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Abstract

This critical and philosophical study explores the relationship between globalization, the evolution of structural education reform policy (i.e., the standards and accountability movement), and the purpose of secondary history/social studies education in American society. From *A Nation at Risk* to Obama’s *A Blueprint for Reform*, federal education policy has narrowed the vision of public education in the United States for the past 30 years.

The purpose of this study is three-fold: 1. question the purpose of history/social studies education in light of the effects of globalization on American public education reform; 2. propose a new rationale for world history curriculum in secondary education; and 3. reconceptualize a curriculum that is responsive to students living in a 21st century global society. I conducted critical discourse analysis (CDA) on the five federal policies since 1983 to explore the evolution of structural education reform and its effects on public education. The findings highlighted a shift in policy that now focuses on the economic potential of the individual in the global economy rather than a traditional democratic, socio-political purpose in the development of society. CDA also was conducted on current history/social studies standards—three state frameworks (Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York) and the Common Core Standards—to understand the influence of policy on what and how history/social studies education is taught in the U.S. All four frameworks reflect the focus on standards-based education reform, but the state frameworks more so reflect the traditional purpose of education where the Common Core Standards reflect the narrowed focus on skill-based learning.
Based on the research and discourse analysis conducted in this study, I developed an epistemological overview of a reconceptualized world history curriculum that argues for an interdisciplinary social studies course entitled “Comparative Global Studies.” The conceptual foundation is based on Pinar’s reconceptualization theory, M. Singh’s concept of responsive education, and the learning theory of critical constructivism, which supports a curriculum that critically engages students with the current state of our world in light of globalization and how they as individuals and part of a greater collective are situated within the 21st century global society.
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**1 – Introduction: The Call for Change in World History Curriculum**

Globalization defines the way of life for many in the United States and other parts of the world. Changes in the global economy, culture, and political systems affect each other and the individuals, groups, and institutions that reside in these nations of the world (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000; Torres, 2003). The term globalization is a relatively recent conception of the social, political, and economic relationship between individuals and groups throughout the world. However, globalization has been an active force for centuries, possibly even thousands of years. The origins of globalization and how it currently exists are traceable back to the time of Christopher Columbus and the Age of Exploration. Hopkins (2002) stated that there are four stages of globalization and the current stage, “post-colonial globalization” (1950s-present), relates to the two prior stages, “proto-globalization” (1500s-1800) and “modern globalization” (1800-onward). These stages reflect Hopkins’ views on the intensification of global patterns that “transform economic, political, social, and cultural relationships across countries, regions, and continents” (p. 19), but recognize the vagueness of the term and how its definition can change depending on the related phenomenon in question. Because of the evolving nature of globalization, the relationship between the global market structure with politics, government, and society becomes more complex over time. The once distinct components of human civilization become so intertwined that eventually it is more difficult to distinguish between the social, political, and economic aspects of the globalized world.

Despite the complexity of what globalization encompasses, scholarship on it can be generally broken down into two patterns: the more realistic version that focuses on
economics and the more optimistic and hopeful version as seen in the words of former US President Woodrow Wilson (1917).

The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them (pp. 4-5).

Since the American Revolution, the ideals of democracy (i.e., natural rights, personal liberties and freedoms) have been used for greater social, political, and economic change. This continued through America’s expansion throughout the rest of the world between the 17th and 20th centuries. Still today with recent global events, such as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, hegemonic forces use the call for spreading democracy, liberty, and freedom to achieve ulterior national and private interests.

The track record of the American government and trans-national corporatism for the past century illustrates a more realistic version of globalization. Since the age of industrialization and the dawn of free-market capitalism, there has been a continuous and frenzied drive towards the domination of world markets. Through the study of world history, this becomes apparent when examining the imperial nature of world events, especially within the past 300 to 400 years. This is somewhat illustrated in secondary world history textbooks and courses, but not in direct relation to the phenomenon of globalization and its effects on the world. Which version of “globalization” should be
taught in a social studies class? Should the concept of globalization even be taught at all? These are just a couple questions that I ask myself as a world history teacher.

**Research Overview**

Several years ago, my school changed the world history curriculum from a strictly chronological teaching of world history to teaching the subject matter chronologically by regions. The regions consist of Europe, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, with the entire first semester curriculum devoted to Europe. This change, instituted by the school's administration, did not have a clear justification.

In addition, the world history curriculum still only focuses on historical knowledge within an isolated context (i.e., region by region) and not on higher order critical thinking skills so students can translate the knowledge and learning from one topic to another (in or outside the history classroom). There is no stated purpose or outcomes to the course on how it will help students in other classes or after high school. This is similar to the lack of social studies focus in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). Despite history and social studies courses still taught in high schools, it is not based on current and future social, political, and economic needs of our citizens and country. These kinds of classes still generally focus on dates and facts, rather than tracing the bigger picture of trends, themes, and connections from the past to the present, and the interconnectedness of the world through globalization. This is especially important in a culturally diverse nation like the United States; due to immigration and the global social, political, and economic presence of the U.S. throughout the world, students should understand how our country became the way it is today and how it impacts them on an individual and collective basis.
The purpose of this study is not to question the justification for the switch to teaching world history regionally, but an overall reappraisal of how world history could be taught to secondary level (i.e., high school) students in light of this change. I am only using my current teaching environment as a launching point to a larger discussion of how the purpose of social studies, specifically world history curriculum, should change in light of globalization and the evolution of American public education reform. I believe world history should address the current force of globalization as it has become completely entrenched in the economic, social, political, and cultural fabric of the United States and much of the world. Events, places, people, and phenomena should not be studied in isolation, but in a responsive and relational framework (M. Singh, 2007), almost like an interdisciplinary comparative studies course. So not only should history be studied, but also the economics, politics, culture, society, geography, and the social ecological environment of various regions around the world. These should be researched, examined, and discussed to overall better understand what globalization was, is, and what it will become, and the impact it has had on human civilization. This could be achieved through multiple mediums (Crocco, 2005), including history, political science, sociology, economics, anthropology, music, the arts, theory, philosophy, and literature with the incorporation of critical thinking skills, problem-based learning, and technology integration.

The overarching theme of this study is based on Pinar’s (2004a) reconceptualization theory and M. Singh’s (2007) concept of responsive education. Pinar’s (2004a) reconceptualization theory is situated within the curriculum field and how curriculum is hegemonically entrenched in society. He stated, “what is necessary is
a fundamental reconceptualization of what curriculum is, how it functions, and how it might function in emancipatory ways” (p. 154). M. Singh’s (2007) concept of “responsive education struggles with existing constraints to construct transformative policies, pedagogies and politics that enable intergenerational engagements with changing global/national imperatives” (p. 114). Ideologically, these two theories are in conflict with one another; Pinar seeks to find ways to fundamentally change society through reconceptualizing curriculum where M. Singh seeks to reform curriculum within the current restraints placed on education by policy, governance, and hegemonic systems. However, I believe these two theories complement one another in that one has to think beyond the current norms of educational practice to contemplate the potential of teaching and learning in relation to current policies and practices in public education. Within this, I am seeking ways to rethink how a world history curriculum could be re-approached and taught within and outside the current structures of the history curriculum at the secondary school level, but also in relation to the educational structures at the local, state, and national levels as related to current and future public education policy.

Currently, the focus of public education, and more generally, the purpose of education overall, is on the economic potential of individuals within a globally centered national economy (i.e., the United States). The purpose of education has realigned itself with this globally focused mind set on economic potential and output. Since the advancement of mass public education in the 1800s, economics has always partially driven education, but along with the goal of advancing the ideals of equality and equity in a democratic society. That democratic piece has been replaced and I believe needs to be re-engaged into the national and global discourse on the purposes of education in a
globalized society. I am doing this through research on the evolution of structural education reform in light of the effects of globalization on American society and how that has translated into educational practice (i.e., what and how social studies is taught on the secondary level).

Before moving into a discussion of the research problem, purpose, and questions of this study, the concept of globalization is introduced and how it has affected recent American education reform efforts. By no means is this an exhaustive review of the literature on globalization, but it will begin to help shed light on the complexity of how globalization infiltrates all aspects of human civilization and connects to public education reform. As a result of this developing research, I have come to quickly realize the messiness of the topic and how other research areas of education and the social sciences are intricately interconnected with my study, which will need further investigation in the future.

**Introduction to Globalization**

In order to understand the current climate of the field of education and public education reform in the United States, it is important to recognize the influencing factors behind the evolution of the structural education reform movement (i.e., the standards and accountability movement). The transformation of the American economy from a system based on manufacturing and domestic output to a market structure based on services and global competition requires an awareness of the relationship between globalization and its effects on society.

Much of what will be discussed in this section reflects on the macro level relationship between global economic matters and its correlation to other facets of
civilized society. This relationship is also referred to as “globalization from above” (e.g. the phenomenon of globalization is directed down on individuals and groups by multi-national corporations and global political/economic organizations) (Singh, Kenway, & Apple, 2007). “Globalization from above” is looking at the whole picture when it comes to the impact of globalization on human civilization (i.e., a top-down perspective).

Hegemonic powers dictate the social, political, and economic actions and interactions that occur within and between societies. It blurs the lines between politics and economics along with national/global boundaries (Beck, 2000). With the globalizing of economic and political discourses and relationships, human civilization intricately interconnects itself from within due to the complex relationship of social, political, and economic matters, which often obscures the difference between issues of a localized or regional nature.

Defining globalization.

Globalization is a dynamic term. It encompasses a wide field of topics and issues. The term appears in everyday language and numerous academic fields of study. Even though the use of the term globalization is relatively recent (past three decades) (Crafts, 2000; Dower & Williams, 2002; Held & McGrew, 2003), it has in fact been in practice for centuries (Aronowitz & Gautney, 2003; Coatsworth, 2004; Stearns, 2009). Similar to Hopkins’ (2002) stages of globalization (mentioned earlier in this chapter) that divides world history into stages from the Age of Exploration to the present, Amin (1996) provided a similar chronology of globalization development that occurred within the evolution of human civilization. Amin presented how globalization evolved around the development of mercantilism and capitalism from the 1500s to today. Over time, global
economic practices have not just involved industrialized or post-industrialized nations, but even rural, primarily agricultural countries as well for their raw materials, natural resources, and food production capabilities. Often times the success of both industrialized and non-industrialized nations have been based on their integration into the developing global economic structure and their ability for sustainability over long periods of time (Coatsworth, 2004; Diamond, 2011). With the over harvesting of the world’s natural resources and the search for alternative materials, the global economic structure has had to evolve to circumvent these challenges for free-market capitalism to continue.

The overlapping of various historical periods within the paradigm of globalization has seen the acceleration of the global market structure and its relationship to politics, government, and society (Sampatkumar, 2007). As Castells (2000) stated, to where today what develops is “an economy with the capacity to work as a unit in real time on a planetary scale” (p. 101); though the rate of interaction the world sees today is not same that existed in the past. Since the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Greece, Rome, and China to today, globalization has been in existence and developed over time through the evolution of regional trade and economic patterns, and the intermingling of various social and political cultures.

Current economic structures of the free world correspond to the 16th and 17th century ideas of Jean-Baptiste Colbert and Adam Smith. Colbert believed in mercantilism, which provided for governmental involvement in domestic economic growth (Bresiz, 2005). Adam Smith’s (2008) Wealth of Nations brought to the forefront the idea of unfettered access to economic potential and opportunity through the free market structure. Through the ideas of laissez-faire thinking and free-market capitalism,
Milton Friedman extended these concepts to shape the way the global market works today. Theoretically, society as a whole will benefit from little or no governmental interference in the economy and it will allow the market structure to work freely through its natural course. The belief is that economic policies that benefit the wealthy will eventually “trickle down” and advance the masses (Supply-Side Economics, 2011).

Since the 1800s, there has been an increased acceleration of the above phenomenon (and discussion about it, including in the work of Saint-Simon, Durkheim, Weber, Marx, and Mackinder) (Held & McGrew, 2003; Mott IV, 2004). Social thinkers of the time foresaw how industrialization and technology were changing the world socially, politically, economically, and geographically in response to the development of capitalism and the modernization of the global society. However, it has not been until more recently that the actual term globalization becomes more common in academic, policy, and everyday discourse.

What is globalization? Simply it is the compression of space and time within human civilization (Castells, 2004), although, globalization is not as simple as that. Globalization involves every aspect of the social, political, and economic fabric of society, especially in the western modern world. Globalization often relates to the westernization (Pardo, 2001) or even the Americanization of the world (Scheuerman, 2010). With westernization, a country or region adopts characteristics of the social, political, and/or economic systems of Europe and North America. Americanization refers to the specific influence that the United States has on the development of the rest of the world. Often globalization manifests as an economic phenomenon, as related to the major economic structure of the world—free market capitalism. Under recent
globalization forces, Americanization and free-market capitalism go hand-in-hand due to the powerful influence that the United States’ economic market and policies have on other countries’ and regions’ capitalist and even non-capitalist economies (Barber, 1996). Klein (2007) stated that the dominant influence of globalization is a product of neoliberalism, which corresponds to the ideas of free-market capitalism. Neoliberalism describes the tenets of free-market capitalism in that there should be as little regulation and restriction as possible on economic markets and systems. This will allow the markets to be efficient as possible to meet the requirements of supply and demand (Klaf & Kwan, 2010).

Due to the strong influence that economic actions and policies have on societies, it is hard to fully isolate the economic nature from the social and political aspects of globalization (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). Money makes the world turn. With wealth comes power, with power comes the ability to influence and dictate the course of social and political development within a society. In turn, with increased amounts of social and political power, there is the capacity to influence the direction of economic growth and development (e.g., congressional regulatory power over the national economy and the resulting influence on the global economy as seen in the 2008 American economic crisis). Beck (2000) stated that all parts of society and civilization interconnect under globalization. All parts of the system have to be in continuous motion together for the overall structure to work.

The driving force behind globalization is the interaction and integration of economic structures and actions on a global scale (Arnove, 2003; Carnoy, 2000; Gibson-Graham, 1996). This relationship has evolved since the development from local to
regional trade and commerce of ancient civilizations. Trade has been and continues to be a major factor in the process of globalization. As the practice of trade expanded over time, especially when Europe became more involved globally in the 1400s and afterwards, colonization, and thereby imperialism, became an extension of trade (Esteva & Prakash, 1998). Trade markets became more powerful and influential all over the world (O’Rourke & Williamson, 1999). For instance, the impact of markets in Asia could directly affect the markets in Europe. Geography and the environment was a prominent factor in the relationship between developed and emerging markets around the world due to the correlation between the need for raw materials and the manufacturing of finished goods and products (Diamond, 2011). The trading of goods and services has forced the interaction and integration of peoples from various cultural and geographical locations around the world. It becomes only a matter of time to see how these interactions influence the various individuals and groups of these regions. If a financial crisis occurs in one country, it will more than likely cause a chain reaction for other financial crises to occur throughout the world (Friedman, 1999; Gray, 1998; Klein, 2007). For example, Southeast Asia faced a financial crisis in the late 1990s that had a ripple effect on global economic markets. More recently, the banking and debt crisis in the United States has more or less plagued the world financially for the first 13 years of the 21st century.

Modernization is an extension of the globalization phenomenon (Giddens, 1990; Pardo, 2001; Waters, 1995). Through the passage of time, civilizations have progressed across all areas of human advancement from food production and medicine to transportation, communication, and technology. As technology advances, this influences
the process of globalization as it compresses the amount of time it takes for various peoples around the world to interact (Castells, 2004; Gibson-Graham, 1996; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). From the creation of ships and railroads to the telephone and Internet, the time it takes to conduct business on a regional and global scale has become less over time.

Globalization: The good, the bad, and the ugly.

Numerous changes to society have and do occur because of globalization. The exchange of technology, economic transactions, goods, labor, communications, social customs, cultural influences, and political processes are all part of the interaction and migration of individuals and groups from various regions of the world (Castells, 2004; Gibson-Graham, 1996; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). Because of this, there are many positive and negative effects of globalization (Giddens, 2003; Kellner, 2002; Stiglitz, 2002). Overall, the world has become smaller so individuals and groups have more opportunity to interact with and learn from one another (Beck, 2000). Not only does globalization extend economic policy throughout the world, but also democratic ideals (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Fukuyama, 2006). “Economic liberalism provides the optimal route to prosperity to any people willing to take advantage of it” (Fukuyama, 2006, p. 234). The principles behind free-market capitalism focus on the unrestricted access of opportunity. Through this, individuals and groups have the possibility for freedom of choice and action, which reflect the ideals of democracy. For the most part, capitalism has allowed for democracies to succeed and vice versa. They both provide for the freedom of movement, choice, and opportunity. However, there also have been instances of authoritarianism and capitalism co-existing side by side (e.g., China).
Many other aspects of globalization, including access to higher food production levels, and more extensive sources of financial credit and technology, were originally seen as a positive, but over time they have had adverse effects on various groups and regions of the world (Dower & Williams, 2002; Hirst, 1997). From overproduction, mass consumption, privatization, political, and military action to corporatization, brain drain, and new divisions of labor, globalization affects the world every minute of every day (Arnove, 2003; Klein, 2007; Nitta, 2008; Saltman, 2007; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). Globalization has created further inequality between various individuals and groups (Chomsky, 1999; Wolf, 2000). Globalization oppresses individuals, groups, and communities based on their connection and relationship to the hegemonic market structure (Freire, 2000). For underdeveloped and emerging markets, especially ones that provide raw materials and/or the labor force for the manufacturing of finished goods, they base their success or failure on the demand of products by consumers, often times produced by citizens of other nations. This in turn affects the lack of social and political influence that these oppressed individuals, groups, and communities not only have on their existence, but also on the overall development of their society in relation to the markets they serve on a global scale.

Because of the diverse effects of globalization, Giddens (2000) discussed the possibility of finding a new way to do things, economically and politically. As a result, an anti-capitalist movement has begun to emerge given the adverse effects of globalization economically on marginalized individuals and groups (Callinicos, 2003). As Amin (1996) stated, globalization affects all parts of life and human civilization. It even develops a state of dependency (Gonzalez Casanova, 1996). Nations are no longer
independent of each other, but in fact rely on the other for survival and success (R. Robertson, 1992).

There is also an unknown factor to globalization and its future effects on society and the world. Much of the discourse on globalization focuses on what has already occurred or the oppressive nature of it on society, but scholars, researchers, and educators should also examine the “what could be” factor of globalization and its effects. Because of the transnational nature of globalization, many new ideas, influences, and hypotheses have already disseminated across nations’ borders; what about the ones that have not yet? Gough (2000) referred to this as the “imaginary” or the unknown potential of globalization. Human civilization during the past several decades has had to focus on catching up to the effects of globalization. Could the world ever catch up to these effects and truly foresee what may result from globalization, and if so, could this expand the “imaginary” or creative aspect of the transnational, global society and thus become a more positive influence on the world? There is a possibility of this; a truly evolving society, including a transformative public education system, could provide avenues for this to occur, such as a comparative global studies course that could provide the space for this type of thinking and possibility to cultivate.

The Intersection of Globalization and Education

Globalization has also greatly affected education (Carnoy, 2000; Rideout Jr., 2000) and the production of knowledge (Arnove, 2003). Specifically, I am referring to the neo-liberalist policies that advocate for free market ideology and laissez-faire capitalism (Klein, 2007; Morrow & Torres, 2003; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). Neoliberalism and the phenomenon of globalization go hand-in-hand; neo-liberalist
policies transcend into the social, cultural, and political manifestations of globalization, including the pursuit, access, and attainment of knowledge.

Due to varying factors compressing space and time (i.e., Internet, satellite communications, etc.), it is generally easier and faster to learn new information and skills (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000; Tamim, Bernard, Borokhovski, Abrami, & Schmid, 2011). There are no longer any permanent structures of knowledge and learning. Within modern times, new knowledge and learning is always occurring (Arnow, 2003; Giddens, 1994). It is unlike earlier times where knowledge was more static and permanent. Because of the rapid acceleration of knowledge and learning, it is also much easier to find possible problems in current thought and thus create uncertainty in what is supposedly true (Kenway & Bullen, 2000). Although knowledge has become more precise with the advances in scientific reasoning, there is so much of it now that it is hard at times to decipher what is true and false, and what is worth knowing. I often struggle with this myself as a world history teacher. By becoming more knowledgeable about the state of public education, the impact of neo-liberalist policies on society and education, and the constant juggling of curricular content choices due to the effects of structural education reform efforts (i.e., the standards and accountability movement), I find myself questioning everything that I teach now. This includes how I teach the content, the content itself, and whether or not it is worthy of my students’ limited precious time within the classroom environment.

Under the umbrella of globalization, knowledge has become fuel for production, economic growth, and competition (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). As Rhoades and Slaughter (1991) stated, education reform is necessary so students are better prepared for
the work environment after their schooling experience is complete. However, curriculum and the transmission of knowledge have not changed much in the past century (Carnoy, 2000). Therefore the curriculum will have to match what the students will need and experience to be productive workers, including critical thinking and problem solving skills (Coatsworth, 2004; Suarez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004).

Education has become a product marketed to society as a solution that addresses the wider social, political, and especially economic needs of the public and national good (Bray, 2003; Raduntz, 2007). Multi-national corporations have become more influential players in America’s education system (Saltman, 2004). From this view, education will need to mimic the larger economic market structure to help solve societal issues. However, this product will contain only as much as is required for workers to be competent and productive workers. As a result, curriculum and the influence of teachers in curricular development have been watered-down to meet these minimum requirements. For example, the arts and humanities in American secondary education are set aside for the perceived notion that math, science, and literacy education are the only essential keys to success in the modern economy (as reflected in what is assessed in numerous regional and national standardized tests) (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Darling-Hammond stated there is a de-skilling of students and teachers because of this. Students will receive the training that is only necessary to achieve a limited skill set and therefore will not have the capacity to think beyond the set tasks within a given job. Teachers will become “line managers” moving students from one “factory” to the next through pre-packaged curriculum to obtain these limited skill sets.
Educational governance.

Under the phenomenon of globalization, neo-liberalist policies are affecting how education is governed, which is interconnected with larger social, political, and economic issues facing nations, such as financing, equity, and access to opportunity (Arnove, 2003). This is a result of global competition and nations striving for economic dominance. Nations are seeking out new ways to prepare its’ citizenry and infrastructures to compete on a global scale (Bray, 2003). Multi-national corporations heavily influence nations to seek cooperation in order to dominate economic markets (Darling-Hammond, 2010). These corporations are realizing more than ever that education and school reform will be one of the keys to their success. There is a reciprocal relationship between education, business, and government. If a nation provides a quality public education for its citizens, the citizens are more qualified and better prepared for their careers. If citizens are better workers, this provides for a more productive and profitable business. If a government provides this for a corporation then it is more likely that the corporation will help the nation through financial and political support. Ultimately, the notion is that this relationship will in turn assist the social, political, and economic welfare of its citizens.

As globalization has transformed the economic structures of the world, nation-states have begun to remodel their education systems to mimic the “real world.”¹ This

---

¹ A major component of globalization and free-market capitalism is the argument over deregulation versus regulation of economic activity; this includes the degree of regulatory power that the nation-state has over the economy (Castles, 2004; Ohmae, 1990; Olssen, 2008; Welch, 2003). Due to major economic crises, such as the Great Depression and the recessions of the 1980s and 2000s, various interest groups have called for restrictions and interventions to be placed on the marketplace by governmental organizations to help protect the overall welfare and security of the public (i.e., regulation). Jones (2000) declared that the very nature of globalization included deregulation. Since the dawn of modern capitalism, there has been a struggle over the control of the economy (nationally and internationally) by nation-states and international governance organizations. A similar struggle is also occurring over the regulation of social and political activity through legislation and policy (e.g., standards and accountability movement in public education reform). Hirst (1997) stated that the global economy
remodeling program has often begun with the structures of a nation-state’s education system. Historically, industrialized nation-states have had a very centralized, national curriculum where issues from content to assessments are managed by the central government and not on local levels (Bray, 2003; Darling-Hammond, 2010). However there are exceptions to this, for example, the United States’ education system has been left up to its individual states to determine how they would structure and fund education (Kirst, 1995; Nitta, 2008). This has slowly changed in recent decades as the pressures of globalization have forced the United States to rethink its structure of education and how it relates to the country’s economy. Conversely, nation-states that had centralized education systems have begun to decentralize and/or privatize their structures to help their countries compete in the global market (Astiz, Wiseman, & Baker, 2002; Bray, 2003). Even American school districts have experimented with privatization of public schools (i.e., charter schools). A paradox has developed in the globalized world where seemingly economically competitive countries are reforming their education systems according to contradictory patterns.

At the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, countries like the United States wanted to become “modern” (socially, politically, and economically) and began to change their theories of education, where they became more formal and systematic to help meet this goal (i.e., factory model of education) (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). The world is seeing a similar change now as the new “industrial revolution,” globalization, is altering nations to become part of a global economic market structure. If nation-states want to compete in this emerging global market, they will need to have the

---

does need regulation with a common set of rules and guidelines for nations to follow to ensure a sound economic structure, thereby providing for a stable social and political society. In some instances nations have not always followed this logic (Olssen, O’Neill, & Codd, 2004).
tools to compete and these tools are skilled workers (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Where will these workers be trained so the nation may succeed? They will be trained in educational settings that mimic what they will experience in the real world, which will be fluid and evolving over time to meet global supply and demand requirements. As nation-states try to create education systems to compete in the global economy, they are making shifts in determining if they need to have a more centralized and/or decentralized/privatized education system (Astiz, Wiseman, & Baker, 2002). All aspects of a nation-state’s education system will have to seamlessly integrate itself within the transitioning and evolving 21st century global economy.

Research Problem

As a result of the complex relationship between globalization and public education reform, social studies curriculum in many American public high schools has become secondary to other core subject areas, including mathematics, science, and literacy (Darling-Hammond, 2010). This is due to the evolution of American public education reform since the 1980s to the present based on the growing concern around global economic competition between the United States and other countries. From a top down management approach (i.e., “globalization from above”), federal education policy has focused on mathematics, science, and literacy as the keys to the current and future success of the United States in the global market economy. In addition, federal education policy has concentrated on standardization and accountability measures to guide school districts to ensure that all students are receiving a similar focus in curricular content knowledge and skill development within these areas (Nitta, 2008). As seen in the era of standards and accountability, including the current environment of the No Child Left
Behind Act of 2001, policymakers, corporations, and the public perceives students are still not attaining this knowledge and skill set (Nitta, 2008; also see Chapter 5). During the past 30 years, there have been numerous calls for public education reform from corporations to politicians to local communities, educators, parents, and students. With these demands, how much change has actually occurred over the course of three decades of federal and state level public education reform policy?

Research Purpose and Questions

In light of globalization and the effects of federal policy on American public education, the objective of this study is to critically and philosophically reconceptualize the purpose of secondary-level world history curriculum for a global era. This would not be a world history course in the traditional sense, but a comparative global studies course where the world and its interconnectedness is studied on a macro scale through history, political science, economics, humanities, the arts, geography, and the environment in a comparative context. Countries and regions would be comparatively studied to understand the role of globalization and its impact in a global context, and how it has affected the evolution of human civilization over the course of time. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the purpose of this work is an overall reappraisal of how world history could be taught to secondary education students throughout American society that will meet multiple needs on an individual and societal basis. These needs range from personal growth and a personal understanding of how the individual is part of a greater force to the betterment of society and American social, political, and economic interaction on an international scale. The use of my current teaching environment is only a backdrop to help understand how social studies, specifically world history curriculum,
could change in light of globalization and its impact on public education and society as a whole.

The overarching theme of this study is multi-faceted. Taking the notions of Pinar’s (2004a) reconceptualization theory and M. Singh’s (2007) concept of responsive education, I am seeking ways to rethink how a world history curriculum could be approached and taught within and outside the current structures of the history curriculum at the secondary school level, but also at the district, state, and national levels as related to current and future educational policy in light of globalization.

The research problem in this study focuses on multiple interrelated layers as related to my central question: how can public education reform respond to the challenges that globalization has placed on American society and public education through reconceptualized curriculum?

As reflected in Figure 1.1, the following research questions are explored in this study:

1. What is globalization? What effect has it had on American education reform (1980-present) and secondary history/social studies curriculum?
2. What effect has structural education reform (standardization and accountability) efforts had on secondary history/social studies curriculum?
3. What is the purpose of world history curriculum? Has it changed? Does it need to change? Why or why not?
   a. What is the current “paradigm” of world history curriculum?
      i. Why does world history curriculum tend to focus only on the historical narrative?
b. What would the new paradigm look like?

4. How can a reconceptualized world history curriculum meet the evolving needs of students and society in the 21st century? (How does the curricular paradigm need to change for a new “world history” curriculum?)

5. What would a comparative global studies course constitute on the secondary education level?

Figure 1.1 – Research Focus

- Globalization
  - Impact on society & the world
    - Impact on American public education, policy, & reform
      - Structural education reform
        - Narrowing of school curriculum
          - What is the purpose of world history curriculum in a global era?

- a global social, political, & economic community
  - focus on global economic competition

- Standardization & accountability
Methodology Overview and Research Organization

Methodological overview.

This study used three primary methodologies, with the first two concerning approaches to research and the third as a process to begin developing a new mode to teaching world history: 1. critical inquiry (i.e., literature exploration, and policy and curricular framework analysis), 2. philosophical inquiry, and 3. curricular reconceptualization. I used policy and curricular framework analysis to examine the effects of globalization on American public education reform, the thematic evolution of history and social studies education in the United States, and the current condition of history and social studies curricular frameworks at the state level. I examined the policies’ and frameworks’ text through the use of critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 2011a; Goffman, 1974; Lakoff, 2004). Philosophical inquiry provided for the exploration of the purpose of world history curriculum and the need for it in today’s society in light of globalization and its effects on society, education policy, and curriculum.

The policy analysis included the coding and analysis of five federal education policies from the 1980s to the present. The policies are President Ronald Reagan’s *The Nation at Risk*, President George H.W. Bush’s *America 2000*, President Bill Clinton’s *Goals 2000*, President George W. Bush’s *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), and President Barack Obama’s proposed reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA; currently known as NCLB)—*A Blueprint for Reform*. I chose these federal-level education policies as they were the key initiatives set out by the federal government to bridge the developing need for education reform based off of
standardized student performance and the international ranking of the United States based on educational achievement and economic performance standards.

In addition, I researched and analyzed the Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York history and social studies curricular frameworks, and the newly established multi-state adopted Common Core Standards. I used the same CDA process on the four curricular frameworks. I chose to use Illinois’ framework since it is the framework that I am most familiar with as a teacher from the state for the past decade. I chose to analyze Massachusetts' framework due to the high regard of its education reform efforts in the academic and research communities, and New York’s long history of using standards-based assessments (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 1993; McDermott, 2006; New York State Education Department, 1996). This provided for a comparative look into how states currently frame the purpose of social studies and its curriculum, specifically world history curriculum. The outcome of this critical and philosophical inquiry research is to reconceptualize the purpose of world history curriculum into a comparative global studies course.

