for equality while not necessarily having equality in the workplace themselves. Being able to successfully navigate their roles, while still feeling like authentic individuals who can display their entire self, and not hide their sexual orientation, can impact their curriculum choices, pedagogical techniques, and relationships with students, faculty, and staff (Mayo, 2005).
Although written in 1983, Lightfoot’s book chapter, “The Lives of Teachers,” accurately describes the expectations of teachers both in and out of the classroom. Teachers are still expected to “conform to more traditional and conservative norms of behavior” (Lightfoot, 1983, p. 245). LGBT teachers, in most communities, do not fit the norm. Teachers are held responsible for acting appropriately outside the classroom or they can face negative consequences. Inside the classroom, there is a “constraining [of] the personality” of teachers in order to be seen as the authority figure” (Lightfoot, 1983, p. 245). Teachers restrain who they are because society has deemed them as the “guardians of morality, as caricatures of virtue, and as symbols of traditionalism” as they hold themselves with dignity and decorum fitting these titles (Lightfoot, 1983, p. 246). Since teachers are supposed to observe these roles at all times, being a member of a non-traditional could group weaken their authority in the classroom and community. Many times all teachers, but especially LGBT teachers, seek to create a barrier between their personal and professional lives in order to remain respected by the community and their students.

There are many stereotypes about LGBT people in general and LGBT teachers in particular. Janna Jackson (2007) claims:

The common but false association between homosexuality and pedophilia [which] has silenced gay and lesbian teachers, prevented gay and lesbian teachers from advocating for themselves and for young people, and caused educators to turn a blind eye to the existence, let alone contributions, of gay and lesbian teachers (p. 2).

Campaigns such as Anita Byrant’s “Save our Children” campaign to overturn Dade County, Florida’s nondiscrimination protection for gay and lesbian teachers cast those teachers as “predators waiting to ‘recruit’ or ‘molest’ innocent students” (Jackson, 2007, p. 2). Each of these
stereotypes causes LGBT teachers to make many micro decisions every day about their sexual orientation and the impact it can have on their teacher persona. All teachers are advised they should not meet alone with students, but this rule is at the forefront of many LGBT teachers’ minds, especially with the number of teacher-student sex scandals in the news. Simply being a LGBT teacher makes the likelihood of an accusation seem greater (Cavanagh, 2007; Sanlo, 1999).

The inclusion of teacher beliefs in the classroom is a sensitive area. During faculty meetings and at new teacher orientations I have attended, teachers are warned not to discuss their own political or religious views; because of the inherent unequal power relationship between student and teacher, there is always the possibility students could be swayed to adopt the beliefs of the teacher. Moreover, it can cause strained relationships with families, parents, and the community at large. I believe social studies teachers have to take extra precautions because of their subject matter in order to follow the directives of the policy-makers. Since social studies teachers’ standards include politics, economic theories, and social justice topics, it can be easy to reveal a personal opinion, rather than act as a neutral guide to content. As a practicing social studies teacher, I try not to disclose my personal, political, or religious beliefs, mindful that students should examine all belief systems and develop their own philosophies.

However, not all education researchers believe that teachers have as large an effect on student beliefs as traditionally thought. Although there has not been much research on the impact of teacher disclosure on students’ political beliefs, in one study, Hess and McAvoy (2009) administered surveys to and interviewed both teachers and students about this topic. They found that although teachers worried about the effect of disclosing their beliefs, students did not feel as though teacher disclosure significantly influenced their beliefs. Hess and McAvoy (2009)
concluded they found “virtually no evidence to suggest that teacher disclosure does influence students’ views” (p. 109). The decision to disclose or not disclose personal beliefs is one, which each teacher must make and then implement in a way, which ensures students the opportunity to discover their own opinions without negative effects.

I believe current events, which since the 1990s through today have included LGBT rights, are a valuable way to connect social studies to life beyond the school. Even with the considerable gains for the LGBT community since 2004 when Massachusetts was the first state to legalize gay marriage, I believe many LGBT teachers hesitate to engage in those topics. They fear they will be perceived as pushing a gay agenda in the classroom and are trying to recruit students to become LGBT.

LGBT teachers must also make the decision whether to disclose their sexual orientation to students, faculty, and parents (Khayatt, 1997; Renesenbrink, 1996; Sanlo, 1999). This decision can weigh heavily on teachers. They often weigh the perceived positive and negative consequences of being out (Khayatt, 1997). Many choose to remain closeted for fear of losing their jobs or experiencing diminished feelings of respect from school stakeholders (Griffin, 1992; Stader & Graca, 2007)). As a result, many LGBT teachers take great care to maintain a straight persona (Griffin, 1992) and to develop a “super” teacher persona, which means being the teacher who is most knowledgeable about content and pedagogy so that if they are found out to be gay, their teaching can be beyond reproach (Kissen, 1996; Rudoe, 2010). Even with legal protection and protection from teacher unions, it appears many teachers choose to remain in the closet.

There is a widely held belief that teaching is, at its base, an autobiographical act (Finley, 1998; Jersild, 1955; Knowles, 1998). Who I am as a person and my previous experiences affect who I am as a teacher and, therefore, my students' learning. Rarely are teachers provided the
space to examine the influence of beliefs on their teaching. From personal experience, frequently, reflection on teaching is based on the mechanics of a lesson and possible improvements, not the reasons for making specific curricular-instructional decisions.

**Purpose and Rationale**

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between what I say I believe and actual classroom practice (Whitehead, 2000). Identifying possible living contradictions in practice is one way to generate research questions for self-study research (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Whitehead (2000) describes a living contradiction as a place in a teacher’s practice where we would describe ourselves one way, but others involved in our practice would describe us differently. I believe that my identity as a lesbian affects my teaching, but through dialogues with colleagues and reflection on my practice, it was challenging to come up with multiple exemplars of this influence. Thinking about this area of possible “contradiction of conflicted aspects of identity, value, and belief” lead me to design this study (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p.61). I wanted to look at the intersections of identity and integrity that will provide a more thorough understanding of myself and ways to improve my practice (Parker, 2004). I believe who I am impacts the way I set up my classroom, the inclusion and exclusion of content, and the pedagogical decisions I make on a daily basis. This study, through multiple qualitative data collection methods, looked to investigate the extent of the living contradiction. Due to the nature of the study, a personal history self-study was conducted. This method allows for the examination of the “formative, contextualized experiences that have influenced teachers’ thinking about teaching and their own practice” (Samaras, Hicks, & Berger, 2004, p. 909). The purpose of a self-study is not to generalize findings to a large group of people, but to have real
learning about practice in order to improve my own practice. Other teachers will be able to learn from my study ways to improve their own practice.

According to LaBoskey (2004) who completed an examination of methodology in self-study, there are five elements: 1) It is self-initiated and focused 2) it is self-improvement-aimed 3) it is interactive 4) it includes multiple, mainly qualitative methods, 5) it defines validity as a process based on trustworthiness. My personal history self-study met the requirements for all five elements. This study was undertaken because I wanted to find ways to improve my practice and explore the relationship between identity and classroom practice. The goal of this study was to become a better teacher---to engage more students, to utilize more outside resources, to advocate for LGBT students through their inclusion in formalized education. Although I believe I had already attempted this, a careful analysis of practice, helped clarify and push me to do more and become better.

For the third element, the study was interactive because I had a critical friend. A critical friend plays the role of engaging with a teacher (in this case myself) to help elicit my rationale for practice (Fenstermacher, 1994). My critical friend was a colleague at my school site. She and I engaged in a discussion of practice and then discussed the reasons for my practice or the decisions I made during practice. Unlike an interview, these conversations are informal in nature with regards to structure and planned questions. As a graduate of the same PhD program and teacher in the same setting, she was an excellent critical friend since she understood both the research process and the context of the study. In addition, we have known each other since I began working at my current site, so I was comfortable having critical conversations with her. As explained in Chapter 3, multiple methods of data collection were employed, including journaling and lesson plans. For the final element, trustworthiness was created through “collaboration with
peers, with a skeptical self, [and] with participants in my work” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 165). In addition, I strove to be humble, authentic, and vulnerable. I provided transparency throughout the study—-from providing context, to data collection, to data analysis, to reporting—-that hopefully helped increase trustworthiness (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). By explaining each step of the process, readers will hopefully connect with the account and find ways to be more reflective about their own curricular-instructional practices.

Self-study researchers acknowledge the lack of generalizability, but also reject the idea as related to their research. Instead, the aim of the research is to provide exemplars for readers so they may use the information in their own practice (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). In addition, Donmoyer (1990) using Piaget’s ideas of assimilation, accommodation, integration, and differentiation as his schema to promote the generalizability of single case studies, argues that case studies allow readers to live vicariously through the case study. Donmoyer (1990) continues to say there are multiple advantages to case studies concerning generalizability—-accessibility, seeing through the researcher’s eyes, and decreased defensiveness. Accessibility in case studies allows the reader to go “to places where most of us would not have an opportunity to go…and experience vicariously unique situations and unique individuals” (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 193). Not everyone knows lesbian social studies teachers or their experiences, so this will allow them to read about that experience. He goes on to say, “from the schema theory view of generalizability, the purpose of research is simply to expand the range of interpretations available to the research consumer… [and] uniqueness is an asset rather than a liability” (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 194). This study also allows the readers to see the researcher’s eyes. By “expanding the reader’s cognitive structures” through this case study they will be able to expand their practice by drawing upon my
experience. Finally, readers will, hopefully, be less defensive about exploring the interaction of their own identity and teaching.

Context

Samaras, Hicks, & Berger (2004) assert that since personal history self-study is about “the self in relation to others in historical and social contexts,” the context of the study is important (p. 911). Further, they explain that context allows the study to be grounded and provides the reader with a “rich, in-depth description of the scene, situation, and action” (p. 912).

This study was conducted during the second semester of a high school U.S. History Honors class. The students attended an affluent public school in Tampa, Florida. The students, for the most part, come from upper-middle class families and because of this socioeconomic characteristic, the school is well-resourced by parents. Although these students were not participants in the study, understanding who they were is important because they are people I was teaching. The information described below is reflective of the general trends of the school since it opened in 2009. During the school year I conducted my study, 27.1% of the students enrolled in my 11th grade U.S History Honors class were eligible for free/reduced lunch. Most of the students (89.1%) came from nearby zip codes. About half of the students were female (50.6%). 59.6% of the students were white, non-Hispanic, 27.1% were Hispanic, 6.6% were Black, 3.6% were Multiracial, and 3% were Asian/Pacific Islander. For the most part, the area is a conservative area concerning politics. From anecdotal incidents and observations, many students participated in at least one extra-curricular activity or had a job. Most students planned to attend a post-secondary institution, mainly a four-year college or community college. Many of the students were well traveled both domestically and internationally. The students were fairly compliant during class, so they were willing to try new things. In my experience at this school,
many students who have come to terms with their LGBT sexuality are out at school and generally accepted. Couples of all types are seen holding hands and making out. A few years ago, a gay couple was voted as “cutest couple” by their peers. Although there probably are disparaging remarks made to LGBT students, students are careful not to make them in front of teachers. Understanding the character of students helps inform the character of the school in which I teach and can influence my actions as a lesbian teacher.

As for the work environment, I am member of the social studies department with 18 colleagues. At the time of the study, I was completing my fifth year at this school site. Through the years at this school, there has been one other lesbian social studies teacher. Throughout campus, there have been lesbian guidance counselors, teachers in other departments, and an administrator. Socially, there is acceptance and welcoming by my administration and staff of lesbian staff members. Some of the lesbian staff are open about their sexual orientation with colleagues, but not with students. I speak openly about my personal life both to my colleagues and to students. Although I am out at work, I do not make an announcement of it each year. Many teachers give an “About Me” talk at the beginning of year. I do not. I believe these talks are inauthentic and awkward. Instead, the students and I come to know one another as the year progresses. I do not change any pronouns I use when speaking about my home life. I have had students directly ask if I was gay and I responded honestly. Through my years at this school, I have incorporated lessons about LGBT people and experiences without any complaints from students or parents. Appendix A is statement of my beliefs about teaching and learning; Appendix B is an autobiography with a focus on my experiences of becoming the teacher I am today, including coming to terms with my sexual orientation.
Research Questions

The following research questions will be addressed in this study:

1. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my beliefs about curriculum and teaching?

2. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “preactive” curricular-instructional decision making?

3. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “interactive” curricular-instructional decision-making?

Theoretical Perspective

A transformative perspective is an extension of the constructivist paradigm (Mertens, 2010). In both perspectives, there are multiple versions of what is “real” to people, with people’s individual experiences contributing to their reality. The transformative perspective extends this to include the idea that not all perceptions are the equal because some do not account for inherent, unrecognized privilege of one’s reality (Mertens, 2010). Transformative researchers place importance on the experiences of diverse, marginalized groups. Not only do they explore the experiences of the participants, but they also explore how marginalized people’s lives are constrained by societal structures and the techniques marginalized people use to combat or accept these structures (Mertens, 2010). Participating in this study is an exploration of my life, both personally and professionally.

In addition to the transformative perspective, I utilized Thornton’s (1991) framework of the teacher as the curricular-instructional gatekeeper. In this framework the teacher acts the gatekeeper by deciding what to teach, when to teach, and how to teach it. This is an inevitable process undertaken by instructors, whether they are aware of their role or not (Thornton, 1991;
In the case of this study, I am looking to see if my identity as a lesbian impacts my role as curricular-instructional gatekeeper—either consciously or unconsciously as much as I think it does. Jerslid (1955) argued that a teacher’s “understanding and acceptance of himself is the most important requirement…to help students…” (p.3). Teachers need to come to terms with themselves, both professionally and personally. In his book, Jerslid also reports teachers have concerns about their own freedom to think and freedom to feel. If teachers must hide their thoughts and feelings, they are unable to truly help children learn to think and feel. Additionally, teachers expressed concerns about “the burden of conformity” (Jerslid, 1955, p. 10). The teachers he studied in his research had difficulty being themselves in a multitude of situations. Since teachers are concerned with being themselves, they act as personal information gatekeepers when determining what to share with whom and under what circumstances about personal lives. Although not the same type of gatekeeping, sharing personal information can help build the classroom culture. LGBT educators decide for whom they will open the gate of personal information and how widely it will be open.

Another important framework for this study was Eisner’s (1985) ideas of explicit, implicit, and null curriculum. Explicit Curriculum is the publicly stated goals and course offerings of schooling that appear in curriculum guides and school course selection guides (Eisner, 1985). These are the courses and standards stakeholders are aware of. For example, state standards are published on websites and course descriptions are given out via syllabi at the beginning of the year. Implicit Curriculum is the school culture and societal virtues and norms that are taught and learned without a formal curriculum guide, i.e. punctuality, initiative, deferment of instant gratification, perseverance (Eisner, 1985). Using a tardy system students are taught the value of being on time, but this is not explicitly described as the reason. Null
Curriculum is what schools do not teach; either the intellectual processes schools emphasize and neglect or the content or subject areas that are present and absent (Eisner, 1985). These are things that are left out of the explicit or implicit curriculum. A third component of the null curriculum is affect which includes the “values, attitudes, and emotions” that are considered with the selection of content (Flinders, Noddings, and Thornton, 1986, p. 35). Both societal and personal context of the school can guide teachers’ choices when deciding what and how to teach. These three types of curriculums guide schooling and are informed by teacher curricular-gatekeeping.

Definitions of Key Terms

**Coming Out.** This refers to the process homosexual people go through when telling people they are homosexual. Often, people come out to family, friends, and work colleagues. For many people, the coming out process is repeated as new people are met. LGBT people choose whom to come out to and how much to reveal (Kissen, 1996).

**Course Curriculum.** “What each of us plans when we decide on the content, organization, and evaluation of the courses we teach” (Eisner, 1965, p. 160)

**Curriculum Activities.** “the basic unit of the curriculum” planned by faculty and/or students to bring about education change (Eisner, 1965, p. 158)

**Curricular Decision Making.** The act of deciding what to teach and the order in which to teach (Eisner, 1965)

**Covering.** This term applies to LGBT people who purposefully leave out details about their sexual orientation in order to prevent disclosure. People who cover do not necessarily deny they are homosexual nor do they actively pretend to be heterosexual (Griffin, 1992).

**Explicit Curriculum.** The publicly stated goals and course offerings of schooling which appear in curriculum guides and school course selection guides (Eisner, 1985)
Glass Closet, The. This term applies to people who accept being perceived as LGBT, but who are not completely “out”. They prefer to confirm their sexual orientation when asked, rather than announce it (Kissen, 1996).

Heteronormativity. This term refers to the idea that being straight is the norm and the traditionally acceptable way to live. Often, the heteronormativity of society is not recognized by those who are heterosexual. Even homosexual individuals have trouble recognizing the structures in place that delegitimize the homosexual experience (Thornton, 2003).

Identity Management. This term is a broad description of the techniques LGBT people use to hide or display their sexual orientation. The use of techniques can change depending on the situation and over time (Woods & Harbeck, 1992).

Implicit Curriculum. The school culture and societal virtues and norms that are taught and learned without a formal curriculum guide, i.e. punctuality, initiative, deferment of instant gratification, perseverance (Eisner, 1985).

“Interactive” Teaching. “What happens when students enter the classroom” during the actual acts of interactions with the students while the planned lessons are being taught (Jackson, 1966, p. 13)

In the Closet. This term refers to a homosexual hiding her sexual orientation from friends, family and/or colleagues. The term “closeted” means the same thing (Woods & Harbeck, 1992).

LGBT. An acronym for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender individuals. Although there are other acronyms in use, this one is used in most of the extant literature in educational research (HRC, 2016); as such, it is the term that is used in this study.

Null Curriculum. What schools do not teach either the intellectual processes schools emphasize and neglect or the content or subject areas that are present and absent (Eisner, 1985) A third
component of affect which includes the “values, attitudes, and emotions” that are considered with the selection of content (Flinders, Noddings, and Thornton, 1986, p. 35)

**Out.** This term means a homosexual person is open about her sexual orientation (Griffin, 1992)

**Passing.** This term refers to homosexual people “passing” as heterosexual. They may make up false partners of the opposite sex or explicitly lie about their sexual orientation (Griffin, 1992)

“**Proactive**” **Teaching** “Behavior that is relevant to the teaching task,” i.e., preparing lessons plans, classroom arrangement, grading papers, reviewing data, increasing content knowledge, thinking about behavior of students (Jackson, 1966, p. 12)

**Significance of the Study**

This study will add to the growing body of research on the experiences of marginalized groups, specifically lesbian educators. The experiences of lesbians can differ greatly from those of gay males, so a study specific to their experiences was necessary. In particular, there is a paucity of work in the area of social studies education research about LGBT issues and teachers (Mayo, 2016). This study will open the door to other studies about the intersection of sexual orientation and social studies curriculum and pedagogy.

This study will also add to the field of work located under personal history self-study methods. Since self-study emerged in the 1990s as a form of research, there has been much growth in the field. Much of the research is focused on self-studies to teacher educators rather than practicing K-12 teachers. This study helps practitioners find their voice.

Palmer (2007) believes “we teach who we are…and teaching holds a mirror to the soul” (p.2). If teaching holds a mirror to the soul, self-study research is the mirror that allows the researcher/teacher to look inward (Johnston, 2006). This study will achieve the broad goals of
self-study research-self-understanding and professional development (Cole & Knowles, 1998), but will also provide insight to other teachers about the impact of identity on teaching.
Chapter 2

Review of the Related Literature

Introduction

The literature on lesbian educators does not specifically focus on the lives of social studies educators. Much of the literature combines the experiences of gay men and lesbians. However, there is a growing body of work discussing the specific experiences of lesbian educators. This literature review includes the legal right of LGBT teachers to be out, the management of educators’ lesbian identity, the coming out process and effects it has on curriculum decisions, teaching, and students. Also included is literature covering the incorporation of LGBT curriculum in English Language Arts, in elementary education, and in social studies.

Legal Protection

As of August 25, 2016, 34 states and the District of Columbia have state laws banning discrimination based on sexual orientation and/or gender identity (Human Rights Campaign, 2016). These states are generally located in the Northeast, upper Midwest, and far West. Of the 34, 12 offer protection to public workers only. In most other states, protection is dependent upon local laws and business practices (Hynes, 2012). Although each school district sets its own anti-discrimination laws, the Supreme Court has upheld the right for LGBT teachers to not have to hide their sexual orientation (Biegel, 2010).

Homosexual teachers have not always had the protection of courts. In the 1950s, gay teachers were subject to dismissal based upon perceived sexual orientation (Harbeck, 1992;
Blount, 2004). In 1969, the case *Morrison v. State Board of Education* set the precedent of sexual orientation of teachers is insufficient grounds for termination (Harbeck, 1992). In 1969, the California Supreme Court ruled that engaging in homosexual behavior did not meet the moral turpitude clause in the education code. This decision marked a step forward for homosexual educators, since their private lives could not be grounds for dismissal any longer (Biegel, 2010). Another step forward was in 1974, when the National Education Association added “sexual preference” to their non-discrimination clause (Harbeck, 1992). In 1978, California again became the epicenter for homosexual teachers’ rights. State Senator John Briggs introduced Proposition Six, popularly known as the Briggs Initiative, which would have made it legal to refuse employment and to fire “a schoolteacher…who engages in public homosexual activity and/or public homosexual conduct directly at, or likely to come to the attention of, schoolchildren or other school employees” (State of California, 1978). The California voters 59 to 41 percent defeated the ballot initiative, even though initial polls showed support of the initiative (Biegel, 2010). Briggs blamed the loss on ex-governor Ronald Reagan who spoke out at length against the initiative (Harbeck, 1992).

