Theory & Research in Social Education

ISSN: 0093-3104 (Print) 2163-1654 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/utrs20

Against 'economic man': A feminist challenge to prevailing neoclassical norms in K-12 economics education

Neil Shanks

To cite this article: Neil Shanks (2019): Against 'economic man': A feminist challenge to prevailing neoclassical norms in K-12 economics education, Theory & Research in Social Education, DOI: 10.1080/00933104.2019.1647904

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2019.1647904

Published online: 19 Aug 2019.

THEORY & RESEARCH IN SOCIAL EDUCATION
https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2019.1647904

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Against 'economic man': A feminist challenge to prevailing neoclassical norms in K-12 economics education

Neil Shanks

Baylor University

ABSTRACT
This article outlines core tenets of feminist economics and contrasts these tenets with traditional neoclassical economic assumptions about human nature, value, markets, inequality, and power. Further, it challenges the *Voluntary National Content Standards in Economics* and the *C3 Framework* for their exclusion of any perspective beyond the neoclassical paradigm while exposing the deleterious consequences of this paradigm, including its promotion of neoliberal policies; its opposition to democratic ideals; its exclusion of topics related to race, class, and gender; and its problematic assertions about human welfare. The article concludes with alternative ways of thinking about economics that might encourage teachers to question the prevailing neoclassical dominant narrative with a feminist counter narrative.

KEYWORDS
Economics; economics education; feminist economics; neoclassical economics; critical economics; feminism; standards

This article attempts to expose the sexism inherent in a particular paradigm of a prominent social science: economics. Prevailing assumptions in economics education are founded on the neoclassical paradigm (Fine, 2008; Freeman, 2010), which scholars have critiqued for its problematic conceptions about human nature (Graupe, 2012), the role of markets (R. Miller, 1993), and social values (Lutz & Lux, 1988; Remmele, 2011). Included in these problematic assumptions are conceptions of "economic man" as an individual, rational actor who pursues his own self-interest (Graupe, 2012; Nelson, 2006) and the idea that an unencumbered market is the ideal way to coordinate these interests (Blanchard & Coléno, 2016; Mikl-Horke, 2010). Further, neoclassical theory assumes that the market can be studied with all the accuracy and confidence of the physical sciences (Rosenbaum, 2000) and, thus, policy decisions can be made with all the confidence of mathematic exactitude (Bresser-Pereira, 2012). Scholars have argued that these assumptions are deleterious to social health and democracy (Daly & Cobb, 1994; Earle, Moran, & Ward-Perkins, 2016; Marglin, 2008); yet, they would be less dangerous if neoclassical economics was not taken as gospel by a large percentage of economists (Keen, 2011) and an even larger percentage of K-12 economics and social studies educators (Khayum, Valentine, & Friesner, 2006; Leet & Lopus, 2007). The overwhelming adherence to neoclassical economics in K-12 state and national standards (MacDonald & Siegfried, 2012; National Council for Economic Education, 2010; Walstad & Watts, 2015) and economics textbooks (Lee & Keen, 2004; Leet & Lopus, 2007) means that students of economics often leave their economics courses believing that neoclassical economics *is*

CONTACT Neil Shanks neil_shanks@baylor.edu Baylor University, One Bear Place #97304, Waco, TX 76798.

economics, which excludes other paradigms that challenge the problematic assumptions of the neoclassical model.

This article demonstrates the patriarchal foundations and ramifications of an unquestioned adherence to neoclassical orthodoxy, the omnipresent paradigm of economic thought that has become unquestioned dogma in K-12 social studies (E. Adams, 2019), and exposes the consequences of its prevalence in social studies education literature and K-12 economics standards. By exploring the major tenets of feminist economics, this article offers an alternative that may be more relevant or meaningful to students and teachers of economics alike. By critiquing the specter of neoclassical economics, this article formalizes a dominant and counter narrative in K-12 education. Further, by offering a way forward through feminist economic concepts and pedagogy, it demonstrates to teachers and researchers of social studies education the power of feminist economics in a world increasingly beholden to the neoclassical worldview.

Orthodox neoclassical economics: Core elements

If there is one conclusion that social studies researchers have agreed on when it comes to economics, it is that social studies teachers are generally unfamiliar with the discipline (Aske, 2000, 2003; Ayers, 2016; Joshi & Marri, 2006; Lynch, 1990, 1994; Walstad, 2001), and perhaps as a result, the discipline remains understudied compared to other social studies subjects (S. Miller & VanFossen, 2008). Therefore, this brief overview of the fundamental tenets of neoclassical economics will draw from the sources most familiar to those social studies teachers and researchers who might have had limited exposure to some of the more in-depth discussions of the discipline itself. Specifically, I draw on the *Voluntary National Content Standards In Economics* (*VNCE*) (National Council for Economic Education [NCEE], 2010) and the *College, Career & Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards* (National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS], 2013). These codified bodies of economic knowledge are intended to represent "the most important and enduring ideas, concepts, and issues in economics" (NCEE, 2010, p. v), as well as what it means to "become more economically literate" (NCSS, 2013, p. 86). The comprehensiveness of this vision, coupled with the minimal body of literature on economics in K-12 social studies, means that these standards carry an outsize weight among social studies teachers and teacher educators. Rather than explore the 20 standards in the *VNCE* or break down the 15 indicators under the four categories of economics in the *C3 Framework*, I will attempt to synthesize the core elements of orthodox neoclassical economics as they are presented in the *VNCE* and *C3 Framework* with particular attention to the ontology, epistemology, and methodology revealed through axioms of individualism, optimization, and equilibrium (Arnsperger & Varoufakis, 2006).

The *C3 Framework*'s scholarly rationale explains that "economic actors" are considered "individuals and/or organizations such as corporations" (NCSS, 2013, p. 85). Economic analysis then occurs on the individual level, and even when using economics to describe large-scale phenomena, this analysis is predicated on the understanding of an individual's choices. Scarcity, a fundamental concept of neoclassical economics, is described in the *VNCE* as the understanding that "[p]roductive resources are limited. Therefore, people can not have all the goods and services they want; as a result, they must choose some things and give up others" (NCEE, p. 2). This emphasis on individualism as a core tenet is invoked in both the *C3 Framework* and the *VNCE* standards through concepts as varied as incentives, trade, and specialization.

The second core tenet involves the optimization of individual behavior. Specifically, this tenet assumes that humans "are rational beings or entities focused on satisfying their own self-interests" (NCSS, 2013, p. 85). In the *VNCE*, the concept of decision making reflects this tenet by claiming that "people and organizations must weigh the benefits and costs of using their resources to do more of some things and less of others" (NCEE, 2010, p. 5). The predication of economic behavior on optimization is reflected in the *C3 Framework* and the *VNCE* through many standards including those that deal with income, prices, and the global economy.

The final core tenet of neoclassical economics is that of equilibrium. In essence, this takes the previous two core tenets, individualism and optimization, and applies them to "marketplace activity" where "patterns become deeply important," and therefore, "economic investigators employ economic models" (NCSS, 2013, p. 85) to better understand large-scale economic activity and utilize quantitative analysis. To resolve the economic problem of scarcity, for example, the *VNCE* describes allocation through a market system that establishes prices "by interaction between buyers and sellers" which "helps people anticipate market opportunities and make better choices" (NCEE, 2010, p. 17). These "market allocations are impersonal" (NCEE, 2010, p. 17) and rely on "the language of numbers" (NCSS, 2013, p. 85) for a thorough understanding. The emphasis on equilibrium is prevalent in the *C3 Framework* and the *VNCE* standards and is relevant to fundamental concepts such as supply and demand, the role of government, and market structures.

These three core tenets—individualism, optimization, and equilibrium—have firm implications for the ontology, epistemology, and methodology of neoclassical economics. Neoclassical economics has an ontological predilection with scarcity, an emphasis on individual analysis as the foundation of inquiry, and a belief in an autonomous and independent human nature (Network for Pluralist Economics, n.d.). Epistemologically, neoclassical economics is aligned with positivist forms of inquiry that emphasize the "scientifically neutral extraction of real causalities" (Network for Pluralist Economics, n.d., para. 1) and a general desire to build models and theories. On a methodological level, this stance means using deductive reasoning and formalistic testing to better understand human behavior on both a micro and macro scale (Network for Pluralist Economics, n.d.).

Consequences of orthodox neoclassical economics

I utilize the term orthodox neoclassical economics for a specific reason. While I am aware that at the post-secondary and graduate level, a minority of scholars in a minority of departments in a minority of universities have attempted to address the critiques below (e.g., Chang, 2014; Earle et al., 2016; Hayes, 2007; Matthews, 2019; Moran, 2018), the above section illustrates that the definition and core elements of economics in K-12 social studies are bound to certain core principles of neoclassical theory that have remained unchanged for decades. Using the core tenets of neoclassical economics, this section unpacks the broader implications of this paradigm through critical perspectives that have, to this point, been underrepresented in social studies education literature. This section draws on pluralist and heterodox scholars who are utilizing alternative paradigms to challenge the neoclassical hegemony in the discipline of economics itself. In Europe specifically, much of this work has come out of or been highlighted by student-led groups such as Rethinking Economics, the Post-Crash Economic Society, and resultant publications (e.g., Earle et al., 2016; Fischer et al., 2017).[1] While many of the criticisms below stem from feminist economists, feminist economics is but one perspective among many that are seeking to illuminate the problems with a discipline beholden to a single paradigm. Perspectives as varied as behavioral economics, institutional economics, post-Keynesian economics, and Marxian political economy have critiques to offer, and many pluralist or heterodox approaches from scholars across the economic spectrum criticize the tenets of individualism, optimization, and equilibrium.

Individualism

Arnsperger and Varoufakis (2006) described the methodological individualism inherent in neoclassical economics as rooted "firmly within liberal individualist social science" (p. 7) where phenomenon under study should be analyzed "by focusing on the individuals whose actions brought it about; understanding *fully* their 'workings' *at the individual level*; and, finally, synthesizing the knowledge derived … in order to understand the complex social phenomenon at hand" (p. 7, emphasis in original). This individualization of economic analysis results in an "'atomistic' view of the world" (Earle et al., 2016, p. 38) that explains the economy through the choices of individual actors.