**Organization of the study.**

In Chapter 2, I discuss in greater detail the methods that I used to conduct this critical and philosophical inquiry. A deeper explanation is provided into why I used the three methods that were introduced in the previous section—critical inquiry (policy and curricular framework analysis through the use of CDA), philosophical inquiry, and curriculum reconceptualization. I discuss why these methods needed to be used before conducting a more traditional empirical study on the current practice of social studies and world history education. In essence, I want to explore what a global studies curriculum
could look like without completely recycling assertions that have already been made in
the education reform and social studies research disciplines.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the impact of globalization on American education reform
by introducing the concept of structural education reform (Nitta, 2008) and how it has
shaped public education policy in the United States for the past three decades (i.e., the
standards and accountability movement). I provide an overview of this period by
describing the federal policies that are critically analyzed in the next chapter: *A Nation at
Risk, America 2000, Goals 2000*, the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, and *A Blueprint
for Reform*.

In Chapter 4, I use critical discourse analysis (CDA) on the five major policies to
highlight the influence of globalization discourse on federal education policy and the
impact this has had on reforming public education in the United States. This provides
insight into the current context of public education, and how policy has shaped teaching
and learning in public schools. In Chapter 5, I present a thematic overview of the
purpose of history and social studies education in the U.S., including an examination on
the impact of structural education reform (i.e., the standards and accountability
movement) on this curriculum. In Chapter 6, I use CDA on three current state curricular
frameworks and the new Common Core Standards to understand the effects of structural
education reform efforts within secondary-level history and social studies education
discourse. This provides a context for how history and social studies education is taught
today within the standards and accountability movement.

In Chapter 7, I examine what the current paradigm of world history curriculum
consists of and what is meant by the various conceptions of it: world history, world
studies, and global education. There are various course titles for a world history curriculum on the secondary level. For example, this curriculum is entitled “World Studies” in my current teaching environment even though it is no different than a world history course. I review the similarities and differences between the three conceptions to help gain a greater understanding of how the academic field has developed over time. Finally, I use the literature explored and the data analyzed to reconceptualize the purpose of world history curriculum into a new comparative global studies course for secondary public education. To assist in this paradigmatic shift in curriculum, I use the theories of reconceptualization (Pinar, 1975a, 1975b, 2004a, 2004b, 2011), responsive education (R. Robertson, 1992; M. Singh, 2007; Tollefson, 2008), global critical theory (Freire, 2007; Greene, 2004; Lipman, 2007; Pensky, 2005; Pinar 2004b), critical education (Allman, 1999, 2001; Apple, 2006, 2009; Ardizzone, 2007; W. Au, 2012; Evans, 2011; Giroux, 2010), and standpoint theory (Connell, 1993; Nozaki, 2006), including the concept of minority vs. majority worlds (Singh, Kenway, & Apple, 2007) to assist in the conception of a comparative global studies course.²

In conclusion, I provide a summary of the study, future areas of research, and next steps. Areas of promise and concern are reviewed to help guide future research into the

² See pp. 4-5 for overview of the reconceptualization theory and the concept of responsive education. Global critical theory refers to the examination and critique of society and culture on a multi-national, global scale. Critical education “involves a thorough-going reconstruction of what education is for, how it should be carried out, what we should teach, and who should be empowered to engage in it” (Apple, 2009, p. 3). Standpoint theory refers to the relationship between lived experience and knowledge by focusing on the viewpoint from subordinate groups to the hegemonic powers in society and not the other way around, which is traditionally how society, history, and culture are studied. The concept of minority and majority worlds flips the notion of what is traditionally meant by the terms of majority and minority when referring to individuals, groups, and societies; minority worlds refer to the hegemonic social, political, and economic powers of the world (e.g., the United States, the West, industrialized and post-industrialized nations, etc.) and majority worlds refer to the rest of the world, the majority of nations and human populations who live under the hegemonic powers of the few and elite.
possibilities and potential shortcomings of a comparative global studies curriculum could have on public education, students, communities, and the nation as a whole.

**Research Significance**

Globalization has fully infiltrated every aspect of American society and culture. The effects of globalization in relation to our economy, governance, and social lives influence individuals every day. Globalization has even influenced the purpose of public education and how it changes to meet the economic needs of today and tomorrow. The relationship between society, the economy, and government has become complex on both a national and international scale due to globalization. The world is interconnected and the linkages between the various aspects of commerce, politics, and social and cultural issues are elaborate in that it is often difficult to understand how human civilization actually works and exists.

Critical education is vital to traverse today’s world. Theoretically, students learn the skills of critical thinking and problem solving to gain essential knowledge that can be used to function in and examine the nature of our current reality and the world we live in. However, these tools and knowledge do not seem to translate to the real world, as is evident in the faltering economic standing of the U.S. and the shrinking number of jobs for which Americans are qualified (Darling-Hammond, 2010). In addition, I am not sure how many of us in American society critically examine how the social, political, and economic world works and the resulting effects it has on us. Substantial changes have not been made to the American public education system to meet the challenges of a global society; I hope to add to this conversation for transformative reform. Providing relevance for students through a reconceptualized social studies curriculum, including a
comparative global studies course, would construct a foundation for students to apply their knowledge and skill base from other academic disciplines that in turn can be used to function in a globalized world and critically examine this world at the same time.

I believe American society and the entire globe are at a critical juncture for the future course of human civilization; either we revolutionize our social institutions to meet current and future local, national, and global challenges, or we continue on the same path of non-reform. I realize the unlikelihood of this kind of absolution, but real change does need to occur to allow individuals to at least have the knowledge and critical thinking capability to understand why our world is the way it is and potentially to bring about change in it.

This is why I believe social studies education, specifically world history curriculum, is very important for the advancement of our society and the world. Individuals need to be able to thoughtfully and critically examine the world they live in and how their actions and the actions of others affects each other on a daily basis and over time. Current world history curriculum is just that, history—a series of facts and dates taught to students without any correlation to the world they actually live in and will participate in for the rest of their lives. So students then tend not to carry over this knowledge into their adult lives and therefore may not fully understand why our nation and world function the way they do.

The creation of a comparative global studies course that delves into the history of the modern world and its relation to events of today and tomorrow will provide students with a critical education that will be beneficial to them and society over the course of time. Adding the disciplines of economics, political science, the humanities, the arts, and
geography to history and current events will provide an overall understanding for students to use in their daily lives and interactions with the world around them. By having an interdisciplinary course that incorporates various perspectives, concepts, and methods from across academic disciplines to understand globalization, students will learn about its effects on society and the world and how it relates to them. For example, students could learn why Europe’s recent economic crisis affects the American economy, which results in global economic uncertainty.

There is much on the history of social studies curriculum and its evolution since the Industrial Revolution in the United States to today (see Chapter 5). However, the purpose of social studies curriculum, specifically world history curriculum, has not been thoughtfully revisited to understand how this curriculum could be better developed and taught to our students to in turn provide for a better society to live in. A more thorough combination of theoretical research and practice need to come together to help bring about positive change; this study is a start.

Education reform in the United States has consisted of a recycling of ideas for decades now (see Chapters 3 and 5 for further detail). It is time for a new conception of what students and citizens need to understand in order to succeed in the globalized world that the United States and other countries are a part of. Globalization is not going away, so it is time that the public understands what it is and how it is changing (or not changing) our nation and the world.
2 – Methodology: Practical Philosophy & Critical Inquiry in Curriculum

Development

A “good beginning characterization of philosophy is that it is the sustained inquiry into the principles and presuppositions of any field of inquiry” (Archie & Archie, 2004, p. 20). Philosophical inquiry is messy. This type of study is unique compared to other types of more traditional research in the education field in that within philosophy, you are exploring a topic without knowing exactly where the course of study will take the researcher and it is generally not empirical in nature (Siegel, 2010). Due to this unique nature, this methodology chapter is not concrete. Since the impetus for this study is philosophically-based, it has developed over time and therefore the exact philosophical and critical methods described in this chapter expand and contract as needed as the other chapters are researched, critically examined, and written. However, the eventual goal out of this study is to lead towards an actual curriculum that works within and outside the constraints of current and future public education policy.

Methodological Beginnings

As a practicing educator, I have always been concerned about the breadth, but lack of depth in world history curriculum. Even though most high school history curriculum is only meant to be a survey course, too much is covered in content and therefore it does not provide enough opportunity for much in-depth study with the use of historical reasoning, critical thinking, and problem solving skills. Without the possibility of students engaging deeper into the historical connections of the world, it is harder for students to understand the relationship between what happened in the past to the development of human civilization today.
As my scholarly research interests have emerged over the past several years, I have a strong interest in the macro level relationships between politics, economics, and education. In general, secondary education and even undergraduate colleges and universities tend to teach subjects in isolation and not in relation to one another. It was not until my graduate studies where I had a chance to explore the overt and covert social, political, and economic relationships within society as related to the field of education. Because of these emerging research interests, I wanted to find a way to connect these new understandings to my current practice as a teacher.

**My teaching practice.**

Several years back, my current school’s administration changed the content format of the world history curriculum. Before the change, the content followed a strictly chronological format covering all regions of the world with a focus on European history and limited coverage of Latin American, African, Middle Eastern, and Asian history. Despite there being too much focus on Europe, students were still provided the opportunity to learn about the relationship between the various regions through a chronological study. After the change, the content was broken up regionally with European history taught during the first semester and the second semester covering all other regions mentioned above. Within each region, the history still followed a chronological format, but now each region is studied in isolation from one another. Without a full explanation, the administration stated the change was partly due to teachers focusing too much on European history. However, not much has changed since the new regional format was instituted; the teachers who focused on Europe too much still do and thus do not move into the other regions until they finish Europe, even if that
means not starting the next region—Latin America—until well into the second semester. Some teachers even cut out entire regions to end the year on Asia with the other teachers.

Since the change there have been relatively few measures put in place to make sure all world history teachers follow the same pace and content of the survey course. Although, the department has begun to institute common assessments (each teacher gives the same semester final exam within a subject area) to help keep teachers accountable of the content they cover in their class. Ultimately the administration does not enforce this, so there is no incentive for teachers to cover all regions in their teaching and give the common assessment.

My current teaching environment was the motivating factor for this study, but there are much larger implications for why social studies curriculum is taught the way it is today in the early 21st century. Over the past 30 years, teaching and learning in public schools have faced growing constraints due to state and federal education policy reform. The underlying cause of this is due to the impact of globalization on American society and this country’s standing in the global political and socio-economic community of human civilization.

**Emerging scholarly interests.**

"The doing of philosophy is more concrete, grounded, and practical than it is normally credited with being” (Burbules & Warnick, 2006, p. 490). This philosophical study is from the perspective of practical philosophy, which is two-fold: “look inward to the parent discipline of philosophy and outward to educational practice” (Siegel, 2010, p. 3). As a practicing educator, I began to question the format and structure of world history curriculum on the high school level. As an academic, I began to question the purpose and
rationale for world history and what secondary students learn. Simply, this study is an exploration “concerning the nature, aims, and problems” of world history education (Siegel, 2010, p. 3). There are several questions in relation to this and my research questions that were discussed earlier (see Chapter 1, p. 21):

- Why does world history curriculum focus only on the historical narrative?
- How have recent state and federal education reform efforts impacted social studies, including world history courses?
- What influenced the education reform efforts that eventually affected world history curriculum?
- Despite the current state of social studies curriculum in American public schools, what is the purpose of social studies curriculum, specifically world history curriculum, in the 21st century? How should this curriculum be reconceptualized to meet the needs of citizens living within a globalized world?

Thus, this study is a philosophical exploration of how globalization has affected curriculum in American public secondary schools, in what is and is not focused on in terms of content and skills, and how a reconceptualized world history curriculum could help meet the needs of the new millennium. Not only does this study address how globalization affects public education reform, but also questions whether or not globalization should affect curriculum.
Why use philosophical inquiry as a method?

Philosophical inquiry “involves studying ‘basic’ or ‘fundamental’ issues that are often so deeply embedded in our thinking that we are unaware that they exist and have an influence on us” (Willis, 2008, p. 300). Our modern world has become entrenched into the technology-driven global free-market economy that many in the United States and around the world do not even realize (or want to) how much the larger hegemonic forces control our daily lives. That hidden oppression is part of the very fabric of human civilization (Freire, 2000), which are the hegemonic elements that seemingly dictate the decisions individuals make on a social, political, and economic basis every day.

The purpose of philosophical inquiry addresses the basic questions before other topics are explored (Willis, 2008). This is the reason why I question the purpose of world history curriculum in our modern public education system and what its goals are and should be for our students and the larger public sphere. Many research studies in the social studies curriculum community have focused on practical explorations of what occurs in the classroom from subject specific pedagogies to larger frameworks of curriculum like problem-based learning or social justice education (Andri, Brown, Hannafin, & Boyer, 2009; W. Au, 2009; Bender-Slack & Raupach, 2008; Brush & Saye, 2008; Hernandez-Ramos & De La Paz, 2009; White, 2011). In the market-driven world of education today, educators need to step back to question why are we doing what we do in the first place before starting something new without questioning its goals, methods, outcomes, and underlying assumptions.

A good “reason for the overlap of philosophy and education is that, while educators are concerned with methods for imparting knowledge,
philosophers are professionally concerned with the concept of knowledge itself. The entire sub-discipline known as epistemology is concerned simply with that notion. Educators, in looking at teaching methods and theories about how to impart knowledge, naturally want to begin with a sound understanding and definition of knowledge itself; and getting such a definition requires quite an excursion into philosophy” (Scriven, 1988, pp. 130-131).

Scriven may be optimistic in thinking all teachers want to begin with “a sound understanding and definition of knowledge,” because many probably don’t do this due to various factors, including curricular, district, and time constraints, but one may only gain knowledge and understanding of an issue by the exploration of the philosophical underpinnings of educational practice.

“Epistemology in the broadest sense is concerned with giving an account of knowledge” (E. Robertson, 2010, p. 11). Questions concerning curriculum depend on epistemology and the nature of the subject matter (e.g., world history, chemistry, British literature) (Siegel, 2010). For example, why should world history be studied? For skills such as reasoning and critical thinking, for understanding of our current reality and world, for indoctrination into dominant belief systems? Does any type of teaching change belief systems of students? Should it? Alternatively, should schooling only teach students to help them form their own understanding of the globalized world around them? Should students learn how to “reason” from others or on their own? What is “reason” when it comes to world history or does it only relate to the skills of critical thinking taught in
social studies coursework? How can critical thinking and reasoning foster learning outside current hegemonic forces?

Through a comparative global studies course that is proposed at the end of this study, students should learn to understand what they come into contact with within their education; that it is just a certain set of ideas, beliefs, and understandings about human civilization and its’ existence—there is no definitive answer about the evolution of human civilization. There are multiple ideas and stances on the course of world history and how it has affected the development of civilization over time.

**Positionality.**

I am very much aware that the philosophical exploration into the reconceptualization of world history curriculum may or may not have the right answers for public education reform in the United States. However, this inquiry at least provides for the means to reveal the various layers of complexity within social studies teaching and learning in public education (Burbules & Warnick, 2006). In addition, due to the expansiveness of philosophical inquiry, my position on a reconceptualized form of world history curriculum evolves over the course of this study, which in the end is good as it reflects the progression of understanding throughout this exploration (Willis, 2008).

I have extensive experience in an urban public school district in the United States. I have worked both at a low-performing, low-income high school and at a high-performing magnet high school; both schools are in the same district. My experience at the low-performing school quickly opened my eyes and understanding on how the standardization and accountability movement influences public education at a local level. As a history teacher, I saw over the course of time social studies erode away from an
integrated history and social sciences curriculum to a glorified reading course, due to the implementation of *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) in the early 2000s. With the focus on annual standardized tests, administrators expected social studies teachers to focus on reading and literacy skills while English teachers focused on grammar and writing to help prepare the students for testing. Social studies teachers still taught history and related content, but it was purely a medium through which to teach reading and test taking skills. There seemed to be no intent by the administration for teachers to actually engage students with historical knowledge and critical thinking skills. A considerable portion of teacher evaluations was based on the realignment of our curriculum and lesson plans to reflect the focus on test taking skill development. Teachers were closely watched in what they taught, experienced numerous professional development sessions that focused on test preparation within the curriculum, and cross-collaborated between grade levels and subject areas to ensure proper implementation of the realigned narrowly-focused curriculum.

The environment is completely different in the magnet high school that I currently teach in. There is little to no discussion of standardized test preparation in social studies classes. The school’s administration does not closely watch curriculum and teaching; therefore, classes are not cohesive in curriculum and pedagogy. NCLB mandates have only become a recent concern with certain populations within the school, mainly low-performing minority students and special needs students due to their performance on standardized tests compared to the rising benchmarks the school should be meeting for these subgroups.
Because of my varied experience in an urban public school system, I have numerous positive and negative recollections about the implementation and impact of standardization and accountability measures across social studies curriculum, which in the end reflected how and what I taught. This has very much influenced my research interests and is why I am so interested in how the macro affects the micro, i.e., the impact of globalization on education reform and its effects on social studies curriculum (e.g., world history curriculum) and what is taught in the secondary school classroom on the local level.

I want to be upfront with this experience about the knowledge and understanding that I brought to this complex relationship between varied institutions and ideologies within American and even global culture. This provided value through the interpretation of the historical and policy research used as it integrated my subjective experiences to the philosophical, critical, and curricular work in this study (Berg, 2009; Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Rousmanier, 2004; Zinn, 1989). At the same time, I had to be aware throughout my philosophical inquiry that I am providing even coverage of the topics and issues being explored from globalization to developing new curriculum (Creswell, 2009; Kaestle, 1988).

There is no true objectivity, especially in qualitative research (Kaestle, 1992; Zinn, 1989). The policies analyzed are relative to the larger paradigm studied: globalization. Meaning making developed from the complex layers of study (Finkelstein, 1992). By using critical theory, philosophy, and policy analysis, I identified the relationship of how each method assisted the other in this study (Kaestle, 1992). I then employed all of this
work toward the reconceptualization of world history curriculum into a comparative global studies course.

**Methods: Employing Philosophical & Critical Inquiry Toward a Practical Critique**

The format of this study generally follows a conventional form of philosophical study (as seen in Willis, 2008). I started out by laying out the major issue of study—world history curricular reform—and its interrelated topics: globalization, education policy and reform, and curriculum development. Throughout my study, I developed my position for a new comparative global studies course by discussing the various components of globalization, the effects of globalization on American public education policy and reform, the effects of public education reform on social studies curriculum, and the purpose of and what is world history curriculum that relate to this new curriculum. Within this, I used critical inquiry, including policy and curricular framework analysis, to further understand the causes of our current educational climate and how social studies curriculum was impacted by these causes. In addition, I gained a broader understanding of how world history curriculum is currently structured throughout the U.S. and how world history curriculum could be repurposed for secondary education students in light of the above causes and effects (Berg, 2009; Heck, 2004).

In conclusion, I discussed what I see as the arguments that favor this type of curriculum and weaknesses that may potentially arise and what others may point out within these weaknesses (Willis, 2008). As a part of this concluding section, I explored the positive and negative implications for employing this type of curricular framework into an expanded world history curriculum, and what that may mean for the larger secondary school curriculum structure.
Methods introduction.

Drawing on Burbules and Warnick (2006), three specific philosophical inquiry methods guided this study: first, “questioning a particular educational practice or policy;” second, “proposing the ends or purposes education should achieve, either in terms of benefits to the person, to the society, or both;” and third, “speculating about alternative systems or practices of education, whether utopian or programmatic, that contrast with and challenge conventional educational understandings and practices” (p. 491). These three methods followed one another as my study evolved, but there was overlap between my questioning of recent and current education policy with my developing understanding on the aims and purposes of world history curriculum. The first two methods manifested within the third method as I moved towards a reconceptualized world history curriculum.

With philosophical inquiry as the underlying foundation of this study, I employed critical inquiry into Chapters 3-6 to understand the complex relationship between globalization, public education reform, and history and social studies education. Specifically, I explored the complexity of globalization and its impact on public education reform in the United States since the Reagan era to the present (see Chapters 3 and 4). Over the course of time, the standardization and accountability movements narrowed secondary education curriculum to position America in the continuous power structure of the global economy (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Nitta, 2008; Saltman, 2007). Through a critical lens within this philosophical inquiry, I took into account these power structures and how they affect society, specifically education, within this time (Lather, 2004; Tyack, 1991).
Essentially, this study questioned the current practice of world history curriculum in secondary public education. This is the major issue addressed in this study, but is interrelated to the complexity around globalization and its relationship to public education reform (Willis, 2008). This questioning was multi-faceted in nature due to the complexity around the current structure of world history curriculum. Because of this, I used both philosophical and critical inquiry to create an overall account of social studies curriculum, specifically world history that exists today in order to understand the positioning of social studies in high school curriculum structures, what we are teaching our students in terms of world history, and why we are doing this.

**Questioning a particular education practice and policy.**

I questioned particular education policies (federal education policy from the 1980s to the present) and practices (recent/current history and social studies education practice):

- What are the effects of globalization on society and the world?
- How do these effects influence American education policy and reform?
- How do these policies and reform efforts affect high school history and social studies curriculum?

I started by way of questioning what globalization has become over time and how it influenced society through a review of literature on the topic. This conversation started in the opening chapter, but is further developed in the next chapter (see Chapter 3) as I examined how globalization affected American public education reform for the past 30 years.
With critical discourse analysis (CDA), I critically examined federal education policy from the Reagan administration to the present to understand the current state of social studies education, including world history, in American public schools (Berg, 2009; Gee, 2011a; McCulloch & Richardson, 2000; Heck, 2004; Schram, 2006; Tyack, 1991; Willis, 2007; Windschuttle, 1996). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is the detailed inspection of an action, idea, or object within written or oral communication and language (Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 2011a). The goal of CDA is to understand the surface and underlying issues, causes, and effects of something in relation to a larger concept or action. The following question guided this analysis: How do these policies highlight the effects of globalization on society by way of public education reform efforts?

This policy analysis provided for an interpretive lens into the facts, figures, events, and data that are part of this historical era in relation to the research focus (Berg, 2009; Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Rousmaniere, 2004). When needed, the policy analysis included historical background information to provide context for the relationship between the time and policy. This enabled me to construct an account into what happened over the course of time in the standardization and accountability movement that led to the current climate for social studies curriculum in American public schools. Through this research, I was able to uncover relationships between globalization, federal education policy, and social studies curriculum (Finkelstein, 1992). This provided insights into why social studies curriculum is not a focus in public schools when compared to the sciences, mathematics, and literacy (Darling-Hammond, 2010). This research provided justification for the need of a comparative global studies course that can help students and society to uncover these complex social, political, and economic
structures and relationships within American society (Berg, 2009; Johnson & Christensen, 2012).

Theoretical and practical connections were considered in order for more effective policy analysis and curriculum development to occur (Heck, 2004). Philosophical, critical, and practical considerations were taken into account to provide a basis for positive education reform. To facilitate this, I explored the following key pieces of federal education policy: the Nation at Risk report (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the America 2000 policy (America 2000, 1991), the Goals 2000 legislation (Goals 2000, 1994), the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2002) and the proposed reauthorization—A Blueprint for Reform—of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act/NCLB3 (Elementary and Secondary Education [ESEA], 1965; United States Department of Education, 2010).4

Over the course of time, these policies have led to the incremental narrowing of curriculum and the deskilling of teachers, which has eroded what and how students are taught in public schools today. In addition to examining the narrowing nature of the curricular components of these federal policies since the Reagan administration to the present, I examined how these policies reflected the evolving impact of globalization on education policy to further illustrate what has happened to social studies curriculum in public schooling, public schooling in general, and society as a whole. “Policy is shaped by the nature of the policy environment and the historical time period. Trends in political and economic conditions can provide links between the changing policy environment and resulting ideological shifts in policy activity” (Heck, 2004, p. 53). Themes were

---

3 Obama’s reauthorization plan was released on March 13, 2010; NCLB will expire in 2014.
developed as I coded the documents to further understand the relationship between the policy and the corresponding historical period. My correct assumption was that I would see the development of standardization and accountability measures over time as they related to the connection between education and American economic success in the global society.

The CDA tools that I initially thought I would use to code the documents were: a general lens and *a priori* coding (globalization affects education policy) of the documents, Deixis, Fill-in, Making the Familiar Strange, and Framing (Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 2011a; Goffman, 1974; Lakoff, 2004). I would use a general lens to code the documents to uncover what themes emerged from the documents on their own. Then I would develop themes from the codes as they related to the focus of my research study. I would use these themes as a guide when I employed the various CDA tools to provide a more in-depth analysis of the documents. Deixis as a tool would provide meaning and context to the subject matter of the text. The Fill-in tool would help me to examine the text of the document by looking at what is not said in the written text and determine the covert language that was used. Deixis and Fill-in would provide a more micro interpretation of the text where I would use the Making the Familiar Strange tool to understand the larger picture of the documents by examining the ideology that becomes visible from the text by denaturalizing and clarifying the text. Frame analysis would help determine the situated context signaling value systems, schemas of belief, and individual contexts reflective of relationships to the larger society in which we live (Fairclough, 2010; Goffman, 1974; Lakoff, 2004). In addition, I would use two CDA questions based off the work of Gee (2011a) to assist in the analysis of the themes and ideas that developed from the coding of
the documents. The two questions were: 1. “What relationships are relevant in the context and how are they being enacted, recruited, and used?” and 2. “What are the relevant connections and disconnections… in this context and how are these connections or disconnections being made or implied?” (p. 102). Using these two questions at the end of the coding process would help to synthesize and sort through the data gained from the CDA process.

The purpose of these tools would allow for themes and central ideas to emerge from the data in hopes to gain connections and meaning to the relationships between globalization, education policy reform, and world history curriculum (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000; Heck, 2004; Schram, 2006; Willis, 2007). The coding of the documents and my analysis of the coding would assist with my eventual goal of reconceptualizing world history curriculum (Pinar, 2004a). To ensure reliability with my coding, I would compare the content of the documents with the codes so as not to sidetrack myself from the original code definitions that I created (i.e., verify that my codes reflect the subject matter of the documents) (Creswell, 2009). In addition, comparing the data drawn from the documents by using my initial coding, the four CDA tools, and the guiding questions of Gee (2011a) would provide another step in reinforcing the themes that emerged. This would assist in sifting through the breadth of education policy and the historical evolution of globalization since the 1980s on both a national and international scale (Iannaoccone, 1988). Connections constructed between policy, education reform, and social studies and world history curriculum would facilitate further understanding of the complexity behind the hidden relationships of hegemony and education.
Ultimately, I ended up using a hybrid version of the above methodical process that I had initially outlined before conducting the critical discourse analysis on the documents. Chapters 4 and 6 provide a further explanation of how and why I refined my methods as I did in relation to the overall development of my research and data findings.

**Proposing the purpose of world history education, and how it benefits the individual and society.**

The second philosophical method mentioned above is just an extension of the first in that it explored the purposes of education and how those purposes will help the individual and society as a whole (Burbules & Warnick, 2006, p. 491). Before determining how world history curriculum could be reconceptualized, I provided a thematic overview of the purposes and aims of social studies education since the time of industrialization in the United States to now (see Chapter 5). I questioned whether a secondary level world history class is an appropriate venue for discussing globalization, and how this questioning can push us toward a comparative global studies course. Philosophical inquiry “allows [for the] analysis and clarification of concepts, arguments, [and] theories” that are integrated into educational practice (Noddings, 2007, p. xiii). This new course could provide the knowledge, and critical thinking and problem solving skills needed to traverse the complex environment that we live in today. Thereby, the students could have a more applicable education to employ into their other classes and the reality of their own lives on an individual level and in a larger public arena.

Furthermore, I critically examined four curricular frameworks currently in use from the states of Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York, and the New Common Core Standards to understand how the evolution of social studies curriculum has manifested
itself into its’ current practice (see chapter 6). Using these curricular frameworks added more “data sources of information by examining evidence from the sources and using it” to ensure validity within the code themes that emerged from the study (Creswell, 2009, p. 191). I chose these standards for various reasons. I chose Illinois’ standards because of my familiarity of the state’s social studies framework (Illinois State Board of Education, 1985). I examined Massachusetts’ framework due to the past success of its standards as one of the most extensive curricular structures in the nation (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 1993; McDermott, 2006). I analyzed New York’s world history framework due to the long-standing position of the state’s Regents high school graduation examination in academia and education research (New York State Education Department, 1996). Finally, I examined the new Common Core Standards currently adopted by a majority of states in the U.S., including Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York, as their new foundation for curricular standards (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010). Just as with the federal policies studied in Chapter 4, I used the same coding and analysis process to determine themes and central ideas (Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 2011a; Goffman, 1974; Lakoff, 2004; McCulloch & Richardson, 2000; Heck, 2004; Schram, 2006; Willis, 2007). I explored how these standards are similar to and/or different from the context and themes of the previously mentioned federal education policies. In addition, I assessed the potential positive and negative consequences of these standards and how that relates to my reconceptualized world history curriculum.

All policy analysis conducted in this study assisted in the reconceptualizing of world history curriculum into a new comparative global studies course for secondary students. In light of the current curriculum in place due to standards and accountability
measures, this guided me in proposing a new world history course that will be beneficial for both students and the greater society as it will provide for the knowledge, understanding, and the critical education needed for a modern citizenry (Burbules & Warnick, 2006).

Speculating about alternative systems or practices of education, whether utopian or programmatic, that contrast with and challenge conventional educational understandings and practices.

The third philosophical inquiry method focused on the reconceptualization of world history curriculum into a comparative global studies course on the secondary level. This methodology chapter is not the place to flesh out all the possible nuances and directions that the development of the curriculum could go, but provides an opportunity to discuss the potential product to come out of this philosophical and critical inquiry into the evolution of a comparative global studies course.

I want to consider possible alternative approaches to education outside the current norm of society. Despite espousing to a realist conception of society and human civilization within my personal and professional life, I am intrigued and growing into the mindset of a reconceptualist when it comes to education reform and curriculum development for public schools. “There are no prescriptions or rationales [in curriculum development]. …What is necessary is a fundamental reconceptualization of what curriculum is, how it functions, and how it might function in emancipatory ways” (Pinar, 2004a, p. 154).

There is no practical way of developing curriculum without considering ideas that may be controversial or strange (Greene, 2004).
This “is an activity… to ask interesting questions and hypothesize about possible answers [in the development of curriculum]. Such thinking may foster new categories or perspectives on familiar problems, or help generate a new vocabulary for talking about educational problems. It might help to illuminate the unspoken and unexamined assumptions that drive daily practice by considering what it might look like to think and act in a radically different way. As a result, our current assumptions may come to seem as less natural or neutral than we take them to be. ...Utopian thinking can also help to inspire and motivate daily practice by providing a vision of the best that may be possible, even if our actual efforts can only approximate it” (Burbules & Warnick, 2006, pp. 497-498).

Because of the realist in me, I assumed that this philosophical curricular reconceptualization for a new comparative global studies course would be a melding of old and new pedagogies and practices due to the current constraints on curriculum as a result of the standards and accountability environment in American public education today. However, I did not want this to limit the possibility of what evolved from this philosophical and critical inquiry into curriculum development.

This reconceptualized world history course will conceivably lead to other emancipatory actions to awaken my own department, school, district, and the public from the controls and constraints placed on them by hegemonic powers (Freire, 2000). Using philosophical and critical inquiry allowed this study to delve into the aims and purposes of education, but more specifically, what a comparative global studies curriculum could do for both individuals and society as an emancipatory experience.
Several curricular theories helped to develop this study. Reconceptualization (Pinar, 1975, 2004a, 2004b, 2011) and critical education (Allman, 1999, 2001; Apple, 2006, 2009; Ardizzone, 2007; W. Au, 2012; Evans, 2011; Giroux, 2010) allowed for a deeper level of understanding through related literature and thought on the theories of responsive education, standpoint theory, and global critical theory. Responsive education looked at how education can be responsive to the needs of students and society depending on current issues facing the individuals and/or groups in question (R. Robertson, 1992; M. Singh, 2007; Tollefson, 2008).

