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Abstract

An Abstract for the thesis of K L. Lighty for the Master of Science in Gender and Women’s Studies at Minnesota State University, Mankato, Minnesota.

Title: The Sex/Gender Distinction in Contemporary Gender and Women’s Studies Introductory Textbooks

Understanding the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender are important learning outcomes in contemporary gender and women’s studies introductory courses. These theories challenge hegemonic binary ideas about the relationships between sex and gender and between male and female identity formations. Little academic attention has been paid to how teaching materials, specifically textbooks, explore these topics, despite the potential for them to influence students and instructors. This study address this gap in the literature by using critical discourse analysis (CDA) to examine the methods being used to explore the sex/gender distinction and social constructions of sex and gender in contemporary gender and women’s studies introductory textbooks. This analysis seeks to answer what methods are being used and how they either reinforce or challenge hegemonic ideas about the relationship between sex and gender. I utilize a historical review of the development of these theories as well feminist pedagogy as a critical lens to examine how often and in what ways these theories are explained in these textbooks. Additionally, I identify the importance of intersex conditions and the ways intersex identities are utilized to demonstrate the real world applications of theories about the sex/gender distinction. Further analysis and discussion focus around the reoccurrence of particular authors, especially Anne-Fausto Sterling and Judith Lorber, as well as the emergence of an overarching progress narrative that frames these theories as progressive and superior to previous forms of defining sex and gender.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Until the mid-twentieth century, sex and gender, subjects that today are viewed as distinct topics within the field of gender and women’s studies, as well as society at large, were synonymous enough that the concept of gender did not exist separate from sex (Meyerowitz, 2002). At the same time, it was realized that gender was in fact not an intrinsic, immutable identity, but was developed by societal stimuli and exposure to precepts that established specific gender roles as norms. In contrast, for much of this time, sex was viewed as an innate biologic base on which gender identity developed and presented itself. Since the emergence of theories about the sex/gender distinction and the social construction of gender, the academic scholarship has expanded to also view sex as something that is socially constructed. This is not to say that sex is not biological, but that even biology and other scientific and medical facts are often constructed to fit a pre-existing narrative (in this case, one that sex is a binary system of male and female that is fixed and commonplace and based on biological certainties).

As topics and theories become well established within a field, they inevitably filter down to being taught in courses and introductory literature designed for their respective fields. This project deals specifically with textbooks being marketed and presented as textbooks for introductory collegiate level gender and women’s studies courses. In my survey of the existing literature on the topic, I found no studies that examine the ways in which the sex/gender distinction of the social constructions of sex and gender are presented in these introductory materials. As such, this study fills a gap in the literature on the topic.
By examining both the methods by which and the extent to which the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender are explored in introductory gender and women’s studies textbooks, it is possible to see what theories and ideas have gained prominence amongst those responsible for both creating and publishing these textbooks. As these courses and materials are often the first time students are presented with discussion of the sex/gender distinction, they have a significant impact on shaping both understanding and acceptance of the concept.

As this study is concerned with the way in which theories about the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender are presented, it draws upon the work of scholars of these topics. This is a topic that lends itself to the interdisciplinary aspect of gender and women’s studies as a field. Important contributions come from authors such as biologist Anne Fausto-Sterling, sociologist Judith Lorber, anthropologist Gayle Rubin, and gender theorist Judith Butler, as well as many others (these contributions are expanded upon in this project’s literature review). These topics have a direct impact on the lived experiences and daily lives of minority groups, especially transgender and intersex individuals, whose identities often exist outside the hegemonic male/female, man/woman binary system imposed by sex and gender.

Feminist pedagogy is also central to this project. While the contents of textbooks do not strictly dictate what instructors are teaching in their courses, the textbooks do represent what hegemonic ideas are considered important. Publishers and textbook writers select what content is going to be included in these introductory materials, and that itself helps to shape what is discussed. If feminist literature and research is a core component of gender and women’s studies, then it follows that content relating to it
should be presented in a way that is in line with feminist pedagogical values. Core among these are the decentering of knowledge from those in positions of power and valuing the knowledge and ideas of marginalized groups and individuals.

Throughout this project I use feminist pedagogy as a critical lens to analyze the discourse created by the presentation of material related to the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender in recent textbooks being marketed as materials for introductory collegiate gender and women’s studies courses. To accomplish this, I identify a sample of seven textbooks for this project and utilize a critical discourse analysis to identify major themes and reoccurring ideas related to the sex/gender distinction.

A Note on Terminology

There are several important concepts that appear throughout this thesis. While many of them are defined in the chapters and sections that feature them the most, it is important to present some of them here. Throughout this project, I refer to the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender. The sex/gender distinction refers to theories of sex and gender that have developed in the past century to disconnect the idea that sex and gender are intrinsically linked to each other (Butler 1990). Within the sex/gender distinction, sex is often framed as being biological, while gender is framed as cultural. The social constructions of sex and gender refer to the idea that both sex and gender are ultimately social constructions that are mutable and have changed and meant different things at different points in time. When discussing the sex/gender distinction,
the social construction of sex is often the most controversial, as biology and medical science are often framed as being absolute and indifferent to cultural whims. However, a critical view of this topic shows that sex cannot be defined always by either chromosomes of genitalia, and that the male-female, man-woman binary system that is reinforced by scientists and doctors is just as culturally constructed as gender (Fausto-Sterling 2000).

Another important concept in this project is hegemony. Hegemony refers to how different ideas and concepts express dominance over other, less mainstream ideas. As Butler (2000) says “hegemony emphasizes the ways in which power operates to form our everyday understanding of social relations, and to orchestrate the ways in which we consent to (and reproduce) those tacit and covert relations of power” (p. 14). Hegemony refers not only to which ideas are most popular, but also how ideas are established by groups to reinforce ideas that benefit them. This project includes many examples, such as the hegemonic binary system present in both discussions of sex and gender. Male and female (or man and woman) are assumed as the only valid identity choices because of the hegemonic influence of gender binaries on society. This benefits organizations and individuals who exclude or deny transgender, intersex, and others who identify outside the male-female binary. Another place hegemony is important is in the discussion of what ideas are presented in the textbooks examined as a part of this project’s sample. Which ideas are being published for students represent the hegemonic power of both textbook writers and publishers in deciding what material is relevant or not.
Overview of Chapters

This thesis is separated into four chapters. In the second chapter, I provide a review of the literature essential to understanding the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender. This includes a historical review of the development of the sex/gender distinction from sexologists of the early twentieth century to contemporary feminist theorists. I also discuss feminist pedagogical values and ideas and how they best serve as a critical lens throughout this project. Chapter three explains the specific methods and procedures that went into completing this project. I detail first the criteria and rational for selecting the seven textbooks featured in my sample. I then delineate the steps taken to examine, code, and analyze the textbooks. This chapter also includes a statement of my positionality as a researcher and personal investment in this project. In the final chapter, I present my analysis of the major themes that emerged during my examination of the sample and discuss many of the implications I found those themes
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Before analysis can be conducted, it is important to consider the literature that a project builds off and is in conversation with. In this project’s case, there are two bodies of literature that are significant in situating the project within the larger field of gender and women’s studies: the sex/gender distinction, and feminist pedagogy. In this chapter, I will review the literature surrounding these two fields, beginning first with the sex/gender distinction. In doing so, it is important to understand the history of the term gender and its relationship with what is commonly known as biological sex. After contextualizing this history, I explore how modern feminist scholars and post-structural theory have developed a view of sex and gender that no longer can be established as a strictly binary dichotomy. The second body of literature is that of feminist pedagogy. This chapter’s review of feminist pedagogical literature will examine how the ideology shapes the ways that feminist teachers engage with learners and, most relevantly to this project, how those practices can and should guide textbook development for feminist classrooms.

Body of Literature: The Sex/Gender Distinction

Gender has not always had the meaning that is associated with it today. In fact, until the mid-twentieth century, much of what is today associated with gender—mannerisms, dress, occupations, etc.—were all still categorized under the broad term of “sex” (Meyerowitz, 2002, p 3). Until that turning point, the term gender saw minor popular use, and was usually associated with the linguistic “gender” of words in romance languages such as French and Spanish (Nicholson, 1994, p. 80). As a part of this body of literature, it is important to know when and why the change in western societies understanding of the word “gender” occurred. In the first half of this section, I will detail
how the word was adopted first by psychologists and sexologists beginning in the 1950s and 1960s and move onto how it was adopted and impacted the feminist movement in the 1970s. In the second half, I will explore how this conceptualization of gender and, furthermore, of sex, has changed since then to incorporate views of sex and gender that move past deterministic and essentialist ideas.

**Historical Development of the Term Gender**

As mentioned previously, until the 1950s, the conceptualization of sex included many of the social prescripts that are now associated with gender as well as sex. It was at this point that research by sexologists and psychologists took initiative to separate sex and gender from each from an academic and medical perspective. Among these early researchers, the work led by Dr. John Money was particularly significant. Money and his colleagues at John Hopkins University defined the term “gender” as distinct from “sex” (Meyerowitz, 2002, p. 114). According to Money (1955), gender included “all those things that a person says or does to disclose himself or herself as having the status of a boy or man, girl or woman” (p. 258). This distinction was important because it critiqued the long held western idea that all of a person’s social behaviors and attitudes were determined during sexual development in utero, and that these characteristics were immutable and fixed.

While Money defined “gender” in 1955, it would not be until 1964 that a different group of researchers, led by Dr. Robert Stoller, a psychiatrist, coined the term “gender identity.” Gender identity, they defined as “One’s sense of being a member of a particular sex” (Meyerowitz, 2002, p. 115). This specifically removed the inclusion of sexuality from one’s gender. Sexuality and gender identity were recognized as distinct, if
sometimes connected, concepts. Before this, sexuality, almost always defined heterosexually, was considered a natural result of one’s sex/gender identity (which itself always was in line with biology).

It is important to note that many of these researchers were primarily interested in the topic of gender because of its significance to their studies of hermaphroditism, a condition known today as intersex. Intersex individuals are born with ambiguous genitalia, chromosomes, or a mixture of the two and are often surgically operated on at a young age to “fix” the issue and assign them a traditional sex and gender identity. (Fausto-Sterling 2000, p. 50-58). However, this practice of operating on infants who are unable to consent to surgical changes to their bodies, has been met criticism, both by feminists and members of the medical community.