Often, this individualist perspective is described through the metaphorical tool of *homo economicus* (*HE*), or rational economic man (Feiner, 1999) who is omnipresent in the worldview of neoclassical economists despite the fact that textbooks tend to occlude any description of this figure (Hollis & Nell, 1975). Lafferty (2017) summarized this representation of an economic agent as a "self-interested, goal-oriented, utility-maximizing individual" (p. 162). Representing a vision of humanity that rationally maximizes limited resources through informed choices, the figure "fits well with American values of individualism and consumerism" (E. Adams, 2019, p. 3). Feiner, a feminist economist, playfully used the abbreviation *HE* to simultaneously critique individualism within the neoclassical paradigm and explore the masculine notions that undergird its prevalence in the discipline.

The masculine foundation of this character is explored further in the sections that follow, but with respect to individualism, Feiner (1999) and others (Barker & Feiner, 2004; Benería, Berik, & Floro, 2016; Ferber & Nelson, 2003; Hewitson, 1999; Nelson, 1992) have connected the masculinity of economics with masculinist notions of enlightenment science and rationality. For Feiner (1999), *HE* is "reared in the Cartesian nursery, nourished by a diet long on atomism and short on empathy" (p. 193). Throughout the history of science, ideas of "hard science" and "reason" have been attributed to masculinity in much of western scholarship in contrast to femininized "soft science" and "emotion" (Nelson, 1996). In short, *HE* leads to analyses that focus on maximization of self-interest, a disjuncture between the individual and societal or communal commitments, and an assumption of universal and unencumbered choices in the economic world. At the same time, *HE* is maintaining "the metaphorical association of particular traits with gender in post-Enlightenment Western, white, thought" (Nelson, 1996, p. 7).

There are also specific assumptions at the root of how *HE* experiences constraints within the neoclassical paradigm. Miraculously, *HE* springs up "fully formed, with preferences fully developed, and is fully active and self-contained" (Nelson, 1992, p. 115) and attempts to maximize those preferences to achieve desires within the constraints of limited resources (Benería et al., 2016). Importantly, this self-interest is unlimited, and *HE* seems to be "always driven to climb up the 'utility mountain' to ever dizzier heights … In other words, [his] peculiar journey across the mountain of utility recognizes no climax. It does not reference or account for any limitation of satisfaction" (Graupe, 2012, p. 71). To assume that it is human nature to want more and more is at odds with a number of marginalized schools of economic thought (e.g., Lasn, 2013; Payutto, 1994; Schumacher, 2010), but more importantly, the assumption that it is objective or neutral to make these assumptions is a political stance and will decisively impact the questions that can be asked and answered via economic inquiry. While one might think that "cooperation and caring also play a role in the economy" (Schneider & Shackelford, 2001, p. 84), the emphasis on individualism requires that *HE* only collaborate to satisfy individual preferences and pursue self-interest. Fundamentally, then, neoclassical economics is premised on the separation between an individual from society and from nature where "the emphasis is on separation, distance, demarcation, autonomy, independence of self" (Nelson, 1996, p. 30). The epistemological unity between neoclassical economics and the modernist project of positivism is revealed in this mode of inquiry (Rosetti, 2001) and is problematic for the same reasons that positivism can be problematic (J. Adams, Keane, Dutton, & Steinmetz, 2005; Hollis & Nell, 1975), particularly through its emphasis on Eurocentric ways of knowing and assumptions of value-free, objective analysis.

In order for rational economic man to offer utility in neoclassical analysis, *HE* must be functionally autonomous (England, 2003), an idea that is among the first presented to students of economics which leads to the assumption that "economics is the 'science' of the choices of *isolated individuals*" (Fullbrook, 2010, p. 103, emphasis in original). The imprimatur of individuality creates an actor "defined absent gender, race, class, or any other markers of social location. Indeed, neoclassical economists see the universality of rational economic agents as the triumph of their paradigm" (Barker & Feiner, 2004, p. 4). While *HE* might represent a masculine figure as a representation of ontology and epistemology in neoclassical economic inquiry, *HE* is constructed as a sexless, raceless mannequin and is unconnected to society or culture (Lewis, 1999) except through "an ideal market in which prices form the only, and only necessary, form of communication" (Nelson, 1992, p. 115). This stance pits economic agents against each other, a friction that can only be resolved via transactional exchange (Feiner, 1995).

Optimization

The epistemological and ontological foundation of individualism is a necessary precondition for the second tenet of neoclassical economics: optimization. Optimization is more than just assuming that *HE* is trying to "optimise explicit goals in [his] behaviour" (Earle et al., 2016, p. 38) by making the most efficient use of their resources. Optimization assumes *all* behavior can be understood as the pursuit of satisfying preference, which removes any "philosophical room for questioning whether the agent will act on her preferences" (Arnsperger & Varoufakis, 2006, p. 8) and results in analysis that is in effect a "narrow version of consequentialism" (Arnsperger & Varoufakis, 2006, p. 9) in order to simplify models of human behavior. Recent work on exogenous preferences notwithstanding, much neoclassical analysis assumes that fixed preferences are pursued through rationality, in which rationality is defined as "weighing different options in light of income and time/resources constraints and expressing … preferences and choices in consistent ways" (Benería et al., 2016, p. 51). Ironically, it is this emphasis on self-interest and preferential motivation that underlies the "detached disinterested objectivity" (Strassmann & Polanyi, 1995a, p. 132) that neoclassical economists so prize. Emphasizing rationality and objectivity through optimization inherently delimits the analysis that can be performed in neoclassical economics by assuming neutrality of outcome and freedom of choice in economic activity. To put it simply, if inputs are free and rational, then outputs are ideal, so many economic questions become about how to reach that ideal rather than if the inputs are free or rational in the first place.

Classical economics included a great deal of interest in the way wealth was created and distributed, but the neoclassical turn in the early 20th century "increasingly gave way to [an] … emphasis on the calculus of rational choice" (Nelson, 2006, p. 20). This calculus is performed in a uniquely dispassionate way in economics. Nelson (2006) wrote specifically about her experience as a women in academia, recalling reading academic work by education scholars, sociologists, psychologists, theologians, and philosophers who discussed "ethics, meaning, and concern for those in need … awareness of our deep human links to our natural world . . and sensitivity to ecological balance" (p. 28). Yet, she found the same people who wrote movingly about morality, caring, and relationships in other disciplines encountered economics and "[went] along with the idea that people are helpless in the face of 'economic laws' and inevitably become self-interested calculators" (p. 28). The calculations themselves are often rooted in quantifiable outcomes to preserve the ability to model preferences, as shown in Feiner's (1999) simple analysis of labor and time optimization. A worker must leave the pleasures of childhood behind to enter the working world, not because the "work has intrinsic value or merit or pleasure to him (indeed if it did he would get paid less [!] according to the theory of compensating wage differentials)" (p. 204). Instead, a worker chooses to work so they can obtain the income necessary to bargain for their happiness in another market.

The resolution of this bargaining allows neoclassical economists to make claims about efficiency and neutrality of outcomes in economic life. Indeed, the "conclusion that the outcome of rational choice in competitive markets is 'optimal' may be read as a broad endorsement of existing conditions—'we get what we choose'" (Seiz, 2010, p. 39). This assumption implies that resources have been distributed in the most efficient manner; therefore, income distribution, racial discrimination, and other problematic outcomes are simply imperfections in an otherwise flawless machine (Feiner & Roberts, 1999). On a systemic level, the impetus to "treat current inequities as the effects of millions of constrained maximizing choices effectively obliterates history by admitting it only in the form of exogenously given preferences, endowments, and institutional imperfections. In a curious way, history comes to look like destiny" (Feiner & Roberts, 1999, pp. 59–60). On an individual level, choice rationalizes a number of troubling assumptions about human decision-making.

The preferences, or tastes, of rational economic man are unchanging (England, 2003), and choices are freely made in ways that optimize outcome. Superficially, this idea implies that everything in life is a choice—that *HE* is empowered, informed, and liberated. In short:

> this is a person with a sense of control over his or her life … [t]here is not a glimmer in this basic model that any individual might ever feel dominated, oppressed, passive, stuck, ill, unsure about his or her abilities, or unaware of alternatives. (Blank, 2009, p. 141)

This notion leads to some troubling conclusions about why inequality exists, especially if one believes that "[p]oor people, who are disproportionately women and children, do not choose to be poor" (Barker & Feiner, 2004, p. 15). Additionally, the neoclassical individual is constrained to choices that are exclusively market-based. In this way *HE* "can only choose between given goods whose price is dictated by the market … Moreover, money is always preconceived as the entry ticket into the realm of satisfaction" (Graupe, 2012, p. 74). A price delimited choice that is ignorant of any structural consideration is a great way to compute whether a market is at equilibrium or to calculate efficiency that rewards the status quo (Benería et al., 2016), but it is a poor method of understanding an unequal world.

Equilibrium

Neoclassical economics has an outsized influence on the political processes of ostensibly democratic states in the modern world due to the weight given to neoclassical analysis in policy propositions (Charusheela & Zein-Elabdin, 2003; Earle et al., 2016). Yet simply viewing economic behavior as mechanistic actions in pursuit of individual satisfaction would not necessarily lead to that level of discursive and material power. It is the third axiom of neoclassical economics, the imposition of equilibrium, that allows neoclassical economists to build predictions of the basis of the assumptions of individualization and optimization and, therefore, influence policy with the predictive power of a hard social science (Nelson, 1996). Equilibrium stresses that *HE* makes decisions and adjusts behavior until they "have, based on their individual judgement, achieved the outcome which is best for them, and there is no reason for anyone to alter their behaviour" (Earle et al., 2016, p. 38). Rather than question whether "equilibrium is likely, let alone probable, or how it might materialise" (Arnsperger & Varoufakis, 2006, p. 10), neoclassical analysis and prediction begins from the assumption that equilibrium is natural, then asks whether "once at that equilibrium, the 'system' has a propensity to stick around or drift away" (Arnsperger & Varoufakis, 2006, p. 11). Thus, *HE* is always at the point that "he takes to be optimum believing (however falsely) that any marginal change would be for the worse. From individual indifference to international trade, he is forever striking the best subjective balances between disincentive and reward" (Hollis & Nell, 1975, p. 54). Crucially, marginal decision making, on the back of the axioms of individualization and optimization, leads to two foregone conclusions: that markets naturally exist and are necessary and that they should be left to their own devices without consideration of provisioning or ethical interference.