Nozaki (2006) discussed the use of standpoint theory, which allows for the construction of curriculum to center on multiple voices that are in response to or counteraction against dominant hegemonic and ideological forces. This allows for students and educators to see the multiple viewpoints of the impact of globalization on the world at a local, regional, and global level. Educators and students could possibly compare how hegemonic forces are perceived and interpreted from “above” and “below” (Singh, Kenway, & Apple, 2007).

Developing ideas around globalizing critical theory were explored in conjunction with the theories mentioned above. Scholars such as Freire (2007), Greene (2004), Lipman (2007), and Pensky (2005) were examined to understand what insights they bring to my research on curriculum development. Providing for a more critical form of education will create spaces for students and thus society in the awakening of their consciousness (Greene, 2004) and understanding of the globalized world that they find themselves in.
Public education should not be a tool for hegemonic indoctrination, but an experience for individuals to develop their own understanding how the world functions socially, politically, and economically. By providing the space in the classroom to explore this through a historical context within the current reality, students will be able to inform their own understanding of the globalized world and how they will interact within it on an individual basis and how that fits into the larger society. Pinar (2004b) stated, If public education is the education of the public, then public education is, by definition, a political, psycho-social, fundamentally intellectual reconstruction of self and society, a process in which educators occupy public and private spaces in-between the academic disciplines and the state (and problems) of mass culture, between intellectual development and social engagement, between erudition and everyday life (p. 15).

This environment within a classroom allows for students and educators to question the current reality and course of human civilization and its subsequent future development; a comparative global studies course can provide an introduction on the workings of the globalized world. Because of this curriculum, students can then take action as seen fit to better their life, community, and world.

**Bridging the Gap Between the Philosophical and Empirical Worlds of Policy and Curriculum Research**

When it comes to federal education policy, there tends to be a narrow scope of acceptable research, which tends to be empirical and quantitative in nature (Heck, 2004). A deeper connection is needed between the philosophical aims of education and how education policy is developed and reformed over time. By focusing "on the historical or
temporal context and how this contributes to policy patterns that develop over time” (Heck, 2004, p. 24), this type of policy research provided analysis to the connections between economics, public policy, and public education that occur over time through the evolving nature of globalization. A critical perspective allowed for the unearthing of possible tensions of policy implementation and how policy affects society and culture at large via the hegemonic powers and institutions in place that continue the dominance of the few over the masses (Freire, 2000; Heck, 2004; Keith, 1996).

With this study, my hopes were to bridge the empirical and philosophical spheres of education research to show how philosophy provides a theoretical understanding of the relationship between globalization, public education policy, and curriculum development. This philosophical exploration can help guide and influence actual education reform efforts by exploring the aims and purposes of education in the 21st century with current and future educational practice (Heck, 2004; Kaestle, 1992; E. Robertson, 2010; Siegel, 2010). By doing this, reform may be more successful in providing systemic change in the school systems and society. This could occur because of proper understanding of how policy influences the reality of teaching and learning.

***

In the next chapter, I critically examine the globalization phenomenon and the current ramifications it has on education policy, reform, and curriculum. I discuss the impact of globalization on American education reform by introducing the concept of structural education reform and how it has shaped public education policy in the United States for the past three decades. This leads into Chapter 4 where I code and analyze five
federal education policies to further understand the effects of globalization on public education and how that corresponds with the purpose of social studies curriculum.
3 – The Economics and Politics of American Public Education Reform

The United States developed into a global superpower from periods of territorial expansion, industrialization, immigration, imperialism, and globalization. On a continual basis, America faces numerous social, political, and economic issues as a result of the evolution of these changes over the past two and a half centuries. Since the era of industrialization and mass immigration in the late 1800s, American society has used public education as a means to fix the systemic problems facing this country, both domestically and internationally. Within the past three decades there has been a significant shift occurring from the local to the national in terms of who dictates American public education policy and reform.

This chapter focuses on this shift and how it mirrors the response of hegemonic insecurities of the American economy to globalization. The ideals of American democracy have been reshaped with the survival and continued dominance of American economic power within the global free market structure. First, I describe the interconnected relationship of increasing federal oversight of education in response to American challenges within the global economy (i.e., structural education reform). In order to make sense of this, there is a need to understand the hegemonic dominance of economic over democratic discourses about schooling and society in order to provide a basis for unraveling the evolution of the standards and accountability movement inside recent public education reform efforts. Second, I explore how the standards and accountability movement has provided space for greater hegemonic control of school reform through increased federal oversight and management of public education. Finally, I continue my discussion on the reconceptualizing of public education, the purpose of
schooling in a global era and what this may look like within a social studies curriculum. This chapter provides a backdrop to the next chapter on the critical discourse analysis (CDA) of key federal policies and how they reflect the literature on the hegemonic redefining of the purpose of education.

**The Emergence and Domination of Structural Education Reform**

Historically, American public education evolved under the auspices of the local community and, later on, through state control during the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries (Carnoy & Levin, 1976, 1985; Mann, 1847; Nitta, 2008). In the 1800s, common schools started to develop under local jurisdictions where decisions on curriculum, personnel, policies, and guidelines would be constructed and enforced (Nitta, 2008; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Traditionally, states rights advocates have distrusted the overreach of federal power (Bailyn, 1993), but in the 1960s, education reform came under increasing authority of the federal government with the passing of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA). However, the goal of early federal efforts was to preserve local control of schools, but with federal-level programmatic and budgetary strings attached to assist in school improvement (Nitta, 2008). Theoretically, these measures were to create the social and economic potential for a more equitable system of public schooling across the nation.

One decade later, new research started to emerge on the connection between public education and the economic sector of American society (Apple, 1978; Carnoy, 1972, 1974; Carnoy & Levin, 1976). Since then, a shift has occurred and the American public education system came under greater influence of and scrutiny by the federal government through reforms and policy changes due to the increasing connection
between the economic growth and stability of American capitalism and political power both on a national and global scale. Additionally, various social, political, and economic interests (e.g., community groups, politicians, lobbyists, multinational corporations) influenced the shape of education reform in this country (Nitta, 2008). From these legislative reforms, the federal government imposed standards and accountability measures, which fragmented the power of state boards of education and local school districts. These measures have not focused on traditional forms of change, (i.e., curricular and pedagogical changes), but more on structural reforms and performance standards of accountability that signify the tenets of neoliberalism.

**What is structural education reform?**

Structural education reform refers to the concerted federal focus on transforming the nation’s schools through accountability, standardization, and assessment methods (Nitta, 2008). Nitta discussed structural education reform under the authority of a “loose-tight” arrangement (pp. 3-4). The federal government has greater authoritative control over funding and accountability, while schools continue to retain local control over curriculum, staffing, and innovation. Initially the federal government became involved in this process of education reform by way of the Civil Rights movement and the call for equity in public schools (i.e., desegregation, school funding, busing). Over time federal involvement in public education reform became more complex through the standards and accountability movement. As federal authority over public education reform increased, the arrangement was more like a “tight-tight” relationship (Nitta, 2008, p. 101). Local control of schools is lost due to new federal guidelines, such as *No Child Left Behind*, where states and local school districts are measured by the performance and progress of
their students on standardized tests. Schools fall under state and possibly federal control if they do not perform up to a certain threshold.

**Intentions divided: Economics trump democratic values in education.**

The era of structural education reform divided the intentions of public education into two sectors: economic and political/democratic. Historically, public education discourse had more of a focus, among other goals, on the political and democratic value of schooling to society. Since this division, public education discourse has used the political and democratic value of public schooling as a guise to meet the needs of the American economy and hegemonic free market structure. There continues to be a tension between the democratic and economic discourses on the purpose of education, but this tension is no longer as explicit as it was before; now, the national focus has realigned itself towards the economic potential of an educated citizenry.

Hegemony is the dominance of a presiding system of meanings and practices that are lived through a shared experience, sometimes within a dualistic vision of society (e.g., one democratic and the other economic) (Apple, 2004; Gramsci, 1971). Historically, Dewey (1929) and other progressive education reformers saw public education as a tool for democratic and social change. Despite the argument that American schooling will provide the means for one to break free from hegemonic control (Freire, 2000), it actually further entrenches individuals within a capitalist hierarchy. According to Carnoy (1974), education should provide liberation, despite its tendencies to covertly indoctrinate individuals to become reliant on the dominant hegemonic forces within society. Carnoy suggested that education in a capitalist society (or world) is purely economic in that it engulfs individuals into the socio-economic structure of society.
Since federal legislation affects an entire nation, education reforms are for the needs of the masses that are couched in meritocratic and democratic discourses. However, these reforms end up serving the capitalists’ interests themselves. This is politically motivated as well, as capitalist forces and economic interests continue to use politics and government to create change as seen fit for the greater society and ultimately themselves (via economic and cultural hegemonic power structures) (Carnoy, 1974). For example, with the recent economic crisis in the United States, federal legislative efforts focused on rebuilding corporate capitalism and the market economy through a series of financial bailouts, takeovers, and restructuring. The congressional mindset was to focus recovery efforts on corporate economic concerns, which would theoretically help the masses as well (i.e., trickle-down economics) (Klein, 2007). Over time, economic interests trump democratic rights and concerns in American society, as seen in policy changes and reforms in public education, especially when it comes to American competition within the global market economy. Thus corporate and even American military interests were able to establish the expansion of science and mathematics in schools to meet the needs for better economic competition within the global economic and political structure.

Levin’s (1989) work on the role of economics in education signified the intentions and motivations behind American public educational policy and reform. By discussing the issue of the allocation of resources in public education, Levin further illuminated the relationship between the role of education as social and economic reproduction of the work force to current and future capitalist needs in the United States. Conversations around profit, losses, and efficiency within economic productivity and competitiveness
drives the role of education into a pursuit of “wealth,” not academics. For example, the use of performance management techniques from the corporate world are now used with school boards of education to better set and manage performance standards and targets for a school district (Eadie, 2008). There is a constant drive for efficiency and the meeting of growth targets in school-wide performance on domestic and international standardized tests.

Carnoy and Levin (1985) stated that capitalist interests have come to dominate the traditional focus of American schooling and education reform—social injustice and democracy. They realized the importance of social and political influence on education reform, but concluded that economics and capitalism will be the driving force in defining social and political agendas with regard to schooling in a society situated within a neoliberalist agenda, which is a movement that has intensified from the Reagan administration to the present.

This however does not detract from the use of American public education reform to solve larger societal issues such as racial integration and the end of socio-economic segregation in schools and society (Levin & Belfield, 2003; McDermott, 2011). These are defined through an economic lens that manages this democratic discourse of education. Competition and privatization efforts encapsulate these social issues within economic discourse as to seemingly diversify the options for all Americans in the types of schooling sought after from college preparation to vocational education (e.g., magnet/selective enrollment schools, trade schools, education to career training, etc.). Families are able to choose which school setting is best for their student(s) and their needs, based on current and future aspirations and goals. Because of this, schools will
have to “compete” amongst each other for “customers” (i.e., students and their families), thereby mimicking free-market business practices.

Proponents of free enterprise and capitalism use other issues and causes, such as social integration, as a means to overtly and covertly achieve their goals. For example, hegemonic forces use calls for the spread of freedom and liberty (e.g., “shock therapy” tactics [drastic social, political, and economic reform measures]) to instill free-market structures in emerging or reconstructed democratically supported capitalist societies (Klein, 2007). This has even transcended the political and economic sectors into societal issues like quality schooling as seen after Hurricane Katrina and the resulting efforts to privatize schools in New Orleans. “School choice” provides the option for parents and families to choose which schools their students go to, which seemingly promotes democratic freedom and personal liberty. Theoretically this use of “disaster capitalism” focused on furthering democratic ideals, but in reality, it was just the continuance of Milton Friedman’s free market ideology (Klein, 2007). This furthered the notion of capitalist incorporation and stratification, which ultimately goes against the belief of social equity and advancement (Levin & Belfield, 2003).

Whether one supports the spread of free-market capitalism or a truly equitable society of freedom and opportunity, should the education system provide for both these potential outcomes? More realistically, if education is to be solely a means to an economic end, then why not have public education teach the knowledge and skill base needed to maneuver within the free-market capitalist system, but at the same time provide for the democratic potential to understand and break away from these hegemonic forces? Hegemonic control is never complete or total, so there is the potential for marginalized
discourses and ideologies to interrupt the unquestionability of economic hegemony. Ultimately I believe in providing an education system that works in and outside the constraints of a hegemonically controlled society. Individuals need to know how to work in a system like this, but also at the same time be able to question and challenge hegemonic power.

*The “business” of education reform.*

The enterprise of education reform in American society has followed the form of American capitalism through the idea of cost analysis and growth potential by focusing on funding, management, and performance. Structural reform and policy has transferred over into the education community through language and research emphasizing accountability, assessment, and oversight (Levin, 1989). Apple (2004), Levin and Belfield (2003), and Saltman (2007) recognized that even if the marketplace drives education, public education must answer to the families and communities they serve. As a result, public education should then provide freedom of choice, efficiency, competition, equity, and social cohesion. Both sides of education reform discourse, economic and democratic, have coopted these “freedoms,” making them part of their rationale for reforming the American public education system.

There is a nexus between the economic intentions behind public education reform with the more social values of schooling as means of spreading democratic values (Apple, 2004; Saltman, 2007). Education is supposed to provide all with an equitable chance for success within schooling and beyond, but recent education reform efforts are only redefining these in economic terms of choice, when realistically these reform efforts are not solving the real problems in education curriculum and pedagogy. Public education
has become an extension of the market-driven consumerism of society. Saltman (2007) stated that the capitalist model of development mirrors the discourses over public education reform where the implementation of privatization and deregulation is becoming the standard for “successful” schools (i.e., charter schools).

American public education reform efforts create infrastructural reform within education rather than traditional reform efforts around curriculum and pedagogy (Nitta, 2008; Ravitch, 1995; Ravitch & Vinovskis, 1995). This reflects the use of New Public Management (NPM) principles in education where authority and accountability are the standards of improvement and control (McDermott, 2011; Nitta, 2008). Ultimately NPM reforms focus on performance; with schools, this means student performance. The emphasis on student performance reinforces the larger social and economic hegemonic structures within society, which concentrates on individual production and success within the larger culture (Apple, 1978).

Due to the influence of NPM principles—authority and accountability, a developing area of research on American public education reform has focused on the “nationalization” of education. As far back as the 1970s and earlier, there were increasing calls for national testing to help assess society’s readiness for the U.S. to compete in a global economy (Spring, 1976). Calls for national testing evolved into an entire area of reform (Apple, 2004; Carnoy and Levin, 1985; Levin, 1989; Levin & Belfield, 2003; Nitta, 2008; Ravitch, 1995; Ravitch & Vinovskis, 1995; Saltman, 2007). This corresponded with the structural education reform movement of the past four decades as seen through federal legislation and school privatization efforts (Nitta, 2008; Saltman, 2007). The themes that have emerged are standards and assessments through
accountability and curriculum (i.e., official knowledge) (Apple, 1993; Epstein, 2005; Groen, 2007; Ravitch, 1995; Ravitch & Vinovskis, 1995).

Recently, public education reform has moved away from the ideas of a national education system back to redefining local control of public schooling with oversight by the federal government. This has produced some change in the frameworks of curriculum and pedagogy, but mostly in how schools are accountable for the results end of student performance on standardized assessments.

**The Coopting of American Public Education Reform**

Through economic development, globalization has affected many areas of society, including education, teaching, and learning. The growth of trade and commerce has transformed the Earth into a global financial machine; the accumulation, access, and control of wealth is the retaining force behind this global power structure and is what drives the world’s affairs (Klein, 2007). The same could be said for our national development. With this, hegemonic powers have coopted public education as a tool to ensure their social, political, and economic survival and success. In doing so, public education reform has become another medium for continued hegemonic control.

Since the 1800s, American public education has followed the factory model of education by moving students en mass through school in batches by age and subject matter (Robinson, 2010). Even though the American economy has moved away from a complete focus on industrial production and more to a focus on service-and consumer-oriented business, public education has only seen limited modification in its evolution (Carnoy & Levin, 1976, 1985; Nitta, 2008). Most of the changes have occurred in who controls public education by moving away from local and state control to having more
federal oversight through the standards and accountability movement. What and how students are taught has not changed much; what has changed is why we educate the nation’s populace. At the turn of the 20th century, public education was used as a tool to create a collective body that worked towards advancing a democratic society. Similar language is still used today, but only as discourse to push America’s focus on economic production and global supremacy (see Chapter 4).

This change in educational discourse started in the 1970s and came into fruition in the 1980s. For the past three decades, there has been a growing correlation between the economy and education in regards to the influence they have on each other (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Through the Nation at Risk report (1983), a direct connection was made between the economic prosperity of the United States and the quality of its education system. This report created by the National Commission on Excellence in Education was in response to the growing concern that America’s public education system was not meeting the economic challenges facing the nation both at home and abroad.

Since the publishing of A Nation at Risk, American public education has been at a “crisis” point. Because of this “crisis” (Tollefson, 2008), education has become more of a focus for transforming the American economy and society. As a result, “the Nation at Risk report launched the structural education reform movement in the United States” (Nitta, 2008). For the social, political, and economic well-being of the United States, its education system is to provide for the sustainment of American global economic dominance (Apple, 1978; Saltman, 2007).

Robinson (2010) stated there are two reasons for education reform: 1. economic and 2. cultural. Hegemonic powers want to keep the current status quo of economic
control in place in order to maintain their power. It is also true for culture, in that cultural practice and ideologies must not change in order to continue this control. One could argue this is the point of structural education reform; with the standards and accountability movement, test scores drive the success or failure of students, educators, schools, and communities (Nitta, 2008). If the benchmarks continually change that students and schools must meet to show adequate yearly progress (AYP), then it is hard to meet those standards and accountability goals. As a result, there is justification to continue top-down management practices within the public education system that will continually drive the standards and accountability movement to reform public schools to meet the ever changing benchmarks set by local, state, and federal education agencies.

Structural education reform has stripped away the traditional influence that educators, local communities, and state governments have on public education. Ultimately, public education does not achieve its goal in creating a well-educated populace and only serves the interests of hegemonic powers. The next section will go into greater detail on the evolution of structural education reform in the United States.

**A brief overview of federal education reform: 1980s to the present.**

Structural education reform has been the model for change in American public schools for the past three decades (Nitta, 2008). From the presidential administrations of Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush to the proposed changes by the Obama administration, all have focused on the need of education reform, not only for the sake of the students, but also for the country as a whole. As President Reagan tried to dismantle the newly established Department of Education in the early 1980s, Secretary of Education Terrel Bell looked to expand the powers of the federal
education department. This was due to the perception that American students’ academic performance was declining rapidly compared to other students throughout the industrialized world and thus would inhibit continued American dominance in the evolving global market structure (i.e., globalization). The *Nation at Risk* (1983) report called for sweeping changes in America’s public schools from “back to basics” curriculum to stronger standards for teachers, technology in schools, and the amount of overall resources needed to be once again the global example of quality public education.

The standards-based movement continued into George H.W. Bush’s presidency with his call for national education goals (Ravitch, 2010). The Bush administration’s *America 2000* proposal featured the ideas of standards, accountability, flexibility, and choice (Nitta, 2008). There was never any intention of transforming the mode of instruction or curriculum in the nation’s schools, but to create a vague structure that would focus on innovation, accountability, and restructuring to meet the new “goals” set forth to change public education for the betterment of the nation. In the end, Bush looked to transform America’s public education system through standards and privatization measures, namely, the use of vouchers for school “choice.” Through the use of tax dollars, parents could choose where to send their students to school if their original school was not providing a quality educational experience. Public education would reflect free market capitalism where competition would drive schools to increase student performance and the quality of education provided to students.

Ultimately Bush’s plan for education reform failed, partly due to the unpopular focus on vouchers and privatization efforts. However, this did not deter Bush’s successor, President Bill Clinton, from continuing the push towards furthering the structural
education reform agenda. From the start, Clinton focused on centrist education policies that both the “left and right” of the political aisle would agree upon. Centrist education policies would provide just enough reform to exhibit change without causing controversy with the American public, private business interests, or mass media. Thereby standards, flexibility, and assessment became the goals of Clinton’s education policy (Nitta, 2008). This would bring about change that both the “left and right” would agree upon without promoting too much change at one time. As conveyed to the public, moderate structural reform would be the key to accomplishing positive change for the nation’s public schools. These prior structural education reform efforts by Reagan, Bush, and Clinton would be the basis for the largest federally supported education reform legislation the nation had ever seen (i.e., George W. Bush’s No Child Left Behind).

**NCLB: intentions versus reality.**

The intent behind and the reality of NCLB are vastly different (Tollefson, 2008). The original version of NCLB, the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA) was limited in scope that it targeted low-income students by providing extra resources to the schools that serve them (McGuinn, 2006). NCLB is much broader in scale and focuses on outputs (academic achievement) verses inputs (resources). The federal legislation on public education reform was to provide an equitable and quality education for all children in the United States through standards-based reform efforts. These efforts would be developed by state governments and held accountable by the federal government. NCLB regulation would tightly enforce accountability unlike past legislation. If states were noncompliant, federal funding would discontinue. Despite the tough stance, the federal government did not implement the new legislation in an
adequate manner. At first, states were unclear at what they were actually supposed to do to become compliant under the new law. Soon thereafter, the inadequacy of NCLB became quite apparent to stakeholders, including politicians and educators (Hess & Petrilli, 2006). Not much has changed under the Obama administration; as NCLB deadlines loom over states, Congress has yet to create a viable reauthorized bill of ESEA (Burke, 2012; McNeil & Klein, 2011). President Obama and the Department of Education have created short-term waivers for states to bypass NCLB deadlines coming to term in 2014 as long as the states continue to enforce their own accountability systems to improve student and school performance.

Critics question whether the true intent behind NCLB was indeed for school and public education improvement or more ulterior motives (Craig, 2004; Kohn, 2004). Meier (2004) stated that NCLB has removed much of what has made public education in this country public. She continued by stating that the very fabric of American democracy is slowly eroding away with less public participation in schools due to increased private sector involvement (e.g., charter schools and education management organizations). Tollefson (2008) questioned whether there was even a “crisis” in American public schooling to begin with or if it was a way for private interests to become more involved with and profit off public schools. Some critics even suggest that the impact of NCLB will move so far as to end public education in the United States and fully privatize schooling (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Kohn, 2004). This mimics how other public services and government functions have privatized over time (Klein, 2007) (e.g., utilities, corrections, airports, etc.). It would not be shocking to see schools privatized since this
will allow American hegemonic powers to continue to “gate keep” who does and does not have access to all that society has to offer.

There is a trend for school curriculum to narrow due to the high level of focus on standardized tests and their results. Schools’ curriculum over time focused more on skills-based education (i.e., skills around reading, mathematics, and science). Other subject areas, even ones once held as the core of a school’s curriculum including social studies, move to the side for the matter of improving test scores and the future of schools themselves. The days of a high quality, inquiry-based curriculum that includes problem solving, creativity, independent learning, and student reflection is no more, at least for now (Darling-Hammond, 2010). I question if the type of education Darling-Hammond seeks has ever existed in the first place. Furthermore, the viability of an education system that reflects the democratic values of American society is in question. The values that Gutmann (1999) envisioned and that I agree with would provide students with a better capability of being critically aware of the world around them, which would go against the current accountability, assessment, and testing movement.

Not only is NCLB narrowing the focus and purpose of public education, but also forces more students out of the system than any other time in the past (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Wood, 2004). Education is a tool to keep social classes “in order” and continue generations of stratified society (Nieto, 2005). Accountability and testing do not focus on the child, it focuses on the performance of schools and districts. The system’s design is not to reward, but to punish. Besides punishing schools and districts on “inadequate performance,” they also punish each child and their potential along with a teacher’s opportunity to provide a rich education for each student.
NCLB will not only punish “failing” schools and students, it will also punish successful schools (Kohn, 2004). By 2014 all children in the United States will need to make a proficient or better score on their state standardized tests. This is statistically and humanly impossible, especially on the types of norm-referenced tests that students take. The tests are designed for all students to not pass them (Darling-Hammond, 2004). Despite NCLB not doing what it set out to do by providing an equitable and quality education for all, schools and teachers are often too afraid of the possible ramifications of not meeting standards, especially on high-stakes testing. The fear of sanctions and the possibility of rewards due to standardized test score results lead to a distortion of the meaning behind them (Greene, Winters, & Forster, 2004).

In addition, the reality of accountability, assessment, and testing under NCLB has greatly influenced the teaching profession as well. With the focus of teaching and learning taken away from curriculum and towards standardized tests, teachers are finding it more difficult to provide a rigorous education while at the same time prepare students for testing (Craig, 2004). Eventually teachers realize their only purpose is to teach to the test (Reichel, 2009).

As I have experienced, there have been three phases to NCLB reform over the past decade. First, teachers and schools resisted the reform efforts (Darling-Hammond, 2004). Over time, teachers and schools “bought-in” on the purpose behind structural education reform, whether through propaganda and/or fatigue. Third, teachers begin to question their teaching practices, motivations, and purpose as an educator. Even the mantra of what a good teacher is under NCLB—“highly qualified teacher”—is questioned of what that actually entails (Reichel, 2009). American public education has
become a one-size-fits-all system, which strips the democratic nature of teaching and educators are no longer required to “teach,” just manage (Meier, 2004).

The narrowing of public education can now be seen in the new standards movement of the Common Core curriculum that many states have adopted, which continues the focus on “core” skills (Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011). The Common Core Standards to date focus on English language arts and mathematics, but are purported to expand into other academic disciplines in the future. Many recent education reformers view history and social studies courses secondary to the other subjects for schools to improve on. However, at least social studies skills, such as reading comprehension and analysis, are part of the literacy area of the new Common Core Standards (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010). Still though, these skills are only focusing on literacy. Yes it is a start towards bringing back history and social studies into the core structure of school curriculum, but there is still a long way to go. In order to better understand how to disrupt the hegemonic dominance of economic power one needs to better understand how this has been shaped through federal policy.

Ever since the introduction of standards-based education in public schools, assessment and testing measures have been the pillars of the accountability movement (Ravitch, 2010; Taubman, 2009). With this, the democratic value of public education becomes questionable. As public education falls further into the control of the federal government, charter schools, and education management organizations, there is less public participation in the educational process (Meier, 2004). Corporations and business interests have Congress’ attention, not the actual interests of American society. Despite the loose-tight arrangement of structural education reform where local and state
governments still oversee the day-to-day operations of public schools, federal mandates and guidelines increasingly orchestrate these actions (Mintrop 2004; Nitta, 2008). As private corporate interests further infiltrate public institutions and the lives of everyday Americans, the nation is becoming less democratic and further entrenched under the manipulation of hegemonic forces. These forces have evolved into outside private entities, increasingly known as educational management organizations (EMOs), which run publicly-funded educational institutions (Klein, 2007; Saltman, 2007). If left up to the champions of privatization, public schooling would no longer exist (Klein, 2007).

Government regulation is a clear interference with the free market structure, which in the eyes of Milton Friedman and other supporters of free market capitalism would be a direct attack on American democracy itself. Without schools competing for business—i.e., students—the tenants of laissez-faire capitalism within the educational system will vanish. Critics like Meier (2004) argued the exact opposite; public education will keep American democracy alive, as it will provide for a forum and space to freely express new ideas and undergo new experiences. Although, I believe this will only occur if teachers and schools are willing to educate beyond the boundaries of the standards and accountability movement.

**The potential of accountability in education.**

Accountability is the umbrella over assessment and testing. Historically, accountability, assessment, and testing have fallen into separate spheres of influence, thereby having no direct relationship between the three (Popham, 2004). This is why there has not been a strong positive impact from structural education reform efforts in the past 30 years. What should it entail then? To begin with, the system of accountability:
…should be focused on ensuring competence of teachers and leaders, the quality of instruction, and the adequacy of resources, as well as the capacity of the system to trigger improvements. In addition to standards of learning for students, which focus the system’s efforts on meaningful goals, this will require standards of practice that can guide professional training, development, teaching, and management of the classroom, school, and system levels, and opportunity to learn standards that ensure appropriate resources to achieve the desired outcomes. Alongside relevant, valid, and useful information about how individual students are doing, and how schools are serving them, accountability should encompass how a school system hires, evaluates, and supports its staff; how it makes decisions; how it ensures that the best available knowledge will be acquired and used; how it evaluates its own functioning; and how it provides safeguards for student welfare (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 301).

Accountability should be an all-encompassing reform effort that reworks public education from instructional goals to professionalism to funding in a unified and well-functioning system. As seen from the past decade, NCLB is broken (Burke, 2012). With the current standstill in Congress, it is not hopeful that the next reauthorization of ESEA will bring any positive change to public education.

Even though I agree with the language above that Darling-Hammond (2010) used for a total accountability system, what would this actually look like? What should American public education look like in the era of globalization? How would it function to actually be effective on a full-scale basis? To begin with, it does need to be a cohesive
and relational network that reconstructs the entire educational system from the ground up thereby transforming the teaching and learning that each student receives (i.e., a “globalization from below” perspective and not from a top down vantage point—“globalization from above”). Curriculum, instruction, assessment, accountability, and funding actually need to work hand-in-hand. The piecemeal efforts of past and current reforms are not working and will never do so unless whole reform efforts take place.

The Purpose of Schooling

The era of accountability, assessment, and testing.

Accountability is “defined primarily as the administration of tests and the attachment of sanctions to low test scores” (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 301). However, it is part of a larger structure of holding all stakeholders, from students, educators, administrators, and schools to districts and communities, responsible for the creation and maintenance of a quality system of education (Darling-Hammond, 2004). Despite the vast amount of support behind structural education reform efforts in recent decades, even once staunch supporters of the accountability movement have questioned the purpose and/or quality of education underneath the era of standards and testing. Ravitch (2010) questioned whether or not if the very purpose of schooling is still even relevant with the focus on the measurement of education and not the goals of education. Either way, there needs to be clear objectives and goals for education, especially if testing will be used as a tool for measurement. The two should be in direct correlation with one another. Otherwise, what is the point of measuring students’ performance if educators and stakeholders do not even know what they are looking for?
This connects to the current relationship between education and economics. If educators do not know what they are testing for, especially if it is not tied directly to educational objectives, then how will corporations and businesses know whether or not the entering workforce is qualified to meet their needs? If for nothing else, change should occur and become evident in the caliber of the American workforce. If American society is going to use education as a tool for the production of tomorrow’s workforce, then there should be a direct connection so the means justify the ends to the purpose of education. However, one might need to dig a bit deeper to think about what the purpose of public education is in the first place (F.M. Hess, 2010). Social morals, values, and “common” cultural beliefs (what is deemed as normal social behavior within schools and out in the real world) are institutionalized into students by way of what is taught to students in schools (Kusch, 2009).

Assessment is the evaluation of the quality and ability of someone’s performance. In the context of education, assessment does not only involve students’ performance in schools, but also the performance of educators and schools. Student in-class assessments range from informal to formative and summative methods of evaluation (Gipps, 1999). Over time, the range of assessments has broadened to include standardized tests, authentic and performance assessments. With structural education reform efforts, this range has decreased back recently to more quantitative methods of assessment as seen in the many types of standardized tests students take in school today, such as the new Common Core Standards assessments now in development (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010; Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011; Taubman, 2009). Not only do these assessments evaluate students, but also the performance of educators
and schools as well (e.g., teacher merit pay, school/district report cards). With this, there are real consequences behind these evaluations where once before there were no mechanisms to reinforce legislative mandates that tied to standardized testing.

