

**National history curriculum:  
Finding space for a critical global education**

By

Phillip Albert Hophan

B.A., Ithaca College, 1998

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Curriculum Studies)

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

DECEMBER 2006

© Phillip Albert Hophan 2006

## Abstract

This investigation provides important insights for how a critical model of global education might be incorporated within national history pedagogies, in the face of increasingly strident neoliberal policy making in education. The demand of teaching, learning and theorizing in the contemporary political environment of the United States or Canada exerts undue pressure on students, teachers, and educationalists in the name of standardization, assessment and global economic preparedness. This research illuminates the critical possibilities that lie in the cracks of such oppressive policies, possibilities that may encourage students and teachers to act more substantially in defense of a globally infused national history education. Numerous foundational definitions of global education and four emergent models are extracted from a survey of North American global education literature, since 1980. These models are located in the official national history and social studies curriculum of the state of California and the province of British Columbia, respectively. Neoliberal educational policymaking is examined for its bearing on the advancement of global education in these jurisdictions. Significant differences in findings in California and British Columbia are explicated. Freirean critical pedagogy is considered as a theoretical framework for students and teachers to employ in turning back the neoliberal tide, by finding and utilizing space within the official national history curriculum for the rooting of a critical global education.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Preface.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Dedication.....	x
 Chapter I Introduction.....	 1
Purpose.....	1
Context.....	3
Significance.....	9
Research questions.....	14
 Chapter II Methodology.....	 15
Data collection and analysis.....	15
The researcher.....	20
Limitations of the study.....	21
 Chapter III Literature Review.....	 25
 Chapter IV Global education models.....	 57
Learning about the world.....	70
Learning how to live in the world.....	72
Learning how to compete in the world.....	76
Learning to transform the world.....	80
 Chapter V Place of global education in contemporary official curriculum documents.....	 84
Official social studies curriculum documents in British Columbia.....	85
Official history curriculum documents in California.....	95
 Chapter VI Neoliberal policy making and the advancement of global education.....	 111
Globalization.....	116
Education.....	122
National history curriculum and Global education.....	131
 Chapter VII Finding space within the official curriculum for a critical global education....	 138
Freirean critical theory.....	141
Implications for teachers and students.....	158
 Chapter VIII Conclusions and recommendations for further research.....	 166
References.....	172
 Appendices.....	 195
Appendix A: Global education: Definitions, conceptualizations, models.....	195
Appendix B: Summary list of curriculum documents.....	196

## Preface

Given this investigation's interest in curricular documents, it is appropriate to describe briefly my own conception of curriculum. This research suggests a set of implications for the teaching and learning of national history in California and British Columbia. It does not empirically reflect the work being done by actual teachers and students in their classrooms in these two jurisdictions. If educationalists, teachers and students are to make use of this research, they must accept and embrace the emancipatory possibilities that exist around curriculum design and delivery. An educationalist maintaining a restrictive interpretation or definition of curriculum may consider the findings of this research too ambitious or utopic. This educator must decide if the findings are convincing enough to adjust his or her outlook on curriculum. The educationalist who finds my curricular orientation compatible with his or her own, more easily accepts the notions of critical pedagogy forwarded here.

In my opinion, teachers should be activists who advocate for children on a daily basis. Curriculum is the spirit and practice of this daily advocacy. Curriculum documents at some level are helpful to organizing meaningful classroom activities. However, when curriculum is heavily mandated, teacher and students cannot create curriculum together in a local and organic manner. As teachers and students approach the daily goings-on of the classroom, they should be inspired and excited by the possibilities that lie on the horizon of their teaching and learning. This inspiration is the curriculum Doll (2000) speaks of when he describes curriculum as "... coursing, as in an electric current" (p. xii). As teachers and students negotiate the intellectual challenges associated with the practice of this conceptualization of curriculum, they become aware of specific trials that face them at the hands of the neoliberally inspired official curriculum. Mandated curriculum and assessment in California is pervasive; it can easily



dislodge the inspiration students and teachers share as they investigate, and attempt to improve, the world in which they, and many others, live, work and play. In British Columbia, it is my contention that the current provincial curriculum and examinations are the early stepping-stones toward what has become a pressing matter in California. Here, it is helpful to quote John Dewey (1935) at length as he provides insight into this conceptualization of the work of teachers and students:

What will it profit a man [or woman] to do this, that, and the other specific thing, if he has no clear idea of why he is doing them, no clear idea of the way they bear upon actual conditions and of the end to be reached? The most specific thing educators can first do is something general. The first need is to become aware of the kind of world in which we live; to survey its forces; to see the opposition in forces that are contending for mastery; to make up one's mind which of these forces come from a past that the world in its potential powers has outlived and which are indicative of a better and happier future. (p. 7)

For critical pedagogy to be employed as a useful framework for teaching and learning, curriculum must be conceptualized in this manner. Teachers and students who create meaning out of the educational experiences they share are behaving contrary to a conceptualization of curriculum that is economically inspired by and politically mandated for use in every North American classroom; standardization, here, is the objective of neoliberal<sup>1</sup> policy making.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this investigation, neoliberalism is continually defined and conceptualized, but always from a critical perspective that finds neoliberalism an oppressive ideological movement. There exists, although no reference will be made to these influences, a field of support for neoliberalism as the driving economic force in the world since the 1960's. Furthermore, there are groups, for example, on the conservative right in the United States and Britain which have problematized neoliberalism for their own explicit reasons. This investigation does not agree with these distinctions, nor does it attempt to include them in this report.

At the same time, curriculum may be theorized in a largely pragmatic manner. The nature of the official curriculum invites students and teachers to exploit the structures and expectations inherent of the school day, to find space<sup>2</sup> within that system for the rooting of alternative projects. While teachers cannot realistically look forward to a complete reform of the four-walls, bells-a-ringing, lunch-served-on-a-plastic-tray realities of most school settings, their work as educators can be transformative. On the other hand, if the official curriculum is allowed to dominate the minds and actions of students and teachers, standardization results and all those involved will suffer the consequences of a paralyzing daily existence.

Curriculum can inspire praxis for and between teachers and students. This condition is not easily acquired. Henderson and Kesson (2004) offer insight into the matter of achieving a balance between the theoretical and the pragmatic nature of education when they suggest teachers might reach a point of “curriculum wisdom” in their educational venture. It is my assertion that successful propagation of content knowledge depends to some extent on the teacher’s state of mind. When teachers and students strive for curricular projects such as the one researched here, the learning that goes on far outweighs what is gained through the implementation of an official curriculum. Those who mandate the curriculum might believe that students are better off not envisioning a different world and that students need not be inspired to act upon what they know and what they have experienced in the interest of humanity. Teaching and learning under these conditions limits the ability of the curriculum to inspire intellectually based responses to future problems. This is not an appropriate means by which to educate our children or to reform society, locally or globally. The cross-fertilization of critical, practical and

---

<sup>2</sup> The term “space” is employed here as a metaphor for the possibilities teachers and students have to forward emancipatory projects in spite of the formal structures of the official school curriculum. This clarification reflects the abundant use of the term in gender, sexuality, multicultural, and in other critical literatures.

visionary inquiries discussed by Henderson and Kesson, characterize the elusive notion of curriculum wisdom. While this utopic vision of curriculum design and delivery may be challenged for its incompatibility with the norms of current trends in education and assessment, it is that very place of dissonance where a critically stimulated, globalized and just national history teaching may root. It is within this framework for understanding curriculum that this research project finds its inspiration and direction.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Department of Curriculum Studies, the Faculty of Education, and the Faculty of Graduate Studies at the University of British Columbia for accepting my application and supporting my studies by providing services essential to my success as a graduate student.

I recognize my faculty committee as absolutely invaluable in my pursuit of a thesis degree. I am indebted to Penney Clark for her extreme dedication to guiding my research, reading, and writing. The support and confidence she provided was welcomed at every turn, particularly when she saw in me potential for improvement and insisted I achieve that potential. I also thank Penney for the opportunities she provided me to participate in her own research endeavors. I hope that was able to contribute in some minor way to the success she will continue to have as an award winning professor and researcher.

To Wayne Ross, your teaching and advice challenged me personally and professionally. In a manner not often duplicated, your slight of hand style and your daily demonstration of experienced-based teaching methods will not go unforgotten. Your advice was vital in my successful completion of coursework, research and conference participation.

To William Pinar, although I wish I could have dedicated more attention to the significant projects you have on your horizon, your teaching and particularly your voluminous writing has been and will continue to be a guiding light in my own academic pursuits. You are larger than life, and yet are the most gentle and soft-spoken gentleman I have every met. Your outright appreciation of my academic contributions meant more than you know.

I owe a special recognition of Peter Seixas and the associates at the Center for the Study of Historical Consciousness: Carla Peck, Stuart Poyntz, Yoko Namita, Rosa Sevy, and the

tragically late Michael Cromer. Faced with trials and tribulations this year that were larger than us at times, the Center, its Director, and the associates continued to amaze me with their perseverance and dedication to the largest and most important projects in Canada around the subject of history education. Your support of my research interests, and the opportunities for debate and discussion that came with close personal and professional time together will continue to inspire both my historical theorizing and the reality of my teaching experiences to come. I wish all of you the very best of luck and success in your personal and professional lives.

I must make mention of three individuals who provided ongoing support for my organizational efforts and whose professionalism and unending imparting of knowledge are precious resources no graduate student could ever repay. To Ulrike Spitzer, of the Network of Centres and Institutes; to Shelagh Plenty of the Department of Curriculum Studies; and Basia Zurek also of Curriculum Studies, you all play such an essential role and will continue to do so for hundreds of future graduate students.

## Dedication

I am indebted to so many people for the love, support, guidance and inspiration imparted to me over the course of my lifetime. Those same influences continued to find their ways into my life as I wrote this thesis and I must thank you for all that you have done to sustain me.

To all of my wonderful and caring parents and grandparents, whose love and support, in all their unique and different ways, has been foundational to who I am as a person and who I strive to be as an academic and teacher.

To my academic advisors, professors, support staff and new found friends at the University of British Columbia and in Vancouver, British Columbia, my intellectual experiences would be incomplete without all that you offered in the way of teaching, listening, and helping.

To my students of past years, I am inspired to do better as I reflect upon our time teaching and learning together. To my students who will one day sit with me in a classroom somewhere, my work has inspired me to do great things with you, and to teach and act in defense of a just educational experience for you and those who follow.

Most important to me, no matter what, is the love and companionship of my dear partner Maria and our beautiful son Isaac. Maria, you amaze me in your capacity as a woman, as a musician, and as a person. Thank you for our son, the gift of music you bring into our lives, and the work you do as a teacher. Goodness knows you have taught me the world. Isaac, although it will be awhile before you can read this, and while you were the best distraction ever from my reading and writing, I am enthralled by every whimper, cry, smile, shriek, and tooth you produce. I will protect you and love you both forever.

I dedicate this humble contribution to you, who have made great sacrifices from both far and near, so that I may succeed.

Thank you.

Excerpt from a Freirean inspired Sandinista (Nicaragua) science textbook, circa 1980:

*"We can only say we have learned something when we are capable of applying [knowledge] to transform little by little our reality."*

(quoted in Westerman, 2005, p. 117)

## **Chapter I: Introduction**

### **Purpose**

This investigation has four purposes to which the researcher is earnestly dedicated. First, the field of global education is surveyed for the purpose of gauging the core definitions and resulting models of the field, since 1980. As Thomas Popkewitz (1980) asserted at global education's contemporary conception, "An initial glance at the literature makes me gasp at the word configurations . . . I think I value global education, but I am mired in its linguistic confusion" (p. 303). To partially alleviate this difficulty, popular definitions as they have first emerged in the field's literature are identified. These definitions are used to formulate four models of global education, each representative of the vast literature that exists beyond the definitional origins from which the model emerged. The field is subjected to a comprehensive and non-essentialist scrutiny of its goals and of global education's ability over time to grow its central missions in light of neoliberal policy making towards education.

Second, the official national history curriculum of British Columbia and California is examined for evidence of the four models of global education. In the United States, " . . . a history centered curriculum in which controversial questions are avoided or de-emphasized or in which the experiences and perspectives of certain groups of people are arbitrarily ignored or misrepresented is more akin to indoctrination than a defensible conception of social studies" (Whelan, 2002, p. 49). In the United States the global perspective is often ignored, as standards based education reform in California sidesteps opportunities that encourage a critical global inquiry. In Canada, the outlook is more positive, yet concerns still exist for the future of global education in British Columbia. "By the early 1990's [in Canada], it was apparent that two distinct paradigms were competing for control of the educational reform agenda: education for global



economic competitiveness and education for global interdependence. Despite the fact that 'the paradigm of global economic competitiveness' has dominated educational reforms, there has been little debate about the problems posed by this kind of globalization" (O'Sullivan, 1999, p. 321). In Canada, it is unknown the manner by which global education will be employed in the future, however, the field enjoys some official support currently. The prospects for global education existing as, or in the case of British Columbia, remaining a vital component over this period of increased standardization becomes evident.

A third purpose is to hold responsible neoliberal economic policies, and the educational mandates around curriculum and assessment that grow from them, for their bearing on the position of global education. As David Gabbard (2000) suggests, the political agenda for school-reform minded individuals must include a realization that "meanings assigned to a whole vocabulary of words and phrases frequently used to discuss the role and reform of U.S. public schools reflect an essentially economic view of the world" (p. xi). Furthermore, David Geoffrey Smith's (2003) notion of the first type of globalization, that of "the dominant form arising out of what can broadly be called the revival of radical liberalism, or neoliberalism, dating back to the administrations of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher in the 1980's" (p. 35), speaks to the possibility of what has become pervasive in the United States as gradually occurring in Canada. In British Columbia, a provincial curriculum, official resources, and mandated examinations have been implemented for grade eleven social studies. While the existence of these does not mean a corporate influence has found its way into the content of the curriculum, the curriculum must be examined for evidence of an ideological foundation. In California the stakes are reportedly higher around school performance. It will be decided to what extent the content of the

curriculum is more or less able to support global education given the pressures faced by students and teachers in the state.

Fourth, Freirean critical theory is employed to find prominent real estate within the official secondary national history curriculum for the advancement of a critical model of global education. Paulo Freire wrote, "Any educational practice based on standardization is predetermined, is bureaucratizing and anti-democratic" (quoted in Shor, 1993, p. 28). A critical model of global education, inserted into the national history curriculum in California resists the standardization of the curriculum content. In Canada, opportunities for this same project must be supported where they exist, and encouraged where they do not. Freirean critical theory can help teachers and students to reject what is unwanted and unjust in the way of history curriculum that is, or could be, crafted in the spirit of neoliberal economic objectives.

### *Context*

A significant number of intellectual pursuits have influenced the composition of this study, including: the examination of the field of global education, the official curriculum documents that govern national history teaching and learning, neoliberal policy making as it has played out in educational reform, and the theoretical domain of critical pedagogy. While each of these strands contributes its own significant context, it is the contemporary implications of all four colliding with each other that provokes genuine interest. In California, this cross-fertilization might exhibit a different composition than in British Columbia. The extent to which neoliberal influences have impacted global education in each jurisdiction will determine if critical theory is required to accomplish the project of globalizing the national history curriculum.

In defining the abstract concept of global education, scholars using multidisciplinary perspectives have been unable to determine how the field might best contribute to students' understanding, this being the purpose of continuous re-examinations of its definition. While William Gaudelli (2003) admits no comprehensive literature review has been done of global education, this author makes the effort to demonstrate some of the definitions and conceptualizations of global education as they have appeared through the global education literature (p. 7-8). Much of the modern theory around the need for global education principles to be included in mainstream social studies teaching was established by the work of Robert Hanvey (1976), when he set forth the notion that "education for a global perspective is that learning which enhances the individual's ability to understand his or her condition in the community and the world and improves the ability to make effective judgments" (p. 36). Roland Case (1999) notes, "There has been considerable vagueness and uncertainty about the goals of global education. Whatever else it is, global education is not about transmitting more information about the world . . . it is centrally concerned with helping students view the world . . . in a different light" (p. 76). As Merryfield and Subedi (2001) suggest, "A world-centered global education removes the nationalistic filters that allow students to only see . . . through the lens of their country's national interests and government policy" (p. 278). Finally, Gaudelli (2003) suggests global education is "a curriculum that seeks to prepare students to live in a progressively interconnected world where the study of human values, institutions, and behaviors are contextually examined through a pedagogical style that promotes critical engagement of complex, diverse information toward socially meaningful action" (p. 11). From this small sample of attempts to define global education, it is clear that the project to do so is ongoing, and yet there exists a consensus around some aspects of proposed definitions.

The local-global orientation of global education is an essential concept for students and teachers to grapple with as they seek out educational experiences that have reflected slogans such as “Act Locally, Globally. Think Globally, Locally,” and so forth. For teachers, efforts are made to help students embrace their local capacity for global understanding. For students, so much of the world on some level has been deposited on their doorstep so that a great curiosity about the world has emerged. It is as if an expanded world-view has allowed students to understand the local in increasingly humble terms, as citizens of both the local and the global community. “. . . [Through history education] we can see ourselves not only as citizens of a particular country, but as members of the human community . . . moreover, if we take democracy seriously, we have an obligation to take active interest, and ideally to play some part, in the affairs of those communities” (Osborne, 1995, p. 7). The expression of community and citizenship, by example, are increasingly transferable to the global context, for school children and adults alike. However, this context is at the same time problematic. Students and teachers are faced with contradictions, cynicism and outright attacks on the notion that either the local or the global provide the best arena for student learning, and the tension between the two has only to intensify.

Global education, over twenty-five years since the commencement of worldwide economic globalization in 1980, reflects great variety of favor and disdain for its advancement as a means to embrace the local-global dynamic. On one end of the spectrum, notions of global education as a critical pedagogy are present in the literature. On the other, assertions that “global education, like global thinking and the global economy, is a western, modern concept, reflecting the paradigm of industrial society” (Good & Prakash, 2000, p. 271) are present as well. While the basic premise of a ‘global education’ has great appeal, this investigation does not hold the field as all-important or somehow essential to the process of globalizing the curriculum. With

global education as a contested pedagogy, this investigation works to first define, and then reorient the cores assumptions of the field so that their purpose is clearly favorable to anti-oppressive applications within national history teaching and learning.

The notion at the forefront of this investigation is the place of a critical model of global education in mandated national history curriculum in two jurisdictions. National history teaching and learning are typically considered sacred ground, to be left untouched by the winds of critical reform, especially efforts to globalize the curriculum. The lack of critical reflection in American history is due to mandating of official curriculum that “. . . transmits selected factual knowledge and positive feelings about our society and the American way of life . . . ” (Evans, 1996, p. 152). In George Richardson’s (2004) account of the impact of globalization on the social studies, he writes critically (although notably less so than Evans’ account in the United States), “In terms of global education in Canada, citizenship has typically been seen in two ways . . . in both cases global citizenship is framed as a matter of national self-interest and almost exclusively tied to civic structures of the nation state” (p. 145). Under current political circumstances, space for a critical global perspective in the curriculum is limited, or in the case of California, it is nearly extinct. Educationalists and policy makers charged with the preservation of the national grand narrative in textbooks, standards and benchmarks, and other examples of the official curriculum do not often rely upon notions of global education or an internationalized teaching of national history in the California. In British Columbia, while there is no evidence to say that the official curriculum has had the same degree of impact on national history, the mere existence of a mandated curriculum and mandatory testing suggests controlling teaching, learning, and knowledge in the province will always have the potential for becoming the product of business and political ideology.

This investigation investigates the problematic rise of neoliberal policy making inherent in official school curriculum documents. Neoliberalism encourages an educational system that remains friendly to the needs and aspirations of a society and government bound by the very worst of worldwide economic globalization. "The phrase 'global village' has become clichéd, yet the extent of globalization is vast and real, for well and for ill" (Gaudelli, 2003, p. 3). The advancement of market-driven expectations within education has left in its path a trail of educational destruction riddled with standardized examinations, dictated curriculum mandates, the de-professionalization of the teacher, and learning experiences turned learning requirements. The advancement, or decline, of global education over the past twenty-five years is conceived of within the context of sweeping "reforms" brought to bear on schools by educationalists and policy makers bent on situating the entire enterprise of educational training within the scope of a managed business apparatus. David Smith (2003), historicizes global education in current social studies curriculum practices: "Most immediately, the language of globalization began to emerge...with the collapse of the binary logic of the cold war, a political dualism that had defined the international balance of power since the end of World War II" (p. 37). The influence of neoliberal education policy making has drawn fervent criticism from all sides since 1980, but capitalist-motivated doctrines continue to determine the status of global education, in the United States and to a much lesser degree, in Canada.

The fuel that powers national, state and provincial, and even local policies of standardization toward education, schools, teachers and students in this the age of globalization, are grounded in neoliberal governance. In constant defense of an open and free market, neoliberal strategies provide overarching support for the institutions and managers of the national and transnational economic infrastructure. Institutions of cultural significance such as schools are

required to adopt these measures, or accept the use of an official curriculum to guide their teaching and learning. As Michael Apple (2000) notes, “neoliberals represent dominant economic and political elites who are intent on ‘modernizing’ the economy and the institutions connected to it” (p. xxiv-xxv). Neoliberal policies do not discriminate. Whether in Canada, where global education must preserve its status, or in the United States, where global education must struggle for opportunities to be employed, standardization of any kind is harmful to any international project. Standardization is considered autocratic, while global education promotes emancipation.