If *HE* has a mother, it is the market. As infants' wants and needs are satisfied by the actions of a mother, in "economic theory wants and needs are met through the actions of markets" (Feiner, 1995, p. 156). An introduction into neoclassical economic analysis is generally an introduction to market analysis where scarce resources are distributed via choices made at the margin and where "production, distribution, and allocation of goods and services are what they are because people, acting in markets, choose these outcomes" (Feiner & Roberts, 1999, p. 52). These outcomes are ideal as they provide "the maximum outputs of the goods and services most desired by the population and at the lowest possible cost" (Feiner & Roberts, 1999, p. 53). The market, then, is not only the mother of rational economic man, but it also is symbolically the "perfect mother who is unfailing in her capacity (and willingness) to meet all needs and wants" (Feiner, 1995, p. 156).

The maternal market provides these needs and wants in the face of a "world characterized by scarcity" (Benería et al., 2016, p. 53). Strober (1994) argued that this scarcity is imposed in neoclassical models and concluded that there is a lack of analysis of the inverse of scarcity, that of abundance. Yet, time and time again, economics is defined by the assumption of scarcity, and this definition has significant ramifications for questions of how markets respond to provisioning. If one assumes that a market at equilibrium produces the most freedom and the most efficient growth (Rai & Waylen, 2013), then there is little incentive to consider how goods are provisioned in the face of scarcity, or which goods should be produced to benefit society. Indeed, the "primary distinguishing characteristic of a good is whether or not it can be exchanged on a market, not what human needs or wants it may satisfy or what role it may play in a more global, ecological system" (Nelson, 1996, p. 34). In this way, provisioning becomes less a question of how to ensure that human needs are met with (potentially) abundant resources and more a way to satisfy the unlimited appetite of wants by the select few who hold the resources to bargain on the market (Nelson, 1992). The "cash nexus is the only possible connection" between human beings, and social and ecological conditions are "only the inevitable result of market forces" (Feiner, 1999, p. 196). Any attempt to change the status quo would be a perversion of the natural state of the free market and weaken its ability to provide the most goods for the least cost (Feiner & Roberts, 1999). Thus, remediation of the status quo is an impossibility as it represents a distortion of the flawlessly rendered model of the market. While *HE* is discursively free to choose how best to satisfy needs and wants, *HE* is functionally bound by the ruthless efficiency of equilibrium.

The pervasiveness of neoclassical economics in K-12 social studies

The above tenets of neoclassical economics do not align with a humanizing vision of social studies (R. Miller, 1993). Yet these tenets are replete in the standards that guide economics instruction in K-12 social studies classes across the country. As E. Adams (2019) wrote in her review of literature that evaluated neoclassical influences on national standards and textbooks, "[t]he neoclassical tradition that informs economics standards and texts in the United States has become so normalized in K-12 and university-level economics courses that it has become synonymous with simply 'economics'" (p. 4). The authors of the *VNCE* took great care to explain their allegiance to the neoclassical paradigm, writing in their preface that they chose to include only the "'neoclassical model' of economic behavior" in order to "produce a single, coherent set of standards to guide the teaching of economics in America's schools" (NCEE, 2010, p. vi). While the authors are aware of alternative paradigms (even going so far as to occasionally add "enhancement boxes" where behavioral and other perspectives might be important, literally consigning these ideas to the margins of the individual standards), they deliberately universalize the neoclassical paradigm, claiming that "[i]ncluding strongly held minority views of economic processes and concepts would have confused and frustrated teachers and students" (NCEE, 2010, p. vi). By acknowledging the possibility that there are other paradigms but demeaning the intellectual ability of teachers and students to "sort out the qualifications and alternatives without a sufficient foundation" (NCEE, 2010, p. vi), the authors have made a vast and problematic assumption with significant ramifications that extend far beyond the realm of economics education.

Perhaps more perniciously, the authors of the *C3 Framework* were *not* explicit in their adherence to neoclassical economics; yet, they adhered to the framework exclusively. Their scholarly rationale writes about "economic thinking" (NCSS, 2013, p. 85) by deploying a rhetoric of certainty (Loewen, 2008) that includes only neoclassical tenets. They excluded other paradigms when homogenizing "[e]conomic investigators" as those who "are interested in the comparison of marginal costs and marginal benefits" (NCSS, 2013, p. 85). These investigators "typically believe that economic actors … are rational beings or entities focused on satisfying their own self-interests" who are interested in "marketplace activity … [and] the language of numbers" (NCSS, 2013, p. 85). By defining economics in this way, with no mention of alternatives, educators who use this framework are being shortchanged. Critiquing the general assumptions and fundamental epistemology of any discipline is essential to social studies inquiry that is meaningful, integrative, value-based, and challenging (NCSS, 2016). A shallow vision of economics does not befit an organization with a reach as wide and a mission as critical as that of NCSS.

While the recency of the *C3 Framework* makes it difficult to ascertain how extensively it has been adopted, the widespread usage of the *VNCE* is well documented. Originally published in 1997, the updated version in 2010 extolls the spread of the standards to textbooks, popular online teaching resources, the National Assessment of Educational Progress Economics test, and state curriculum standards (MacDonald & Siegfried, 2012). While only 25 states require students to take an economics class (Council for Economic Education, 2018), all 50 include economics concepts in their K-12 standards, which are closely aligned with the *VNCE* principles. These principles have been relatively unchanged for 50 years (Walstad & Watts, 2015), so this alignment is perhaps unsurprising. According to at least one study, these standards are implemented in classrooms as well, and therefore, "the standards appear to be moderately successful in achieving [their] intended goal of creating convergence in content coverage in high school economics curricula" (Khayum et al., 2006, p. 69). Further, a textbook analysis by Leet and Lopus (2007) found that all textbooks in their study covered most of the *VNCE*, and most came close to covering all 20 standards.

If neoclassical economics has achieved, as E. Adams (2019) wrote, a "synonymy [that] results in the kind of anonymity that conceals authorship in the social studies disciplines and thus creates a powerful mechanism of gatekeeping and control" (p. 4), we must consider the ramifications of synonymy and control as another dominant narrative within K-12 social studies. The ramifications of the dominant narrative of neoclassical economics are severe and discouraging for those social studies educators who promote democracy, challenge neoliberalism, critique embedded power structures in society, and foster human welfare.

The consequences of neoclassical economics in K-12 economic education

The field of social studies education has addressed a number of dominant narratives in recent years, including those that promote White supremacy (Chandler, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 2003), patriarchy (Engebretson, 2014; Schmidt, 2012), deculturalization of non-western and non-English speaking groups (Shear, 2015; Spring, 2016; Yoder, Johnson, & Karam, 2016), and neoliberalism (Schmeichel, 2011; Wright-Maley & Davis, 2016). Notably, however, these challenges are largely occurring in the disciplines of history, geography, or civics, and save for a handful of recent challenges (E. Adams, 2019; King & Finley, 2015; Sober, 2016, 2017) and one from a few decades ago (R. Miller, 1993), such challenges almost never occur in K-12 economics (Shanks, 2018a, 2018b).[2] As Feiner and Roberts (1999) wrote, "[i]t is especially important for scholars from disciplines other than economics who study the intersection of race, gender, and class to be aware of both the nakedness of the emperor and the availability of an entirely different wardrobe" (p. 45). Challenging narratives that foster racism, sexism, neoliberalism, and other unjust social structures in *only* history, geography, or civics allows these malicious processes to continue unabated in a discipline that has extraordinary political power (Earle et al., 2016) and has significant ramifications for the health of our society.

Neoclassical economics forms the philosophical foundations for neoliberal policies. Neoclassical economics assumes that *HE* "registers his preferences on the free market and the market supplies him with all he can afford. The logical extension of this assumption is that there is no need for government intervention except to promote the free market" (Hopkins, 1995, p. 250). Attention to social problems will only occur through the introduction of markets where none had existed before in order to leverage competition to produce efficient outcomes, effectively ascribing "every aspect of human activity" to "supply and demand behavior" (Feiner & Roberts, 1999, p. 62). Inasmuch as social studies is concerned with attention to market fetishization and its attendant impact on public policy, teachers of economics should critically evaluate the unquestioned assumptions of neoclassicism that give rise to these outcomes.

Teaching for democracy has long been a goal of educators (Dewey, 1916/2004), and this goal has been deeply explored by social studies educators (Johnson, 2016; Parker, 2003). Yet neoclassical economics is anti-democratic in a number of ways. First, the voices in neoclassical economics "have seldom been female voices, seldom been voices on the margin, seldom been voices not legitimated by the mainstream of power and control" (Strassman & Polanyi, 1995b, p. 10). Second, policymaking is dominated by neoclassical perspectives (Nelson, 2016) that foreclose debate, effectively creating an "econocracy" (Earle et al., 2016) rather than a democracy. Whether one takes a pro-capitalist view or one that is critical of capitalism, neoclassical economics only offers "prescriptions [that] all agree that the capitalist economy is a machine. They merely differ about whether the machine should be dismantled, controlled by the state, or enclosed within containment walls" (Nelson, 2006, p. 34). Teachers concerned with representation and a full scope of policy options within a democracy must contend with the delimitation of discourse enforced in neoclassical economics.