California was not the only state persecuting homosexual teachers. Since this study takes place in Florida, it is important to note the history of persecution LGBT people in Florida have experienced. Throughout the Cold War, the state of Florida purged the gay and lesbian teachers employed (Graves, 2009). Similar actions took place throughout the United States, including at the national level. In *The Lavender Scare* by David Johnson (2009), under McCarthy, and after his censure, there was a purging of homosexuals or perceived homosexuals from the State Department. The purge of homosexuals occurred with the purge of suspected communists, but received much less attention due to a decrease in interest from the press because of the
“routinization and institutionalization in the bureaucracy” of the government’s anti-gay efforts (Johnson, 2009, p.5). The removal of homosexuals from government positions actually predated the McCarthy era and continued well into the 1970s (Johnson, 2009). In Florida, the Johns Committee, named after state Senator Charley Johns, was established in 1956 as the Florida Legislative Investigation Committee. Originally created to “interrogate, harass, and intimidate members of the NAACP” (Graves, 2009, p. 2), the Johns Committee sought to stop integration by investigating the practices of the NAACP. When they could not stop them, the committee attempted to link the NAACP to communism. Eventually, the Johns Committee would take over the search for homosexuals in Tampa and throughout the state. At the same time the Johns Committee was established, another committee was established to study the effectiveness of tuberculosis hospitals in the Tampa Bay area. During the investigation, the high number of gay men employed at these hospitals was uncovered. The large number of gay men caused concern about the morality and community standards which prompted the Tampa police department to take an active interest in the lives of gay men since sodomy was illegal, the Tampa police began an investigation into homosexual behaviors. Their investigation began with hospital employees, but the scope quickly expanded to other occupations, including education. The Tampa investigation began naming teachers as homosexuals.

The Johns Committee heard of the events in Tampa and took over the investigation in order to convince the state legislature to extend funding for the committee. The Johns Committee, already trying to tie the NAACP to communism, used this to link homosexuals to communism (Graves, 2009). Simply the accusation of homosexual behavior by the Johns Committee or other agency resulted in the loss of teaching credentials and jobs. From 1957-1963, the Johns Committee revoked the teaching certificates of 71 teachers. In addition, they
had 63 other cases pending, and another 100 suspects (Graves, 2009). This event was not unique in America at that time; it simply reflected the zeitgeist of the nation regarding homosexuals.

Fifteen years later, in Dade County, Florida, former beauty queen Anita Bryant fought a campaign to “Save Our Children.” In 1977, the Dade County Metro Commission decided to add sexual orientation to its anti-discriminatory laws. Bryant, Miss Oklahoma of 1959, fought to stop Dade County. She believed more students would be prone to become homosexuals because their teachers were homosexual. Her campaign worked and Dade County did not add sexual orientation to the anti-discriminatory laws. It was not until 1998 that sexual orientation was added to Dade County’s law books (Graves, 2009).

In the same year Dade County, added sexual orientation to their anti-discriminatory laws, Bruce Glover, an openly gay, white man, won his suit against the Williamsburg School District in Ohio. Glover was not rehired to teach in an elementary school after rumors began about him holding hands with his partner at a Christmas party. Even though these rumors were disproved and he had a good teaching record, Glover was not rehired because he was suspected of being gay. He challenged the Williamsburg school district under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. When the federal court decided in favor or Glover in 1998, it reinforced the idea that homosexuals could not be discriminated against because they openly expressed their homosexual orientation (Biegel, 2010).

In Utah in 1999, Wendy Weaver, a volleyball coach and teacher, affirmatively answered a student’s question about her sexual orientation. Shortly after this, she was fired from her position as volleyball coach and a formal reprimand was placed in her file. She also challenged her school district, Nebo School District. She based her challenge on the First Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment. Like in Glover v. Williamsburg Local School District (1998), the
U.S. district court found in favor of Weaver. The school district had violated her Fourteenth Amendment right to equal treatment. *Weaver v. Nebo School District* (1999) also established the legality of a teacher talking about her sexual orientation both in and out of the classroom, since the official reprimand in her file prohibited her from expressing her First Amendment rights (Biegel, 2010). Although the court did support Weaver on the basis of First Amendment rights, the rights of LGBT educators to express themselves freely on school campuses are limited which means there is not a clear answer, based on the First Amendment, regarding if teachers can tell students they are gay. However, the Fourteenth Amendment does support this right of teachers to disclose their sexual orientation.

One of the biggest steps towards the equal protection under the law was the U.S. Supreme Court case *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003). Prior to 2003, 14 states had sodomy laws which were enforced whereby people were prosecuted for violating them. For homosexual educators, coming out as gay or lesbian would be admitting to breaking these laws in the eyes of their employers because it would indicate they engaged in sodomy, which was equated with homosexual behavior. Four states, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri, applied the sodomy laws to homosexuals only. Lawrence and his partner were arrested for having sex in a private home. They sued based on privacy rights and equal protection. The U.S. Supreme Court overturned the Texas laws criminalizing sodomy, and therefore overturned all state sodomy laws. Although the basis of the court case was to ensure equal treatment of gay individuals, the Supreme Court decision protected the right of privacy for both homosexual and heterosexual individuals. Even though the 6-3 decision ended the criminalization of homosexual acts, the dissenting justices repeatedly expressed the immorality of homosexuals (Biegel, 2010). Although Lawrence was not a teacher, in the dissenting opinion written for *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003b) by
Justice Scalia and supported by Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justice Thomas, Scalia insisted, “many Americans do not want persons who openly engage in homosexual conduct as...teachers in their children’s schools” (p. 602). Scalia made sure to bring educators into this case because of his personal beliefs against homosexuality. Even with these disparaging remarks, many supporters of LGBT rights viewed the decision positively; especially given the majority opinion was written by Justice Kennedy and supported by Justice O’Connor, both Republicans appointed by President Reagan (Biegel, 2010). Although this case does not directly relate to LGBT teachers or schools specifically, it decriminalized being gay which afforded LGBT teachers more protections despite the disparaging remarks by the dissenting justices. Since sodomy was no longer illegal, this case marked the end of the legal necessity to remain in the closet. It did not address the social need to remain in the closet though.

**Managing the LGBT Identity**

For the purposes of this study, the term managing identity refers to the various means by which LGBT people express or repress their sexual orientation. Teachers who feel they have to manage their LGBT identity report a higher level of stress than those who are out at work (McKenzie-Bassant, 2007; Szalacha, 2004). These teachers live in a constant state of fear about being found out, having limits placed upon their careers, and jeopardizing their relationships with students and colleagues (McKenzie-Bassant, 2007). The amount of time teachers spend managing their identity can take away from their ability to teach and manage students (Mayo, 2008).

Even with the recent development of anti-discrimination laws, teachers still feel the need to manage their identity while at school. Even with legal protection, school administration and the community in which teachers work contribute to the stress teachers feel about being seen as a

Most of the early research on LGBT educators focused on how they remained closeted and maintained double lives (Clarke, 1996; Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Sanlo, 1999; Sparkes, 1994; Woods & Harbeck, 1992). Griffin (1992) identified four strategies teachers use to manage their LGBT identity at school. Through interviews with 13 self-identified gay and lesbian educators over the course of 15 months, Griffin sketched a continuum of managing identity from “passing, covering, being implicitly out, and being explicitly out” (Griffin, 1992, p.175). Passing strategies involved direct lying about activities and partners. Other members of the community were led to believe the participant was heterosexual. Participants who passed as a management technique felt dishonest and unauthentic as individuals. There was a large disconnect between who they were and how they acted. Covering, involved omitting details about events rather than purposefully deceiving. Instead of making up stories about a heterosexual lifestyle, participants would censor what they shared. They also avoided pronouns, avoided acting out while in public, and avoided gay social or political events or commenting on those events. Participants who used this strategy did not feel as dishonest as those who used passing. Being implicitly out meant participants did not confirm or deny their homosexuality. They used the appropriate gender pronoun when talking about their partner; they used their partner’s name in conversations, and were honest about activities. They allowed their counterparts to make sense of the information as they needed to. Some would even wear symbols traditionally attributed to gay and lesbian lifestyle. Being implicitly out gave the participants the option of returning to covering or passing if needed, but it also allowed them to feel authentic and as having integrity. The end of the continuum was being explicitly out. Participants carefully chose whom to come out to at school.
based on their perceived trustworthiness. They came out to both heterosexual and homosexual colleagues. At the time of Griffin’s study, two participants were out to current students, but others were out to past students. Those participants who were explicitly out felt the highest level of integrity, but being explicitly out also carried the most risk. The participants did not use only one strategy all the time. Instead, they changed their management technique based on the other people. None of the participants were explicitly out to the entire school community (Griffin, 1992). This study outlined the management techniques many teachers still use today.

Even though the study is dated, it still helps researchers today with methodology. By interviewing 15 people, Griffin collected enough information so that her data was rich and thick. The 15-month period also helped increase credibility since she had prolonged and persistent contact. The participants had various roles within the school. Their experiences in education ranged from six to 23 years. Griffin also had representatives from different sized school districts, from rural to urban. By having a diverse group of participants, Griffin increased the transferability of her study.

In a study only on lesbian educators alone, Woods and Harbeck (1992), found similar coping mechanisms as found by Griffin. They added to the literature by providing additional ways lesbian teachers manage their identity. The participants in their study, 12 self-identified lesbian physical education teachers, also passed as heterosexual. By including only physical education teachers, the researchers reduced the transferability of their finding, but it was important to study this particular group of teachers because of stereotypes. Having 12 participants to interview is a relatively large sample for a qualitative study. The data meet the rich and thick qualification due to the three-interview protocol for all 12 participants. Each 90-minute interview started with one focus question.
Woods and Harbeck discovered another management technique the participants employed was self-distancing from others. They consciously avoided situations with school stakeholders where personal information might be shared. Participants actively portrayed themselves as “stern, businesslike, efficient, task-oriented, and…aloof” (Woods & Harbeck, 1992, p. 152). Even though they acknowledged the harm this had on personal and professional relationships, and their own feelings of honesty and integrity, participants thought it was best to distance themselves because they valued their jobs as teachers. A third management technique participants used was to distance themselves from issues of homosexuality. They did not get involved when issues relating to homosexuality arose. This included name calling, AIDS education, and helping students deal with sexual identity questions. They would ignore homophobic comments by students and teachers, even when directed at them. The participants felt guilty about not standing up in these situations, but the fear of being perceived as a lesbian outweighed the guilt. They also felt they let down the students who were dealing with their own sexual orientation questions. By avoiding them, the participants were not acting as positive role models. Even though all participants were comfortable with their personal lives, there was a stark line drawn separating the personal from the professional (Woods & Harbeck, 1992).

In addition to managing their personal lives, gay and lesbian teachers go to great lengths to develop teacher personas (Griffin, 1992; Kissen, 1996). Rudoe (2010) interviewed eight secondary school teachers in England who employed varying styles of identity management. Although the study took place in England, LGBT citizens had similar rights to those in the United States. None of the participants were out to their students; however, all were out to at least one colleague. A theme that emerged was the participants’ desire to be respected as an educator. All participants sought to establish the reputation of a good teacher. This desire to be
seen as a “good teacher” could stem from the desire to have a positive reputation in case the lesbian identity is revealed (Rudoe, 2010).

In a 1999 study of northeastern Florida gay and lesbian teachers, Sanlo found the 16 educators in her study to use the various management techniques described by Griffin (1992). None of the participants were explicitly out at work, although some were out and active politically. However, they felt isolated from all groups. Sanlo developed a triangular figure (see Figure 1) with growing concentric circles inside to describe factors leading to the isolation of LGBT educators:

![Figure 1-Factors leading to the isolation of LGBT educators (Sanlo, 1999)](image)

The filter of fear circle emanating from the center represents the buffer lesbian and gay teachers employ to filter relationships with the people in the outer circles. The larger circles are people and groups who can have a negative impact on a teacher’s life, if they were to be discovered as gay. The outer triangle depicts the communities to which the teachers belong,
however, their disconnect with the circle shows the isolation lesbian and gay teachers feel since they cannot be fully committed or honest with any of the groups because of their sexual orientation (Sanlo, 1999).

**Being Out**

The decision to come out at school can depend on individual circumstances (Khayatt, 1997). Sometimes, the decision to come out is planned by teachers; other times, the decision to out oneself is spontaneous (Harbeck, 1992; Jackson, 2007; Jennings, 2005; Kissen, 1996; Rensenbrink, 1996; Woods & Harbeck, 1992). Many teachers who do come out explicitly at school report having a positive impact on school culture through the creation of connections with stakeholders, the challenging of stereotypes, the creation of a safe space to question the culture and speak up (Jackson, 2009; Rensenbrink, 1996). The incidences of homophobic comments decrease, students feel safer, and stereotypes are challenged (Jackson, 2007; Jennings, 2005; Kissen, 1996).

Kissen (1996) did a comprehensive study of LGBT educators from across the county. The participants in her study were from communities ranging from rural to urban and conservative to liberal. There were 105 people interviewed for her study. Most of the interviews took place in person (88) and the rest took place on the phone. This is the most comprehensive piece about the experiences of LGBT educators. Kissen identifies herself as heterosexual, and as such, does not try to speak for LGBT teachers. Instead, she used their stories to find themes and used the participants’ words to explicate them. Not all the participants were out to students and faculty at school. However, for many the process was a gradual one, beginning with a few colleagues, then a few more, and sometimes ending with coming out to students, either on an individual basis or to an entire class (Kissen, 1996). Many of the participants report a positive
experience again, this would be more informative if you briefly described how with regards to coming out to students. Although many expected parent phone calls, name calling by students and teachers, and formal reprimands, their fears proved unfounded. Even though teachers fear job loss and security by coming out, one teacher realized “her survival depended on being more open about her identity, rather than less” (Kissen, 1996, p. 99).

Coming out is a process many lesbian and gay people experience in a variety of situations, often repeatedly again (Kissen, 1999). Jackson (2007) studied the process of coming out with nine openly gay teachers. Jackson described a three-phase process with multiple parts to each phase. Although the speed of each phase varied by teacher, all teachers proceeded through the phases in order. The first phase for a gay teacher is the “pre-teaching phase which contained the coming into gayness and coming into teacher phase” (Jackson, 2007, p.42). The paths participants took to come into gayness varied dramatically based on personal experience, family support, and personal acceptance. This phase could have lasted anywhere from adolescence to adulthood, depending on the level of comfort with their own gayness the participants experienced. Coming into teaching phase came from three paths. Participants either knew from a young age they wanted to be a teacher, worked in fields related to teaching prior to entering the profession, or had to work at creating a teacher identity because it was not the original plan.

The next phase in the development of the gay teacher identity was the closeted teaching stage. The super-teacher phase in the closeted teaching stage concurred with other literature describing how lesbian and gay teachers worked very hard to create personas of authority (Griffin, 1992; Jackson, 2007; Kissen, 1996, Rudoe, 2010). Creating the perception of being a perfect teacher who is knowledgeable about content and pedagogy serves as a layer of protection
in case they are accused of homosexuality (Jackson, 2007; Jennings, 2006; Lipkin, 1999). The teachers in Jackson’s study changed the way they dressed, spoke, and acted while at school in order to maintain their identity. The second phase in the closeted stage is called the on the verge phase where teachers consider coming out. Rising dissonance between personal beliefs and professional actions caused the teachers to want to either come out to their students or leave the profession. For many, they were discussing content directly related to being homosexual and could not be authentic individuals. They feared this sent a negative message about being gay and mixed messages about it being ok to be gay, but acting as though it was shameful while at school (Jackson, 2007).

Once teachers reached the on-the-verge phase, they began to plan how and when to come out to students. Once they came out, they entered the final stage of gay teacher identity, post-coming out stage. Once the initial “15 minutes of fame” subsided, gay teachers entered into the “gay poster child” phase (Jackson, 2007, p.68). During this phase, gay educators were seen as a resource for students, teachers, and parents (Griffin, 1992; Jennings, 2006). They became the go-to person for anything relating to a LGBT event. The gay poster child phase and subsequent authentic teacher phase resulted in feelings of empowerment for the teachers. They were able to be open about their lives, combat stereotypes and be a resource for the community. As teachers entered the authentic teacher phase, they reported a feeling of being complete. Jackson makes sure to emphasize that prior to coming out the teachers were still authentic teachers, but they had not been able to merge the personal and professional into one identity (Jackson, 2007). However, participants became more aware of presenting themselves as more than one-dimensional. Glen, a participant in Jackson’s study expressed it best when he said, “I can be the [gay teacher] who likes Broadway show tunes and has dinner parties…I need to present the widest possible portrait
of what [being a gay person] looks like” (Jackson, 2007, p. 75). Study participants incorporated LGBT issues in their classrooms without the fear of being seen as having a political agenda. They also constructed an atmosphere that disrupted the heteronormative culture that exists in classrooms.

For the participants in Jackson’s study, many factors contributed to the decision to come out. Related to personal characteristics, factors included are age, race, personality, gender conformity, religion, and family status. Professionally, the work experience contributed to the comfort level teachers had with coming out. Generally, the longer the teachers were employed, the more comfortable they were coming out. In addition, the subject matter taught made it easier for some to come out. Using the curriculum as a context to discuss their sexual orientation made it easier to find a teachable moment. The teachers who taught health and the social studies easily found the context to come out. Participants also agreed, the older the students, the easier it was to come out. However, middle school teachers felt it was most important to be open for that age group (Jackson, 2007).

The impact of being out in the classroom has been well-documented (Gregory, 2004; Jackson, 2007; Jennings, 2005; Macgillivary, 2008; Rensenbrink, 1996; Rofes, 2000; Sapon-Shevin, 2004). The intersection of gayness and teaching resulted in safe classroom environments, a heightened awareness of language in the classroom, the creating of gay friendly classrooms through pictures, posters, and decorations, orchestrating interactions between students that would challenge stereotypes, and listening to student voices (Jackson, 2007). Their classrooms also incorporated more ideas about social justice. Students were encouraged to speak up for minorities and work together to change things they perceived as wrong (Jackson, 2007; Rensenbrink, 1996).
Jackson’s finding about the impact of having an openly gay teacher mirrored those of Rensenbrink (1996). Rensenbrink studied the impact Rosemary Towbridge’s lesbianism had on her classroom. Through interviews and observations, Rensenbrink came to the conclusion that being a lesbian impacted her classroom in three ways: creating a safe space for students to be “who they are”, creating an environment where students question the dominant culture and ways in which they deal with the world, and encouraging students to speak up for themselves and others (Rensenbrink, 1996, p. 265). Rensenbrink is worth quoting when she says being an openly lesbian teacher “counts those ‘million lite suicides’ so that kids know ‘you can be who you are’” (1996, p. 270).

Rensenbrink’s case study methodology gave a voice to the many lesbian teachers. Although case studies can be limited in terms of transferability, the credibility of this study seems quite high. Rensenbrink spent a lot of time with Towbridge, including interviews and observations. She engaged in member checking and triangulation.

Student voices about having an openly gay teacher have also been entering the literature (Macgillivray, 2008; Rofes, 2000). Although most of the literature discusses the teacher perspectives of being openly gay, it is important to reference the student voices we have since many of the reasons teachers give for not being out is alienating students or offending parents. Rofes (2000) contacted his former students to analyze their experience with having an openly gay teacher. All of the respondents to his inquiries were straight. They reported, “they did not spend much time considering the nature of that [gay] identity and...a teacher’s sex life” (Rofes, 2000, p. 410). This could mean being out is more significant to the adult rather than to the students. Rofes taught these students when they were in middle school and his gayness was not what they remembered most. Many reported recalling his height and size and political activism
as more defining of their relationship (Rofes, 2000). Another significant conclusion that could be drawn is the impact a gay teacher has on students’ moral and political development. Rofes contends that by having a gay teacher, students saw him as a person and not as a possible pedophile. I hope that exposure to gay teachers reduces the stigma LGBT have and reduces feelings of homophobia (Rofes, 2000). Rofes did not report any negative responses from former students to having an openly gay teacher.