One significant case relating to sexual reassignment of infants is that of David Reimer. Reimer was born male and had no genital or chromosomal abnormalities. However, at six months of age, a botched circumcision resulted in most of the child’s penis being destroyed. His parents eventually contacted Dr. John Money, whose work on gender and identity was then gaining more mainstream interest. Money theorized that gender primarily developed based on social stimuli and interactions and believed that a forced sexual reassignment and hormone therapy would allow Reimer to grow up to be a healthy woman. Money and his team operated on Reimer, removing his damage penis and testes and forming an artificial vulva. They also placed him on hormone replacement therapy to provide female hormones. Money and John Hopkins Hospital initially reported this procedure as successful until it was followed up on by Dr. Milton Diamond in 1997. Milton contacted David Reimer and discovered that Reimer had grown to identify as
male despite his childhood surgery and hormone replacement. The story was reported publicly by John Colapinto in both *Rolling Stone* magazine and a book dedicated to the subject, *As Nature Made him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl* (Butler, 2004).

According to Reimer’s personal account of the outcome, he returned to identifying as male during his teenage years and underwent procedures to undo the effects of hormone replacement and the sexual reassignment surgery. After years of struggling with the events of his childhood, Reimer committed suicide in 2004 at the age of 38.

As Butler (2004) discusses, the outcome of the case of David Reimer has been argued as an allegorical proof that gender identity is innate and tied to one’s genitals and chromosomes from conception. However, she also notes that it is important to recognize that Reimer was neither an intersex individual or identified as transgender or transsexual. This case, it seems, suggested less about gender identity and formation and more about the importance of self determination surrounding medical procedures.

*Feminist Adoption of the Sex/Gender Distinction*

Despite its roots in medicine and psychology, the sex/gender distinction was widely adopted by the feminist movement in the 1970s, and since then has become more associated with the latter than the former. However, as Meyerowitz (2002) notes, early feminist adopters of the distinction often used it in the opposite manner than transsexuals had up until that point. Feminists argued for the artificiality of gender and immutability of sex, while transsexuals argued that their gender was innate, and their sex had to be changed to match their gender (Meyerowitz, 2002, p. 128). To understand these contrasting opinions, as well as see how these views on sex and gender eventually developed into modern theories of social construction, it’s necessary to consider the
feminist writers and ideas that gave shape to such opinions.

One of the first notions among feminists that gender and sex were not
synonymous can be found in Simon de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex*. Beauvoir
(1949/2011) establishes the notion by saying, “one is not born, but rather becomes,
woman” (p. 330). This shows that gender, even when not distinguished from sex, has
always been a social construction. The ways that individuals are expected to perform
gender roles have never been defined solely on the circumstances of their birth. While
Beauvoir and feminists at the time did not use the term gender, the idea that one’s sex
(how one is born) and gender (what one becomes) were not synonymous or predestined
was present in their writings early on.

Gayle Rubin was one the earliest feminist scholars to engage with the sex/gender
distinction. Rubin (1975) argues that “every society also has a sex/gender system—a set
of arrangements by which the biological raw material of human sex and procreation is
shaped by human, social intervention and satisfied in a conventional manner, no matter
how bizarre some of the conventions may be” (p. 165). This idea of a “sex/gender
system” laid the groundwork for feminists to argue that while sex was predestined (an
idea that will later be complicated), gender was created and forced upon individuals by
societal expectations and norms.

However, not all feminists saw the distinction as either valid or useful for
advancing the feminist agenda of the time. The idea that the basis of feminism, that of
womanhood, might not be a universal experience that all women shared in the same way.
Some recognized the distinction but engaged in what might be called “strategic
essentialism,” a termed coined by postcolonial feminist scholar Gayatri Spivak, whereby
essentialism is advocated for in order to fulfill political agendas which wholly or partly rely on shared identity. Other’s outright denied the distinction. This was particularly damaging to the relationship between feminists and the LGBT community. According to Meyerowitz (2002), “In the 1970s and 1980s gay men, lesbians, and feminists increasingly cast transsexuals variously as irrelevant, out of style, invasive, or conservative” (p. 258). These schisms, both in the LGBT and feminist movements would result in continued tension between members the trans community and other feminists even to present, with some feminist spheres still advocating for trans-exclusionary radical feminism (TERF) today. This exemplifies the tension and continued disagreement over the distinction, even among feminists.

The Social Constructions of Gender and Sex

While it is important to understand how the sex/gender distinction developed and was adopted by feminists, this project is ultimately concerned with how modern developments and theories about the social constructions of both sex and gender, and the distinctions between the two categories, are being presented in introductory textbooks. In this section, I will explore the theories of sex and gender that have emerged more recently to explain the ideas posed by earlier feminists, psychologists and sexologists. These theories are of particular importance to this project, as readings and texts that explore them are expected to be included in the samples this project examines.

Gender

The development of theories of the sex/gender distinction in the mid twentieth century resulted in robust discussion within feminist academia. In non-feminist spheres though, discussion about gender as natural and innate was, and in many places still is, the
de facto view of gender. Gender is an important topic when discussing births, clothing, cosmetics, jewelry. Even foods are commonly marketed as being suitable as better for audiences of men or women. The narratives surrounding gender have taken root as allegorical examples in scientific texts, as Martin (1991) explores in her research on how sperm and ova are commonly represented in stereotypical male/female roles, such as how the damsel in distress-egg eagerly awaits the heroic-sperm to come and rescues it. As she notes “the models that biologists use to describe their data can have important social effects” (p. 500). Within the academy though, the understanding of gender as a construct that arises from societal stimuli is better understood. Sociologist Judith Lorber (1994) presents a functional explanation of gender as a social construct:

For the individual gender construction starts with assignment to a sex category on the basis of what the genitalia look like at birth. Then babies are dressed or adorned in a way that displays the category because parents don’t want to be constantly asked whether their baby is a girl or a boy. A sex category becomes a gender status through naming, dress, and the use of other gender markers. Once a child’s gender is evident, others treat those in one gender differently from those in the other, and the children respond to the different treatment by feeling different and behaving different. (p. 14)

Lorber does not attempt to make any value judgement on if this system of assigning gender and establishing norms is beneficial or positive. Her theory also does not explore individuals whose gender identity does not ultimately align with the experiences they have in early childhood. She does point out though, that gender, at least initially is assigned based on apparent sex. One flows from the other and not the other
way. Nevertheless, we can see that gender assignment does not always equal gender identity. Lorber (1994) briefly discusses trans individuals and their quests for sexual affirmation procedures and makes the comment that “They do not become a third gender. They change genders” (17-18). This is significant, because even at this point, gender was still seen by society at large, as a binary system. Even if you did not agree with the assignment you were given at birth, you only had a single other option to identify as.

It’s important to note that Lorber’s understanding of gender still relies on certain assumptions about both sex and gender. She assumes that male and female and man and woman are the only options for sex and gender, respectively. Other scholars argue that gender exists beyond a binary system. Fausto-Sterling (2000) states that “Gender systems change. As they transform, they produce different accounts of nature” (p. 77). Butler (2004), writes that

To assume that gender always and exclusively means the matrix of the ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ is precisely to miss the critical point that the production of that coherent binary is contingent, that it comes at a cost, and that those permutations of gender which do not fit the binary are as much a part of gender as its most normative instance (p. 42).

According to Butler and Fausto-Sterling, man and woman are not the only gender options available. There are individuals who identify in-between these identifications and those who outright reject identifying within the system of gender that society constructs. Have these genders always existed, forced into categories by a rigid binary dichotomy, or have they developed recently? Lorber (1994) says that western society lacks a third gender. Fausto-Sterling’s suggestion that “gender systems change,” does not attempt to
answer this question, either (2000, p. 77.). However, the emergence of non-binary
genders and Fausto-Sterling’s research on sexual differences, specifically intersex
individuals, does lead her to pose an important question that turns this examination of
social construction from gender to sex: “Should there be only two sexes? (2000, p. 77).

Sex

The previous section examined how ideas about gender have more recently
developed, this section is more concerned with sex While explanations of gender in the
early 1990s and 2000s demonstrate a nuanced understanding about how gender is
developed and assigned to a person after birth, feminist scholars were already developing
other theories about how gender originates. Of particular note is Judith Butler’s post-
structural examinations of sex and gender in Gender Trouble. She poses questions about
the nature of how both sex and gender are assigned, asking “Can we refer to a ‘given’ sex
or ‘given’ gender without first inquiring how sex and/or gender is given, through what
means?” (1990, p. 9). These questions lend themselves to the one posed by Fausto-
Sterling. If gender had more than two possibilities, could not sex as well?

Fausto-Sterling (2000) notes that one of her earlier works, which had suggested a
revamped system of five sexes, had met with what she considered a surprising amount of
negative response. She admits that her intent had been less serious than, but takes note
that the response shows how entrenched her respondents were in the validity of the two-
sex system. Sex is generally a distinction based on several biological criteria, primarily
chromosomes and genitals, and divided into two categories: male and female. However,
the discussion in this chapter has already begun to undermine such a definition. Much of
the work done by psychologists like John Money and the related work by feminist
scholars such as Anne Fausto-Sterling are focused on the existence of intersexed people and the way that the binary dichotomies of sex and gender have impacted them. Fausto-Sterling (2000) decries the relationship of sex/gender as real/constructed as a “false dichotomy” and is quick to point out how even scientific definitions of sex are dependent and influenced by many biases and preconceptions on the part of the scientists involved (p. 28).

However, if sex is also constructed, does it have any significance outside of gender? This idea is approached by Butler (1990) when she says “If the immutable character of sex is contested, perhaps this construct called ‘sex’ is as culturally constructed as gender; indeed, perhaps it was always already gender, with the consequence that the distinction between sex and gender turns out to be no distinction at all” (p. 9-10). She continues by saying that some suggest that sex is “produced and established as ‘prediscursive,’ prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts” (p. 10). The idea that gender and sex have no distinction but are in fact the same cultural construction is even further removed from the idea that both are intrinsic aspects of one’s identity. This possibility has continued to impact the development of theories about the sex/gender distinction, and Butler is cited often by Fausto-Sterling in *Sexing the Body*.