Furthermore, schools as cultural sites which mandate all young citizens to participate, have proven increasingly political over the past twenty-five years, and have moved toward an ideological indoctrination around capital and consumerism that is too strong for young people to resist. In the California particularly, neoliberal policy making manifests itself in the corporate advertising that now goes on in schools, influences are present in the form of military recruiters pressing students to join, and a curriculum which favors a national historical narrative that evokes progress and power over critical analysis. In Canada the threat is diminished, and yet a public demand for school accountability, driven by private interests, may very well continue to spur on injustices not yet discovered in the official curriculum. Neoliberalism is operationalized in this investigation for the purpose of describing and debunking the influence of market based educational decisions that have been designed to bring national history teaching into the capitalist fold and discard notions of global perspective and social justice.

Various forms of critical theory have positioned themselves as possible frameworks that resistance-minded teachers and students might conjure up in opposition to neoliberal policy making. What remains questionable, is whether or not any sort of critically motivated apparatus

is capable of dislodging firmly rooted neoliberal tendencies grounded in the discourse of school improvement that are so powerful in California? Can Freirean critical theory be enacted to preserve the space that exists for global educationalists in British Columbia? Critical theory, for all of its claims, must prove effective in creating a spacious understanding for where and how teachers and students can reasonably, and not treasonably, fight the fight. Critical theory is examined, as it often is, as an emancipatory endeavor, one that aligns teacher and student against the claims and demands made by neoliberal educationalists and policy makers. Specifically, the writings of Paulo Freire seem capable of this enormous political task, as education should never be considered a neutral practice in either jurisdiction.

### **Significance**

This investigation provides students, teachers, and researchers in the fields of national history teaching, global education and critical theory, with important insights for how best to defend notions of critical pedagogy in the face of increasingly strident neoliberal expectations. The demand of teaching, learning and theorizing in the contemporary political environment exerts undue pressure on students, teachers, and schools, who are generally unprepared to guard against the onslaught of standardization leveled against the school sector in the name of economic preparedness. In California, standardization must be urgently addressed as having significantly altered the curricular landscape. In British Columbia, the importance of these findings resides in a project of rejecting the early signs that standardization has begun to impact teaching and learning. This research illuminates the critical possibilities that lie in the cracks of such oppressive policies, possibilities that may encourage students, teachers and educationalists to act more substantially in defense of a globally minded national history education.



For the student who is negotiating his or her way through the coursework and requirements typical of eleventh grade social studies or history instruction, it may be very difficult to recognize the added pressures that stem from increased political scrutiny of education. A critical pedagogical experience designed by teachers and students will allow young people the opportunity to observe the process of education that guides their learning. If students are able to, for example, ask insightful questions of the teacher that deviate from the normative and complacent design of a social studies or history class, not only will they experience a much more meaningful dialogue, the content of their questions would be informed by their own humanly experience, and not dictated by a one size fits all educational policy. Paulo Freire's theory of the banking of knowledge rings true here. "The theory and practice promulgated by banking education is that which domesticates the student, whilst dialogical education is based on the process of praxis in which the cultural experiences of the students seeks to define the social world and to challenge theory from the perspective of her/his oppression" (McLaren & Leonard, 1993, p. 4). By challenging the field of global education to take on a truly critical method, by asking teachers to become aware of the neoliberal policies that influence the official curriculum, and by situating this project in the most unlikely of places – the teaching of national history in the United States and Canada – many more students will be exposed to valuable attitudes and perspectives regarding the reform of current political policies toward education and schools. As citizens of the nation and of the world, students will experience national history learning in a way that emancipates them from that history.

For teachers, possibilities for significant breakthroughs on many fronts present themselves in this investigation. For those educators who have had very little exposure to the field of global education, this research suggests that now is the time to explore this pedagogy,

albeit drastically re-imaged as a truly critical practice, for its bringing to the forefront of students' minds issues facing all of humanity. For educators who already employ the techniques of global education, this investigation recommends ways to evaluate the impact of their work, to assess the pedagogical form global education has taken in their classroom, and to measure the ability of their lessons to significantly transform the way students observe the world.

For the *activist* teacher, or someone who is very much aware of how neoliberal policies manifest themselves in the everyday of the classroom, this project offers much needed support and a purposeful framework for formulating resistance to such an assault. A primary challenge in disseminating a critical model of global education to pre-service and professional teachers of social studies, is the lack of an exhaustive staging of all that pertains to the discipline; it is difficult for a teacher to fully appreciate the scope, history and present day curricular weight of global education simply because they lack access to a holistic study of the subject. For teachers, the most significant aspect of this study proposes critical pedagogical practices that will neutralize the ill effects of standardization, weighty measures of assessment, and increasingly oppressive policies toward education. Paulo Freire's theories of critical pedagogy can "...enable teachers to acquire a greater purchase on forms of critical practice that might serve to interrogate, destabilize, and disorganize dominant strategies of power and power/knowledge relations and in doing so envisage a means of enlisting pedagogy into the construction of a contestatory space where a radical and plural democracy might begin to take root" (McLaren & Silva, 1993, 48-49). If teachers and students consider standardization and assessment oppressive, they must work to alleviate that oppression which is inherently a political project. Notions of the freedom and space that is garnered from a close and critical approach to standards based learning models are too

impressive for teachers, students and global educationalists to ignore and the risks involved with not questioning standardization are far too great.

This research constructs a unique application of global education to that of the national history education realm. Global education must consider its advancement in light of neoliberal strategies cast upon the work of all educationalists, and further consider reforms that might reinstate that advancement in the most meaningful ways possible. This investigation suggests global education as a political pedagogy and in this respect, the field has the choice of supporting education either as “facilitating the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bringing conformity to it, *or* [emphasis added] as the practice of freedom, where men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world” (Shaul, 1983, p. 15). The latter must have a place in the teaching of national history, if learning history is to inspire critical awareness in students. In California, historical content has fallen prey to neoliberalism and is characterized as an economic narrative. In British Columbia, it is not evident that the national history curriculum has suffered in the same manner, however, the imposition of official curriculum and testing is currently being used to assess student and school performance, and teachers reportedly fear losing control over the design of their curriculum.

Critical theory must persist in demonstrating its ability to inspire revolutionary praxis; theorizing about teaching and learning must arouse a sense of a need for social action in the classroom where teachers and students are encouraged to transform the conditions that presently exist, or preserve ones favorable to emancipatory teaching and learning. Critical theory, specifically espoused by Paulo Freire, must continue to guide and challenge progressive educators throughout North America with notions of a highly politicized education, the

unification of action and analysis, the centrality of dialogue in the process of learning, and the significance of critical awareness in social transformation (Hendricks, 1998, p. 4). Given that neoliberal policies are only gaining ground in mandating the processes of teaching and learning, critical theory must prove that commonly accepted and valued notions of social justice have the ability to inform a meaningful objection to this oppressive contemporary political reality.

Lastly, in the United States national politics do claim education policy and school reform as an important platform item (especially during elections), and federal legislation is written to direct state enforcement of these policies. "George W. Bush's 'blueprint' to 'reform' education, released in February 2001 (No Child Left Behind), crystallizes key neoliberal, neo-conservative, and business-oriented education policies" (Lipman, 2005, p. 1). From a critical perspective, Ross (2003) describes the oppressive nature of official curriculum in the United States, "...standardized tests demand more standardization of curriculum – tighter control of what goes on in the classroom by people who are not there. Standards and tests are designed to promote a singular view of truth, knowledge and learning" (p. 1). In Canada, a political conceptualization of education "is much less common...except for some routine ideas about equality of opportunity, meeting students' needs and the like, political parties have for the most part steered clear of educational policy, treating it largely as an administrative matter best left to the professionals" (Osborne, 1999, p. 8). For educationalists working in California or British Columbia, it will be interesting to note the level of support for a critical global education within national history education, relative to each jurisdiction.

### **The Research Questions**

Having established the purpose, context and significance of this investigation, the following research questions will guide the method, analysis and theorizing offered in this research report:

- A) What are the emergent definitions and prominent models of global education in the North American literature, 1980 to present?
- B) What is the place of global education in the official grade eleven national history curriculum of the state of California and the province of British Columbia?
- C) What are some possibilities for using Freirean-based critical theory to find space within the official secondary national history curriculum to advance a critical global education?

## **Chapter II: Methodology**

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

#### **Research Question #1:**

**What are the emergent definitions and prominent models of global education in the North American literature, 1980 to present?**

An exhaustive survey of research and theoretical offerings from 1980 to present in the field of global education was carried out in two parts. First, authors who introduce specific definitions of global education for the first time in the field's history are discussed chronologically. An on-going project for all global educationalists is to define the field in terms of their own nuanced imaginations. When global educationalists refer to the work of a peer, it is usually by way of the definition that person is most associated with. As such, it is appropriate for this investigation to use first time definitions as an entrée into a review of literature.

Subsequently, these original definitions are clustered so that four models of global education are drawn from the work of the past twenty-five years. Once the narrative data were collected for the literature review, analysis included looking for theoretical as well as language based commonalities in determining a grouping of like-minded conceptualizations. Frequent occurrences of similar uses of certain definitional elements of global education allowed for the construction of four viable trends, or models of global education. The four models that emerged can be considered as wholly representative of global education and therefore can be used to determine the field's status within official curriculum documents, despite the ambiguous and competing variances of definitions that do exist in and around the field. The processes involved here are as valid as they are revealing.

## **Research Question #2:**

### **What is the place of global education in the official grade eleven national history curriculum of the state of California and the province of British Columbia?**

To investigate the second research question, selected contemporary curriculum documents of the official social studies curriculum in British Columbia and of the history curriculum in California were analyzed for their inclusion of the four models of global education. Official curriculum document selection is limited to the national history and social studies curriculum at the secondary level, grade eleven in British Columbia and California. The choice to pursue content analysis in these two jurisdictions was made based upon the author proximity to and familiarity with the official curriculum in the two sites.

The measurement used to assess and report upon the centrality of the four models of global education to these official curriculum documents is descriptive. The organization of the official curriculum's headings and demarcations, the language used in crafting the descriptions of pedagogical expectations and content standards, as well as the inclusion of notions alternative to or in opposition to global education have been critiqued; narrative explanations of all of these provoke a descriptive measurement that adequately assesses and reports the data. As a final step, the narrative data produced from the content analysis of the official curriculum was leveled against the emergent language of each of the four models of global education. Narrative descriptions were again used to report the degree to which each model corresponded with the language of the official curriculum. This analysis led to the production of implications for the state of global education, as it exists under the mandate of the official curriculum.

In the province of British Columbia, official curriculum documents (Western and Northern Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Education, 2000); Integrated Resource Packages (Ministry of Education, 2005a, 2005b), textbooks and textbook related materials

(Cranny and Moles, 2001), and provincially published testing preparation resources (Ministry of Education, 2006, 2005e), relevant supporting informational (Ministry of Education, 2002a), and instructional materials (Ministry of Education, 2006a, 2005) used by teachers, students, parents, and administrators, were scrutinized in an effort to determine the centrality of the four models of global education to grade eleven social studies. In order to provide as much data for critical and multi-layered analysis as possible, the British Columbia Civics 11 curriculum was included as a separate object of content analysis. A newly devised and only sparsely implemented course, the unique language of this particular document speaks to future development of curriculum in British Columbia; that is, leaving it out would have been ignoring the on-going nature of curriculum design in the content area of national history and civics education in British Columbia.

In the state of California (CDE will stand for *California Department of Education*), official curriculum documents (CDE, 1998), curriculum frameworks (CDE, 2005), content and skill standards (CDE, 2006e; National Center for History in the Schools, 2004; NCSS, 2006), textbooks and textbook related resources (Bailey, et al, 1998), state published testing preparation resources (CDE, 2006g, 2002), and relevant supporting informational (California Curriculum News Report, 2006; CDE, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2006f), and instructional materials (CDE, 2006d, 2001) used by teachers, students, parents, and administrators, were examined in an effort to determine the position of the four models of global education within the specific discipline of grade eleven United States history. In order to balance the inclusion of the Civics 11 curriculum in British Columbia, a separate analysis of the Grade 12 Government course mandated by the state of California was included.



### **Research Question #3:**

**What are some possibilities for using Freirean-based critical theory to find space within the official secondary national history curriculum to advance a critical global education?**

In order to investigate the third research question, critical commentary was collected and reported upon as to the possibility of neoliberal inspired educational policies having any impact on the centrality of global education to the official curriculum in California and British Columbia. Literature specific to educational policy making and curriculum design was surveyed to gain further understanding of what these neoliberal influences are and how they take shape in schools across North America. In order to further narrow the breadth of this literature, authorship that contextualizes its criticisms of neoliberal policy making in a critique of worldwide economic globalization, and an understanding of globalization's impact upon global education and national history education, was employed. Specific to each jurisdiction, the notion of neoliberal policy making is used as a framework to discuss the potential shortcomings and successes global education has had in asserting itself upon the official curriculum authorized in California and in British Columbia. The purpose of analyzing authorship that takes up a critique of neoliberal policy making towards education, and the perils of worldwide economic globalization, is to contextualize and better understand the nature of the official secondary national history curriculum in each jurisdiction. This being done, a more relevant and appropriate application of Freirean critical theory may be had. Highlighting neoliberal influences as important to the development of global education lays the foundation for a Freirean application that specifically targets the conservative political nature of schooling in the United States and to a lesser degree in Canada.

In order to explicitly address the third research question, Freirean critical theory was cited for its ability to find, create, and embrace space within the official curriculum that governs the

teaching of national history in each jurisdiction, for the placing of a critical model of global education. Specific strategies and implications for finding and utilizing the evasive space within the official secondary national history curriculum were drawn out of Freire's writings, conversations, interviews, and musings. This analysis of Freire's critical theory began with a comprehensive assessment of his foundational work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). Here, the fundamental themes of his work were explicated in terms of neoliberal policy making towards education. These three themes were employed in order to demonstrate the restrictive nature of neoliberal policy-making in education and to inspire critical opposition to those inhibitive measures. Freire posits *oppression, the student-teacher relationship, and dialogics* as instrumental in understanding what can both be gained and lost at the hands of the neoliberal regime. Finally, drawing upon Freire's later work, the notion of *colonialism* framed a set of potent implications for teachers and students as they prepare to embark upon this project of globalizing the national history curriculum in the face of official curricular mandates. In introducing Freire's theoretical basis as well as one of his most matured conclusions, this researcher was able to demonstrate fair, relevant, and strong use of Freirean critical theory as a means for teachers to reflect and act upon the current status of global education and the official curriculum within the context of national history teaching in California and British Columbia.

## **The Researcher**

I am a Master's student at the University of British Columbia who has eight years of secondary social studies teaching experience in American public schools in New York, Virginia, and most recently, California. I have taught primarily United States History, United States Government, and Economics, and to a lesser extent, World History and Geography. As a natural Canadian citizen, born to American parents, whose father immigrated to Canada during the Vietnam War, I have studied, resided and traveled in both countries extensively. Academically, my research is positioned in the field of curriculum studies, within the community of graduate studies in education. Intellectually, my investigation manifests itself as a political project inspired by national and global policy-making, as it describes the economic and cultural implications of these local and global political transactions. The bias I bring to this project is that of a persuasive political orientation; that is, I am a strong, left-leaning liberal, with great faith in the international society project located on the peripheral of geo-political reality. As well, I am passionately aware of the power-capital-class relationship as foundational to my criticisms of neoliberal educational policy making. I am a passionate educator and researcher, an enthusiastic citizen of the global community, as well as an ardent opponent of neoliberally, and neo-conservatively, informed worldwide economic globalization and the local manifestations of this governance upon schools and other cultural institutions.

### **Limitations of the study**

What Paulo Freire was working to defeat in Latin America, looks very similar to authoritative pedagogies of a past decade in the United States and Canada where a teacher-focused history classroom presides over an expansive domain of historical content. Today, students are faithfully trained and tested around the standardized-test. The nature of the official curriculum and accompanying assessments requires that many content activities or lessons be imparted with test-taking strategies. When Freirean critical theory was first explored in the context of North American education, educators were challenging the authoritative delivery method of knowledge to students. This investigation's contemporary application of Freirean critical theory faces a equal, if not worse foe in the mandated secondary national history curriculum.

The possibility of a domesticated critical theory (McLaren, 2003), or theory that fails to meet a transformative standard, is of concern to the researcher. This project should not begin by proclaiming the possibility of critical theory as emancipatory, and not deliver research, conclusions and implications that make good on this promise. What motivates this research project is the possibility of transformative changes taking place in regards to teachers' pedagogical consciousness and in the ways in which students experience national history that is globally situated. The hope is that others who read this research will be inspired to take transformative action to remedy what ails the official secondary national history curriculum in British Columbia and California.

To use Freirean critical theory is to inherently take on the criticisms of a great number of authors, many of whom have great respect for Freire but at the same time recognize contradictions or problems with his work. In surveying these potential conflicts, the following

issues have arisen within the scope of the application of Freire in this investigation, such as the repetitious and potentially overuse of Freire's work (Bowers, 1986), its vagueness (Elias, 1994, 1976), students' (peasants') ability to achieve what I, or Freire have set out for them to accomplish or become conscious of (MacEoin, 1972), that Freire's work is too utopic vision (Stanley, 1972), that the teacher has only to encourage a leftist (Caulfield, 1991) or elitist (Berger, 1974; Millwood, 1974) ideology, not to mention Freire's problematic conceptualization of dialectics (Au, 2006). Those unwilling to uncritically accept the popular notion of Freirean critical theory cite numerous other inadequacies. The subjects of these critics' angst include Freire's frequent and exclusive use of the male pronoun throughout his early work, his fervent political bent within the context of schooling, the casual pedagogical positioning of the teacher/facilitator, and the difficulty that exists in deciding between local and global applications of his theory, by example in environmental circles. When these issues present themselves in this investigation, they will be addressed.

Global education plays a prominent role in shaping and defining what a critical pedagogy might look like when inserted into the practice of national history education. This investigation strives to clearly define the field's potential to act as a critical pedagogy, and as having a globalizing effect on the teaching and learning of national history. Despite this investigation's de-emphasis of the field, it is important to recognize the numerous critics of global education (Werner, 1990) who specifically write from within or at the edges of the field, as opposed to those who ideologically dispose of any notion of a global education. Werner (1990) writes of three contentious elements around the political nature of global education: the varying, and sometimes competing, agendas that have begun and continue to drive global education; the contradictions that exist between the construction of official schooling and the values promoted

within global education; and, the existence of global-economic constructions that tend to dominate global education's scrutiny of the developing world (p. 77). This investigation accepts and promotes global education as a political endeavor, especially when applied to national history education. The official curriculum in California represents global education's political antithesis. In Canada, the official curriculum represents many more significant opportunities for global education. However, mandated curriculum and testing must remain a political issue that may not always remain friendly to global pedagogies.

Another potential limitation of this investigation has to do with its seeking to compare the United States with Canada as to each jurisdiction's relative association with neoliberal policy making in education, with practices of global education, and with national history teaching. The question arises if the two nations might be able to be compared at all, and is the choice to use the local jurisdictions of British Columbia and California the best that exists of all the provinces and states? If neoliberal policy making in education is grounded in larger market driven forces, then surely, both nations share significant tendencies towards a marketization of institutions such as schools and the neoliberal policy making that supports these tendencies.

Finally, this is an investigation that is grounded in the rhetoric of the official curriculum and not in the reality of the classroom experience. Official curriculum documents are playing an increasingly central role in the day to day of what goes on in classrooms in California and British Columbia, to varying degrees. In California, the impact of the official curriculum and high stakes examinations is pervasive and has progressed at alarming rates, In Canada, the impact is less severe, yet signs have emerged that, given the severity with which this curriculum and assessment is administered, teachers and students are likely to feel a great deal of pressure to

adopt these standardized processes. Therefore, an investigation grounded in theory and documents, is significant and will provide meaningful foundations for future research.

### **Chapter III: Literature review**

#### **Global education emergent definitions**

In Chapter Four of this thesis, emergent definitions of global education are further explicated as models of global education in order to determine the status of global education in the curriculum of British Columbia and California. The results will be examined in Chapter Five. The implications will be discussed in Chapters Six and Seven. The primary objective of this thesis is to instigate a critical global education. This is a pedagogy that will be inserted into the official curriculum which governs the teaching and learning of national history. The opportunity is made possible through an application of Freirean critical theory. Given the complicated nature of global education (Tucker & Evans, 1996; Tye & Tye, 1992), a survey of North American literature from 1980 to the present must be undertaken in order to discover core philosophical models. William Gaudelli (2003) admits that no comprehensive literature review of global education has been done (pp. 7-8). Not surprisingly, the task is complex and this investigation will not attempt to survey the entire field. As Thomas Popkewitz (1980) stated, "An initial glance at the literature makes me gasp at the word configurations ... I think I value global education, but I am mired in its linguistic confusion" (p. 303). Years later, Roland Case (1999) noted, "There has been considerable vagueness and uncertainty about the goals of global education" (p. 36). Global education is both criticized and embraced for the difficulty it has in defining itself. Toni Kirkwood (2001) reminded us early in 2001 (a year of unusually heightened geo-political activity and unrest), the global age was upon us: "Despite some definitional ambiguities, global education offers teachers opportunities to guide students on their twenty-first century journey to shape a more perfect world" (p. 14). While each year brings reconfigurations and addendums to the language of purpose in global education, each author's contribution



supports the next endeavor to define the field. This review of literature does not distinguish between Canadian and American global educationalists and does not make the attempt to offer a definition specific to British Columbia or California. A review of North American literature will provide the necessary context for which to examine the status of global education in each jurisdiction.