Perhaps the most strident critiques of neoclassical economics that are relevant to social studies educators concern the way that neoclassical economics attends to issues of race, class, and gender. Neoclassical economics will occasionally "address inequality, but attribute it to variables like luck, human capital, occupational choice, and skill variance rather than factors like discrimination, segregation, or inequality of opportunity" (Feiner & Roberts, 1999, p. 43). Theories of premarket events, exogenous preferences, or information asymmetries "are inadequate for the task of explaining racial inequality" (Saunders & Darity, 2003, p. 101) and elide the role White supremacy plays in structural racism (King & Finley, 2015). Much of the literature in feminist economics exists because of the failure of neoclassicism to attend to patriarchal structures (Aerni, Bartlett, Lewis, McGoldrick, & Shackelford, 1999; Hewitson, 1999; Himmelweit, 2017; Nelson, 1996; Shackelford, 2012) both within the discipline and more globally. Additionally, the "notion of class has been expunged from [neoclassical] economics by the concept of the indifference curve and its 'one size fits all' treatment of everyone from the poorest Somali to the richest American" (Keen, 2011, p. 66). A classless world through the neoclassical lens leads to a conception of economic justice where "market forces at work in factor markets and in goods and services markets are assumed to deliver what is deserved to every participant in the economic process" (Scaperlanda, 1999, p. 419). Finally, neoclassical economics does not offer the intersectional analysis (Barker, 2005) of these structures that would be necessary to attend, for example, to the way that poverty has been feminized (Barker & Feiner, 2004), how "the effect of sexual orientation often differs by gender" (Benería et al., 2016, p. 66), or the disparate impact of the recent financial crisis by race, gender, and family type (Fukuda-Parr, Heintz, & Seguino, 2013). A failure to move beyond neoclassical economics is a failure to expose the fundamental components of inequality and may inhibit action in social studies classes to address injustice.

Finally, neoclassical economics has a toxic effect on the way social studies can talk about human welfare. This effect occurs on both a macro- and micro-level. On a large scale, neoclassical economics promotes a utilitarian framework of well-being that often evaluates the efficacy of an economy on the basis of quantitative growth, either from income or consumption (Nussbaum, 2003; Sen, 1999) rather than one that addresses human capabilities such as life, health, imagination, emotion, and freedom (Nussbaum, 2003). This emphasis produces knowledge that "is likely to be one-sided and biased against gender equity and social justice" (Barker & Feiner, 2004, p. 10) or other ways of conceptualizing well-being (Naz, 2016; Nussbaum, 2016; Power, 2004). On an individual level, neoclassical economics equates happiness with consumption (Bell, 1997; Lewis, 1999; Strassmann & Polanyi, 1995a) and "undermines the emotional base for … moral action and focuses attention away from norms related to community or sacredness" (Nelson, 2016, p. 14). If there is any hope for social studies curricula to model, evaluate, and strive for more humanizing relationships among society and individuals, neoclassical economics cannot be the lens through which these connections are assessed.

Feminist economics: Ontology, epistemology, and key tenets

In the face of a discipline overwhelmingly adherent to the neoclassical paradigm (Fine, 2008; Freeman, 2010; Keen, 2011; Lee, 2004), the question of what is missing from economics education is urgent. What perspectives, questions, answers, epistemologies, and lenses are lost by treating neoclassical economics as economics writ large? This section begins to answer that question by exploring some fundamental assumptions of one alternative to neoclassical economics: feminist economics.

Feminist economics is not a “single, monolithic pillar” (Shackelford, 2012, p. 205); therefore, this section is not an attempt to distill feminist perspectives into a singular representation of a feminist paradigm within economics. However, there are certain perspectives that many feminist economists have in common that, in sum, represent a challenge to the prevailing neoclassical norm. Feminist economists suggest that economists should address the way that patriarchy is maintained in the discipline of economics (Ferber & Nelson, 2003), critique the way that neoclassical economics precludes analyses of gender inequality (Nelson, 2006; Strober, 2003), push for new forms of economic analysis that include attention to race and gender (Feiner & Roberts, 1990, 1995), implement a broader definition of the purpose of economics beyond “thinking like an economist” (Aerni et al., 1999), and break down these walls of pedagogy, content, methodology, and definition to promote transformative social action (Lewis, 1999).

In this paper, I elaborate on Rosetti’s (2001) postmodern approach to feminist economics that draws on McCloskey’s (1998) analysis of rhetoric in economics to frame critiques of the neoclassical order through feminist lenses. McCloskey (1998) used a hermeneutical analysis of the language of economics to “‘toggle’ between philosophical and rhetorical readings, to know what the passage says but also how it achieves its end, persuasion” (p. 4). Given the modernist roots of economics, a postmodern approach to critique is ideal. This approach questions the positions and ideas that are taken for granted, thereby taking “apart the ‘universal’, the enthroned hierarchies by showing how the ‘other’ is implicit in the text,” (Rosetti, 2001, p. 310). While others have sketched out frameworks that broadly encompass feminist approaches (e.g. Aerni & McGoldrick, 1999; Barker & Kuiper, 2010; Ferber & Nelson, 2003; Kuiper & Sap, 1995; Schneider & Shackelford, 2001; Strober, 1994), Rosetti (2001) asserted that “the first step in creating a feminist economics is in criticizing the failure of the old economics in order to clear space for the new” (p. 311). In taking that first step, the following subsections elaborate on feminist economics’ critique of neoclassicism while simultaneously proffering a new feminist paradigm in economics. This two-handed approach to defining feminist economics is perhaps necessary in a world where neoclassical economics has achieved dominance, but a two-handed approach is also an important part of a project that recognizes the stakes of the debate. For if:

> there isn’t a True eternal meaning to be found, there are competing, contingent, particular, meanings which communities regard as true … While the implications for debate within the academy are fairly obvious by this point, the implications for the ‘real world’ are perhaps in the long run even more important. For no longer are just the terms of evaluation up for debate but the very definition of the field and its ‘actors’ themselves. When we are brought face to face with the knowledge that the ‘economy’ is constructed, we are given the opportunity to redefine … an economic theory that privileges humanity rather than efficiency. (Rosetti, 2001, p. 310)

Specifically, this approach to feminist economics recognizes dualism and hierarchy, points out what is omitted in neoclassical theory, highlights the relationship between the spoken and unspoken, challenges the problematic assumptions of neoclassical models, discusses power and authority in the discipline, and attends to standards in economics and the policies they inform.

Recognition of dualism and hierarchy

Pujol (1995) underscored the critical need to attend to dualism and hierarchy by reminding us that "as feminist economists … the personal is political and the political is personal" (p. 19). Dualism here means that for every emphasis in neoclassical economics (and indeed many other sciences) there is an inverse, and within that inverse there is a hierarchy (Nelson, 1996). Neoclassical economics deploys a very specific rhetoric (McCloskey, 1998) that has gendered the discipline in distinct ways that embed masculinity into the very structure of the discipline (Nelson, 1992), thereby excluding women and constructing them as subjects "other" than *HE*, who is the only economic agent worth studying (Hewitson, 1999). Masculinity is baked into neoclassicism through two distinct processes, the modernist agenda to enhance the status of economics as "science," and the manner in which economics positions itself as superior to other social sciences.

As McCloskey (1998) wrote, "words carry with them a ranking with respect to their opposites" (p. 16). In economics, the words used to define the discipline under the neoclassical paradigm connote a masculinity that is replete in positivist approaches to science (Mirowski, 1991). Economics attempts to analyze the public, individual agents, and efficiency, leaving unspoken and unexplored the private sphere, societal institutions, and equity (Nelson, 1996). It uses methods that are rigorous, precise, and objective; leaving untouched tools of intuition, ambiguity, and subjectivity (Nelson, 1996). The assumptions of the discipline include the autonomous rationality of the individual, eschewing consideration of concepts such as socio-emotional dependency (Nelson, 1992). These dualisms are embedded in neoclassical thought (Pujol, 1995). From founders who "wrote as one in a voice laden with patriarchal condescension" (Pujol, 1995, p. 17), to current methodologies "imbued with patriarchy, sexism and misogyny (Pujol, 1995, p. 29), there are significant barriers to neoclassical thought embracing feminist principles. The discipline too often positions women as dependent on men, as mothers or caregivers, as women as unproductive workers, and women as irrational when they act outside the roles they have been proscribed (Pujol, 1995).

Neoclassical economics is also invested in a project to differentiate itself from other social sciences, leading to further investment in the dualisms described above (Grapard, 2001; McCloskey, 1998; Rosetti, 2001; Seiz, 2010; Strassmann, 1993, 1996). Given the preordained hierarchy inherent in "soft" social sciences, neoclassical economics positions itself as a "hard" social science, by "ridiculing the lack of 'rigor' in other social sciences" (Nelson, 1992, p. 109) and doubling down on methodologies that emphasize quantitative analysis. The link between this emphasis and the persistent lack of women involved in the discipline is well chronicled (Bartlett, Ferber, & Green, 2009; Dynan & Rouse, 1997) and is also relevant to the discussion of the next point of emphasis in feminist economics: including that which has been ignored.

Pointing out what is omitted or not valued

Feminist critics assert that neoclassical economics omits or otherwise does not value "family, the work or value of child-bearing, [and] decision-making inside the household" (Rosetti, 2001, p. 312). The preference for "hard," quantitative analysis in economics inevitably leads to equivocating money with value (Nelson, 1992), which in turn eliminates any potential exploration of non-monetary activity or analysis of the impact that economic policy might have on women or gender beyond that which can be documented on a balance sheet (Seiz, 2010). This critique has existed for longer than the hegemony of neoclassical economics, as shown by Grapard's (2001) analysis of the 19th century writings of Charlotte Perkins Gilman. Gilman explored the radical changes to economic analysis that would result from attending to the actual labor in the household and the concomitant exclusion of "explicit considerations of female agency … from mainstream economics" (Grapard, 2001, p. 266). Fast-forwarding a century, feminist perspectives on economics offer similar critiques: the work of the home and the complexity of the household are under-theorized and that the body and feminist standpoints are not valued as starting points for economic analysis.

Aside from the above issues with labor and human capital analyses in neoclassical economics (Bell, 1997), feminist perspectives on economics call attention to the absence of concern for nonmarket work and the family as a multivariate institution that affects economic behavior (Ferber, 1999). K-12 students are more likely to be familiar with nonmarket work given their age; therefore, a failure to include nonmarket work in an economics class can have a negative impact on student participation and perceptions of relevance (Lewis & McGoldrick, 2001). A reduction in participation and seeming irrelevance of curriculum can have a negative impact on diversity in the discipline by discouraging future study when students realize, as Nelson (2006) did, that "[m]ainstream economics really had nothing to say of any intelligence about the economic relations characterizing the life I had led at home … [h]uman connections, human needs, and the appropriate ethical responses to these were left to other fields" (p. 27). By emphasizing the nonmarket work of care and domestic labor, feminist economics offers methods of conveying human connection in the face of rampant individualism (Power, 2004).