Testing is more narrowly defined as a tool or method of evaluating knowledge and skill-base. The most common forms of testing are standardized tests (both low- and high-stakes) along with classroom-based examinations. Standardized testing has become the dominant force in shaping curriculum and instruction in American public education (i.e., standards-based reform). McDermott (2011) recounted Smith and O-Day’s (1991) definition of standards:

Standards are state-level statements about what students should know and be able to do at each stage of their schooling. The central tenet of standards-based reform is that all state education policies, including funding, evaluation of performance, and training for teachers, should be reorganized around the goal of ensuring that students learn what state authorities (generally in conjunction with teacher and educational-administrator representatives) have identified as important (p. 4).

Overall standards-based testing has narrowed the focus and purpose of teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Hamilton, Stecher, & Yuan, 2012). As stated earlier, there is little to no correlation between standardized testing and classroom curriculum (Taubman, 2009). Tragically enough, the use of standardized testing has evolved into the preparation for other standardized tests. For example in the state of Illinois, freshmen and sophomores in high school take the EXPLORE and PLAN standardized tests respectively. The main function for these tests is to gauge how well students will do in
the future on the high-stakes Prairie State Achievement (PSAE) examination in their junior year, which includes the national college-entrance exam—ACT. Even in the junior year of high school, students are now taking full practice PSAE exams to prepare for the actual tests that occur every April. The education of students has devolved into the testing for future testing.

Educational testing has evolved over time in teaching and learning. “Tests have been a fixture in American education since the early decades of the twentieth century, when they were used to make decisions about matters such as promotion to the next grade, graduation, and college admissions” (Ravitch, 2010, p. 151). Not much has changed. From assessing subject matter knowledge to the accreditation of teachers to the current reality of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), testing has become the backbone of American education, from the early years to higher education. Today many standardized tests have become “high-stakes,” especially for schools and districts (McDermott, 2011). Schools, sometimes even whole districts, are either rewarded or more likely punished based on student performance from standardized tests.

The impact of testing has become to mean much more than how it affects students’ education. Critics view testing, just as schooling, as a form of social control and power in the social reproduction of society (Gipps, 1999; Kusch, 2009). Within the interpretivist paradigm, critics have equated testing to tactics in legitimating power and control. From societal gatekeeping to the allocation of funding for public education and access to higher education, standardized assessments and testing have evolved into an elaborate method of social and economic stratification. This diminishes the democratic values of American society as it further entrenches students into the “unconscious”
reproduction of social and political values (Gutmann, 1999). However, education can further democratic ideals that eventually spread out to the rest of society.

During the past century, one of society’s major battles has been over the expansion of civil liberties and rights for all living in the United States. Through federal legislative efforts, individuals and groups marginalized socially, politically, and economically have gained a more equitable footing within society. This is now eroding away through the reforms that concern public education in this country (Meier, 2004). For example, NCLB regulations hurt schools in urban and rural areas more often than suburban schools as they have the social, political, and economic means (i.e., socio-economic status and wealth) to traverse the legislative hurdles often put into place that deem some schools as failing and others as meeting standards.

One of the major arguments for testing relates to the success of globalization and its impact on the world. If business and commerce can be quantified down to simple numbers and the manipulation of statistical information, then education should be able to do the same (Taubman, 2009). Thereby testing has become the key assessment tool into the educational preparation of students and how schools are accountable for this. Unfortunately though, testing and standardization have narrowed school curriculum so much that students are no longer able to transfer skills and knowledge to other situations (Williams, 2001). The opposite should occur. Dewey (1916) discussed the “plasticity” of life and how one’s experiences should help guide the individual through future endeavors. Not only will this help the individual, but it will also assist in the advancement of society. Under free market ideology, capitalism in the end will benefit all. Therefore, the economic sector should be in favor of a more aligned system with
education. Thus is the goal of accountability, assessment, and testing meeting its own needs or actually self-destructing?

**The potential of 21st century public education.**

By resituating the purpose of public education back into a democratic discourse, this will provide for a means to fundamentally change the infrastructure of public education, which then may bring forth emancipation, or at least a greater understanding of hegemonic influence. Fundamental change will have to occur so public education may provide for this evolutionary and democratic development of the United States within the global society (F.M. Hess, 2010). Schools should provide students the means to provide change in their individual and communal lives (Stratman, 1997). Through a “globalization from below” perspective, students, and by association the greater society, will have the tools and knowledge necessary to bring about positive change for continued social, political, and economic development from the bottom up. For this to occur, a tighter relationship between America’s role in the global society and its public education system will have to be considered.

Despite education perpetuating current societal norms, educators will have to find a way to educate so students can liberate themselves from “oppression,” and be able to have the capability of transforming society and the current hegemonic world (Freire, 2000). The democratic purpose of education will have to be re-introduced into the reform conversation in a meaningful way and not just by using the rhetoric of advancing a democratic society for economic purposes (as seen in federal education policy since the Reagan presidential administration; see Chapter 4). There needs to be a balance between the economic and democratic purposes of education so there is more to formal education
than job training. This type of change could manifest itself in a more critical form of education.

Critical education, also known as critical pedagogy, intends “to help students develop consciousness of freedom, recognize authoritarian tendencies, and connect knowledge to power and the ability to take constructive action” (Giroux, 2010, p. 1). Based on the work of Freire (2000), critical pedagogy signifies that certain privileged groups oppress the masses in society. Individuals need to study the deeply rooted causes, ideologies, and consequences of historical and modern hegemony so they may understand the current reality in order to overcome barriers in their lives (Allman, 2001; Freire, 2000; P. Singh, 2004). This type of change could partly occur through the reconceptualization of social studies curriculum in secondary public education. Reconceptualization is the idea of complete and fundamental change in a culture or society (Pinar, 2004a). This would allow individuals to liberate themselves from oppression since they would have the capability to bring about change (Freire, 2000). In a sense, if social studies curriculum entered back into the foundational core of public education that currently consists of math, science, and literacy education, then individuals would theoretically have the historical knowledge and ability to critically think about how to advance themselves and their communities within a democratic society.

Since the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), i.e. the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), social studies education has been removed from the core focus of instruction in many public schools (Darling-Hammond, 2010). For the most part social studies is not tested through standardized assessments; these assessments are administered on the state level and in turn are one of the metrics
that schools are rated on by the federal government in order to receive continued Title I funding. The focus has been on mathematics, science, and literacy curriculum. The federal government and its education partners targeted these areas of instruction as the keys to success for the United States to retain its status as the leading political and economic power of the world. Theoretically these areas provide the basis for knowledge construction, problem solving, and skills needed to succeed in the real world.

To help break apart the continued control of hegemonic power, the agency of the American citizenry should increase through the development of their understanding of how the social, political, and economic landscape of American hegemony intricately intertwines itself into every aspect of our democratic society and culture (regionally, nationally, and internationally). One area that would be beneficial for this purpose is the study of world history and current events (national and global) so the public understands why the world is the way it is; i.e., studying the past will allow individuals to understand current events domestically and internationally, and how those events relate back to individual’s daily lives. Overall today, the average American citizen does not have much knowledge of either American or world history (Dillon, 2011), and thus does not have a strong underlying understanding of the current issues facing our nation and the world as a whole. Some scholars would argue this was and continues to be the goal of American and corporate hegemonic power so they are able to retain the current paradigmatic structures (Apple, 1978; Robinson, 2010; Saltman, 2007). This would help to explain the relative little transformation that has occurred in our public education system for the past century.

***
The intent and reality of structural education reform are not matching. The impact of accountability, assessment, and testing on American public education has adversely affected the future of every student, citizen, and the country as a whole. Globalization is here to stay for the foreseeable future. Students and citizens will need to be able to fully function in the global economy, but at the same time, should be able to critically examine the world that they live in. Education should be more than answering multiple-choice tests. Students need the skills and knowledge base to critically navigate the globalized world, for both survival and success.

In the next chapter, the major legislative efforts by the past five presidential administrations: the Reagan era A Nation at Risk, George H.W. Bush’s America 2000, Bill Clinton’s Goals 2000, George W. Bush’s NCLB, and legislative developments under President Barack Obama’s efforts to reauthorize NCLB/ESEA are critically analyzed using critical discourse analysis (CDA). By using CDA, this provides for gaining a better insight into the relationship between globalization and public education reform in the United States. In addition, the analysis of recent federal policy provides for a basis in my later discussion on understanding how social studies curriculum has become secondary to other core subject areas in recent years and how this relates back to the overall interconnection of globalization with public education reform.
4 – Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Understand the Effects of Globalization on American Public Education Policy

From *A Nation at Risk* to *A Blueprint for Reform*, American federal public education reform policy for the past 30 years has championed and propagated globalization discourse. In this chapter I have used critical discourse analysis (CDA) to highlight the prominence of globalization discourse within federal education policy and the impact this has had on reforming public education in the United States. The CDA conducted in this chapter further illustrates the economic focus within the discourse on recent federal education policy. The themes that emerged from the CDA are situated in an economic discourse and less so in a democratic discourse, which was more prevalent in education policy during the Civil Rights movement between the 1950s and 1970s. Identifying a relationship between globalization and public education reform assisted in developing an argument for reconceptualizing world history curriculum (see Chapter 7).

This chapter focuses on my use of CDA to understand the complex relationship between globalization and public education reform. The use of CDA provided a greater context and understanding that informed my critical and philosophical exploration of a reconceptualized curriculum as a tool for public education to respond to the challenges that globalization has placed on American society.

**Critical Discourse Analysis Process**

I chose to analyze five federal education policies from the past three decades as this period corresponds with the shift in America’s focus from a domestic economy and society to global economic development and competition. The current reality of the standards and accountability movement developed during this same period. Through CDA, I explored the following sections within each text. In Ronald Reagan’s *A Nation at*
Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983), I analyzed the section entitled “report.” In George H.W. Bush’s America 2000: An Education Strategy (1991), I analyzed the sections entitled “Address to Congress” and “Title I, II, IV, V, VI, IX.” In Bill Clinton’s Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994), I analyzed the sections entitled “Section 2 – Purpose” and “Title I—National Education Goals, Sec. 102 – National Education Goals.” In George W. Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), I analyzed the section entitled “Title I—Sec. 101 – Improving Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged, Sec. 1001—Statement of Purpose.” In Barack Obama’s A Blueprint for Reform (2010), I analyzed the section entitled “Priorities in A Blueprint for Reform.”

The sections that I focused on were pertaining to the issues, concerns, and goals that each policy highlighted on education reform. These sections corresponded with the goals of my study in finding connections in the text on the effects of globalization in public education reform. The sections that I omitted were in regards to the logistics, implementation, and/or enforcement of each policy as this would divert attention away from the focus of my research.

**Steps for text analysis.**

I adapted Creswell’s (2009) steps for data analysis in qualitative research to guide me through the CDA process. Step 1, I collected the raw data—federal public education policy. Step 2, I organized and prepared data for analysis by electronically obtaining the policies from the US Department of Education’s archival web site (www2.ed.gov/) and formatted the text of each policy from PDF files to Microsoft Word documents to allow for coding and the creation of themes. Step 3, I read all the data. Step 4, I coded the data (in 3 rounds). Step 5 focused on the development of themes and descriptors. Step 6
focused on the interrelation of the themes and descriptors. Step 7, I interpreted the meaning of the themes and descriptors. (Steps 2-7 were an ongoing process to help validate the findings and analysis.) And in Step 8, I formulated connections between the meaning of themes and descriptors back to the central and related research questions of this study.

Initially, I conducted three rounds of coding. First, inductive (general) coding was applied to uncover recurring topics and issues that emerged from the text of each policy. Second, I created categorical themes based on the first round of coding. Lastly, I used these themes to drive the third round that focused on the specific use of four CDA tools in order to provide a more in-depth analysis of the themes that emerged. The four tools were Deixis, Fill-in, Making the Familiar Strange, and Frame Analysis. Deixis provided meaning and context to the subject matter of the text (Gee, 2011b). Fill-in focused on what is said and not said within the text (i.e., reading between the lines in order to find clarity within the text and the meaning of that text). I analyzed the overt language that is used to develop a specific argument, idea, or concept and the covert language that focused on what is omitted from the text (Gee, 2011b; Rapley, 2007). I used the Making the Familiar Strange tool to search for ideology that is unclear, confusing, or worth questioning within the text (Gee, 2011b). Frame Analysis concentrated on the situated context and relationships in reference to the larger picture (e.g., society, globalization, education reform). This tool assisted in relating the text to the constructs of context, values, power, and relevance on a macro scale (i.e., the larger society in which we live) (Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 2011b; Goffman, 1974; Lakoff, 2005). Within this third round of coding, I also used *a priori* coding—globalization affects
education policy—through two specific questions to synthesize and analyze the findings. The two questions were based on the work of Gee (2011a) and were used in conjunction with understanding these policies in terms of how globalization affects education policy:

1. What relationships are relevant in the context and how are they being enacted, recruited, and used? 2. What are the relevant connections and disconnections in this context and how are these connections or disconnections being made or implied?

Conducting multiple rounds of coding provided for consistent comparison of the development of my coding, which refined my themes and categories that emerged over the course of analysis with each policy individually and comparatively.

**Adjustments to the text analysis process.**

Ultimately, the coding process of all five policies was not conducted with the same amount of detail. I started to question the use of all four tools based on the initial third round coding of *A Nation at Risk* with the above-mentioned CDA tools. Too much time was spent on the coding and analysis of the text in relation to the central intent of this study when compared to the amount of new insights gathered from the analysis of the text. Thus I re-analyzed the intent and goals of each CDA tool in regards to the overall goals of my research and I chose to only use the Fill-in and Frame Analysis tools. Frame Analysis would be the main CDA tool used in the third round of coding and the Fill-in tool would be used to provide further clarification when needed. I chose these two tools because they would get at the heart of the research in regards to providing greater understanding of the discourse of globalization and its effects on public education reform. This would eventually drive my critical and philosophical reconceptualization of world

---

5 This section provides insight into the evolutionary journey my research took from conception to fruition, which I believe is necessary to understand the justification into the refining of my methodological process.
history curriculum for the 21st century American classroom. I would still use Gee’s (2011a) questions at the end of the analysis to help make sense of and synthesize my findings.

After coding George H.W. Bush’s *America 2000* policy and comparing it to the analysis of *A Nation at Risk*, I further weighed the benefits and shortfalls of the CDA coding and analysis process that I developed for my study. Just as I did after coding *A Nation at Risk*, I questioned again the amount of time spent and the relative number of new insights gained from the coding and analysis compared to the original intentions of my study. In addition, I started to notice a pattern between the texts that I did not originally consider. When combining the literature read on globalization and federal education policy with the coding and preliminary analysis conducted thus far, I recognized a shift was occurring with the language and goals of each text in relation to the social, political, and economic development of American society at the time of the writing of these policies. *A Nation at Risk* was predominately a policy about the failing of American public schools and the effects this would have on the United States, chiefly in regards to development of the American economy and labor supply within an internationalized context. With the language of the *America 2000* policy, I noticed not only more text about the issues and goals facing American public education, but also how the nation should go about reforming American public schools to meet these challenges (i.e., language around standards and accountability emerged from the text).

As a result of these new insights, the idea emerged that *A Nation at Risk* was the foundational move of a fundamental shift in discourse about the purpose of public schooling and its reform. From this shift, each subsequent policy from the presidencies
of George H.W. Bush to Barack Obama were responses to this. Thus I revised my coding and analysis of the federal policies after *A Nation at Risk* and focused only on the macro level in terms of how these policies responded to the challenge of reforming American public education. I concluded that with the last four federal policies I would only conduct the first two rounds of coding described earlier and the third round would only use Gee’s (2011a) two questions as a point of synthesis when it came to comparatively analyzing all five policies in light of my central and related research questions.

**Code Development and Emerging Themes**

Based on the CDA of the five federal education policies, Table 4.1 represents the different major themes that developed from the coding of each text. Not all themes arose between every policy, but each code was based on repetitive topics from either a primary, secondary, or tertiary level. Table 4.1 represents all major themes that emerged from the policies in varying degrees as either a major theme or as a descriptor under another theme. In Table 4.2, I have noted the codes (primary and secondary) and corresponding descriptors that emerged as related topics to the major themes that developed over the course of the policy analysis.

Seven major themes evolved from the five federal education policies analyzed: *Accountability, Change, Teaching & Learning, Education Reform, Equity, Stakeholders,* and *Standards.* In the next section, I will discuss the development of each theme within each federal education policy, including the overt and covert relationships that surfaced between the themes and descriptors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Nation at Risk</th>
<th>America 2000</th>
<th>Goals 2000</th>
<th>NCLB</th>
<th>Blueprint for Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition (ed. funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Reform</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegemony</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual v. Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Security v. Fear/Harm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. X = major theme/category in the text; ✓ = sub-theme/category in the text.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accountability</td>
<td>measuring progress, growth; student performance; improvement plans; national education and federal control (federal mandates for change and reform, with the local and state agencies determining how to go about instituting these changes and reforms); teacher/school; standardized testing â data driven change; allocation of resources based on performance; local school, district, and state levels; flexibility; assessments and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>reform; challenges in the future; education reform â improvement, progress, achievement; legislation; growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition</td>
<td>international competition (political and economic); America’s role in the world; globalization (&amp; the developing global society/economy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition (educational funding; school quality)</td>
<td>rankings, reports; tax dollars for public education; funding on all levels; schools v. schools, districts v. districts, states v. states; school choice: students / parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economy</td>
<td>regarding jobs, manufacturing, careers, industry, money, technology; historically speaking: growth, decline, and questionable future; resources; free enterprise / laissez-faire capitalism; monetary cost of change, including education, societal issues, etc.; globalization/global competition; skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education - teaching and learning</td>
<td>regarding curriculum; types of education: formal and informal; opportunity; potential of the human mind; life-long learning; teaching and learning; resources; educational services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education reform</td>
<td>regarding school readiness, school completion rates, curriculum reform, parental participation, teacher/principal professional development, focus on math/science/literacy education, adult literacy, teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equity</td>
<td>equitable/fair opportunity, equal access/chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hegemony</td>
<td>regarding the status quo; what are common values and belief systems; domestic and international hegemonic powers on a social, political, economic, and military scale; ideology; responsibility for educating everyone; common understandings/expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual v. group</td>
<td>looking at who benefits from education and education reform, on an individual level and group level (i.e., community, state, national, etc.); goals (individual and societal); rights; responsibilities; what is the purpose of the individual in society; values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>othering</td>
<td>identifying/naming specific groups of students by race/ethnicity, ability, etc. (pseudo-marginalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of education</td>
<td>need for early education â health; employment; parenting; citizens; use of technology; equal access to societal opportunities; lifelong learning; betterment of a democratic society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety/security v. fear/harm</td>
<td>this is both real in terms of the US v. the world within global economic competition and the theoretical in terms of what will happen to the US if it cannot continue is domestic and global dominance within the “free world” (free-market capitalist global society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td>what is at stake for each of these groups?: students, parents/families, teachers, administrators, schools (K-16), school districts, state and public agencies, federal government, national society, communities, business/labor, politicians, community organizations, minority/marginalized groups; doers and recipients of education, reform, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards</td>
<td>standards-based education (student, teacher, principal); high quality instruction and content; standardized testing/assessments; flexibility (who institutes standards, usually on the state level); types of student standards: content, college and career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 1 – Accountability.

The concept of accountability, as part of the larger standards and accountability movement, has become more prominent and central to public education reform over the past three decades. The theme of accountability refers to the structures and programs that are put in place to ensure and measure the improvement of schools, and the growth of student performance in the classroom. This theme developed from the establishment of each policy and became more dominant from each subsequent text.

Accountability as a theme in A Nation at Risk was not as dominant in the text as what emerged in later policies. The Reagan-era policy discussed the need for fundamental reforms to the education system due to declining student achievement scores on standardized tests. It continued by stating that everyone in American society from parents to politicians should be held accountable for the quality of its education system, not just teachers.

Thus, we issue this call to all who care about America and its future: to parents and students; to teachers, administrators, and school board members; to colleges and industry; to union members and military leaders; to governors and State legislators; to the President; to members of Congress and other public officials; to members of learned and scientific societies; to the print and electronic media; to concerned citizens everywhere. America is at risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, “The Learning Society,” para. 3).

George H.W. Bush’s America 2000 policy had similar language around accountability—“It’s time we held our schools—and ourselves—accountable for results”
(America 2000 Excellence in Education Act, 1991, pp. 3-4). However in this policy, discussion started to occur around how schools would be held accountable, such as improved student performance through new national educational goals and standards, higher high school graduation rates, and higher scores on standardized tests (e.g., AP/College Board and SAT tests).

Three years later in the Goals 2000 policy by the Clinton administration, language around accountability was pushed even further in specifying how schools would become accountable for providing a high quality education. A high standard of accountability would be structured under a series of frameworks for teaching and learning, including national education goals (similar to the first President Bush’s goals) and voluntary national standards around student performance and skills development. Discussion around quality of schools was also prevalent with language on school improvement plans and “high quality assessment measures” to assess the performance of America’s schools on an international level (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994, “Section 2 Purpose,” para. 2).

Under the current federal education policy of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), language involving accountability was very prominent and targeted in its use. Direct connections between student and school performance to federal funding were made clear by:

- ensuring that high-quality academic assessments, accountability systems, teacher preparation and training, curriculum, and instructional materials are aligned with challenging State academic standards so that students, teachers, parents, and administrators can measure progress against
common expectations for student academic achievement (No Child Left

are held accountable through adequate yearly progress (AYP) reports on how schools
perform on state-level standardized tests. If schools continued to not make AYP, then
schools would be placed in varying levels of probation and/or reconstitution. Essentially,
all reform measures and goals stated under NCLB are directly tied to the accountability of
schools based on student performance.

The education reform proposal by President Barack Obama, A Blueprint for
Reform, had similar language on accountability as NCLB, but under a different viewpoint.
Accountability was even further delineated in this policy as the language was targeted
towards the evaluation of students, teachers, principals, and schools through related
accountability systems. However, what was different from NCLB was the positive tone
of accountability through terms such as “rewards,” “success,” and “support,” where NCLB
focused more on remediation tactics for failing schools. The other variance between
NCLB and A Blueprint for Reform is how the latter policy encompassed these
accountability measures in language that reflected versatility and how “leaders at the state,
district, and school level will enjoy broad flexibility to determine how to get there
[college and career-readiness goals]” (United States Department of Education, 2010,
“Equity and Opportunity for All Students,” para. 1).

Despite language around accountability becoming more specific within each
subsequent policy after A Nation at Risk, none of the issues and goal setting sections of
each policy formulated how these accountability systems would transpire. However,
what CDA did provide was the unveiling of the past four federal education policies as a
response to the initial conversation around providing accountability measures to improve schools within *A Nation at Risk*.

This unveiling of the accountability half of the greater standards and accountability movement would allow for structural education policies, such as New Public Management (NPM) principles from the business world (see Chapter 3), to lay the foundation for stakeholders to be held accountable for the improvement (i.e., student performance growth) of schools to occur. Thereby the quality of the workforce would increase, which would greatly assist in the continued American dominance in the globalized free market structure.

**Theme 2 – Change.**

The theme of *change* was more amorphous than the other major themes that emerged out of the five policies. This theme refers to any type of adjustment, adaptation, or revision within the subject matter of each policy. For some policies, the theme of *change* referred more so to economic topics and issues where in other policies *change* became a category based on societal topics, such as the purpose of education. Overall, this theme was a sub-theme of other emerging categories or was standalone from other major themes that developed from the text.

In *A Nation at Risk*, the theme of *change* became apparent in the tone of the text as it discussed how American society was evolving in the latter half of the 20th century. For example, there was much conversation around how the American economy was changing from a manufacturing base to a more service industry oriented economy. In addition, the American economy was not only changing because of domestic influences, but due to the fact of the growing global market structure and corresponding international
economic competition—“Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, para. 2).

The America 2000 policy was similar to A Nation at Risk in that the theme of change was more fluid throughout the other major themes that developed out of the policy, but did become part of its own major theme categorized as “Problems, Change, and Opportunity – Domestic and Global.” Language in this policy around change referred to the development of several societal issues, including: education reform, how technology and resources were altering the scope of employment in the U.S., and what challenges the nation would face in the future as a result of growing economic and political competition around the world—“Think about the changes transforming our world. The collapse of communism and the Cold War. The advent and acceleration of the Information Age” (America 2000 Excellence in Education Act, 1991, p. 1).

The theme of change became more focused in its characterization within Clinton’s Goals 2000 policy. Language in this policy around change centered on education reform and what specifically needed alteration and/or improvement within the American public education system. A wide range of topics were connected to this theme, including “school readiness,” “school completion,” “student achievement and citizenship,” “teacher education,” and “curricular reform.” A more comprehensive type of reform would have to occur for not only America’s schools to improve, but also the improvement of the American economy due to global competition. The improved competition of the American economy on a global scale is directly related to the improvement of schools and the raising of students’ performance on standardized tests.
Just like in the *Goals 2000* policy, both NCLB and *A Blueprint for Reform* followed the theme of *change* through education reform, but were interconnected to the other major themes of *accountability* and *standards*. Change would have to occur through the improvement, progress, and achievement of students and schools. For example, there is discussion about “closing the achievement gaps” in NCLB and “improving student learning and achievement” in *A Blueprint for Reform* (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002, “SEC. 1001. Statement of Purpose,” para. 4; United States Department of Education, 2010, “Priorities in a Blueprint for Reform,” para. 1). This change would occur through higher accountability measures and standards around student performance on standardized tests, the measuring of teacher effectiveness, and the allocation of resources and funding. The one variance between these two policies was since *A Blueprint for Reform* is just a proposal on education reform thus far, it called for legislative change within the current law as NCLB (i.e., the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* [ESEA]) is slated for reauthorization in 2014.

The second major theme, *change*, that emerged out of the CDA of federal education policy maintained its prominence throughout each text, but was nuanced from text to text in how it revealed itself in relation to other themes and topics. As related to the reform of public education, this theme exposed itself within the contexts of the economy, international relations, technology, and politics, which are vitally important in the age of globalization and reflects the overall shift in discourse from a democratic and economic purpose of education to purely an economic purpose of education. The idea of change is inherent in any kind of reform movement, but it was interesting in how it manifested itself between different discourses and the actual texts themselves. The
success of one sector of society, such as the economy, is directly correlated with the success of other sectors, such as the implementation and accountability of local, state, and federal public education reform policy in schools that will ultimately produce the human capital needed for domestic and international economic growth. This is essential in a globalized market structure where a nation’s economic success is intricately dependent on its success within the overall global economy.

**Themes 3 & 4 – Education: Teaching & learning/reform.**

The third and fourth themes, *teaching & learning* and *education reform*, will be discussed together, because of their intricate interconnectedness across the different policies. These two themes are of course the most pervasive due to the larger social, political, and economic contexts of each text. However, the reason for highlighting these two categories as themes within education reform policy is to provide an overall representation of how the concept of education reform is approached in each text and how they are contextualized.

Even though *education reform* is the fundamental purpose behind each of the policies analyzed in this study, it is not at the forefront of *A Nation at Risk*. This policy centered on the actual state of the nation and what issues and concerns it was facing in relation to the larger context of the globalizing world. What is at the forefront of this text is the economy and that is on two different planes: 1. on the basis of an individual person and 2. the nation as a whole as it pertained to both overall domestic and international strength of the time. Evoking the earlier idea that *A Nation at Risk* may be seen as a fundamental shift in American education reform and each subsequent policy as a response to it, this policy is very rudimentary in the language of how American public
education should change. This is why the actual language around education reform focused on what the purpose of education was for the time and why it should change in light of the then present and future needs to the American economy in a globalizing world. “Learning is the indispensable investment required for success in the ‘information age’ we are entering” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, “The Risk,” para. 2). Important to this shift was the evolving relationship between the U.S. and the world in regards to the impact and reaction to the growing understanding of globalization as both a domestic and international phenomenon.

The rudimentary state of the language of education reform found in *A Nation at Risk* is also prevalent in the *America 2000* policy. The next step that this policy takes from the former is that its language is more about what education can do for the individual—“It is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education”—and nation in terms of providing opportunity and vision for the potential that America exhibits on a national and international spectrum (America 2000 Excellence in Education Act, 1991, p. 1). Additionally, the discourse around *education reform* starts to include language on the connection between standards and accountability as a tactic to reform public education.

*Goals 2000’s* focus with the third and fourth themes revolves around the purpose of education. The scope of this is broader than the traditional terms of how it promotes the self within a growing democratic and capitalist society. This policy also discussed how education provides an avenue for a healthier populace that would positively affect the traditional terms previously described. On top of this, Clinton’s policy described how education can help “promot[e] the use of technology to enable all students to achieve” in
society along with providing for the foundation to lifelong learning (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994, “Section 2 Purpose,” para. 5). These attributes would therefore not only improve the specific goals themselves, but also with individual’s contributions to a democratic and capitalist nation within a global society.

In regards to NCLB and A Blueprint for Reform, the topics of “curriculum,” “teaching resources,” and “educational services” are discussed within the wider realm of teaching and learning. The scope of education reform is specifically outlined in the text around standards and accountability. For the most part just like A Nation at Risk, the text moves away from general language about education reform and more specifically into interrelated topics from equity to who should be held accountable for the success or failure of specified reform measures. Furthermore, A Blueprint for Reform very much permeates with the language of competition between schools, districts, and state boards of education in regards to federal support through funding—“provide incentives for excellence”—and of parental school choice (United States Department of Education, 2010, “Raise the Bar and Reward Excellence,” para. 1). This competitive nature mimics the successful economic competitiveness that the U.S. is continually seeking within the globalized world.

The themes of teaching & learning and education reform within the wider context of these policies are subtle in difference in how they are formally discussed within the other related major themes and descriptors. Through CDA, various focal points of the respective time periods of each policy became more apparent when examined from policy to policy. With this, the shift to the purpose of education becoming solely about
economics within a global context becomes more apparent, especially when all of the major themes from the CDA are contextualized within the era of globalization.

**Theme 5 – Equity.**

Even though *equity* was one of the foundational themes in federal education policy prior to the 1980s, it continued to be one of the most consistent themes amongst the federal education policies from *A Nation at Risk* to *A Blueprint for Reform*. The utilization of this theme revolved around the concepts of access and opportunity. Each policy described how all individuals should have the potential to the same impartiality of possibilities that a public education may offer through such phrases as “the twin goals of equity and high-quality schooling” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, “Excellence in Education,” para. 2), “creating a vision of excellence and equity” (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994, “Section 2 Purpose,” para. 4), and “to give every student a fair chance to succeed” (United States Department of Education, 2010, “Greater equity,” para. 1). These possibilities range from the types of curriculum and courses offered to the same resources (e.g., supplemental learning sources, funding, school environment, extra-curricular activities, education and social services) available for a high quality education. In addition to these types of in-school opportunities, also the social, political, and economic opportunities that one may have access to after completing a formal education were also both implied and formally acknowledged.

What was not acknowledged, for the most part, was the structural inequality that existed and still exists in American society, especially on a social and economic scale. Yes, all presidencies called for equity in public education and other facets of American society, but not recognizing that it did and does not exist within the theoretical access and
opportunity that a democratic and free market capitalist society should allow for. Language alluding to equity and opportunity compared to the actuality of equity and opportunity in society, especially in a society that values economic competitiveness and growth on a national and global scale, are two separate and distinct ideas.