**Body of Literature: Feminist Pedagogy**

If the social constructions of sex and gender represent the specific content and discourse that my project is concerned with, then feminist pedagogy represents the way that content is distributed and taught to students and other learners. In this section, I will
first define, based on a collaboration of sources, what feminist pedagogy is. Then I will examine the way in which feminist pedagogy is a useful theoretical framework to help guide the critical analysis portion of my project, and finally, I will discuss what implications feminist pedagogy has on the materials which are selected in feminist classrooms, such as the materials I will analyze for this project and cite examples of other projects that have engaged with pedagogy and teaching materials such as textbooks.

*Defining Feminist Pedagogy*

It would be unwise to cite feminist pedagogy as an important critical lens without a core understanding of what exactly feminist pedagogy is. In this section, I will compare various definitions of feminist pedagogy as well as materials which attempt to show feminist pedagogy in action in order to establish an understanding of the essence of what this pedagogical framework represents for the purpose of my project.

What is feminist pedagogy, then? Shrewsbury (1993) explains it directly as

Engaged teaching/learning - engaged with self in a continuing reflective process; engaged actively with the material being studied; engaged with others in a struggle to get beyond our sexism and racism and classism and homophobia and other destructive hatreds and to work together to enhance our knowledge; engaged with the community, with traditional organizations, and with movements for social change. (p. 166)

From this conceptualization, it can be seen that feminist pedagogy is not so much a specific way of instruction as it is a way of engagement with the act of instruction. It
does not seek to dictate the specifics of which exact methods are the most effective or successful, but rather helps existing methods to be critical of systems of power and privilege that exist both inside and outside the classroom. Shrewsbury (1993) says that “it [feminist pedagogy] requires continuous questioning and making assumptions explicit” (p. 167).

Magnet, Mason, and Trevenen (2016) explain that a key paradigm of feminist pedagogy is what they call the “politics of kindness.” This idea urges feminist teachers to reject the all-to-common neoliberal attitudes of pitting ideas against each other as right or wrong. It asks both teachers and students to step back and look at opposing viewpoints in a more holistic manner, gaining what is useful from both and not necessarily placing a value judgment on either. However, they do note that it is important, as a feminist teacher or student, to admit when you are wrong. This aspect of feminist pedagogy is particularly useful for my project because it is important to remember that I am not attempting to pass an absolute value judgment on the current state of Gender and Women’s studies textbooks. Rather, I am more interested in examining where currently available texts have similarities and differences in the research being done regarding sex and gender dichotomies and what this suggests about the discourse being presented at this locus.

Mckenna (1996) points out that “in an interactive de-centered classroom where the situatedness of the teacher, student, and material are all taken seriously, there is no pretending that knowledge is neutral and universal” (p. 182). This aspect of feminist pedagogy is not only vital, but one of the reasons why feminist pedagogy is an excellent theoretical lens for this research. Gender and sex are areas of study that are plagued by assumptions about what is universally true about biology and society. Using a framework
which calls these assumed truths into question is essential in any serious analysis of this nature.

We can now return to the question of “what is feminist pedagogy?” Building from Shrewsbury and Mckenna especially, feminist pedagogy can be summed up as the following: A pedagogical standpoint that seeks to enable feminist principles in learning by de-centering the neoliberal absolutist view of knowledge production and learning and by decentralizing the power dynamics common to classrooms. Feminist pedagogy favors a collaborative learning environment over a competitive one and aims to be critical of knowledge regardless of its locus of production or dissemination.

*Feminist Pedagogy as a Theoretical Lens for Analysis*

Why use feminist pedagogy as a critical lens for this research though? Why pedagogy at all? hooks (1994) writes that “the classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academy” (p. 12). When examining a similar question, McCusker (2017) brings up the topic of using feminist pedagogy as a paradigm in contrast to feminism(s) as a whole. While feminism is a multifaceted and varied series of standpoints and opinions, the specification of feminist pedagogy places an extra value on the way that instructors engage with students. If hooks’ assumption is true, then pedagogy is one of the greatest ways of encouraging radical change as feminists. Teaching, then, should be a key focus of feminists, not only as academics, but as a whole, should it not? Yet, the neoliberal model which treats education as a consumer product is still the most widely practiced. This limits both instructors, who are seen as those providing a paid service, and students, who are expected to absorb information and move on. hooks says that “students
are often fearful, as I was, that there are no spaces in the academy where the will to be self-actualized can be affirmed” (p. 18).

We can see from hooks that pedagogy, and especially feminist pedagogy, is not only the praxis of instruction. It is also a means of liberation. As the discussion surrounding gender and sex evolves and recognizes the myriad possible sex/gender configurations, it is important that this discourse serves a liberatory purpose as well as an educational one. In the previous section, I explored how feminist theorists are critical of the assumptions and ideas being presented by scientific works. In much the same way, feminist pedagogy seeks to liberate learners and students from situations where they are treated as blank slates to be filled with knowledge from instructors. Regarding this topic, Freire (1970) describes education as a common “narrative,” where “the teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalized, and predictable.” (p. 71). In a similar way, textbooks serve as tools that seek to imprint information onto students and fill them with knowledge. However, Freire notes how this system risks leaving information production and distribution in the hands of the privileged and that “From the outset [the educator’s] efforts must coincide with those of the students to engage in critical thinking and the quest for mutual humanization” (p. 75). Textbook creators are, though be it indirect, educators too, and their actions must seek to achieve these pedagogical goals. Whether or not the texts they creator seek to facilitate such a learning determines whether they serve the goals of feminist pedagogy.

Feminist pedagogy has the potential to shape and reshape the way that new and future students experience and engage with academia and feminist theories of knowledge as a whole. This decision to use feminist pedagogy as a driving tool in my analysis is
framed by how this study focuses on materials developed for Gender and Women’s studies courses. As such, feminist pedagogy ought to be at the heart what is being presented in these works and should be a guiding principle in their development and organization.

_Feminist pedagogy and teaching materials_

While this project’s specific engagement is unique, there are many other projects which examine teaching materials and textbooks from a pedagogical standpoint. It is important to identify examples of other similar work and explore how they are successful in applying pedagogy as a frame for examining teaching materials.

Bethune and Marnina (2015) employ critical discourse analysis in examining several teaching resource materials regarding girlhood bullying. Their study is interested in the examination about how the materials being presented about bullying serve to reinforce the ideas and scripts that they describe in the first place. This is similar to the way which this project will attempt to examine the models being used to explain sex and gender in order to see if they reinforce systemic ideas about how sex and gender operate. The authors clearly delineate which texts they are going to be examining and discuss how using critical discourse analysis will allow them to analyze their research most effectively. This project also is of interest because the authors are directly examining the texts from a feminist point of view.

Keenan (2012) discusses a series of considerations when attempting to make textbooks compatible with pedagogy. One of these considerations is on design. Textbooks, they say, are designed to convey information to the reader, in this case students, in a particular manner. Another consideration is that textbooks are designed to
produce a profit, or at the very least recoup a loss, for the publisher. One result of this consideration is that textbooks are only updated so often. It is not financially feasible for publishers to release a new edition every year. It is important to acknowledge how this implicates textbooks within a system of privileged information that is not unbiased or neutral. Textbooks are as much about profit as they are about teaching, and that is an important consideration when using them as a primary source for analysis. While this project is not explicit in its feminist nature, the examination of systems of privilege and benefit when considering why textbooks are designed the way they are is in line with feminist pedagogical principles.

Conclusion

The texts reviewed in this chapter accomplish three goals. First, they established the complex history of the sex/gender distinction, both inside and outside of feminist scholarship. An understanding of this history is essential to the second goal, which is to examine how the distinction resulted in modern theories about the social constructions of sex and gender. Finally, they establish the primacy of feminist pedagogical values in this project and how those values will shape the analysis portion of this project.

It is important to note that the development of both of these bodies of knowledge is still ongoing and will continue after the completion of this project. That vitality, both in continued examination of the sex/gender distinction and the espousal and development of feminist pedagogical values is partly what drew me to this project. These are areas where important work is continually being expanded upon, and I have great respect for the feminist scholars and authors who see it done.
Chapter Three: Methods

In this project, I explore the ways that the relationships between sex and gender are explored in seven major textbooks being marketed for use in introductory gender and women’s studies courses. In this chapter, I will first describe the process and rational for selecting the textbooks I used for a sample. Second I will describe the methods and processes used in collecting and analyzing data from the sample. Third, I will discuss my positionality as a researcher and how it impacts this study. Finally, I will discuss limitations and potential issues that were considered when developing this project.

This study serves to fill two purposes. First, it seeks to close a gap in the literature. As of now, there have been no major studies examining the discussion of sex and gender in introductory gender and women’s studies textbooks. Second, it aims to identify whether the introduction to the concepts of sex and gender in introductory texts acknowledges the complex reality posed by the social constructions of sex and gender or if the texts present a more simplified version of the information for students who are only beginning to study these topics. This thesis is guided by the following research questions: 1) What popular models are being used to differentiate sex and gender in collegiate introductory gender and women’s studies teaching materials. 2) How is sex being presented? As biologically immutable? As a socially constructed explanation for apparent biological differences? Or through alternative models? Also, how is gender being presented in relation to sex? 3) Are the models being used reinforcing or complicating binary models of sex and gender?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Editor(s)</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Referred to in this study as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Women’s Gender and Sexuality Studies:</td>
<td>L. Ayu Saraswati, Barbara Shaw, Heather Rellihan</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Introduction to Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and Intersectional Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, Gender and Sexuality: The New Basics</td>
<td>Abby L. Ferber, Kimberly Holcomb, Tre Wentling</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Sex, Gender and Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday Women’s and Gender Studies: Introductory Concepts</td>
<td>Ann Braithwaite, Catherine M. Orr</td>
<td>Routledge</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Everyday Women’s and Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6th Edition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Culture: An Intersectional Anthology for Gender and Women’s</td>
<td>Bonnie Klime Scott, Susan E. Cayleff, Anne Donadey,</td>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Women in Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>Irene Lara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Selection Process

When deciding on the selection criteria for texts that this thesis examines, there were several competing factors that led me to select the texts listed in Table 1. The first of these is the date of publication. This was an important focus in selection because of the ongoing research and discussion about the social construction of sex and gender within the larger field of gender and women’s studies. Determining if and how these textbooks are presenting and discussing contemporary theories is a major goal of this study, and so it is important to prefer this criteria more than adoption rate or sales figures which might more accurately reflect total exposure, but fail to represent the most immediate and recent works. To meet this criteria, I initially limited my selection to textbooks published since 2007, however out of those selected for this study, *Feminist Frontiers* was published earliest, with its most recent edition in 2011.