### **The Global Perspective**

Global education was first put forward as a necessary endeavor by Becker and Anderson (1969). While this text falls beyond the scope of the thesis, it is interesting to note the broad goals of these authors: the development of awareness, attitudes, and competence related to global interdependence; cultural diversity; oneness of the human species; individual participation in global society; diverse perspectives and values; and an understanding of current world conditions (Kniep, 1985, p. 17). This thesis outlines the definitions of global education which have been generally accepted.

By 1976, literature in global education had defined doctrines aimed at focusing the efforts of teachers and schools to promote curriculum and teaching that might complement narrow Western viewpoints with more worldly ones. Robert Hanvey (1976) offered interesting possibilities for the infusion of global education into the school curriculum and strongly suggested that schools were the one cultural entity that might encourage world views alongside national and self-interested perspectives. Writing critically of media influences that shape society's consumer mentality, Hanvey identified the notion of *perspective* as a important in countering this stimulus. Perspective, for Hanvey, allows students to challenge commonly held assumptions about social, economic and political conditions around the world. Students would consider alternatives to conventional solutions to world problems that Western learners and

leaders cannot imagine. Hanvey offers five *dimensions* for attaining a global perspective in students' minds. His expansive construction provides a blueprint not only for considering perspective, but also defining and re-defining global education over thirty years. Hanvey's influence is found throughout the literature. Hanvey (1976) wrote, "With effort we can at least develop a dim sense that we have a perspective, that it can be shaped by subtle influences, that others have different perspectives" (p. 5). In addition to this first dimension, *perspective consciousness*, Hanvey suggests four additional demarcations to encourage a wider perspective: *state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, and awareness of human choices*. These points are described in Hanvey's (1976) "An attainable global perspective." It is clear that students who are given opportunities to widen their perspective will develop cognitive skills to assist them in sorting out world issues. At the same time, they can reflect upon their own position in relation to the world. After exploring developments in communication and technology, the natural environment, emerging world systems, global change and transition and shared humanity, Hanvey warned the reader:

The central message of these studies is awesome. Before very long the world system is going to break down. Exponential growth is treacherously rapid and will bring us to the earth's finite limits – and thus to a condition of severe stress – within a few generations.  
(p. 31)

Hanvey challenged proponents of global education, teachers and students to reverse this march towards Doomsday. Nothing else would "light the fire" under academics who write about these enlightened visions of global education and global perspective.

The literature in the late 1970s began to support Hanvey's conclusions (Kerr, 1979; Anderson, 1976; Nelson, 1976) and firmed up the foundation for the concept of perspective.

Clark Kerr (1979) cited systemic cognitive orientations, knowledge of other nations and cultures, and cross-cultural awareness as key in developing different perspectives in university and for secondary students who are increasingly aware of world conditions. Kerr agreed with Hanvey to the extent that both authors define global education as an expansive world-view rather than the current limited view

Global education theorists began to antagonize those who believed in nationalistic education in Western countries, especially the United States. Nelson (1976) noted, "Global education has not been a common activity in American schools" (p. 3). He argued that this was the result of nationalistic tendencies that find their way into all aspects of schooling. Nelson specifically cited California as having required educational edicts that ignore global perspective and emphasize moral patriotism. These political efforts leave little room for alternative viewpoints. Nelson suggested a definition of global education that contested the national bias in education during the late 1970s, that is, a need for a different form of nationalistic education: "one which fosters knowledge of global affairs without necessary hate of others or false national bias; one which provides for critical examination of national and global issues; and one that inspires a sense of global community" (p. 38).

Another proponent of global education, Lee F. Anderson (1976), examined perspective in the light of *interconnectedness* when he wrote, "We are simply saying that we need to recognize the existence of these [global] interrelationships and how we, as individuals and societies, participate in these linkages" (p. 137). Anderson offered four types of competencies: *awareness of involvement in the world system, decision making, judgment making, and the exercise of influence*. Anderson suggested ways of presenting global perspectives in which students might develop strategies for dealing with world issues from a position of humility and understanding.

For Anderson, global education's operational definition must provide a bridge between perspective and interconnectedness that allows students to observe the world and examine their assumptions. Students may feel responsible for how the world has developed to this point.

### **Global Interconnectedness**

Between 1979 and 1983, the concept of global interconnectedness in world systems influenced definitions of global education. Authors began to examine the global enlightenment Hanvey promoted in his work and they moved beyond identifying global perspectives to embracing the similarities and differences that exist between cultures (Woyach, 1983; Rosenau, 1983; Anderson, L., 1982; NCSS, 1982, 1981; Anderson, 1981; Swift, 1980; Sny, 1980; Taskforce on Global Education, 1979; Anderson, 1979; Leestma, 1979; Becker, 1979; Joyce & Nickolson, 1979).

In 1975, the US Commissioner of Education created a Task Force on Global Education which issued a "Report with recommendations" (1976). It noted, "The high degree of global involvement of the United States and its interdependence with other nations and peoples of the world are revealed daily by direct observation and experience" (p. 5). The report described instilling a sense of global interconnectedness in students: "Related to this interdependence are the enormous and growing deficiencies that afflict large segments of the world's population" (p. 5). While firmly rooted in a system whose purpose is to educate Americans for reasons of national security, defense and economic competitiveness, the report insisted that many avenues for promoting a global perspective and interconnectedness would fall under the heading of global education.

Appropriately titled, "Schooling for a global age," James M. Becker's (1979) collection of essays is chosen from authors who have moved beyond mere perspective taking. Becker

himself argued for a definition of global education that promotes world-centered schooling with an emphasis on the community of humanity. It should express the goal of “[developing] within students the competencies required to live intelligently and responsibly as individuals, human beings, earthlings, and members of a global society” (p. 41). For world-centered schooling and global education to establish a footing in the education system, Becker offered three views of global education: *world-centered education*, *world affairs or foreign policy studies*, and *world cultures or area studies*. For each view, the author suggested the primary goal was to provide realistic opportunities to embrace viewpoints that reflect globalization. Becker’s competencies are viewed by Swift (1980) as special cognitive skills that are essential to living and participating in local and national environs. They represent a multidisciplinary effort on behalf of teachers of all subjects to promote changing attitudes.

Sny (1980) offered a justification for Becker’s vision of global education. He defined global education as “the lifelong growth in understanding, through study and participation, of the world community and the interdependency of its peoples and systems – ecological, social, economic, and technological” (p. 23). Joyce and Nicholson (1979) expanded this concept of global interconnectedness by asserting the possibility of *multiple loyalties* or a philosophy of global education that exists, “as a system or set of beliefs and values that is internally consistent and at the same time complete enough to inform all the widely divergent programs that are included under the rubric of global education” (p. 98). The authors suggested three domains of education that met this lofty goal: *the personal*, *the social* and *the academic*. These domains elevate the notion of global perspective to that of global interconnectedness and attempt to explain the complexities of a world on the verge of cultural overlap. Furthermore, Leestma (1979) saw the resolution of the global and educational “facts of life” being reliant upon the

definition of global education. Global education is a multidisciplinary entity that not only identifies global dynamics, but encourages healthy and vibrant communities, nations, and humankind. Leestma (1979) noted, "The national mood – the beginnings of an awakening to interdependence and related global issues – and the educational movement seem to be coming together [and] there is movement and momentum in global education" (p. 242). Leestma believed that developing present realities beyond mere existence should be the goal of global educators. The National Council for Social Studies (1982, 1981) agreed when it described global education as:

Efforts to cultivate in young people a perspective of the world which emphasized the interconnections among cultures, species, and the planet ... to develop in youth the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to live effectively in a world possessing limited natural resources and characterized by ethnic diversity, cultural pluralism, and increasing interdependence. (1981, p. 164)

C. Anderson (1979) summed up the literature of this era when she defined global education as "consisting of efforts to bring about the changes in the content, in the methods, and in the social context of education in order to better prepare students for citizenship in a global age" (p. 3). Globalizing the content, making relevant the processes of teaching and learning, and refocusing social studies education in an international sense, Anderson argued, will bring the idea of responsibility in line with the notion of perspective.

Anderson (1982) insisted that it was imperative to expose students to a globalized education. Anderson cited the decline of American hegemony as reason alone to accept the notion that a global system without the restraints of a hegemonic element must be accompanied by a shift in global attitudes at the local level. This assertion opened the way for the declaration

made by global educationalists (Rosenau, 1983; Woyach, 1983) that it was a transnational world that teachers and students would be exposing themselves to when they engaged in global educational practices. By the mid-1980s the argument had shifted to global perspectives, global interdependence and the study of world knowledge and world systems. These elements became the essence in defining global education.

### **Global Knowledge**

By the mid-1980s, numerous authors were eagerly building upon the definitional foundation that included global perspectives and global interconnectedness. They offered content knowledge as pivotal to furthering the goals of the field (Cleveland, 1986; Oliver, 1987; Kniep, 1987, 1986a, 1986b, 1985). Kniep (1986a, also see Kniep, 1985) replied to the question of continued viability and current trends in global education with his treatise "Defining a global education by its content." In an effort to offer a more substantial orientation toward global education content, Kniep proposed "four elements of study as being essential and basic to a global education: the study of human values ... of global systems ... of global problems and issues ... of the history of contacts and interdependence among peoples, cultures and nations" (p. 437). Arguing that current world histories tend to reflect Western values and the spreading of those values to non-Western parts of the world, Kniep described global education as a specifically historical enterprise. It encouraged attention to the rooted histories of worldwide development. Kniep offered a conceptual map for the historical content of social studies courses that included: *interdependence, change, culture, scarcity, and conflict* (p. 537). He considered this essential in a global education that can claim to be grounded in content knowledge representative of global society and not just the Western world.

Cleveland (1986) described the concern for global education as grounded in content (i.e., facts and figures). He added that it would be impossible for students to use this stark knowledge beyond their high school years. Cleveland suggested an education system that observes the realities of a globally connected world must strive for a passion in student understanding. The understanding should include life-long association with world-minded principles, based in relevant and inspiring content knowledge. Cleveland included the following items that students might develop a *feel* for when studying world issues: *global change, national security, the way of the economy, cooperation and consent building, diversity and pluralism* (p. 43). This notion of global education (an entity that must stand upon a reliable and realistic set of content objectives) is developed by Kniep's (1987) assertion that school and curriculum reform must be based in a reorientation of the content to an increasingly global environment. These authors argued for global education as not merely complementing the work that was done in subject matter fields, but rather guiding the entire enterprise of curriculum design and delivery. Oliver (1987) cited *global learning* as an avenue of understanding that would allow students and teachers to process situations and issues in a way that would lead to "some more equitable distribution of the planet's cultural and material wealth" (p. x). These are lofty goals and yet the viability of global education seems to these authors to be predicated upon the appropriate acquisition of global knowledge by students and teachers. It is not merely a distant global perspective or peripheral understanding of global interconnectedness.

### **Global Systems**

As *world knowledge* became important in the definition of global education, its counterpart, a *global systems view*, drew increased attention in 1986 and 1987. Global education accepted that humans should not only be aware of each other and of our two-dimensional



relationship, but that ours is one of millions of social, political, and economic exchanges across the world in any given day. These exchanges make for a global system, a network that continually creates global conflict, global issues and global norms. Students of global education must be made aware of the complexity of applying their global knowledge to different beliefs and realities; a difficult task of balancing numerous viewpoints and removing nationalistic lenses. Those who introduced the formal application of a global systems view (Knierp, 1987; Lamy, 1987a; Lamy, 1987b; Alger & Harf, 1986; Boulding, 1985) must be acknowledged. Alger and Harf (1986) noted, "This perspective of global education simply asserts that there is a diversity of actors in worldwide systems and that these actors merit examination by those desiring to know how the world works and how to deal with pressing world problems" (p. 2). For these authors, global education is both defined and justified by the existence of global networks and systems, through which students become conscious of their influence on people living around the world. Global education, while accepting global systems, continually strives to make connections between the local and the global that demonstrate that these systems exist. Alger and Harf (1986) suggested five basic themes in worldwide relations and institutions which act as avenues to this type of world view: *values, transactions, actors, procedures and mechanisms, and issues*. They explained, "Each has offered a window of opportunity for grasping a piece of the essential nature of the globe" (p. 11). Global education must be defined by its potential to help students and teachers link the local to the global in balanced, meaningful and relevant ways.

Knierp (1987) described four domains from which a definition of global education might grow. For each domain, Knierp illustrated several points that define and justify the term "global." They are: *human values and cultures (universal values, diverse human values); global systems (economic systems, global political systems, ecological systems, technological systems); global*

*issues and problems (peace and security issues, development issues, environmental issues, human rights issues); global history.* This framework outlines what Kniep argued were the key elements of a truly *global* education where schools are making the local-global connection substantively and realistically.

Steve Lamy (1987a, 1987b) challenged global education to pursue measured goals connected with contemporary international systems. By 1987, these systems were on the verge of ushering in significant numbers of new actors and circumstances in addition to those present as the result of trends in worldwide globalization. In the contemporary international system, Lamy (1986a) cited nine elements as necessary for the inclusion of world systems in global education: *new state actors, multiple linkages, the increased power and influence of non-state actors, transnational enterprises, the increased power and influence of non-state actors, non governmental organizations, the establishment of international organizations and regimes, changes in distribution of power and force, growth of technology and communication networks, persistence of war and inequality, and a new international agenda.* Lamy (1986a) declared, "What developed was a more pluralistic international system in which actors, new issues, and new values emerged as the result of growth and expansion of the core states in the system" (p. 41). Setting aside concerns about undo nationalism and hegemonically based inequality, authors considered the establishment of a proper context for global education to be significant; that is, local participation in complex and highly charged world systems. Lamy (1986b) continued, "An education which is sensitive to system transformations and encourages the development of transnational competencies will prepare students for both cooperative and competitive situations" (p. 135). Certainly, Lamy is willing to accept globalization as a strong economic force in the

world, and yet puts great emphasis on helping students understand the power of cooperation and conciliation in the complex contemporary environment.

### **Geo-political**

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, the geo-political climate of the world shifted because of the end of the Cold War, the emergence of hegemonic conditions, and the advancement of the market economy and of world economic globalization. Global education would begin to define itself in political terms (Lamy, 1988, 1990; Tye & Tye, 1992). As a result, the field was forced to choose how to cast its influence – either for or against the status quo.

Lamy (1988) recognized four aspects of global education, each with very different political goals: *the neomercantilist or national interest, advocates of international society-communitarian viewpoints, Marxist orientated individuals, and the religious fundamentalist interest* (p. 32). Lamy (1990) presented strong opposition to what he claimed were “ultraconservative” forces in opposition to the political goals of global education. The author also warned about the “vague and ambiguous” definitions of global education that had been offered over time. With the ultraconservatives working to oppose global education, and while accepting global education as inherently political and controversial, Lamy cited Cunningham’s (1986) *Blowing the whistle on global education*, as the impetus for global education to respond to its politically driven critics. Lamy (1988) suggested, “Global education efforts must take unusual care to introduce teachers and students to contending theories that explain the actions of state and non-state actors and describe the characteristics of human relations in the international system” (p. 54).

Combining the analysis of school change with that of global education practice, Tye and Tye (1992) of the Center for Human Interdependence at Chapman College, reasserted the

inherently ideological nature and classification of global education as a social movement. Here the specific definition of global education becomes less of a quandary. The notion of global education as a set of critical practices that crosses multiple curricular and national boundaries allows for a more generalizable definition. This concept invited broad criticism of the movement for being too political and ideological for educational purposes. Tye and Tye suggested global education as a reform movement, not merely a pedagogical tool. They thought it reflected the deep structure of schools which, they argue, has schools follow first to the tune of the larger society and second to local aspirations.

The geo-political definition of global education emerged partly as a response to the emphasis of politicians and educationalists. They believed that an economic awareness should characterize all educational endeavors to adapt students' skills and attitudes to the realities of economic globalization and national preparedness, deemed all important by business and government. Sharpening the political edge of global education would inevitably draw criticism. As a result, global education would be moved to the periphery of mainstream educational practice. Acknowledgement of global education as geo-political, however, would provide an opportunity for resistance to economic globalization as manifested in the official curriculum.

### **World Economic Globalization**

In an effort to adjust global education to economic objectives that would become part of mainstream education and many other cultural institutions, a limited number of texts described global education in economic terms (National Governor's Association, 1989; Becker, 2002). The field did not embrace this shift, so prominent global educationalists moved decidedly to the left in their promotion of global education as contradictory to the influences of globalization. Yet, global events, national goals in education, and conservative politics strongly influenced global

education. Global efforts were described now as the project of increasing global knowledge and understanding as part of a skill set required by students and schools to compete in the global market. The conceptualization of global education as in favor of world economic globalization aligned itself with the geo-political aims of especially the United States, and to a much lesser degree of Canada. Although both nations entered to global market place as affluent western countries, the United States' mantra of economic preparedness dominated American curriculum, as it had during the Cold War. In Canada, while mandated curriculum and testing has been implemented, pedagogical approaches such as education were not forced to consider national economic objectives as they were in the United States.

The report of the National Governors Association (1989) in a document entitled, *America in transition*, called for the field of education to quickly identify and embrace the changing nature of geo-political conditions as "World trade and financial, economic, and political developments have transformed disparate economic systems into a highly interdependent global marketplace .... Today, the nations that inhabit the planet are often more closely linked than neighboring states or villages were at the turn of the century .... Schools and universities reflect the same lack of global understanding that pervades the nation from governments and business leaders to school children" (as quoted in Fleming, 1991, p. 1). The National Governors Association attaches great value to economic prosperity and believes that a global perspective in education is the means to achieve critical awareness and skills to this end.

In "Globalization and global education", Becker (2002) accepted the economic realities of economic globalization. He wrote, "The global marketplace, tourism, and massive flows of cheap information have multiplied the number of cross-continental contacts .... The United States has enjoyed a long period of prosperity, and most Americans seem to be satisfied with the

way the world works” (pp. 52-53). Alternatively, Becker and others (Barber, 2000; Nye, 2001) reflected upon the divide between promoting the global marketplace and realizing the failings of a government that is unwilling to support a geo-political infrastructure which might alleviate problems that globalization has created. Despite this attempt to recognize what can go very wrong in accepting the conditions of globalization, Becker accepted the premise that global education would continue to prepare students for success in the global economy. In contrast, many of Becker’s peers stressed that global education could reform these conditions.

It is well known that the literature that could speak for those who believe education should be co-opted in support of North American participation in economic globalization falls outside the global education field. However, the pro-globalization mantra is powerfully stated and will remain a challenge for those educationalists and global education theorists who envision a very different orientation for global education.

### **Global Citizenship**

As the world’s political and economic infrastructure continued to undergo great change, global education began to take on the issue of citizenship. More specifically, it engaged in the debate between a focus upon local, national or global citizenship that had occurred many times in global education literature. As citizens of the world and as global consumers, students were identified by global educationalists as in need of citizenship training (Reardon, 1988; Jefferson, 1988; Lamy, 1989; Tye, 1991, 1990; Anderson, 1990, 1991; Pike & Selby, 1995; Kniep, 1986b, 1985). This training would lead them to think critically not just of their own conditions, but those of people all over the world. This notion of citizenship was first used in defining global education by Kniep (1986b, 1985) when he asserted, “A global education prepares young people to participate responsibly in the whole world in which they live” (1985, p. 18). Again, the author

remarked, "A global education extends that mission by enlarging the vision and meaning of citizenship to include not only the local community, the state, and the nation, but also the global community" (Kniep, 1986b, p. 536). Reardon (1988) and numerous other authors suggested a peace-oriented education (one that envisions a peaceful world as the product of a just world) as the basis of any educational endeavor. Here we must acknowledge the uniqueness of peace education as opposed to global education, and yet it is difficult to ignore the prominence of a peace education in defining global education practices, especially where citizenship is concerned. Jefferson (1988) presented a number of controversial world issues as the basis of global education and saw these issues as the object of people's critique. Jefferson (1988) declared, "American students are members of a global community. Their education should include ways to help them learn how to accept differences in cultures, in values, and to respond to the emerging problems that are socially significant" (p. iv). Global education is faced with the difficult task of establishing loyalty to the state or the world, a conflict for any student who grapples with difficult global issues.

Lamy (1989) discussed this contentious debate in his article, "The national interest or global interests"? As mentioned before (Lamy, 1983), this author believed global education was guided by three competing viewpoints: the "national interest-neomercantilist", the "international society-communitarian", and the "human-centric". The last point is described by Lamy as the "intellectual center" of global education and one that "supports global education as a way of promoting change in the international system ... a more value-laden and prescriptive view [that] promotes a global education agenda that encourages the development of attitudes and then policies aimed at securing peace, social justice, a clean environment and economic well-being for all citizens" (p. 41). The emphasis on global citizenship, for global education, would expand

students' attitudes as citizens of the state and would consist of the following four intellectual goals constructed by the Danforth Foundation (1989):

1. Knowledge acquisition from a multiple perspective;
2. Exploration of world views;
3. Skills for understanding; and
4. Strategies for participation and involvement. (As quoted in Lamy, 1983, p. 44)

These objectives allow global education to design a curriculum that considers students and teachers to be citizens of the nation *and* of the world.

K. Tye (1990) and B. Tye (1990) advocated global education as a means of achieving school reform. This reform was radical and imaginative and had much in common with the concept of global citizenship already being entertained by students. L. F. Anderson (1990) saw changes taking place in the world that allowed reform in American schools. Although it began with the local-global connection inherent in global education (ASCD, 1994; C. C. Anderson, 1990), global education may be defined as generating educational change from social change, which stems from global change and an emerging sense of global citizenship.