**Theme 6 – Stakeholders.**

*Stakeholders* was another theme that dominated the discourse of education reform with most of the policies. This theme refers to the various individuals and groups who have some level of interest in how public education is reformed in the nation. Stakeholders in education reform range from students, teachers, and parents to schools, government agencies, and the economic sector of society (domestically and internationally).

*A Nation at Risk* was the one policy that did not include much direct language around the theme of *stakeholders*. For the most part, this theme was implied throughout the text of the policy, though just embedded within other themes and topics. For example, it may be implied from the text that businesses and the American economy have a stake in the success of public education. “Workers… will need further education and retraining if they--and we as a Nation--are to thrive and prosper” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, “Excellence in Education,” para. 4). Education is one of the factors that contributes to a strong and productive labor force, which will help dictate the success and strength of the American economy in a globalized context.

From *America 2000* to NCLB, the theme of *stakeholders* took on a standard meaning as described in this theme’s opening section. There was a continuous conversation around the idea that all parts of society, from the individual to the federal
government, have a vested interest to see public education succeed in this country. The one variation with this theme in the three policies was that in *America 2000*, connections were made to how stakeholders are part of the catalyst of change that is needed for improvement to occur in public education (e.g., “commitment” of teachers and parents in improving a student’s education)—“It’s time we held our schools—and ourselves—accountable for results” (*America 2000 Excellence in Education Act, 1991, pp. 3-4*).

Obama’s *Blueprint for Reform* was very similar to the prior three policies in that there was an ongoing dialogue about who has a stake in public education reform. However, the notable difference between this policy and the others was that within the theme of *stakeholders*, language arose around two major groups who make up this theme: the “doers” and the “recipients.” There was overlap of sub-groups that comprised the two large groups, but there was a clearer demarcation within the text of who is able to drive change in American public education reform and who will benefit from this change. The typical groups that were isolated in the prior policies are of the same composition in the “doers” group within *A Blueprint for Reform*, but some of those sub-groups were described in further detail in terms of who makes up the “recipients” group. Within the students sub-group, tertiary sub-groups included “students living in poverty,” “students living with disabilities,” “English learners,” “migrant students,” and “rural students.”

From the analysis of all five policies, certain demographic groups that were specifically noted was so that these groups were evident with other demographic groups who have been traditionally recognized in prior education policies (e.g., African Americans in Supreme Court cases, such as *Brown v. Board of Education*, and the original *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*). Rightly so, the theme of
stakeholders is pervasive throughout the policies analyzed in this study, but moreover throughout all social, political, and economic policy as it was part of the justification needed for change (or at least perceived change) to occur from the status quo and to provide equity sought after in the text analyzed. The main difference was just the degree of overt or covert language found in the policies’ text on who will do and/or benefit from these changes that will theoretically benefit all in a society that seeks equity to access and opportunity in a globalized free market structure.

Theme 7 – Standards.

As indicated at the beginning of this section on the development of CDA themes from discourse on federal policy, the theme of standards was the other half and arguably the more substantial half of the dominant area of education reform policy in the last 30 years. The term “standards” in the education field has become synonymous with not only the umbrella term of “school reform,” but also with the concepts of standardized testing, performance measurements, and benchmarks. These concepts are the tools to be used to measure the growth and success of student performance that will ultimately benefit the growth and success of a global American economy.

Just like the theme of accountability, standards as a theme and guide in public education reform has evolved and become more precise in its language through each subsequent policy after A Nation at Risk in the early 1980s. There was just a basic discussion about how society “should expect schools to have genuinely high standards rather than minimum ones” drive school improvement and accountability measures so the United States could continue along its strong line of dominance in 20th century global affairs, especially with economic matters (National Commission on Excellence in
Education, 1983, “Excellence in Education,” para. 3). With the federal education policies that were created in the 1990s was where the text became more explicit in the types of standards to be used as a catalyst for school change and improvement.

In America 2000, the theme of standards became more specific in its language in terms of the types of standards that were called for in this policy: “World Class Standards for schools, teachers, and students in the five core subjects: math and science, English, history, and geography” (America 2000 Excellence in Education Act, 1991, p. 5). Language arose around accountability in the relationship to the adoption of these standards (which were voluntary under this policy) and the receiving of federal funding for local and state-level education services.

The direct reference of standards diminishes in Goals 2000 for the emphasis was on the purpose of education and schooling as outlined in the proposed national education goals. There were accompanying references to standards through various frameworks mentioned in the national education goals, such as “the establishment of high-quality, internationally competitive content and student performance standards” along with skills-based education and student performance on standardized tests (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994, “Section 2 Purpose,” para. 4).

The prominence of the standards theme reemerged in NCLB and A Blueprint for Reform with direct connections made between standards-based education and holding teachers, schools, and districts accountable for measurable improvement on correlated student standardized tests. Within these two policies, the focus was on being able to measure student growth and teacher performance by specific systems of standards. For example, in A Blueprint for Reform, there is a new emphasis on standards “that build
toward college and career-readiness” with “the development and use of a new generation of assessments that continue the precedence of skills-based education as more important to the goals of the ongoing reform movement than the actual content that is taught to students in schools (United States Department of Education, 2010, “College- and Career-Ready Students,” para. 1 & 2). This is a complete reversal from the evolution of content standards during the 1980s and 1990s to now; the focus is no longer on content, but directly on skills development.

Once the standards movement progressed after *A Nation at Risk*, each subsequent policy more or less had similar language in regards to the types of standards to be applied to public education reform. Standards were seen as the impetus for change and what district, state, and federal level education agencies would use to hold educators and schools accountable for student performance on standards-based assessments.

With this theme, there was not much direct correlation between the use of standards and the phenomenon of globalization within an American context. However, this connection can very much be implied as the standards are part of the tools to be used to measure student performance growth that will inevitably holds schools and education agencies accountable that ultimately creates the future workforce. Based on the quality and flexibility of this workforce will dictate the growth in American economic output and profits within a global market structure.

**Analysis of CDA Findings**

In this section, I use Gee’s (2011a) two questions, referred to at the beginning of the chapter, to synthesize and analyze the findings from the CDA of the five federal education policies. This provides a space for relationships, connections, and/or
disconnections to be developed between the themes that emerged from the CDA to the *a priori* code of “globalization affects education policy.”

As reflected in Figure 4.1, the seven themes that developed out of the CDA of federal education policy from the 1980s to the present are interconnected in a relationship that is cyclical in nature to the theme of *change*. Ultimately, the relationship between these seven themes is much more complex than what is represented in Figure 4.1. However, there is a logical progression between the themes that starts from the impetus for reform—economic, social, and political changes in American society and the world—to the goal for this change, which is equitable access to opportunity within the global free-market economy. Within this progression, there are multiple competing and supporting connections, both explicit and implicit, that attach each of these themes to one another.
The impetus for the standards and accountability movement has advanced because of the argument for public education reform due to the domestic and international changes facing American society during the middle to latter half of the 20th century. From the gradual collapse of global communism to the growing tide of social, political, and economic conservatism, public education became the binding agent for this change to occur. Teaching and learning in American schools is now data-oriented and results driven by (that were taken from the NPM principles of the corporate business world) and for the various groups of stakeholders to have the perceived equitable potential and opportunity for all to participate in the improvement of the global American economy.
Globalization affects federal education policy.

*A Nation at Risk* positioned itself as the foundation for modern public education reform. This resulted as a parallel shift occurred in the developing 20th century global market structure where the United States no longer had sole supremacy over the direction of global capitalism (i.e., globalization). The U.S. expanded capitalist ideology to emerging markets around the world to help further benefit the already saturated domestic markets here at home and to expand profit margins by using foreign natural and manufacturing resources. Eventually, these markets matured into true competitive economic forces against American economic hegemony. Consequently, foreign economies are no longer just a cog in the American capitalist machine, they are now a true competitive force that very much is not just influenced by American markets, but influences this market as well. This could be argued as a clearer vision of globalization as it no longer is dictated by a sole super power or hegemonic conglomerate of nations. Realistically, today’s global market structure is still hegemonically controlled by a select number of nations and multi-national corporations, but there is now more influence and sway by all contributing factors and not just the primary drivers and beneficiaries of those changes.

Ever since *A Nation at Risk* and the shift from a dual purpose (democratic and economic) of education to today’s national primary economic objective of education, the goal of *America 2000, Goals 2000, No Child Left Behind* (NCLB), and *A Blueprint Reform* has been to provide a mechanism for the American economy and society to continue its hegemonic dominance over the rest of the world. Through these policies, the belief was and still is today that public education can be the tool to help improve the
weaknesses in the American work force and populace. These weaknesses correspond with the foci of these policies in terms of what will be taught to students (i.e., math, science, and literacy) in order to help the United States to maintain their global power. To help ensure that students are taught the needed skills and knowledge to contribute to retaining this status quo, standards are aligned with what students should know and be able to do. Accountability metrics are constructed to measure whether students and schools are achieving the desired results sought after by American hegemonic forces (i.e., the ultimate, but covert stakeholder in public education reform).

On a secondary level, this shift in the focus of education in the United States overlaps the continued use of public education as a mechanism to instill equity and equality in the social and political development of American society that started in the earlier decades of the 20th century. Throughout the five policies, a disconnected but related argument is laid out concerning these unfinished goals to allow all Americans to have equitable access and opportunity in all areas of society and its development. The policies connect this argument back to the idea of what the individual can do for the collective populace in terms of improving democracy in this country. When this argument was used in the policies, most of the time there was never a direct connection made between these social and political goals to the shifting balance of American economic power on a global scale and what problems this potentially posed for the United States. However, this connection was very much implied through the cyclical relationship of the seven major themes that encompass the scope of the federal policies analyzed that ultimately shift the conversation to a more economically focused vision of American public education.
Conclusions

A common thread surfaced from the five most recent federal policies on public education reform. Public schools need to cultivate fully participatory members of society for two main reasons. First, for individuals to use their education as a tool to improve and achieve their goals for themselves and local community. Second and arguably more important for the relationship between the U.S. and the world within the context of globalization, for individuals to work in a greater collective towards resolving current issues faced in society and to accomplish the implied national goal of the United States as the modern version of the shining example as the “city upon a hill” (Winthrop, 1630, p. 17), meaning a free-market capitalist and democratic success in a globalized world. Even though all five policies grandiosely advocated for a strong democratic society, the policies’ discourse branched off into two distinct categories: economic and political/democratic (as also seen in the literature reviewed in the prior chapter). As I analyzed the text from one policy to the next, the discourse overtly and covertly used democratic ideology as a frame for economic potential of American citizens.

Overall, there was a prominence of globalization discourse within the federal education policies analyzed using critical discourse analysis. Viewing the policies as a collective, overt and covert language provided for the reasoning and implementation behind the federal endeavor to reform public schooling. Each policy more or less built off the prior policy’s efforts to help shift the need for and how public education would be reformed. The one true revelation made from the CDA of the policies is that *A Nation at Risk* may be viewed as a fundamental shift in American education policy and how the four subsequent federal level policies were a response to reforming public education in
light of globalization. Using CDA to dissect public education reform discourse allowed for the literature discussed in Chapter 3 on the relationship between globalization and structural education reform to be situated within actual policies that developed the standards and accountability movement in the American education system.

A major disconnect emerged out of the CDA findings that is related to the same literature discussed in Chapter 3. That disconnect is between the ideology of free-market capitalism and the advancement of structural education reform policy in the United States. Despite free-market capitalism espousing for deregulation and the influence of capitalist ideology on American public education, federal- and state-level reform policy was and still does not follow this mantra of laissez-faire, hands-off philosophy. Even in Chapter 1, I indirectly referred to regulation and deregulation (see p. 17). I described the paradox of industrialized nation-states either possessing or not possessing centralized forms of public education. I specifically noted that historically the United States is of a few, if not the only industrialized nation that did not have a national education structure. However, the U.S. is becoming more centralized in the 21st century with increased levels of standards and accountability systems where other industrialized nations are doing the opposite. Based upon the references throughout my study to the literature on hegemony in society, I am not surprised that public education reform is not truly mimicking free-market ideology. Hegemonic powers want to make sure that reforms are meeting the needs of economic growth and development in the evolving relationship between the U.S. and global economies that ultimately benefits the hegemonic few and not the general public. This is a very interesting insight into the interconnectedness of economics, globalization, and education. Not only by there being a disconnect between free-market ideology and
practice in the field of economics, there is also a disconnect in the field of education. This should be researched further at a later date, including the correlation between the performance (growth vs. decline) of the American economy to national attention towards the state of public education. This could also be conducted in a comparative context to see whether or not other nations’ efforts to reform their education systems is stimulated by economics, politics, and/or societal issues on a domestic and global scale.

Despite there being no other revelations made from this policy analysis, it did verify and support the literature discussed in my prior chapters on the evolving relationship between globalization and attempts to reform the American public education system.

***

Moving forward, the research completed in this chapter will help guide the next two chapters on a thematic overview of social studies curriculum and critical discourse analysis of state curricular frameworks for world history along with the newly implemented state level and nationally supported Common Core Standards. In chapter 5, a thematic discussion is presented to help understand the evolution of social studies curriculum and the conception of the Common Core Standards in the United States. This includes an overview of the development and implementation in the use of social studies content and skills standards. In chapter 6, three state curricular frameworks on world history standards are coded and analyzed using the same procedures conducted in this chapter. In addition, the Common Core Standards are included as more states are adopting these standards as an accompaniment to their current content standards or even as a complete replacement of current standards in use. The Common Core Standards are
coded and analyzed in the same manner as the three state curricular frameworks. Relevant relationships within the corresponding literature and standards are discussed in terms of how the effects of globalization on federal education policy trickled down to the state level and manifested into content- and skills-based standards.
5 – The Road to Nowhere: Recurring Trends in Social Studies Education

The modern inception of history and social studies education occurred in the late 1800s during the same period when the United States was on the fringe of becoming a global superpower. From the beginning, there has been tension and ambiguity about the focus and purpose of history and social studies education in a democratic society. Today as the United States is trying to secure its hegemonic control as arguably the sole superpower of the world in the early 21st century, scholars and practitioners have not resolved those tensions and questions about the role and place for history and social studies education in secondary schools. If anything, the ambiguity found in the field of history and social studies education has increased as the purpose of education has shifted towards a primary focus on the global American economy. Thereby, a shift occurred in where history and social studies education has fallen outside the new core curriculum of mathematics, science, and literacy—the perceived education key to a growing and competitive American economy on a global scale.

The purpose of this chapter is not to provide an exhaustive historical account of social studies education as there already has been much done on this topic (Burson, 1989; Hertzberg, 1971, 1987, 1988; Ross, 1997, 2001a, 2001b; Saxe, 1991, 1992a; Seixas, 1993; Tyack & Cuban, 1995), but to highlight the trends over the past 130 years in order to understand how the purpose and teaching of history and social studies has stayed the same and/or changed. Providing this thematic overview of trends will create a context for the current field of history and social studies education and where it may need to go in the future, especially in light of the effects of globalization on public education policy and practice in the United States.
Educating for a Democratic Society: 1880s to the 1920s

Social studies education resulted as a partial response to the Progressive Era’s call for increased social welfare and reform in American society (Saxe, 1992a; Smith, Palmer, & Correia, 1995). The United States grappled with several social, political, and economic issues of the time, including the effects from industrialization, immigration, and economic imperialism. Progressive reformers, such as Francis Parker and John Dewey, saw schools as a way to promote social change and reform through the combination of teaching democratic citizenship, academic subject matter, and critical thinking skills (Dewey, 1916, 1929; Grossman, 2004). Promoting this type of education could address both national social needs and individual needs of students.

A divisive relationship manifested between proponents of history education and the emerging field of social education as a result of this pressure on schools to alleviate societal problems. A unity had formed in the promotion of history curriculum in the schools by the end of the 19th century (Saxe, 1991, 1992a; Smith, Palmer, & Correia, 1995). It was during the 1890s when the emergence of social education and social studies curriculum began to divide the existing field about the purpose of teaching history in schools. This mirrored the development of the various academic subjects within the social sciences field (i.e., economics, political science, sociology, etc.). Proponents and critics of this developing field questioned whether or not the social sciences had a place in history education (Saxe, 1991). The 1892 Committee of Ten argued that history education should move away from the sole purpose of rote memorization and towards the inclusion of recently developed teaching methods that advanced the human mind through critical thinking (Hertzberg, 1988). The American Historical Association’s (AHA) 1892
Committee of Seven furthered this work by studying current practices and providing recommendations on how to improve history curriculum (Bohan, 2004). One of the more widely used methods that developed to promote critical thinking was the use of primary sources in the classroom. Students would be given a set of historical and current documents with a series of questions to see what conclusions they could come up with, much as a historian might do (Hertzberg, 1971). By the time of the 1916 Committee on Social Studies, traditionalists argued that introducing social science subjects would only obscure the purpose of history education in schools (Sutton, 1916); this was exactly what occurred.

Progressive ideology continued into the early 20th century in regards to the reforming of history education in American schools. Democratizing curriculum became one of the central goals of teaching history that ultimately paved the way for the development of social studies education (Makler, 2004). The purpose of a “democratic” social studies education was to influence the various populations that constituted the nation to promote moderate progressive change in society. The seminal work of Dewey on the relationship between democracy and the purpose of education had a great influence on this time and, as such, the development of social studies education (Dewey, 1916; Egan, 1980). His work focused on a student’s learning to be grounded in real life and day-to-day experiences. Education was seen as an extension to the evolution of a democratic society.

The 1916 Committee on Social Studies campaigned for the inclusion of citizenship education (Saxe, 1992b), and the marriage of the “curricular models and educational objectives of both the current-issues and the history-centered initiatives”
(Whelan, 1994). Other committees and organizations formed during the early 20th century to promote the incorporation of more social science subjects, such as political science, sociology, and economics, but partially remained separate from the development of history and social studies curriculum (Smith, Palmer, & Correia, 1995). However, these fields did influence the field of social studies education to combine the studying of the past with the assembly of a conscious populace for the betterment of a democratic society. What ultimately resulted from the development of social studies education was that “the subject [history] hold a central place in the school curriculum, that it focus on modern historical themes and issues, and that it be taught in a way that cultivates the intellectual abilities and attitudes of enlightened citizenship” (Whelan, 1994). This development did not resolve the ongoing discussions about the purpose of history and social studies education in schools.

**Narrowing the Vision of Educating for a Democratic Society: 1930s-1950s**

The development of social studies education for a democratically conscious and active population was redirected due to more immediate concerns of the time with the onslaught of the Great Depression in the 1930s. The colossal financial crisis led to the downsizing of schooling. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and other programs under President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal program repurposed social education for a country in an economic depression and eventually in a second world war (S.J. Gross, 2004). The CCC and its counterparts focused on the creation of thousands of jobs for young Americans and the skills that those individuals would need to succeed.

Due to the immediate focus of job creation and the end of the depression, education during this period focused on “vocationalism (learning to use the tools
involved in a single project), social efficiency (finding one’s place in the economic order and learning just what one needs to fulfill the obligations of that place), and life adjustment (learning how to be dependable, a good worker, obedient, and reasonably content with one’s lot)” (S.J. Gross, 2004, p. 43). Essentially education became a tool to mold individuals into their place within the collective and provide the best support to the nation’s goal of ending the Great Depression and ultimately be victorious in World War II.

After World War II, the world polarized as it began to reconstruct itself and side with either the democratic United States or the communist Soviet Union in the developing Cold War. Social studies education regained its focus on “developing intelligent, responsible citizens” as a means to help counteract the developing communist influence around the world; however, no clear method on how to do this was agreed upon (Greenawald, 1995). This was a partial result from there never being any true cohesion in the first place about the purpose of and what should be included in social studies education.

In the 1950s, social studies education advocates and critics both demanded curriculum reform that eventually focused on citizenship education and what individuals can do to defend democratic ideals and freedoms. The core curriculum movement progressed out of its initial phase in the 1930s to the 1950s as a central means to prepare the American public for the domestic and foreign challenges it faced ahead (Hertzberg, 1971). This type of curriculum focused more on the how of teaching than the what, including block teaching of social studies and English together, integration of activities for individual and group development, and basic knowledge of content and skill.
The “New Social Studies” Movement: 1960s-1970s

Major events like the launching of Sputnik during the early decades of the Cold War sparked a flurry of efforts to reform education as part of the defense against Soviet aggression around the world (Mahood, 1976). Initially, history and social studies education was not a part of legislative reform efforts—the focus was on mathematics and science (e.g., the 1958 National Defense Education Act)—reports such as The Process of Education (Bruner, 1999) pressured for sweeping reform measures in social studies education to take place in the late 1950s and early 1960s (Greenawald, 1995). Several new curriculum projects were piloted with “using rich discipline-based original sources, inquiry strategies, an emphasis on concepts, and higher level thinking skills, …[this] laid the foundation for what was to be known as the New Social Studies” (p. 420). Reformers saw this as a chance for students to have a more hands-on approach to learning with opportunities for students to study real data and have them formulate their own questions to answer about the topic of study (Brown, 1996). Across the field of social studies, hundreds of new projects promoted the integration of skill- and inquiry-based learning with historical and current content.

Tension did not disappear with the advent of the “New Social Studies” movement. It was still difficult for reformers to define whether social studies education should be citizenship-focused or discipline-based (Greenawald, 1995). Additional points of interest for this wave of reform included teaching social understanding, using a problems-based approach, and ultimately what place history education would have in the social studies field. Structural elements were still in contention with whether or not social studies would be an interdisciplinary study of the social sciences or just an umbrella for history
and all of the social sciences to continue autonomously. Furthermore, the social sciences were continuing to influence history and social studies education. New branches within the area of social history emerged on how there were different possibilities to studying a topic, such as a thematic, historical crisis, problem-topic, or revisionist approach (Seixas, 1993). With these new means on how to teach history, questions started to arise about teaching from a national historical perspective or through a collective identity of specific groups (e.g., women, ethnic, workers).

More curriculum projects were developed as the movement continued into the 1960s. The pedagogical concept of “slow learning” was developed by Ted Fenton and Allan Knowslar (Penna, 1995). This teaching method was viewed as a more authentic type of learning that studied a topic in-depth and promoted critical thinking with inquiry-based instruction. The teaching of core concepts and basic skills also intruded back from prior eras into the “New Social Studies” movement. With influences from the Civil Rights movement and President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society, equity became a major theme in many of the curriculum projects and new textbooks being developed at the time (Earle, 1982; Penna, 1995) (as well as with initial federal attempts in public education reform, i.e., the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965). As the 1960s came to a close, the entrance to the next decade still did not see any resolution into the battles going on in the field of social studies education.

The “New Social Studies” movement developed out of the need for national security ensuing from the Cold War. In addition, the Civil Rights movement and other domestic issues facing the United States prompted education reformers to look towards social studies education as a mechanism to fight the more immediate domestic issues
facing the country during the 1960s and 1970s. Elements of the “New Social Studies” blurred into the next wave of reform at the dawn of the 1970s that focused on “the emphasis on relevance and the immersion in the immediate here and now; the commitment to social action; the stress on interpersonal relations; the involvement of students in deciding what to study; the impatience with traditional disciplines, and the attempt to integrate or fuse them” (Hertzberg, 1971, p. 2). As Hertzberg alluded to in his work, yet again no consensus was reached within the field about the purpose of social studies education. Later on he pointed out the fact it seemed that each new wave of development and reform of social studies never reviewed to understand attempts of the past to create a cohesive, fully-supported curriculum and pedagogy. Mahood (1976) recognized the cyclical nature that was developing in social studies education and stated that other reasons aside, social studies should be in school “due to its application of the social sciences to the study of the social, to discovering more about the interaction between people and events, people and the physical environment, and people and people” (p. 19). Similar attitudes are traceable back to the inception of social studies education at the turn of the 20th century.

“It’s the Economy, Stupid” - Social Studies Education in a Global Era: 1980s to the present

To borrow Bill Clinton’s famous phrase from his successful 1992 presidential campaign, American society’s focus since the 1980s revolves around its burgeoning global economy (see Chapters 3 & 4). Education reform efforts, including the ongoing development of social studies education, concentrated on the evolution of the American economy and its relationship to globalization. However, this focus was camouflaged
through similar political, democratic, and social welfare discourse that was seen at the height of the Cold War and the domestic social revolutions of the 1960s and 1970s in the United States.

**1980s.**

*A Nation at Risk* (1983) reflected the uncertainty of the 1980s about previous efforts to reform public education. Critics questioned what students were actually learning and if schools were held to any basic standard for what all students should learn (Moore & Williams, 1980). The public, politicians, and the economic sector cried out for some level of accountability to hold schools for providing a high quality education. As a result, standardized testing of “minimum competency” (p. 28), even in the area of social studies education, became common place to evaluate the state of teaching and learning in American schools.

In the 1983 *A Nation at Risk* report, the National Commission for Excellence in Education called for improvement in all academic subject areas and that a curriculum of mathematics, science, English, foreign language, art, and social studies should provide a rigorous preparation for all students to enter into society and a productive workforce. The theme of common learning and core knowledge among all students was prevalent throughout the reform initiatives from history education to the social science disciplines that fell under social studies (e.g., civics, economics, geography, and political science) (Patrick, 1989). Two reports even focused on the inclusion of international studies and global education as part of social studies education (Study Commission on Global Education, 1988; Task Force on International Education, 1989). Increasingly, discussion around the idea of a more globally-aware education became more frequent during this
time. Gagnon (1988) stated that American history should be studied within a global context. By studying this type of history in an interdisciplinary atmosphere, it allows students “to ‘do’ history” (Burson, 1989, p. 67) and understand the interconnectedness of the social sciences. Students come away with a sense of the big picture in terms of how the United States is historically and currently related to the rest of the world.

One of the two major entities of the 1980s to study how to reform social studies education was the Bradley Commission on History in Schools (1989). The commission connected its mission to similar efforts from the late 1800s and prescribed itself two goals:

- to explore the conditions that contribute to, or impede, the effective teaching of history in American schools, Kindergarten through Grade 12.
- to make recommendations on the curricular role of history, and on how all of those concerned… may improve the teaching of history as the core of social studies in the schools (p. 8).

Essentially, the Bradley Commission wanted all Americans to have a common understanding of the past and the shaping of the future United States. They found that a common historical heritage was what binds Americans together like religion or a common ethnicity does in other countries. The commission’s recommendations reflected many of the pursuits of prior attempts to reform social studies, but did include language about students gaining a more “worldly” view by obtaining knowledge and understanding of peoples outside of the United States. Various topics, themes, skills, curricular patterns,
course structures, and methods were outlined in their report on how they saw the teaching of American history, western civilization, and world history.

Soon after the release of the Bradley Commission’s report critics were already identifying faults with the report’s findings and more generally the education reform patterns over the 20th century. Jackson (1989) argued that there was very little evidence about the declined performance of students that the commission claimed, but that the breadth of education offered by schools had reduced, specifically the amount of history and social studies courses available. In addition, Jackson asserted that even a couple years after the release of the Bradley Commission report that social studies education and education reform literature highlighted the growing awareness of how schools have become the cause and effect of the greater social, political, and economic issues facing American society. Not only are schools succeeding in bettering American society, as called for by education reformers of the past century, but schools are also perpetuating social issues, like segregation between suburbia and inner cities.

The other major initiative into the reforming of social studies education came in 1989 with a report by the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century. This report was a comprehensive effort to adjust the K-12 curriculum to meet the current needs of society and recommendations for the future. The commission’s goals were to “enable students to develop:

1. Civic responsibility and active civic participation.
2. Perspectives on their own life experiences so they see themselves as part of the larger human adventure in time and place.
3. A critical understanding of the history, geography, economic, political and social institutions, traditions, and values of the United States as expressed in both their unity and diversity.

4. An understanding of other peoples and the unity and diversity of world history, geography, traditions, and values.

5. Critical attitudes and analytical perspectives appropriate to analysis of the human condition” (Mehlinger, 1992, p. 151).

The report included suggestions for a social studies curriculum based on the five points above, research to reinforce the suggested curriculum, essays reflecting the various social science disciplines and how they perceive changing the curriculum, creating a curriculum that meets the future challenges of the 21st century, teaching methods that focus on inquiry and skill development, and overall creating a balanced and prepared democratic citizenry in a globalizing society (Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, 1989; Mullins, 1990). For the most part, there was nothing new or different from prior attempts to develop social studies education over the past century. Mehlinger (1992) noted that the commission took a bold step in the introduction with a partial focus on widening the scope of the curriculum to a more globally-aware perspective. However, inserting this perspective into social studies curricular reform was nothing new as it appeared in prior attempts. Mehlinger also indicated in his discussion that this report was another example of the politics of education reform and unless public or private organizations move forward on the commission’s proposal, that again nothing will come of this work. This is very true as seen in the past 100 years of social studies curriculum development that has for the most part repeated prior attempts of the past.
Although, one interesting point to note is the commission’s fifth goal in incorporating “more critical attitudes and analytical perspectives” into the curriculum (p. 151); this reflected the theory of critical pedagogy. Segall (2004) called attention to the introductory exposure of post-modern/critical discourses in history and social studies education journals during the 1980s. Since critical discourses were still somewhat new during this time, the relatively quick crossover of the two fields was substantial in its own right. Over time, this trend continued into efforts of social studies education reform.

1990s.

Entering the last decade of the 20th century saw a continued fervor for social studies education reform and more importantly consensus about the purpose and nature of the field. Nevertheless, consensus was hard to reach with the continued division about what should incorporate social studies education and at what level of reform this would take place; by this point, it became a running theme since the creation of social studies in the prior century (Barth, 1993; Seixas 1993). In addition to the lack of unity within the field, reoccurring conversations commenced about social studies education cultivating a democratic society through the integration of history into the social studies, critical thinking and inquiry-based instruction, and an overall interdisciplinary approach of connecting the past to the present.

If anything, a deeper wedge between history and social studies education occurred as a result of the introduction of national standards in history, which were reflected in George H.W. Bush’s America 2000 (1991) federal education policy. Under this policy, history and geography would be taught as two separate subjects. National standards continued as a theme in Bill Clinton’s efforts to reform public education as well (Brown,
Critics suggested that social studies standards should be included in with the history standards as both Bush’s and Clinton’s education policy continued the use of language promoting citizenship education and modes of teaching students to understand the complexities of today’s and tomorrow’s world (Barth, 1993).

As seen in the 1980s, language on the use and influence of critical inquiry and theory in social studies education became more frequent in the field during the 1990s. The use of alternative/critical viewpoints and theory are included in conversations about reforming social studies education to be more relevant for students in regards to current issues and the growing prominence of globalization in everyday life (Cherryholmes, 1996; Gough, 1999; Parker, 1991; Seixas, 1993). Global education became more prominent in social studies education discourse from previously seen in the 1980s and before. Curriculum frameworks were drafted that reflected the need for educating students in a global society (Kniep, 1986, 1989; Parker, 1991). These frameworks included scope and sequence of content, and several sets of conceptual and issue-based themes. Furthermore, defined teaching methods of instruction, such as issues-centered education, started to conceive of possibilities with a more global approach to connecting historical contexts with current issues (R.E. Gross, 1996; Merryfield & White, 1996). Ultimately, these critical efforts to reform history and social studies education has yet to provide a tangible impact on the overall movement of public education reform.