In a separate survey eight years later, another openly gay teacher surveyed ex-students for their reflections on having an openly gay teacher in high school (Macgillivray, 2008). Unlike Rofes’ (2000) participants, some of Macgillivray’s participants self-identified as homosexual or bisexual. At times, Macgillivray used the term LGBT to describe the research field and at other times, he used the term LGB (lesbian, gay, bisexual) to describe his students. Although the reason for the difference was not explicitly stated, I inferred it was because none of his student identified as Transgendered, so he left off the T in LGBT. Three themes emerged from the analysis of the three LGB students: “a) being comfortable with oneself; b) always knowing they were LGB; and c) being pleased that other students began to change their views about gay people” (p. 77). These findings can help combat any arguments against being out in the classroom, even though it is an extremely small sample size. The effects of having an openly gay teacher for the heterosexual students centered around an initial discomfort with having a gay teacher, becoming aware sexual orientation was only a small part of a person’s identity, and being certain they were not gay. These findings support the claims that having an openly gay teacher helps LGBT youth by having a positive role model and straight youth to build acceptance (Jackson, 2007; Jennings, 2005; Kissen, 1996).
LGBT Curriculum

There is a wealth of resources available for teachers who want to teach LGBT issues in their classroom. Sites such as Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) and the Human Rights Campaign offer lesson plans, posters, interviews, and other methods to discuss LGBT issues in the classroom (GLSEN, 2018). They also have interviews with people who were part of major LGBT historical events and suggested discussion questions with extension activities. However, there is a significant gap in the literature about infusing LGBT issues into social studies and other curriculum subjects. At the elementary level, Schieble (2012) found pre-service elementary teachers were wary of including LGBT issues in an elementary classroom. This included the use of LGBT picture books and other literature. The participants cited fear of parent complaint and questioning of their own sexuality as reasons for not including LGBT literature at the elementary level (Schieble, 2012). In another study, Taylor (2012) did an analysis of four picture books with LGBT characters. He found that even though they included LGBT people, they were still not queer, meaning the characters belonged to “White, middle class America” (p. 144) and did not belong to the “others (queer people of color, working class queers, differently abled queers, etc.)” (Taylor, 2012, p. 137). The only oppressed group the characters belonged to was sexual orientation. Otherwise many of the characters were white, married, and had families. They appeared to be upper middle class and the characters maintained heteronormative roles within the LGBT family (Taylor, 2012). The characters did not disrupt the normative views of families.

The documentary, It’s Elementary: Talking About Gay Issues in School, shows teachers in elementary and middle schools discussing sexual orientation, families, and discrimination (Cohen & Chasnoff, 1996). When it came out in 1996, public media objected to showing it to
students. Bozell, from the *New York Post*, called it “vomitus” and accused the filmmakers of not having “common sense and decency” (quoted from Murphy, 2007). However, the film was distributed across the nation and, for many, was the only training teachers had with discussing LGBT issues in their classrooms (Murphy, 2007). The subject of the film was not the teachers, but the students. Most of the film focused on student attitudes, beliefs, and experiences (Cohen & Chasnoff, 1996). In 2007, the directors released *It’s STILL Elementary* (Cohen & Chasnoff, 2007). This film includes much of the original footage and follow-up interviews with some of the children in the original. Many of the children remember being excited about sharing what they thought about LGBT issues and a sense of relief to have everything out in the open. For one, discussing the issues in elementary school stopped some of the bullying he experienced (Murphy, 2007).

When *Queering Elementary Education*, published in 1999, by Letts and Sears was the most comprehensive publication about LGBT issues in the elementary classroom. Sears remembers it being difficult to find educators to contribute to the book since so few actually taught about LGBT issues (Sears, 2009). The book is a collection of international articles about the queering of education. It is an important distinction from LGBT articles; queering education implies purposefully examining the structures in place to maintain the heteronormative culture and using pedagogy to combat that culture (Sears, 2009).

Moving away from elementary school, the English Language Arts field has published a solid amount about incorporating LGBT issues into their curriculum. In 2009, the National Council of Teachers of English published an issue of *English Journal* that contained 16 articles about incorporating LGBT literature into the curriculum. NCTE also included a position statement, which resolved to:
1. provide leadership for including the study of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in all teacher preparation programs;

2. urge the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to require the study of LGBT issues in teacher preparation programs;

3. urge NCTE members to address the needs of LGBT students, as well as children of LGBT families, and to incorporate LGBT issues in their work;

4. urge the NCTE Editorial Board to be proactive in seeking strong scholarship in LGBT studies for publication and, where relevant, encourage NCTE authors to draw out the queer studies implications of their work;

5. continue to address LGBT issues in its programs, conferences, publications, and advocacy initiatives; and

6. publish guidelines and instructional materials and offer professional development opportunities designed to assist teachers in their teaching of LGBT issues. (NCTE, 2009, 14).

One of the leaders in the field of including LGBT literature is Mollie Blackburn. She has written extensively about the importance for LGBT youth to see themselves reflected in literature (Clark & Blackburn, 2009; Blackburn, 2002, 2006). Not only does she advocate for inclusion, but for teachers to explore the heteronormative culture in which students live and read literature (Blackburn, 2002; Blackburn & Smith, 2010). Blackburn and her compatriots not only advocate for inclusion and queerness of the curriculum, but they also offer suggested books, short stories, and tips for the classroom (Blackburn & Clark, 2011; Blazar, 2009; Clark & Blackburn, 2009; Curwood, Schliesman, & Horning, 2009; Moje & MuQaribu, 2003; Sieben & Wallowitz, 2009; Vetter, 2010). Queering the curriculum would educate students about the “interconnections
among sexuality, identity, and literature” (Blackburn & Buckley, 2005, p. 202). A simple search on the NCTE website delivers many options for articles pertaining to LGBT literature and recommendations.

**Gatekeeping in Social Studies**

Thornton’s (1991) argument that teachers are curricular-instructional gatekeepers provides a frame of reference for this study. Since this study looks at the curricular-instructional decisions lesbian teachers make, it is necessary to have an understanding of the relevant research in gatekeeping. Thornton has written extensively on gatekeeping in the social studies (1991; 1994; 2012). Thornton (2012) defines curricular-instructional gatekeeping as the idea that “teachers make the day-to-day decisions concerning both the subject matter and experiences to which pupils have access and the nature of that subject matter and those experiences” (p. 29). In a classroom, teachers make many decisions about curriculum based on previous experience—whether that be personal or professional.

In their book, *Teaching History for the Common Good*, Barton and Levstick provide an overview of multiple theories on teaching history. Although much of the book concerns different theories of teaching history, near the end, they discuss gatekeeping as part of teacher education and come to the conclusion that teachers with a strong sense of purpose where the most aware gatekeepers (Barton & Levstick, 2004). Teachers who have a strong understanding of their own purpose in teaching their content are the ones who are most aware of the reasoning behind their curricular-instructional decisions.

With the continued emphasis on testing in education, there have been quite a few studies, which investigated the impact of testing on social studies teachers concerning their curricular-instructional decision-making. Grant (2010) wrote that testing and accountability influences
“teachers’ content, instructional, and assessment decisions differently” (pp. 44). However, he goes on to say content decisions are impacted the most by testing and accountability. In a previous study, Au (2009) offered a competing argument that testing does affect pedagogical decision-making. Pace (2011) observed and interviewed five classrooms in California where social studies were not tested, but reading and math were. There were grades four through seven. She found that even though social studies was not being tested, the other testing did encroach on time allocated for social studies instruction (Pace, 2011). In addition, there was a difference in the size of the negative effect on gatekeeping in schools of differing performance levels. Teachers in schools which were considered low performing reported having less autonomy in their classrooms, leading to less independence with regards to making curricular-instructional decision. While those teachers in mid- to high-performing schools believed they had more autonomy to act as gatekeepers (Pace, 2011).

In a comprehensive survey of 6,312 secondary social studies teachers across 44 states and Washington, D.C., Patterson, Horner, Chandler, and Dahlgren (2013) studies the impact of testing on “enacted curriculum and gatekeeping function” (pp. 290). Of the 44 states, 31 were states where social studies was not tested at the state level, while the remaining 12 states tested social studies. Overall, teachers felt they had less control over content than instructional strategies, echoing the argument by Grant (2010). Teachers reported having stronger gatekeeping action in non-testing states than in testing states (Patterson et al., 2013).

DeRose (2011) interviewed eleven people about their choices in using a resource to incorporate local history into the curriculum. After distributing a survey about demographic information and the use of the Making of Milwaukee resources, he selected 11 teachers to interview. From his interviews, he concluded that time was a large influence on gatekeeping
He also identified four types of gatekeepers—commissioners, administrators, guardians, and independent. He coined these terms based on the participants’ reasons for including local history. These terms might not be applicable for all studies, but they provide a good description about motivations of teachers with regards to gatekeeping.

Bergstrom (2015) used gatekeeping as her analytic framework in her study about teachers of gifted social studies. She conducted semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and analyzed artifacts for six middle grades social studies teachers. She found there were multiple factors with regards to gatekeeping. Teachers were actively engaged in the process and selected content and activities based on the student’s best interests. Teachers also had to make decisions about changing the lesson plan based on student interest or engagement, and felt most confident to make those decisions when they were well prepared. Overall, teachers expressed a need to balance the agendas of school stakeholders such as the Florida Department of Education, school district, school site administration, and the students (Bergstrom, 2015).

**LGBT Curriculum in Social Studies**

With as much literature as there is on incorporating LGBT issues into the English Language Arts curriculum, for example, see Blackburn & Clark, 2011; Blazar, 2009; Curwood, Schliesman, & Horning, 2009; Sieben & Wallowitz, 2009; Vetter, 2010, there should be nearly as much, if not more, for incorporating LGBT issues into the social studies curriculum. According to the National Council for the Social Studies website, “the primary purpose of social studies is to help young people make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” (2010). This definition may allude to LGBT inclusion, but does not explicitly mention what constitutes cultural diversity. In addition, of the 11 position statements on the NCSS website, one includes
reference to LGBT issues in the curriculum. The position statement on human rights education advocates for students to examine the implications of human rights and to “consider how they relates to questions of diversity…” (NCSS, 2014). It mentions sexual orientation only once in the document. Homosexuality was not directly addressed until 2003 in *Theory and Research in Social Education* (Crocco, 2003). As of 2003, when “Dealing with Differences in the Social Studies” was published “virtually no one in the social studies seems to have paid much attention to gay and lesbian matters” (Crocco, 2003/2004, p. 116). In the same article, Crocco suggests LGBT content will make its way into the school curriculum “perhaps 30 years after legitimation by the academic disciplines” (p. 108).

In 1994, Thornton suggested the inclusion of sexual orientation in the classroom in “The Social Studies Near Century’s End: Reconsidering Patterns of Curriculum and Instruction”. The following year, Wade (1995) put forth the necessity for teaching about religion and sexual orientation in the social studies classroom, especially at the elementary level “when children are more accepting of diversity” (p. 19). Wade (1995) argued it was necessary to teach about the controversial subjects of religion and sexual orientation since being part of a democratic society depended upon the “acceptance of controversy and tolerance of differences” (p.19).

Even though teachers are hesitant to teach about controversial topics because of fear of community reprisal or censorship from administration, it is still necessary to introduce these topics of diversity to children since they will be required to live and work in a society in which there are people who belong to these groups (Wade, 1995). In order to combat protests, Wade suggests teachers be prepared to answer questions. Teachers need to have sound reasons for including sexual orientation into the curriculum. Wade (1995) suggests “some soul-searching” and an examination of personal values (p. 20). Secondly, teachers should have a support base for
including these topics. She suggests having the NCSS 1975 “Freedom to Teach and Freedom to Learn” position statement available. She does not offer any other NCSS support for LGBT topics, but does give multiple documents to support the teaching of religions in school. The third piece of advice is to be ready for inquiries from parents about why you are including those topics and from students about your personal beliefs. The final piece of advice is to be knowledgeable about the complaint policy in the district (Wade, 1995).

The final part of the article gave some suggestions for teaching about religion and sexual orientation in class. The first suggestion was to incorporate the topics into class discussions about diversity and groups who are discriminated against. At the elementary level, teachers should focus on the humanity of homosexuals; for example, include homosexual families in a unit about family structures. She also suggests incorporating picture books into the curriculum. At the secondary level, she suggests using current events to broach LGBT issues (Wade, 1995). Although this is a landmark piece of literature about incorporating LGBT into social studies, it barely scratches the surface of inclusion.

In the wake of multiple school shootings in the late 1990s, people were searching for ways to prevent future shootings. Crocco, in an article published on 2001, cited the “misogynistic and homophobic norms in American society have contributed to these contemporary examples of social deviance” (p. 65). She continues to say that educators should tackle these norms “as part of the social studies curriculum” (p. 65). She gives three specific goals for social studies educators:

a) critiquing the sometimes self-destructive gendered scripts our society provides for both young men and women; b) challenging the unwritten curriculum of schooling that normalizes male-dominant, misogynistic, and homophobic patterns of male and
female interaction; and c) ending the anti-gay bias that results in high levels of absenteeism, dropouts, and suicide for gay youth (Crocco, 2001, p. 66).

The first task requires social studies educators to combat the stereotypes of what makes a male and female. By disrupting the ideas of maleness and femaleness, students can let go of some of their preconceived notions and, ideally, not tease people who do not completely fulfill the characteristics of an ideal male or female. The second task follows closely with the first. It requires a shift in the way students interact in traditional male/female roles. Instead of accusing boys who do not appear to be “masculine enough” of femininity or of being gay, teachers need to challenge that assumption. They should not allow students to be called gay or lesbian simply because they do not fulfill gender norms. This leads directly to the third task of social studies educators: to end homophobia. Although a monumental goal to accomplish nationwide, if each social studies teacher ended homophobic remarks in their classroom and hallway, it would be a step closer to changing. The social studies agenda must include “providing a safe and respectful space in our classrooms for the one in ten young people who are gay and lesbian” (Crocco, 2001, p. 68).

Like Wade (1995), Crocco (2001) suggests teachers look at their own actions and inactions when dealing with homophobic actions in schools. Since many do nothing, to effectively institute a curricular shift, some teachers need to be prepared to take action. In order to incorporate gender and sexual orientation into the curriculum, Crocco suggests using James Banks’ transformation or social action forms of curriculum integration. This allows students to study an issue or problem from different perspectives and then work to solve the problem (Crocco, 2001). She also suggests using The Handbook on Teaching Social Issues by Evans & Saxe in 1996. Evans and Saxe offer a chapter describing a “semester long course where students
examine gender and sexuality in social life and culture…from both a historical and cross-cultural perspective” (Crocco, 2001, p. 69). The final suggestion is for teachers to become more familiar with gay and lesbian literature, history, and internet resources.

“Silence on Gays and Lesbians in Social Studies Curriculum” further emphasizes the exclusion of LGBT people in the content areas of social studies (Thornton, 2003). Textbooks might mention important figures during eras of history, but they often leave out their homosexuality. In fact, few textbooks even use “the words homosexual, straight, or gay” giving the idea that “the millions of gay inhabitants…did not exist” (Thornton, 2003, p. 226). Thornton builds upon Wade’s (1995) and Crocco’s (2001) suggestions for including LGBT material. Utilizing current events and children’s picture books offer good ways to introduce LGBT content into a social studies classroom. He also gives concrete examples in the content areas of history and geography. Throughout the article, Thornton emphasizes remaining within the established curriculum and simply adding to what is taught, not replacing (2003).

One of the more recent publications about inclusion of LGBT into social studies curriculum comes in Wayne Ross’ (2006) The Social Studies Curriculum: Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities. Kevin Jennings authored the chapter entitled “Out in the Classroom: Addressing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues in Social Studies Curriculum.” Like his predecessors, he deplores the nonexistence of LGBT historical figures in textbooks, or at least, the mention of their homosexuality. He argues both LGBT students and non-LGBT students are done a disservice by the exclusion of significant LGBT persons (Jennings, 2006). Since the social studies are tasked with preparing student for a diverse world, social studies educators are not living up to this task when they do not include LGBT people. Jennings also
reports that when homosexuality is discussed in textbooks, there is an “overall pattern of omission, inaccuracy, and bias” (p. 257).

Jennings offers three suggestions for inclusion into the curriculum. The first is telling the truth about the people we already talk about. This echoes Thornton’s (2003) suggestion. Second, Jennings suggests we broaden the teaching of historic events to be inclusive of LGBT. Since homosexuals have been present in nearly every era of history, describing their experiences and lives would draw the interest of the students. Finally, Jennings proposes that basic skills should be taught using LGBT materials. Asking students to analyze current events and problem solve falls under the purview of social studies skills. In addition, having students research LGBT history and primary sources would incorporate LGBT and important social studies skills (Jennings, 2006).

The most significant step towards inclusion of LBGT into the social studies curriculum came in the middle of 2011 with the passing of California Senate Bill 48, known as the FAIR Education Act. California state Senator Mark Leno proposed a bill to amend sections of the education code to include the mandatory teaching in the social studies of “the role and contributions of …lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans…” (S. 48, 2011). In addition to the legal code mandating teaching about LGBT people, it also said textbooks could not be adopted that contained adverse portrayals of people on the basis of sexual orientation and that textbooks up for adoption had to contain the roles and contributions of LGBT people (S. 48, 2001). The law took effect on January 1, 2012. The law does not give explicit direction about what content to teach and in what grade levels. Those decisions are left to local districts (California Department of Education, 2011). Proponents of the law, including Equality California and Gay-Straight Alliance Network, believe including LGBT issues in social studies
will promote tolerance and acceptance in the elementary grades that will decrease the incidences of bullying. According to the FAIR Education Fact sheet published by GSA (2010), the long-term hope is to create safe schools, where LGBT youth feel safe so they come to school and have an outlet to discuss their feelings, thereby decreasing the number of suicides.

In an article in Social Education, Bailey and Cruz (2017) make an argument in favor of an LGBT inclusive curriculum by tracing recent developments. They begin with much of the same research mentioned previously and discuss the curricular efforts of California, the only state with a requirement to include LGBT content. They go on to say inclusion of LGBT content in the social studies is necessary in order to give students an accurate picture of history and so students can see themselves reflected in the curriculum. Bailey and Cruz conclude with multiple examples of ways to include LGBT content in many of the social studies disciplines and multiple pedagogical techniques teachers can employ. This article helps lay a contemporary foundation for a change in curriculum.

J.B Mayo, Jr. published a chapter in the 2017 edition of The Wiley Handbook of Social Studies Research where he discusses sexuality and queer theory in social studies. On of his main points is students are already exposed to sexuality in the social studies curriculum through “seemingly neutral passages of historical prose in a textbook” (Mayo, 2017, p. 256). The example Mayo used was drawn from Kathy Bickmore’s 2002 article where she reports a teacher saying “Boers took their wives and children with them” (p.201). This simple statement was used to support the idea that sexuality was present in the curriculum but as a “common sense [assumption about] male protagonists in heterosexual, married, male-dominated nuclear families” (Bickmore, 202, p. 201). Mayo also argued for the use of queer theory to guide future research in social studies. He seems to believe that using queer theory will open new venues of
research and allow for social studies research to take an active role in disrupting the heteronormativity found within the curriculum. Mayo also recognized the need for more research on LGBT issues and the social studies, including how the “discourse [around LGBT issues] is steadily making its way inside schools” (2017, p. 265). He also proposes “longitudinal studies within the social studies that centers [on] LGBTQ lives” including gay teachers (Mayo, 2017, p. 265).

**Research on Lesbian Teachers**

Much of the research above describes the experiences of both homosexual men and women. Although in the past, there was only a small amount of research on lesbian educators, recently more attention is being paid to the unique experience of lesbian educators. Unlike their gay male counterparts, lesbian teachers also have to negotiate the male-dominated society (Khayatt, 1992). It is important to look at the experiences of lesbian experiences separately from those of gay men (Mayo, 2005). *Lesbian Teachers: An Invisible Presence* offered the most comprehensive look at the lesbian teacher experience in Ontario, Canada in the late 1980s (Khayatt, 1992). For her dissertation, Khayatt interviewed lesbian teachers about their experience, identity management at work and home, and the possible effects of being “outed”. She published this as a book five years later. It marked the beginning of lesbian stories in the literature. Editor Epstein (1994) included the stories of lesbian educators in her compilation, *Challenging Lesbian and Gay Inequalities in Education*. Ferfolja has focused on the experiences of Australian lesbian teachers. Most of her research revolves around the silencing of lesbian teachers and homophobia they face (1998, 2005, 2007, 2008). The largest body of research about lesbian educators is about lesbian physical education teachers. In the early 1990s, Woods and Harbeck interviewed physical education teachers (1992). Clarke has published multiple

Throughout all the literature, the only time lesbian social studies teachers are participants is within the context of both gay and lesbian studies of teachers of multiple subjects (Kissen 1996, Sanlo, 1999, Jackson, 2007). The gap in the literature concerning the experiences of lesbian social studies teachers with regards to curricular and pedagogical decisions will be addressed with this study.
Chapter 3
Research Design and Methods

Type of Study

I conducted a personal history self-study. Self-study methods were used to gather data for this study. A self-study is a way of “researching one’s self, one’s actions, one’s ideas, as well as the ‘not self’. It is autobiographical, historical, cultural, and political…it draws on one’s life, but it is more than that. Self-study also involves a thoughtful look at texts read, experiences had, people known, and ideas considered” (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 1988, p. 236). Self-study provides the space for an inquiry into one’s practice in order to reveal knowledge about one’s practice (Dinkelman, 2003). Many times self-study researchers investigate “living contradictions…when we believe we are one thing and then find ourselves acting in opposition to that belief” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p.52). I believed that my identity as a lesbian impacts my teaching, but through dialogues with colleagues and reflection on my practice, it was challenging to come up with multiple exemplars of this influence. Looking at the intersections of identity and integrity provided a more thorough understanding of myself and ways to improve my practice (Parker, 2004).