Pike and Selby's (1995) *Reconnecting from national to global curriculum* is a major piece of global education literature in many respects. Their prime assertion is the importance of promoting the concept of global citizenship. Pike and Selby are critical of the present condition of schooling. They believe it is rooted in the industrial ways of the nineteenth century and suggested global education as a significant remedy for that ailment. "Global education offers an important way forward for schools – most, if not all, of which are still at a pre-global stage – so that they can make a more positive, purposeful and relevant contribution to preparing students for an increasingly systemic, fast-changing, polycultural and uncertain world" (p. 6). Pike and



Selby (1995) presented their four-dimensional model of global education (temporal, inner, spatial, issues), which will be discussed in its most current form (Pike & Selby, 1999) later in this thesis. On global citizenship in particular, Pike and Selby asked what they called *critical questions*: “Is there education for global citizenship? Do schools encourage the development of practical visionaries; students who have the necessary capacities to transform awareness into positive action?” (p. 23). By asking these questions and citing examples of current curriculum that either promotes or discourages answers to the questions, Pike and Selby are moving global education into the challenging realm of debate on the nature of citizenship, a debate that is ongoing in many educational and political circles.

Certainly, global education takes a significant step forward into controversial and yet established territory, when the field considers the possibility of global citizenship. Global citizenship (as rooted in the national imagination, rather than being grounded in the “global first national second” conceptualization of citizenship) will remain a dilemma for global educationalists. Each educator understands the concept very differently and while the former supports a mediocre effort to globalize the minds and actions of students, the latter breaks critical ground and encourages a progressive conceptualization of global education.

### **Critical Global Mindedness**

As the geo-political nature of the world began to settle into a post-Cold War niche, a great deal of literature (Schuyler & Schuyler, 1989; Werner, 1990; McConaghy, 1990) on critical thinking contributed its perspective to defining the practice of global education. In promoting the pedagogy of global citizenship, Schuyler and Schuyler (1989) found critical thinking to be the essential element in having students ask if and when social or even global change is necessary. They noted, “Critical thinking helps to cut through competing arguments and assertions that

surround controversial issues. It enables people to question inequality, to see the links among economics, politics, and hunger or human rights; and it helps them to gain a measure of control over the barrage of information to which they are subjected" (p. 163). Schuyler and Schuyler warned of the difficulty involved in power constructs and the origin of knowledge when they admitted, "A redistribution of power whether within the school, within Canada, or globally, faces immense challenges" (p. 164). If students raise critical questions in a global-education setting, their action challenges the status quo in such a way that is quite transformative if given the opportunity.

McConaghy (1990) simply stated, "Today there is a mismatch between the human mind and the world we inhabit" (p. 646). Global educationalists argue that students and adults alike lack the critical thinking skills necessary to measure actions and events in a global manner. Therefore, it becomes an impossible task for humankind to reform itself, given the atrocities the world has committed against itself. Global education might succeed, McConaghy argued, if it was removed from the curriculum as a separate subject and replaced with a global method that would cut across subject and content areas. Pivotal to this representation of global education was the observation that critical thinking skills were needed if a global perspective was to be retained throughout the curriculum.

### **Global Issues**

Global issues in education have been constant in the field's curricula. By the early 1990s global issues were an essential defining principle of global education. Global educationalists, as well as those educationalists interested in specific issues-based pedagogies (such as environmental education, multicultural education, peace education and a multitude of others), wrote a comprehensive commentary. This commentary places the primary focus of global

education on issues that students and teachers could get excited about, relate to their own existence, and that gave critical substance to the curricula. Only literature connected to or associated with global education should be discussed in this literature review, but attempts have been made to show how content areas outside global education might have affected global education itself at this time.

In the field of global education, many authors have identified a curricular focus on *issues* as an important component of defining the enterprise (Tye & Kniep, 1991; Fleming, 1991; Avery & Gamradt, 1991; Tye & Tye, 1992; Pike & Selby, 1995; Merryfield & White, 1996). Authors Tye and Kniep (1991) defined global education as "involving learning about those problems and issues which cut across national boundaries" (p. 47) as they attempt to find similar definitions of global education in the programs of other nations. By example, Tye and Kniep discussed the issue of third-world poverty (connected to Western agricultural processes) and trade with developing nations from the perspective of North American global education studies. In reviewing the changes to curriculum in the states of California and New York in favor of global education, Fleming (1991) determined that a focus on global issues played a significant role in these modifications. Avery and Gamradt (1991) examined how students perceive the world and concluded, "Students tended to associate social problems with the national and world spheres" (p. 324). They discovered that students understand the world in relation to problems that exist locally. Tye and Tye (1992) recognized a plethora of issues that teachers and students grapple with in global education settings. They concluded that global education was defined by its ability to relate education to global issues, current events, and world wide concerns (pp. 90-92). No discussion of issues-based global education would be complete without mention of Pike and Selby's (1995) *issues dimension*. This concept has three aspects: (1) calling upon schools to give

students the opportunity to learn about essential global issues; (2) requiring that students become familiar with and confront the principal arguments, opinions and perspectives brought to bear on specific issues studied; and (3) the application of holistic, or systems thinking to global issues (pp. 11-12). In collaboration with globally oriented teachers, Merryfield and White (1996) described an issues-centered version of global education as defined by its attention to political, cultural/social development, and economic and environmental issues. These issues relate to each other and to Western policies and institutions. They expose students and teachers to the possibility of an authentic global understanding and perspective. Merryfield and White (1996) wrote, "Issues-centered global education prepares young people for their adult decision making as citizens in a democracy who are inextricably linked to peoples and issues worldwide" (p. 184).

In September 1998, the journal *Social Education* featured global education: the challenges, cultures, and connections in that field. East (1998) wrote an article that emphasized the use of international issues in the post-Cold War era to orient students towards a more complex understanding of conflict and cooperation between nations. East (1998) cited a study of world economics, international organizations, and human-rights issues as key to this end and suggested, "The greater complexity of international issues means that it is more important than ever to analyze various sides of an issue" (p. 251). This journal regularly features articles on issues-based global education topics such as population, development, social and economic inequality, and human rights.

The emphasis on easily understood social, economic and political global issues could be readily compared and contrasted by students. In fact, global education was becoming defined more often than not by a study of tangible global issues. Some authors argued for a focus on

specific issues because global education was beginning to be accepted in the official curriculum of some jurisdictions. Most importantly, global education was identified by multicultural educationalists (Cole, 1984; McCarthy, 1990; Kobus, 1992; Wilson, 1993; Bennett, 1995) as a powerful rebuke to the racial bias inherent in any educational practice that does not include a global perspective. Cole (1984) believed that global education (when employed in defense of transnational, cross-cultural, multicultural, and multi-ethnic interactions) draws attention to international human rights. Cole drew upon previous definitions, yet he convincingly argued that these definitions in conjunction with “skills necessary to appreciate a culturally diverse local and global environment” (p. 154) have the power to multiculturalize global education. He believed this was a formidable objective for the field to endorse. In the same vein, Kobus (1992) considered global education and multicultural education to be conceptual and curricular partners, working to “lead individuals to informed decision making and social action against structural inequalities within the national and the global arenas” (p. 225). Kobus saw cultural democracy as the product of cultural diversity and he viewed both as existing first on national and then on global levels. Cultural democracy was, therefore, in the domain of global education. Other authors wrote specifically on peace education, environmental education and citizenship education. Yet others were interested in human rights and global economic development as key issues for students and teachers to debate. This literature has shaped the progress of global education. It influenced global education’s orientation to issues-based curricula and would accompany *global morality* in its rise to prominence in the second half of the decade.

### **Global Morality**

Helping students to meet cognitive objectives in their global education and taking emotional initiatives played into the definition of global education once an issues-based concept

of global education had taken hold. Literature citing global morality as a major advancement in the field (away from superficial generalization and limited long-term impact in teaching about global issues) encouraged concern in aligning students' hearts and minds as they prepared to face these issues throughout their life (Hammond & Collins, 1993; Case, 1993, 1996; Farr-Darling, 1994, 1995; CIDA, Canadian International Development Agency, 1995; Werner, 1996; Werner & Case, 1997).

In their inspirational piece *Educating children for social responsibility*, Hammond and Collins (1993) called teachers to action when they wrote, "Let's start now to develop globally appropriate values and attitudes in the consciences and consciousnesses of tomorrow's citizens" (p. xiii). They described world peace as impossible without this sort of attention to global moral development in students.

Case (1993) demonstrated this attempt by global educationalists to bring increased meaning to the concept of global perspective by suggesting, "Promoting the perceptual dimension involves nurturing perspectives that are empathetic, free of stereotypes, not predicated on naïve or simplistic assumptions, and not colored by prejudicial sentiments" (p. 318). Case (1996) also argued, "We are in danger of manipulating and indoctrinating students if we fail to encourage them to reflect on the implications and significance of adopting global attitudes" (p. 176). The tenets of global perspective, citizenship, and critical thought must also include personal action in support of some moral standard. Here, the cognitive and affective potential of global education to help students gain tools with which to critique the world emerge as the basic elements of a global perspective. Case called this element *empathy*, as did Farr-Darling (1995) when she investigated empathy and global perspective. Darling argued extensively for (and is supported inside and outside global education circles) "developing a global perspective which

recognizes the moral significance of individuals in the world, and hopefully strengthens ... connections among us" (p. 35).

Werner (1996) examined a *moral focus* as one of four starting points in global education, and asked teachers to ask students, "How could people elsewhere or in the future be affected? Do we have the right to jeopardize the health and security of those distant from us in time or space? Is it fair to borrow from the well-being of the next generation? What responsibility do we have to those not yet born?" (p. 172). These questions are complex and require students to make decisions not only about their own exclusive and privileged world, but about others' conditions of justice, fairness and equality.

Werner and Case (1997) saw global education as inclusive of many themes, none of these more important than "*caring* ... as expressed as a sense of concern, attachment, or commitment for someone or something" (p. 187). Discussing a third theme attributed to the 1990s, *the global future*, Werner and Case recognized the limits of students' involvement in what they learn at school. Another difficulty the students face is translating a current understanding to future events that will affect them and others in the world.

### **The Global Future**

Many authors (Gidley & Inayatullah, 2002; Selby & Pike, 2000; Pike & Selby, 1999; Townsend & Otero, 1999; Werner, 1999, 1996) continue the task of defining global education. It is a visionary enterprise to prepare students to make future decisions based on a learned respect of global understanding. Most importantly, this literature provides the basis for recent attempts to define education as invested in global-youth activism. For Werner (1995), *hope* illustrated this concern for the future. He wrote, "For children, pictures of a broken world speak directly to their own future. Implied is their tomorrow. Whether this realization occurs in a dramatic moment of

insight or slowly awakens as a vague awareness, the consequence can be uncertainty about the future or, even worse, some loss of hope” (p. 51). As an illustration, Werner described students’ behavior when they rejected contentious discussions on global issues and demonstrated a longing for positive class activities. Werner (1999) defined global education as emotive, informational, visionary, and a call to action in favor of a better future than the one represented in those essentially controversial images and descriptions typical of global education practices. As a second of his starting points for global education Werner (1996) noted a *futures focus*. Citing sustainability and development issues in global education, Werner suggested students must face the fact that reality will become more complex. They must be prepared to answer those questions with a finger to the wind of the future so that complex solutions will come to those who are cautious and aware of both their own fate and that of the future peoples.

Townsend and Otero (1999) wrote from the perspective of the Third Millennium schools project. They emphasized the need for global educational practice to orient students to the future and to require that they think about and engage in global issues as the future of education. These notions are reflected in Pike and Selby’s (1999) monumental work, *In the global classroom*, discussed below. In another piece, Selby and Pike (2000) “argue strongly for significantly greater consideration of the future; to provide learners with opportunities ... to dwell on a range of alternative futures, including the probable future ... the possible future ... and the preferable future” (p. 140). Selby and Pike (2000) anticipated a turn toward youth global action when they linked alternative futures to global citizenship and responsibility. Written in testament to this theory, Gidley and Inayatullah’s (2002) voluminous work, *Youth futures*, imagines a pedagogy that empowers individuals to reflect on the future (p. xii). In contrast to the next Pike and Selby statement, Gidley and Inayatullah suggested that all educators challenge, embrace, encourage,



and involve youth to this end. The future of global education depends upon students' ability to see the world clearly but, at the same time, work toward a positive future.

### **Global Activism**

By the turn of the century (2000), a review of the literature showed the effort by global educationalists to define the field. They saw their efforts as more transformative than those in the past and that, as a critical pedagogy, global education must use the skills, knowledge and attitudes that are the foundation for global education activities. It must infuse these activities with a deep moral concern and understanding for issues that face the world. The most influential authors (Gaudelli, 2003; Bigelow & Peterson, 2002; Global Citizens for Change, 2002; Merryfield & Subedi, 2001; Ashford, 1995) describe global activism as essential for students who consider their role as a global citizen as one who is prepared to learn, but also prepared to act.

In 1995, Ashford suggested that global education was a means to provoke students into social action. "Tomorrow's citizens will need to be able to analyze the merits of conflicting claims and the values on which they are based. They will need to know how groups and individuals influence policy decisions and will need the skills and the confidence to work change themselves" (p. 75). Grounded in the knowledge of social structures, Ashford discussed ways of empowering students through school organizations, with an emphasis on issues, debate and reflection.

In contrast to the safe national global-education activities, Merryfield and Subedi (2001) referred to a progressively global enterprise in which students' and teachers' minds are "decolonized," their Western assumptions are challenged, and where alternative global histories

are introduced. As Merryfield and Subedi suggested, "A world-centered global education removes the nationalistic filters that allow students to only see ... through the lens of their country's national interests and government policy" (p. 278). Merryfield and Subedi advised that students must investigate their own world-views to arrive at profound knowledge, skill and attitudes grounded in a global perspective. As a result, these students might act as global citizens, and not merely as Americans or Canadians who live at times in the global realm, but rarely act to reform that global dimension. Global Citizens for Change, a prominent global education organization, grounds these efforts in the subject of international development. The organizers present two definitional traits of global education curriculum and practice: "The first involves learning about the world and our impact on it; the second is about acting on that knowledge to help destroy inequalities and build a sustainable future for all" (p. 1); that is, being global citizens for change.

Bigelow and Peterson (2002) took a strong, somewhat apologetic, stance on the teaching of issues based on the debate on economic globalization. "The more we taught about issues of globalization, the more we found ourselves telling our students: 'Everything is connected. You can't really understand what's going on in one part of the world without looking at how it's related to everything else'" (p. 4). Bigelow and Peterson (2002) take a hard left turn at issues such as sweatshops, neoliberal policy-making, and military interventions when they suggest a direction which global educationalists might follow if interested in expanding the field to the outer edges of conventional educational practices. Varying perceptions of globalization will certainly play a major role in discussions of global education's definitional project as the future of the field is considered.

Finally, Gaudelli (2003) suggested that global education is “a curriculum that seeks to prepare students to live in a progressively interconnected world where the study of human values, institutions, and behaviors are contextually examined through a pedagogical style that promotes critical engagement of complex, diverse information toward socially meaningful action” (p. 11). Gaudelli reviewed research that introduced teachers and students who had actually grappled with controversial issues of globalization in an effort to promote global citizenship and social action. Students engaged in global education activities crafted around these definitions came away with knowledge they saw as relevant to their own action in the world, in the future, for the future.

### **Globalization**

In looking to the future of global education (and future attempts to define and redefine the model goals and objectives), many authors described the future as full of even more engaging critical possibilities and pedagogical progress (Noddings, 2005; Richardson, 2004; Tye, 2003). These possibilities included the importance of current debates on the impact of economic globalization patterns. Tye (2003) maintained the notion that global education must continue to be defined by traits of global citizenship and social action. He recognized the work that had been done around the world to this end. Finding varying results, Tye suggested that the tie that binds us in the world (the possibility and threat of globalization) must be the target of educational efforts to incite students and teachers to promote change in the world. Continuing in the same vein on how global education must be redefined in light of economic globalization, Richardson (2004) stated “that our understanding of global education has changed in response to different ways of viewing the world and that of globalization – a phenomenon that brings with it its own particular world-view – has emerged as a force that presents significant challenges to the

meaning and the role of global education in schools” (p. 138). Richardson emphasized a shift in stance from students’ knowing about the world to “one that suggested that students take a much more participatory and activist stance towards addressing global issues” (p. 141). Richardson described global education’s struggle to address issues of globalization with three debates which are sure to shape definitional discussions in the future: *transmission or transformation, single or multiple perspectives, national or global citizenship*.

On one side of the debate, Richardson quoted Smith (2000) to illustrate what he called the neoliberally inspired tack to decide between these opposed viewpoints. Smith believed the purpose of global education was to help students develop the knowledge and skills that would allow them to be competitive and successful in the global arena. Globalization was seen as an essentially positive force (Smith, 2000, pp. 7-26). On the other side of the debate, Richardson (2004) presented a brief summary of Spring’s (1998) and Couture’s (2000) arguments to illustrate the negative influence of global education. He wrote, “The purpose of global education is to help students develop a sense of connectedness, empathy, and an appreciation for the diversity and difference” (p. 147). Richardson continued with curricular excerpts from the same piece of legislation that used both definitions of global education. Richardson’s viewpoint indicates that global education is at a crossroads in this era of heightened globalization; the social, economic, and political effects of globalization are apparent.

Noddings’ (2005) edited collection, *Educating citizens for global awareness*, provides an insight into the challenges of providing opportunities for citizenship education in terms of economic globalization. To counteract the negative factors of globalization, Noddings suggested, “True education summons forth the innate goodness of humanity – our capacity for nonviolence, trust and benevolence” (p. ix). Noddings suggested three qualities that should be instilled in

students and teachers through education: *wisdom, courage and empathy*. While these descriptors are contrary to the nature of market-minded globalization, global education for global citizenship cannot be achieved without humanizing the curriculum. This concept is on the cutting edge of the enrichment that global education might provide in the future. Noddings wrote, "Advocates of globalization ... come close to defining global citizenship solely in terms of economics. A global citizen, from this perspective, is one who can live and work effectively anywhere in the world, and a global way of life would both describe and support the functioning of global citizens" (pp. 2-3). If global education can provide global-citizenship training for students and teachers in the face of what Noddings argued was the very worst of economic globalization, the challenge is deciding the priority of national or global citizenship and the place of the local-global relationship that remains the basis for global-education practice.

Globalization is pervasive. A global education that models standards which are contradictory to an economic view of the world will evoke criticism from the business and political leaders of North America. At the end of this review of the literature, global education has found itself at a crossroads. Will the field be folded into what has become global homogeny? Or, will global education emerge as a critical pedagogy capable of transforming the way students and teachers perceive and act upon world affairs?

## **Conclusion**

Most global educationalists would agree that Robert Hanvey at the Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives at Indiana University (1976) clearly established the notion that "education for a global perspective is that learning which enhances the individual's ability to understand his or her condition in the community and the world and improves the ability to make effective judgments" (p. 36). He ushered in the first and most persistent contemporary view of

global education. Although 2006 is the thirtieth anniversary of Hanvey's publication, his work remains a guiding force for teachers and theorists when a definition of global education is needed (Kirkwood, 1990, 1995; Merryfield, 1997). His definition is so widely accepted that a review of global-education literature has been based on his five interdisciplinary dimensions of global education (Kirkwood, 2001): *perspective consciousness, state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, and awareness of human choices*. To encourage students to achieve this wide perspective was, by definition, the goal of most global-educational endeavors as global education developed its public presence in schools and curricula. Over time, many other definitions of global education have been added to this basic premise. Finally, as the millennium has come and gone, global education, troubled by increasing attention to issues of globalization, has had to decide which route to take. Models of global education (discussed in the next chapter) will put future global-education literature into competing domains. These models will then be assessed for their inclusion in the official curriculum of social studies programs in British Columbia and in history programs in California.

As previously mentioned, Lamy (1988, 1990) introduced global education as controversial pedagogical practice. Popular culture is becoming increasingly international, so schools must take the opportunity to globalize their curriculum. The question remains: "Whose concept of globalization are global educationalists accepting?" And: "What reform can possibly occur under the provisions of globalization?" At one end of the spectrum, notions of global education as a critical pedagogy occur in the literature. At the other, statements are made that "global education, like global thinking and the global economy, is a Western, modern concept, reflecting the paradigm of industrial society" (Good & Prakash, 2000, p. 271).

This thesis will examine global education as a political pedagogy. In this respect, the field may support education either as “facilitating the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bringing conformity to it, *or* [emphasis added] as the practice of freedom, where men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world” (Shaul, 1983, p. 15). The latter concept must have a place in the teaching of national history in order to reverse neoliberal policy-making in education. Borrowing once again from Richardson (1999), “Caught between learning *about* the world and learning about how to live *in* the world, the specific challenge of global education is how best to prepare students to act as informed, caring, and active participants in a globalized world” (p. 147). The question remains: “Which of many models of global education will be adopted by the official curriculum, to what end, and with what consequences?”

## Chapter IV: Models of global education, 1980 to present

This investigation has addressed emergent definitions as they have seen entrée into the chronological history of contemporary global education. The contributions made by various global educationalists and those interested in the project of internationalization of history and the social sciences, are further analyzed in two ways. First, the work of a small number of global educationalists who have contributed full conceptualizations of global education over time will be reviewed (Richardson, 2004; Merryfield, 2001, 1998, 1992; Pike & Selby, 1999, 1988; Collins, Czarra & Smith, 1998; Hendrix, 1998; Harries, 1990; Lamy, 1983; Anderson, 1982; Hanvey, 1976). These authors go beyond offering a definition for the field; they construct entire complex conceptualizations often including multiple definitions. Second, this researcher will propose a set of theoretical models of global education. The four models will be used to scrutinize global education's status in the official curriculum of the province of British Columbia and the state of California: *Learning about the world*; *Learning how to live in the world*; *Learning how to compete in the world*; *Learning how to transform the world*. These models are conceived through an analysis of the definitional entrées from chapter three, the aforementioned conceptualizations of global education, and finally, by evoking supporting literature across the field which may not have functioned as a definitional entrée, but has a significant place in the literature (See Appendix: A).