The second criteria I considered when selecting texts was whether each text was being marketed as a textbook intended for introductory gender and women’s studies courses. This is vital, as, without this consideration, any number of textbooks, anthologies, or edited collections might be considered. This in turn would expand the scope of the study far beyond its original intent. Focusing solely on texts which are being published and marketed as introductory collegiate level texts on the subject of gender and women’s studies allow this study to analyze not only the material that is being presented, but how each text contributes to the overarching themes and ideas being constructed about the social construction of sex and gender for introductory audiences and students.

With these criteria in mind, I went about constructing my purposive sample. To do so, I cross referenced several sources to determine which texts were most appropriate
for my sample. This included asking for recommendations from instructors who I know have taught introductory courses, examining publisher websites to identify which texts are being marketed as introductory materials within this discipline, and examining which texts were often the results of searches for introductory gender and women’s studies textbooks on common textbook selling sites such as Chegg, Amazon, and Barnes and Noble. With these two initial criteria, I found myself with an initial sample of 11 texts.

The final major criteria I employed was that only textbooks that are formatted as either anthologies or selected text readers would be included. During my sampling survey of textbooks, I found that only a small sample of the books available within this discipline were structured in a format which focused strictly on synthesis of information, rather than exposure to primary sources. Limiting the sample to anthology styled textbooks accomplished two things. First, it focuses this project on examining how textbooks are including and discussing the theories of authors in the field, such as those explored in this project’s literature review. Secondly, my initial survey showed that many of these textbooks, in addition to including theoretical materials, include many anecdotal examples of how these topics impact the lived experiences of people, especially marginalized groups.

Applying this third criteria reduced my sample to eight texts, and the final sample of seven texts was established after deciding to exclude a text that focused on a transnational viewing of the issues of gender and women’s studies. While the text itself fit the three criteria I had set out, its transnational focus was outside of the scope of this project.
Analytical Methods and Definitions

The analytical method used to examine texts in this project is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). CDA is a qualitative form of research, and my selection of such a type was deliberate. To understand the significance of selecting this method, it is first important to define and contextual what I mean by “discourse.” According to Weedon’s (1987) interpretation of the works of queer theorist Michel Foucault, discourse can be defined as the “ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the ‘nature’ of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects they seek to govern” (p. 107). As such, discourse refers not only to the knowledge being presented or produced by a work, but the way that knowledge establishes power and governance over those that it impacts. In the case of the textbooks being examined in this study, the discourse in question is representative of the ideas and knowledges the textbooks present and how those ideas construct the reality of how social constructions of sex and gender are understood and prepared for introductory readers and courses. This particular type of discourse reflects what Foucault (1981) calls “internal procedures…procedures which function rather as principles of classification, of ordering, of distribution” (p. 56). This type of discourse shapes ideas about social construction by determining what information is presented and in what context and to what group (in this case readers of introductory textbooks).

With discourse defined, I can explain what CDA attempts to accomplish, and how it is used in this project. Baker and Ellece (2010) note that historically, discourse analysis
has had a number of meanings associated with it. They specify that “While some discourse analysts focus on how meaning and structure are signaled in texts, others, especially since the early 1990s, have used discourse analysis more critically to examine issues relating to power, inequality and ideology” (Baker & Ellece, 2010, p. 32).

Discourse analysis recognizes that true objectivity is an impossibility, and that it is important to be reflexive in examining not only information being presented, but who is presenting it and why (Baker & Ellece, 2010). In this way, discourse analysis aligns with the framework of feminist pedagogy. Baker and Ellece (2010) describe critical discourse analysis (CDA) as

An approach to the analysis of discourse which views language as a social practice and is interested in the ways that ideologies and power relations are expressed through language. Critical discourse analysts are particularly interested in issues of inequality, sometimes keeping in mind the question ‘who benefits?’ when carrying out analysis. (p 26)

CDA goes a step further than traditional discourse analysis by attempting to answer questions about who the discourse being established might benefit and what ideologies it might reinforce. Examples of this analysis can be seen in other projects, such as in work done by other feminist scholars. Feminist critic and analyst Patrice McDermott (1998) examines a collection of teaching materials, in this case also introductory gender studies textbooks, for the purpose of analyzing ways that they define feminism. She notes that “Introductory textbooks used in the daily practice of undergraduate teaching are particularly crucial in translating the political ambiguities of feminist discourse into specific forms and practices within the culture of the academy”
(McDermott, 1998, p. 403). Her work determines that there are three major paradigms of how feminism is defined, and that each of these paradigms seeks to establish feminism in a distinct way, for specific reasons. These paradigms both seek to reinforce certain notions about what it means to use the word feminism, and to benefit those who would prefer feminism be used in that way. Here we can see how CDA is a method that aims to answer the question of ‘what’ is going on, but also ‘why’ is it being done this way and ‘who’ does it benefit.

In a similar way to McDermott’s work, this project is also concerned with the way in which introductory textbooks reflect discussions and analysis within the academy and also how it affects first time learners who are obtaining knowledge from the textbooks written by those scholars. However, rather than look at definitions of feminism, this project is concerned with the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender and how ideas about these theories are presented in relation to one another.

**Procedures**

In this section, I will delineate the exact steps I took while examining each textbook and including it in my analysis. For each textbook, I first located which chapter or subsection within the textbook was identified as containing information regarding gender identity and social construction. In many cases, the titles and contents of these chapters focused on embodiment or identities. For example, in *Everyday Women’s and Gender Studies*, there were two chapters that dealt with these issues, one titled “bodies” and another tilted “identities.” In cases like this, where multiple chapters were deemed relevant, I conducted the following steps on all of the chapters. I also examined the other chapters in each textbook to check if any other readings concerned with the sex/gender
distinction were included in other chapters. For example, the reading “Hermaphrodites with Attitude: Mapping the Emergence of Intersex Political Activism,” by Cheryl Chase appeared in Everyday Gender and Women’s Studies in the chapter “Violence and Resistance.” I still included it in my analysis because of its important focus on intersex individuals and the ways they are impacted by the sex/gender distinction and social constructions of sex and gender. After locating these sections in each textbook, I read through each of the sections, noting taking notes in a Word document on which texts dealt with social construction and which ones dealt with other topics entirely.

After reading through the sections in their entirety, I re-examined each of the texts that dealt with relevant topics. I also used this time to examine the introduction, if one existed, to the section. I identified passages that discussed the social construction of sex and gender or ones which discussed social construction more broadly. I transcribed these sections (both from the introductions and the primary readings), into a second Word document. I then annotated this second document to provide more detailed coding of the transcribed texts than my initial notes included. Finally, after coding the individual components of each text, I assigned an overall code to the each textbook based on its approach to teaching social construction theories. Coding, in this context, refers to establishing a “world of short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language based of visual data” (Saldaña, 2009 p. 3). For example, when I encountered materials that included a significant amount of original content written by the authors of the textbooks, I coded them as “synthesis heavy.” Another code I found myself using was “anecdotal,” which I used to notate readings or introductory content that relied heavily on individual stories to
explore how real world impacts of the topics being discussed. This method of examining qualitative data helped to facilitate the analytical portion of this project by allowing me to quickly examine and identify reoccurring themes and topics of discourse within the sampled textbooks.

Based on my literature review and initial sampling, I hypothesized that at least two major distinctions would be 1) textbooks which present an overview of gender as constructed and sex as biological, while leaving a more thorough discussion of the construction of sex for higher materials intended for higher level study, and 2) textbooks which present both the social construction of sex and gender alongside each other. However, and this will be explored more heavily in the next chapter, this hypothesis was rendered largely irrelevant as each of the textbooks included discussion of the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender. With this in mind, I used my previously coded data to look for other emerging themes for analysis.

**Positionality**

As a white non-binary identified researcher, it is important to recognize how my gender and privileges influence both my desire and ability to conduct the research required for this project. This is a single researcher project, and as such, the background and positionality of that researcher cannot be divorced from both the analysis and results of this project.

Secondly, I must admit that my interest in this project cannot be removed from my non-binary identity. As someone who identifies outside the binary male-female dichotomy that is often represented in society, there is a large component of affirmation
to be researching information that challenges and deconstructs that hegemonic idea in favor of an epistemology that includes a much broader idea of gender identity. This is further complicated by this project's inclusion of the social construction of sex, which as someone who is typically read as male-presenting yet identifies as non-binary, is an affirming view.

Feminist pedagogy and feminist studies as a whole encourage the decentering of pre-established knowledge in favor of bringing in the experiences of everyone involved. In this way, I think it is appropriate that a non-binary researcher be engaging in work that surrounds and demystifies their own identity. However, I must note that my experience as a non-binary individual and researcher cannot be generalized, and so my insights and thoughts cannot be generalized in a way that would be approved by everyone with this identity.