The concept of history education as cultural literacy is introduced into the field. Connecting back to the findings of the Bradley Commission, cultural literacy acts as a binding agent connecting all Americans together under a collective national narrative. Seixas (1993) argued that in addition to cultural literacy providing a common bond for
Americans, this would provide a basis for a more advanced study of a topic or issue rather than focusing merely on basic facts. However, he continued on by realizing students would then have to have a solid historical background on the United States and its collective story.

The continued dialogue on reforming social studies education became more complex as a result of the growing dominance of the standards and accountability movement in the wider national spectrum of public education reform. Education reformers sought to streamline public education through a national education system with matching content standards and goals.

[The] movement toward educational standards is a rationalized managerial approach to issues of curriculum development and teaching that attempts to explicitly define curricular goals, design assessment tasks based on these goals, set standards for the content of subject matter areas and grade levels, and test students and report the results to the public (Ross, 1997, p. 19).

Comparable to the Cold War, social studies education reform on a national level in the 1990s received less coverage than the targeted focus on mathematics and science education. Consequently, both periods not only noticed a need for cohesion within the social studies field, but also fighting for relevance as a core part of a school’s curriculum. This was due to the perceived national perspective that high student performance on mathematics and science assessments would provide a solid foundation for a strong and knowledgeable labor supply. Since the 1980s, student performance became a key data point in assessing the success or failure of the nation’s schools (Evans, Newmann, &
Assessment discourse became common throughout the field from national standards to classroom-based assignments through the mastery of content- and skills-based learning (Brown, 1996). As a result of the focus on standards and accountability, Brown and other critics worried that social studies education would revert back to the days of rote memorization (i.e., focus only on factual knowledge).

Despite the increased support for national reform efforts of social studies education, some critics believed a more appropriate way to see actual change was through local efforts. Parker (1991) believed the most likely chance to achieve actual reform was on the local school level through the work of individual teachers (i.e., a decentralized vantage point). Teachers would work with students and curriculum on a daily basis, and would have tangible moments to see what reform efforts worked and ones that needed improvement. Assessing the quality of curriculum and student performance were central with even localized efforts of reform.

**2000s.**

Moving into the first two decades of the 21st century, there is still uncertainty about the purpose and goals of social studies education (Ross, 2001a; Thornton, 2005). Ross (2001b) wisely deduced that a lack of consensus within the field about its core purpose was due to the fact of the broadness of the field and the many subject areas within the realm of social studies education. With outside influences, such as the standards and accountability movement, the field has continued to struggle to define and find a place for itself within the core curriculum in schooling (W. Au, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Grant, 2003; Grant & Salinas, 2008). On a daily basis, teachers and schools are fighting for relevancy of social studies curriculum in an atmosphere that
regards this type of curriculum inferior to the more tested subjects of mathematics, science, and literacy. As a result of these pressures, teachers and schools question and alter their social studies curriculum to meet the limited rationale behind standardized tests (see Chapter 3).

Standardized assessments and testing is becoming a world-wide phenomenon due to globalization (Kamens & McNeely, 2009). Standards-based teaching and being held accountable for what was taught through informal and formal assessments has become the basis for teaching and learning in the first decade of the 21st century due to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). This was a result from prior efforts through federal education policy and subject specific efforts, including the creation of standards, to make sure students were prepared to enter the global workforce and society (Mathison, Ross, & Vinson, 2001; Vinson, Ross, & Wilson, 2011; also see Chapters 3 and 4).

Teachers, education professionals, and others interested in school reform continue to resist the focus and drive behind the standards and accountability movement by the federal government, politicians, and the private sector. This resistance “is based on three quite distinct arguments:

1. a technical one—the tests are technically flawed or inappropriately used;
2. a psychological one—SBER’s [standards based education reform] reliance on external motivation is counter-productive and will lead to lower levels of achievement and disempowerment for teachers; and
3. a social critique of testing—testing is a social practice which promotes corporate interests and anti-democratic, anti-community values” (Mathison, Ross, & Vinson, 2001, p. 96).
Despite the resistance to standardized testing, a growing discourse around performance-based and authentic assessments has gained momentum as a possible counter-argument to more quantitative-type testing (Mathison, 2001; Summers & Dickinson, 2012; Supovitz, 2009; also see Chapter 3). This type of accountability would be more productive in determining the direction of teaching and learning in schools at a local level as they would provide opportunities for students to be assessed on their problem-solving and critical thinking skills. However, there would need to be compromise on the end goals of these types of assessments for all stakeholders in order for the assessments to be successful measurements of a student’s ability.

A growing number of teachers have come to terms with the standards and accountability movement as they realized the use and stress on standardized testing will be a part of the American education system indefinitely (W. Au, 2009; Grant, 2010; Grant & Salinas, 2008; Yeager, 2005). Teachers have infused literacy, critical thinking, problem solving, and test-taking skills into their practice as history and social studies educators. These “wise” practices develop out of the modifications of lessons and content to fulfill both the needs from the school district and state in meeting standards on high stakes tests, and the goals that teachers have for their students and the curriculum that they teach (King, Newmann, & Carmichael, 2010; Larson, 2005; Lee, 2005; Libresco, 2005). As I initially proposed in Chapter 1 and will later defend in Chapter 7, responsive education provides for this opportunity for teachers and schools to work in and outside the constraints of current education policy. Educators can meet the needs of policy mandates, but at the same time teach students the knowledge and skills needed for living in a globalized society. Of course, this is dependent on the personality, skill, and
overall nature of each individual teacher. For varying reasons, most teachers have not been able to do this successfully and ultimately have to at least compromise in how they teach (van Hover & Heinecke, 2005). In addition, this depends on the political environment of their school and district in regards to the value placed on standardized testing, and the content and pedagogical background knowledge of the teacher. Whether an educator is successful or not in straddling the fence between “wise” practices of teaching and preparing students for a standardized test, it is a huge challenge for anyone (Grant, 2010; Grant & Salinas, 2008; Kelly & VanSledright, 2005).

Studies have been conducted on the relationship between standardized testing and social studies education (W. Au, 2009; Grant, 2003). As S.G. Grant’s (2003) study concluded, there is no definitive answer on whether or not standardized tests impact the way educators teach their students and the results that these assessments have over other types of assessing students’ ability and knowledge. I would argue that the weight of standardized tests on how educators’ teach is dependent on how their administrations and school districts value the resulting scores. More generally, both critics of standardized testing and I see social studies education as an agent for change against the hegemonic power of the greater standards and accountability movement that public education has succumbed to in the United States (W. Au, 2009; Bender-Slack & Raupach, 2008). Theoretically, teaching from a critical viewpoint and in a responsive manner would provide students an education that meets the needs of all stakeholders.

A new approach to social studies education is necessary to teach about the effects of globalization on students and the larger society (Garii, 2000). Unless social studies curriculum moves away from a national/patriotic approach to teaching history and the
social sciences, this will not be able to occur (Merryfield & Subedi, 2001; Myers, 2006). Global citizenship education “is a more accurate curricular frame for orienting social studies education because it accounts for the changing nature of citizenship in the context of globalization” (Myers, 2006, p. 371). Global economic and social factors come into play here with a focus on “international human rights,” “reconciliation of the universal and the local,” and “political action beyond the nation state” (p. 376). In a sense, this moves beyond the idea of democratic citizenship education in promoting the social, political, and economic development of society as it includes the entire world and not just the nation. For this type of teaching to occur in the United States, students would need a solid foundational understanding and awareness of the rest of the world. Due to the nationalistic atmosphere of social studies education and discourse, especially within today’s conservative climate, it may be difficult to pursue a global education perspective (Merryfield & Kasai, 2004).

In relation to the developing use of critical theory in social studies education as seen in the 1990s, Agbaria (2011a, 2011b, & 2011c) argued for the teaching of globalization in a more critical light of the phenomenon. Various and critical points of view should be included in the teaching of globalization that portrays it as an ideology that has historically developed over time from political and economic hegemonic influences. I would add though that these influences shaped the course of human events and actions that has perpetuated the ideological phenomenon through its evolution. As previously discussed and supported by Agbaria (2011c), education should be responsive to the current needs and ideal future aspirations of students. Providing a more critical form of social studies education would help students’ understanding about navigating the
ins and outs of a globalized society (Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga, 2008). A more globally-aware education could provide opportunities for students to become more interconnected with the world through a critical, multicultural, multiple perspective, and interactive curriculum (Garii, 2000; Merryfield & Kasai, 2004; Merryfield & Subedi, 2001; Merryfield & Wilson, 2005). Unfortunately, current standards in many states do not reflect this belief. As of 2009, only 15 states’ standards included the term “globalization” (Rapoport, 2009). However, related terms and phrases are reflected in most states’ standards, but global citizenship education has not been widely adopted in the United States as seen in other countries around the world. Democratic citizenship education has been in existence since the early 1900s, so teachers and curriculum specialists need to keep pace with the rapidly changing environment of today’s world and thus globalization discourse and global citizenship education should be incorporated into this dynamic of social studies education (Rapoport, 2011). Global education and global citizenship education is still in its infancy; research is growing quickly in this field, but there still is not a strong grasp on what is actually taught by teachers and what students are learning (Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga, 2008).

Within the last decade, a resurgence has occurred in discourse about equity, access, and inclusion that initially became more prominent in the 1960s as a result of the Civil Rights movement. Due to the influence of the Civil Rights movement on society, multiculturalism, feminism, gender studies, diversity, sexuality, and social justice are pronounced topics in the field of social studies education (K.H. Au, 2010; Banks, Cookson, Gay, Hawley, Irvine, Nieto, Schofield, & Stephan, 2010; Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Bernard-Powers, 2001; Bickmore, 2008; Crocco, 2008; Epstein & Shiller, 2010; D.
Today’s focus on equity is due to rising influences, such as immigration, racism, globalization, and transnationalism, on American society (Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Nelson & Pang, 2001). Since the 1960s, there have been many other rights movements to ensure equity and equality for all individuals in the United States. Social studies education has historically taken the position that it should not only study history, but of topical, current, and controversial issues facing society and the world (D. Hess, 2008). For example, it has become one of the arenas for fighting against discrimination and othering of various minority (e.g., ethnic, cultural, lifestyle, etc.) groups over time. Studying social processes and “social practices requires us [teachers, students, society] to situate our own local and specific knowledge and experience within a larger context” (Hursh, 2001, p. 128). Social studies curriculum should continue challenging societal norms and itself to ensure a broader and meaningful coverage of contributions to society and culture from traditionally underrepresented groups (Nelson & Pang, 2001; Noddings, 2001).

**Conclusions**

To this day there is still no consensus on the role and purpose of history and social studies education in public schooling and its relationship to an evolving capitalist and democratic society, especially within the current era of globalization. From the traditional studying of history and democratic citizenship education to creating a more critical and globally aware populace, there are many ideas and opinions on what should be taught to students. Overall though, I do believe that most of the advances and approaches in teaching history and social studies have all wanted to create a more knowledgeable citizenry, because of the similar trends that have occurred over the past
decades in what should be taught and how to go about it. This also reflects the greater education reform movement over the last several decades in that no true consensus has been reached between education professionals and outside reformers (see Chapters 3 and 4).

Even though I did not overtly see this in the literature reviewed in this chapter, I would argue that proponents of history and social studies education have had to fight against the growing hegemonic momentum of the economic influence on public education reform. As revealed in Chapters 3 and 4, the overall purpose of schooling in American public education has become divisive in answering the question: should the purpose of schooling be primarily focused on the economic or political/democratic development of American society (with the former winning over the latter in the past three decades)? I would purport that both could be done in a responsive manner to meet the needs and potential of the individual and to the development of the greater collective in society. Creating a social studies curriculum and pedagogy that includes important historical knowledge and understanding, critical thinking and problem solving capability, and comprehension and appreciation for current events and movements in a global society could meet this possibility of a dual-purpose, hybridized form of education.

Globalization is complex and evolving, our nation’s education system needs to resemble this so all stakeholders may have the possibility for success in a global era. Due to all of the varying pressures and influences on public education reform, educators and reformers need to come to the realization that an extensive overhaul may need to happen to create a system of education that works for the new global world we live in; band-aiding the issues will not solve the problem. Educators will not be able to teach
everything that worked in the past in addition to all of the evolving teaching and learning methods needed for the 21st century. I think it is hard for everyone, not just teachers, in letting go the “revisionist aura” of how students were taught in the past (i.e., “if it worked for us [adults] when we were in school, why can’t it work for students now?”). Despite social studies educators espousing the belief that we need to remember the past in order to understand the present and prepare for the future, educators, reformers, and the general society have to be able to remove themselves from this premise and objectively see how each generation has different circumstances and thus need repurposed and/or different tools to live in the here, now, and future. For education to evolve with the times, American society has to reorient their mindset in how the purpose of education must transform for the smaller, more closely tied global world we find ourselves in.

***

In Chapter 6, I will use critical discourse analysis (CDA) to analyze three current state social studies curricular frameworks and the specific history/social science Common Core Standards to further understand the effects of globalization on public education reform. I will conduct the analysis based on the same methods used in the federal education policy analysis completed in Chapter 4. Through this use of CDA, I will be able to examine the macro and micro level effects of globalization on public education policy and reform to understand the current state of public schools and how might the teaching of world history could be reconceptualized for educating 21st century students living in a global society.
The evolution of history and social studies education in the United States has experienced a somewhat isolated, but paralleled development with public education policy and reform. This field has campaigned for its own purpose and worth in American public education while the standards and accountability movement focused education reform on the economic potential of the individual and society in the larger global market economy. Similar to Chapter 4, I will use critical discourse analysis (CDA) to understand the manifestation of structural education reform efforts, mainly the standards and accountability movement, within secondary level history and social studies education discourse.

Using CDA in this chapter as the main method of inquiry will call attention to the intricate relationship between the influence of globalization on American public education policy and reform—structural education reform—and the manifestation of the standardization efforts within history and social studies education. This will highlight the connections sought after in my first two supplemental research questions: 1. What effect has globalization had on American education reform and secondary history and social studies curriculum and 2. What effect has structural education reform (standardization and accountability) efforts had on secondary history and social studies curriculum? CDA will provide that next layer of understanding, which will contribute to my critical and philosophical exploration of reconceptualized world history curriculum as a tool for public education to respond to the challenges that globalization has placed on American society.
Overview of State Curricular Frameworks and Common Core Standards

Before moving into the critical discourse analysis of the four sets of standards, I will provide a contextual overview of the development of each framework. This will set a foundational basis for the creation of each framework as related to the larger standards and accountability movement.⁶

The state of Illinois adopted their 34 State Goals for Learning in 1985 (Illinois State Board of Education, n.d.). Based on these goals, the Illinois State Learning Standards were developed in the 1990s to help “communicate to students, teachers and parents exactly what is expected for students to learn. Specific standards make clear the types of tests and measures that accurately gauge student progress. Data from these tests inform educators and the public about student progress and where improvements are needed” (p. 1). The rationale provided for these standards by the state are reflective of the larger standards and accountability movement of the past three decades. The language of accountability, equity, change, progress, school improvement, and standards permeates throughout the texts. The development of the Illinois standards system was a multi-year effort and used various sources beyond the 1985 goals as a benchmark for development, “including national and state standards from across the country as well as… examples of Illinois schools’ own expectations for student learning” (p. 4). The standards went through several drafts that included a public comment period and were finally adopted in 1997.

The Massachusetts History and Social Science Curriculum Framework was a product of the Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993 (Massachusetts Department

---

⁶ The terms “standards,” “curricular/curriculum framework,” and “framework” are used interchangeably in regards to history and social studies curriculum state policy.
of Elementary & Secondary Education, 1997 & 2003). The original framework was adopted in 1997 and was later updated in 2003. It was devised from the work on “the Bradley Commission, the several national standards documents, and frameworks from California, Virginia, and other states” (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 1997, Introduction section, para. 1) along with commentary by teachers, administrators, colleges and universities, and public officials. The framework “presents the academic content and skills in the four areas of History, Geography, Economics, and Civics and Government that are essential to the study of human experience past and present, and to the development of educated and responsible citizens” (Introduction section, para. 1). It includes an overall even coverage of U.S. and world histories along with the other disciplines of the social sciences. Students take a statewide assessment based on these standards in either Grade 10 or 11.

The state of New York has a long history in the use of standardized assessments (Grant, 2003). The Regents exam covers all academic subjects in both content- and skills-based learning. Students have to pass a series of examinations in order to receive a Regents diploma, which denotes a higher achievement in graduation than a standard school-level diploma. The exams are not only high stakes for the students, but also for individual schools and school districts across the state. Developed in 1996, the state’s learning standards are tied to what is assessed on the statewide examination (New York State Education Department, 1996 & 2011). The initial intent behind the state’s standards was “to raise expectations for all students” by “following three strategies: 1. set higher learning standards and revise the assessment system, 2. build the capacity of schools to support student learning, and 3. develop an institutional accountability system”
Since then, the state’s standards have been revised under the influence of federal- or nationally-supported structural education reform efforts, mainly NCLB and the Common Core Standards.

The newest set of standards, the Common Core State Standards Initiative, is from a joint effort by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers; the final standards were released in June 2010 (Common Core Standards Initiative, n.d., “Process” section, para. 1). Just like the three sets of state standards above, these were developed through cooperation by multiple partners, contributors, and sources along with suggestions and feedback from the public. These standards focus on college and career readiness. The history and social studies standards are found within the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy, which are skills-based only with a specific focus on reading and writing skills. Since these standards are still new and are in the developmental implementation process, it is not yet clear how states will assess these standards. However from personal teaching experience in the state of Illinois, the current state standardized tests are slated for redesign to meet the new standards’ requirements.

Critical Discourse Analysis Process

I chose to analyze three state curricular frameworks and the Common Core Standards to help gauge the influence of structural education reform on secondary history and social studies education. I selected the state standards based on two criteria: familiarity and stature. I have taught under the Illinois State Standards for most of the past decade. The state standards in Massachusetts and New York are two hallmarks in
public education reform research and practice. The Common Core Standards is the newest wave of structural education reform policy in the United States and have been adopted by 45 states, three territories, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense education system (as of August 2012) (Common Core Standards Initiative, n.d.). For each set of standards, I focused my analysis on the sections pertaining to history and social studies education.

For the most part, I followed the same procedures in this course of CDA as I did for the federal education policy analyzed in Chapter 4, including Creswell’s (2009) steps for data analysis and three rounds of coding (inductive coding, thematic code development, and a priori coding). With the a priori coding, I altered the code to match the intent of this chapter—structural education reform affects history and social studies education. One additional piece of analysis that I added to this chapter was to go back and conduct a quick analysis of the five federal education policies analyzed in Chapter 4 to see how often references were made to history and social studies education in regards to federal efforts to reform American public education. This will provide a point of comparison into the overall relationship between federal and state level efforts to reform public education within the structural education reform movement. Finally, I will use Gee’s (2011a) two questions to help synthesize my findings by comparatively analyzing the four sets of standards, along with the history/social studies references in the federal policies, in regards to my central and related research questions.

**Code Development and Emerging Themes**

Table 6.1 represents the various major themes that developed from the coding of each text. Unlike the theme development in Chapter 4, all themes were prevalent in three
of the four frameworks analyzed in this chapter. The Common Core Standards
framework was unique from the other texts in that only one theme emerged from the text
with three brief references to other themes. In Table 6.2, related sub-themes and brief
descriptions are provided for each major theme that further identifies the codes that
developed out of the CDA. Four major themes developed from the standards analyzed:
Content/Subject Matter, Geographical Focus, Individual v. Group, and Skill-based
Learning. Two of the four major themes were further sub-divided to help delineate
between the specificities within each thematic code. Content/Subject Matter was divided
into different subject areas: Current Events, Economics, History, and Politics &
Citizenship. Geographical Focus was split between the U.S. and the World.

Table 6.1 – Primary and Secondary Codes in State and Common Core Curricular Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Common Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content/subject matter: current events</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/subject matter: economics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/subject matter: history</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/subject matter: politics &amp; citizenship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Focus – U.S.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Focus – world</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual v. group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-based learning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. X = major theme/category; ✓ = sub-theme/category. *Only one reference to this sub-theme category.*
In the next section, I will discuss the development of each theme within each set of standards, including the overt and covert relationships that emerged between the themes and descriptors within the larger context of structural education reform in the United States. Compared to the CDA of federal education policies in Chapter 4, this CDA was more concise due to the context and subject matter of each text. As a result, there was less variance in these texts than seen in the purpose and various topics found in the federal education policies.

**Theme 1 – Content/subject matter.**

Although skill-based learning has been a cornerstone to the standards and accountability movement, content-based learning is a central component to the three sets of state standards critically analyzed. The theme of content/subject matter refers to the different subject areas and topics that students are taught in a history/social studies...
classroom setting. This theme was sub-divided to indicate the major and specific subject areas that made up each set of state standards; the Common Core Standards are not in any way content specific. *Current events* relates to topical issues of the current era on all aspects of society. *Economics* focuses on the economic development of a location (locally and/or globally), terminology, and types of economic structures and actions. *History* pertains to the actual historical content and development of a locality, nation, region, and/or the world on a social, political, economic, environmental, and cultural context. *Politics & citizenship* references the political make up of a society, in terms of systems, structures, groups, and organizations along with civic duty and citizenship on a local, national, and international scale.

The Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York history and social studies standards provided similar coverage to all four areas of the *content/subject matter* theme: *current events, economics, history, and politics & citizenship*. *Current events* was minimally present in the state standards. Only Illinois and Massachusetts made brief references to students learning about current events and their relationship to the other subject areas within social studies curriculum. For Illinois, the phrase “current events” is used once in the economic standards: “Analyze the impact of current events (e.g., weather/natural disasters, wars) on consumer prices” (Illinois State Board of Education, 1985, “State Goal 15,” 15.B.4b). Only one reference is used in Massachusetts’ standards: “They [teachers] are also encouraged to inform and enliven classroom study by considering current events and issues that have a significant relationship to important historical themes or events under study” (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 2003, “The Organization of the Learning Standards,” para. 3).
The other three areas of the *content/subject matter* theme are all majorly discussed in the three sets of state standards. *History* is the overriding subset that acted as a binding agent to the other areas of the *content/subject matter* theme. This is especially true in the Massachusetts standards; the other social studies subject areas are dispersed throughout the history standards as relevant to the topic(s). The Massachusetts history standards is the only set of standards that is very specific in topics, ideas, people, places, and events that should be studied in historical context, such as Standard WHI.3: “Analyze the causes, course, and effects of Islamic expansion through North Africa, the Iberian Peninsula, and Central Asia” (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 2003, “The Emergence and Expansion of Islam to 1500”). The Illinois standards provides brief examples of historical content to teach, such as “analyze worldwide consequences of isolated political events, including the events triggering the Napoleonic Wars and World Wars I and II” (Illinois State Board of Education, 1985, “State Goal 16,” 16.B.5a [W]). There are no references to specific events in New York’s history standards for world history: “Study of the major social, political, cultural, and religious developments in world history involves learning about the important roles and contributions of individuals and groups” (New York State Education Department, 1996, “Standard 2 – World History,” Key Idea 3). “Economics and *politics & citizenship* are both treated in different sections of the Illinois and New York standards, but also are present in the history-specific standards as pertaining to the historical context of the subject matter.

The Common Core Standards refers to the study of *economics, history, and politics & citizenship* respectively once. This occurs in the reading skill portion of the standards in regards to students “determin[ing] the meaning of words and phrases as they
are used in a text, including vocabulary describing political, social, or economic aspects of history/social studies” (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010, p. 61). Beyond that, the standards are generic, but specific enough to only cover skill-based learning.

Overall with this theme, there was not an overt correlation between subject matter and the phenomenon of globalization, though it may be implied by the study of economics. Surprisingly, current events is not more of a focal point of the standards, especially with the Common Core Standards. I could see reading and writing skills that relate to students correlating topics to a larger context such as current events; but again, these standards are not content specific in any sense. The Common Core Standards are generic enough that they could almost be placed within any academic or technical subject area.

Theme 2 – Geographical focus.

The geographical focus theme refers to the content-based portion of the state standards and is primarily broken up between the United States and the world. The geographical focus of each set of state standards are primarily historical in nature, but are also connected to the other major subsets of the content/subject matter theme (i.e., current events, economics, and politics & citizenship). The Massachusetts and New York standards are the most equal with even emphasis both on the subjects of United States history and world history, however New Yorks’ world history standards do not specify any specific events and/or time periods where they do in the standards for United States history, such as time periods of “colonization and settlement; Revolution and New National Period; immigration; expansion and reform era; Civil War and Reconstruction; The American labor movement; Great Depression; World Wars; contemporary United
States.” (New York State Education Department, 1996, “Standard 1 – History of the United States and New York,” Key Idea 3). The Illinois standards are more U.S.-focused, but do provide a general coverage of world history, and global economic and political matters. The specific standard on geography is where the Illinois standards become more substantive when it comes to a global focus, but still in relation to the United States: “Understand world geography and the effects of geography on society, with an emphasis on the United States” (Illinois State Board of Education, 1985, “State Goal 17”). The Massachusetts standards are the most specific when it comes to breaking down world coverage amongst the different topics, including explicit coverage on all inhabited continents. For example, in the section entitled “World History I - The World from the Fall of Rome through the Enlightenment,” the standards refer to historical events in the Middle East, Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Americas (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 2003). As a whole, the three sets of state standards do not provide direct connections between the geographical focus of study to globalization; they may not even be able to be implied since traditionally American or world history has not been taught in a truly comparative context. There were no references to geography or geographical focus in the Common Core Standards.

**Theme 3 – Individual v. group.**

Outside the realm of the content/subject matter and skill-based learning themes, the individual v. group theme is a dominant theme in the state standards (there were no references to this theme in the Common Core Standards), which was also very prevalent in the CDA of the five federal policies in Chapter 4. The individual v. group theme applies to a nationalistic/democratic essence to the purpose of history and social studies
education found in these standards. Topics included in this theme are individual and collective contributions to society, economic potential, employment and labor, making choices as an individual that also affects the collective, one’s civic duty, and the overall development of a democratic society. Within this theme, the Massachusetts standards’ language even included discourse on the purpose of education and what role it has in the development of a democratic society.

Our [society’s] call for schools to purposely impart to their students the learning necessary for an informed, reasoned allegiance to the ideals of a free society… [includes the idea] …that democracy’s survival depends upon our transmitting to each new generation the political vision of liberty and equality that unites us as Americans (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 2003, “Introduction”).

The introductory section of the Massachusetts standards permeated with language about what the collective populace can do for the nation if it comes together as an educated entity to provide change and opportunity in the democratic development of American society. In addition, it extends this vision to the world as a whole and how a strong democratic American society can inspire and assist others throughout the world to cultivate their own democratic traditions and beliefs.

Not to the extent of Massachusetts’ framework, the Illinois standards also include language about the democratic purpose in history and social studies education—“The study of social science helps people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” (Illinois State Board of Education, 1985, para. 3). New York’s is
even less so than the other two, but does include a handful of statements on how history and social studies education can unify a society under “the basic civic values of American constitutional democracy” (New York State Education Department, 1996, “Standard 5 – Civics, Citizenship, and Government,” para. 1).

There is not much text on the economic potential of a quality history and social studies education except for a few statements about influencing the workplace and the economy in the Illinois standards—“prepare them [students] for careers and life long learning” (Illinois State Board of Education, 1985, para. 3), and the ability to “make informed and well-reasoned economic decisions in daily and national life” in the New York standards (New York State Education Department, 1996, “Standard 4 – Economics,” Key Idea 2). This does not reflect the nature of federal education policy and reform that has occurred during the same time as the development of these state standards. However, the lack of economic language in the standards’ text does not reflect the larger development and reform of history and social studies education in the United States as referenced to in Chapter 5. Including economics was one of the few unifying pieces that most scholars, practitioners, reformers, and developers of history and social studies curriculum could agree upon.

Even though not explicit, there is a stronger sense of globalization discourse within this theme compared to the other themes that emerged from the CDA. Similarly to the federal education policies, these standards reflect the role of the individual within a greater national and global context that will both benefit the success and growth of the self, the self in relation to the collective, and the collective as a whole. However, these standards reflect the discourse on public education reform found prior to the 1980s where
there was more of a dual purpose of education: the democratic and economic
development of the United States and not the more recent shift seen since A Nation at
Risk towards the primary focus on economics.

**Theme 4 – Skill-based learning.**

The last major theme that emerged out of the CDA of all four sets of standards is
*skill-based learning*. This theme refers to the various skill sets and concepts that students
should acquire as part of their education. Some of the skills included in the four sets of
standards analyzed are critical thinking, making connections, problem solving,
interpretation, historical understanding, geographic literacy, and use of technology.

In the three sets of state standards, the skills and concepts mentioned tend to be
specific to the subject area and/or topic discussed in each section of the standards. As
seen in the following example, the skill of comparing and contrasting is prominent in
standards regarding global matters, whether historical or topical in nature (i.e., economics,
politics, etc.). “Compare socialism and communism in Europe, America, Asia and Africa
Other skills are prominent throughout each section of a state’s standards; for example, the
skill of cause and effect is prevalent in Illinois’ state standards for “political systems,”
“economic systems,” “history,” “geography,” and “social systems” (Illinois State Board

The Common Core Standards are different from the three other frameworks
analyzed where their sole purpose is for skill-based teaching and learning. Even though
the Common Core Standards are quite detailed in the specific skills of reading and
writing, they are generic enough at the same time that they can be applied for various
types of subject matter and lessons. For instance, the writing standards include the skill of providing textual evidence to support precise claims.

Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly, supplying data and evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both claim(s) and counterclaims in a discipline-appropriate form and in a manner that anticipates the audience’s knowledge level and concerns (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, “Writing Standards for History/Social Studies,” Grades 9-10 students: Text Types and Purposes 1b).

Like the standard above, they could be used in both history and social science based classrooms.

In regards to the fourth major theme, there is very much an implied relationship between skill-based learning and the economic shift seen in the larger context of structural education reform over the past three decades. Skill-based learning is directly related to the overall standards and accountability movement. This is due to the correlation between globalization and the purpose of education in American society.

**Frequency Coding of Federal Education Policy**

To help connect the CDA findings between the history and social studies standards to the federal education policies analyzed in Chapter 4, I determined it would be beneficial to understand the extent that history and social studies education was part of the federal discourse on public education reform. In each federal policy, I recorded the number of references made to history and social studies education. Table 6.3 provides a list of terms used in the search and the frequency each term appeared in the five federal
policies. I based the terms from the codes and themes developed from the standards’ analysis. For each term, I noted the context in which the term was utilized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Phrase</th>
<th># of References</th>
<th>Context &amp; Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>civics</td>
<td>N@R 0</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultur* (culture, cultural)</td>
<td>N@R 0</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>econom* (economics, economic / financial literacy)</td>
<td>N@R 2</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geography</td>
<td>N@R 1</td>
<td>A 2000 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>N@R 1</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>N@R 2</td>
<td>A 2000 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politi* (politics, political science)</td>
<td>N@R 0</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soci* (social, sociology)</td>
<td>N@R 0</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social science</td>
<td>N@R 0</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social studies</td>
<td>N@R 0</td>
<td>A 2000 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Frequency** | 6  | 4  | 5  | 0  | 3  |
Surprisingly there are not many references to history and social studies education as part of each policy’s goal to reform public education. “Civics” is referred to once in the Goals 2000 policy and once in A Blueprint for Reform. “Economics” is mentioned a couple more times with two references in A Nation at Risk, and one each in Goals 2000 and A Blueprint for Reform. Geography has the same number of references with one in A Nation at Risk, two in America 2000, and one in Goals 2000. “Government” has only two references with one in A Nation at Risk and one in Goals 2000. “History” is mentioned the most compared to any other term searched; two references in A Nation at Risk, two references in America 2000, one reference in Goals 2000, and one reference in A Blueprint for Reform.