Richardson (2004) posits five perspectives of global education, each with their own understanding of the purpose of global education, its own worldview, and its own value structure:

1. A discourse of imperialism that develops nationalism and national pride. (p. 139)



2. The ideological orientation resulting from the bipolarity of the Cold War period.  
(p. 140)
3. The multipolar imaginary which favors a worldview sympathetic to the values of multilateralism and interdependence, as applied to global issues, circumstances, and relationships. (p. 140-142)
4. An ecological, or cultural awareness, model that has students engaging as world-minded and concerned citizens. (p. 142 – 143)

Richardson recognizes the multitude of perspectives over time contributing to what might be called global education. With citizenship as his primary concern, the problem arises, to whom should citizen allegiance be awarded? Should students be encouraged to think as citizens of the world, or of Canada? “The opposing themes of interdependence and autonomy . . . stand as evidence of the ideological tensions existing within global education” (p. 147). Richardson tailors each perspective to the historicity of the time at which the perspective was being taught, in that the imperial perspective dominated the first half of the century, the bi-polar perspective defined the cold war era, the multi-polar perspective embodies the way in which history was taught following the fall of communism, and finally an ecological mindset was present in the early 1990’s.

Richardson speaks to another perspective that is often drawn out in assessments of the status of global education in the current geo-political climate (Blaney, 2002; O’Sullivan, 1999; Jameson & Miyoshi, 1998; Barnett & Cavanagh, 1994; Morehouse, 1987); one couched in the neoliberal, market-based events of this era of globalization. Should global education construct global citizens or global consumers? Here, the question of global and local citizenship is considered in light of how the global market requires the crafting of global consumers, not

critical global citizens. For now, global education literature reflects a middle of the road response to this challenge. "Caught between learning about the world and learning to live in the world, the specific challenge global education faces is how best to prepare students to act as informed, caring, and active participants in a globalized world" (p. 147). This investigation attends to this query by suggesting that global education must emerge from the confines of learning about, and how to live in, the world. Instead global education must value itself as transformative, in light of, and in spite of, worldwide economic globalization.

Hendrix (1998) argues for globalizing the curriculum and arranges the field into four components: *The study of human and universal values; the study of global systems; the study of global issues and problems; and the study of global history* (p. 306-307). From the perspective of evaluating global education programs, Hendrix suggests these components must be present in order for global education practices to be considered effective. While this arrangement lacks a cohesive statement regarding student and teacher action in the world, the author's conceptualizations are consistent with definitional language emergent over the past twenty-five years of global education.

Merryfield (2001) reviews global education literature as it engages the issue of globalization at the end of the Cold War. Merryfield offers three mainstay understandings of globalization. Merryfield writes, "... assumptions implicit in the seminal scholarship in globalization that 1) globalization is neither good nor bad, it is simply the result of long-term trends in technological progress, 2) globalization demonstrates the superiority of western capitalism, free markets, and democracy over communism, and 3) if schools educate young Americans in the dynamics of globalization, their generation will be able to sustain the American way of life and the role of the United States within the world system (p. 180). While this

conceptualization reflects a general acceptance of globalization as an economic force, it leaves room for a more critical interpretation. For those who are willing and prepared to challenge world economic globalization, they can. For those who wish to sustain globalization and American prosperity and cultural dominion, they can as well. Merryfield's work begs the question: Will the field move past acceptance of globalization to a place of critical theory and practice, or will the forces of globalization encourage the field to fall in line with most other educational projects going on in research institutions and schools today?

Pike and Selby's (1988) *Global Teacher, Global Learner* established a set of norms that encapsulate all of the above-mentioned definitional entrees into one set of four powerfully imagined dimensions of learning. These have existed as the premier standard for global educationalists in terms of putting a concise definition before the field. Pike and Selby argue for a four-pronged approach to instilling global values in consumers of global education curricula. Teachers and students would address each and intertwine these four dimensions of learning: *the spatial dimension, the temporal dimension, the issues dimension, and the human potential dimension*. Pike and Selby assert that if any one of these dimensions is ignored or subverted, global education will fall short in achieving the aims they see as central to the field's mission: having students acquire the ability to think and reason in a systems mode; to achieve a perspective consciousness that has students realize that they have a worldview that is not universally shared; to reach an awareness of the health of the planet that addresses global conditions, trends and future impacts; to accept this type of learning as process oriented and that there is not a final destination in mind when studying the world (p. 34-35).

One important aim which Pike and Selby emphasize deserves special attention. The authors forward the notion of *involvement consciousness and preparedness*, a concept that drives

the curricula that is born out of *Global Teacher, Global Learner*. While previous authorship has suggested this particular process, never was the emphasis as strong as for Pike and Selby. As perspective, systems, and other conceptualizations usually took center stage in the 1970's and 1980's, the thought that students would be encouraged by the teachings of global education to become aware of the choices they make as social and political activists living in the world began to emerge. As Pike and Selby write, "... present choices and actions can carry implications for the future well-being of humankind and the environment. Failure to choose and act can have as many repercussions as conscious choice and action" (p. 35). Pike and Selby's "person centered, planet conscious learning" would personalize the practice of global education resulting in a strengthening of the field's resolve, and drawing increased attention from its critics. Schools, Pike and Selby argue, cannot promote nothingness in regards to students' potential to grasp these powerful global concepts; cognitive and affective processes embellish personal, interpersonal and impersonal opportunities to explain and interact with the world.

Pike and Selby's (1999) *In the global classroom* demonstrated a significant leap beyond the attempts made by the field to define its core theoretical philosophy over the years. Pike and Selby expand the conceptual map of global education by establishing four dimensions of globality: spatial, temporal, issues, and human potential (or inner dimension). While the basis for their work remains true to the Hanvey definition of global education, Selby and Pike's monumental work move beyond those early conceptions that emphasis a one-dimensional perspective taking, to an increasingly multifaceted understanding of how students think about the world and their location in it. Selby and Pike's address themes such as interconnectedness and interdependence, multiple perspectives, the integration of past, present and future, and the development of self while remaining aware of the world around us. These notions were

inspirational for future authors who would struggle to further understand and explicate a working definition of global education that goes beyond perspective taking.

Pike and Selby remind their readers that the four dimensions they forward are not meant to act of their own accord, rather they should be objectified in the same manner as literacy and numeracy are regarded as vital to meaningful participatory democratic experiments. These authors presented two processes in global education that define the field's content and direction: *filtration*, where practices in the whole of the school are put up against these dimensions of global learning, and *enrichment*, where new programs of study look to include the four dimensions significantly and without disdain when awarded real-estate in the official curriculum of schools and classrooms. For each dimension, these authors list necessary ideas, knowledge, skills, and attitudes present in that domain; all together, the four dimensions are the necessary to implementing meaningful curricula. Furthermore, Pike and Selby maintain a need to establish a rhythm to learning, that is, security, challenge and response, reflection and analysis, and most significantly, action (p. 25). It is this fourth piece that will lead global education formidably toward a pedagogical orientation of action where skills and knowledge are applied in a most critical manner. *In the global classroom* presents numerous classroom activities and applications of its model as students,

... for both the journey outwards and the journey inwards, they need a classroom environment which is affirming, secure, and challenging. They need this to encourage them to examine their own assumptions and perspectives; to take risks in their learning; to share their opinions and values; and to be receptive to the feelings, ideas and perspectives of others. (p. 31)

It is then the responsibility of the students and the teachers to make strides forward in linking global history to the global present, and again to the global future. Pike and Selby establish a norm of global education: that is, to encourage youth and teachers to think now about the future and their responsibility in maintaining the skills, knowledge and global attitudes necessary for participatory global citizenship.

Merryfield (1992) offers a review of the most common and authoritative definitions of global education surfacing up to this point in the field's history in her piece entitled *Getting started in global education: Essential literature, essential linkages for teacher educators*. While grounded in the discipline of teacher education, Merryfield's treatise presents four lessons that build upon the basic acceptance of the importance of teaching and learning to achieve global perspective.

First, Merryfield stresses the importance of conceptualizing global education from a local and personal location; that is, deciding what global education means to those who practice the pedagogy. Examining alternative conceptualizations and sharing thoughts and ideas around this inquiry will allow an important local contextualization to emerge, although Merryfield offers a consensus definition of global education that focuses on three areas:

1. An appreciation of cultural differences and similarities, including multiple perspectives / perspective consciousness,
2. The world as a system and the concept of interdependence,
3. How students' decisions affect and are affected by global connections in their local communities. (p. 58)

Second, Merryfield focuses upon the national / international dichotomy when she declares

the importance of understanding and participating to some degree in the national and international contexts of global education. Merryfield cites numerous agencies interested in linking global educationalists with other educationalists and with resources that offer support. Offering opportunities for global education to see itself as a local-global pedagogy, gives credence to the claim that global education is capable of encouraging a worthwhile and meaningful global perspective in students and teachers.

Third, Merryfield hones in on local context when she argues the importance of understanding and taking advantage of local contextual factors and resources in order to build and maintain effective global education programs (p. 60). Making global education experiences relevant and useful for those who will teach and those who will learn about the world, requires a local contextualization that bridges what remain as obvious tenets of the local (participatory citizenship) with the global equivalent (global citizenship). By establishing local foundations, more challenging global aims can be met without resistance that declares such endeavors anti-nationalist and supra-nationally unrealistic. Successful teacher educators have "...learned to build on existing resources and interest groups, become cognizant of cultural concerns and norms, adapt to funding opportunities and constraints, meet the felt needs of teachers facing curriculum mandates and create networks with other educators" (p. 62).

Fourth, and perhaps in anticipation of what is considered a progressive move forward for the field as new and different definitions emerge in the remainder of this preliminary investigation, Merryfield presents a final lesson for global educationalists: "... to understand the controversial nature of global education and be proactive in their networking, curriculum and course development" (p. 62). Here, critics of global education are recognized, and the need for resilient efforts to preserve the field, are encouraged. As global education finds itself running in

opposition to worldwide economic globalization, and as the nature of global education is challenged by those bent upon accountability and assessment, attempts to redefine the field in progressive terms will meet drastic challenges. Merryfield, at this key turning point in the literature of the field, recognizes the importance for global educationalists to stay strong and steadfast in citing and acting upon the goals and objectives of the field that will naturally emerge, as controversial as others may consider them.

In a later piece, Merryfield (1998) maintains seven conceptualizations of global education: *Understanding of humans and the world/planet as dynamic, organic and interdependent systems; understanding of global issues; understanding of diverse cultures and multiple perspectives; understanding of, skills in and responsibility for making choices and decisions and taking action locally and globally; interconnectedness of humans through time; cross-cultural understanding, interactions, and communications; perceptual growth for prejudice reduction and moral education within critical contexts* (p. 369). Merryfield's work illustrates many of the same definitional entrées offered up by this investigation in the form of models. At the same time this arrangement lacks some of the stark contrasts evidenced in the debate and controversy around defining global education. This investigation strives to implicate these divisions in an effort to discover the degree to which competing conceptualizations of global education have found prominent space in the official curriculum and which have not.

Harries (1990) suggests another approach to conceptualizing global education theory and practice. Harries argues that both an understanding of the world as it is and how the world might one day be imagined must be encouraged. These are difficult understandings to acquire, as both experience in the world and the ability to remove nationalistic blinders are required for such enlightenment. "American students labor under two disabilities with regard to understanding the



world. First, they are Americans; second, they are students, and for the most part young” (p. 16). This investigation maintains a forward thinking orientation, that is, while an increasingly critical global perspective is necessary for global education to thrive, so is the notion that students and teachers of global education are able to transform the future. This investigator argues that indeed challenges are present, and yet, students no matter how young or inexperienced must be encouraged to nurture efforts to understand the past, present and future implications of learning and teaching about national history in the United States and in Canada.

Lamy’s (1983) text *Defining global education* set out to interrupt the theoretical flow of ideas from educationalists taken up with the notion of global education by advocating for cautious reform of the state-centric model of social studies education through a specified set of goals and objectives. Lamy poses three questions at the outset of his article:

1. Should the focus of our citizenship training be limited to local and national concerns or should it also include an international or global dimension?
2. If we exclude an international studies dimension in our curriculum are we failing to prepare students for participation in an increasingly complex and interconnected world?
3. If international or global education is important to any society what should its purpose be? (p. 9)

The author concedes that while there is some consensus as to the definition of global education, individual nation-states tend to dictate the extent to which global education is practiced in any given country. *Defining global education* works to announce the prevailing theories of global education, and by doing so demonstrates the competing definitions sometimes leveled against the field.

For Lamy, global education’s definition lies within a scope that includes at least four world-views that at best organize the variety of perspectives that exist in the world. First, there are those who note an idealistic perspective and who believe education to be the cite where learning about all the worlds cultures would fend off war and conflict, not to mention any attack

on the international system. Second, there are those who forward a geopolitical perspective for how global education might address world issues through a realistic lens of American military power and economic development. Third, global education may function within a transnational view of the world in that the field might promote either a *free-trade internationalist perspective* which emphasizes the importance of cooperation for business purposes . . . or a *functionalist-internationalist* perspective which stresses the importance of cooperation in responding to global issues that threaten humankind (p. 14 – 15). Lastly, the “radical perspective challenges the idea that every nation-state benefits from global interdependence” (p. 16). This world-view reflects upon the plight of the less developed nation at the hand of global economic superpowers and encompasses a great number of other radical perspectives on the world order from the right and the left of the political spectrum.

Lamy supports the *global perspective education* as an effective method of recognizing and critiquing all of the above-mentioned world-views when negotiating teaching and learning within global education. “We all need to remember that the only perspective that is wrong is the one that claims to be the only perspective on how the world operates” (p. 19). Despite Lamy’s obvious political loyalty to one perspective or another, this monumental work frames the definitional controversies within global education that are present today and those that will continue to dictate global education’s progress and success.

Lee Anderson (1982) posits five overlapping interest groups, each heralding their own conceptualization: conservatives concerned about education that will meet the manpower needs of the nation’s corporate and political elites; liberals concerned about education for citizenship and individual self-development in a changing world; radicals concerned about education for social change; parents concerned about educating their children and grand-children for self-

survival; and educators concerned about providing the successor generations with a high quality basic education (p. 160). Global education has answered the call of each of these groups as the definitions educationalists use to describe global education accommodate one or more of these. Therefore, while slight differences exist, essentially this investigation offers similar if not identical conceptualization of global education in the form of four proposed models.

Collins, Czarra and Smith (1998) limits the focus of global education to three broad themes: *Global challenges, issues and problems; global cultures, and world arenas; and global connections: the United States and the world*. These authors believe these standards will “help validate local curriculum decisions and ensure that the international dimension receives attention” (p. 311). Within each theme, the authors give a rationale for study, offer knowledge objectives for understanding, list skills necessary for acquisition of these themes, and offer participation objectives to help students address challenges present in global society.

Finally, Hanvey (1976) must be cited for his forward thinking, if not incomplete and imaginary, conceptualization of global education from the outset of the field’s conception. While grounded in the notion of perspective as defined in the first model of global education presented below, Hanvey suggests five dimensions to perspective taking. These dimensions are far-reaching and allow for an eventual emergence of conceptualizations more powerful than just perspective. “This is what is meant here by an *attainable* global perspective...we imply a modesty of goals” (p. 2). Where perspective and only minimalist versions of his work took hold immediately, it would be Hanvey’s insight that would stay with the field for all twenty-five years of its recent past history. Hanvey’s five dimensions allow us in the contemporary world imagine a most critical pedagogy in global education, or something quite apart from critical. Hanvey’s *perspective consciousness, state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of*

*global dynamics, and awareness of human choices*, are inclusive of all that this author suggests in worthwhile in suggesting global education might accomplish, and yet, most work in the global education arena does not live up to a most critical and dramatic interpretation of Hanvey's *An attainable global perspective*. Hanvey warned of what could occur on the world stage if his work manifested itself in the mundane of global education, "Before long the world system is going to break down" (p. 31). This investigation stresses the sustainability of global education through a realization that competing models of global education exists and an explanation of their individual attributes.

With these conceptualizations in mind, the definitions of global education taken from a thorough examination of the literature since 1980 must be described as theoretical models, if the field is to be properly evaluated for its place in the official curriculum of British Columbia and California. The following is the conceptualization set decided upon by this investigator, having first taken into consideration the history of the field defining itself, and second, the aforementioned conceptualizations of global education that have been offered since 1980.

### **Model One: Learning about the world**

The first model of global education offered here is grounded in the origins of the field, and must be regarded as the most traditional, if not safest, application of the field. *Perspective* is regarded as foundational, in that global education practices would expect students and teachers to understand that the world-view they own exists as a product of their own limited experience in the world. *Interconnectedness*, assumes some economic, political, and limited social connections between continents and peoples. Students and teachers would not necessarily be expected to engage the implications of this connectivity. *Knowledge* about the world is seen as important, however, the information students and teachers are expected to work with is factual and written from an express Western point of view, which in turn students and teachers accept but do not truly understand. *Systems* are understood to exist, and yet in this simplistic model of education, infrastructure is regarded as functional, and is not emphasized as connected to human existence on any side of the globe. Numerous authors (Quashigah & Wilson, 2001; Begler, 1998; Selby, 1995; Case, 1993; Karp, 1992; Coombs, 1989; Darling, 1989; Study Commission on Global Education, 1987; Gilliom, 1982; C. Anderson, 1982; Muessig & Gilliom, 1981; King, Branson & Condon, 1976) have adopted these four concepts as principal to the theory that guides this very basic model of global education.

C. Anderson (1982) evokes Hanvey's review of perspective as the most valid approach to the teaching and learning of global education. "Approaches to global education are rich and varied but share a common, consistent element; all seek to promote what has come to be called a global perspective" (p. 169). Gilliom (1982) posits interconnectedness as the key orientation for all global educational endeavors. "To a greater degree than ever before the day to day lives of average citizens, as well as the lives of nations, are being influenced by our growing

international, cross-cultural linkages” (p. 162). Begler (1998) suggests cultural knowledge as the foundation, and as a visual organizer, for global educational practices. “Think how much your class would learn about a culture by answering these [geographic, historical, economic, social, political, aesthetic, values and beliefs] questions?” (p. 275). Moreover, The Study Commission on Global Education (1987) recognizes the value of teaching and learning about the social, economic, political, and cultural systems that link one part of the world with another.

When learning *about* the world, students and teachers are taking an important first step toward understanding how to *live* in the world. As such, perspective taking was an early project of contemporary global educationalists and theorists. Despite the existence of other models of global education, a return to emphasize perspective is often demonstrated in the literature. The reasons for this, as this author imagines them, will be discussed in chapter six. An effective global education, if not a critical pedagogy, must employ conceptualizations that move beyond perspective taking.

## **Model Two: Learning how to live in the world**

The second model of global education considers the notion of the world as a shared entity, with humanity covering the earth and political, social and economic diversity defining one from another in the world. The notion of perspective is graduated to *multiple perspectives* and interconnectedness, knowledge and systems are modified to *global consciousness*. Students and teachers are expected to begin considering their own and another's location in the world relevant to the each other. Furthermore, the global educationalist considers the *geo-political* nature of the world and the attached notion of *global citizenship*. Illuminated here is a conceptualization of the world that accepts competing political units as existing in the world. As well, citizenship is seen as nationally bound, with perspectives being tied to national, not global, citizenship. Finally, as students and teachers develop a *critical global mindedness* about *global issues* they examine, this model assumes they will begin to develop *global empathy* for those in the world who live at the center of the issues the students engage. While students and teachers assume this measured role, they do so from a limited national perspective, without placing themselves at the core of the issues or circumstances they are studying, and certainly not as complicit participants. A number of authors (A.F. Smith, 2002; Good & Prakash, 2000; Alger, 1998; Collins, Czarra & Smith, 1998; Byrnes, 1997; Menchions, 1997; Cross & Molnar, 1994; Massiales, 1991; Coombs, 1989) theorize within the bounds of this second model of global education that moves away from passive perspective taking to a broader form of global consciousness, even if the model does little to spark the thought of personal action on the part of the student.

Cross & Molnar (1994) invite global educationalists to present varying world views or global perspectives, of which these authors present three dominating ones, in order for students and teachers to engage the complexity of the world system and to illustrate a complete picture of

the world and of world perspective on global issues. "It seems appropriate that children in schools should learn about the nationalistic, international commerce, and humanistic perspectives of the world" (p. 139). Andrew Smith (2002) proposes the importance foreign language instruction, geography instruction, and world history instruction, extracurricular activities, and technology education play in cultivating an informed global consciousness in students so that global issues, or global challenges will have contextual significance for students and teachers. "Global issues will not resolve themselves without deliberate action on the part of citizens who understand the complexity of these issues. Students should develop such skills as recognizing, analyzing, and evaluating the interconnections among local, regional, and global issues and between their personal lives and global events" (p. 41).