**Contributions and Limitations**

As noted in my literature review, few, if any, studies similar to this one have been conducted within the area of gender and women's studies regarding the presentation of the social constructions of sex and gender in introductory college level textbooks. While similar studies have been completed on topics in other disciplines, and CDA has been used within feminism to analyze other groupings of teaching materials (as demonstrated in my literature review), this particular combination of methods and focuses is unique, at least at this time, to my project. This study will serve to bridge the aforementioned gap in the literature regarding the discourses created by the narratives of social construction in these textbooks.
Despite the unique approach employed by my study, I feel that I should note the limitations that I encountered during the development and execution of this project. The first, briefly mentioned already, is the text selection process. It would have been time consuming and beyond the scope of this project to employ criteria that attempted to look specifically at which textbooks are being used most in modern introductory Gender and Women’s Studies courses. Access to syllabi, sales figures, and other information would have been required in order to even begin to determine a sample based on that goal. Additionally, it is important to recognize that even though textbooks are being marketed to, and adopted by instructors, that it is not possible to say for certain how those materials are being taught in the classroom. Rather, when considering these limitations, it seemed more important to focus on how the textbooks, which are developed and updated in response to advancing research within the discipline, create a discourse that represents hegemonic ideas about what should be taught in introductory courses.
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion

This analysis examines what models are being used to explain the distinction between sex and gender in introductory Gender and Women’s Studies textbooks, whether sex is being presented as biologically immutable, and whether sex and gender are explained in ways that reinforce or complicate the binary male/female, men/women system of sex and gender. This chapter is divided into three primary areas of analysis. In the first section, I discuss how authors of the textbooks either chose to provide a significant amount of introductory content (which includes material written by the authors of the textbooks) in order to establish terms and ideas outside of the readings (which are materials written by outside authors, often published as journal articles or book chapters) or chose to rely on the readings themselves to provide such background and terminology. Second, I analyze the reoccurring theme of the discussion of intersex conditions and how this topic is used by many of the textbook authors to create a practical connection between the social construction of sex as a theory and its real-world implications. My final area of analysis examines how the authors of each textbook construct a “progress narrative” (a term coined by feminist theorist Clare Hemmings). I accomplish this by analyzing readings and introductory content that demonstrate how feminism has progressed to include discussions and theories about the social constructions of sex and gender and the distinctions of sex and gender.

I had initially predicted that some, if not all, of the textbooks would omit a detailed discussion of the social construction of sex, which complicates the sex/gender distinction, and as noted by Judith Butler (1990), suggests that there may be no distinction. This prediction resulted in part from my own experience both attending and observing introductory gender and women’s studies courses, as well as a brief survey of
sylabli for such classes when developing this project. However, all of the textbooks included at least a brief mention of the social construction of sex and its distinction from gender. This initial finding did impact the rest of the analysis in this chapter, as I had initially planned to examine what such an omission might suggest. Instead, however, in this analysis I explore the specific ways which the authors of these textbooks engage with and explain these topics.

Overview of Samples

In this section, I give a brief overview of the samples included in this analysis. While coding and reviewing each textbook, I focused on examining how each of the textbooks engaged with the sex/gender distinction and the social constructions of sex and gender. For each textbook, I identified which material dealt with the social construction of sex and gender and the distinction of sex and gender. These materials typically fell into three different categories. The first were introductory content that featured a broad overview of concepts important to gender and women’s studies. The textbooks often also included readings that established the concept that sex and gender are not synonymous and should not be viewed as such. The other two types of materials were typically introductory content that focused on either bodies and how they relate to the world, or identity and identity formation. The textbooks varied in which types of introductory content and readings they contained. For example, in *Introduction to Women’s, Gender & Sexuality Studies*, the materials I examined included the first section of introductory content, “Mapping the Field: An Introduction to Women’s Gender and Sexuality studies,” which included “The Five Sexes, Revisited,” an important reading from Anne
Fausto-Sterling’s book *Sexing the Body* (which is discussed in this project’s literature review) as well as significant introductory content that establishes definitions for terms such as gender identity, social constructionism, and transgender. In the same textbook, I also examined the fourth introductory content chapter, “Epistemologies of Bodies: Ways of Knowing and Experiencing the World,” which included discussion of how bodies influence identity and understanding of gender, sex and other topics.

It should be noted that every single textbook included substantial discussion and explanation of the social construction of gender, as I predicted. For example, in *Feminist Frontiers* and *Women’s Voices, Feminist Visions*, this topic is addressed by the inclusion of readings from sociologist Judith Lorber, primarily her reading “‘Night to His Day’: The Social Construction of Gender.” If the textbooks did not include a reading such as this from an outside author that dealt with the topic, the authors instead included an explanation of the concept in their own introductory content. This can approach be seen in *Everyday Women’s and Gender Studies* when the authors explain that “social constructionism, the approach we authors take here, refers to the idea that definitions of and meanings attributed to identity categories are specific to time and place, arising out of the environment and culture in which they are embedded” (Braithwaite & Orr, p. 64). They go on to link this definition to not only gender, but to race, disability and other topics of interest to students of gender and women’s studies.

Readings and introductory content that address the social construction of sex are also included in each textbook. However, in several cases, these discussions are shorter and less elaborate than the same textbook’s content that engages with the social construction of gender. For example, whereas *Sex, Gender, and Sexuality* and
Introduction to Sex, Gender and Women’s Studies both include longer readings which are entire excerpted chapters from Anne Fausto-Sterling’s Sexing the Body, the textbook Feminist Frontiers includes the much shorter and less detailed “The Bare Bones of Sex” (also by Fausto-Sterling), which suggests that sex might be socially constructed, but strays short of outright saying that it is.

The sex/gender distinction is also represented in each of the textbooks. In each textbook chapter that deals with either bodies or identities, the distinction that sex is related to biology and that gender is related to culture is clearly defined in either a reading or in introductory content from the authors. The idea that sex and gender might have no true distinction is also represented in “The Medical Construction of Gender,” a reading by Suzanne J. Kessler found in Feminist Frontiers. The authors argue that the modern notions of sex and gender are largely indistinguishable from each other for practical purposes and that gender should be used for both, while the term sex should be relegated to discussing sexual acts.

The inclusion in these discussions of many authors and texts that also appeared in my literature review shows that these textbooks are often not only talking about these subjects in a sophisticated way, but including detailed discussion from experts such as Anne Fausto-Sterling (included in four of the textbooks) and Judith Lorber (also included in four of the textbooks). Despite this, of note is the absence of any readings by Judith Butler, whose work on the distinction of sex/gender is essential to an understanding of the topic (as discussed in my literature review), yet who is not included in any of the textbooks (although she is sometimes mentioned in introductory content). There are a variety of possible reasons why Butler is not cited directly, but I believe it to be that her
work is generally seen as more challenging and difficult to understand compared to the works of other theorists. I will discuss this more in the final section of this chapter.

**Strategies: Reliance on Introductory Content vs. Readings**

While every textbook in the sample included discussion of the social constructions of sex and gender and the sex/gender distinction, how the authors present each of the concepts varies. In this section, I define two categories that describe the strategies used by the textbook authors to explain topics and theories. I then provide a more detailed analysis, examining examples from both categories to show how, using the different strategies, the textbook authors accomplish a similar outcome.

Largely, the textbooks can be split based on which of two strategies the textbooks authors chose to employ: textbooks which rely on introductory content by the textbooks’ authors to explain concepts, and textbooks which allow the readings themselves to flesh out these topics. It is important to clearly define what is meant by “introductory content” versus a “reading.” Introductory content includes content written by the authors of the textbooks and is typically included as a preface to each chapter’s selection of readings. Introductory content varies greatly in length and scope, with some of the textbooks including only brief descriptions of the following readings, while others contain discussion, definitions, and examples of concepts that the authors deemed essential for students to understand Gender and Women’s Studies. Readings, in contrast, include sections that are not written by the authors of the textbook. Readings include essays, articles, and excerpted chapters from other books and are often written by experts in the
field of their topics or by people whose lives are impacted by the real-world implications of the topics focused on in each textbook chapter.

*Women’s Voices, Feminist Visions, Women in Culture, Introduction to Women’s and Gender & Sexuality Studies,* and *Everyday Gender and Women’s Studies* all include significant introductory content (between 7 and 20 pages before each section of readings). The other set of texts are *Gendered Society Reader, Feminist Frontiers,* and *Sex, Gender and Sexuality.* In these textbooks the authors’ introductions are primarily a summary and justification of the inclusion of the readings, comprising usually no more than two to three pages.

**Texts with Significant Introductory Content**

I look first at the set of textbooks which included a significant amount of introductory content. In each chapter found in these textbooks, the readings selected for a chapter are prefaced or introduced by a significant (defined above as more than 7 pages) amount of content which attempts to define terms and ideas and to contextualize the inclusion of the readings that are also included in the introduction. Within this set, there exists an amount of variation in how this introductory content is formatted and displayed. For example, in *Introduction to Women’s and Gender & Sexuality Studies,* the authors include, at the beginning of the introductory content for the first chapter, a clearly delineated list of “learning outcomes” for the section. This introduction also includes clear definitions of terms like “gender identity” and “social constructionism” in the margins next to the main text. This is similar to the strategy used by the authors of *Everyday Women’s and Gender Studies,* which use the margins of these introductory sections to include discussion questions and ideas for readers to consider while reading
both the introductory content and the readings that follow. *Women’s Voices, Feminist Visions* follows a similar strategy, using textboxes to examine additional topics and questions related to what is discussed in the introductory content. This contrasts with the authors of *Women in Culture* whose introductory content sections are more essay-like and do not include any sort of additional formatting such as lists or textboxes which signal specific content to the reader.

Despite differences in formatting, these sections tend to focus on synthesizing information and presenting it in a direct, concise way. The authors of *Women in Culture* and *Introduction to Women’s, Gender & Sexuality Studies* contextualize their definitions with the words of other writers. For example, in *Women in Culture*, the authors discuss the relationship between sex and gender system citing Gayle Rubin, saying:

> For Rubin, the “sex/gender system” is ‘the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity.” This definition acknowledges that sex and gender cannot be easily pulled apart along the lives of nature versus culture but that they constantly interface with one another. (Cayleff,, Donadey, Lara, & Scott, 2017 ,p. 6)

In *Introduction to Women’s, Gender & Sexuality Studies* the authors cite Judith Lorber when discussing the relationship of sex and gender:

> While gender may appear to be a natural and simple outgrowth of sex, it is a social process “constantly created and re-recreated out of human interaction, out of social life, and is the texture and order of that social life.” (Relihan, Saraswati & Shaw, 2017, p. 5)
This citation of Lorber is then complemented by the editors’ own definitions for the terms trans (which they use as a shorthand for transgender), gender identity, and social constructionism in order to provide more broad understanding of topics that relate to this central idea that gender and sex are different, but related. In this way, the textbook authors include the expertise of authors like Lorber and Rubin without necessarily including a full reading (although readings from Lorber are also included in many of the textbooks).