“Action research happens when people are involved in researching their own practice in order to improve it and to come to a better understanding of their practice situations. It is action because they act within the systems that they are trying to improve and understand. It is research because it is systematic, critical inquiry made public” (Feldman, 2007 as citied in Feldman, Altrichter, & Posch, 2008, p. 6). Even though Feldman used the term action research, self-study
could have easily been substituted. According to LaBoskey (2004) who completed an
examination of methodology in self-study, there are five elements: 1) It is self-initiated and
focused 2) it is improvement-aimed 3) it is interactive 4) it includes multiple, mainly qualitative
methods, 5) it defines validity as a process based on trustworthiness. My study addressed all five
of the elements. Clearly, this study was self-initiated and focused. My goal with the study was
to analyze the tension between my sexual orientation and the curricular-decision making in
which I engaged. My study was interactive since I recruited a critical friend to engage in
dialogues about my practice and beliefs and to serve as a control to prevent naval-gazing. In
addition, although I believe there is a connection between my sexual orientation and teaching, a
critical colleague helped me discover any dissonance between what I believe and what actions I
take in the classroom. As explained in a future section, multiple methods of data collection will
be employed. For the final element, trustworthiness was created through “collaboration with
peers, with a skeptical self, [and] with participants in my work” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p.
165). In addition, I strove to be humble, authentic, vulnerable, and make changes in my practice
(Schulte, 2012). Transparency throughout the study—from providing context, to data collection,
to data analysis, to reporting—helped increase trustworthiness (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). By
explaining each step of the process, hopefully, the reader will connect with the account and find
ways to improve their practice.

Although there are many types of self-studies, a personal history based study
“reconstructs significant life events to inform…their professional identity formation and to help
make meaning of pedagogy and the connections of practice to theory” (Samaras, Hicks, &
Berger, 2004, p. 906). Since my focus is on the major life events while coming to terms with my
sexual identity and the impact of those events on my professional identity, this model aligned
with the goals of my study. Personal history is more than an autobiography. It places the “self in relation to others [italics original] in historical and social contexts” that lead to the beliefs about education (Samaras, Hicks, & Berger, 2004, p. 911). I became who I am because of historical events and social contexts of my past. Those events influence this version of self. By connecting self and history, I gain “insight into the nature of my relationship to individuals, institutions, cultural values, and political events, and the ways in which these social relationships contribute to my identity, values, and ideological perspective” (Britzman, 1986, p. 452). Personal history self-studies also “consider their institutional contexts and learn to mediate among a variety of complex forces as they create and re-create their own professional identities” (Samaras, Hicks, & Berger, 2004, p. 916). The first time I read this description of personal history self-study research, I immediately thought of Jackson’s (2007) study where she describes the phases gay teachers go through as professionals throughout their careers. The convergence of Jackson’s findings and personal history methods align with my ontological stance.

**Participant**

As this is a self-study, I was the main participant. I am a 36-year-old woman who self-identifies as a lesbian. I have been teaching in the same school district for 14 years, in the sixth year at my current work site. I currently teach 11th grade U.S. History Honors at an affluent high school in West Central Florida.

**Informed Consent**

The IRB at the University of South Florida was contacted about informed consent and approval of this study. Due to the self-study nature, an informed consent is not necessary since I am the sole participant in the research.
**Data Collection**

For this self-study, data was collected using multiple formats in order to achieve “exemplar-based validity” (LaBoskey, 2004). I wanted to provide a clear picture of my practice and my thought processes. Data was collected at the beginning of the second semester in January and continue until my students take the end-of-course exam in April.

As a basis for my study, I wrote a statement of beliefs about teaching and learning, including the role of identity. This provided background information for both the reader and my critical friend. The role critical friend is discussed in an earlier section. The personal statement provided the comparison for the living contradiction.

I also wrote a personal history about my coming out in the workplace and educational experiences. This was a working document, the more I discussed my practice and beliefs, the more events recalled.

To address my practice in the classroom, I took pictures of my classroom seating arrangement and décor. The purpose was to give readers an insight into the physical arrangement of the room, as well as the atmosphere. I also collected lesson plan artifacts and student work to compare to my statement of beliefs about teaching and learning. I also used the state standards related to high school U.S. History. Finally, my critical friend completed one observation of teaching and then we debriefed it.

To address my thinking and reflect on my practice, I kept a journal throughout the semester. Journal topics included, but were not limited to, reflection on a lesson plan, reaction and reflection to student interaction, reflection on conversations with my critical friend. I also used the journal to keep track of any bias. The journal is a two-column journal where one column described what happened and the second column reflected on what I felt about an event.
Van Manen (1991) describes three types of reflection-anticipatory reflection, which is “oriented to future action”, active reflection that is a “stop-and think type of reflection [which] permits us to make decisions virtually on the spur of the moment”, and recollective reflection that “helps us make sense of past experiences” (p. 101). All three of these types of reflection were utilized in the study.

Table 1 - Data Sources for each research question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my beliefs about teaching?</td>
<td>• Statement of beliefs about teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Autobiography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “preactive” curricular-decision making?</td>
<td>• Photos of classroom (no students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Journaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lesson Plan Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State Standards Analysis for opportunities to incorporate LGBT content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversation with a critical friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “interactive” curricular-decision making?</td>
<td>• Journaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observation and debrief from a critical friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student work (anonymous) artifacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

Data analysis was done using Eisner’s (1985) explicit, implicit, and null curriculum and Jackson’s (2007) stages of coming out as frameworks for analysis. Each piece of data was sorted
according to research question(s). Then each piece of data was coded according to the stage of coming out I was in at the time. Then, for each stage, I coded for examples of explicit, implicit, and null curriculum. This provided a framework to make connections between by sexual orientation and different curricular-decisions. Sorting and coding were done during the study.
Chapter 4

Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between what I say I believe and actual classroom practice with regards to the effect of my lesbian identity on classroom practice. Although I thought my identity impacted my teaching, after conversations with colleagues, I began to doubt that supposition since I was unable to list many examples. My colleagues and I often engaged in discussions about teaching and they were supportive of my reflective questions. So I decided to take an in-depth look at my beliefs and practices.

I spent 14 weeks, from January 9, 2018 to April 20, 2018 collecting data about, and reflecting on, my teaching. This time period was chosen as it was the beginning of a new semester until the end of year, which provided concrete starting and stopping points. Since the End-Of-Course exam was given at the beginning of May, I did not have a full semester to collect data, where students were held accountable for the explicit curriculum. My explicit curriculum during those weeks covered U.S. history from World War II through present day. I wrote in a journal detailing experiences that involved my sexual orientation, I collected artifacts of student learning and my planning, I was observed by my critical friend and had a critical conversation with her. I also wrote an autobiographical sketch, kept a working document about my beliefs, analyzed state standards, took photographs of my classroom.

After a brief description of myself, the findings will be presented for each research question along with any themes that emerged.
1. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my beliefs about curriculum and teaching?

2. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “preactive” curricular-instructional decision-making?

3. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “interactive” curricular-instructional decision-making?

Participant

I was the main participant in this study. I am 36 years old and am in my 14th year teaching. My career began as a sixth grade Language Art, Reading, and Social Studies teacher, but my goal was to teach only Social Studies. After four years in the district, I moved into an eighth grade U.S. History position. I remained at the grade level for five years and then became and continue to be an 11th grade U.S. History teacher. I have been “out of the closet” to my family and friends for 15 years and “out” at work for the last six. Appendix A is an autobiographical sketch that includes my coming out process. Since the purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between my identity and curricular decision-making, a description of my work site will give the reader some context. I am currently the only lesbian social studies teacher at my school site, but have had social studies colleagues, both at my current site and past sites, who also identified as lesbians. The school at which I teach is considered an affluent school because of the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood. We have earned a state grade of an “A” since our opening 10 years ago. The state of Florida’s Department of Education awards schools grades based upon a variety of factors including the graduation rate, the number of students enrolled in Advanced Placement classes, the percentage of students who pass state assessments for reading, math, and U.S. History. Since U.S. History End-of-Course scores have
been included in the school grade, at my school the U.S. History scores have earned the most points towards the school grade of any category. There is a high level of parental involvement at the school. Approximately 80% of the students plan to attend either a four-year university or two-year community college so they need to be prepared, with regards to both explicit and implicit curriculum.

**Research Question 1: In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my beliefs about curriculum and teaching?**

After coding my autobiographical sketch (Appendix A) for Jackson’s (2007) stages of coming out, I then applied those codes to my beliefs about teaching and learning (Appendix B). From that document it became apparent that, as I moved through Jackson’s stages of coming out from my first year teaching until today, I shifted from solely relying on the explicit curriculum to guide my philosophy about teaching and learning to believing I had a responsibility to disrupt the null curriculum with regards to LGBT content. The ways in which I demonstrated this shift was through my changing beliefs about what tools and resources I should utilize in the classroom and my changing beliefs about classroom environment. To a lesser extent, my changing beliefs about pedagogical techniques were impacted by the stage of “out” I was in. Finally, my beliefs about implicit curriculum I taught remained the same throughout.

**Tools and Resources**

As a beginning teacher who was just coming into myself as a teacher and lesbian, I felt overwhelmed and nervous about most things, including my “first observation and first date” (Appendix A) with a woman. Because I wanted to calm those feelings, I relied on the concrete tools to get me through the teaching part. Although there were state standards at the time, the district did not yet emphasize using the standards to plan instruction. In addition, because I felt
so overwhelmed by everything, I did not have the energy to locate outside sources. Therefore, I relied on the “textbook to guide…my content knowledge” (Appendix B). I believed that the textbook was the best resource to prepare my students for their exams. During these first three years, I only “taught the information presented in the book” (Appendix B). I did not critically analyze what was missing from the textbook or curriculum.

During my closeted teaching years, both the “superteacher” and “on the verge” phases, I began to “deviate from the textbook” (Appendix B). Instead of just presenting the information from the textbook, I added other information or details that I knew from my own study. I started bringing up current events, which at the time included same-sex marriage. We had discussions in class about that same-sex marriage, which I never would have done previously. We also discussed gay people serving in the military and discrimination against gay people. Although these conversations came up occasionally, they were not an everyday occurrence. However, I did not shy away from addressing student questions, where in the past I would have. I sought outside sources from multiple perspectives. I wanted to give the students the opportunity to get “more from the class than just the founding fathers” (Appendix B). Although I added to the curriculum, I did not go as far as introducing LGBT content within the historical context. LGBT content was confined to current events. I did “incorporate more women’s history” into the content that was required (Appendix B).

Once I came out at work, there was a definite shift from relying on only the textbook to using the textbook as a baseline for content. I still use the textbook to provide basic content knowledge. Once students have gained an understanding of events, they “analyze primary and secondary sources” which I have gathered from various sites. I also make a point to “incorporate content not mentioned in the textbook and only alluded to in the standards” (Appendix B). Some
of that content is feminist in nature, but most of it relates to LGBT content. Since there is no mention of LGBT figures or history in the standards, I actively find ways to incorporate the content. I had a student, Will, to whom I became a mentor during his senior year. We became close and kept in touch when he went to college. During one of our conversations after he left, he told me that because of my class, he was one of the only ones in his collegiate history class to know anything about the gay liberation movement of the 1960s. He said his classmates had not learned about it while they were in high school. He went on to say not only did he like knowing more than his classmates, but that he was grateful to have been able to see someone like him in history. Incorporating information outside the explicit standards hopefully negates the message, sent by lack of inclusion, that LGBT people did not exist or have an impact on the history of the United States.

Classroom Environment

The decorations in my classroom shifted from bland, unoriginal pieces to posters and art that are deeply personal over the last 14 years. Although I do not have pictures for comparison, I remember my first classroom was devoid of any personal touches. Little was placed on the walls besides “occasional student work” (Appendix B). There was nothing in the room that said, “This is Ms. Colborne’s room” --- perhaps that is because at the time I did not know who Ms. Colborne was, both personally and professionally.

My next few classrooms saw an increase in the number of personal touches, but they were limited. There were a few trinkets on my desk from travels, a sheep from Ireland or flip-flop magnet from the Bahamas (Appendix B). However, there were no pictures of the people with whom I had traveled because it was a group of lesbians. Instead, most of the decorations reflected the content: the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, the Doolittle prints
of Lexington and Concord, or the branches of government and houses of Congress (Appendix B). In my last year before coming out at work, I was given a bumper sticker promoting marriage equality with the Statue of Liberty kissing Lady Liberty. For a long time it sat in my desk drawer. Then, once I came out to one student, I put it up behind my desk. People could not immediately see it, but if someone was behind my desk and looked to the side of the computer monitor, it was visible. To a stranger who walked into my classroom it may have been obvious I loved my content and loved being a teacher, but they would have had to look very hard to find elements of who I was outside of teaching.

Today, it is obvious who I am as a teacher and a person from my classroom environment. A stranger would be able to tell I love Harry Potter, Marvel movies, *Hamilton*, and travel because of the large collection of mementos on the file cabinets (Figure 2).

![Figure 2-Mementos travels and interests](image)

Upon closer inspection, a snow globe from Seattle with the city’s iconic Space Needle can be found with rainbow lettering (Figure 3). I remember debating with myself about displaying this
in my classroom and coming to the conclusion, “Why not?” The students already know I am a
lesbian. This was the first obviously gay object I put in my classroom on display. Since the
rainbow flag is a well-known symbol of gay people, students frequently associate anything
rainbow with LGBT people.

From there, I quickly, and without hesitation, put more references to LGBT issues: a poster
electing students to use a word other than “gay” to describe something in a derogatory
manner (Figure 4), a poster referencing gender expectations (Figure 5), and a poster entitled
“Unfortunately, History Has Set the Record a Little Too Straight” (Figure 6).
I still have the content posters: Constitution (Figure 7), Declaration of Sentiments (Figure 8), Electoral College Map (Figure 9), but they are only a part of my classroom environment, instead of the bulk.
Pedagogical Techniques

Unlike the resources and classroom environment, my beliefs about pedagogical choices did not change as drastically. During the first three years, I relied on individual work, with occasional partner activities. As I became more comfortable teaching and had more training, I shifted to more cooperative learning strategies and project-based learning. Today, I employ a variety of types of pedagogy. Some days complete independent seatwork or fill in the blank PowerPoint notes. Other days, students work in groups to analyze primary source documents or create a poster of content to use in a gallery walk. My students also create storybooks, poems, comic strips, and other products to demonstrate their learning. The one place where my beliefs about pedagogy are impacted by my sexual orientation is when I create groups or assign topics to groups. I will purposefully assign LGBT topics to students who are not part of the heteronormative culture, or at the very least give those students an opportunity to choose LGBT
topics first, so they can see themselves reflected in the curriculum. I firmly believe students not part of the heteronormative culture should be able to study in detail the contribution made by other members of their group and take steps to see that happen. All students in the class are eventually exposed to LGBT content when the lesson concludes, but non-heteronormative students are the ones presenting the information.

**Implicit Curriculum**

One area that did not change as I transitioned through Jackson’s (2007) stages of coming out was my beliefs about the implicit curriculum. My sexual orientation did not change my beliefs about the implicit curriculum. One constant throughout my beliefs about teaching is the phrase “hard work.” I believe part of what schools teach students is to work hard and success will follow. Since schools do not just give grades based on tests, but also on classwork and homework, students are taught that they have to do work in order to succeed. As I coded my beliefs about teaching and learning document, the words “hard work…dedication…[and] personal responsibility” came up in all stages of my coming out process. In the out phase I elaborated on other elements of the implicit curriculum like “perseverance…the ability to work with others, and participate in a national and global community” (Appendix B). I do not think the addition of these additional descriptors are because of my sexual orientation, but are because I teach at a high school and place greater emphasis on the skills needed to be successful after the students graduate. Just like my other beliefs about creating a positive, authentic classroom environment, I included these elements of my beliefs in the decorations in my classroom. I have motivational quotes from various people displayed above the window (Figure 10). I also have the “Iceberg Illusion of Success” prominently displayed on one of my walls (Figure 11).
Overall, who I am and what I believe about teaching and learning has changed over time. A lot of those changes are related to my sexual orientation, as I became more confident in who I am as a person and with my lesbian identity, I was able to be a more authentic person in my classroom. This authenticity gave me the freedom to enhance my craft as a teacher and re-evaluate my role as simply a deliverer of information to one of a creator of thinkers.

Research Question 2: In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “preactive” curricular-instructional decision-making?

Since I am currently “out” at work, all of the data collected for research questions two and three occur during the last phase of Jackson’s (2007) phases of coming out. During the beginning of my “preactive” curricular-instructional decision-making for each unit I create a unit organizer. Figure 12 is the unit organizer from my unit on World War II.
The unit organizers contain the essential questions, objectives, state standards, textbook chapters, and a calendar of topics to be covered with dates of quizzes, tests, and school-wide events (Appendix C). While planning each unit, I use the state standards as a starting point, along with the textbook, and instructional planning calendars from past years. Once I have the standards that will be covered, I look to them for opportunities to incorporate LGBT content (Figure 13), thus disrupting the null curriculum (Appendix D). After deciding which standards relate to the unit, I pencil in topics for each day.

Figure 12- Sample unit organizer from World War II unit
Finally, I go through the topics and decide what type of lesson would work best and make the needed adjustments. For the days we delve deeper into the content, I assign a reading quiz so students will come in to class with background information. I also determine the dates of vocabulary quizzes so I monitor the students’ learning. Opportunity and time were the two major determining factors, which emerged after I analyzed the data sources for my inclusion of LGBT content and the disruption of the null curriculum. In addition, the explicit curriculum led my “preactive” curricular-instructional decision-making, while the implicit curriculum was also a prominent feature.

**Null Curriculum-Opportunity and Time**

During the course of the semester, 32 state benchmarks, associated with two state standards relating to U.S. History were covered. For almost every state benchmark, there lists “remarks/examples” where the state provides some specific content pieces and informs the public that the standard could be tested on the End of Course exam. Nowhere in any of the

---

**Figure 13- State standard analysis for selected benchmarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19522A.61</td>
<td>Analyze significant foreign policy events during the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations. Remarks/Examples: Examples may include, but are not limited to, the Domino Theory, Sputnik, space race, Korean Conflict, Vietnam Conflict, U.S. and Gary Powers, Bay of Pigs invasion, Cuban Missile Crisis, Berlin Wall, Pug-Pong Diplomacy, opening of China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19522A.61</td>
<td>Analyze causes, course, and consequences of the Korean War. Remarks/Examples: Examples may include, but are not limited to, Communist China, 38th parallel, Chinese, firing of guns, Douglas MacArthur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19522A.61</td>
<td>Analyze causes, course, and consequences of the Vietnam War. Remarks/Examples: Examples may include, but are not limited to, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh, Johnson, Nixon administration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Standard 7: Understand the rise and continuing influence of the United States as a world leader and the impact of contemporary social and political movements on American life.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19522A.61</td>
<td>Identify causes of World War II prosperity and its effects on America society. Remarks/Examples: Examples may include, but are not limited to, GI Bill, Baby Boom, growth of suburbs, Beatnik movement, youth culture, religious revivals (e.g., Billy Graham and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen). Consumerism of the 1950s and the protest in the 1960s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19522A.63</td>
<td>Compare the relative prosperity between different ethnic groups and social classes in the post-World War II period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19522A.63</td>
<td>Examine the changing status of women in the United States from post-World War II to present. Remarks/Examples: Examples may include, but are not limited to, increased numbers of women in the workforce, Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Feminist Mistsique, National Organization for Women, War v. Wade, Equal Rights Amendment, Title IX, Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem, Phyllis Schlafly, Billie Jean King, feminism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19522A.64</td>
<td>Evaluate the success of 1960s era presidents’ foreign and domestic policy. Remarks/Examples:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
benchmarks or standards is LGBT history or content required. The explicit curriculum does not contain LGBT history. Of the 32 state benchmarks, 12 have the opportunity to incorporate LGBT content (Appendix E). For example, SS.912.A.6.8 is “Analyze the effects of the Red Scare on domestic United States policy...Examples may include...loyalty review program, House Un-American Activities Committee, McCarthyism (Sen. Joe McCarthy), McCarran Act”. This benchmark has the opportunity to incorporate LGBT content through the study of the Lavender Scare, yet does not mention it. The Lavender Scare was the witch hunt for homosexuals that occurred in concordance with the Red Scare. Suspected homosexuals were fired from their government jobs. In Florida, a committee was established to find homosexuals in academic fields and remove them. The Lavender Scare could also be taught under SS.912.A.6.15: “Examine key events and peoples in Florida history as they relate to United States history.” Considering the impact of the hunt for lesbian and gay teachers in Florida, it would be simple to incorporate, but is not.

Another opportunity to include LGBT content is SS.912.A.7.1, “Identify causes for Post-World War II prosperity and its effects on American society”. Included in the remarks/examples is the idea of conformity of the 1950s and the Beatnik movement. We spend some time talking about how not everyone conformed to the 1950s standard. Including LGBT non-conformity would be well-placed here since there were same-sex families during this time period.