Overall, A Nation at Risk had the most references to history and social education and No Child Left Behind had the least with zero references. This directly correlates with the shift seen in federal education policy over the past 30 years. Economics has trumped the former dual purpose of education: democratic and economic. The specific skills of communication and technical knowledge have been deemed as the necessary tools for a successful global American economy, which traditionally history and social studies education has not focused on. Even with the standards and accountability movement slowly infiltrating this field, history and social studies educators, researchers, scholars, and other practitioners have yet to come to a common understanding on how to formulate a curriculum that meets the needs of a 21st century society and what is heralded as pillars of a quality history and social studies education (as discussed in Chapter 5).
Analysis of CDA Findings

I will conduct this analysis section in similar fashion to the discourse analysis completed in Chapter 4. In addition, I will use the frequency statistics to assist in identifying relationships, connections, and/or disconnections found in the text of the standards and comparably to the structural education reform language rooted in the five federal education policies.

As reflected in Figure 6.1, the four major themes that developed out of the CDA of the three state curricular frameworks and the Common Core Standards are rooted in the theme — *individual v. group*.

Figure 6.1 – *The Relationship of the Standards’ Themes*

Public education reform is based on the social, political, and economic needs of society (on an individual and collective basis). In the era of structural education reform, education reform concentrates on the economic needs within society. Standards-based education includes measures to assess progress in student performance on specific goals and objectives, which are theoretically beneficial to a society focusing on economic development and success. These specific goals and objectives tend to deal with skill-based instruction (e.g., critical thinking and problem solving skills, reading and writing
skills) that has the ability to be measured on standards-based assessments. In the field of history and social studies education, skill-based instruction is taught through the medium of a historical narrative and its relationship to the specific subject areas of the social sciences.

**Structural education reform affects history and social studies education.**

Over the past three decades, structural education reform efforts have reoriented the purpose of education in that student learning is driven by standards and accountability measures. This reorientation is reflected in the reform and development of history and social studies education. Parallel to federal-level reform efforts, state governments and other organizations have created varying sets of history and social studies standards to correspond with the standards development in other subject areas, such as mathematics, science, and literacy. In addition to the creation of state-level standards, national standards have been created in many subject areas, including history and geography. However, these national standards, at least ones in social studies, have not been formally incorporated into federal-level reform efforts, but they have influenced the development of state-level standards.

The three sets of state standards that were critically analyzed reflect the literature discussed in Chapter 5 on the development of history and social studies education. The respective proponents of history education and social studies education have not resolved ongoing tensions about what and how history and/or social studies should be taught in schools. These tensions are reflected in the state standards in how the different subject areas, including history, civics/government, and economics, are treated in a somewhat isolated manner from one another. The standards analyzed are discussed in separate
sections with superficial connections made where there is overlap in content, often historical in nature. Overall, there is no integration of subject matter despite more continuity in the discussion on skills-based learning within each standards’ text.

The lack of content integration does not reflect the globalized world we live in. Language is used in the text on the integration of the subject matter, but it is not reflected in the actual standards themselves. History and the other social studies subject areas are still taught in an isolated manner. The Illinois and New York standards treat the different subject areas within social studies in a segmented manner with specific sections provided for each; the Massachusetts standards are integrated more so within the United States and world history content portions of the standards with only brief sections on skills knowledge—the skills are specified throughout each history content area.

Social studies is still U.S. centric even though there is more language within the text concerning global topics. The nationalistic flavor of history and social studies standards is prevalent through the highlighting of U.S. history over world history and these two geographical regions are never taught in any integrated fashion; there is some handling of the two regions in a comparative manner, but is only superficial at best and from a nationalistic point of view.

There is considerable coverage of economics in each set of state standards. Despite the democratic and nationalistic nature of each set of standards, the amount of inclusion economics is given reflects the influence of globalization on American society and its wider efforts to reform its public education system. The connections between the two are not direct, but are implied through the coverage and language used in what students should know about in regards to economics content and skill development.
The Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, and Common Core Standards reflect the overall standards and accountability movement with a focus on standards-based education through skills instruction. Accountability is held through state-based assessments on the student acquisition of skills and standards. The Illinois and New York standards are more generic in content compared to skills-based instruction, but Massachusetts’ standards is equally balanced between the two areas of instruction. The Common Core Standards focus solely on skills-based learning. Despite all the work states have completed on their own sets of standards in history and social studies curriculum, this work is not reflected in the same capacity in federal education policy. In addition, the shift seen in federal reform efforts with more of a focus on the economic purpose of education is not seen as clearly in state-level standards and curricular frameworks. History and social studies education is only now receiving more attention due to the Common Core Standards and the almost non-existent integration of history and social studies content within the standards’ literacy skill set. The skill set that history and social studies education has been attached to are generalized reading and writing skills that could work in almost any subject area.

**Conclusions**

There is a disconnect between the reform and development of history and social studies education to national efforts in reforming public education in the United States. There is little to no discussion about reforming history and social studies education to meet the needs and goals set out in federal structural education reform policy. This is evident in the findings on the frequency of history and social studies education references in the federal policies analyzed in Chapter 4. Perhaps the disconnect between federal
policy intent and history/social studies standards is the reason why the history and social studies disciplines have not been able to establish a cohesive purpose, rationale, and pedagogy, especially in regards to the phenomenon of globalization as the main driver of recent and current education reform efforts. As I am not a mathematics, science, or English teacher, I am unaware if these disciplines have had similar tensions in the past or presently, but I could only assume with the focus that these fields receive in education policy and reform that they are more unified than history and social studies education.

Due to the nature of the texts analyzed in this chapter, there is a prominence of structural education reform discourse in the four sets of standards. Overall, there are no major deviations in context (content or skill). These standards are an example of how the structural education reform movement has changed public education with its focus on measuring student progress through accountability measures even though the standards themselves do not reflect the shift in discourse on the purpose of education (i.e., a primary economic focus) as seen in federal education policy.

The four sets of standards analyzed in this chapter are examples of the disconnect discovered in Chapter 4 between the ideology of free-market capitalism and the advancement of structural education reform policy. These standards go against the value of deregulation and keeping government out of education reform. The exact opposite is occurring with public education becoming more centralized, at least in regards to holding schools, districts, and state education agencies accountable for the performance of students on standards-based assessments. This provides another example of top-down management (“globalization from above”) in which hegemonic powers keep societal development in check with their objectives.
In Chapter 7, I will use the discourse analysis completed in this chapter and Chapter 4 along with the literature on globalization, public education policy, and curriculum development discussed up to this point to help philosophically reconceptualize world history curriculum for a global era. I will begin the chapter with a examination of the research conducted in this study and what it means for reconceptualizing world history curriculum. Next, I will provide a brief overview of the different conceptions of world history curriculum. This will help lay the foundation for the next section on the reconceptualization of how world history curriculum could change in order to meet current and future needs of the social, political, and economic development of American society in a global context. I will provide a rationale for the course along with the goals, objectives, key topics, and possible lessons and assignments that could be included in this curriculum. Finally, I will discuss future areas of research and final conclusions to this study.
7 – Reconceptualizing World History Curriculum for a 21st Century Global Society

In the past six chapters, I have explored and examined the relationship between the phenomenon of globalization, public education policy and reform, and the development of history and social studies education in the United States. There is a direct relationship between the evolution of the American economy and the growth of global free-market capitalism. In response to this, American public education has been reformed to meet these economic needs. Structural education reform policy through the standards and accountability movement has transformed public education into a system focused on the development of a workforce that is receptive to the changing dynamics of a global economy.

Providing for a globally minded workforce has narrowed the curriculum in American public education. This narrowing has created a focus on mathematics, science, and literacy education as the essential keys to success for continued American economic dominance throughout the world. History and social studies education has not seen the same shift in purpose as seen in other academic subject areas. History and social studies education has adopted some of the same reform efforts, such as the establishment of standards-based education, but as seen in the literature reviewed and curricular frameworks analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6, the purpose has continued to predominantly focus on educating students as participatory citizens for a democratic society.

There should be a continued and renewed focus on creating a participatory democratic citizenship that is not only mindful of bringing about social and political equity in the United States, but continued economic development as well. Public education needs to be transformed to meet the requirements and needs for 21st century
citizens that live in a complex and uncertain global society. Students should learn about and explore this dynamic and fast-faced environment. There is no better way to do this than to critically study, research, and analyze the current world they live in and its connected historical past.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the possibilities of a reconceptualized world history curriculum in light of the literature reviewed and data analysis conducted in this study. First, I will discuss the lessons learned from the literature reviewed over the course of the study along with the data analyzed in Chapters 4 and 6. This will contextualize the linkages between the phenomenon of globalization and its relationship to structural education reform efforts conducted on the federal level since the 1980s and its manifestation within the overall standards and accountability movement—state level and nationally-supported (Common Core) curricular frameworks. I will then discuss how this applies to the reconceptualization of a world history curriculum for secondary level students in the 21st century. Second, I will provide an overview of the various conceptions of world history curriculum: world history, world studies, and global education. Third, I will construct a rationale for my understanding of a reconceptualized world history curriculum and what I envision this curriculum to consist of as reflected in its title: Comparative Global Studies. Fourth, I will discuss my epistemological assumptions for the curriculum, including goals and objectives of the course, and key themes and topics. Example lesson ideas will be described throughout the chapter to illustrate the possibilities of a Comparative Global Studies curriculum. Lastly, I will examine the possible concerns of implementing this type of curriculum, next steps and future areas of research, and final conclusions.
Lessons Learned: What Does the Research Say?

Initially, I came to the conclusion that despite increased federal intervention into public education reform, there is still a disconnect between policy and the curriculum standards that currently frame what is taught to secondary level history and social studies students. The reason for this conclusion was based on the lack of inclusion of history and social studies education as part of the overall focus of public education reform as reflected in federal education policy. For example, the newly adopted Common Core Standards that is at the forefront of today’s reform movement has only included history and social studies education as an addendum to their focus of skills-based education. The current Common Core history and social studies standards are embedded within the English Language Arts (literacy) framework. But is there really a disconnect? There may be more of a severing between the focus of structural education reform efforts over the past 30 years and what, how, and why history and social studies is taught in today’s classrooms (as championed by history and social studies education advocates, scholars, and educators).

History and social studies education does not reflect both the socio-political and economic needs of educating global citizens for the 21st century. With the shift in purpose of education that is primarily focused on national economic growth, development, and competition, the traditionally democratically centered history and social studies curriculum does not fit into the equation of a standards-based education.

History and social studies education has tried to meet this shift in education policy and reform with the adoption of standards-based education practices (e.g., national history/social science content standards and state level history/social studies standards),
but the standards for the most part still reflect the democratically-centered traditions of this field. Even with the newly adopted Common Core history/social studies reading and writing standards, there is still no direct correlation between the larger standards movement that is driving public education reform and the long standing purpose behind history and social studies education. The Common Core history/social studies reading and writing standards are devoid of any history and social studies content. The mere connection of the Common Core movement to history and social studies education is a step towards bridging the gap between the general trends of skills-based instruction within the standards and accountability movement to the teaching of history and social studies education. Yet, what does this actually do for the reforming of public education and the betterment of a democratic nation in an economically driven global society? A merger between the democratically centered traditions of history and social studies education and standards-based education that incorporates the critical thinking and problem solving skills is needed for individuals to be able to traverse the 21st century global society. By having an education that works inside and outside the confines of current structural education policies, there is space for students and educators to explore and critique the world with both a hegemonic and counter-hegemonic lens.

This is the juncture where a reconceptualized world history curriculum could begin to fill the gap between the economic purposes of education and the democratic traditions of history and social studies education, but also includes the addition of critical pedagogy that illuminates the complexities of the globalized world and how human civilization arrived at its current state. This will allow students the opportunity to begin contextualizing how they fit into the bigger picture—socially, politically, economically,
culturally, and environmentally. Thus, students will have the means to function and personally succeed within a globalized society, but also be able to question, have an informed opinion, and take the steps needed to push against the larger hegemonic forces in society (e.g., corporate, economic, and political power) and create space for dialogue and interaction in a counter-hegemonic environment.

**Types of World History Curriculum**

There are different conceptions of what constitutes a world history curriculum. Even the terminology is different within the titles given to this curriculum field: world history, world studies, and global education (which also includes global history and international education). There is no consensus within any of the connotations of world history about which perspectives, topics, themes, events, and pedagogical methods should be used. Disagreements continue about whether or not the subject matter should be taught from a global perspective or a western/European perspective (Dunn, 2010). World history could be viewed as a catch all for various historical methods and themes that connect the world across borders between countries, but also identifies the contraditoriness of various approaches and explanations that highlights what is different across national boundaries (Manning, 2003). With the acceleration of the globalization phenomenon, now historians and educators have to include conceptions of the world that move beyond the traditional sense of the world being divided up along the notion of the nation-state and into ideas about regionalization and supra-national organizations and groups.

Despite the lack of continuity within the world history field of the past, there are new conceptions of what constitutes and influences world history scholarship today. For
example, the idea of “big history” is emerging in this curriculum field where the relationship between the human race and its correlation within the known universe (i.e., observable non-human worlds) is questioned and analyzed (Christian, 2004). In addition to this form of historical research, there is also a growing area of scholarship around the idea of “future history.” This type of historical scholarship examines the relationship between experience and expectations about how social, political, and economic development will shape the future course of human civilization—nationally, regionally, and globally (Engerman, 2012). The ideas behind histories of the future developed out of the 1940s, but have continually progressed over the past several decades. After World War II and into the Cold War era is when researchers began looking for a “systematic and scientific approach to the future” by analyzing social, political, and economic data to prepare the present for possible future scenarios based on the development of societal issues (Andersson, 2012, p. 1411). In a way, this division of historical scholarship was just not about studying the past, but studying the past to hypothesize about the future regarding current events and phenomena. For example, the American government employed historians and other scholars to sketch out the probable future within the developing nuclear age between the Soviet Union and United States during the Cold War (Andersson, 2012). Engaging students in this developing field of historical research could provide interesting case studies for them to examine different themes that existed in the past and what the world is still facing today and in the future, such as the proliferation of nuclear weapons or the rise of autocratic entities within an ever increasing global society of democratic nations.
Beyond what is taught within world history curriculum, other research areas have started to focus on how world history is taught in a social studies classroom, especially in the age of standardized testing and standards-based education (Dunn, 2010). However, McArthur Harris & Bain (2011) stated there is little research on what is taught in a world history classroom and the level of content knowledge teachers possess within this field of curriculum and education. With the limited research that has been conducted, findings show there is no common thread to how teachers understand world history.

There is practically no literature on the connotation of how world history is taught within my urban school district—world studies. This is not surprising since historically within my district world studies has more or less been taught as a world history survey course with the focus on history and very little on the other social studies fields and skill sets. At least from my frame of reference, world studies is no different from world history. Nevertheless, Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga (2008) defined world studies as including “culture, geography, and history” (p. 199), thus being modeled more so along the lines of an interdisciplinary social studies approach that incorporates many fields from the social sciences and not just from the field of history.

What has gained considerable attention in the past several years is the idea of global education. The origins of global education can be tied to Hanvey (1976). He focused on five areas in creating the idea of a global perspective: perspective consciousness, state-of-the-planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, and awareness of human choices (Hanvey, 1976; Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga, 2008). Merryfield & Kasai (2010) stated global education’s “primary goal is to prepare students to be effective and responsible citizens in a global society. Toward this
end, students need to practice real life skills, gain knowledge of the world, and develop expertise in viewing events and issues from diverse global perspectives” (p. 165). The authors continued by discussing the areas educators tend to focus on at this point in regards to global education: multiple perspectives, global interconnectedness, global issues, and cross cultural experiences. This is a good starting point that allows students the opportunity to understand how the world is globally interconnected, but what needs to be added to this type of curriculum is providing alternative perspectives in how others view the world compared to their own and that of the hegemonic status quo. This would afford students the capability of understanding the complexity of today’s globalized world, how it evolves over space and time, and how we fit into it (Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga, 2008). This understanding would be created from multiple perspectives that in essence will provide more of a complete picture into an issue or topic of study.

Merryfield & Kasai (2010) recognized the possibility of global education becoming another fad and that it is just adding more content to an already overburdened discipline. I can understand this point of view; from my experience as a public school educator, new reforms and policies never make edits to already existing structures of classroom curricula, they just tend to make additions to what is already taught. However, Merryfield & Kasai also noted that specialty social studies courses could provide a more in-depth understanding of the past and how it led us to its current place today. Ultimately, if these types of curriculum changes are going to be successful, then policymakers, scholars, and educators will have to make substantial changes to the already overloaded curricula in secondary education, especially in the field of history and social studies education.
Within the discipline of global education is global citizenship education. This type of education focuses on how the individual interacts with the collective across time and borders (national/regional/cultural) (Rapoport, 2011). In the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) position statement on “Preparing Citizens for a Global Community” (2005), the NCSS stated that a “globally-oriented social studies [curriculum] today” consists of the study of interconnections across time and participation in local and global communities that highlights multiple perspectives that pay attention to the actors and bystanders of globalization (pp. 18-19). Despite the nuances of what scholars and organizations see as the purpose of global and global citizenship education, both do support the position of students learning and understanding about various perspectives across the world in comparison to their own.

**Rationale for the Reconceptualization of World History Curriculum**

As an experienced history/social studies educator, I have come across many students who have a hard time connecting to the historical past. Students often see history as a collection of facts, dates, individuals, and events that are removed from their current lives. Even if students conceptually understand about the purpose of studying the past and why we do it, they still do not see how it is connected to them. There could be a whole host of reasons for this, but could one reason be that there is no personal or overtly direct connection between them and what we study in class? If this is the case, how do educators make these personal connections occur; how do we draw the students in? Can we even do this or does it have to occur in some sort of organic manner that comes to fruition over time? Moreover, is this type of teaching and learning even possible in the current era of standards and accountability?
History and social studies educators may be able to stimulate the personalization of history to students by starting with what students know best—that is the world they live in now—both locally and globally. But do high school students actually understand what is occurring on a daily basis on a local, national, regional, or global scale? Perhaps this is where educators should start.

In order for students to understand the past, they first must understand the current world they live in as a point of origin so students can contextualize the similarities, differences, and the overall development of human civilization across time. If students can understand the complexities of 21st century society, from global conflicts to national politics to the political, economic, and environmental dynamics that go into the manufacturing of their smartphones, they should begin to foster an awareness and appreciation for the linkages between them and the larger dynamics (e.g., politics, commerce, etc.) that influence the conscious and unconscious decisions they make on a daily basis. Upon an understanding of the present, this will provide a foundation for students so they can comprehend the relationship between the past and present in order for them to hypothesize about the future development of the world.

**Course description: Comparative Global Studies.**

Below is a course description for a reconceptualized world history curriculum that comparatively studies different societies (nations, regions, and the world)—past and present as a whole—as it relates to the phenomenon of globalization and its many facets (i.e., socially, politically, economically, culturally, and environmentally).

The Comparative Global Studies course will provide secondary level students the opportunity to examine critically and comparatively the
current global society in which we live through an understanding of the social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental issues and concerns facing the world on a global and local context. The central theme of the course is “globalization,” including the various manifestations of the phenomenon and its development over the past 600 years. This examination will occur through the exploration of current events and major trends in our global society by students studying the historical context of this through research and critical analysis that will allow them to infer about the future and what it holds for the world on a global and local scale. With teacher facilitation, students will critically reflect about the globalized world they live in and how they are connected to it through an exploration of our historical past. The pedagogical foundation for the course will be based on a critical constructivist and interdisciplinary social studies approach that will incorporate the disciplines of history, political science, economics, sociology, physical and human geography, anthropology, and the humanities into the curriculum.

Further specifics of the course, including theoretical foundations, course structure, objectives, key themes and topics, potential lesson ideas, and other points of consideration will be elaborated on in the next section.

An Epistemological Overview of a Comparative Global Studies Curriculum

There is one main learning theory that will guide the development of the Comparative Global Studies curriculum: constructivism, specifically critical
constructivism. Additionally, I will explore several curriculum theories and concepts that will aid in the development of the course. For the purposes of this study, I will only introduce the learning theory and how it relates to the epistemology of the course structure. Further research will need to be conducted on the influence of the theory and possible related learning theories as they apply to the development of the course and to secondary education practice.

Constructivism is based on the idea that learning is experientially based through exploration and interaction, which results in the construction of new knowledge (Bruner, 1961; Dewey, 1997; Glasersfeld, 1989a, 1989b; Jonassen, 1994; Kincheloe, 2001, 2008b; Piaget, 1964; Taylor, 1996, 1998). Moreover, Kincheloe (2008a) stated that critical constructivists believe

the world is socially constructed—what we know about the world always involves a knower and that which is to be known. How the knower constructs the known constitutes what we think of as reality. …Thus, the purpose of education in this critical constructivist process is not to transmit a body of validated truths to students for memorization. Instead, critical constructivists argue that a central role of schooling involves engaging students in the knowledge production process. A central dimension of teaching in this context involves engaging students in analyzing, interpreting and constructing a wide variety of knowledges emerging from diverse locations (pp. 2-3).

This type of learning includes critical thinking and analysis where the student is at the center of learning, and the teacher acts as a facilitator and not as the source of knowledge
Critical reflection is also a necessary component of constructivism (Jonassen, 1994). For students to contextually understand about the current world they live in, how they fit into that globalized world, and what the future holds for our local and global societies, students will have to personally interact with the exploration of our current world, our historical past, and the linkages between the two. Students will be the main drivers of their exploration of global history and teachers will facilitate this exploration within a constructivist conception of learning and an interdisciplinary social studies approach.

The following curricular theories and concepts will be explored: reconceptualization, responsive education, and critical pedagogy. In addition, concepts regarding multiple perspectives and different points of view will be reviewed. Including these theories and concepts will enhance and further specify the rationale and purpose of a Comparative Global Studies curriculum.

**Reconceptualization.**

Reconceptualization theory refers to the development of curriculum in relation to the culture and society that it is situated in (Pinar, 2004a). Therefore, research and development of curriculum is a political action that either reinforces or challenges current norms in society. For the most part, public education reform maintains the normative hegemonic order. Reconceptualists see education as a way to move outside the current norms of society by developing curriculum that can “function in emancipatory ways” (p. 154). Through a reconceptualized world history curriculum, students will discover about the forces that dictate current events and trends, and how these developed over time from the past to the present. For example, students could explore the development of free-
market capitalism, from its modern day conception to its historical roots in mercantilism. In conjunction, the development of political systems could be studied to correlate how capitalism developed over time with the concept of a nation-state and the ideals of democracy. Thus, students will be able to comprehend how economic and political hegemonic forces work alongside one another to continue the status quo of private interests controlling the masses (i.e., the public).

It is difficult to work outside the normative and hegemonic systems in any society, but as in the past, public education has been used in the United States as a tool to bring about greater change, such as the fight for social justice during the Civil Rights movement. Today, public education is being used as a tool for continued American dominance in the global economy. These two examples are diametrically opposed to one another: the civil rights movement example broke down normative societal understandings and the economic example reinforces normative societal understandings. If it will be nearly impossible to truly break down hegemonic control over society, especially in an era of top-down management of public education (i.e., structural education reform), then why not use public education as a tool to work in and outside the current norms (i.e., counter-hegemonic ideas and actions) and allow for change to grow from the bottom up (i.e., responsive education)?

For this to be able to occur, curriculum development needs to become a truly interdisciplinary field where all of the social sciences are used in tandem to tackle the social, political, and economic issues around the reform and development of public education, including at the very core its purpose for existence. In addition, the development of curriculum and the actual curriculum itself needs to be of a critical nature.
in order to provide a more transformative experience as experience is at the center of reconceptualizing curriculum (Pinar, 1975a, 2011). Through a critical constructivist theory of learning, it is that student experience I want this reconceptualized world history curriculum to focus on—where and how do students fit into the bigger puzzle of human civilization.

**Responsive education.**

The concept of responsive education does not seek to fundamentally change or overthrow existing systems of education, but to work along with these systems (M. Singh, 2007). However, I see a relationship where the tenants of reconceptualization theory work well with the idea of responsive education. “Responsive education struggles with existing constraints to construct transformative policies, pedagogies and politics that enable intergenerational engagements with changing global/national imperatives” (p. 114). While working within the constraints of the current structural education reform agenda (e.g., NCLB, Common Core Standards, state and local level standards and mandates), educators may also seek ways to transform or reconceptualize education at the school level through classroom curriculum and pedagogy (i.e., a bottom up approach—“globalization from below”). Responsive education allows the possibility to explore “innovative pedagogies for developing students as knowledge producers” (p. 118) and not just knowledge receptacles. Tollefson (2008) recognized the rigidity of the top down approach to education through a reference to Foucault’s (1977, 1984) image of a panopticon [methods used to control the populace]. However, she realized that change could occur through localized avenues, such as the confines of a teacher’s classroom. Taylor (1996) noted that teachers should not do this type of transformative work on their
own, but to collaboratively work with each other in order to reconstruct education through a critical constructivist approach.

Reconceptualizing world history curriculum will allow social studies curriculum to respond to the complexities that globalization places on local and global histories and realities. “Meaningful engaging curriculum narratives [through responsive education] provide students with the opportunity to analyze, interpret, and comprehend the multifaceted dimensions of globalization” (M. Singh, 2007, p. 119). It illustrates to students that history is not linear and there are always multiple narratives and points of view that create the concurrent realities as related to the historical past and the development of the future. In addition, there are not fixed periods to study in history, but in fact there are multiple periods in history that overlap each other and flow from one to another. As civilization moves forward in time, we are able to provide more interpretations of the past by the way of new knowledge and understandings that recognize the fluidity and complexity of humanity and its relationship to the physical world.

**Critical education.**

Critical theory is a broad field of study that questions the status quo of society and culture, and seeks out new ways of thought and “transformative possibilities for social and political theory and practice” (el-Ojeili & Hayden, 2006, p. 9). As Freire (2000) considered it, it is to seek out new ways of emancipating oneself and others from the hegemonic forces at work in society. el-Ojeili and Hayden (2006) referred to Hoffman’s (1987) views on critical theory that it
entails the view that humanity has potentialities other than those manifested in current society. Critical theory, therefore, seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent; it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions (p. 233).

Critical theory allows the possibility to understand the deep seeded issues of society, to derive new ways of comprehending the causes and effects of these issues, and to find solutions. One way for this to occur is through the field of education, specifically social studies curriculum, where individuals learn about the past in order to understand the present and shape the future. However, the current public education system that is based on old models of education no longer matches the globalized world we find ourselves in today.

Curricular and pedagogical methods of the past do not work for the current realities of education in a global society. Curriculum needs to inspire students to question and investigate the world that they live in—to awaken their consciousness about how their individual self is connected to a greater collective that is linked to the past, present, and future (Ardizzone, 2007; W. Au, 2012; Freire, 2007; Giroux, 2010; Greene, 2004). A critical form of education allows for the possibility to emancipate oneself from hegemonic forces and to produce one’s own knowledge about the world they live in, how it functions, and how that individual may bring about transformative change (Allman, 1999, 2001; Evans, 2011; Lipman, 2007). This transformative change will most likely
not be immediate, but will develop over time from a grassroots, bottom-up perspective. This can be cultivated through the teacher-student relationship as a teacher is also a student and a student is also the teacher (Freire, 2007). Through this interconnected partnership, critical thinking may be applied to the current realities of a globalized world and how that resulted from the historical past, because “critical thinking is applied thinking” (Lipman, 2007, p. 427). Teachers and students may apply knowledge and thought from multiple perspectives that can question the “official”/legitimate knowledge of current hegemonic forces in society and thus create social transformation over time (Apple, 2009). Teaching and learning can “take students beyond the world they already know, in a way that does not exist on a particular fixed set of altered meanings” (Giroux, 2007, p. 3). Weiner (2007) believed that critical pedagogy could be the most powerful tool in the field of education against hegemonic forces and the continued institutionalization of the status quo. He goes on to say how critical pedagogy will help to reimagine how education functions in society and how society will function itself beyond the constraints of hegemonic oppression. Weiner aligned his beliefs about critical pedagogy with Maxine Greene. “Imagination, for Greene, is the key to critical reflection, as well as a way to conceptualize a future in light of realities henceforth unknown” (p. 73). Greene (2000) stated “teacher educators and school administrators do not think speculatively despite all the work towards fruitful conceptions of active learning, critical questioning, and the construction of meanings. There is almost no mention of imagination or of its relation to notions of the possible” (p. 272). Without this inclusion of the imaginary, what are students and educators supposed to do with their knowledge and understanding of the historical past and its relationship to the current realities of the
globalized world? By including the imaginary in history and social studies education, this provides an outlet for students and educators to creatively apply their knowledge and understanding to social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental issues and concerns facing our global and local societies.

**Multiple perspectives.**

Through an interdisciplinary and multiple perspective social studies approach, critical education will create new possibilities and “imaginaries” about what could become of the current normative and hegemonic structure of the globalized world (Greene, 2004; Pensky, 2005). Transformative change can occur from the local level and permeate upwards through cracks in the rigidity of current structural education policy.

**Globalization from above and below.**

I have referred to the perspectives of “globalization from above” and “globalization from below” throughout this study, but a moment needs to be taken here to situate these perspectives within the context of reconceptualizing social studies curriculum to be able to respond to the issues and challenges of not only modern public education reform, but also to the issues around globalization as well.

“Studies of ‘globalization from above’ focus on the big picture and describe major trends and patterns associated with globalization” (M. Singh, Kenway, & Apple, 2007, p. 3). This is a top-down perspective that contends with the larger societal and hegemonic forces with a primarily economic focus, but also confronts the relationship of social, political, cultural, and environmental matters. More often than not, “globalization from above” often evokes the negative effects and resulting issues of the phenomenon of globalization, but it still provides a perspective that is needed in the historical and social
study of local, regional, and global narratives. Students and educators can then grapple with the bigger picture in regards to the implications of globalization.

However, the perspective that is often left out, but continues to grow in scholarly research is the perspective of “globalization from below.” This perspective refers to the multiple points of view and experiences from the local, often marginalized groups under hegemonic influences that are not heard in normative societal settings (R. Robertson, 1992; M. Singh, Kenway, & Apple, 2007). Connell (1993) stated that these perspectives are from “‘the position of those who carry the burdens of social inequality’ serves as ‘a better starting point’ for the construction of knowledge about the society than ‘the position of those who enjoy its advantages’” (as cited in Nozaki, 2006, p. 76).

Another way to think about the perspectives of “globalization from above” and “below” is from the vantage points of “Minority” and “Majority” worlds (M. Singh, Kenway, & Apple, 2007). A more familiar rendering of this may be thought of as the historical and more out-of-date phrases of industrialized, post-industrialized, or developed and underdeveloped nations, or even the use of “first” and “third” world countries. The notion behind the term “Minority World” is that only a small proportion of the world’s nations are on top of the stratification of what is considered “civilized” and socially, politically, and economically developed. At the opposite end of the spectrum are “Majority Worlds,” where these nations, more numerous in the world than “Minority World” nations, are underdeveloped and considered not to be as civilized comparatively to the industrialized and technologically advanced “Minority World.” As often seen through neo-imperialist and post-colonial relationships (Nkrumah, 1965; Sartre, 2001), “Majority World” nations are politically and/or economically tied to “Minority World”
nations directly or indirectly through direct diplomatic and/or economic trade agreements. Recent examples include the hegemonic relationships between numerous post-colonial African and Latin American/Caribbean nations and supra-national organizations like the United Nations (UN) or World Trade Organization (WTO).