Unique even amongst this group of textbooks, the approach used by the authors of *Everyday Gender and Women’s Studies* puts an even stronger emphasis on the introductory content of each chapter. While the authors do utilize a combination of introductory content and readings, the readings are primarily used to demonstrate anecdotally the real-world applications of the concepts discussed and explained in the introductory content. This differs from the other introductory heavy textbooks, which utilized a combination of both anecdotal narratives (which focused on the lived experiences and political impacts of the topics being discussed) and articles and essays by experts as material for included readings. For example, when discussing the distinction of sex and gender, the authors explain it by saying:

“In much the same way as race, we can argue that both sex and gender, as identity categories, are also historically produced. For example, in the West, the notion that men and women are of the ‘opposite’ sex or that masculinity and femininity constitute complete contrasts is also, historically speaking, a new idea. The dominant way of thinking about sex and gender—that is, about biology (sex) and about social roles (gender) attributed to biology—is that one is born male or
female and then becomes masculine or feminine based on their biology. Even more, biology is assumed to be fairly unproblematic; external genitalia, reproductive organs, secondary sex characteristics, hormones, and genetics all line up with each other as clearly male or female. So not only do sex and gender align, but one’s sex, or biology, is always clear and clearly different from the other sex. And, of course, one’s gender always follows (as if in a causal relationship) one’s sex and is clearly differentiated from the other. (Braithwaite & Orr, p. 65).

In this paragraph they argue both for the social constructions of sex and gender (which they here describe as historically constructed) and identify the overall societal perception that sex and gender are supposed to be in tandem and operate within a binary system. The section that follows discusses how a binary, sexually dimorphic model of human biology did not develop until the eighteenth century, and how intersex conditions complicate the idea that sex and gender are congruous with each other.

Braithwaite and Orr rely heavily on descriptions and discussions like this to lay out important concepts for the reader. In contrast, the readings they include following the introductory content are heavily focused on content that shows how these ideas impact the lives of people. For example, they include the reading *The Rest Off My Chest*, in which non-binary author and activist Ivan Coyote discusses how they were forced to perform a specific narrative of transness in order to have their sexual affirmation surgery covered by their insurance. Coyote writes that:

The psychologist refers to me a psychiatrist for a formal diagnosis. Acquiring this diagnosis quickly became complicated for me, because there are very few psychiatrists in my province who the bureaucrats have certified to be allowed to
make such an important decision about me, for me. On top of this, I have been writing about the gender binary and my place in it, or outside of it, for many years now, and one by one the psychiatrists that the bureaucrats had deemed qualified to decide if I was indeed transgendered enough to proceed with surgery were all forced to recuse themselves from making any decisions about me on ethical grounds, because they had read my work on gender in their own-to-be-nice-to-trans-people sensitivity workshop when they were going through the process of being trained to be certified to be allowed to make decisions about people like me.

(p. 200)

Coyote’s narrative shows that the process of gatekeeping access to medical treatments and surgeries is still controlled by groups that, even when dealing with transgender individuals, place great emphasis on maintaining on a traditional binary view of gender, as Braithwaite and Orr discussed in their introduction. In this way, the reading serves to expand upon the initial introductory content in a way that might help readers ground the concepts in real world issues.

Texts with Less Introductory Content

The second set of textbooks included the Gendered Society Reader, Feminist Frontiers, and Sex, Gender and Sexuality. The authors of these textbooks, rather than laying out different concepts in introductory content, allow the readings to introduce concepts directly. This introduces a much different dynamic than the readings and introductory content in the first set of textbooks. In this section I discuss and compare the strategies used by the authors of these textbooks and how they compare to the textbooks which featured more introductory content.
While the first set of textbooks could, in theory, be picked up by a student or reader and read cover to cover, with the introductory content providing context and information about why the readings are included and how they relate, the second set of textbooks might lend themselves better to being used by instructors that want to include their own content or lectures rather than rely on the pre-created introductions found in first set of textbooks. As I mentioned previously, these textbooks do include brief introductory content in each chapter. For example, in the introduction to the eight chapter of Feminist Frontiers, titled “Bodies,” the authors write that:

It might seem that women’s bodies and physical health are biological rather than social matters. However, factors such as access to health care, working conditions, and nutrition are all socially determined and have a big impact on our physical selves. In addition, cultural ideologies about women’s bodies affect how we perceive our own bodies, as well as how social institutions regulate women’s bodies and health. As with the other aspects of women’s lives that we have explored so far, class, race, ethnicity, nationality, sexuality and ability intersect with gender in shaping the social and culture forces that affect women’s health and physical well-being. (Rupp, Taylor, & Whittier, 2011, p. 323)

After this, they give a brief description of each of the readings in the chapter and why it is included. This chapter included the reading “The Bare Bones of Sex,” by Anne Fausto-Sterling, a reading which begins a conversation about the distinctions of sex and gender. In their description of it, the authors summarize Fausto-Sterling's work by saying:

In “The Bare Bones of Sex: Part 1-Sex and Gender,” biologist Anne Fausto-Sterling uses the case of bone density and bone health to show how aspects of
bodies that are generally considered purely biological are in fact affected in profound ways by cultural factors. Her analysis once again raises the question about the relationship of sex and gender, nature and nurture. (p. 323)

In this section, as well as in this particular reading from Fausto-Sterling, the idea of the sex/gender distinction and the nature of social construction is hinted at, but never explicitly defined for the reader, whereas it might have been in a text with a heavier emphasis on introductory content. As I suggested above, though, this might give an instructor more room to incorporate other outside content in teaching the subject, but might leave someone just reading the book unclear about the exact relationship between sex and gender.

The other two textbooks in this set follow similar paths in regard to introductory content, briefly discussing each readings’ inclusion in the chapter. Gendered Society Reader takes this the furthest, including roughly two pages before each chapter that gives a brief introduction before moving straight into the readings. The authors of Sex, Gender and Sexuality, still manage to augment the content of the readings. Each reading in this textbook is prefaced with a series of discussion questions that are aimed at ensuring that readers identify the core concepts of the reading. For example, the following questions are included before Anne Fausto-Sterling’s “Dueling Dualisms” (a chapter excerpted from Sexing the Body which focuses on the dual systems of sex and gender):

1. Why does Fausto-Sterling argue that imposing categories of sex and gender are socially, not scientifically, driven.

2. How do contemporary categories of sexual identity complicate our understanding of historical findings of same-sex sexual behavior?
3. Why does the sex/gender dualism limit feminist analysis, according to Fausto-Sterling?

4. What Limitations are there in using developmental systems theory? (Ferber, Holcomb, & Wentling, 2016, p. 4)

By examining these questions, it is possible to deduce what learning outcomes the authors of the textbook might expect from readers without them explicitly stating the ideas, as many of the authors in the more introductory content-heavy textbooks did. The first question, for example, asks readers to figure out why exactly Fausto-Sterling argues that the categories of sex and gender are socially, not scientifically based. In doing so, the reader should be able to also understand many of the key aspects of social constructionism and how it relates to topics in gender and women’s studies.

Ultimately, both sets of textbooks manage to accomplish similar goals in different ways. They all engage with the social construction of sex and gender and the sex/gender distinction. While the authors of some of the textbooks chose to lay out directly what they believe to be the essential information that students of gender and women’s studies should be learning in an introductory setting, others simply provide the sources, and in some cases questions, that are meant to either guide the reader themselves, or be augmented by an instructor’s additional content and materials. I will further discuss what these different strengths might mean in terms of feminist pedagogical values in the discussion portion of this chapter.
The Intersex Component

While both of the content strategies demonstrated different ways of presenting content, there were a number of reoccurring themes within the introductions and readings themselves. In this section I will discuss one of those themes that I found most prevalent during my analysis: the use of intersex as a real-world application of the sex/gender distinction and the social construction of sex. As discussed in the literature review of this project, there is important feminist pedagogical value in using knowledge and pedagogy to both help liberate and expand the voices of the marginalized. In such a way, the inclusions of discussions of intersex individuals, the issues they face, and their lived experience serves as a way to bridge the more theoretical aspects of feminist theories with marginalized groups like intersex individuals.

With the exception of the Gendered Society Reader, which included readings that mention intersex, but in little detail, each of the textbooks included in this sample featured a reading or section of introductory content where intersex conditions are defined and discussed in terms of how intersex individuals are impacted disproportionately by the hegemonic binary sex/gender system. In three of these cases, the reading that discuss intersex individuals is by Anne Fausto-Sterling, excerpted from Sexing the Body. Fausto-Sterling centers her entire argument about the construction of gender and societal maintenance of the sex/gender distinction around intersex individuals. In “Dueling Dualisms,” featured in Sex, Gender and Sexuality, Fausto-Sterling writes about Spanish Olympic athlete Maria Patiño, who in 1988 was disqualified for having a Y chromosome, despite having androgen insensitivity syndrome (AIS), which made her develop female characteristics. AIS, one of many intersex
conditions, leaves individuals like Patiño at the mercy of systems designed around a strict binary view of gender that assumes that gender must follow from biological sex.

However, not all the discussion of intersex individuals was rooted in the work of Fausto-Sterling. In *Everyday Gender and Women’s Studies*, the authors introduce the topic of intersex in their own introductory content for the chapter “Identities,” saying:

The diagnosis of intersex, at birth or later, generally results in medical interventions, surgical and/or hormonal. These medical interventions to “correct” or “fix” anatomies that don’t fall clearly into one of two categories demonstrates how much a belief in (and attachment to) sex dimorphism actually overrides human variation. Indeed, the belief that there are two sexes, separate and opposite from each other (and two genders aligned with those sexes), imposes a binary structure on biology even when nature is much more complex—a binary structure that the medical establishment works to perpetuate. (Braithwaite & Orr p. 66)

This introduction to intersex links the topic directly to the societal norm of a gender binary system in which gender and sex are congruous and where drastic medical procedures are performed on infants to ensure the hegemony of such an idea. This concept is used by the authors to further introduce the constructed nature of other identities that are made by society to look natural.