Multiple times throughout the standards students are asked to evaluate the success of the era’s presidents’ domestic policies. With the varying domestic policies regarding the rights of LGBT Americans, students can grapple with the actions of various presidents. Also, students are asked to look at major Supreme Court decision. No Supreme Court decisions are included in the remarks/examples, but the experiences of other minorities and the rights of the accused are. The
most obvious place to incorporate LGBT history is in SS9.12.A.7.9 “Examine the similarities of
social movements (Native Americans, Hispanics, women, anti-war protesters) of the 1960s and
1970s.” It is very easy to include the gay liberation movement when discussing the other
movements.

During the course of the study, I incorporated LGBT content with six of the associated
benchmarks. However, some benchmarks are written quite broadly, and give multiple
opportunities to talk about LGBT content. SS.912.A.7.12 to “Analyze political, economic, and
social concerns that emerged at the end of the 20th century and into the 21st century” offers the
opportunity to talk about AIDS, both Reagan’s response and Clinton’s response, the policy of
Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, the Defense of Marriage Act, the emergence and classification of hate
crimes against gay people like Matthew Shepard, and the fight for marriage equality.

Although there are ample opportunities to incorporate LGBT content, time constraints
prevented me from addressing all the opportunities. With only 14 weeks to cover content before
the End of Course Exam, rather than a full 18 weeks in a semester which other courses have,
there are severe time constraints. When planning for a unit I had to decide if covering LGBT
topics, that would not be tested, could be fit in. When there were multiple opportunities in a unit,
I only incorporated one. In a journal entry from January 8, 2018 I wrote, “I decided to talk about
the persecution of lesbian and gay people during the Holocaust rather than teach about the
experiences of lesbian and gay people in the army” during the Unit on World War II. I decided
to use the Holocaust since I knew most students had background in the topic. However, this
actually worked against me. After we talked about the Holocaust, I wrote, “I wish I would have
talked about gay and lesbian service members. I think the students would have gotten more out
of it” (Journal, January 22, 2018). Since student interest is highest when new information is
presented, especially related to a topic like gay and lesbian people, I think the impact of the lesson was decreased since no new information was presented. The students already knew about Hitler’s extermination of gay and lesbian people.

In the next unit, which covers the Cold War, I made sure there was time to talk about the Lavender Scare, the U.S history government’s persecution of gays and lesbians. Occurring simultaneously with the Red Scare, the Lavender Scare was especially virulent in Florida. Chapter Two provides a more thorough summary of the events. Although it is not written on the unit organizer, in a journal entry dated January 30, 2018 when I planned the unit, I wrote, “There should be time to discuss the Lavender Scare on the same day we do the Red Dot Simulation. After we debrief, I can tell the students about it.” During the Red Dot Simulation students are randomly assigned either a black dot or a red dot which they must keep secret during the class. The goal of the black dots is to form the largest possible group without any red dots. The goal of the red dots is to secretly infiltrate and be the only red dot in a group of black dots. Students are given five minutes to form groups. The only rule is they cannot not show their dot to anyone. If a student wanted to join a group, all group members had to agree. If a student was suspected of being a red dot, they were sent to me to be questioned. At the end of the five minutes, we showed the dots and there was a victorious group. Afterwards, we debriefed the activity and students easily drew parallels between the game and the Red Scare. Kids really enjoyed the game and gained an understanding of a witch hunt. Plus it does not take the entire class period, so I knew I would have time to include the Lavender Scare information. However, because of time constraints, I decided to not address lesbian and gay families in the 1950s. We had limited to time to discuss those who did not conform to the 1950s ideal. I prioritized talking about the
Beatnik movement and youth culture, which the “students enjoy and find interesting…because they can identify with” some of the actions and complaints (Journal, February 16, 2018).

One place where I consistently incorporate LGBT history is during our study of the Civil Rights Era. Even though none standards relating to the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, SS.912.A.7.4, SS.912.A.7.5, and SS.912.A.7.9, mention LGBT civil rights, I am sure to include it. The Gay Liberation Movement is one of the four social movements I cover, other than the Black Civil Rights Movement. During the unit four days were allocated for students to work on and present their project. Students were tasked with reading about a social movement, gathering important information, and creating a children’s book about the movement (Appendix F). In each class, there were at least two groups who were assigned gay liberation. Although students were able to choose their topics, I covertly made sure groups with LGBT students were able to choose first so they could get the LGBT topic if they wanted.

The final unit covers from the 1970s through today. By the time we get to this unit, we are getting very close to the End of Course Exam. When I planned this unit on March 26, 2018, I wrote, “How am I going to cover Nixon through Obama in 14 days?!?!?” I still wanted to incorporate LGBT topics as much as possible, but the question was how? During these last days of the year, there is more lecture and discussion and less group work simply because I can move faster. Even though speed was a priority, I was still able to incorporate Reagan’s lack of response to the AIDS epidemic, and the passing of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell and the Defense of Marriage Act under Clinton. The unit calendars just list Reagan Domestic Affairs and Clinton Domestic, but I had a list of topics I wanted to cover for Clinton listed in my journal on April 10, 2018 when I planned that lesson.
During the “preactive” stage of teaching, I am aware of my lesbian identity and the relationship between it and my classroom. I am actively making the decision to include content related to LGBT topics. During a conversation with Athena, my critical friend who observed a lesson on Clinton’s domestic policies including Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell and the Defense of Marriage Act, I told her, “I’m more aware [of my lesbian identity] in the planning stages than I am in the execution stages” in response to her asking me if I was aware of my identity. She and I both agreed that sometimes we decide to talk “about historical topics that aren’t represented in the curriculum…because it’s really historically relevant”. For me, inclusion of LGBT topics goes beyond just historical relevance, and to student relevance also.

**Explicit Curriculum as a Guide**

A majority of the semester was spent on the explicit curriculum. Of the 67 days before we began reviewing for the End of Course Exam, I had planned to only disrupt the null curriculum on eight days and purposefully include LGBT topics. As will be described in question three, during instruction, unplanned discussions about LGBT history came up, but for the preactive stage of teaching, the explicit curriculum was used as a guide to incorporate LGBT topics. As stated above, of 32 the state benchmarks, 12 have the opportunity to incorporate LGBT history and some of those have multiple opportunities. None of the remarks/examples list LGBT events or people. In fact, for SS.912.A.7.9 “Examine the similarities of social movements (Native Americans, Hispanics, women, anti-war protesters) of the 1960s and 1970s,” there are no remarks/examples listed at all. It does not even say that this benchmark will be tested on the state End of Course Exam like is present for every other benchmark. This is the benchmark where the Gay Liberation movement fits.
There is one place in the explicit curriculum where a topic related to LGBT issues is mentioned in the remarks/examples. SS.912.A.7.12 to “Analyze political, economic, and social concerns that emerged at the end of the 20th century and into the 21st century” and in the remarks/examples, AIDS is mentioned. During the planning for the last unit I made sure to include the topic in the PowerPoint about Reagan. This is the only occasion in the Florida standards a topic directly related to the gay community is addressed. The standard does not give guidance in how to teach the content. As opposed to mentioning AIDS as a negative aspect of LGBT history, I chose to present the information in a critical manner. Students were presented with some of the data from the AIDS epidemic and the lack of government response. I wanted students to be critical of the government’s response or lack thereof. I also made sure to include it when talking about Clinton, since he was the first sitting president to visit the AIDS quilt. The AIDS Quilt project is memorial to those who died from AIDS. Construction began in June 1987 in San Francisco as a way to both memorialize those who died and to spread awareness of the pandemic ( NAMES Project Foundation, 2018). Since the last full viewing was in 1996, most of my students were not familiar with the project.

Since teachers are held accountable for the content they teach through both state and district exams, there is less leeway to teach outside of the standards. Teachers have to follow the state standards. Although, I would have liked to “include important LGBT court cases”, they are not part of the explicit curriculum (Journal, February 25, 2018). There are at least ten Supreme Court cases listed in the state benchmarks for the second semester. I could not add anymore to that list. Instead, I have to use the explicit curriculum to guide my planning phase.
Implicit Curriculum

As stated above, it is important for me to teach students that hard work and perseverance are vital to success. When planning for each unit, I hold students accountable through reading quizzes and vocabulary quizzes throughout the unit. There was no evidence that this part of the implicit curriculum was impacted by my sexual orientation. However, creating a classroom environment that is accepting of others and fosters students’ ability to work together was evidenced. In a journal entry from March 1, 2018, I wrote, “I hope students choose their groups for the Children’s Book assignment and don’t make a big deal about studying gay liberation”. The following day, I wrote about how glad I was the groups seemed to be working together in a respectful manner. The planning of lessons and inclusion of LGBT topics is a balancing act using the explicit curriculum between opportunity and time.

Research Question 3: In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “interactive” curricular-instructional decision-making?

The impact of my lesbian identity on “interactive” curricular-instructional decision-making was sometimes planned during the “preactive” phase but sometimes occurred spontaneously. The execution of the planned disruption of the null curriculum occurred, for the most part, in the way that I planned. In addition, a couple of unplanned opportunities arose to disrupt the null curriculum. The “interactive” teaching of the explicit curriculum, which tangentially can be connected to LGBT content, resulted in fantastic interaction and questions. Finally, students really created an accepting classroom atmosphere where respect was paramount.
Disrupting of the Null Curriculum both Planned and Spontaneous

There were four occasions when I planned to disrupt the null curriculum and each had positive and negative outcomes. The first was on January 19, 2018 when we were talking about the Holocaust. I had planned to briefly mention the persecution of homosexuals as well as Jews, since the textbook did not include that. When I brought it up, “most of the students already knew” (Journal, January 19, 2018). I was happy the students already knew, but disappointed there “was not much discussion about it” (Journal, January 19, 2018). I had hoped students would have more to say about the persecution of gay and lesbian people.

The second planned occurrence was during our study of McCarthyism. We did the Red Dot Simulation, as explained previously, and then debriefed the activity with regards to the Red Scare. The final part of the lesson was to analyze political cartoons of the era. One of the cartoons shows a teacher being investigated, which prompts questions from the students. I knew I was going to take the opportunity to discuss the Lavender Scare. As I was going through a summary, most students seemed “shocked” that something like that happened so close to home (Journal, February 7, 2018). I thought the lesson was such a success and that students really grasped the information.

The third planned disruption was in March for the civil rights movements. We had already covered the black civil rights movement and were moving on to the women’s movement, Hispanic movement, American Indian movement, and gay liberation. Students had from March 2 through March 8 to research their topic, summarize the key points, and create a children’s book about that movement. Students were able to choose their own groups and I orchestrated the topic choice to give LGBT students first choice so, if they wanted, they could choose gay liberation. On March 2, Students got into groups easily and there were no issues with choosing topics. I had
done this lesson in the past, but this time, it went perfectly. In most classes, the “LGBT students did choose to do gay liberation” but not always (Journal, March 2, 2018). One group of students who had a gay member elected to do the Hispanic movement, which “surprised me” but was probably because he is Hispanic (Journal, March 2, 2018). I was also happy that no one in any of the classes “hesitated to choose gay liberation unlike the previous year” when one group who chose last had to do gay liberation and was not happy about it (Journal, March 2, 2018). As I recall, they were a partnership of two boys who would just say “I don’t want to or it’s weird” when questioned about why they did not want to create a LGBT children’s book. In the end, they did complete the assignment.

During the information gathering stage and creation stage, students “remained on task…and were excited to share their work with me” (Journal, March 6, 2018). On the 8th, students got into small groups and shared their books. I was very happy with most of the books created by students this year. Some of the books focused on pride (Figure 14) and the actual movement (Figure 15), while others were less serious and used the literary device of personification to tell their stories (Figures 16 and 17). Others focused on the people of the movement and their experiences (Figure 18 and 19). One group even dedicated their book to me (Figure 20 and 21). During the sharing of the Children’s Books, the students had positive things to say about each other’s books. This was the “most successful year of doing this lesson” (Journal, March 6, 2018). Appendix F contains two examples of entire books written by the students.
Figure 14 - Children’s book focusing on the gay liberation movement

Figure 15 - Children’s book focusing on the gay liberation movement

Figure 16 - Children’s book using animals to tell the story

Figure 17 - Children’s book using animals to tell the story
Figure 18- Children’s book focusing on the human aspect of the gay liberation movement

Figure 19- Children’s book focusing on the human aspect of the gay liberation movement

Figure 20- Cover affirming it’s acceptable to be gay

Figure 21- Dedication of “It’s OK to be Gay”
The final planned disruption of the null curriculum came at the very end of the semester. The students were studying the domestic policies of the Clinton presidency. They had multiple topics including Monica Lewinsky affair, impeachment, the Brady Bill, and the economy. During the “preactive” stage of teaching I decided to also include the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell policy and the Defense of Marriage Act, even though it was not part of the remarks/examples for the benchmark. Students worked in groups to read a primary source about their policy and answer some questions. After each group finished, we had a class discussion about the various topics. As I walked around, students had a hard time interpreting the text of the Defense of Marriage Act Bill. It was not until I directed them to section seven that they realized “it hurt gay people” (Journal April 17, 2018). Then they read Clinton’s statement about signing the bill into law and were “confused” that he claimed to oppose discrimination against gays and lesbian people but still signed this bill into law. During the whole group discussion, students who had not read the DOMA information could not believe what happened. The students who had the reading on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell did not have any problems with the reading” and were able to expand on the content by mentioning in the whole group discussion “that Obama had stopped enforcing the policy” (Journal, April 17, 2018). Overall, this was a very successful lesson that students gained important information about the experiences of LGBT people.

I was able to disrupt the null curriculum spontaneously on two occasions. The first was a brief mention about Eleanor Roosevelt. One student brought up FDR’s multiple affairs and I told the class that Eleanor had affairs herself, including a long-term affair with a woman. I told the students many of their letters survived in which they expressed their feelings, but only hinted at a physical affair (Cook, 2000). The students asked if she was a lesbian. I responded with she
probably would not have labeled herself as one because that is a relatively new habit of putting labels like that on people. Students definitely remember that piece of information.

The other time I was able to spontaneously disrupt the null curriculum was during the civil rights children’s book assignment. While speaking with the groups who had the women’s movement, they wanted to know why “some feminists didn’t want lesbians in their groups” (Journal March 5, 2018). One of their sources was a timeline of major events in the feminist movement and it mentioned the discord between straight feminists and lesbian feminists. After talking to them about how feminists wanted to appeal to the most number of people and lesbians were on the fringe of society which detracted from the feminist message. One group even connected that idea “back to the fight for women’s vote…when they wouldn’t let black women be part” of the movement (Journal March 5, 2018). I was so amazed and happy they made that connection.

**Explicit Curriculum**

Since there was only one opportunity in the explicit curriculum to discuss something related to LGBT history, I made sure to take it. I “wish I had more time to cover Reagan’s lack of response to the AIDS epidemic” (Journal April 10, 2018). Although I was only able to briefly include the AIDS epidemic in a PowerPoint and have the students fill in their note guide with information, students were very interested in the topic. They asked about the AIDS quilt picture, wanting to know “what it was…how it was made…” (Journal April 10, 2018). We actually held a pretty long discussion about the AIDS quilt and how Reagan and George H.W. Bush did not go to see it. In a couple classes we “talked about how the surgeon general actually made Reagan mad” because he issued a statement about the epidemic and encouraged people to use condoms. Most kids were “disappointed” in Reagan’s lack of response, especially when I told them his
friend Rock Hudson died after contracting AIDS (Journal April 10, 2018). I would have liked to have been able to spend an entire day on the AIDS epidemic.

**Implicit Curriculum**

Although I emphasize work ethic as a major component of my implicit curriculum, it was the ideas of accepting one another and working together, despite differences, which really seemed to take hold during the “interactive” stage of teaching. There were many occasions throughout the semester when students would correct one another’s word choice from “gay” to describe something in a negative manner. If a student did use “gay” negatively, another would tell him to pick another word. I heard this happening at least twice a month, so it probably happened more frequently out of my earshot. Students knew not to use that word around me. I even heard one of my students correct another student in the hallway (Journal February 20, 2018). When seniors I had as students the previous year came into my room to get something or talk during a club period, they would also correct students (Journal February 14, 2018).

Further evidence of a respectful classroom came from the conversation with my critical friend. She said there was “quite a culture of inclusive students” and students were accepting of each other’s comments (Critical Conversation May 29, 2018). She observed a lesson where small groups of students had various domestic policies or events which occurred while Clinton was president. Topics included the Monica Lewinsky Affair, the Brady Bill, Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, and Defense of Marriage Act. Students were asked to read primary sources concerning one of the those topics and record on their paper what the policy was, any arguments made for/against the policy, and if it was still in effect today. Athena sat near one of the groups reading about Defense of Marriage Act and she “looked to see the reaction of group members” when they talked about same-sex marriage (Critical Conversation May 29, 2018). She did not
see “darting eyes…or [evidence] something that might be offensive to somebody else” was said (Critical Conversation May 29, 2018). It appeared to her that students were comfortable talking about LGBT topics. The students also knew that same-sex marriage was legal because of a Supreme Court case.

Also, students asked about what my girlfriend and I did over our breaks from school without any hesitation. On January 11, 2018 they wanted to know if we did anything fun over Winter break. I told them I worked at a local home décor store and did nothing fun because my girlfriend had a terrible toothache the entire second week of Winter break. They responded with “That sucks.” After spring break asked if we went anywhere. I told them Heather and I “spent a couple of days at Disney” but we didn’t leave the state. There “wasn’t any weirdness or awkwardness” when I told them about Heather or our plans. It was just like I was talking about anyone. I believe that this ability to be totally open about my life helped make students comfortable talking about LGBT topics in class.
Chapter 5
Conclusions

Teachers come to the profession as a product of their own learning and experiences (Finley, 1998; Jersild, 1955; Knowles, 1998). As they teach, they cannot help but incorporate themselves into their teaching. Although some of teachers’ selves is incorporated without forethought, much is purposefully included or excluded. Teachers must decide what to disclose about personal beliefs, their personal lives, and their past educational experiences. Teachers are also tasked with making multiple curricular-instructional decisions both while planning learning opportunities and during the teaching of the learning opportunities. Simply put, teachers are the most important curricular and instructional gatekeepers in the classroom (Thornton, 1991).

Gay and lesbian teachers must also decide whether to disclose their sexual orientation and, if so, when and in what ways. It follows that as teachers make curricular-instructional decisions, their identity, with regards to race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, becomes part of that decision-making process. This study was undertaken to explore the relationship between my identity as a lesbian and my identity, beliefs, and practice as a teacher. I sought to answer the following three research questions:

1. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my beliefs about curriculum and teaching?

2. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “preactive” curricular-instructional decision-making?
3. In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my “interactive” curricular-instructional decision-making?

In order to understand the relationship between my sexual orientation and my teaching, I collected data from a variety of sources during the second semester of the 2017-2018 school year. I wrote an autobiographical sketch, which I then analyzed according to Jackson’s (2007) stages of coming out for teachers. I also kept a statement about my beliefs about teaching and learning, which I coded for Jackson’s stages and then coded for either explicit curriculum, implicit curriculum, or null curriculum. Also, throughout the semester I collected planning samples in the form of my unit calendars where I decided what to include in the unit, lesson plan samples which described how I was going to teach the curriculum, and artifacts from teaching, such as I kept a reflective journal of significant interactions between my sexual orientation and my teaching. I also had a critical friend observe a lesson and we debriefed the lesson together, talking about the classroom environment, the lesson, and the possible impact of my sexual orientation. After the semester ended, I analyzed the data I collected throughout the semester. The remainder of the chapter contains the interpretation of the findings, the limitations of the study, my reflection on my experience as the researcher, the implications of the study, and recommendations for future research.

**Interpretation of Findings**

The findings of this self-study presented multiple themes for the ways in which my lesbian identity affects my teaching practice. I begin with the discussion of my own progression through Jackson’s (2007) stages of coming out. Then, the interaction between my lesbian identity and the following themes will be discussed: classroom environment, my curricular-
instructional decision-making, high stakes accountability, students groups, and spontaneous inclusions will be discussed.

**Jackson’s (2007) Stages of Coming Out**

After reading through the data collected for the first research question (In what ways does my sexual orientation affect my beliefs about curriculum and teaching?), it became apparent that my beliefs about teaching and learning and my identity as a teacher changed as I became more comfortable with my identity as a lesbian throughout my career. By using Jackson’s (2007) stages of coming out to code my autobiographical sketch, it became apparent as my identity as a teacher and my identity as a lesbian became more ingrained individually, they became more entangled, to the point that, today they cannot be separated. I exemplified Jackson’s (2007) stages of teachers coming out. At the beginning of my career I was nervous about students finding out I was in a relationship with a woman and “being out at work…never crossed my mind” (Appendix A). At the same time, I was a brand new teacher and still figuring out my teacher persona. I was in an unadorned closet built of textbooks and standards. I limited myself with teaching and my relationships with people at work. Through the next few years, my teacher identity became more defined. I could elaborate on my beliefs about teaching and learning using educational language and I learned to back up classroom decisions with standards and content. I gained this educational knowledge during the “super-teacher” phase of coming out (Jackson, 2007). I earned my reading endorsement and Master’s degree. I wrote trainings and trained other teachers on incorporating reading and math skills into social studies classes. I was doing everything I could to become an expert. The professional closet I had built was still made of textbooks and standards, but it became flimsier as I poked holes to find outside resources. I began to take more risks in my classroom and was “on the verge” of coming out to my students
as I saw some of them struggling with their own sexuality. It was seeing this struggle in a student with whom I had developed a rapport that prompted me to come out to her (Appendix A). I have been out ever since.