Alger (1998) posits three formative questions: Where am I? How did I get here? Where am I going? He suggests considering supra-national models, the many agencies and bodies that make up the United Nations for example, as important in answering these questions. "As citizens of the United States, we are pledged to uphold the ideals embodied by UN Covenants to which the United States has agreed (for example, Rights of the Child, Rights of Refugees, and Prevention of Racial Discrimination)" (p. 284). The geo-political circumstances Alger reflects upon, do not suggest a re-orientation from nationally grounded citizenship to that of a globally conceived citizenship as will be evidenced in the most critical model of global education, but the reality of geo-political contexts and the importance of North American citizenry participation is recognized. Byrnes (1997) stresses the importance of maintaining progressive qualities of a global education classroom, one that is student centered and essentializes critical thinking, also "...by emphasizing interdisciplinary concepts, modeling inquisitiveness and skepticism, and stressing participatory learning" (p. 1997). The knowledge, skills, and attitudes forwarded by



Byrnes, “enable global educators to help students think conceptually, apply content knowledge from one context to another, promote retention, and engage students in learning about self, others, and the world” (p. 100), and fosters a critical global mindedness about and around the issues present in global society.

Menchions (1997) argues students will react to world current events and the actions of their government, if they are engaged, asked to think and encouraged to deliberate. “How do we get this impulse to act? Is it possible for us in schools to work toward cultivating a sense of moral outrage in our students? Yes! Should it be high on our list of "musts"? Absolutely!” (p. 2). Menchions goes on to affirm the belief amongst global educators that once students gain a global perspective, dialogue will find its way into the classroom, making the educational experience more dynamic and that students will begin to empathize with those in world who deal with challenging life issues on a daily basis. Menchions writes, “The classroom atmosphere is transformed into one of expectancy and challenge -- a creative tension. Most thrive on this kind of dialogue. They learn valuable communication skills: to respect and listen to each other's viewpoints and effective speaking. Perhaps, they also gain a sense of self – worth” (p. 1). Good and Prakash (2000) speak to the nature of global education as instilling global empathy within students, and their work bridges upon the transformative work of global educationists working for a critical global education. “. . . modern education produces students who are unable to feel for the damage occurring to persons, flora, and fauna and are unmoved to take concrete corrective actions” (p. 276).

It is of primary importance that this second model of education work with and around the objectives of the first model of global education in order to establish a baseline conceptualization of global education theory and practice. From here, global education as critical pedagogy might

be imagined. The question remains, to what extent will the very different perspective of *learning to compete in the world* discourage the projects set in motion by the authors of the first two models of global education, and the project of modeling a critical global education?

### **Model Three: Learning how to compete in the world**

A third model of global education is forwarded here as an endeavor in support of world economic globalization. If global education prepares students for life, work and success in the global economy, then it should be embraced. If global education constantly challenges the permanence of globalization in an effort to suggest transformative solutions to the world problems, then it is unhelpful in promoting national progress on the global economic front. For these educationalists and political theorists, presentation of the *global economy* as tied to all matters of global importance should be the mainstay of global educational activities. The *global competitive* is understood as the force behind this learning orientation. If the world is painted in such a way that students see their actions as tied to economic success or failure for the nation and for themselves, they will act to acquire the skills, knowledge and attitudes required for profit-maximization and economic domination. Finally, this model accepts and embraces *globalization* as an inevitable force that will result in the betterment of world society through market forces acting to spur on investment, production, and a higher standard of living for all those, and all nations, who cooperate. Carefully chosen authorship (Gulledge, 2006; O'Sullivan, 1999; Gutek, 1993; Rieff, 1993; Kiplinger & Kiplinger, 1989; Newell, 1987, Leetsma, 1979) is helpful here in explaining the nature of global education as in service to national participation in the global market economy. These authors accept global education as part and parcel to globalization, and imagine students learning how to compete in the world as helpful, and any attempt to critically transform the current world economic order as hurtful.

Gutek (1993) in *American education in a global society* argues that global education is necessary for numerous reasons, among those, economic vitality, national security, and development and modernization projects at home and around the world. Gutek writes, "The rise

of new sectors of economic development in the Pacific Rim and in Western Europe affects our domestic economy and has an impact in how we educate and train people for work in the reality of an interdependent global economy” (p. 6). Gutek reflects at length about what reforms were announced in the American document, *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* (1983). Gutek reasserts the reports primary thesis, “. . . if Americans can restore academic rigor and quality to their schools, they can recapture the leading position the United States once held in the world economy” (p. 86). For Gutek, herein lies the important project of global education. He quotes at length uncontested passages of the report in an attempt to suggest that global education, as reform pedagogy, might very well be the key to economic viability and global competitiveness for the United States.

In a chapter named *America's educational unpreparedness*, Gutek again cites at length the *Nation at Risk* report, as well as another. “The National Governors’ Association’s Task Force on International Education (1989) identified major deficiencies that weaken the capacity of the United States to participate to its fullest in the world economy” (Gutek, 1993, p. 238). This author defends the principle of global education in a very different manner than has been demonstrated by authorship attached to any of the other models this investigation forwards. Gutek’s arguments are well stated and informed, and may well cause those who read his work to conceptualize global education as in defense of the global competitive. Frankly, this is not a difficulty theoretical jump to make, as global education for the global competitive props up North American economic superiority and the prosperity enjoyed by millions of Americans and Canadians. However, it must be understood that despite the vitality and commonsensical nature of these theories, the global competitive stands in opposition to a fourth model of global education, a critical global education.

Brian O'Sullivan (1999) argues two global paradigms exist when setting goals for a more internationalized education: global economic competitiveness and global interdependence. "I argue that to prepare students for the global challenges of the new century, excellence in education should be defined as meeting the requirements of both paradigms" (p. 311). Furthermore, O'Sullivan puts forth the notion that a study of all subjects related to global change, economic and technological, should exist in the curriculum. "The paradigm of global economic competitiveness asserts that knowledge is a commodity and that Canadians have national interests to protect in a common global future" (p. 311).

Brenda Trofanenko (2005) in her article *In defense of the nation*, states the importance of maintaining national allegiance as the central characteristic of social studies and history education. Trofanenko promotes a conceptualization of global education that is very much rooted in the sustainability of the nation that does not attempt to move the nation into the global realm. "We need to move beyond the 'feel good' global education ideology to question how nation remains central to social studies education" (p. 194). This author posits a proper global ideology "... that requires a balanced critique of other cultures, one from which students would position the United States as a center point" (p. 195). Trofanenko suggests a globalizing of the notion of nation, while preserving that entity as central to any educational project. This conceptualization of *nation* inherently favors world wide economic globalization when it suggests that that Americans should have their cake and eat it to. If the nation is preserved, merely in the context of world wide economic globalization, then global education must abandon many of the projects and inspirations it has set forth to promote, or run in complete opposition to the theory and practice of globalization. Trofanenko sees this as an impossible choice, that students must recognize the nation as supreme, and accept the nation's role in patterns of globalization.

Standing in stark contrast to the fourth and final model of global education, *learning to compete in the world* offers a conceptualization of the field that aligns itself quite well with current literature in support of worldwide economic globalization and the benefits that grow from such economic enterprises for the western world, and specifically North American countries. The model *Learning to compete in the world* is often quite critical of other voices from within the field, especially those who envision a critical global education. In fact, this model's authorship might very well claim that a critical model of global education threatens the prosperity enjoyed by Americans and Canadians, when values are instilled in children that run contradictory to support of the capitalist global market economy that globalization spurs on. Those who are critical of this conceptualization of global education, and who think the field has been co-opted when claims are made like the ones illustrating this third model, must speak up loudly if their contentions are to gain ground.

#### **Model Four: Learning to transform the world**

A fourth model posits a formidably critical global education in support of the transformative potential of the field, and in opposition to an orientation that has students learning to compete in the world. Having students learn and act upon the possibilities of reforming the status quo is imagined as a powerfully progressive force in education and schools. This conceptualization is understood an intentional departure from global education as nationally bound and individually conceived of. In place of the first two models of global education, the fourth model suggests students as globally informed participants in activity on behalf of those in the world who require defense, even if that defense flies in the face of global market standards. Students and teachers learning to transform the world can imagine a *global future*. It will become evident that dire consequences exist for the actions we display as participants in humanity. Global educationalists writing in support of this critical model of global education envision students acquiring the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to take part in projects of *global activism*. As *global citizens*, and this time from a global as opposed to national orientation, students and teachers will care for the world they live in and for the people and animals who share the earth, water, and air that makes up our planet. For this model to be considered as a critical pedagogy, and not merely a politically neutral practice of teaching and learning, global education must embrace an *anti-globalization* stance. If the current economic order breeds inequality and inhumanity, then global education must be imagined as able to engage and transform these perilous conditions. Global educationalists who have continued to evolve in their progressive defining of the field (Carlsson-Paige & Lantieri, 2005; Thorton, 2005; Merryfield & Kasai, 2004; Gadotti, 2003; Tye, 2003; Becker, 2002; Blaney, 2002; Ramler, 2002; Clark, 1999; Kirkwood, 1990; Alladin, 1989) find these four qualities being the only ones left worth fighting

for from within global education. It is this critical global education that will fill the space within the official secondary national history curriculum created by a Freirean application of critical pedagogy, thereby globalizing national history teaching and learning in a most sensible and essential manner.

Blaney (2002) proclaims global education as a critical pedagogy aimed at instilling in students and teachers values of global participation and empathy when he describes the aspirations and desires associated with the field, “a desire to understand and to act effectively in the world so that we might shape our own destiny and the world’s (p. 269). Almost twenty-years ago, Alladin (1989) identified global education as capable of “ . . . raising awareness of the interdependence of nations and the choices available to the global citizen in saving planet Earth” (p. 6). Merryfield and Kasai (2004) envision a global education that prepares students for active citizenship on the global stage through a study of and participatory outlook on global issues. “The pedagogy of global issues often involves participation and action” (p. 318). Ramler (2002) contributes his conceptualization of global education as the building of global citizens, “To build citizens for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we must continuously strive to offer instruction that helps students learn to see through the eyes, minds, and hearts of others” (p. 44).

Critical of the effects of globalization in the world, Kirkwood (1990) argues that global education “offers teachers opportunities to guide students on their twenty-first century journey to shape a more peaceful world” (p. 14). Suggesting that global educationalists and students not allow the process of globalization to be merely a material transformation, that our times demand a critical change in mindset, Tye (2003) argues, “Global education can make a significant contribution to such a change” (p. 168). Myers (2006) advises, “A curriculum guided by global citizenship would place human rights as the foundation for learning about globalization, instead



of global markets" (p. 376). For Myers, nurturing a notion of global citizenship brings out in students and teachers a willingness to oppose the worse globalization has to offer as an economic force in and upon the world; a sense of empowerment (Clark, 1999) that might manifest itself in the improvement of community, nation, and world.

A model of global education that critiques globalization, and challenges the world economic status quo and the products of worldwide capitalism, is a contentious one. It is, however, the avenue of conceptualization some global educationalists have chosen to embark upon. Their success to this end remains to be determined.

In conclusion, it is helpful to quote Selby (2006) at length, as he describes the linkages that exist between all of the models of global education presented as part of this study:

Global education is an approach to education that's based upon the interconnectedness of communities, lands, and peoples, the interrelatedness of all social, cultural and natural phenomena, links between past, present and future, and the complementary nature of the cognitive, affective, physical and spiritual dimensions of the human being. It addresses issues of development, equity, peace, social and environmental justice, and environmental sustainability. It encompasses the personal, the local, the national and the planetary. Along with these principles, its approach to teaching and learning is experiential, interactive, children-centered, democratic, convivial, participatory, and change-oriented. (p. 1)

If nothing else, the foundation has been laid for the formulation of a critical global education. As powerful as that conceptualization is, its adversary in the field, that of a global education for global economic competitiveness is an equally powerful mainstay of current educational

objectives. To best understand the implications involved with each of these models of global education, they must be located in the official curriculum of the British Columbia and California.

## **Chapter V: Place of global education in contemporary official curriculum documents**

In April 2006, the Superintendent of Schools in California Jack O'Connell wrote in an article entitled "Preparing students for a rapidly changing global economy", the following:

"... we must close the achievement gaps that not only threatens the future of our students, but also the future economic health and security of our state and nation" (p. 1). O'Connell made this speech in support of increased academic standards for mathematics and visual and performing arts courses in California. This blatant characterization of schooling as key to national economic development disguises a less obvious reality, that national history curriculum content in California reflects the tenets described by O'Connell and a disdain for global education. In Canada, where the imposition of a formal curriculum and secondary examinations is noticeably less severe, global education enjoys more prominent stature. What follows is a descriptive report of findings from this investigation's analysis of the official curriculum of the two jurisdictions for evidence of the four aforementioned models of global education. The official curriculum includes national, region, state and provincial standards and framework mandates and a selection of supporting documentation, including textbooks, relevant to grade eleven national history courses. While the findings reflect the analysis of a great number of documents, reflections upon fifteen of these documents are employed for the purpose of this investigation (see Appendix: B). The official curriculum impacts history classrooms in British Columbia and California very differently, and while it reflects only one of many forms of classroom practice, the assessment movement in each country remains a real influence upon the work of students and teachers and therefore worthy of close scrutiny. A strict descriptive analysis of the content of the official curriculum will follow, as the language of the four models of global education is set against the backdrop of the verbiage of numerous mandated curriculum documents.

## Official social studies curriculum documents in British Columbia

### Finding #1:

**The official curriculum of British Columbia provides ample possibilities for the inclusion of a model of global education that has students learning about the world and how to live in the world.**

The first model of global education, *learning about the world*, finds some space within the official secondary national history curriculum of British Columbia. More importantly, the curriculum reflects a strong dedication to the tenets reflected in the second model, *learning to live in the world*. The second model encompasses the values of the first while encouraging a significant move forward in globalizing the curriculum in a manner that moves students and teachers beyond the most basic elements of perspective, interconnectedness, knowledge and systems. The model *learning about the world* does present itself markedly in one curriculum document: Cranny and Moles (2001) social studies textbook *Counterpoints: Exploring Canadian Issues*.

The first unit of the textbook reflects a similar tact as that of the American history textbook discussed later in this report in that the nature of Canada as a colonial nation and participant in world wars lends itself to a limited, yet still present, contextualization of Canadian historical events and actors in a global sense. Interestingly, the language and organization of the text demonstrates a willingness to engage questions of a global nature such as Canada's national identity in the shadow of American influence (p. 66, 151, 154), where Canadian history is cast more in the light of North American history (p. 76), when Canadian economic policies are presented critically for the difficulties they may have caused the other countries during and after the Depression (p. 82), the substantial European contextualization of World War II (p. 96), when significant attention is paid to Canada's commitment to international organizations such as

NATO (p. 134), NORAD (p. 135) and the United Nations (p. 137), and when Canadian foreign policy toward Fidel Castro and Cuba (p. 146), to name a few examples. Interestingly, in this first unit, an entire section titled *A new era of globalization* is awarded textual space (p. 157-158). In this section, globalization is painted quite critically, and even notes the United States as complicit to this end (p. 158). Quite apart from the American history textbook's portrayal of native Americans and immigrants, *Counterpoints* paints Canada as in fact a nation made up of many nations (p. 190), including immigrant populations, French Canadians, and Aboriginal peoples. Part and parcel to this assessment is the presentation of Canadian multiculturalism as an ongoing and contentious national project.

Most importantly, in this first unit that presents the history of Canada, Canadian economic progress is not presented as the predominant focus. Instead, issues of social and political importance are presented in a balanced manner, allowing for a critical review of Canadian history that is severely lacking in *Counterpoints'* American counterpart. Because of the presence of a non-essentialist historical narrative, the opportunities teachers and students have to weave in global perspectives, to realize examples of historical interconnectedness and global systems, and to build a foundation inclusive of world knowledge, are abundant. Moreover, the official curriculum of British Columbia reflects an assumption that national history classrooms will identify the foundations of this most basic model when the majority of time is spent looking at *how students live in the world*.

An abundant number of examples exist within the official curriculum where students and teachers must grapple with notions of multiple perspectives, global consciousness, the geopolitical, global citizenship from a national orientation, critical global mindedness, global issues, and where students are able to demonstrate global empathy. Cranny and Moles' (2001) first unit

from the social studies text *Counterpoints* focuses primarily on global education's introductory concepts, the second unit, *Government and Law*, features a unique section entitled *The Era of Human Rights* features many of the second tier ideals within the definitional structure of global education. By introducing topics such as the global movement for human rights, the universal declaration of human rights and the international criminal court, and then relating those institutions to Canada's own system of government and law, Cranny and Moles ask students to critically consider the global implications of their own national existence. For example, students are asked to "design a campaign to make others in your school aware of the human rights issues people in these [Indonesia, China, Chile, Columbia, Iran] countries face" (p. 313). Furthermore, students are asked to apply international standards to their own: "Conduct a survey in your community to determine how public facilities ensure that they can provide services for people with disabilities" (p. 313). More astonishing is the realization that this last chapter on human rights is actually a preface to the third unit entitled *Geography and Global Issues*.

In this unit, Cranny and Moles ask students to think about first, world demographics and the implications attached to global population; second, students reflect on global living standards; third, students investigate global urbanization and worldwide sustainability; fourth, patterns in global economic development; fifth, the global environment; and lastly, a section titled *Looking Forward* treats Canada and the World as equals when considering the future. Towards the end of this unit, aspects of the fourth model of global education begin to emerge, as discussed later in this research report of findings. Chapter thirteen "... examines reasons behind the huge growth in world population in the twentieth century and what this means for the future . . ." (p. 314). Students are asked to consider the following student inquiry posed at the end of the chapter, "With two other students, research a complete demographic profile of a country from

each of the developed, developing and least developed worlds. Use a poster format to compare and contrast the countries” (p. 339). In this exercise, students must reorient their perceptions of themselves in relation to the other, a lesson that would lead to tremendous discussions and debate and a realization of the existence of multiple perspectives. Chapter fourteen observes, “. . . as population has increased, the gap in living standards between rich and poor has widened . . . ” (p. 314). Here a number of summary questions ask students to reason morally through world problems, for instance, “Prepare a two-minute radio talk on the Human Development Index. In particular, address the question of why all but two of the bottom twenty-five countries in the HDI are in Africa” (p. 365). Chapter fifteen claims it “. . . deals with the reasons behind [urbanization] and [associated] problems . . . ” (p. 314). Critical thinking skills are employed here as students “. . . compare urbanization patterns in the developing world, such as Africa, with those of the developed world, including Canada” (p. 393). Chapter seventeen “describes the impact on the environment of all these issues outlined in previous chapters . . . ” (p. 314). By the end of this unit students have been asked to grapple with at least one final question embedded inside the text and in the reviews, “With a partner, make a collage with images that reflect the benefits of democracy . . . what is your assessment of democracy in the world?” (p. 459). With this inquiry, and previous ones, students must grapple with the concept of global citizenship, albeit from a national standpoint, for now. It goes without saying that a classroom teacher or student using this text in a British Columbia social studies classroom has a second model of global education playing a central role in the curriculum.

The primary official curriculum document for social studies eleven in British Columbia is *Integrated Resource Package (IRP) (2005)*. Students and teachers are provided many opportunities to exhibit qualities of a global education that has them *learning to live in the world*.

Some prominent examples include the following findings: Debate is heavily encouraged throughout the document, encouraging a display of multiple perspectives toward issues and knowledge of global importance. "Have students debate the issue of whether or not Canada should play a role in preserving or ensuring the human rights of people and/or nations in the world" (p. 62). In another activity teachers are asked to "provide students with information that examines the issues of growing world population and its impact of the global environment" (p. 72) and students are asked to "assess the information in terms of bias, point of view, currency of information, range of perspectives, and sources quoted or referred to (p. 72). In reference to the UN Millennium Project and conferences Canada has participated in to that end, students are asked to develop a global consciousness, or context, in which they may ground debate. Students should reflect on . . . whether all nations are in agreement about what to do to address development issues . . . what leadership role Canada should play in these type of conferences . . . and, what role do students think individuals can play in dealing with these problems (p. 78)?

The geo-political nature of the world is demonstrated when significant attention is paid to Canada's participation in the United Nations. Students are expected to evaluate Canada's contributions to the United Nations, including peacekeeping, role in the Security Council, and support of UN agencies (p. 33). As well, students are asked to research and debate the role of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization in international development (p. 77). Students are encouraged to grapple with the notion of global citizenship, albeit from a national perspective. "Through their participation in social studies, students are encouraged to understand and prepare to exercise their roles, rights, and responsibilities within Canada and the world" (p. 11). The official curriculum emphasizes skills that encourage critical thinking about global issues when it calls for research of important



indicators of human development for Canada and developing countries, including life expectancy rates, literacy rates, infant mortality rates, disease, fertility, and GDP (p. 34). A curriculum organizer presented in the introduction of this document makes significant mention of global issues as a target of student learning. "Students develop understanding of the global issues that arise from the disparity in standards of living, how they affect our environment, and our response to these issues" (p. 12). Empathy is encouraged when it is suggested that students speak with an invited guest from an international relief organization and are asked to "discuss the idea of the poverty cycle as it applies to developing nations or as it applies to pocket of poverty within a developed nation like Canada" (p. 76). Additional references are made to definitions included from within the scope of the second model of global education in numerous other curriculum documents (Western and Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Education, 2000, p. 5-7, 9, 17, 18; Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 18-20, 22; Ministry of Education, 2005e, p.3; Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 3-5). The result is that room exists for the situating of at least the second model of global education within the mandated work of teachers and students within British Columbia.

## **Finding # 2:**

**The official curriculum of British Columbia provides some degree of opportunity for the inclusion of a model of global education that has students learning to transform the world.**

While the second model of global education is clearly the most commonly found conceptualization in most official curriculum documents, the most critical model of global education is also evident. *Learning to transform the world* includes notions of the global future, global activism, the global citizen from a global orientation, and anti-globalization rhetoric. While considerable attention is given to these concepts within the Civics 11 *IRP* (2005b) where over ten separate references are made, these contributions will be considered as part of another finding later in this report.