In *Women in Culture*, the topic of intersex is first addressed in chapter five, “Sexualities and Genders.” In the introductory content, the authors introduce the concept of intersex, similarly to the authors of *Everyday Gender and Women’s Studies*. While this introductory content is brief, and not followed by a reading in the same chapter, there is another reading later in the book in the chapter “Violence and Resistance,” that explores
issues faced by intersex individuals. “Hermaphrodites with Attitude: Mapping the Emergence of Intersex Political Activism,” by Cheryl Chase, intersex activist and founder of the Intersex Society of North America, details the ongoing struggles of intersex activists to organize and seek better conditions and outcomes for intersex people, especially infants who are operated on without their consent, as well the development of support networks and groups for intersex adults dealing with their own experiences. Speaking of her own experience as a child being operated on without her consent, Chase writes that

At age eight, I was returned to the hospital for abdominal surgery that trimmed away the testicular portion of my gonads, each of which was partly ovarian and partly testicular in character. No explanation was given to me then for the long hospital stay or the abdominal surgery, nor for the regular hospital visits afterward, in which doctors photographed my genitals and inserted fingers and instruments into my vagina and anus. These visits ceased as soon as I began to menstruate. At the time of the sex change, doctors had assured my parents that their once son/nov daughter would grow into a woman who could have a normal sex life and babies. With the confirmation of menstruation, my parents apparently concluded that the prediction had been borne out and their ordeal was behind them. For me, the worst part of the nightmare was just beginning (p. 393).

My literature review of the case of David Reimer and his sexual reassignment by Dr. John Money has already shown what traumatic effects surgeries like these, where unconsenting children, regardless of the justification, are forced to have operations performed on their genitals. Yet, as Chase discusses, this is the standard practice for
individuals with intersex conditions in order to address the “psychosocial emergency” that occurs when an intersex child is born. The choice to use this type of reading demonstrates how the desire to maintain the binary, biological view of sex has dire consequences for the intersex individuals who are often affected as children.

Similarly, the reading “Angry Intersex People with Signs!” included in Women’s, *Gender and Sexuality Studies* includes the author, Riki Wilchins’ experiences meeting and working with Cheryl Chase and her movement. While this reading is much shorter and less detailed than Chase’s own account of her life and work, it still presents the magnitude of trauma and stress that intersex deal with because of societies attempts to regular their bodies and lives. What all of these intersex narratives accomplish though, is a linking of the theoretical concepts of the social construction of sex and the sex/gender distinction to the practical lives of real people, but especially marginalized people. While this provides visibility to a marginalized group that is often ignored, it also has risks for that same group of people. As feminist researcher Veronica Sanz (2017) says,

> Intersex people have been the clearest bearers of nonmatches between the sex variables across different historical periods. Because of this, scientists have repeatedly tested their various theories on them, and medical practitioners have followed whatever theory of sex was prevalent in their time to diagnose a ‘condition’ and assign a sex. (p.15)

Textbook authors, much like the researchers that Sanz (2017) discusses, view intersex individuals and their stories as tools to explore the practicality of theories about the sex/gender distinction. While this has the benefit of rooting theoretical concepts by
connecting them with real world implications, it also risks overdetermining the place of intersex individuals within feminist spaces.

**Progress Narrative**

The final theme that this analysis examines the progress narrative created by the discussions of the sex/gender distinction and social constructions of sex and gender and how these discussions are presented by the textbook authors. In this section, I will discuss first what exactly a progress narrative is, then analyze how the introductory content and readings of textbooks serve to construct such a narrative around the topic Feminist theorist Clare Hemmings discusses the concept of feminist theory as a story or narrative, saying about it:

> The story of its [feminist theory’s] past is consistently told through a series of interlocking narratives of progress, loss, and return that oversimplify this complex history and position feminist subjects as needing to inhabit a theoretical and political cutting edge in the present. (Hemmings, 2011, p. 3)

Of particular interest to my analysis is her conceptualization of the progress narrative, which I believe best describes the way which the distinctions of sex and gender and the social constructions of sex and gender, are presented in the textbooks in this sample. She frames the epistemology of the progress narrative by saying,

> We used to think of “woman” or feminism as a unified category, but through the subsequent efforts of black and lesbian feminist theorists, among others, the field has diversified, and feminist itself has become the object of detailed critical and political scrutiny. Far from being a problem, difference within the category “woman”, and within feminisms, should be a cause for celebration…Since
“woman” is no longer the ground of feminism, and the relationship between subject and object of feminist theory has been destabilized, an intellectual focus on gender or feminism alone may indicate an anachronistic attachment to false unity or essentialism. (Hemmings, 2011, p. 3-4)

In this way, the progress narrative requires an examination of how feminism has changed from originally focusing on the essentialized experiences of women to include other groups and individuals. Feminism now includes trans individuals and intersex individuals. It also separates the experiences of white women and women of color and includes discussion of disabled women and other identity categories. This shows that over time, feminism has become more inclusive and tolerant of different identities. However, it also ignores the fact that these marginalized groups (such as trans women and intersex individuals) were contributing to and participating in feminist discourse even before the mainstream feminism movement had accepted them.

Hemmings defines the criteria of a progress narrative as such:

First, it is a clearly positive account, one told with excitement and even relish. It is a narrative of success and accomplishments and positions feminist theory, and its subjects, as attentive and dynamic. Second, it is a narrative with a clear chronology: we are taken from the past—in one extract explicitly in the 1970s—via key shifts in politics, theory, and feminism’s subject, and towards a complex feminist present…Third, these shifts in time and approach are not represent as an inevitable flowering of difference and multiplicity, but are the outcome of that critical energy, directed explicitly at older approaches seen as lacking. (2011, p. 35)
Examples of progressive narratives can be seen throughout the textbooks examined in this project. In *Everyday Women’s and Gender Studies*, the authors begin their discussion of identity categories (which leads into their discussion of intersex, gender identity, and the distinctions between sex and gender) by saying:

Taking a more historical approach to this set of assumptions [about the supposed inherency of identity categories] raises a number of points that allow us to see how much these distinctions have also been produced or constructed, rather than simply existing in nature. (Braithwaite & Orr, 2017, p. 65)

The authors then go on to discuss at length the way that various identity categories (but especially sex and gender) have been constructed from historical and social ideas that limit the expression of identities. They end this section by saying that,

Acknowledging the complexity of historical and institutional legacies, along with recognizing the variety of ways their limited definitions are resisted and subverted provides a deeper understanding of the centrality of this concept in our lives, denaturalizing its taken-for-granted status and allowing us to see it as a complex set of process of ongoing definition and negotiation in our daily lives.

(Braithwaite & Orr, 2017, p. 74)

Braithwaite and Orr view the historical conceptualizations of the sex/gender distinction as “limited.” They suggest that it is possible to see how, with current research and theories, how identity categories (in this case sex/gender) are constantly being re-negotiated as newer, better information is made available. This fits the progress narrative criteria because it is assumes that the past was incapable of coming to conclusions about identities, while the present has found ways to come to those conclusions. However, this
ignores that complex identities have always existed, even if language and theories about them have not. It also assumes that what we know about identities is definitely correct, when we are constantly changing and updating our knowledge as new information becomes available.

The progress narrative is not only perpetuated by the authors themselves though. The inclusion of readings such as Ivan Coyote’s “The Rest Off My Chest,” or Buck Angel’s “The Power of My Vagina,” are both anecdotal accounts that contribute to this narrative by featuring stories about transgender individuals (one a transman, and one non-binary identifying) who, despite not being the traditional subject of feminist focus, are examined and celebrated. By including individuals whose identities were once questioned or discounted by feminists, the progress narrative shows how feminists have become more inclusive and accepting over time.

In *Women in Culture*, the authors do not directly speak to the progress narrative in their discussion of the distinctions of sex/gender or the social constructions of sex or gender. However, the readings they include still contribute to the narrative. In “Aligning Bodies, Identities and Expressions: Transgender Bodies,” Judith Lorber and Lisa Jean Moore talk about the subject of the transgender body and how trans people have made strides in resisting the stigma and policing by society at large. Similarly, the story of Cheryl Chase and the Intersex Society of North America, which I discussed in the previous section, demonstrates the celebration of activists and theorists within feminist circles who exist outside a binary model of sex or gender.

In addition to the many anecdotal accounts which demonstrate the ways in which this modern understanding of sex and gender has created impact, the progress narrative is
also corroborated by the repeated citation of particular authors. Biologist Anne Fausto-Sterling and Sociologist Judith Lorber are both cited by many of the textbooks. Their works, as discussed in the literature review of this project, present a feminist theory that is built on the work of scientists, physicians, and sociologists who came before. As such, the frequency with which they are cited as experts on the topics of sex, gender, and the related constructions and distinctions, helps to reinforce a progressive narrative of feminist theory, where a complex theorization of sex and gender has emerged from where there was none.

However, the progress narrative is not necessarily always the best way to frame feminism. It is important that feminists continue to be inclusive and progressive in our understanding of different identity formations. However, the progress narrative conceptualization of feminism also ignores where feminists have made mistakes and fallen short of their goals. Mainstream feminism is not always intersectional. Not all feminists accept transgender individuals as having valid identities, and there is a subset of feminism that continues to focus primarily on those who the identity of “woman” is their only source of institutional oppression (so called “white feminism”). It is important that we are cognizant of the need to constantly improve ourselves and our feminist praxis and this means recognizing and accepting our failures as well as our victories. The progress narrative of feminism, as it stands, presents a view of knowledge that claims to be descriptive of essential truths, which is at odds with the social understandings of sex and gender that feminism has developed. Gender and women’s studies textbooks, as tools of feminist pedagogy, should avoid entrenching this type of presentation of feminist
knowledge in favor of a more critical examination that acknowledges both successes and failures.

Discussion

The seven textbooks included in the sample of this study all include discussion of the distinction between sex and gender, as well as the social constructions of sex and gender. They all present both sex and gender as mutable social categories that are ultimately defined by humans, whether it be through social scripts and expectations or policing by medical and scientific bodies and professionals. When I had initially drafted this project, I hypothesized that there would be some textbooks that did not posit sex as a social construction. This hypothesis was based on my own prior experience with introductory gender and women’s studies courses, as well as a brief survey of syllabi of recent courses.