Professionally, I am not hesitant to move beyond the textbook and state standards. Walls built of textbooks no longer confine me when making instructional decisions. Jackson’s (2007) stages include a “post-coming out” stage where teachers become the “gay poster child” and then an “authentic teacher” (Jackson, 2007, p. 71). During my own “gay poster child” phase colleagues asked for my opinion about LGBT topics or looked to me for how to address something in their classroom, which does align with Jackson’s stage of “gay poster child” where a gay teacher becomes the go-to resource or all things LGBT-related (2007). They also come to me to get advice or talk about a variety of topics that have little to do with sexual orientation, pedagogical choices, behavior management questions, content questions, and teacher/student interactions. So in my case, it seems going through the “super-teacher” phase has had a lasting effect on my relationships with colleagues.

The “authentic teacher” phase occurs when teachers are able to integrate all aspects of their identity (Jackson, 2007). Like Jackson’s participants, I too made an effort to include LGBT content when I first came out, but as I continue to evolve as a teacher, I feel most authentic when all parts of my identity are woven together. I include LGBT content because I am a lesbian, and as such am more aware of its absence, and I include feminist content because I am a feminist, but I also make references to the musical Hamilton and the Harry Potter series because I love those as well. I also include LGBT content because I believe in an inclusive, accurate historical narrative. The “gay poster child” phase continues to occur as I serve as a resource for colleagues, but my identity as an authentic teacher continuously evolves as I change as a person.
Classroom Environment

One area where my sexual orientation has the greatest impact on my beliefs is the classroom environment. I am sure to make my classroom representative in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. For example, I have a poster which disabuses the gender roles stereotypes. I also display student work when we study the experiences of various ethnic groups in U.S. History. With respect to sexual orientation, the multiple posters including gay people or featuring alternatives for the word “gay” make it apparent I will not tolerate disrespectful actions or words in the classroom. Those posters would have never been in my classroom prior to me being out.

Curricular-Instructional Decision-Making

For my second research question, during the pre-active teaching phase, my sexual orientation impacted the explicit and null curriculum instructional decision-making more than the implicit curricula. As I planned each unit with the explicit curriculum, I actively sought ways to disrupt and move beyond the null curriculum. For example, part of the explicit curriculum is to teach about McCarthyism and the Red Scare; I also make sure to include the Lavender Scare when planning my instruction (Journal Entry Jan. 30, 2018). When I teach about the multiple civil rights movements of the late 1960s, I include gay liberation even though it is not included in the remarks/examples of the state standards (Appendix E). These are decisions I make during the planning stages and are done with the intent to inform students about content they would not be exposed to otherwise in school, as far as I am aware since LGBT content is not in the state standards. The state standards make sure to include major African-American, Mexican-American, and women’s contributions to U.S. History, but leave out the history and contributions of LGBT figures. Many of the standards include the phrase “events that shaped
American history”, yet, according to the standards, no part of LGBT history has shaped the broader American history. I decide to include LGBT content and contributions because I am a lesbian and I want my LGBT students to see themselves in the content. I also want all students of all orientations to recognize and understand the contributions and issues associated with LGBT Americans. In contrast, one of my colleagues does not include the Lavender Scare or gay liberation when he teaches the same course. He is a wonderful teacher who is progressive and an ally to LGBT causes, yet he does not make the time to include this content. I argue that because I am a lesbian and this history is important to me, I make more of an effort to include it, even though it is not required.

**High Stakes Accountability**

Although I do include some content related to LGBT history and issues, I do not take every opportunity that I identified in the state standards. As I reviewed my journal, I realize I could do more. For example, I could include the experience of lesbian and gay families during our study of 1950s conformity. I could also include the experiences of gay and lesbian service members in World War II, the Korean War, or Vietnam. There have also been numerous court cases, such as ONE v. Olsen (1958), Boutelier v. Immigration and Naturalization Service (1967), or Lawrence v. Texas (2003), I could include. As I try to discern why I do not include these topics, I realize that the high stakes testing movement impinges on my curricular-instructional decision-making as it does on so many other teachers (Grant, 2010) I feel as though I do not have enough time to include those additional topics alongside the explicit curriculum because I know the students will be held accountable for certain information on their End of Course exam. In turn, I too will be held accountable for the success of the students on the End of Course exam through the number of students who earn a passing score. I also incorporate topics, which are
most closely linked to the state standards so that I am still covering the explicit curriculum. Since students are required to know the American Indian Movement, Hispanic Rights Movement, and Women’s Rights Movement, it is easy to add the LGBT Rights Movement to the list since it will not take a lot of time. I use the same thinking for covering Clinton’s domestic policies—students have to know about his impeachment, the Family Medical Leave Act, and the Brady Bill. Adding Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell and the Defense of Marriage Act into the lesson plan does not strain the timeline before the End-of-Course exam. Whereas, if I were to include the Supreme Court cases mentioned earlier, that would be an additional lesson which could possibly take away a day or two from the explicit curriculum. Although I want students to learn about LGBT people and their impact on United States history, I still find it difficult to let go of the explicit curriculum, which is tested.

**Student Groups**

Another area where my sexual orientation impacts my pre-active instructional decision-making is when grouping students or assigning topics to various groups. Although all students will eventually be exposed to the LGBT content, when possible, I want to ensure my LGBT students have the opportunity to study it more in-depth so I assign them to LGBT topics or at the very least, give them the opportunity to choose to work with that content. That way they are responsible for teaching the other students about the topic.

**Spontaneous Inclusion**

Where my sexual orientation impacted the explicit and null curriculum decision-making but not the implicit curricula decision-making during the pre-active phase of teaching, the opposite was true for the interactive part of teaching. I found my sexual orientation impacted the implicit curriculum during the interactive phase of teaching, but the explicit and null curricular
decision-making was not as impacted during this phase. Timeliness, perseverance, hard work, and acceptance of others are the main components to my implicit curriculum. The part of the implicit curriculum most related to my sexual orientation is the acceptance of others and the ability to work together because like most members of an “other” group, I am more aware of the importance of these skills. Most of the time, my identity as a lesbian comes into play when I correct students’ word choice when describing something as “gay” or have side conversations with small groups about working together. Students will complain about working with certain students and this gives me an opportunity to talk to them about learning to work together and to use each other’s strengths to achieve a goal. Since there is not any explicit instruction in these skills in high school, taking the opportunity when it comes up, like I described in Chapter 4, is important to me. Other times, just random conversations with students about their lives or current events they heard about give opportunities for me to teach acceptance or working together. I think the reason my lesbian identity has more of an impact on the implicit curriculum during the interactive stage of teaching is because I have already planned the impact of my sexual orientation on the explicit and null curricula during the pre-active stage of teaching. Also, although I have some LGBT content knowledge about the major events, I do not know enough to spontaneously include LGBT content in all the units we study, which is where the explicit and null curriculum would be most impacted. This self-study has shown me there is room for professional growth in my content knowledge about LGBT history. I would like to know more of the history so I can include it in lessons or as spontaneous piece of information if students ask.

Limitations

As a relatively new method of academic research, self-study receives criticism concerning “what counts as research, data, knowledge, evidence, and effectiveness, and who I
the final analysis can legitimately be regarded as a knower about issues related to teaching, learning, and teacher development “(Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2004, p. 46). Leaders in the self-study movement have established guidelines in order to combat some of the criticism. Bullough & Pinnegar (2001) lay out 13 guidelines and answer the question of when self-study becomes research. According to them, “when biography and history are joined, when the issue confronted by the self is shown to have relationship to and bearing on the context and ethos of a time, then self-study moves to research” (p. 15). They go on to say there has to be a balance between the self and the practice. Self-study research “does not focus on the self per se but on the space between the self and practice” (p. 15). Self-study researchers must use a variety of methods to help illuminate this space between. During this study I made attempted to balance the self and my practice through multiple forms of data, journals, critical friend observation and conversations, artifacts from my classroom, and lesson planning artifacts.

Self-study researchers do not embrace the positivist ideas of validity resting on “objectivity, reliability, and generalizability” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 163). Instead, they adopt other concepts of authority- authority of position, authority of reason, and authority of experience (Munby & Russell, 1994). Authority of position comes from the title a person has. In this case researcher and teacher. Authority of reason is more in line with the traditional research validity practices. While authority from experience is the “knowledge that resides in action” (Munby & Russell, 1994, p. 92) combined with the idea of personal practical knowledge which is knowledge that “emerges from our narrative history as humans and names the things we have learned that have become intuitive and instinctive” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 21). This type of personal practical knowledge guides teachers' decision-making without awareness. So instead of insisting upon validity, self-study researchers make claims about actions and

Self-study researchers seek to establish trustworthiness but acknowledge only “the reader can decide about the quality of evidence gathering and the value of the work” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 154). To help establish trustworthiness, Mishler (1990) advocated for the use of exemplars by researchers to heighten the “visibility of the work” (p. 429). Exemplars are the specific examples of the data collected or the detailed description of the data. Exemplars allow the reader to visualize the study by providing context. Including exemplars gives readers an insight into researcher’s thinking and analysis. In this study, I have articulated each step of the research process and provide this for the readers.

Self-study researchers acknowledge the lack of generalizability, but also reject the idea as related to their research. Instead, the aim of the research is to provide exemplars for readers so they may use the information in their own practice and for other researchers (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Contextualized knowledge is specific to the study, but there are similarities and times readers can use that context as their own. Although this study is specific to myself and my context, other lesbian social studies teachers can use my experience to adjust their actions. In order for this to happen, I have provided descriptions of my experience. In addition, Donmoyer (1990) using Piaget’s ideas of assimilation, accommodation, integration, and differentiation as his schema to promote the generalizability of single case studies, argues that case studies allow readers to live vicariously through the case study. Donmoyer (1990) continues to say there are multiple advantages to case studies with regards to generalizability----accessibility, seeing through the researcher’s eyes, and decreased defensiveness. Accessibility in case studies allows
the reader to go “to places where most of us would not have an opportunity to go…and experience vicariously unique situations and unique individuals” (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 193). Not everyone knows lesbian social studies teachers or their experiences, so this will allow them to read about that experience. He goes on to say “from the schema theory view of generalizability, the purpose of research is simply to expand the range of interpretations available to the research consumer…[and] uniqueness is an asset rather than a liability” (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 194). This study also allows the readers to see the researcher’s eyes. By “expanding the reader’s cognitive structures” through this case study they will be able to expand their practice by drawing upon my experience. Finally, readers will, hopefully, be less defensive about exploring the interaction of their own identity and teaching.

Finally, through the collection of multiple pieces of data will allow analysis from multiple perspectives. Although triangulation (Mathison, 1988) and crystallization (Tobin & Begley, 2004) all allow for transparency in a subjective view. Self-study researchers do not see subjectivity as a negative; instead, they are more aware of the subjectivity and make sure to use voices from the field to challenge the subjective conclusions. Critical friends, participants, and exemplars all work to challenge the subjective nature of a self-study.

As with any research, researcher bias was a possibility. As I went through the semester, it was possible I actively sought new sources of information to help me incorporate more LGBT content or to influence my relationships with students. However, if I did, this only enhances the purpose of a self-study since one main goal is professional development (Cole & Knowles, 1998).
Reflection on Research Experience

Since the goals of self-study research is self-understanding and professional development (Cole & Knowles, 1998), this study showed me my sexual orientation does impact my teaching in multiple ways and has since I began teaching. The study has also shown me where I could improve my teaching practice. It has also made me more aware of my decision-making process with regard to the inclusion and exclusion of content. I know that I include LGBT content, which is most easily linked to state standards and there are more opportunities to include more. For future semesters, I plan on incorporating more LGBT content and asking students to question why LGBT history is not part of the explicit curriculum. Delving into my daily practice, both the pre-active and interactive stages of teaching illuminated some preconceived ideas I had about the extent of the impact of my sexual orientation. Although I do not want to be known as the “lesbian teacher” at school --- a teacher who bends all the content to fit a LGBT lens --- I do want to be known as the teacher who will include LGBT content. I am happy to serve as a resource for my colleagues who ask for assistance in this regard. My school does onsite professional development where teachers host mini-professional development sessions for other teachers. These sessions are 30 minutes and cover a topic the host teacher has done in her classroom. After doing this study, I would consider hosting one of these sessions for my colleagues.

However, the study also revealed some surprising findings to me. When I embarked on my study, I thought my identity would thoroughly permeate all of my teaching and am surprised there were not more instances. I found I was still just incorporating the surface information or the easy information, rather than issues of more or deeper substance. I also realized that I could make more of an effort to include more LGBT content throughout the semester; there were
several opportunities that, in retrospect, I could have taken to discuss LGBT people, contributions, events, and issues. In the future, I especially want to include information about families during the 1950s since so many students have an image of the “ideal, nuclear family” from the 1950s in their heads. Between popular culture images of the 1950s and the state standards emphasis on conformity of the 1950s, I want to be sure to elaborate on those who did not fit those images. In class we spend a day talking about the minorities and lower class people who did not adhere to the norms. Next year I will add in LGBT families to that lesson.

I also thought I would see more interactions with students where my sexual orientation would play a role. In previous years, I had developed good relationships with my students by the second semester, both with individuals and with classes as a group. These positive relationships brought my sexual orientation into the light semi-frequently. However, during this time period of study, my relationships with students were not the same. I think it was because I had an intern the semester previous to the study so I was not as present in the day-to-day lives of the students the first semester of school. I recorded more interactions with students from my second and third periods than any other class throughout the study, and that is the class where I would most often pop in during the first semester or be in the class when my intern was teaching. Although not directly related to the study, this pattern certainly made me aware of the impact of having an intern on my relationships with students.

Engaging in self-study both pointed out areas of improvement and validated other areas. I am proud that I have been able to help students see themselves in U.S. history and hopefully helped non-LGBT students see the importance of others. I hope to continue and do even more to be inclusive with regards to the historical narrative. I believe teachers want to be positive role models and I hope that I am that for my students. Many students across the country are not
exposed to some of the LGBT information I teach or have an out teacher, I believe I am giving my students an advantage.

In the area of the self-study research, I think my experience could be a guide for future researchers. Although self-study has been traditionally been used by teacher-educators, perhaps now, practicing teachers can use the method to investigate their own practice.

**Implications**

This study has demonstrated the need for more resources for teachers to use to teach LGBT content. Although I have a few books, I am now purposefully building a professional library related to LGBT issues and history so that I have more information readily available. The book already in my library that I have found most useful is *Understanding and Teaching U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History* edited by Leila J. Rupp and Susan K. Freeman, which has fairly short chapters about LGBT history. Their intended audience seems to be teachers and most of the chapters are written so that teachers can easily incorporate the content into class. At the top of my list is an additional copy of David Johnson’s *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*. I would like to have another copy for students and other teachers to read. I want to add all of Lillian Faderman’s books, but am starting with *To Believe in Woman: What Lesbians Have Done for America*. In this book, Faderman highlights the actions of women from the late 19th and early 20th centuries who today would be called lesbians and worked to achieve rights. She argues that not being in a heterosexual relationship freed these women to focus on improving lives for all women. In *A Desired Past: A Short History of Same-Sex Love in America* by Leila Rupp provides a brief overview of homosexuals throughout American history. She provides stories about a variety of races and classes. Although *Gay and Lesbian History for Kids: The Century-Long Struggle for
LGBT Rights by Jerome Pohlen is meant for students in grades five through eight, I would like to keep it on my shelf for students to read during down time or as a reference for other teachers. The book tells the stories of LGBT people from history and their impact on the United States. It also has activities students can complete after learning about people like General von Steuben in the American Revolution, Jane Addams and her settlement houses, and Bayard Rustin, a leader in the Black Civil Rights Movement. Pohlen’s book also recounts significant moments in LGBT history like the Lavender Scare, the Stonewall uprising, and the AIDS crisis. A book that I want to add just in case I have to teach world history is Days of Love: Celebrating LGBT History One Story at a Time by Elisa Rolle. Rolle provides stories from more than 700 LGBT couples over the course of 2000 years. Most of the above books are survey books in order to provide information about multiple topics since that is the type of course I teach.

As I reflect on my own knowledge and help my colleagues incorporate LGBT content into lesson planning, it is obvious that there is a dearth of information and professional development (PD) for teachers. To begin with, ready made lessons to help teachers easily incorporate LGBT content would make it easy for teachers. Also the GLSEN website offers some resources, it is not extensive, nor are the lessons easy to incorporate for a full class period (GLSEN, 2018). Recently, searching the Internet for LGBT lesson plans yields more results than in the past, however, there is ample space to create more. It would also help other teachers incorporate more LGBT content into their curriculum if district PD trainings were offered. Teacher workshops that included incorporating LGBT content in the various social studies would be beneficial for many teachers. Course specific offerings would help teachers increase their content area knowledge and be applicable for what they teach. Another option, either embedded
within or as a separate course, could be creating a LGBT inclusive classroom which addressed pedagogical decisions and classroom environment.

It also seems clear that LGBT figures and contributions need to be included in the state standards for U.S. History. The inclusion of LGBT history in the state standards would re-define the events that shaped American history by being more inclusive. Beginning with the first standard of second semester, LGBT history should be included with the experiences of LGBT people in the military during World War II (SS.912.A.6.3), how rights for LGBT people changed during World War II (SS.912.A.6.4), and how LGBT people adapted to wartime domestic government policy (SS.912.A.6.5). In the benchmark about the effect of the Red Scare (SS.912.A.6.8), the Lavender Scare should be included in the Remarks/Examples listed.

Standard 7 about contemporary American life also has multiple opportunities to add specifics about LGBT history. SS.912.A.7.1 asks students to identify causes for Post-World War II prosperity and its effects on American society. In the Remarks/Examples, conformity of the 1950s, Beatniks, and protest in the 1960s are specifically mentioned. The Remarks/Examples should also include LGBT families as examples of non-conformity. Another opportunity in standards is in SS.912.A.7.3 where the changing status of women is examined. The Remarks/Examples should include the intersection of the early lesbian movement and feminism. There are also opportunities to discuss the various changes in civil rights protections during the 20th century. The most obvious place to include LGBT history is when comparing the approaches used by groups to achieve civil rights (SS.912.A.7.5) and examining the similarities of social movements (SS.912.A.7.9). African Americans, women, Native Americans, and Hispanics are all mentioned in the standards. It would be a simple addition to include LGBT people. Major Supreme Court decisions related to LGBT people and rights could be included in
SS.912.A.7.8 which already includes Supreme Court cases relating to affirmative actions, reproductive rights, integration, and other topics. Although the Supreme Court cases related to same-sex marriage fall outside the date range of the course, hopefully, they will be included when the standards are updated. Another area in the second semester is with the board benchmark SS.912.A.7.12 which asks students “to analyze political, economic, and social concerns that emerged at the end of the 20th century and into the 21st century”. In the Remarks/Examples AIDS is mentioned, which does pertain to LGBT history. However, the Defense of Marriage Act, Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, and hate crimes like Matthew Shephard could be included. The standard which asks students to examine changes in immigration policy could include the Boutilier Immigration case (SS.912.A.7.16). The very last standard, (SS.912.A.7.17), has students examine key events and people in Florida history where Anita Bryant and the “Save Our Children” campaign should be included in the Remarks/Examples. Just two of the six content standards provide all of the above opportunities to include LGBT history.

Since this study focused on the first semester, only examples related to that content have been described above. However, there are also opportunities to include LGBT content into the first semester of the U.S. History course, thus negating the idea that LGBT history began with the Stonewall Inn event. During the first semester, students could study how the same-sex relationships of muckrakers like Jane Addams freed her from looking after children and a husband so that she could focus on reforms. Or students could learn about how industrialization provided more opportunities for more people to engage in same-sex encounters because of the anonymity large cities offered. Another opportunity arises during the study of the 1920s and the Harlem Renaissance, where it was common to see same sex relationships and men and women
dressing against the gender norms of the time. Presenting the lives of LGBT people throughout the nation’s history gives voice to the people who came before who might not have been seen in their entirety. Although it may be challenging to incorporate information from early America because of a lack of forthright primary source material, with careful reading evidence can be found. Because of societal norms and expectations of early America, it is more difficult to construct the historical narrative with LGBT (in today’s language) figures and stories.