These omissions afflict opportunities to address notions of the body and experiences as well. In feminist economic analyses, "'lived' experiences are given a voice that is often denied in a society that values 'objectivity, empiricism, and value-free' analysis" (Shackelford, 1999, p. 21). Rather than splitting into an economic self, an ethical self, and a female self, feminist economics can encapsulate the mind, body, and soul (Nelson, 2006). A feminist starting point to economic analysis might "examine the embodied, and hence sexed, subject positions produced within the discourse of neoclassical economics" (Hewitson, 1999, p. 22) and build a new economics that can utilize the discursively constructed feminine characteristics such as the body and soul as tools to better understand the economic world.

The relationship between what is spoken and unspoken

If feminist economics shines a light on dualism and hierarchy, and explores the way that hierarchy omits certain values and perspectives, then the "next step is to show the relation between the spoken and the unspoken: the importance of the 'female side' in allowing the 'male side' to exist" (Rosetti, 2001, p. 314). Students of neoclassical economics encounter a fully grown *homo economicus*, with "no childhood or old age; no dependence on anyone" (Nelson, 1996, p. 31). This stance is again an example of the unrealistic assumptions of neoclassical economics, which drives a feminist analysis of how *HE*, if he exists at all, is born and raised. Who is feeding him? Who is providing him shelter, clothing, and other essentials for survival? Who is ensuring that his early preferences for, say sticking his finger in the electric outlet, do not lead to the inability to "grow old enough to sell his labor or express his preferences through consumption" (Hopkins, 1995, p. 251)?

The unspoken foundation for the spoken activities in neoclassical economics shines a light on how women's unpaid labor within the household is interwoven in a system that devalues her labor even in the market. It limits autonomy and stands in contrast to the freedom that *HE* experiences to choose where and how to sell his labor. The appeal of capitalism is challenged here as "[a]utonomy and free choice are the virtues of capitalist ideology" (Hopkins, 1995, p. 251), and this autonomy is pursued through free-market policies. The unspoken obligations for those that provide care until *HE* can participate in the market are relevant to a more global analysis as well, as Wood (1997) explored in her analysis of the relationship between the first and third world. For her, definitions of work *and* housework were "modeled on first world economies, with interesting (if problematic) results for the treatment of third world women's labor" (Wood, 1997, p. 48, emphasis in original). The way we speak about work in this context ignores subsistence labor and reinforces a western model of nonmarket labor even when trying to provide attention to domestic work. This example is illustrative of how care work is not reducible to the commodity that mainstream economic activity attempts to enforce and includes a relational element that is vital to any analysis of the manifestation of how unspoken care work is entwined in economic activity, from the micro to the macro (Himmelweit, 2017).

Challenging problematic models

By addressing the dualism, omissions, and relationships therein, feminist economics can begin to offer alternatives and critiques of the problematic models that are prevalent in neoclassical theory. Essentially, the models of neoclassical theory are based on "the supposed universality revealed to be based on one world view" (Rosetti, 2001, p. 314) that enforce a conception of choice, self-interest, and exchange that are anathema to the lived experiences of many outside the modern, White male that has constructed neoclassical theory on the basis of his world view. While some of these critiques will be brought forth in the discussion section as they relate to K-12 economic education, a short feminist challenge to the problematic assumption of scarcity may be useful to explicate the ramifications of neoclassical modeling.

Scarcity is at the heart of neoclassical economics (Lewis, 1999) and, in many cases, is embedded in the very definition of economics given by educators who adhere to the neoclassical paradigm (e.g. Charkins, 2013; Gwartney & Schug, 2011; NCEE, 2010). Embedding the notion that economics is about how humans satisfy unlimited wants with limited resources into the definition of economics equates "the human economy with its market form" (Polanyi, 1977, p. 20) and suppresses analyses beyond those that can be articulated through market transactions (Lewis, 1999). Feminist economics sees market relations as only a fraction of the human relationships and activity that deserve to be considered in economic analysis (Himmelweit, 2017).

Additionally, the imposition of scarcity and its manifestation in neoclassical modeling impoverishes economic discourse and economic policy. Many students of introductory economics come in contact with these models and find them a jarring departure from their lives. Feminist economics would suggest that "economic theories and concepts grow out of the world of human action, rather than teach them that the world of action must conform to laws identified by economic theories" (Lewis, 1999, p. 32). Such a stance is rare, however, and as Strassman and Polanyi (1995a) wrote, for "those who … experience dissonance with the default assumptions and evaluative signifiers in a story, the situation is different. These people, often women or members of other underrepresented groups, will be jarred in to the realization that they do not fit the terms of acceptability of the community" (p. 142), leading to the reduction of women and people of color observed in the field of economics (American Economic Asssocation Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession [CSWEP], 2016; Bartlett et al., 2009; Dynan & Rouse, 1997; Jensen & Owen, 2001; Kahn, 1995; G. Miller, 2012). Further, socially just policy prescriptions are limited by the imposition of scarcity and its accompanying analysis, for

> when we say that economics is about "rational choice in the face of scarcity," we stack the deck in favor of individualism and selfishness. Contrast this to saying that economics is about "who gets to eat and who does not." The latter packs a visceral punch and directs us toward investigating social relations. (Nelson, 2016, p. 15)

These social relations deserve to be explored throughout society, but it has become abundantly clear that power and authority within the discipline of economics has hindered feminist analysis and thus reified the neoclassical status quo.

Power and authority

Albelda's (1995) finding that "[a]t the most fundamental level, prevailing economic epistemology is directly at odds with the notion of feminist analysis, creating enormous, if not insurmountable, obstacles" (p. 269) to a more pluralistic discipline remains largely accurate several decades later. Women continue to be underrepresented in the discipline (CSWEP, 2016), and "[d]espite the burgeoning feminist literature [in economics], the economics profession has proven to be the least open of the social sciences to the challenges raised by feminism" (Benería et al., 2016, p. 85). The hegemony of neoclassical economics within the discipline constitutes a dominant narrative (Shanks, 2018a) and is imposed by textbooks (Feiner, 1999; Gans, 2015; Leet & Lopus, 2007), standards (MacDonald & Siegfried, 2012; NCEE, 2010; Walstad & Watts, 2015), and disciplinary structures (Bresser-Pereira, 2012; Earle et al., 2016; Evensky, 2004; Freeman, 2010). This monopolization relegates feminist economic perspectives, pedagogy, and potential to the margin of the discipline (Aerni et al., 1999; Kuiper & Sap, 1995; Shackelford, 1999) while "[o]rthodox authors succeed, reproduce, and maintain their collective hold on power and authority within the discipline" (Rosetti, 2001, p. 317) allowing neoclassical dogma to maintain supremacy.

It is then incumbent upon feminist economists and economic educators to explore the language, dualisms, and unexplored questions inherent in neoclassical economics (Feiner, 1999; Nelson, 2001) (i.e., the "herstory" of economics [Kuiper & Sap, 1995]) and directly oppose the epistemological and ontological foundations of neoclassicism (Pujol, 1995). By seeking out truer accounts of economic lives, feminist epistemology in economics avoids promoting undue universality and authority (Strassmann & Polanyi, 1995b) and can offer a more relevant and engaging curriculum and pedagogy for future economists (Lewis, 1999; Shackelford, 1999).

Standards and policy

A codified body of knowledge in the form of standards can be problematic as "much more damage is likely to be done when people erroneously believe that they have all the answers than when they are aware of their ignorance" (Ferber, 1999, p. 138); yet, in the case of economics standards, "the NCEE's content standards materials are, in effect, intended to reinforce 'right' (i.e., orthodox) thinking among uninformed (and unsuspecting?) instructors, thereby not only perpetuating the narrowly-conceived neoclassical paradigm but also indoctrinating future generations with their particular conception of economics" (Lewis & McGoldrick, 2001, p. 93). If the above tenets of feminist economics are addressed and the fundamentals of neoclassical economics are critiqued, the question then becomes whether alternative standards might be utilized in an economics informed by feminist principles. Schneider and Shackelford (2001) appropriately began their attempt to formulate feminist standards with the admonishment that we "[b]e wary of definitive lists of the principles of economics—including feminist principles of economics" (p. 80). However, their proposed standards included a number of important elements that would attend to many of the feminist critiques of the neoclassical paradigm. They emphasized that economics should include the following imperatives and ideas:

> Remind our students and ourselves that values enter into economic analysis at many different levels … Introduce the household as another locus of economic activity … Nonmarket activities are important in economics as well … Note how important power relationships are in an economy … Introduce gender, race and ethnicity as important concepts in economics … Describe the complexity of human interactions and how they are affected by a multiplicity of motives … Emphasize the importance of cooperation and caring … Government action can improve market outcomes … Expand the scope of economics to include relevant contributions from other disciplines. (Schneider & Shackelford, 2001, pp. 80–85)

These are starting points and can be supplemented with other approaches outlined by feminist economics scholars.

Alternatively, Power (2004) suggested a social provisioning starting point for feminist economics with the admonition that "starting places matter" (p. 4) and the enumeration of five distinct components that might unify feminist economics approaches. First is the idea that caring labor and domestic labor are vital parts of any economic system and thus should be in the analysis. This provision carries with it the understanding that human actors are interconnected. Second, "human well-being should be a central measure of economic success" (p. 5). Third, human agency in the face of power and access should be examined. Fourth, ethics are inseparable from economic analysis and are thus valid and should be made more visible. Finally, "considerations of class, race-ethnicity, and other factors" (p. 5) should be analyzed intersectionally. The standard proposals by Schneider and Shackelford (2001) and Power (2004) are not exhaustive, and they both acknowledge the futility (and undesirability) of attempting to universalize a paradigm that arose in opposition to the universality of neoclassicism. It may be better to consider these (and others, e.g., Barker & Feiner, 2004) as potential waypoints rather than destinations. Such approaches could lead to doing economics differently, and if "economics would be done differently, it isn't a great leap to suggest that economic policy might look different as a result" (Rosetti, 2001, p. 317).