Instead, the differences I did discover while conducting this research were largely in the presentation of material. As discussed, one set of textbooks from the sample included significantly more introductory content from the authors of the textbooks than did the other set, which relied primarily on the including readings. There are potential benefits to both methods, as I touched on in my analysis, and it does not seem that either one is intrinsically better than the other. Looking at the different approaches from a feminist pedagogical standpoint, each approach accomplished different feminist pedagogical goals. The more introductory content heavy textbooks synthesized information in ways that might be easier for readers to understand and grasp basic concepts, without having to first engage in somewhat complex readings. This might help to make the topics accessible to people with varying levels of familiarity with feminist
theory. On the other hand, the textbooks which minimized the textbook authors’ own introductory content might serve better to present the information and then allow the student or reader to make up their own mind about what is being presented. This method is more in line with the feminist pedagogical value of not privileging the knowledge of one group over another. This would allow the reader to develop their own thoughts and ideas about the material without the authors forcing their own reading of the texts as the correct one. One possible change might be to present the texts and then have the content form the textbook authors as an afterword.

The reoccurrence of intersex conditions as a major theme throughout the discussions of the sex/gender distinction and the social construction of sex was not something I had anticipated originally. My critical discourse analysis of the textbooks however, helped me to see an emerging trend of intersex conditions becoming a focal point when discussing social construction of sex and the sex/gender distinction. Intersex individuals are used not only as examples, but as justifications for the social construction of sex. However, this is a complicated, and sometimes problematic, paradigm for teaching these topics. While examples of intersex people demonstrate that sex is a complicated subject that cannot be reduced to a male-female binary, the way which these textbooks present intersex individuals risks creating an overdetermined narrative about how intersex defines the social construction of sex. First, it ignores that non-binary gender identities have existed separate of intersex conditions throughout history and society. There are intersex individuals whose identities are wholly male or female, and many non-binary individuals who are not intersex. Secondly, it creates a theoretical fascination with intersex bodies that risks further marginalizing intersex people. As Sanz
(2017) points out, intersex individuals are already the go-to subject for testing theories of sex and gender by scientists. Replicating this problematic fascination with intersex bodies in textbooks risks further marginalizing intersex individuals and alienating intersex students. While intersex issues and stories are important, I would recommend that the authors of future editions and new textbooks carefully consider how they are including discussions of intersex bodies.

As I mentioned, several of the readings that dealt with intersex came from Anne Fausto-Sterling. While I believe that Fausto-Sterling’s work is essential to an understanding of this topic, it would have benefit readers to also have first person accounts, similar to the pieces about Cheryl Chase, included as companion pieces to the more theoretical ones. I understand however, that this might be a limitation of these textbooks being designed for introductory courses which seek to cover a broad range of topics important to gender and women’s studies.

On the topic of citation politics, one omission that surprised me was the absence of any readings from Judith Butler. As discussed in the literature review for this project, Butler’s theories about the relationship and distinction between sex and gender (or possible lack thereof), are important readings in understanding how feminist theories developed to include modern explanations of sex and gender. It is possible, as is my experience with reading Butler and with instructors I know who assign Butler, that her readings might be considered too complex or complicated for introductory students. However, withholding her work completely still seems like a significant absence. Butler (1990) discusses the frustration that some have with the difficulty of reading her work by saying,
It is no doubt strange, and maddening to some, to find a book that is not easily consumed to be “popular” according to academic standards. The surprise over this is perhaps attributable to the way that we underestimate the reading public, its capacity and desire for reading complicated and challenging texts, when the complication is not gratuitous, when the challenge is in the service of calling taken-for-granted truths into question, when the taken-for-grantedness of those truths is, indeed, oppressive. (p. xix)

I agree with Butler that challenging texts should not be omitted simply because they are challenging, especially if they are in service of dismantling oppressive ideas. The textbooks in my sample included a variety of materials which helped to convey the purpose and points of various readings, including discussion questions, summarizations, and definitions. With these assistive tools, I believe that Butler’s work would fit alongside many of the other authors included in each of these textbooks. Even if the textbook authors believe that reading Butler will be a challenge for students, that is not justification for the exclusion of her work. After all, even if a reader finds the work challenging, they can return to it later or seek guidance from an instructor or someone else who has read the content. In this way, difficult works can still be taught.

The current state of introductory gender and women’s studies textbooks do suggest some interesting facts about the evolution of the gender and women’s studies classroom or audience. One subtlety I noticed was that the oldest textbook in my sample, Feminist Frontiers (published in 2011, but still popular and widely used despite not being updated) assumes a female identified, cis-gendered audience. This is not surprising, as in my experience, the majority of introductory gender and women’s studies courses are still
taken by female identified students. However, as the field expands and engages with other marginalized identities, that assumption begins to lose its validity. This is seen in the rather gender-neutral language used by the other six textbooks in my sample. Simply because a topic does not directly impact a student, does not mean that there is no merit in that student learning about it, and this type of language is welcoming without removing the feminist focus of the materials.

Another significant trend that I noticed was the wide breadth of topics included in each textbook, in addition to those that I was analyzing. While introductory courses, and their materials, often serve as a survey of many topics that are important to a field of study or research, this does dilute the time or material that can be dedicated to exploring any one topic. As gender and women’s studies expands as a field, there may be a point where introductory classes themselves need to be more specialized. Should this occur, a follow up to this project would might examine how other gender and women’s studies courses and their materials handle the sex/gender distinction and social constructions of sex and gender.

Based on the findings of my analysis, there are several recommendations that I suggest for the next wave of textbooks aimed at introductory gender and women’s studies courses, especially concerning the sex/gender distinction and social constructions of sex and gender. First, as I discussed before, I believe that the narratives of intersex individuals should be approached in a way that is careful to avoid presenting them as the object of research and interest related to the social construction of sex. As tools of feminist pedagogy, textbooks should be careful to avoid furthering the marginalization of any group. Secondly, the inclusion of readings from the works of Judith Butler should be
included alongside the works of other feminist scholars. Her theories of performativity regarding the sex/gender distinction are important pieces that give definition to many of the subjects that these discussions often examine. Finally, it is important that future textbooks be more critical of the overall narrative they present about feminism. A simplified narrative, such as the progress narrative that I explored in my analysis, should be avoided when possible. Future textbooks should both be critical of the idea that the knowledge that we are working with is complete and show how and where feminism has made mistakes in the past, so that those mistakes serve as lessons on what to avoid in the future.

My study suggests that the authors who are selecting readings and writing content for introductory gender and women’s studies courses are often including robust models that explore the sex/gender distinction and include discussion of the social construction of both sex and gender and that publishers are electing to publish textbooks containing such content. While this cannot predict what exactly instructors will choose to include in their classrooms and syllabi, it does show that the information is being put forward where both students and instructors have access to it.
Appendix: Readings included in Samples

Women in Culture: An Intersectional Anthology for Gender and Women’s Studies

Chapter 1: Introduction to Feminist Concepts

1. Ciscnero, S. “My name”
2. Bunnell, J. and Kusinitz, N. “The new pronoun they invested suited everyone just fine (illustration)”
3. Frye, M. “Oppression”
4. Lorde, A. “Age, race, class and sex: Women redefining difference”
5. Walker, A. “Womanist”
6. Kimmel, M.S. “Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity”
7. Bornstein, K. “Abandon your tedious search: The rulebook has been found”
8. George, R.M. “Feminist theorize colonial/postcolonial

Chapter 2: Stories of Identity and Community

1. Anzaldua, G. “To live in the borderlands means you”
2. Alsultany, E “Los Intersticios: recasting moving selves”
3. Allen, P.G. “Where I come from is like this”
5. Kaye/Kantrowitz, M., Klepfisz, I. and Mennis, B. “From in Gerangl/In Struggle: A handbook for recognizing and resisting anti-Semitism and for rebuilding Jewish identity and pride”
6. Clare, E. “losing home”

Chapter 3: Histories of Feminism

1. Sharp, E. “The women at the game”
2. Truth, S. “And a’n’t I a woman?”
3. Rich, A. “When we dead awaken: Writing as re-vision”
4. Roth, B. “From separate roads to feminism”
5. Davies, C.B. “Feminist consciousness and African literary criticism”
6. Cook, B.W. “The historical denial of lesbianism”
7. Morales, A.L. “The historian as Curandera”

Chapter 4: Women and Gender in Arts and Media

1. Kogawa, J. “Obasan”
2. Maruyama, W. “The tag project: Executive order 9066 (illustration)”
3. Guerilla Girls. “Do women have to be naked to get into the Met. Museum? (illustration)”
4. Newton, E. “The mythic mannish lesbian: Radclyffe hall and the new woman”
5. Woolf, V. “Shakespeare’s sister”
6. Rojas, M. “Creative expressions”  
7. Kilbourne, J. “Beauty and the beast of advertising”  

Chapter 5: Sexualities and Genders

1. Minahal, M. “Poem on trying to love without fear”  
2. Lorde, A. “Uses of the erotic: The erotic as power”  
3. “The happiest day of my life (illustration)”  
5. Peiss, K. “ ‘Charity Girls’ and city pleasures: Historical notes on working-class sexuality, 1880-1920”  
6. Indiana University Empowerment Workshop. “When you meet a lesbian: Hints for the heterosexual woman”  
7. Gay and Lesbian Speakers’ Bureau “Heterosexuality questionnaire”  
8. Judith, L. and Moore, L.J. “Aligning bodies, identities, and expressions: transgender bodies”  
9. Connell, R.W. “Masculinity politics on a world scale”  

Chapter 6: Body Politics

1. Mirikitani, J. “Recipe”  
2. Weitz, R. “A history of women’s bodies”  
3. Steinem, G. “If men could menstruate”  
4. Hershey, L. “Women and disability and poetry (not necessarily in that order)”  
5. Turner, M. “Do we call you handicapped? (illustration)”  
8. haydar,m. “Veiled intentions: don’t judge a muslim girl by her covering”

Chapter 7: Reproductive and Environmental Justice

1. le Sueur, M. “Sequel to love”  
3. Wako, E. and Page, C. “Depo diaries and the power of stories”  
4. Warren, K.J. “Women, people of color, children, and health and women and environmental justice”  
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