This study has also demonstrated that students appreciate learning about LGBT content and do not resist the inclusion in the curriculum, at least at my school site. Both LGBT and straight students gained valuable knowledge about the experiences and contributions of LGBT Americans. In fact, some students expressed gratitude for “including people who were like them” (Journal Entry March 2, 2018). So teachers should not hesitate to include LGBT content on the basis of student objections.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Although a self-study provides an excellent way to explore an individual’s relationship between self and practice, it would future studies could include multiple practicing lesbian teachers. One possibility would be a qualitative study that delves into the lives of lesbian teachers to determine if, and in what ways, their identity as lesbians affects their teaching. Conducting interviews would help determine the extent to which the results from this study are similar to the experiences of other teachers. I think that some lesbian teachers would incorporate LGBT content and be aware of the impact of their own sexual identity. Classroom observations could also shed light on the extent to which LGBT inclusive content is being taught in classrooms. Classroom observations also would illuminate how someone else sees the effect of lesbian identity on classroom practice. Interviewing students about their experiences in a lesbian
teacher’s class would provide another perspective on the influence of identity on classroom practice. A mixed methods study could be conducted by creating a survey tool to identify the lesbian teachers who are in various stages of Jackson’s (2007) coming out process. Once those have been identified, participants could be recruited from each stage to be interviewed about their teaching beliefs and actions. A quantitative study could also be devised wherein the experiences of multiple teachers could be examined through a two-part survey, which, in part one, asks teachers to choose their degree of outness. Then in part two of the survey, teachers could indicate, from a pre-determined list, ways in which their lesbian identity affects their teaching and the degree to which she includes LGBT content. It could also be surprising to analyze the state standards from all 50 states for inclusion of LGBT content. Looking at both the standards and the discussion regarding the inclusion of LGBT content could help policy makers to incorporate LGBT content in states like Florida, which do not include the content. Analyzing recently published textbooks for LGBT figures would be indicative of the level of acceptance in society. Comparing teacher education programs at the university level would also inform the discipline about what is being done to prepare future teachers to include LGBT content and identify areas where improvements could be made. Lastly, a study that examines teachers’ curricular and instructional decision-making on students’ retention of information and skills. The study could compare the results on an assessment between teachers who emphasize the importance of their “pre-active” curricular-instructional decision-making and teachers who emphasize the importance of their “interactive” curricular-instructional decision-making.

Research about LGBT teachers is a field where much can still be investigated. This self-study is only one of many stories that are waiting to be told. Although my experiences may be
unique, my experiences, and those of other lesbian teachers, could help others navigate their own story.
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Appendix A

Autobiographical Sketch

I did not always know that I was meant to be a teacher. Just as I did not always know that I was meant to be a lesbian. Yet, as these two parts of me developed, they grew together in a way that would not allow me to fully exist without both. Growing up, I wanted to be a ballerina, then a lawyer, then a doctor. I finally settled on psychology as my program of study in school. I enjoyed the content and found it to be pretty easy. During my undergrad years, I also volunteered with AmeriCorps. I worked with a group of women and we went into low-income schools to tutor elementary students in reading. I found it rewarding to help students and cultivate those relationships. But after graduation I didn’t know what my next steps should be. I was working at a restaurant when a co-worker was hired to teach. I thought, I could do that; I enjoyed working with the students. I knew I didn’t want to teach elementary school, but if I taught high school, I could teach psychology and use my degree. Unfortunately, I couldn’t find a position in high school. I was able to find a position teaching Language Art, Reading, and Social Studies in 6th grade. Although not my ideal position, it was a stepping stone into the district and I was excited to start teaching.

Around the same time, I met my first girlfriend. My two roommates both had girlfriends; so much of my social life was spent in lesbian circles. I had dated men in the past, but it always seemed a little off. So when I met Anna (pseudonym) and we hit it off, I was excited. Things moved quickly. I was overwhelmed as a first year teacher, but she helped me focus and took care of a lot of things. I distinctly remember sitting in my classroom that first year and being nervous...
about an upcoming observation, but also nervous about our first date. That dual feeling of anxiousness is tied together for me. As a new teacher and new lesbian, being out at work with my students and the greater faculty never crossed my mind. When one of my roommates (who looked like a stereotypical lesbian) started subbing at the school, I tended to avoid her during the day or only talk to her when students weren’t around.

As time moved on things changed. Anna and I grew apart, while I grew into my role as a teacher. I started finding my teacher persona and connecting with other teachers, including lesbian teachers. Anna wasn’t part of the education world and the distance between us grew to be too much and our relationship ended. However, my relationships with my co-workers continued to become central to my life. For the next three and half years, my co-workers and my work were the focus. I became good friends with Barb, a fellow lesbian, social-studies teacher. We frequently attended concerts, pride events, and other activities together. During this time, I became more comfortable with my lesbian identity. After a brief stint wearing cargo shorts and having very short hair, I reverted back to dresses, skirts, long hair, and ballet flats. I didn’t feel the need to project my lesbian identity in easily identifiable characteristics. In social situations, I didn’t need to show my lesbian-ness, I could just be.

In my classroom, when we talked about current events, I was more likely to bring up LGBT rights and gay marriage than in the past. Since it was early 2000s, this was still a hot topic in current events. However, I was not out with my students or with all my colleagues. Those with whom I spent a lot of time knew, but many didn’t. I remember standing in the lunch line with a reading teacher with whom I had had many conversations. For some reason, we talked about something and I mentioned something about my ex-girlfriend. The reading teacher was shocked, her jaw actually dropped, when she realized I was a lesbian. I began to ponder if I
was actively hiding my sexual orientation or just not mentioning it. This prompted more introspection and I found myself questioning my place as a lesbian teacher at a school where there were many of us, yet none were out. As I watched students struggle with their own sexual orientation, I struggled with my own conflict about being out and the message that “being in” sent those students. I knew some thought I was a lesbian. I don’t know if it was bringing up LGBT issues or not allowing the use of the word gay as a slur or hanging out with other lesbian teacher. I became more bothered by the “disconnect” between my experience and what I was teaching. Every year when we talked about the Bill of Rights or campaign issues, inevitably, gay marriage would come up and if it did not, I brought it up as an issue. As a social studies educator I encouraged my students to think for themselves and went out of my way to not tell them what I thought about any political issue. I kept thinking though, why shouldn’t I tell them I think two people who love one another should have the right to get married? Is it a political issue or a human rights issue. I began to wonder if I brought up issues related to LGBT people too frequently and if my being a lesbian caused that. After hearing some particularly hurtful speech by a student directed at another student, I almost came out to my students but chickened out at the last minute, too concerned with all the possible after effects. I wondered if they or their parents would care. I discussed this conundrum with other lesbian teachers. They said their sexual orientation did not matter and did not impact their teaching. But if it was impacting mine, how could it not impact theirs?

During these years and the following three at a different middle school, I continued to grow professionally. I earned my Masters, took on the leadership role of subject area leader, and began training other teachers for the county. I even did the Code of Ethics training, which created the largest, and most concerning, discrepancy. My training partner was Barb and as two
lesbian teachers, we instructed teachers on various elements of the Code of Ethics. One of the points was not discriminating against students on the basis of their sexual orientation. However, in the list of things employees cannot be discriminated for, sexual orientation is left out. So we stood up there, telling teachers to not discriminate, when we were not protected from discrimination. Although a startling realization, neither one of us wanted to make an issue of it. So we continued training and growing as professionals. My personal life was pretty stagnant, but it didn’t bother me. I had a few dates here and there, but nothing really clicked. So I continued focusing on work. My last year teaching middle school, I became close with a student who was struggling with her sexual orientation, along with typical 8th grade issues. After much internal debate, I decided to come out to her. She was in my classroom and we were talking about problems she was having with her mother accepting her sexual orientation. I took a deep breath and told her my coming out story. I remember feeling scared but also free. She was intrigued and asked questions. She told me she had never had a teacher come out. We talked about how it is scary for a teacher and what it could mean for my job. I didn’t explicitly ask her not to tell anyone, but I don’t think she told her classmates or her parents. We continued to have a positive relationship and still keep in touch six years later. This continued relationship reassures me that telling her was the right thing to do. She is currently going to school to be a science teacher.

I am currently in my sixth year at a high school. After that feeling of freedom and lightness, I wasn’t sure I could hide or diminish that part of myself. So I decided not to. I didn’t dodge questions about my personal life or change pronouns. I also didn’t explicitly come out during a “get to know your teacher” speech at the beginning of the year. Instead, I answered honestly which turned out to be the right decision for me. It turns out that my sexual orientation
is posted on the Internet. For one of my Master’s classes, we had to write a blog communicating with someone from another country. In that blog, I talked about my experiences as a lesbian. Since this was an assignment done through a class, I thought they would be removed once the course completed. They were not and students found my entries. It was a student I had my second year, Will, who told me about it. I am so glad I didn’t deny being a lesbian or try to hide it. The message of shame that would have sent to Will and other LGBT students would have haunted me. Instead, he and I became close, especially his senior year, when he began dating guys. Again, it seems as though I became a mentor for another LGBT student. But he wasn’t the only student who turned to me when they needed to talk about their same-sex relationships. Students, both boys and girls, would come to talk at lunch or during a club period. I felt as though I was making an impact in those students’ lives.

I also worked to make both LGBT and non-LGBT students more aware of the existence of LGBT historical figures and challenges. I worked it into the curriculum and purposefully assigned LGBT topics to LGBT students. I wanted to see them reflected in the curriculum. This self-study was prompted by those goals. Do I really incorporate content? Is it because I am a lesbian or because it’s what I’m supposed to do?

A few years ago I began dating my girlfriend Heather. We are building a life and a future together. Now I am comfortable with whom I am and very rarely pause before mentioning my girlfriend by name or using feminine pronouns. I don’t hesitate to share that part of my life. I have fully integrated my identities as a lesbian and a teacher.

Throughout this narrative, the impact of the country’s political discourse surrounding gay rights is absent. When thinking back about what was happening politically, I’m not certain how much they impacted my personal path. In 2003 when the Supreme Court ruled sodomy laws
unconstitutional, I was starting my first year teaching and beginning my first same-sex relationship. My world was filled with teaching conundrums and changes; I wasn’t looking at politics. Even though many states were either legalizing same-sex marriage or civil unions during my early years teaching, I knew my then girlfriend was not who I was going to marry. In fact, I hadn’t given much thought to marriage at all, so the legalizing of it did not have a big personal impact for me. During the mid 2000s through 2015, the events surrounding same-sex marriage made their way into my classroom through current event discussions, about which at first I was nervous. Even in 2015, after the Supreme Court legalized marriage nationwide, I remember being happy that the right was finally granted; but I still didn’t see myself getting married. By that time, I had been teaching as an out lesbian for three years, so there was little impact on my teaching. Perhaps it was my own privilege of being accepted and not dealing with many instance of discrimination which made the political events during these years less impactful.
Appendix B

Beliefs about Teaching and Learning

My beliefs about teaching and learning developed through my own experiences as a student, my changing experiences as a teacher, and my education courses. Growing up I was a good student. I did my work and took pride in the grades I earned. My teachers in high school seemed to believe more practice and more work would lead to greater performance. I remember taking copious notes on history chapters and completing at least 30 practice math problems. My lab reports were ten pages long. I read nearly every book assigned in English (not Frankenstein; it was too detail heavy). I was a nerd and loved it. Not everyone in my school was like me, but many were. For me learning was and is about putting in the work and the time. Taking the 45 minutes to read a chapter and take notes. Although I wished I could learn without the work, I knew it did not work. Today as a teacher I expect the same. I expect students to take the time to learn the content. The methods I use are more structured in order to provide more incentive. Students have reading quizzes on a section of the textbook. They are supposed to take notes ahead of time and are able to use these notes on the quiz. I teach them to use an outline format because that is what I used and I was successful. I also have students write vocabulary term definitions before the vocab quiz. Many want to type the terms, but I require handwritten. I firmly believe the process of writing helps ingrain the information into memory. A difference from my education and how I teach my students is the amount of exposure students get to content. I remember covering information once and then moving on to something new. However, I try to expose my students to the content multiple times before a test. They read the textbook,
write the definitions, and in class we do an activity related to the content. I think multiple exposures to information help students retain information. Because of my hard work in school, I believe hard work and personal responsibility help make students into better learners.

I came into teaching with a lot of those beliefs, which had to quickly be mediated as a 6th grade language arts teacher in a Title I school. Although I maintained my belief that hard work creates better learners, I came to understand the opportunities to take the time for hard work were not always available. Students couldn’t do the homework when their power was turned off or when they had to watch their younger siblings while their mom was at work. I had to adapt my techniques in the classroom. Instead of reading for homework, I had to provide time in class to read. Instead of the lecture style or drills I did as a student, I incorporated active learning strategies in order to keep students engaged in a lesson. Instead of doing mostly independent work, I found time for students to work together and discuss information. Once I moved schools and began teaching 8th grade, I continued active learning strategies and using graphic organizers for notes, but I did incorporate more personal responsibility at home and asked students to complete homework. As I honed my craft, I saw students making connections between topics and content. They began asking questions and wanting to know more. Students began being more involved in current events. As I finished my last three years as a middle school teacher at a magnet school with mostly students identified as gifted, I again increased my expectations for work done at home. However, I made sure to incorporate even more extension activities. My in-class lessons relied more on application of information and active learning. Since students already had some background knowledge, we were able to delve more deeply into the details of the content.
I now teach at an affluent high school where students are held accountable for learning and completing assignments outside of school. They have weekly reading quizzes and vocabulary quizzes. However, in class our learning activities are focused on reviewing the information or thinking like a historian. There is a large variety in the types of activities students do to demonstrate their knowledge and application of historical thinking. Most days are filled with students working in groups or partners to analyze primary and secondary sources or to create a pneumonic device to remember content. Students work to create posters depicting key events of time periods. Each day brings something new. There are days when I lecture, but it is because that topic is generally confusing to students and I want to guide them through the information. Other days, students work independently to learn about content. I want to make sure students who like working in groups have that opportunity, but that students who like working independently also have that opportunity. I believe that variety is the way to ensure student engagement. Keeping students on their toes doesn’t allow them to dread coming to class since they don’t know how they will be learning. As I’ve changed schools, both grade levels and socioeconomic status, I have adapted my teaching style. However, through it all, I have kept the belief that hard work leads to success.

The longer I taught, the more off-book I have become. As a new teacher, I relied upon the textbook to guide both my content knowledge and my pedagogical decision making. I only taught the information presented in the book and I only used their worksheets. As I became more comfortable with the content and as a teacher, I began deviating from the textbook. I found other sources and created my own activities. Once I reached the point of being very comfortable as a teacher, I began incorporating content not mentioned in the textbook and only alluded to in the standards. I found resources and information to give students that was more personal. At
times, like when broaching LGBT topics, I was slightly nervous about pushback from parents, but I also knew that I could justify the content with standards, both state and NCSS. Today, I use the textbook as background information for students. A majority of our in-class work moves beyond the textbook.

As a non-education major, I entered the classroom without any real pedagogical knowledge. It wasn’t until I attended my Alternative Certification Program trainings and earned my reading endorsement within my first two years teaching that I was able to diversify my pedagogical decisions. Then I began my Masters program where I developed a more theoretical basis for my practice. I was able to connect my use of groups to the theory behind it. I was also able to extend my practice and take more risks with pedagogical decisions because I could access the research and defend my choices with expert opinion.

I know and believe that the environment in which students learn is quite important. The classroom sets the tone- bare walls, desks in rows, and a lack of personal artifacts sends a very different message than walls adorned with posters, desks in small groups, and important tchotchkes displayed. Like with most elements of my teaching, it has changed as I have become more comfortable with my personal identity and teacher identity.

As a beginning teacher, my first classroom was bland. Kids sat in partners at trapezoid tables, but if I had had desks, they would have been in rows. There wasn’t much on my walls. Partially because I couldn’t afford much, but also because I didn’t know what to put up. Occasional student work would be displayed, and as I inherited posters from retiring or moving teachers, I put those up. The next three rooms I had were a little different. I did have desks in rows, but they were often moved depending on the lesson. I covered my walls with patriotic posters and content-related posters like the branches of government, houses of Congress, or the
Doolittle prints of Lexington and Concord. I had a few tchotchkes on my desk, but not many-like the sheep from my trip to Ireland or a flip-flop magnet from the Bahamas. Both of these trips were taken with my friends who are lesbians but I didn’t have any pictures on my desk of friends. People could tell it was my room, but it wouldn’t have taken much for someone to change it into their room.

Currently, I have been on the same classroom for five years and it reflects who I am and what I believe is important. The desks are arranged in partners or triads. There are motivational quotes above my window. Students have a student center to hand in wok, get back their graded work, and staple, tape, or hole punch their papers. I have let go of the control of passing up the papers and individually handing papers back. Students have access to crayons, colored pencils, scissors, and other supplies. There is wall space for student work or a gallery walk. On top of my filing cabinets, are tchotchkes from all the places I’ve travelled. The walls have canvases made by students as gifts for me. I also have posters of the Constitution and Electoral College to commemorate the country’s history and the importance of political engagement. I have posters referencing the use of the words “gay” and “retarded” as derogatory terms. My most recent addition is a poster of historical and literary figures who were homosexual. The title of the poster is “Unfortunately, History has set the Record a Little Too Straight”. A poster showing success as an iceberg is prominently placed. My identity as a teacher and a lesbian permeates my classroom- from the success poster to Harry Potter references to posters referencing LGBT issues. All these elements tell part of my story to my students and provide a starting point for them to tell me theirs. My classroom has been curated to send the message of acceptance, respect, and hard work.
As a teacher I believe my main responsibility is to prepare students for their future—whether that be a four-year university, community college, trade school, or work. All of those futures require the reading and processing of information, diligence, perseverance, the ability to ask questions and listen to response, to ability to work with others, and to participate in a national and global community. It is important to me that my class prepares students with those skills. And when students need help with one of them, we work together to improve. I am a strict teacher with high expectations for all students. We don’t have free days and I don’t accept excuses. It takes multiple conversations with students to get them to see that I want them to be successful and believe each of them are capable which is why my expectations are so high. I care about their time and future, which makes me expect a lot of them. I hope they know that although there are tough lessons to be learned, I will be there to support them.
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Unit Organizers

**UNIT VII: WWII**

**ESSENTIAL QUESTION:**
1. Explain the development of the US from isolationism to neutrality in war to superpower between 1929-1945.
2. What are the changes that occurred in the American home front during WWII and the effects on the American public?
3. What were the controversial issues surrounding the dropping of the Atomic Bomb and how did President Truman justify his decision?
4. What was the US response to the Holocaust both during the war and in the years following the war?
5. What was the American military strategy for winning WWII?

**OBJECTIVES:**
- Identify the causes of WWII
- Identify the causes of the US isolationism and neutrality in the 1920s and 1930s
- Identify the policies and changes that led the US into WWII
- Describe the US role in WWII
- Describe the US role in the Holocaust
- Describe the WWII homefront
- Explain the reason for the US dropping the atomic bomb on Japan and the responses to this decision both positive and negative

**STANDARDS AND BENCHMARKS:**
- SS.9-11.S.1.1: Examine causes, causes, and consequences of World War II on the United States and the world.
- SS.9-11.S.2.1: Analyze the impact of the Holocaust during World War II on Jews as well as other groups.
- SS.9-11.S.2.2: Examine efforts to expand or contract rights for women populations during World War II.
- SS.9-11.S.2.3: Examine the impact of World War II on domestic government policy.
- SS.9-11.S.2.4: Analyze the use of atomic weapons during World War II and the aftermath of the bombings.
- SS.9-11.S.2.5: Describe the attempts to promote international justice through the Nuremberg Trials.

**TENTATIVE TIMELINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/17 <strong>Make sure you have read all of Chapters 16 and 17 before the test on Ch. 11, 12, and 13.</strong></td>
<td>1/18 Review of procedures, rise of Dictators/Gov’t in the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s.</td>
<td>1/19 Pot notes start of war</td>
<td>1/21 Note-taking practice 11.2 U.S. Involvement in WWII</td>
<td>1/22 READING QUIZ 11.2 Isolation vs intervention - Lindbergh vs. Santos, SS.9-11.S.2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**15 Terms:**
- Blue Book: 11.1 and 11.2

**16 Terms:**
- Blue Book: 11.3 and 12.1

**19 Terms:**
- Blue Book: 12.2 and 12.3

**16 Terms:**
- Blue Book: 12.4 and 13.1
## UNIT VIII: Post WW II and the 1950s

### ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS:
1. Which countries emerged as the superpowers in the years following WW11 and how did this effect American foreign policy?
2. What is the Cold War and how does it lead to the Korean War and the policies of containment and brinkmanship?
3. Who was Joseph McCarthy and how did his actions in the 1950s increase the national hysteria about communism?
4. What events nearly brought the United States and the USSR to the brink of war during the Cold War and how was war between the two countries avoided?
5. How do the GI Bill and the move to suburbia transform American society?
6. In what ways did American society become "conform" in the 1950s and lead to the development of a counter culture?