Nelson (2006) described the way that both progressive and regressive political policy approaches are grounded in neoclassical theory. Pro-market, pro-capitalist perspectives see "market economies as nonhuman 'engines' that nevertheless promote human well-being by meeting our bodily desires with an ever-increasing quantity and variety of material goods and services" (p. 2). Meanwhile, people critical of capitalism often deride it as “systematically driven by greed and rampant materialism” (p. 2) and ascribe the deleterious outcomes of the system to that same nonhuman engine.

Feminist economic standards can lay bare the values and ethics hidden in neoclassical assumptions and have a significant impact on policy. Trycinski (1995) demonstrated how neoclassical economics constrained the debate over family and medical leave during the George H.W. Bush administration. While “neoclassical economics … more often serves a conservative than progressive agenda” (p. 246), as it did in the case of this policy debate, proponents of a more progressive leave policy did not reject neoclassical analysis and instead sought “empirical evidence measuring the actual costs [and] analyses examining traditional market failures” (p. 231). Instead of considering the racialized and gendered implications of the policy; values of cooperation and caring; or human well-being, agency, or ethics, progressive advocates fought on the epistemological terrain of neoclassical economics against their conservative foes. Whether they won or lost is immaterial, as it is in analyses of the impact of globalization and labor (Barker & Feiner, 2004), privatization and economic reform (Hopkins, 1995), welfare reform (Power, 2004), or economic development (Benería et al., 2016). The only possible policy prescriptions from a political debate on neoclassical grounds involve the methodological tools of neoclassicism (Earle et al., 2016), namely individualism, optimization, and equilibrium. Power (2004) reminded us that these starting points matter “because of where they take you” (p. 15); thus, choosing to start with feminist standards is vital to achieving feminist policy goals.

What feminist economics offers that neoclassical economics cannot

Neoclassical economics utilizes individualism, optimization, and equilibrium to describe the world that *HE* inhabits. By recognizing the dualisms, omissions, and what is spoken and unspoken in this worldview, feminist economics can challenge the problematic models built on these tenets, expose the power and authority that maintains them, and create new standards and policy based on a more humanizing economics. A failure to explore feminist economics and other alternative paradigms will allow neoclassical economics to maintain neoliberalism; inhibit democracy; silence questions of race, class, and gender; and impede a more humanizing notion of well-being. With that in mind, I suggest economic educators and social studies teacher educators build their economics on the idea of *homo economicus (re)imagined (HER).*

HER assumptions are in line with feminist economic principles and would include a discussion of values and ethics that guide more than just economic policy, but economic questions, methods, and analysis. It would include consideration of nonmarket activities and the household as a locus of economic activity. It would bring in an intersectional perspective on how power and oppression shape the structure of the economy and color interpersonal economic actions. It would allow for communal or social factors to enter into choice analyses and question the utility of a strictly rational, individual worldview. It might even allow history, sociology, language arts, or other disciplines to contribute new perspectives.

Students are well-equipped to explore economics this way. Students’ lives stand in stark contrast to the world that *HE* ostensibly inhabits. They certainly know that ethics and values affect choices, they have participated in countless nonmarket activities that allow the market economy to exist, and they have experiences with structural inequality. They cooperate and collaborate for better communal outcomes constantly, and they might look favorably on *HER* attempt to bring in more disciplinary tools to make economics more relevant and meaningful.

Adopting feminist economics in K-12 social studies education: Broader questions and a bigger toolbox

Advocating for a more pluralist approach to teaching economics, Nelson (2011) encouraged economics instructors to adopt a “broader questions and bigger toolbox approach” (p. 11) to fostering a classroom environment that challenges the neoclassical status quo. For K-12 teachers and teacher educators concerned with the consequences of neoclassical economics and its pervasiveness in the curriculum and who seek to implement some feminist principles into a class that responds to these critiques, this approach has a great deal to offer. One, it acknowledges the structural challenges to implementing a wholesale feminist curriculum in K-12 classrooms. Namely, these include the rigidity of state standards, the ubiquity of neoclassical textbooks and resources, and the unfamiliarity of K-12 teachers with anything but the principles contained therein. Two, it broadens the definition of economics to better engage students who are concerned with the applicability of economics to “contemporary real-world issues, institutions, and current events” (Nelson, 2011, p. 11). It also avoids the problematic assumption that any one way of seeing the world is comprehensively appropriate, thus opening the door to the exploration and adoption of a number of paradigms beyond neoclassicism.

Ultimately, the adoption of a broader questions and bigger toolbox approach rests on a reframing of the definition of economics. Rather than “definitions of economics that focus on individual rational decision-making under scarcity” (Nelson, 2011, p. 12), it is vital that we define economics as the study of provisioning, or “how societies organize themselves to sustain life and enhance its quality” (Nelson, 2011, p. 12). By redefining economics in this way, teachers and students of economics can begin to explore their economic worlds in a variety of ways that address the fundamental tenets of feminist economics and the prevailing themes of the era.

Utilizing several key tenets of feminist economics, K-12 teachers have an opportunity to bring *HER* to life in the classroom through broader questions and a bigger toolbox. To attend to the need to recognize dualism and hierarchy, teachers can ask students questions about what might be missing from mathematical analyses that rely on quantitative or monetary measurement. This approach could lead to the use of a bigger toolbox that includes qualitative methods of analyzing choices. When considering what is omitted or not valued, they can ask why the work of the home is not included in their textbooks and utilize tools such as a time diary to recognize the amount of nonmonetary labor that is essential for a quality life. The spoken and unspoken nature of economic theory can be explored through questions about how choices are mediated by prevailing systems of oppression, and tools such as historical analysis of economic disenfranchisement can point out the futility and cost of assuming unencumbered choice. To expose some of the problematic foundations of economic models, teachers can offer questions about other ways that humans build and maintain relationships outside of markets, leading to the use of tools that might provision goods and services differently than through the invisible hand. An economic curriculum that interrogates power and authority might explore the history of economic thought, questioning those theorists who laid out the ubiquitous orthodox neoclassical ideas. A bigger toolbox might include the ideas of non-White, non-male, non-Western economists. Finally, standards and policies can be interrogated through questions about who benefits from the maintenance of these conceptions and the resulting policies, which should allow exposure to a number of new tools in order to compare alternatives.

Conclusion

The options before social studies educators and teacher educators are clear. Neoclassical economics *is* economics in K-12 social studies curriculum (E. Adams, 2019). Neoclassical economics has contributed to an economic world that is unjust and anti-democratic. To continue to teach economics within social studies through this paradigm is to support the status quo of inequality, patriarchy, and neoliberalism. Shifting the paradigm is no small task, given the hold of neoclassicism over the discipline itself and particularly its prevalence in K-12 economics education. The question of where to start does not have to begin with feminist economics, but feminist economics offers the most damning critique of neoclassicism and, therefore, represents the best hope for forging a new economics curriculum that attends to the need for a more just, humanizing social studies.

Decades ago in the pages of *Theory & Research in Social Education*, R. Miller (1993) facetiously called for social studies teachers to stop teaching economics due to the toxic impact of neoclassical orthodoxy on society and the planet. The intervening years have, if anything, bolstered his argument that neoclassical economics is ill-equipped to explain our world, to make predictions about what will happen in the future, or to serve as a foundation for social action. The ramifications of the Great Recession, pervasive effects of climate change, enduring elements of systemic racism, and staggering levels of wealth inequality are but a few of the defining features of our economic era that cannot be addressed through the tenets of individualism, optimization, and equilibrium. We need a new economic language that can point out entrenched oppression, expose that which has been ignored and marginalized, and build a more humanizing economic system that values us all. K-12 social studies needs feminist economics.

Notes

1. Interested readers can learn more about Rethinking Economics at www.rethinkeconomics.org and the Post-Crash Economics Society at www.post-crasheconomics.com.
2. There has been a great deal of critical work done in the field of personal financial literacy. In particular the work of Thomas Lucey, James Laney, and Mary Francis Agnello has provided fantastic resources for social studies educators tasked with teaching this vital topic in a way that challenges the status quo (e.g., Lucey, Agnello, & Laney, 2015, 2016; Lucey & Laney, 2012). These authors at times frame economics and personal finance under the same disciplinary umbrella with important implications for disciplinary critique (Lucey et al., 2016). However, I consider the discipline of economics separate from that of personal financial literacy. While there are indeed many ways that neoclassicism affects the personal financial literacy curriculum and results in some similar manifestations for control and oppression (Lucey et al., 2016), I believe that holding them as separate entities is valuable for two reasons. First, Grimes (2012) and S. Miller and VanFossen (2008) both recognize the

infringement of personal finance on broader economic theory and curricula, thus delimiting the space for an already marginalized subdiscipline.

Second, as Graupe (2007) put it, "the content is dependent on the method" (p. 31), and in the case of personal financial literacy, the method presupposes the individual (or the personal) and the monetary (or the financial) which makes it difficult to "research the price in the sense of a given, unchanging property of things" (Graupe, 2007, p. 31) or the ontology of the individual by blocking constructing an economic "agent as a static substance with given qualities tin order to allow actions to be calculable" (Graupe, 2007, p. 18).

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Kevin Magill, Kelly Johnston, and Phil Nichols for early help in thinking through the framing and orientation of this piece.

ORCID

Neil Shanks http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5453-8151

References

Adams, E. (2019). Economics and the civic mission of social studies education: Two critiques of neoclassicism. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, *18*, 16–32. doi:10.1177/2047173419841915

Adams, J., Keane, W., Dutton, M., & Steinmetz, G. (2005). *The politics of method in the human sciences: Positivism and its epistemological others*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Aerni, A., Bartlett, R., Lewis, M., McGoldrick, K., & Shackelford, J. (1999). Toward a feminist pedagogy in economics. *Feminist Economics*, *5*, 29–44. doi:10.1080/135457099338139

Aerni, A., & McGoldrick, K. (Eds.). (1999). *Valuing us all: Feminist pedagogy and economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Albelda, R. (1995). The impact of feminism in economics: Beyond the pale? A discussion and survey results. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *26*, 253–273. doi:10.2307/1183430

American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. (2016). *American economic association's committee on the status of women in the economics profession annual report*. Retrieved from https://www.aeaweb.org/content/file?id=3643

Arnsperger, C., & Varoufakis, Y. (2006). What is neoclassical economics? The three axioms responsible for its theoretical oeuvre, practical irrelevance and, thus, discursive power. *Panoeconomicus*, *53*, 5–18. doi:10.2298/PAN0601005A

Aske, D. (2000). Who is teaching economics to Colorado high school students? *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *24*, 35–41.