**Standpoint theory.**

“Standpoint theory builds from the basic understanding that power and knowledge are inextricably intertwined” (W. Au, 2012, p. 53). This theory looks at the multiple perspectives of how to understand the world that are based on different vantage points from local communities to the global society—it connects experience to knowledge (Connell, 1993). W. Au (2012) stated that all viewpoints are not visible due to relationships of power (i.e., hegemony) and socially constructed barriers (i.e., ideology), thus it is integral to examine the world from oppressed and marginalized perspectives. By examining the world from these perspectives, it provides experience and knowledge from points of view typically not heard in the normative and hegemonic structures of society (Nozaki, 2006). You are now studying and experiencing the world from a “Majority World” perspective in hopes to bring about change through a “globalization from below” position. With this perspective, you are not only creating knowledge about the world from a bottom-up approach, but from various and diverse perspectives that are often not heard from that confirms or contradicts what is expressed from hegemonic powers. For example, students could explore slave labor issues in “Majority World” nations from the point of view of the workers, their families, and other locally connected individuals and groups on how and why slave labor still exists in the 21st century. Then
students could connect this back to the world they live in and how that relates to the cost of consumer goods we buy on an ongoing basis.

**Course structure.**

I envision the Comparative Global Studies course to be based on current and leading social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental phenomena around the world as related to the central concept of globalization. These would be issues, events, and themes that are of significance on a global scale, but would also include regional contextualization in order for students to understand how nations and local communities interact and influence each other within the greater central concept of globalization. For example, the United States is influential in both “the West” (nations of predominately European descent) and in the Western Hemisphere (i.e., North and South America) in addition to this country’s influence around the world in regards to global affairs and the evolution of social, political, and economic forms of globalization.

The structure of the course would follow a thematic and quasi-chronological format with the first quarter focusing on the present and the following quarters would focus on a chronological study of the global past from the 1400s to the present in regards to the course themes and the overall relationship to the central phenomenon of globalization. Within the aims of responsive education, one cannot teach in a linear fashion, because history is not linear (M. Singh, 2007). Therefore, this course will not follow a strict chronological format; the curriculum will make constant connections between the past and present in regards to globalization and the related course themes.

One cannot establish “periods” of globalization because you cannot create “fixed stages of human progress” with each successive stage being inherently “an improvement
on the previous stage” (p. 123). History overlaps different periods of time and space, which means history teachers can no longer follow a “biased Euro-American Minority World view of globalization and the Earth’s history” (p. 124). Educators and students need to understand the reality based on human values and not just from one perspective. With the aims of global education in mind “is that in an interconnected world our survival and well-being are directly related to our capacity to understand and deal responsibly and effectively with other peoples and nations and with a variety of issues that cut across national boundaries” (Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga, 2008). However, I believe you cannot let go of the vantage point of “globalization from above” and solely fixate on the perspective of “globalization from below.” Both vantage points need to be contended with and debated against one another so educators and students can understand the ramifications of globalization from all directions in human society.

To help determine what phenomena to study, one could reference the leading global organizations that shape international policy and development, such as the United Nations (UN), G8/G20, World Trade Organization (WTO), World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The major initiatives and actions taken by these organizations could shape the global issues and concerns that are studied in class. In addition though, research will have to be conducted to unravel the strategies and methods of how “Majority Worlds” and “globalization from below” perspectives (e.g., “Majority World” local and national governments, non-profit organizations, humanitarian efforts, and grass root efforts) are tackling the same and/or related issues at the foundational level, including in reaction to the “Minority World” institutions that were created to deal and solve global issues—many of these issues being
especially of concern to “Majority World” nations. Moreover, teachers and students can examine how the issues of “Majority World” nations were partially or wholly created by “Minority World” nations and institutions. This will provide a basis for both primary perspectives (i.e., “Majority and Minority” worlds) to be represented in the curriculum.

The first quarter would focus on current events, issues, and phenomena so students could gain a fundamental understanding of what is going on in the world today. This could then be connected in the subsequent quarters to the study of the global historical past and the rise of globalization while at the same time throughout the school year be studying and practicing critical thinking skills to comprehend the complex nature of the globalizing world. This could be done on a two-level basis: global and regional. There is a complex relationship amongst the world’s leading issues and phenomena. For example, even though certain parts of the world are not affected by terrorist attacks on the United States specifically, they still are relationally due to how terrorism affects the United States’ economic and political development, thereby affecting global economic development, which determines the evolution of regional and national economies dependent on their political and economic relationship to the United States’ commercial and financial markets.

The pedagogical approach to a comparative global studies curriculum should be interdisciplinary-based in the social studies and not just in the field of history. “A social studies approach to teaching [a course like this] is directly concerned with ideas and issues being discussed today, rather than just a compilation of events from the past” (Singer, 2011, p. 10). Often in American schools, educators teach the facts of a concept, historical period, or specific event first, then ask students questions to help conceptualize
content. Because of time constraints, focus on standardized testing, and so on, this is a common dilemma with teachers; I am also guilty of this. With a social studies approach, educators should start “with questions about the present and future, use these questions to interrogate the past, and utilize the past to help students answer their questions and [to] formulate new ones” (Singer, 2011, p. 5). I also agree with Singer about how a social studies approach to global history starts with student questions, questions about why the world is the way it is today. It organizes curriculum, units, and individual lessons in order to go back and forth across time, to examine case studies from the past, to help us gain insights into the human condition, and to stimulate questions about the present. …Educated citizens in a democratic society need to think about the past and raise questions about the present so that they can be informed and active participants in shaping the future (p. 5).

However in my teaching experience, many high school students become lost when you jump around in chronological time and/or across different nations’ and regions’ histories. This is one of the issues facing my school with the current regional structure of the World Studies course—the curriculum jumps from one region of the world to the next without many linkages being made between the regions. But if a teacher solely focuses on the past, then students become disinterested as it is hard for them to associate their present and future self with that of the past. I ultimately see the format of a Comparative Global Studies curriculum to match that of Singer’s stance, which is also supported by Merryfield (2011) and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 2005): begin with questions about today and the future and use the historical past to develop an
understanding of how the two chronological entities correlate with one another.

Somehow, there should be a “home base”—students’ concerns, experiences, and thoughts with their teacher’s facilitation—to ground the students’ and educator’s orientation between the past and present. This would provide a familiar point to reference the thematic and chronological understandings that developed from the lessons within a unit and the units throughout the course. Even with this, I can still imagine students having a hard time “connecting the dots” between the different points in time and regions of the world due to how students are often taught history in the elementary grades (i.e., chronologically and that there is only “one right answer” to each historical question studied). Consequently, one of the goals for the course, especially in the first quarter of the academic year, should be to reorient students’ perceptions of space and time so they become more accustomed to the non-linear nature of the development of human civilization from the historical past to the current reality and potential future(s). One possible way to develop this idea of non-linear history is to have students create a multi-tiered timeline that traces the development of pre-Columbian societies in the Americas along with European history, including the Age of Exploration and early colonization efforts in the Americas, to show how multiple histories were going on at the same time, but at certain points, those multiple histories crossed paths or even joined together over time and space.

Based on the leading nations of global political and economic organizations, I would target certain countries of study when it comes to comparatively studying how the world got to be where it is because of historical social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental effects. For instance, referencing the current focus on global terrorism and
economic development in the United States and around the globe as two of the leading issues in today’s world, reviewing regional and international political events (e.g. “Arab Spring,” recent wars and conflicts in the Middle East/North Africa), the member nations of the United Nations Security Council, and the G8/G20 would provide the nations to focus more on within each continent and region of the world. Thus, the regions and countries that I would initially focus on would be Africa (not including North Africa— due to their social and cultural relationship to the Middle East): Nigeria and South Africa; North America: Mexico and the United States; South America: Argentina and Brazil; Central Asia: India and Pakistan; East/Southeast Asia: China and Japan; Europe: European Union (EU) (due to their collective economic influence compared to the national economies of China and the United States), France, Germany, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom; Middle East and North Africa: Egypt, Iran, Israel, and Saudi Arabia. With listing these specific regions and nations does not mean other nations would not be studied and discussed—because they will be needed to provide the multi-point perspective needed for comparison, especially when comparing regions to one another—but the nations and groups listed would tend to be most studied and discussed due to their influence and significance on current and recent historical regional and global development (socially, politically, economically, culturally, and environmentally).

“Globalization from below” will be an integral vantage point where multiple perspectives from the “Majority World” will highlight the issues and concerns facing the planet on a global scale from a local point of view.
Course goals.

The following course goals are based on the course rationale, theoretical foundations, course structure, and the research and data conducted in this study. In a Comparative Global Studies course, high school students will be able to:

1. identify the major developments and relationships (“change over time”) in the non-linear historical evolution of modern globalization, including its many dimensions: social, cultural, political, economic, technological, and environmental, from the 1400s to the present.

2. develop an understanding of the causality of globalization and its interconnected complexity to the various relationships between the development of human civilization and the physical world.

3. recognize the interrelatedness and interdependence of various localities, nations, and regions (e.g., socio-economic, political, and continental) of the world.

4. formulate reasons for the current conflicts, issues, and concerns on a regional and global basis.

5. hypothesize and postulate about the future course of human civilization based off current and historical factors.

6. acknowledge and empathize with the multiple perspectives that make up humanity’s pluralistic society.

7. work collaboratively and independently within a critical constructivist and responsive learning environment that focuses on the skills of contextualization, comparison, using evidence, interpretation, synthesis, and application.
8. participate in the global society as a critical citizen that is knowledgeable about the issues and concerns facing humanity from a local to global level. These goals will need to be delineated in further detail as the various units are developed, including each unit’s guiding questions and objectives. These goals are specific in that they reflect the course rationale and description, but at the same time, are flexible and amenable enough to be responsive to the evolving conflicts, issues, and concerns that face the globalized world and how educators with collaboration from students would incorporate these topics into their course content and student-centered instruction.

**Key topics/themes.**

The themes of the course would reflect leading issues facing the world today that are based on human interactions, and interactions between human and non-human (i.e., the physical environment) relationships. For example, the themes could be derived from national, regional, and international events, the coverage of those events on news media, and issues that the United Nations (UN)—the leading global political organization—deems as central issues. Trade, terrorism, climate change, human rights, atomic energy, poverty, and access to adequate food and water supplies are many of the primary issues confronting the world in the second decade of the 21st century. All of these issues are related to the concept of globalization. The issues in the curriculum could change over time, dependent on and responsive to the course of regional and global events with the focus—globalization—staying the same. Not all of these events directly impact the United States, but students should understand how certain global or regional issues might not be discussed in our own nation, but ultimately are still relevant to our country domestically and more importantly how they directly or indirectly affect the development
of our nation and world within the global community (e.g., human rights, and access to clean water and stable food supplies).

Historically, key themes and topics could be based off current issues facing the world today. Potential themes may include: migration, democratization, transformation and change, interaction, integration, and power. Social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental variables would come into play with each of these themes.

The theme of migration would reflect the increasing movement of people from region to region within continental borders and across the globe. Potential historical topics within this theme could include the development of regional trade, communication, and cultural mingling in the early to mid-1000s CE between Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa that eventually brought about global trade, communication, and multicultural interaction. This prepared the way to the age of global exploration and the eventual migration of people from continent to continent (and the often negative consequences that occurred to the indigenous populations of those “discovered worlds”). Related to this, the advent of modern industrialization and the “opening up” of borders to foreign populations for economic expansion allowed for the mass migration of various national and ethnic groups to move—by force or voluntarily—from one region and/or continent to another. This led into the historical development of democratic governments and practices from a regional to global scale.

Democratization refers to the ideals of democracy and its rising influence on the political development of nations and supra-national organizations along with the democratization of free-market capitalism. Potential historical topics within this theme could include the revolutionary movement in the 1700s and 1800s in the Western
Hemisphere and Europe. This could include the American Revolution, French Revolution, and the numerous revolutions in Latin America that eventually overthrew European control from the “New World” and more recently with direct and indirect imperialist influences in Central America by the United States. This theme then could be translated to the past two centuries where additional movements could be studied to democratize nations and free-market capitalism in Africa, Asia, eastern Europe, and the Middle East. This historical theme and corresponding key topics could tie in with all of the modern themes. For example, democratization led to the space for free-market economic structures to be put into place, which is ultimately what drives our current global economic and political institutions. This thereby positively or negatively influences how certain nations or regions of the world influence others socially, politically, economically, culturally, and environmentally with their resulting actions and reactions, especially when power dynamics come into play (e.g., reasons for terrorism). Democratization is just one example of the broader historical theme of transformation and change in that the ideals of democracy have been a main impetus for the social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental development of civilization since the roots of republicanism during ancient times to today.

Transformation and change would be an all-encompassing theme that would reflect many factors across space and time. This theme could include topics on the changing relationship between humanity and its impact on and use of the physical environment (e.g., global warming); changing morals, beliefs, and habits of humans (e.g., multiculturalism; mass consumption and consumerism); how technological development has positively and negatively transformed all facets of human life from food production
to transportation and communication systems (e.g., the numerous agricultural revolutions, the Industrial Revolution, and the digital revolution of the past two and half decades); similarities and differences between various historical eras and how humans have progressed, but at the same time regressed by grappling with fundamental issues like rights, responsibilities, and layers of power (e.g., rise and fall of empires; civil rights movements in Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe; growth and development of supranational political and economic organizations—United Nations, World Trade Organization, etc.) and their hegemonic relationship to “Majority World” nations; and how humans will deal with the effects of all of these changes in the future. The theme of transformation and change include the following themes of interaction, integration, and power. These themes coexist due to the nature and evolution of globalization from a regional phenomenon to an instantaneous global exchange.

The theme of interaction reflects the positive and negative linkages and relationships between different groups of people, places, cultures, and phenomena over time. Potential historical topics within this theme could include the development of trade networks in the Mediterranean region that connected Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa together; the Age of Exploration and the Atlantic slave trade network; the forced opening of Asia (China, India, Japan, etc.) to western trade and eventual imperialism (territorial expansion for raw materials, natural resources, and the resulting dumping ground for overproduced domestic crops and products to be shipped and sold abroad); European “discovery” of the Americas and the resulting colonization of the two continents and wiping out of the indigenous populations; and western cultural influence on traditional Muslim, Orthodox, and other religiously-based societies. Within these
historical topics, the imbalance between the development and evolution of “Majority and Minority” worlds could be examined in order to understand the social, political, and economic inequalities that still exist in today’s world. The historical theme of interaction and corresponding key topics could tie in with the modern themes of human rights and poverty amongst others due to the linkages between economic growth and competition, and how “Majority World” nations and marginalized groups are used at the expense of continued “Minority World” dominance on a global scale.

Integration as a historical theme relates to the effect globalization has had on the overall development of human civilization and how the products of globalization (e.g., technological advancement, modernization, etc.) have brought various groups of people and nations of the world closer together. Potential historical topics within this theme could include the vast acceleration of global communication, trade, and migratory patterns within the past century compared to the prior 500 years combined; the relationship between social and cultural transformation, political legislation and policy, and economic development; and the transplanting and infiltration of American culture and societal influences on other cultures around the world from Coca Cola and Wal-Mart to rap music and reality television. The historical theme of integration and corresponding key topics could tie in with the modern themes of trade and terrorism. Integration connects to trade due to the nature of global economic business and commerce in that not only are products shipped from one nation or culture to others around the world, but also how corresponding ideas, beliefs, and values are circulated with those tangible products. Integration also connects to terrorism, as seen in many historical and current circumstances; terrorist acts are a reaction against the infiltration of foreign institutions
and practices into culturally- and ideologically-different nations (e.g., westernization efforts in the Middle East during the early to mid-20th century and their resulting effects, including the ongoing conflicts between western powers and Middle Eastern nations and groups).

Power is another all-encompassing theme that ties together the various forces that drive change and the reinforcement of the status quo throughout space and time. Potential historical topics within this theme could include the development of hegemony and what it encompasses from overt to covert forms of it; the interconnectedness of the idea of wealth as power and how its’ cyclical nature creates political power that ultimately upholds the economic power (recycling of the status quo); and the development of local forms of social, political, economic, and cultural power to national, regional, and global manifestations of power relationships. The evolution of free-market capitalism could be used as an example of the theme of power in how it has shaped the course of human history (social, political, cultural, and environmental) over the past 600 years. This historical theme and corresponding key topics could tie in with all of the modern themes due to the extensive reach and influence that economics and wealth have had on the development of various societies, and the interaction and integration of those societies throughout space and time to what it has become in this current global era.

I envision each historical theme to be a foundation for each unit of study throughout the course. After the current realities of the globalized world are covered within the first quarter of the course, each historical theme will help trace the development of globalization and human civilization from the 1400s to the present in the three remaining quarters of the school year (or however a school district’s schedule is
structured). Just as history cannot be studied linearly, the historical and current themes will weave within one another so students can begin to critically comprehend the complexity of our globalizing world and how this developed over time and space. Figure 7.1 illustrates this complex nature and how it would be impossible to disconnect each of the themes as they relate to the phenomenon of globalization.
Figure 7.1 – The Interconnectivity of Globalization

Key:
GLOBALIZATION = course theme
Trade = modern theme
migration = historical theme

= modern theme connection to globalization
= connections between modern themes
= connections between historical themes and/or between historical themes and modern themes
Students and teachers will have multiple possibilities in how they critically study the complexity of globalization as related to the modern and historical themes within the development of human civilization. The examples described in this chapter represent only a fraction of the possible topics and lessons that could be discussed in a social studies class of this nature.

Ultimately, the relationship between the advancement of humanity and its self-destruction can be critically examined. One could argue that the human race has advanced tremendously over time through the development of reason, experience, and technology. Consequently, the human race has also created many of the issues and problems that it faces, including the plundering and overuse of natural resources resulting in global warming, the “Minority World” championing “self-determination” for the “Majority World” creating the threat of a possible nuclear holocaust, and the promotion of free trade that creates subservient relationships that result in sweatshop labor in “Majority World” nations.

**Additional Items to Consider, Next Steps, and Future Areas of Research**

In this section, I will discuss additional factors and elements in designing a Comparative Global Studies curriculum that will need to be researched and developed outside the scope of this study. The research and data analyzed in this study is just a launching point in examining the current notions of history and social studies education. This study provides a basis for reconceptualizing the purpose of history and social studies education in the 21st century. Much more will have to be done to understand the ramifications and possibilities of employing this type of secondary-level curriculum into the American public education system.
Ideally, I see this course as an introduction point in students’ high school social studies career before taking more specific content area courses, such as world or United States history and the other specific social science courses (political science, economics, sociology, etc.). But at the same time, I question whether freshmen have the cognitive capacity and cultural literacy to dive into such a complex and multi-layered study. Either existing research will need to be examined and/or possible new research studies will have to be undertaken with these areas of concern.

If freshmen are not ready for a course like this, then does this course need to be a capstone course, like a senior seminar, that combines what students learned in their freshmen, sophomore, and junior year social studies classes? A third possibility may be to create a social studies foundations course that introduces the key topics, themes, and ideas of a Comparative Global Studies curriculum with a corresponding capstone course that delves into the complexities of this curriculum. Hypothetically with this structure in mind, freshmen would take this course at the beginning of their high school career and then as seniors, students would take the above outlined Comparative Global Studies course as a capstone senior seminar. These two classes would “book end” the subject matter around the other history and social studies courses students would take their sophomore and junior years, which allows for students to draw connections between all of their social studies courses and build upon their knowledge and critical thinking capabilities about the current world they live in, the historical past, and what may potentially happen in the future development of human civilization.

In order to understand the potential in implementing a Comparative Global Studies course, a curricular framework will need to be expanded upon and constructed.
This will include essential and guiding questions, units of study, curricular resources (textbooks and supplemental materials), correlation to current state-level and Common Core Standards and assessments, lesson plans and activities, teaching methodologies, and formative and summative assessments. As a result, ways to embed and implement this type of curriculum into the current structures and limitations of public schooling will have to be considered before fundamental new approaches to teaching and learning alter history and social studies education and/or the overall public education system.

Accordingly, additional research will have to be conducted in the content and pedagogical foundations of the course. Existing and new forms of historical and social sciences scholarship should be researched and explored. This would also include how these fields are evolving and being taught within institutions of higher education. The critical constructivist learning theory will have to be further researched in order to understand the benefits and concerns with this type of methodology. Also, new learning theories and models for teaching and learning should be studied to see how else history and social studies education can be taught to high school students. For example, the flipped model of teaching is gaining attraction and support in how to further engage students with their education (Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Demetry, 2010; Strayer, 2007).

Field research needs to be conducted into current, but relatively unknown teaching practices of this type or similar forms of curriculum (e.g., comparative studies, regional studies, etc.). This will provide evidence that supports or contradicts the form of social studies education that I am advocating for in this study. As referred to earlier in this chapter, McArthur Harris & Bain (2011) stated that there is not much scholarship on actual world history curriculum, pedagogy, and teaching practices. Therefore, in
connection to unknown comparative studies-type teaching practices, additional field research should be conducted into existing forms of world history curriculum and education to see day-to-day practices of how this subject matter is currently being taught and what may be transplantable into a Comparative Global Studies-type curriculum.

From the perspective of students, I initially see two areas that will have to be researched and studied to assist in constructing a Comparative Global Studies curriculum. One area of concern is how to reorient student perceptions of history from a linear to non-linear point of view that will allow for multiple layers and competing interpretations of history to be explored in conjunction with one another. Related to the reorientation of student perceptions of history, field research should be conducted into what students see as the importance of history and social studies education by asking them their thoughts on what should be studied and how to go about it, especially within a course like the one I am advocating for here.

As I have previously stated in this study, there is no cohesion between scholars, educators, policymakers, and the public on the purpose of history and social studies education. Due to this and the evolving nature of the type of curriculum I am suggesting, I understand that there will be several concerns and opinions against the implementation of a Comparative Global Studies curriculum into the American public education system. Traditionalists in the field of history will continue to advocate for the studying of facts, dates, and events; some social studies scholars and educators will want to focus on citizenship education; or even with individuals and groups who feel that American history is being pushed out of the way for “other peoples’ history” (i.e., cultural studies
that hypothetically has nothing to do with the customary nationalistic approach to what American students are taught).

However, I feel like all of these perspectives can be incorporated into the curriculum that I am advocating for. Like any other change, this evolving and “different” form of education will have to be articulated to individuals and groups about the advantages of teaching our students to be active and participatory citizens in the global society we find ourselves in today. One way or another, the world is changing and American public education will have to change as well if the United States wants to continue its dominance and influence globally.

**Concluding Remarks**

**Purpose of study.**

The purpose of this study was to draw attention to the complex relationship between globalization, public education reform, and social studies curriculum in American society. The central research question of this study is: how can public education reform respond to the challenges that globalization has placed on American society and public education through reconceptualized curriculum? In response to this question, the objective of each chapter was to further illuminate the overt and covert interconnections between the development of globalization as a phenomenon and influence on American society, the reforming of public education in the era of standards and accountability, and purpose of history and social studies education in American secondary schools.

The purpose of Chapter 1 was to draw attention to the evolving relationship between the American economy, public policy, and the reform of American public
education in response to the dichotomy of globalization. Globalization espouses for a free market philosophy, but encapsulates modern societies to tightly reshape its public and private institutions to meet the growing demands of a successful interconnected national economy within the global economic structure. It was important to first explore the phenomenon of globalization and its relationship to American public policy and the structural education reform agenda in order to better understand how to reform American public education, specifically social studies curriculum, for educating 21st century citizens working within a global economy and its hegemonic complexities. In addition, this chapter introduced the central themes: reconceptualization (Pinar 2004a) and responsive education (M. Singh, 2007); laid out the research purpose and questions; overview of the three primary methodologies employed in this study: critical inquiry (i.e., literature exploration, and policy and curricular framework analysis), philosophical inquiry, and curricular reconceptualization; organization of the study; and research significance.

The purpose of Chapter 2 was twofold: 1. to establish the rationale for my research focus within the duality as an experienced urban secondary level educator and emerging scholar in the field of education and 2. lay the methodological foundations for my critical and philosophical inquiry into the juxtaposing relationship between the socio-political and economic purposes of American public education in a global era. With this, I described the methods used in this study, including the use of critical discourse analysis (CDA), that enabled me to examine the overt and covert relationships between the phenomenon of globalization and its influence on federal education policy, and thereby history and social studies education in public schools.
In the third chapter, I examined the development of the structural education reform movement (i.e., the standards and accountability movement) as a response to the growing emphasis on the competitiveness of the American economy within the global free market structure and how that has narrowed the purpose of public education over the past 30 years. The major premise that started to emerge out of the literature and later on was reinforced by the critical discourse analysis conducted in Chapter 4 was the dividing intentions behind the purpose of education: the traditional assertion that education in the United States was for the evolution and benefit of a democratic society, and the developing notion that public education is now for the purpose to continue America’s dominance in the global economy.

In Chapter 4, I critically examined the major federal government initiatives to reform public education in light of globalization and its relationship to the American economy. By using critical discourse analysis (CDA) on the federal education policies over the past five presidencies, analyzing these documents provided greater insight into why the structural education reform movement continues to dominate the conversation on the purpose of education in the 21st century. Because of this discourse analysis, I was able to make more visible the shift that occurred in the 1980s and afterwards on the purpose of public schooling and education reform in the United States. The Nation at Risk (1983) report was the turning point in the discussion on public education where more focus was placed on the continued success of the American economy on a global scale and how the schools were not meeting this need. With each successive policy afterwards, from George H.W. Bush to Barack Obama, the policies became more specific in their use of language on how public education would become standardized and be held
accountable for creating a productive American workforce that would be able to compete on a global scale.

The purpose of Chapters 5 and 6 mirrored the intentions and format of Chapters 3 and 4, but with a closer look into how the structural education reform agenda (i.e., the standards and accountability movement) manifested itself into the history and social studies curriculum in secondary education. In Chapter 5, I explored the thematic trends of history and social studies education in order to understand its current state and purpose in American public education. This provided a lens to examine the effects of structural education reform on current frameworks of social studies curriculum, including state-level world history standards in three different states (Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York) and the Common Core Standards. In Chapter 6, I critically examined the effects of structural education reform efforts on history and social studies curriculum. By using CDA on current state level social studies frameworks and the newly adopted Common Core Standards, this provided an in-depth analysis into the degree with which the relationship between the phenomenon of globalization and federal public education policy revealed itself into secondary public education practice. Overall, the structural education reform agenda became apparent because of the heavy use of standards-based education in public schools, even with history and social studies curriculum, as evident in the discourse analysis of the curricular frameworks. However, the economic focus that became more apparent with each successive federal policy was not as prevalent in the history and social studies frameworks. These sets of standards, except for the Common Core Standards that only addressed skill-based learning and no content, still reflected the heavily democratic nature of public education as reflected in policy before A Nation at
Risk. Thus, there is not a cohesive agenda and purpose in the teaching of social studies curriculum between the federal and state level governments.

Based on the research and data analysis in the prior chapters (3-6), and the use of the learning theory critical constructivism and several curricular theories and concepts, including reconceptualization, responsive education, critical education, and standpoint theory, the objective of the final chapter was to reconceptualize the purpose of secondary level world history education. I developed an epistemological overview of what I envision a comparative global studies course to encompass that draws upon multiple areas of the social sciences, including history, political science, economics, and cultural studies. The ultimate intent behind a course like this is to provide students with the opportunity to critically understand the current state of our world and how this developed over the past 600 years through the development of globalization. Students need to understand why our world is the way it is in order to participate in and cultivate the global society of tomorrow. Afterwards, I discussed next steps that need to be taken in order to move towards an actualized history and social studies curriculum that is critical in nature and educates students into the complexities of globalization in the 21st century and our global history. In the following section, I will return to the original impetus behind this study—the intersection between my practical experience as an educator and my emerging scholarly interests in the field of education, and what this means for me and other educators based on the research conducted in this study.

**Educators finding a voice in a complex global society.**

I would like to end my final thoughts on this research study where I began at the beginning of this critical, philosophical, scholarly, and reflective journey—the
intersection of myself as a practicing educator and emerging scholar in the field of education. There is one major takeaway from this study that goes beyond the extensive research, data analysis, and curriculum development conducted—if hegemonic interests (i.e., corporations, politicians, lobbyists, etc.) and even the American public at large are ever going to take seriously the task in creating and sustaining real reform to improve the quality of education in the United States, educators are going to have to take charge of their profession and find their voice in leading this change. Until the voice of experience permeates the hegemonic control over public education reform, no true change will ever come about to transform American schools and its antiquated education system that was designed for a different era.

In this era of structural education reform, standardized testing, and erroneous accountability systems, educators have to move themselves from the sidelines of public education to the forefront of the conversations and actions on what reforms need to occur to achieve the goals of a 21st century education for a global society. With this, educators need to become more accustomed to navigating in and outside the confines of the standards and accountability movement in order to provide students a responsive education that affords them the abilities to critically traverse the complex global society that they live in.

If teachers were ever seen as professionals in American society, they need to re-professionalize themselves as developers of curriculum and pedagogy, and reformers of the public education infrastructure. Structural education reform has removed autonomy and professionalism from teachers due to the bureaucratic role of the standards and accountability movement in public education (Bushnell, 2003; Day, 2002; Gitlin &
Labaree, 1996; Helsby & McCulloch, 1996; S.L. Robertson, 1996; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Educators need to advocate for themselves and their students in these actions. Educators can no longer do this on their own; they should collaborate with one another in a truly meaningful manner that is ultimately beneficial to each other, their students, and society (Bushnell, 2003; Kuzmic, 2006). This is often easier said than done, but educators can no longer close their doors and become “isolated islands” of teaching and learning. The current national and global society we live in is too complex and constantly changing to navigate on our own. Educators need to counter the hegemonic forces that dictate public education, its purpose and reform, and overall place in society. In addition, educators need to counter the “narrowly defined hegemonic constructions of what it means to be a professional” (Kuzmic, 2006, p. 6). Once enough educators do this, the more difficult it will be for the hegemonic forces to fill our news and social media with stories about how our nation’s students are failing, falling behind, and not competitive with other youth around the world.

One way that educators can begin this process is to become more involved with the education reform movement and not just be bystanders of policies implemented by “others” (i.e., non-education professionals, politicians, corporate interests, etc.). “The teaching and learning process is intimately connected to the research act” (Kincheloe, 2008a, p. 3). “Teacher-research provides a means to challenge hegemonic discourses that ultimately support structures, policies and practices that serve in the deskilling, the devaluing of professional autonomy, and the deprofessionalization of teachers” (Kuzmic, 2006, p. 7). Educators need to be vocal and willing to share their research, strategies, methodologies, and practice with other like-minded professionals and to the “outside”
world to exhibit the kinds of transformative, critically based approaches that educators are using with their students. This can be implemented in a multitude of ways from formal research studies to action research and self-study to teacher professional development sessions to collaborative teams on a department, school, and/or district level. The research that I conducted in this study is my start into this process by merging my dual roles as an educator and scholar in the transformation of public education for a 21st century global society.
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