### IMPORTANT PEOPLE AND TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERMS AND PEOPLE YOU SHOULD KNOW</th>
<th>IMPORTANT PEOPLE AND TERMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Cold War</td>
<td>16. H-bomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long Telegram</td>
<td>17. John Foster Dulles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Truman Doctrine</td>
<td>18. Massive Retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Crisis in Iran</td>
<td>20. Nikita Khrushchev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Berlin Airlift</td>
<td>22. Eisenhower Doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NATO</td>
<td>23. Nuclear triad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Warsaw Pact</td>
<td>24. CIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mao Zedong</td>
<td>25. Guerrilla operations in Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Korean War</td>
<td>26. Uniting of Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 38th Parallel</td>
<td>27. Hungarian Revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SCATO</td>
<td>28. Spies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Textbook Chapters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLUE BOOK</th>
<th>Gold Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 13: 2-13:4: The Cold War Begins</td>
<td>Ch. 18: The Cold War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 14: Post War America</td>
<td>Ch. 19: Postwar Confidence and Anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OBJECTIVES:
- Evaluate the origins of the Cold War and its effects on American society.
- Explain the effects of China’s turn to communism and the Korean War on America.
- Explain McCarthyism and its effects on American society.
- List the effects of the nuclear arms race between the US and the USSR.
- Identify the characteristics of 1950s America: the industrial boom, baby boom, pop culture and the subculture, entertainment and the "other America".
- Explain the foreign policies of Presidents Truman and President Eisenhower.

### Standards
- SS.912.A.6.8 Analyze the effects of the Red Scare on domestic United States policy.
- SS.912.A.6.10 Examine causes, course, and consequences of the early years of the Cold War (Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, NATO, Warsaw Pact).
- SS.912.A.6.11 Examine the controversy surrounding the proliferation of nuclear technology in the United States and the world.
- SS.912.A.6.12 Examine causes, course, and consequences of the Korean War.
- SS.912.A.6.13 Analyze significant foreign policy events during the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations.
- SS.912.A.7.1 Identify causes for Post-World War II prosperity and its effects on American society.
- SS.912.A.7.2 Compare the relative prosperity between different ethnic groups and social classes in the post-World War II period.

### Tentative Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>2/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean War Internet Search</td>
<td>Vocabulary Quiz #1-14 Eisenhower’s Response to the Cold War (1953)</td>
<td>Reading Quiz 13.3 Red Scare/McCarthyism</td>
<td>Finish McCarthyism/Start spy cases</td>
<td>NO SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>2/13</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>2/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spy Cases Rosenberg/#Oppenheimer</td>
<td>Reading Quiz 14.2 150s Culture Highlights</td>
<td>Progress Reports CLUB DAY 1950s Culture Highlights</td>
<td>Dissent and Discontent</td>
<td>2/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>2/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Quiz #31-56 Rural and Urban Poverty</td>
<td>Truman and Eisenhower Domestic Policies</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>2/23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- SS.912.A.6.8 Analyze the effects of the Red Scare on domestic United States policy.
- SS.912.A.6.10 Examine causes, course, and consequences of the early years of the Cold War (Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, NATO, Warsaw Pact).
- SS.912.A.6.11 Examine the controversy surrounding the proliferation of nuclear technology in the United States and the world.
- SS.912.A.6.12 Examine causes, course, and consequences of the Korean War.
- SS.912.A.6.13 Analyze significant foreign policy events during the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations.
- SS.912.A.7.1 Identify causes for Post-World War II prosperity and its effects on American society.
- SS.912.A.7.2 Compare the relative prosperity between different ethnic groups and social classes in the post-World War II period.
### Unit 9: 1960s in America: Kennedy, Johnson, Civil Rights, Vietnam

#### Textbook Chapter:
- Ch. 15
- Ch. 16
- Ch. 17.1
- Ch. 18.2 and 18.3

#### GOLD BOOK:
- Ch. 20
- Ch. 21
- Ch. 22, and 22.2
- Ch. 23.2 and 23.2

#### Objectives:
- Be able to explain the changes in Cold War Policy enacted by the Kennedy Administration
- Understand the impact of rioters on achieving political change
- Describe the progress of the Civil Rights Movement including American society, Martin Luther King, Jr.’s leadership, and the significance of the 1963 March on Washington
- Compare and contrast leadership styles of civil rights movements
- Analyze the attempts to end the Vietnam War through the Great Society and the successes and failures of these attempts to promote social and economic justice

#### Key Terms and Phrases:
- New Frontier
- Peace Corps
- Kennedy Assassination
- War on Poverty
- Civil Rights
- Medicare
- Medicaid
- 24th Amendment
- Moon landing
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act
- Voting Rights Act
- Warren Court
- Thurgood Marshall
- Rosa Parks
- MLK Jr.
- Malcolm X
- Stokely Carmichael
- Brown v. Board of Education
- Montgomery Bus Boycott
- Civil Rights Act of 1965
- Civil Rights Act of 1957
- Voting Rights Act of 1965
- SCLC
- CORE
- SNCC
- CORE
- De jure segregation
- De facto segregation

#### Essential Questions:
1. Explain the times during the Kennedy presidency that the country faced its greatest threats to security.
2. Explain the New Frontier and how it changed America. Use the programs to explain why.
3. What role did the American society in the Great Society attempt to correct and how much did that accomplish?
4. Compare and contrast the differences between Civil Rights, the Civil Rights movement, and the African American civil rights movement of the 1960s.
5. Compare and contrast the different approaches JFK and LBJ took with regards to Vietnam.
6. How did the counter-culture movement of the 1960s impact America society?

#### QUIZ 1 on 3/2
- Betty Friedan
- Gloria Steinem
- Phyllis Schafly
- Gorman Chavez
- United Farm Workers Organization
- Chicano Movement
- American Indian Movement
- Feminism
- National Organization for Women
- Roe v. Wade
- Equal Rights Amendment
- Title IX

#### QUIZ 2 on 3/22
- Stonewall Riots
- Roll of TV in 1960 Election
- Robert Kennedy
- Malia Kroutcher
- Robert McNamara
- Fidel Castro
- Alliance for Progress
- Keg of Pigs in Vietnam
- Cuban Missile Crisis
- Berlin Wall
- Hot line
- Limited Test Ban Treaty

#### Quiz 2 on 3/22
- No quiz, just tested on 9 Weeks test

#### Standards:
- SS.9.12.A.15: Analyze key events and people in Florida history as they relate to United States history.
- SS.9.12.A.14: Compare nonviolent and violent approaches utilized by groups (African Americans, women, Native Americans, Hispanics) to achieve civil rights.
- SS.9.12.A.16: Assess the involvement of black Americans, whites, and other groups in achieving integration and equal rights.
- SS.9.12.A.17: Analyze significant Supreme Court decisions relating to integration, housing, affirmative action, the rights of the accused, and reproductive rights.
Unit 10: 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000s, and Today

Textbook Chapter: Gold Books
Ch. 24A: Crisis in Confidence
Ch. 25: The Conservative Resurgence
Ch. 26: Into a New Century

Objectives:
- Analyze how Nixon became president, his re-election and how it led to Watergate, his resignation and his effect on the presidency.
- Analyze the emergence of the environmental movement in the United States.
- Analyze the relationship of the US and the Middle East.
- Analyze the motivation of the US involvement in Latin America and the events that shaped US involvement there.
- Describe the political, social, and economic effects of the conservative revolution of the 20th century.
- Identify and analyze the social concerns that emerged at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century.
- Explain the role of the U.S. in the Global Economy.
- What is terrorism and explain the difference between domestic terrorism and foreign terrorism and the ways America combats them.

EOC Bootcamp:
Optional after school review sessions
Snacks Provided
3:15-4:15
https://tinyurl.com/y98chuy

EOC REVIEW FORMAT
1. Questions on info due that day
2. Quiz on info due that day
3. Time to work on next day’s info.

**If absent for a day, average of quizzes taken will be the absent quiz grade.***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Quiz/Read Quiz/MC</th>
<th>Reading Quiz 19.3</th>
<th>UNIT Test</th>
<th>Review Part 1 DUE</th>
<th>Review Part 2 DUE</th>
<th>Review Part 3 DUE</th>
<th>Review Part 4 DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>Quiz Vietnam-Viet</td>
<td>After school EOC Boot Camp</td>
<td>Club Day</td>
<td>After school EOC Boot Camp</td>
<td>After school EOC Boot Camp</td>
<td>After school EOC Boot Camp</td>
<td>After school EOC Boot Camp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/10 Quiz Vietnam-Viet
4/16 G.H.W. Bush Domestic
4/22 UNIT Test
4/30 Review Part 3 DUE

*****DUE DATES OF THE EOC REVIEW ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE!****

Key People, Terms, and Phrases:
1. Richard Nixon
2.stagflation
3. OSHA
4. DEA
5. EPA
6. Affirmative action
7. Watergate scandal
8. Bakke v. University of CA
9. 225 Amendment
10. SALT II
11. Visit to China
12. Gerald Ford
13. Helsinki Accords
14. Jimmy Carter
15. “Me Generation”
16. Energy Crisis and OPEC embargo
17. Televangelists
18. Boycott people
19. PTSD
20. Return of Panama Canal
21. Camp David Accords
22. Iran Hostage Crisis
23. New Right
24. Moral majority
25. Ronald Reagan
26. Reaganomics (supply-side economics)
27. deregulation & Savings and Loan Crisis
28. Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization Strike-Response
29. Sandra Day O’Connor
30. A Nation At Risk
31. AIDS epidemic
32. Assassination attempt on Reagan
33. Iran Contra Affair
34. Strategic Defense initiative (SDI or Star Wars)
35. End of USSR
36. Glasnost
37. Perestroika
38. End of Cold War
39. Tear Down This Wall speech
40. George H. W. Bush
41. Tiananmen Square-Response of U.S.
42. Manuel Noriega
43. US involvement in ending apartheid
44. Persian Gulf War
45. Operation Desert Storm
46. Immigration Act of 1990
47. INF Treaty
48. Globalization
49. William Clinton
50. Family Medicare Leave Act
51. Brady Bill
52. “Contract with America”
53. Impeachment of Clinton
54. New Gingrich
55. Kenneth Starr
56. NAFTA
57. GATT
58. WTO
59. Oklahoma City Bombing
60. Waco, TX event
61. DOMA passing
62. George W. Bush
63. 2000 election controversy include Bush v. Gore
64. No Child Left Behind Act
65. September 11
66. PATRIOT Act
67. Department of Homeland Security
68. War in Iraq
69. War in Afghanistan
70. 2008 economic crash
71. 2008 election significance
72. Immigration trends in the late 1990s and early 2000s (there is a section in the book)
73. Barack Obama
74. overturning D.C. MA
75. Affordable Care Act
76. Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act
77. Ending of Iraq War
78. Capturing of Osama bin Laden
79. Violence Against Women Act
80. Sonia Sotomayor

VIETNAM VOCAB Quiz 4/2 with MC
1. Ngo Dinh Diem
2. Viet Cong
3. Ho Chi Minh Trail
4. Gulf of Tonkin Resolution
5. NVA
6. Agent Orange
7. Vietcong Tunnels
8. “Living room war”
9. Hawk/Dove
10. New Left
11. Students for a Democratic Society
12. Tet offensive
13. 1968 Democratic Convention
14. “credibility gap”
15. Counter culture movement
16. Richard Nixon
17. Vietnamization
18. My Lai
19. Pentagon Papers
20. Paris Peace Accords
21. War Powers Act
Appendix D

State Standards

Standard 6: Understand the causes and course of World War II, the character of the war at home and abroad, and its reshaping of the United States role in the post-war world.

- **SS.912.A.6.1**
  Examine causes, course, and consequences of World War II on the United States and the world.

  Remarks/Examples:
  
  Examples may include, but are not limited to, rise of dictators, attack on Pearl Harbor, Nazi party, American neutrality, D-Day, Battle of the Bulge, War in the Pacific, internment camps, Holocaust, Yalta.

- **SS.912.A.6.2**
  Describe the United States response in the early years of World War II (Neutrality Acts, Cash and Carry, Lend Lease Act).

- **SS.912.A.6.3**
  Analyze the impact of the Holocaust during World War II on Jews as well as other groups.

- **SS.912.A.6.4**
  Examine efforts to expand or contract rights for various populations during World War II.

  Remarks/Examples:
  
  Examples may include, but are not limited to, women, African Americans, German Americans, Japanese Americans and their internment, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Italian Americans.

- **SS.912.A.6.5**
  Explain the impact of World War II on domestic government policy.

  Remarks/Examples:
  
  Examples may include, but are not limited to, rationing, national security, civil rights, increased job opportunities for African Americans, women, Jews, and other refugees.

- **SS.912.A.6.6**
  Analyze the use of atomic weapons during World War II and the aftermath of the bombings.

- **SS.912.A.6.7**
  Describe the attempts to promote international justice through the Nuremberg Trials.

- **SS.912.A.6.8**
Analyze the effects of the Red Scare on domestic United States policy.

Remarks/Examples:

Examples may include, but are not limited to, loyalty review program, House Un-American Activities Committee, McCarthyism (Sen. Joe McCarthy), McCarran Act.

- **SS.912.A.6.9**
  Describe the rationale for the formation of the United Nations, including the contribution of Mary McLeod Bethune.

  Remarks/Examples:

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, the Declaration of Human Rights.

- **SS.912.A.6.10**
  Examine causes, course, and consequences of the early years of the Cold War (Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, NATO, Warsaw Pact).

- **SS.912.A.6.11**
  Examine the controversy surrounding the proliferation of nuclear technology in the United States and the world.

- **SS.912.A.6.12**
  Examine causes, course, and consequences of the Korean War.

  Remarks/Examples:

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, Communist China, 38th parallel, ceasefire, firing of Gen. Douglas McArthur.

- **SS.912.A.6.13**
  Analyze significant foreign policy events during the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations.

  Remarks/Examples:

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, the Domino Theory, Sputnik, space race, Korean Conflict, Vietnam Conflict, U-2 and Gary Powers, Bay of Pigs invasion, Cuban Missile Crisis, Berlin Wall, Ping Pong Diplomacy, opening of China.

- **SS.912.A.6.14**
  Analyze causes, course, and consequences of the Vietnam War.

  Remarks/Examples:
Examples may include, but are not limited to, Geneva Accords, Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, the draft, escalating protest at home, Vietnamization, the War Powers Act.

- **SS.912.A.6.15**
  Examine key events and peoples in Florida history as they relate to United States history.

  **Remarks/Examples:**
  - [Lavender scare in Florida](teachers in Hills Co)

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, Mosquito Fleet, “Double V Campaign”, construction of military bases and WWII training centers, 1959 Cuban coup and its impact on Florida, development of the space program and NASA.

**Standard 7: Understand the rise and continuing international influence of the United States as a world leader and the impact of contemporary social and political movements on American life.**

- **SS.912.A.7.1**
  Identify causes for Post-World War II prosperity and its effects on American society.

  **Remarks/Examples:**
  - Lgbt families in 50s as anti-examples

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, G.I. Bill, Baby Boom, growth of suburbs, Beatnik movement, youth culture, religious revivalism (e.g., Billy Graham and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen), conformity of the 1950s and the protest in the 1960s.

- **SS.912.A.7.2**
  Compare the relative prosperity between different ethnic groups and social classes in the post-World War II period.

- **SS.912.A.7.3**
  Examine the changing status of women in the United States from post-World War II to present.

  **Remarks/Examples:**
  - Intersection of lesbianism & feminism

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, increased numbers of women in the workforce, Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Feminine Mystique, National Organization for Women, Roe v. Wade, Equal Rights Amendment, Title IX, Betty Freidan, Gloria Steinem, Phyllis Schlafly, Billie Jean King, feminism.

- **SS.912.A.7.4**
  Evaluate the success of 1960s era presidents' foreign and domestic policies.

  **Remarks/Examples:**
  - Lack of protection in govt jobs
  - Civil rights
Examples may include, but are not limited to, civil rights legislation, Space Race, Great Society, War on Poverty.

- **SS.912.A.7.5**
  Compare nonviolent and violent approaches utilized by groups (African Americans, women, Native Americans, Hispanics) to achieve civil rights.

  **Remarks/Examples:**

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, sit-ins, Freedom Rides, boycotts, riots, protest marches.

- **SS.912.A.7.6**
  Assess key figures and organizations in shaping the Civil Rights Movement and Black Power Movement.

  **Remarks/Examples:**

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, the NAACP, National Urban League, SNCC, CORE, James Farmer, Charles Houston, Thurgood Marshall, Rosa Parks, Constance Baker Motley, the Little Rock Nine, Roy Wilkins, Whitney M. Young, A. Philip Randolph, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Robert F. Williams, Fannie Lou Hamer, Malcolm X [El-Haj Malik El-Shabazz], Stokely Carmichael [Kwame Ture], H. Rap Brown [Jamil Abdullah Al-Amin], the Black Panther Party [e.g., Huey P. Newton, Bobby Seale].

- **SS.912.A.7.7**
  Assess the building of coalitions between African Americans, whites, and other groups in achieving integration and equal rights.

  **Remarks/Examples:**

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, Freedom Summer, Freedom Rides, Montgomery Bus Boycott, Tallahassee Bus Boycott of 1956, March on Washington.

- **SS.912.A.7.8**
  Analyze significant *Supreme Court* decisions relating to integration, busing, affirmative action, the rights of the accused, and reproductive rights. *-LGBT court cases*

  **Remarks/Examples:**

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, *Plessy v. Ferguson* [1896], *Brown v. Board of Education* [1954], *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* [1971], *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* [1978], *Miranda v. Arizona* [1966], *Gideon v. Wainwright* [1963], *Mapp v. Ohio* [1961], and *Roe v. Wade* [1973].
- SS.912.A.7.9
  Examine the similarities of social movements (Native Americans, Hispanics, women, anti-war protesters) of the 1960s and 1970s.

- SS.912.A.7.10
  Analyze the significance of Vietnam and Watergate on the government and people of the United States.

  Remarks/Examples:
  
  Examples may include, but are not limited to, mistrust of government, reinforcement of freedom of the press, as well as checks and balances, New York Times v. Nixon

- SS.912.A.7.11
  Analyze the foreign policy of the United States as it relates to Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America, and the Middle East.

  Remarks/Examples:
  
  Examples may include, but are not limited to, Haiti, Bosnia-Kosovo, Rwanda, Grenada, Camp David Accords, Iran Hostage Crisis, Lebanon, Iran-Iraq War, Reagan Doctrine, Iran-Contra Affair, Persian Gulf War.

- SS.912.A.7.12
  Analyze political, economic, and social concerns that emerged at the end of the 20th century and into the 21st century.

  Remarks/Examples:
  
  Examples may include, but are not limited to AIDS, Green Revolution, outsourcing of jobs, global warming, human rights violations.

- SS.912.A.7.13
  Analyze the attempts to extend New Deal legislation through the Great Society and the successes and failures of these programs to promote social and economic stability.

  Remarks/Examples:
  
  Examples may include, but are not limited to, Civil Rights Act of 1964, Voting Rights Act of 1965, War on Poverty, Medicare, Medicaid, Headstart.

- SS.912.A.7.14
Review the role of the United States as a participant in the global economy (trade agreements, international competition, impact on American labor, environmental concerns).

Remarks/Examples:

Examples may include, but are not limited to, NAFTA, World Trade Organization.

- **SS.912.A.7.15**
  Analyze the effects of foreign and domestic terrorism on the American people.

  Remarks/Examples:

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, Oklahoma City bombing, attack of September 11, 2001, Patriot Act, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

- **SS.912.A.7.16**
  Examine changes in immigration policy and attitudes toward immigration since 1950.

- **SS.912.A.7.17**
  Examine key events and key people in Florida history as they relate to United States history.

  Remarks/Examples:

  Examples may include, but are not limited to, selection of Central Florida as a location for Disney, growth of the citrus and cigar industries, construction of Interstates, Harry T. Moore, Pork Chop Gang, Claude Pepper, changes in the space program, use of DEET, Hurricane Andrew, the Election of 2000, migration and immigration, Sunbelt state.
Appendix E

Children’s Books

Book Example 1
It was a hot summer day in 1969. Milk was having a rough day after he had been fired from being a salesman. He asked if he was gay and felt proud of it. So he visited an ice cream stand to refresh his senses.

1969

New York City

Dorothy: Can I have an orange ice cream? Here are the coins.
Customer: Why Dorothy?

Dorothy: Can I have a banana ice cream too, please?
Customer: Why Dorothy?

Customer: I'm sorry. He can't. I'm his sexual partner.

Dorothy: I understand. Actually, Dorothy. Dorothy. Dorothy. I think there was no difference in the person's sexual orientation.

Customer: I'm sorry, but I'm afraid I can't serve you the ice cream.

Dorothy: Oh, wait just a minute. I've got an idea.

Dorothy: Let's just join the other girls. They're practically gay people.

Gay Activists

People have been raising the flag to support the rights of people. This is called the Stonewall Riots.
The Police eventually joined in on the Riots, creating a brutal backlash. Gay Activists and the Police. Now this had been only one of the incidents, apart from other instances and incursions.

Thanks to the protests and actions, Gays can finally fly proudly and openly.

What's going on there?

Nothing.

Mike

What is going on?

Why are you doing this?

Why are you doing this?

Nevermind, why are you doing this?
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Book Example 2

At Tommy and Andrew’s school, they held a sign that said, “Gay Liberation!” Their friends, joined by hundreds of other protesters, were battling against discrimination. Every day, they marched on the street and shouted, “Gay is good!” At 8:00 AM, the police stopped them. In seconds, the protesters screamed and ran away, forever changed. Caught in the midst of it all, Tommy and Andrew are separated. Tommy finds himself on the streets of a far-away neighborhood, while Andrew finds himself sitting behind a police car, hands cuffed.