Aske, D. (2003). How prepared are prospective high school social studies teachers to infuse economics in social studies courses? *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *27*, 23–27.

Ayers, C. (2016). Developing preservice and inservice teachers' pedagogical content knowledge in economics. *Social Studies Research & Practice*, *11*, 73–92.

Barker, D. (2005). Beyond women and economics: Rereading "Women's Work". *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *30*, 2189–2209. doi:10.1086/429261

Barker, D., & Feiner, S. (2004). *Liberating economics: Feminist perspectives on families, work, and globalization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Barker, D., & Kuiper, E. (Eds.). (2010). *Feminist economics: Critical concepts in economics* (Vol. 4). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Bartlett, R., Ferber, M., & Green, C. (2009). The committee on economic education: Its effect on the introductory course and women in economics. *Forum for Social Economics*, *38*, 153–172. doi:10.1007/s12143-009-9038-9
Bell, C. (1997). Race, gender, and economic data. In R. L. Bartlett (Ed.), *Introducing race and gender into economics* (pp. 190–202). London, UK: Routledge.
Benería, L., Berik, G., & Floro, M. (2016). *Gender, development and globalization: Economics as if all people mattered* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
Blanchard, H., & Coléno, Y.-P. (2016). About the use of the word "market" in the teaching of economics: The lexicon at work at the high school and at the university. *Journal of Social Science Education*, *14*(4), 17–26.
Blank, R. (2009). What should mainstream economists learn from feminist theory? In M. Ferber & J. Nelson (Eds.), *Beyond economic man: Feminist theory and economics* (pp. 135–145). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Bresser-Pereira, L. (2012). For a heterodox mainstream economics: An academic manifesto. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, *35*, 3–20. doi:10.2753/PKE0160-3477350101
Chandler, P. (Ed.). (2015). *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
Chang, H.-J. (2014, May 15). *It's time to demystify economics*. University of Cambridge. Retrieved from https://www.cam.ac.uk/research/discussion/its-time-to-demystify-economics
Charkins, J. (2013). What's wrong and what is missing from K-12 economic education? *Social Studies Review*, *52*, 9–16.
Charusheela, S., & Zein-Elabdin, E. (2003). *Postcolonialism meets economics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Council for Economic Education. (2018). *Survey of the states: Economic and personal finance education in our nation's schools* (p. 10). Council for Economic Education. Retrieved from https://www.councilforeconed.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/2018-SOS-Layout-18.pdf
Daly, H., & Cobb, J. (1994). *For the common good: Redirecting the economy toward community, the environment, and a sustainable future*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Dewey, J. (1916/2004). *Democracy and education*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
Dynan, K., & Rouse, C. (1997). The underrepresentation of women in economics: A study of undergraduate economics students. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *28*, 350–368. doi:10.1080/00220489709597939
Earle, J., Moran, C., & Ward-Perkins, Z. (2016). *The econocracy: The perils of leaving economics to the experts*. Machester, UK: Manchester University Press.
Engebretson, K. (2014). Another missed opportunity: Gender in the national curriculum standards for social studies. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, *9*(3), 21–34.
England, P. (2003). Separate and soluble selves: Dichotomous thinking in economics. In M. Ferber & J. Nelson (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 33–59). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Evensky, J. (2004). Economics in context. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *35*, 197–211. doi:10.3200/JECE.35.2.197-211
Feiner, S. (1995). Reading neoclassical economics: Toward an erotic economy of sharing. In E. Kuiper & J. Sap (Eds.), *Out of the margin: Feminist perspectives on economics* (pp. 151–166). London, UK: Routledge.
Feiner, S. (1999). A portrait of homo economicus as a young man. In M. Woodmansee & M. Osteen (Eds.), *The new economic criticism: Studies at the interface of literature and economics* (pp. 193–209). London, UK: Routledge.
Feiner, S., & Roberts, B. (1990). Hidden by the invisible hand: Neoclassical economic theory and the textbook treatment of race and gender. *Gender & Society*, *4*, 159–181. doi:10.1177/089124390004002003
Feiner, S., & Roberts, B. (1995). Using alternative paradigms to teach about race and gender: A critical thinking approach to introductory economics. *The American Economic Review*, *85*, 367–371.

Feiner, S., & Roberts, B. (1999). Hidden by the invisible hand: Neoclassical economic theory and the textbook treatment of race and gender. In A. Aerni & K. McGoldrick (Eds.), *Valuing us all: Feminist pedagogy and economics* (pp. 43–65). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Ferber, M. (1999). Guidelines for pre-college economics education: A critique. *Feminist Economics*, *5*, 135–142. doi:10.1080/135457099337851
Ferber, M., & Nelson, J. (2003). *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Fine, B. (2008). Vicissitudes of economics imperialism. *Review of Social Economy*, *66*, 235–240. doi:10.1080/00346760701821987
Fischer, L., Hasell, J., Proctor, J., Uwakwe, D., Perkins, Z., & Watson, C. (2017). *Rethinking economics: An introduction to pluralist economics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Freeman, A. (2010). The economists of tomorrow: The case for assertive pluralism in economics education. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *69*, 1591–1613. doi:10.1111/j.1536-7150.2010.00758.x
Fukuda-Parr, S., Heintz, J., & Seguino, S. (2013). Critical perspectives on financial and economic crises: Heterodox macroeconomics meets feminist economics. *Feminist Economics*, *19*(3), 4–31. doi:10.1080/13545701.2013.806990
Fullbrook, E. (2010). How to bring economics into the 3rd millennium by 2020. *Real-World Economics Review*, *54*, 90–103.
Gans, H. (2015). High school economics texts and the American economy. *Challenge*, *58*, 241–250. doi:10.1080/05775132.2015.1028786
Grapard, U. (2001). The trouble with women and economics: A postmodern perspective on Charlotte Perkins Gilman. In S. Cullenberg, J. Amariglio, & D. Ruccio (Eds.), *Postmodernism, economics and knowledge* (pp. 261–285). New York, NY: Routledge.
Graupe, S. (2007). *The basho of economics: An intercultural analysis of the process of economics*. Heusenstamm, Germany: Ontos Verlag.
Graupe, S. (2012). The power of ideas. The teaching of economics and its image of man. *Journal of Social Science Education*, *11*(2), 60–83.
Grimes, P. (2012). Economic education in American elementary and secondary schools. In G. Hoyt & K. McGoldrick (Eds.), *International handbook on teaching and learning economics* (pp. 259–272). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
Gwartney, J., & Schug, M. (2011). What every high school student and teacher needs to know about economics. In M. Schug & W. Wood (Eds.), *Teaching economics in troubled times: Theory and practice for secondary social studies* (pp. 11–36). New York, NY: Routledge.
Hayes, C. (2007, May 24). Hip heterodoxy. *The Nation*. Retrieved from https://www.thenation.com/article/hip-heterodoxy/
Hewitson, G. (1999). *Feminist economics: Interrogating the masculinity of rational economic man*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
Himmelweit, S. (2017). Feminist economics: Why all economists should be feminist economists. In L. Fischer, J. Hasell, J. Proctor, D. Uwakwe, Z. Perkins, & C. Watson (Eds.), *Rethinking economics: An introduction to pluralist economics* (pp. 60–75). New York, NY: Routledge.
Hollis, M., & Nell, E. (1975). *Rational economic man: A philosophical critique of neo-classical economics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Hopkins, B. (1995). Women and children last: A feminist redefinition of privatization and economic reform. In E. Kuiper & J. Sap (Eds.), *Out of the margin: Feminist perspectives on economics* (pp. 249–263). London, UK: Routledge.
Jensen, E., & Owen, A. (2001). Pedagogy, gender, and interest in economics. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *32*, 323–343. doi:10.1080/00220480109596112
Johnson, M. (2016). Emancipatory and pluralist perspectives on democracy and economic inequality in social studies and citizenship education. In C. Wright-Maley & T. Davis (Eds.), *Teaching for democracy in an age of economic disparity* (pp. 42–58). New York, NY: Routledge.
Joshi, P., & Marri, A. (2006). An economics methods course?: Challenges of teaching an economics education methods course for secondary social studies preservice teachers. *The Social Studies*, *97*, 197–202. doi:10.3200/TSSS.97.5.197-202

Kahn, S. (1995). Women in the economics profession. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *9*, 193–205. doi:10.1257/jep.9.4.193

Keen, S. (2011). *Debunking economics: The naked emperor dethroned?* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Zed Books.

Khayum, M., Valentine, G. P., & Friesner, D. (2006). A response of high school teachers to the adoption of state economic standards. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research*, *7* (2), 47–72. doi:10.2139/ssrn.611283

King, L., & Finley, S. (2015). Race is a highway: Towards a critical race approach in economics classrooms. In P. Chandler (Ed.), *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives* (pp. 195–228). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Kuiper, E., & Sap, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Out of the margin: Feminist perspectives on economics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. (Ed.). (2003). *Critical race theory perspectives on the social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Lafferty, G. (2017). Homo economicus, moral sentiments, and the challenges of individualism. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *49*, 162–167. doi:10.1177/0486613415623256

Lasn, K. (2013). *Meme wars: The creative destruction of neoclassical economics*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.