The *IRP* (2005) for Social Studies 11 demonstrates the critical quality of global activism when it claims students will “recognize the importance of individual and collective action” (p. 33) in defense of human rights in the world. Students are asked to research, develop the causes of, and suggest possible responses to issues of global development (p. 34) and are asked to consider what role they think individuals or agencies can play in dealing with these problems (p. 78). Two resources are suggested for use in the classroom: *Working for change: Active global citizenship* and *Taking action on climate change*. Each of these encourages students to think of the global future as a target of their individual action.

In addition to the section already mentioned that critically assesses globalization (p. 157-8) in the textbook *Counterpoints*, this text goes on to address issues of a progressive global nature. Questions leveled at the outset of Unit 3, titled *Geography and global issues*, such as “Has the rate of population growth outstripped the capacity of the world to support world population?” which addresses the global future; “What should Canadians and Canadian

governments do to protect air and water quality?" which speaks to global activism; "What policies should Canada adopt to live up to its commitment to the Kyoto Protocol?" which suggests reflection upon global citizenship responsibility; and, "Why are there regional disparities in Canada and countries around the world?" which highlights opportunities to promote anti-globalization sentiments. Of particular interest to this fourth model of global education, are chapter sixteen titled *Patterns in economic development*, and chapter seventeen titled *Environment*, and chapter eighteen titled *Looking forward*. In these chapters, specific opportunities for teachers and students to promote a critical global education are plentiful. The global future is articulated when issues such as development (p. 406) and sustainability (p. 421) are presented. Global activism is acknowledged when subjects such as ecological footprints (p. 454) and world peace in the context of acting globally (p. 457) are illuminated. As well, global citizenship is regarded as significant around issues such as global warning (p. 432) and global deforestation (p. 438). Finally, an anti-globalization tact is made available through a discussion of issues such as ecotourism (p. 444) and multinational corporations (p. 452). This third unit of Cranny and Moles text *Counterpoints* allows for significant heralding of a critical global education.

References are made in two additional curriculum documents to *students learning to transform the world*. First, the Western and Northern Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Education (2000) claims that social studies enables students to "develop the skills and attitudes necessary to become active and responsible citizens, engaged in the practice of democratic ideals, and aware of their capacity to effect change in Canada and the world . . . recognize, speak out, and take action against injustice as it occurs in their schools, communities, Canada, and the world...understand Canadian and world history, so as to better comprehend the present and to

influence the future . . . ” p. 7). A testing preparation resource (Ministry of Education, 2006) provided to accompany the *IRP (2005)* claims students should be able to assess both world conditions and the possibilities of global citizens instigated reform of those conditions as they ill-effect people of the world (p. 22). While some attempt is made to promote the global future, and the actions that students and teachers could take as global citizens on behalf of global future change, this fourth model of global education is not prominent in British Columbia.

### **Finding # 3**

**The official curriculum of British Columbia provides limited opportunities for the inclusion of a model of global education that has students learning to compete in the world.**

The Ministry of Education of British Columbia does not emphasize the need for students to *learn how to compete in the world*. In the official curriculum documents analyzed here, an explicit attempt to encourage this mode of global education is seen on only three occasions, and once in the Civics 11, assessed for a different purpose so not mentioned here. Issues around the global economy, the global competitive, and that which is generally in favor of world wide economic globalization, are not seen as critical elements of the curriculum.

A recommended resource found in the *IRP (2005)* entitled *Working for change: active global citizenship (2005)*, cites both harmful and positive effects of globalization (p. 130). Even here, mention of globalization is fair and balanced and expects students to exhibit critical thinking skills. Aside from the occasional and cautious mention of historical examples of Canadian prosperity (p. 13, 57, 125, 182), *Counterpoints* does not forward Canada's economic competitiveness globally as a primary element of its curricular focus. In fact, when the Canadian economy is discussed, room is left for a critical discussion of the contentious nature of economic progress.

We've been less successful in reducing the use of pesticides and herbicides, and in cutting down on packaging and paper consumption. The rate of depletion of Canada's boreal forests, groundwater supplies, and other resources continues to be a concern if sustainability is to be achieved. Greenhouse gas emissions in Canada have increased, despite our agreement to reduce them after signing the Kyoto Protocol. In some respects we seem to be at an ecological crossroads. The 2000 report of the United Nations Environmental Program stated that our present course is unsustainable and postponing action is no longer an option. (p. 446)

*Counterpoints* exhibits powerful language when asking students to debate and discuss the implications of Canada's actions in both a national and a global context when it addresses trends in the global economy (p. 452), the future of developing countries (p. 453), and the future of our planet (p. 454-454), acting globally (p. 456), and Canada's international role (p. 457-458).

Lastly, in a testing preparation resource document (Ministry of Education, 2006), students are asked to answer a comparative question involving Canada's status in the world in regards to national income (p. 21). This minute effort does not directly suggest that thoughts or actions be taken on behalf of Canada's economic ranking in the world, nor does the question encourage students to thinking competitively in a national-economic manner. Clearly, the curricular emphasis for British Columbia, and for what students and teachers are mandated to learn and teach, does not include the global economy, the global competitive or a pro-globalization slant.

## Official history curriculum documents in California

### Finding #4:

**The official curriculum of California provides some possibility for the inclusion of a model of global education that has students learning about the world and how to live in the world.**

While many California curriculum documents failed to include any text favorable to the first two models of global education, some others made limited mention of students learning about the world or learning how to live in the world.

The *History and social science standards for California* (CDE, 2000a) claims in its introduction that students are expected to "... analyze the changing political relationships within and among other countries and regions of the world, both throughout history and within the context of contemporary global interdependence" (p. 5). This document's brief geo-political reference is the only occasion when the second model of global education is favored. Within the document proper, and under the heading of *Students analyze U.S. foreign policy since World War II*, students are asked to "discuss the establishment of the United Nations and International Declaration of Human Rights, International Monetary Fund, World Bank...and their importance in shaping modern Europe and maintaining peace and international order" (p. 58), otherwise reference is made only to bilateral relationships and regional political policies. A sixty-nine page document, these are the only references that would enable teachers and students to employ either the first or second model of global education.

The *History-social science framework for California* (CDE, 2005), entertains the notion of a first or second model on a number of occasions. The introduction of this document emphasizes the historical concept of continuity and change, both within American society and the world. Important to students grasping this enormous idea is knowledge the social sciences

provide about the United States and the world. "The knowledge provided by these disciplines enables students to appreciate how ideas, events, and individuals have intersected to produce change over time as well as to recognize the conditions and forces that maintain continuity within human societies" (p. 17). A global consciousness is encouraged in a limited sense when the introduction claims students should realize "that only a small fraction of the world's population has been fortunate enough to live under a democratic form of government, and we want them to understand the conditions that encourage democracy to prosper . . . students should learn about the cultures, societies, and economic systems that prevail in other parts of the world and to recognize the political and cultural barriers that divide people as well as the common human qualities that unite them" (p. 17-18). A brief mention of global empathy emerges when the introduction claims that it wants students " . . . to care deeply about the quality of life in their community, their nation, and their world" (p. 17).

A modest attempt to recognize the importance of cultural literacy is mentioned, when the document claims that, " . . . students should learn from their earliest school years that our nation is composed of people whose backgrounds are rooted in cultures around the world" (p. 30). As part and parcel to a geographical study unit, students are asked to "understand" international migration patterns, "understand" major regions of the Western and non-Western worlds, in order to appreciate " . . . the growing interdependence and global complexity of their world" (p. 32). Here, the notions of interconnectedness and perspective may allow teachers and students entrée into the first model. As well, students are asked to grapple with important issues such as nuclear arms proliferation and human rights issues in both a national and a global context (p. 178). Debate and discussion is encouraged as a school-wide project in this document, after students prepare individual research reports in their classrooms.

The following description reflects both the significant attention Canada receives in the California curriculum, as well as the characteristics of a first or second model of global education:

A study of postwar relationships between the United States and Canada should note the long history of peaceful, negotiated settlement of problems between these nations. To understand certain problems, students should become sensitive to the Canadian perspective and to Canada's heavy economic dependence on its forest products and oceanic fishing grounds. In turning to the World Court to settle fishing rights to the prolific Georges Bank...the United States and Canada provide an important case study in peaceful arbitration between nations. Among the unresolved problems confronting these two nations is the problem of acid rain, and issue of global interdependence that concerns other nations in the industrialized world today. (p. 161)

This passage reflects the economic nature of the official curriculum in California, not to mention the potential bias that exists within such documents, as it is doubtful that a British Columbian version of the same passage would read with the same tone or content. For this curriculum, Canada is considered important because of the country's close economic ties to the United States. Numerous other opportunities to compare and contrast the two countries are missed due to this exclusive illustration of relations. However, multiple perspectives are recognized here as significant, if only between two countries, and again, the geo-political plays a role with the mention of a supra-national governance body.

Notably, the *History-social science framework for California (CDE, 2005)*, describes the United States and the American way of life in such a way that makes difficult the acquiring of skills, knowledge, and attitudes characteristic of the first, second, or third models. "...the United



States has achieved a level of freedom, political stability, and economic prosperity that has made it a model for other nations, the leader of the world's democratic societies, and a magnet for people all over the world who yearn for a life of freedom and opportunity" (p. 165). With this sort of nationalistic rhetoric, it is difficult to imagine the inclusion of any model of global education, especially a critical one:

*Aiming high: High schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (2006g) is a guide provided by the California Department of Education for how to implement a standards-based educational system. The publication is meant to accompany the standards and framework documents mentioned above. One reference is made in its executive summary to the potential of standards based units of study and assessment. "*Aiming High* outlines a plan for raising student achievement and integrating standards-based education in a rapidly changing world" (p. 7). The remainder of this fifty-page document touts the economic benefits of knowledge to Americans competing in this rapidly changing global economy. These measures will be discussed later in this investigation, but by example, when phrases such as "rapidly changing world" are manufactured for these sorts of curriculum documents, the emphasis in California is found to be almost always economic, and is never transformative.

The American history textbook *The American Pageant* (2005) was scrutinized for the potential it holds in providing space for the first or second models of global education. While this textbook reflects a historical, rather than social studies, orientation, and is notably academic in comparison to many other approved texts, opportunities for the insertion of global education seemed likely to emerge, and they did. Select examples will demonstrate the nature of that inclusion. The opening chapter entitled *New World Beginnings* begins with a sub-section named *Planetary Perspectives* where the reader is encouraged to think that the American empire is one

of many such entities that have influenced the growth and development of the world and its people (p. 4). From here, the nature of the American historical narrative demonstrated numerous opportunities for the inclusion of global education models that illustrate a global perspective, interconnectedness, knowledge and systems.

Abundant examples exist within the textbook where the global origins of American history are demonstrated, whether it the history of the Dutch separatists (p. 44), the French Protestants (p. 105), English members of parliament and King George III (p. 134), German Hessians (p. 143), trading posts in the West Indies (p. 160), the Canadians during the War of 1812 (p. 233), or the Mexican controversy over Texas (p. 286), to provide some examples. Certainly, students introduced to this text are *learning about the world*, albeit in a strictly nationalistic context. Furthermore, notions of second model that include multiple perspectives, global consciousness, geo-political concerns, global citizenship, critical global mindedness, global issues and global empathy are given some light within the passages of the *American Pageant*. By example, a section entitled *Varying viewpoints* claims to have students debate and discuss the query “Europeanizing America or Americanizing Europe” (p. 62). Again, sweatshops are touted as a domestic and an international issue in a section entitled *Struggling for justice at home and abroad* (p. 662) and World War I is ultimately described as a war to end all wars, when Woodrow Wilson is quoted, “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 domination. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make” (p. 722).

While the nature of American history is one based in the discovery of new worlds and therefore opportunities for global reflection are present from page to page of the American

history textbook, models of global education that move away from mere global knowledge and perspective taking do not emerge. As well, the examples of a first and second model of global education that do emerge are bound by the nationalistic and economic context of American history and therefore, teachers and students must work diligently to discover and embrace these opportunities. Opportunities for some global reflection are not *encouraged*, they are at most *unavoidable* within the American textbook narrative. This will become an important notion as this investigation continues with suggestions of how to find space within the national history curriculum for the rooting of a critical global education.

Two national standards programs of study are evaluated for their global content and briefly discussed in this report; one provided by the National Center for History in the Schools (2004), and the other by the National Council of the Social Studies (2006). These history and social science standards are not found to be as impressive a curriculum upon school classrooms, as they are not mandated in the state of California, however, as respected and influential agents of standardization, the two organizations should be considered as part and parcel to what students and teachers observe as the official curriculum, if not of California, than of the United States. The National Center for History in the Schools (2004) claims, "In this most contentious field of the curriculum, there have been many who have wondered if a national consensus could be forged concerning what all students should have opportunity to learn about the history of the world and of the peoples of all racial, religious, ethnic, and national backgrounds who have been a part of that story" (Preface). A difficult task, certainly, and this statement itself points to the problems present in such an endeavor, especially from a global, or at the very least multicultural, perspective. The standards themselves tend to reflect the same level of content as the California standards, where the models of global education are given minimal attention within the economic

and nationalistic context. A global consciousness is interestingly encouraged when the overview for the first two standards describes students' understanding of native relations to the world, and to exploration. "In studying the beginnings of North American history, it is important for students to understand that Indian societies, like peoples in other parts of the world, were experiencing change--political, economic, cultural--on the eve of the arrival of Europeans" (Overview, Standard 1, 2, Era 1). This example, in all of the overviews of standards present in the document, is the only firm globally oriented one until the very last section, entitled, *The contemporary United States*, where a blatant effort is made to promote these ideas. "There can be little doubt, however, that in global politics the role of the United States has led to seismic changes that every student, as a person approaching voting age, should understand. Students can understand little about American attempts to adjust to a post-bipolar world without comprehending these momentous events" (Overview, Standards 1, 2, Era 10). Even here, the mention of geo-political concerns is mediocre at best and teachers and students will find it very difficult to find the space they require for even the first two models of global education.

The National Council for the Social Studies (2006) defines social studies in the executive summary of its standards project as follows: "The primary purpose of social studies is to help young 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" (Executive Summary, p.1). In addition to the standards themselves (it would be redundant to cite this investigation's analysis of these standards in addition to the others employed here), the NCSS provides a series of ten themes present throughout the standards, four of which make mention of global concepts which teachers and students might employ in favor of the first two models of global education. First, under the heading *Culture*, the NCSS claims "Human beings seek to

understand their historical roots and to locate themselves in time. How has the world changed and how might it change in the future” (p. 3). Second, under the heading *People, Places and Environments* the NCSS writes “The study of people, places, and human-environment interactions assists students as they create their spatial views and geographic perspectives of the world beyond their personal locations” (p. 4). Third, under the heading *Global Connections*, the most obvious assertion made in favor of global education is made,

The realities of global interdependence require understanding the increasingly important and diverse global connections among world societies and the frequent tension between national interests and global priorities. Students will need to be able to address such international issues as health care, the environment, human rights, economic competition and interdependence, age-old ethnic enmities, and political and military alliances. (p. 5)

Finally, a fourth theme is named *Civic Ideals and Practice*, and here the NCSS asks, “What is the role of the citizen in the community and the nation, and as a member of the world community” (p. 7)? This being a reference to global citizenship if only from a national perspective, the first one in all of this investigations analysis of the official curriculum in California.

On that note, it is important to mention that over the course of this investigation, two important definitional entrées within the second model of global education are omitted: global citizenship (with the exception of the above-mentioned example) and critical global mindedness. Mainstays of this model of global education, it must be argued that an appreciating for a critical global education is impossible without the presence of these two entities. Another observation attached to this piece of the investigation is that the best examples of global education are present in the rhetoric of overviews, executive summaries, and introductions. The language embedded

within the actual standards finds less room for global concepts, given the economic and nationalistic nature of the American history narrative. It should also be recognized that perhaps an expectation of the standards based curriculum design in California is that a global emphasis is not required in a national history setting when students will have taken a world history course as part of their studies. It must be stated, in return, that this investigation does not lend support to such a notion and that the absence, or presence, of global education in the official, is the object of this investigation.

#### **Finding #5:**

**The official curriculum of California provides exceedingly limited opportunities for the inclusion of a model of global education that has students learning to transform the world.**

Support is given on only three occasions for the inclusion of elements of a critical global education. Notably, significant curricular documents including the *History and social science standards for California* (CDE, 2000a), omit any attempts to draw curricular attention towards this critical pedagogy. It is clear that a critical global education cannot find space within the official curriculum. The forward of the *History-social science framework for California* (CDE, 2005), claims “We want all students to become prepared to participate successfully in events of local, state, national and international significance” (p. 6). To *participate* could be understood as an effort to promote global activism when the opportunity presents itself to students in the future. In *American Pageant* domestic examples of activism such as the civil rights movement are coupled with global struggles for peace and justice around, by example, protests against the war in Vietnam (p. 954), this being a far cry from any sort of formative global education. Finally, the National Center for History in the Schools (2004), under the heading Historical Thinking Skills, asks that students think chronologically and therefore “distinguish between past, present, and

future time” (p. 9); this emphasis could be used by teachers and students to develop better understandings of global decisions and the future consequences that accompany those decisions. Other than these rather modest examples, the official curriculum of California does not employ the language of a critical global education; that is: the global future, global activism, global citizenship, or an anti-globalization orientation.

#### **Finding #6:**

**The official curriculum of California provides abundant opportunities for the inclusion of a model of global education that has students learning to compete in the world.**

The third model, *learning to compete in the world*, is present and holds prominent curricular space for teachers and students to situate their work in California schools. This being said, many curriculum documents from this jurisdiction do not employ even this conceptualization of global education. Instead, these documents reflect only individual or societal prosperity within the nation state and without regard to globalization. The descriptors used here to define the fourth model of global education, are: the global economy, the global competitive, and a pro-globalization emphasis.

The *History and social science standards for California* (CDE, 2000a) claims in its introduction to the eleventh grade history standards that, “. . . students build upon a tenth grade study of global industrialization to understand the emergence and impact of new technology and a corporate economy, including the social and cultural effects” (p. 54). Therefore, embedded within almost all actual standards (11.1, 11.2, 11.4, 11.5, 11.7, 11.8, 11.9), an economic orientation is the only avenue for discussion of global events as they have impacted and will continue to impact Americans. The *History-social science framework for California* (CDE, 2005) states the obvious when it notes, “It is commonplace to acknowledge that we live in an

interdependent world and function in a global economy” (p. 18). Students are asked to understand the international economic system on five levels, first, the organization and importance of the international economic order; second, the distribution of wealth and resources on a global scale; third, [interestingly] the struggle of the developing nations to attain economic independence and a better standard of living for their citizens; fourth, the role of the transnational corporation in changing the rules of exchange; and fifth, the influence of political events on the international economic order (p. 33). These foundations dictate the content of the official curriculum, the assessments procedures that accompany the curriculum, and often discourage any other pedagogical practice, especially that of a critical global education.

*Aiming high: High schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (2006g) makes significant mention of the global competitive in its executive summary and this is immediately translated into the design of the content standards it explains. This document claims, “To be economically self-sufficient, students need access to the top of the hourglass, jobs with good pay and the greatest growth rate...To remain economically viable in the global economy, the state must meet the labor market requirements and produce employees who think and function at high levels” (p. 4). The document concludes its introduction with a question, “How much will students need to learn to be competitive in this new world economy” (p. 7). These comments inform the first chapter of this guiding document, entitled *Using standards-based education to raise the bar*. In this chapter, standards are explained in eleven pages of economic justification: “Such a system will keep California competitive in the global economy (p. 2), students will acquire “The skills required to do their best to adapt to a changing economy and to maintain California’s position in the new global, information economy” (p. 4), Participation in California’s twenty-first century global economy now clearly depends on mastery of rigorous standards” (p. 9).



Of the two national standards projects, the NCSS makes no effort to promote an economic model of global education, while the National Center for History in the Schools (2004) does make some mention of the global economy, albeit never exclusively, and always along with other goals. The preface of the document reads, "Central to this reform agenda was Goal 3, affirming that by the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy" (p. 1). The document goes on to say, under the heading *Policy Issues*,

What the national commitment to high achievement standards for all students can do is to serve as an engine of change: (1) defining for all students the goals essential to success in a rapidly changing global economy and in a society undergoing wrenching social, technological, and economic change; and (2) establishing the moral obligation to provide equity in the educational resources required to help all students attain these goals. (p. 1)

These standards have as a guiding principle the goal of preparing students for success in both the domestic and the global economy.

The *American Pageant* (2005) best exemplifies what has emerged as the primary emphasis for history students facing a year of eleventh grade American history. It has long been the case that the most popular national history narrative in the United States has been one primarily wrapped in an economic fabric. As such, opportunities for a rooting of an economic global education present themselves throughout the average American history textbook when the stories are told of the system of triangular trade (p. 31), mercantilism (p. 122), customs duties (p.

193), the Louisiana Purchase (p. 218), immigration (p. 302), manifest destiny (p. 387), imperialism (p. 622), the Marshall Plan (p. 692), and the Oil Embargo (p. 976), to name a few. While the term *globalization* is never once used in the entire text of *American Pageant*, it would not be difficult for teachers and students to address globally significant economic issues throughout a course of study in American history.