Lee, F. (2004). History and identity: The case of radical economics and radical economists, 1945–70. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *36*, 177–195. doi:10.1177/0486613404264193

Lee, F., & Keen, S. (2004). The incoherent emperor: A heterodox critique of neoclassical microeconomic theory. *Review of Social Economy*, *62*, 169–199. doi:10.1080/00346760410001684433

Leet, D., & Lopus, J. (2007). Ten observations on high school economics textbooks. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, *7*, 201–214. doi:10.2304/csee.2007.7.3.201

Lewis, M. (1999). Breaking down the walls, opening up the field: Situating the economics classroom in the site of social action. In A. Aerni & K. McGoldrick (Eds.), *Valuing us all: Feminist pedagogy and economics* (pp. 30–42). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lewis, M., & McGoldrick, K. (2001). Moving beyond the masculine neoclassical classroom. *Feminist Economics*, *7*, 91–103. doi:10.1080/13545700110059252

Loewen, J. (2008). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Lucey, T., Agnello, M., & Laney, J. (2015). *A critically compassionate approach to financial literacy*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Lucey, T., Agnello, M., & Laney, J. (2016). Financial literacy in the wake of the great recession. In W. Journell (Ed.), *Teaching social studies in an era of divisiveness: The challenges of discussing social issues in a non-partisan way* (pp. 159–174). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lucey, T., & Laney, J. (2012). *Reframing financial literacy: Exploring the value of social currency*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Lutz, M., & Lux, K. (1988). *Humanistic economics: The new challenge*. New York, NY: Bootstrap Press.

Lynch, G. (1990). The effect of teacher course work on student learning: Evidence from the TEL. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *21*, 287–296. doi:10.1080/00220485.1990.10844676

Lynch, G. (1994). High school economics: Separate course vs. the infusion approach. *International Journal of Social Education*, *8*(3), 59–69.

MacDonald, R., & Siegfried, J. (2012). Refreshing the voluntary national content standards in economics. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *43*, 308–314. doi:10.1080/00220485.2012.686779

Marglin, S. (2008). *The dismal science: How thinking like an economist undermines community*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matthews, D. (2019, May 14). The radical plan to change how Harvard teaches economics. *Vox*. Retrieved from https://www.vox.com/the-highlight/2019/5/14/18520783/harvard-economics-chetty

McCloskey, D. (1998). *The rhetoric of economics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Mikl-Horke, G. (2010). Social knowledge for financial markets. *Journal of Social Science Education*, *9*(2), 6–15.

Miller, G. (2012). Using student-written diaries to teach feminist economics. *On the Horizon*, *20*, 206–217. doi:10.1108/10748121211256801

Miller, R. (1993). In order to save the world for human habitation, we must stop teaching economics! *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *21*, 25–48. doi:10.1080/00933104.1993.10505689

Miller, S., & VanFossen, P. (2008). Recent research on the teaching and learning of pre-collegiate economics. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 284–304). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mirowski, P. (1991). *More heat than light: Economics as social physics, physics as nature's economics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Moran, C. (2018, August 15). Why there need to be checks on mainstream economics. *New Thinking for the British Economy*. Retrieved from https://neweconomics.opendemocracy.net/needs-checks-mainstream-economics/

National Council for Economic Education. (2010). *Voluntary national content standards in economics* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from http://www.councilforeconed.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/voluntary-national-content-standards-2010.pdf

National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

National Council for the Social Studies. (2016). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies. *Social Education*, *80*, 180–182.

Naz, F. (2016). Understanding human well-being: How could Sen's capability approach contribute? *Forum for Social Economics*, *45*, 1–16. doi:10.1080/07360932.2016.1222947

Nelson, J. (1992). Gender, metaphor, and the definition of economics. *Economics and Philosophy*, *8*, 103–125. doi:10.1017/S026626710000050X

Nelson, J. (1996). *Feminism, objectivity and economics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Nelson, J. (2001). Feminist economics: Objective, activist, and postmodern? In S. Cullenberg, J. Amariglio, & D. Ruccio (Eds.), *Postmodernism, economics and knowledge* (pp. 286–304). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nelson, J. (2006). *Economics for humans*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Nelson, J. (2011). Broader questions and a bigger toolbox: A problem-centered and student-centered approach to teaching pluralist economics. *Real-World Economics Review*, *58*, 9–18.

Nelson, J. (2016). Poisoning the well, or how economic theory damages moral imagination. In G. DeMartino & D. McCloskey (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of professional economic ethics* (pp. 184–199). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Network for Pluralist Economics. (n.d.). *Neoclassical economics*. Retrieved from https://www.exploring-economics.org/static/charts/epistemology1/index_en.html

Nussbaum, M. (2003). Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and social justice. *Feminist Economics*, *9*(2–3), 33–59. doi:10.1080/1354570022000077926

Nussbaum, M. (2016). Economics still needs philosophy. *Review of Social Economy*, *74*, 229–247. doi:10.1080/00346764.2015.1044843

Parker, W. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Payutto, P. (1994). *Buddhist economics: A middle way for the market place* (Dhammavijaya & B. Evans, Trans.). Bangkok, Thailand: Buddhadhamma Foundation.

Polanyi, K. (1977). *The livelihood of man*. (H. Pearson, Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Power, M. (2004). Social provisioning as a starting point for feminist economics. *Feminist Economics*, *10*(3), 3–19. doi:10.1080/1354570042000267608

Pujol, M. (1995). Into the margin!. In E. Kuiper & J. Sap (Eds.), *Out of the margin: Feminist perspectives on economics* (pp. 17–34). London, UK: Routledge.

Rai, S., & Waylen, G. (2013). Feminist political economy: Looking back, looking forward. In S. Rai & G. Waylen (Eds.), *New frontiers in feminist political economy* (pp. 1–18). New York, NY: Routledge.

Remmele, B. (2011). The intersubjective turn and its consequences for economics education. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, *10*, 129–139. doi:10.2304/csee.2011.10.2.129
Rosenbaum, E. (2000). What is a market? On the methodology of a contested concept. *Review of Social Economy*, *58*, 455–482. doi:10.1080/00346760050204300
Rosetti, J. (2001). Postmodernism and feminist economics. In S. Cullenberg, J. Amariglio, & D. F. Ruccio (Eds.), *Postmodernism, economics and knowledge* (pp. 305–326). New York, NY: Routledge.
Saunders, L., & Darity, W., Jr. (2003). Feminist theory and racial economic inequality. In M. Ferber & J. Nelson (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 101–114). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Scaperlanda, A. (1999). Matters of economic justice. *Review of Social Economy*, *57*, 419–426. doi:10.1080/00346769900000014
Schmeichel, M. (2011). Feminism, neoliberalism, and social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *39*, 6–31. doi:10.1080/00933104.2011.10473445
Schmidt, S. J. (2012). Am I a woman? The normalisation of woman in US history. *Gender & Education*, *24*, 707–724. doi:10.1080/09540253.2012.674491
Schneider, G., & Shackelford, J. (2001). Economics standards and lists: Proposed antidotes for feminist economists. *Feminist Economics*, *7*, 77–89. doi:10.1080/13545700110059243
Schumacher, E. (2010). *Small is beautiful: Economics as if people mattered*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
Seiz, J. (2010). Gender and economic research. In D. Barker & E. Kuiper (Eds.), *Feminist economics: Critical concepts in economics* (Vol. 4, pp. 21–52). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York, NY: Knopf.
Shackelford, J. (1999). Feminist pedagogy: A means for bringing critical thinking and creativity to the economics classroom. In A. L. Aerni & K. McGoldrick (Eds.), *Valuing us all: Feminist pedagogy and economics* (pp. 19–29). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Shackelford, J. (2012). Feminist pedagogy and economics. In G. Hoyt & K. McGoldrick (Eds.), *International handbook on teaching and learning economics* (pp. 205–212). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
Shanks, N. (2018a). A dominant narrative in economics?: Preservice teachers and pluralism in a social studies methods class. *Journal of Social Science Education*, *17*(3), 19–33. doi:10.2390/jsse-v17-i3-1774
Shanks, N. (2018b). *"Economics is political": Preservice teachers, purpose, and the challenges of critical economics pedagogy* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas at Austin.
Shear, S. B. (2015). Cultural genocide masked as education: U.S. history textbooks' coverage of Indigenous education policies. In P. Chandler (Ed.), *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives* (pp. 13–40). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
Sober, T. (2016). Teaching about economics and moneyed interests in twenty-first-century democracy. In C. Wright-Maley & T. Davis (Eds.), *Teaching for democracy in an age of economic disparity* (pp. 79–94). New York, NY: Routledge.
Sober, T. (2017). *Wise choices? The economics discourse of a high school economics and personal finance course* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond.
Spring, J. (2016). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Strassmann, D. (1993). The stories of economics and the power of the storyteller. *History of Political Economy*, *25*, 147–165. doi:10.1215/00182702-25-1-147
Strassmann, D. (1996). How economists shape their tales. *Challenge*, *39*, 13–20. doi:10.1080/05775132.1996.11471886
Strassmann, D., & Polanyi, L. (1995a). The economist as storyteller: What the texts reveal. In E. Kuiper & J. Sap (Eds.), *Out of the margin: Feminist perspectives on economics* (pp. 129–150). London, UK: Routledge.
Strassman, D., & Polanyi, L. (1995b). Shifting the paradigm: Value in feminist critiques of economics. *Forum for Social Economics*, *25*, 3–19. doi:10.1007/BF02779043

Strober, M. (1994). Rethinking economics through a feminist lens. *The American Economic Review*, *84*, 143–147.
Strober, M. (2003). The application of mainstream economics constructs to education: A feminist analysis. In M. Ferber & J. Nelson (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 135–156). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Trycinski, E. (1995). The use and abuse of neoclassical theory in the political arena: The example of family and medical leave in the United States. In E. Kuiper & J. Sap (Eds.), *Out of the margin: Feminist perspectives on economics* (pp. 231–248). London, UK: Routledge.
Walstad, W. (2001). Economic education in U.S. high schools. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *15*, 195–210. doi:10.1257/jep.15.3.195
Walstad, W., & Watts, M. (2015). Perspectives on economics in the school curriculum: Coursework, content, and research. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *46*, 324–339. doi:10.1080/00220485.2015.1040185
Wood, C. (1997). The first world/third party criterion: A feminist critique of production boundaries in economics. *Feminist Economics*, *3*, 47–68. doi:10.1080/135457097338654
Wright-Maley, C., & Davis, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Teaching for democracy in an age of economic disparity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Yoder, P., Johnson, A., & Karam, F. (2016). (Mis)perceptions of Arabs and Arab Americans: How can social studies teachers disrupt the stereotypes? In W. Journell (Ed.), *Teaching social studies in an era of divisiveness: The challenges of discussing social issues in a non-partisan way* (pp. 63–78). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.