However, despite the content of American history lending itself to a discussion of global economics, the official curriculum does not encourage a global perspective that would produce a viable discussion of global issues in any sort of critical context. The finding that the strongest representation global education has in the official curriculum of California is economic, and that this is spurred along by a primarily economic historical narrative, demonstrates the importance of addressing economics when devising ways and means for teachers and students to apply global education to their study of national history, as this investigation will attempt to do.

#### **Finding #7:**

**The British Columbia Civics 11 curriculum provides a substantial number of additional opportunities for students to learn to transform the world, whereas the California Government 12 curriculum provides almost no opportunities for the inclusion of a critical global education.**

In brief, as this analysis falls out of the frame of reference that is strictly national history education, it is worth describing the global character of official curriculum governing Civic Studies Eleven in British Columbia and Government Twelve in California. A study of the elective course Civics 11 will demonstrate the province's progress forward as it introduces new curriculum. The American Government course is mandated, and will illustrate either congruence with or divergence from the patterns evidenced within the eleventh grade American history

curriculum. Further investigation of these and other core and elective curriculum courses in the United States and Canada is warranted.

The *Civic Studies 11 IRP (2006)* demonstrates a marked dedication to issues of global prominence in its curricular language. The first model of global education is represented by only a few curricular activities including one that has students researching the development of citizenship in Canada and in one other country, historically (p. 58). The second model is represented abundantly in the Civics 11 curriculum. One of many examples of this conceptualization of global education include, "Students will acquire knowledge and develop understandings that enable them to become more mindful of their connections to the civic world and of their responsibilities as members of various local and global communities" (p. 12). Activities attach great importance to this notion of global civic life, demonstrated by this example, "Identify and compare the domestic and international effects of selected Canadian policies or actions...Compare Canada's position on a selected international issue with that of at least one other country" (p. 40). Another activity requires students to assess the function of the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund as it debates the effects of such supra-national interventions. In a critical sense, students are asked to "... propose viable alternatives to the organization's dealings with the country" (p. 101). There are over thirty references to or opportunities for the insertion of a second model of global education throughout this curriculum document.

Furthermore, while there exists only one mention of the global economy (a video resource entitled *The global economy: Globalization*), a relatively significant number of activities and suggested curricular decisions are grounded in the critical fourth model of global education where students learn to transform the world. In more cases than any other curriculum

document, opportunities are provided for teachers and students to insert a critical global education within the official curriculum. "Civic Studies 11 offers opportunities for students to deliberate individually and with others on civic matters – local to global – for the purpose of becoming informed decision makers empowered in civic action" (p. 11); local and global civic action is considered a primary foundation for all activities and curricular projects in this course (p. 31). Additionally, students are asked to evaluate the relative abilities of individuals, governments, and non-governmental organizations to effect civic change in Canada and the world..." (p. 38). Again, much like the second model of global education, a critical global education has significant space within the official curriculum of British Columbia to develop the global, civic, minds of students who decide to take this course.

## **Conclusion**

This investigation intentionally left out reporting upon its analysis of the Grade 12 United States Government course. In reviewing the standards and framework for this mandated curriculum, virtually no references were made in favor of *any* of the models of global education. If the official California curriculum were the only curricular influence present in this course of study, students and teachers would have almost no opportunities to learn about the world, to live in the world, to compete in the world, and certainly not to transform the world. This finding is indicative of an interesting comparative notion that has emerged between the two nations. While the influence of the official curriculum is present in both nations, albeit to a much lesser degree in Canada, a great deal more stands to be learned about the nature of each country's curriculum and associative political orientation, especially in regards to issues of global importance. Does the geo-political ideology (i.e., participation in supra-national organizations, support for global treaties) of each nation to some extent dictate the global nature of the official curriculum? This

research will have to be initiated another day. The question for this investigation remains why did these findings emerge? What social, economic, or political influences are present in each jurisdiction, which are capable of limiting the status of global education, and in many cases, complicating the insertion of a critical global education? Certainly, those influences must be identified, so that the context for suggesting ways and means for teachers and students to insert a critical global education into the teaching and learning of national history may be known and explicated. Moreover, the influence of neoliberal policy making applies quite differently to circumstances in the United States and Canada. This point of contention is discussed in the following chapter and reflects formidably upon the findings reported here.

## Chapter 6: Neoliberal policy making and the advancement of global education

Ira Shor (1986) defines critical thinking as “the habit of analyzing experience and questioning received knowledge” (p. 415), and goes on to describe a critically literate person as someone who, “understands that knowledge is influenced by the values of those who produce it” (p. 420). The remainder of this report will focus upon the official curriculum and the nature of neoliberal policymaking in mandating the teaching and learning of national history. The status of four models of global education in the official curriculum of the state of California and the province of British Columbia has been determined. The results are only moderately appealing for global educationalists, although, British Columbia demonstrated far superior efforts to globalize the curriculum than does California. The first two models of global education received a mediocre level of attention in California, while demonstrating an enhanced status in British Columbia. In California the prominent avenue by which global education found space in the curriculum was economic; a neoliberally inspired conceptualization of global education that promotes learning how to compete in the world. This emphasis was not present in the curriculum documents investigated in British Columbia. Most significantly, a *critical global education*, one that has students learning to transform the world, was not evident in the California history curriculum. In British Columbia, opportunities for the insertion of a critical global education were found frequently in the social studies curriculum.

This investigation will posit neoliberal policy making towards education as a significant culprit in the administering of a formal curriculum and high stakes examinations in California and across the United States. Neoliberalism will be further explicated in this jurisdiction. However, neoliberalism plays a lesser role in the official curriculum and mandated testing in British Columbia. Further study is required around this subject, however, it is clear that in British

Columbia, while the mere existence of a formal curriculum stems from a provincial and possibly corporate need to mandate the work of teachers and students, the economic considerations found in California do not present themselves in the actual curriculum of British Columbia, nor in the sample examinations that were surveyed. Although teachers and union officials complain of attempts by the government to regulate teaching and learning in their province, and although private institutions tied to the economic infrastructure speedily publish comparative data between the schools, when the actual text of the curriculum is analyzed, it is clear that there exists quite an expanse of space for the rooting of critical pedagogies, as well as specifically globally-minded ones. If the influence of neoliberalism were pervasive in British Columbia, the character of the curriculum would be quite different.

While there is no question of the presence of neoliberalism in the United States, only a limited number of authors (Hyslop-Margison & Sears, 2006; Sears, 2005; Smith, 2004; Simon, 2001; Griffith, 2001; Magnusson, 2001; Dale, 1989; Kazepides, 1989) have addressed the signs of an ideological occupation of education by neoliberalism in Canada. These authors, many of whom write in defense of democratic participatory citizenship as a primary element of Canadian schooling, argue that neoliberalism has begun to erode this function. Smith (2004) historicizes the purpose of public schooling when he describes the earliest signs of neoliberal influence in the 1970's, "No longer were Canadians expected to relate to their government as democratic citizens; rather they were perceived as consumers" (p. 306). Hyslop-Margison & Sears (2006) agree that, "schooling for the masses became education for human capital production while democratic education was essentially reserved for the economic elite. Social criticism is viewed as categorically counterproductive to the economic efficiency objectives consistent with market economy logic" (p. 3). Simon (2001) sums up school reform in Canada as dictated by neoliberal

policy making as encouraging all four of the following changes:

The streamlining of school services through budget cuts, adoption of province-wide standardized testing, rewritten mandatory curricula with a focus on a profusion of fragmented learning outcomes, the cutback of teacher development support and preparation time, and the vast reduction in structures that enable local participation in school governance. (p. 11)

Furthermore, Hyslop-Margison and Sears (2006) argue that curriculum documents in Canada have begun to suffer at the hands of neoliberalism, as they have in the United States, and that students and teachers are disabled from envisioning alternatives to worldwide economic globalization. "The naturalization of neoliberal ideology is also expressed throughout contemporary curricula that typically describes present circumstances in terms that suggest their inevitability to learners (p. 12). This assessment is critical of the rise of work-skills education, school choice, and provincial examinations in schools as resembling the businification of schooling that is taking place in the United States. Dale (1989) writes describes curriculum documents throughout Canada as supportive of three educational objectives that are neoliberally inspired: to prepare students as politically passive and compliant workers, to introduce market economy principles such as competition and consumerism directly into public education, and to issue standardized assessments in order to lay blame for educational deficiencies at the feet of schools and teachers instead of government and business. These authors recognize the power neoliberalism lords over education as it creates space for its ideological implantation. This investigation argues that in Canada and the United States, the ideology of a critical global education must fill the place of neoliberalism.

Further research must be done to better understand the potential for business and the



market economy to begin to extend their influence into the content of the curriculum and the examination in British Columbia. Time will also tell, as teachers and students will continue to grapple with the circumstances surrounding the provincial curriculum and examinations. The content of the curriculum must also be continually assessed for changes that result from increased private sector commitment to education. Furthermore, in order to properly distinguish between the two nations, a full geo-political contextualization for each jurisdiction must be completed. After establishing the level and nature of participation of each nation in global affairs, researchers might very well be able to explain the differences that exist in each nation's educational systems and policies. These thoughts are further discussed in this paper's conclusion.

Discourse around neoliberalism is pervasive. Robert McChesney (1999) describes the neoliberal monstrosity in the following manner, "Neoliberalism is a political theory; it posits that society works best when business runs things and there is little possibility of government interference with business as possible . . . where the political sector controls little and debates even less. In such a world political apathy and indifference is quite a rational choice for the bulk of the citizenry" (as quoted in Smith, 2004, p. 35). David Sehr (1997) critically historicizes neoliberalism in this manner:

Neoliberalism is the defining political economic paradigm of our time – it refers to the policies and processes whereby a relative handful of private interests are permitted to control as much as possible of social life in order to maximize their personal profit.

Associated initially with Reagan and Thatcher, for the past two decades neoliberalism has been the dominant global political economic trend adopted by political parties of the center and much of the traditional left as well as the right. These parties and the policies they enact represent the immediate interests of extremely wealthy investors and less than one

thousand large corporations. (p. 5)

There is no doubt that neoliberalism is the primary target of the anti-globalization movement worldwide, and for those who oppose capital's never-ending quest for standardization, privatization and accountability directed towards education in North America, including most global educationalists. McLaren (2000) touts reform of curriculum and educational policy-making, when he writes, "The struggle that occupies and exercises us as school activists and educational researchers needs to entertain global and local perspectives in terms of the way in which capitalists relations and the international division of labor are produced and reproduced" (p. 352). It is the struggle against the influences of neoliberalism as it manifests itself in education that is of primary concern to this investigator.

The purpose of this chapter is to contextualize neoliberalism so that when Freirean critical theory is applied to the national history curriculum in the last chapter of this report, neoliberalism may be targeted for its impact. Space has got to be found for the inclusion of a critical global education. This is not a simple task. "The abstractions of neoliberal capitalism pose particular problems for progressive and critical educators because the language of democratic agency and social responsibility is erased under the prerogative of private values and concerns" (Weiner, 2005, p. 4). Neoliberal policy making towards education ultimately obstructs the effort to instill critical pedagogies and only allows for commonplace conceptualizations of global education.

The application of a critical global education to the national history curriculum by way of Freirean critical theory must identify and contend with standardization and assessment procedures that grow out of neoliberal mandates. In contextualizing neoliberalism, world wide economic globalization must first be branded as the most powerful inspiration for educational policy making that strives to assure the worker and consumer mindedness of students. Second,

neoliberalism must be cited for its specific authority over education, national history curriculum, and global education. In the case of California, these measures are needed immediately, while in Canada an assessment of educational mandates may very well prevent any further measures of standardization from cropping up in the province. With these implications firmly in place, the writings of Paulo Freire are offered as a framework for finding space within the official curriculum for a rooting of a critical global education.

### **Neoliberalism and Globalization**

Globalization is conceptualized here as a world wide economic force, supported and maintained throughout the western and northern world through local, national and supranational neoliberal policy making towards institutions of cultural significance. The ideological glue that binds local and national policies to the global market is neoliberalism. The socio-economic implications of neoliberal enforcement and the global market for non-western and southern countries are widespread and severe. Kellner (2005) argues, "... globalization unfolds a process of standardization in which globalized mass culture circulates the globe creating sameness and homogeneity everywhere" (p. 90). This results in the reformation of culture, the decline of tradition, the loss of language and heritage, and poverty of a more dangerous sort for the poorest nations in the world. While globalization might also display a side of good, or one that gives voice to those who have never spoken in a way that only contemporary geo-communication can provide, globalization must still be seen for how it propagates poverty, ill-health, and market indoctrination for those in the world that rely upon global economic mechanisms such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. This notion is exhibited in a document published by the World Bank (2004) where the organization describes the purpose of education as follows:

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, workers need to be lifelong learners, adapting continuously to changed opportunities and to the labour market demands of the knowledge economy. A comprehensive program of lifelong-learning education for dynamic economies, within the context of the overall development framework of each country, encompasses all levels.

(n.p.)

Bigelow and Peterson (2002) forward four factors that cause workers around the world to accept extremely low wages, deplorable working conditions, and absolutely no possibility for reform or resistance:

1. The history of colonial domination of much of the world that took self-sufficient economies and horribly distorted them.
2. The debt crisis, and how it has been manipulated by western-led institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which bully poor countries with “structural adjustment programs.”
3. The free-trade, “neoliberal” emphasis of recent trade agreements like NAFTA, and now the World Trade Organization, that encourage poor countries to export their way to economic health and to specialize in the “commodity” of cheap labor.
4. Military interventions in places as far apart as Vietnam, Guatemala, and the Congo which have discouraged alternative routes to development. (p. 3)

To ensure the preservation of this global-economic status quo, developed nations must replicate the conditions for success on the global economic front, in places where knowledge and attitudes are primed and readied. Schools are a primary target for national policy making that appeases global market practices and expectations. “Although on a political level schooling is a national enterprise, the essential educational activities of curricula, teaching, and administration

are shaped not just by local and national influences but increasingly by transnational forces” (Baker & LeTendre, 2005, p. xi). In public schools, enforcement of academic standards, mandating of official curriculum, high stakes assessment, and the de-professionalizing of teachers and students are just a few of the circumstances that exist as a result of a national affinity for global economic success. Majia Nadesan (2006) uses well-known Foucauldian power constructs to shape a description of neoliberal inspired disciplinary practices, when she writes, “Although one can applaud the lack of physical force against student bodies . . . one must also attend carefully to the effects of systems of control that hold students psychologically accountable for all transgressions even when stifling classroom conditions . . . are at issue” (p. 18). These abhorrent classroom conditions reflect the neoliberal requirement that world wide economic globalization continue its march, left unchallenged by critical minds. If globalization was to encounter critical challenges, students, teachers and even politicians would realize that world wide economic globalization is best described as a series of myths commonly held and uncontested for students and teachers:

Myth #1: Increased trade equals more jobs for Americans at higher wages.

Myth #2: Governments protect the environment more as global trade creates economic growth.

Myth #3: Foreign investment automatically raises living standards.

Myth #4: Free trade benefits consumers.

Myth #5: Globalization produces development.

Myth #6: What benefits corporations, benefits us all.

Myth #7: Sweatshops are not necessarily a bad thing; that’s how the United States developed, after all.

Myth #8: Immigrants are a drain on the U.S. economy.

Myth #9: Globalization will spread freedom and democracy by increasing trade between nations.

Myth #10: U.S. workers don't need to worry about globalization because we're so much more productive. (Bigelow & Peterson, 2002, p. 17)

These critical issues are currently not part of the curriculum that mandates teacher and student performance in the classroom in California; from the point of view of the official curriculum, students have no introduction to these issues, in fact much of what is constructed as useful knowledge is quite the opposite in nature. In British Columbia, the mandating of curriculum and assessments is itself an outgrowth of economic standardization, modeled on the corporate requirement of quality control and accountability. However, the content of the curriculum in British Columbia allows teachers and students to gain purchase on issues of global significance while deemphasizing a story of national history that is economically bound. It is unclear if the content of the curriculum will continue to demonstrate global allegiance, or if the private sector, the public, or the government will require a content that caters increasingly to issues of national economic development at the expense of global responsibility.

Literature around the subject of globalization as it impacts schools, teachers and students is wide-ranging. Various authors (Monahan, 2005; Torres, 2004; Gaff, 2003; Gandin & Apple, 2002; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Smith, 2002; Fitzsimmons, 2000; Rizvi & Lingard, 2000; Ungerleider, 1996) associate worldwide economic globalization with domestic neoliberal policy-making, and agree that a strong fight must be fought locally, if change is to be had globally. While some theorists argue that turning globalization on its side and taking advantage of its nature to forward emancipatory projects is required, educationalists should not be distracted from

the more important task of confronting neoliberal tendencies toward education that encourage global marketization. For the International Forum on Globalization (2002), globalization is a destructive force when it comes to public schooling. "Global corporations are aiming at nothing less than the dismantling of public schools and health care systems (p. 99). Neoliberalism is the ideological justification for the demise of the public in favor of the private. Teachers and students must act to offset the local and national manifestations of global capitalism if schools and students are to remain places of freedom, and critical teaching and learning.

Other educationists (Baker & LeTendre, 2005; Neubauer, 2005; Papastephanon, 2005; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004; Majhanovich, 2002; Reynolds & Griffith, 2002; Meyer & Boyd, 2001; Dale, 2000; O'Sullivan, 1999) have essentially, and unhelpfully, accepted globalization as a inevitable if not unstoppable force and continue to investigate ways globalization might be reimagined as accommodating the internationalization of education or even the furthering of neoliberal goals in education. These individuals often gloss over the tragedies of globalization and strive to suggest ways teaching and learning might *evolve* to meet the *challenges* of globalization. Green (1997) suggests the demise of the nation state will bring an ultimate and dramatic end to public education, as it is known, this due to the patterns and influence of globalization. "As the national state becomes a marginal force in the new world order so education becomes an individualized consumer good delivered in a global market and accessed through satellite and cable links" (p. 3). The infestation of the official curriculum and the high stakes assessment procedures present in California, and of provincial curriculum, resources, and examination evident in British Columbia, exhibit early signs of this bleak future for education.

This investigation describes the brutal uniformity of the neoliberal classroom environment as having students standardized, assessed, and reassessed on a daily basis. Peter McLaren (1999),

among others (Apple & Singh, 2005; Giroux, 2005, 2004; Huey-Li, 2003; Smith, 2003; Bigelow & Peterson (2002); Daun, 2002; Smith, 2002; Gabbard, 2000; Flecha, 1999; Macedo, 1999; Smith, Carson & Milligan, 1999; Willis, 1999; Winner, 1999; McLaren & Gutierrez, 1998), paints the influence of globalization in much more dramatic terms, calling upon critical theorists to answer the call of the capital-oppressed peoples and denounce the globalization process (McLaren, 1999, p. 11). Specifically, McLaren cites California, when he theorizes class, race and gender in an attempt to link globalization with neoliberal directives locally with the bond of critical theory. Critical theory, when introduced to the neoliberally inspired classroom, can provide an assortment of approaches to teaching and learning that are capable of opposing the general acceptance of globalization as a permanent global force for good and noble causes. Peter McLaren (1994) forwards critical, or contraband, pedagogy as able to illuminate the ideology of the free market as catering exclusively to dominant class interests. McLaren writes, "Critical pedagogy functions as a form of critical utopianism that reveals the birth of tomorrow out of the struggle of today" (p. 33). If teachers and students resist the neoliberal policy making that exists in California and the structures of standardization that exist in British Columbia, then they will be left with their collective interests fulfilled, instead of the interests held exclusively by the most elite class.

The nature of globalization is that individuals experience the effects of it as both national and global citizens. It is here that national history teaching and global education are faced with directives that are the antithesis to what progressive educationalists in these disciplines wish for. "Neoliberalism, as the dominant expression of globalization in the public sector, colonizes public education with its rationalities and yokes the institution to global capital. This helps explain why flexible, multitasking, and enterprising students are desired by the system...and why less



adaptive students are labeled as disciplinary problems and doomed to poverty, imprisonment, or both” (Monahan, 2005, p. 182). This is discovered in every aspect of schooling, and especially in the construction of the official curriculum. If students and teachers accept these conditions, they face the possibility of their own demise, as learners and as professionals. This investigation attempts to locate this local-global tension in the specific realms of national history teaching and global education so that an unambiguous, pedagogically based engagement of the official curriculum in specific jurisdictions might ensue. In these locations, neoliberalism must answer for its specific impact on behalf of world wide economic globalization.

### **Neoliberalism and Education**

Particularly in California, education is central to national economic production. Neoliberal policymaking must be addressed for its arguably destructive effects upon educational practices. William Tabb (2001) defines the nature of neoliberal policy making in education as “...making the provision of education more cost-efficient by commodifying the product; testing performance by standardizing the experience in such a way that allows for multiple-choice testing of results; and focusing on marketable skills” (p.1). Many authors who cite neoliberal influences as destructive (Ross, 2005; Apple & Oliver, 2003; Apple 2003, 2001; Kuehn, 1999; Puiggrós, 1999) find educational policy making, and the day-to-day processes of schooling, as engaging on an entirely political level. Apple (2003) declares education a political endeavor on all levels,

Formal schooling by and large is organized and controlled by the government. This means that by its very nature the entire schooling process – how it is paid for, what goals it seeks to attain and how these goals will be measured, who has power over it, what textbooks are approved, who does well in schools and who does not, who has the right to ask and answer these questions, and so on – is by definition political. (p. 1)

The question of education as political becomes even more immediately crucial when mandates to reform schooling is taken into consideration. All of a sudden, the corporate influences that prey upon legislators will have a heavy hand in moving schooling in one direction or another, as is the case with most institutions of social and cultural importance as the corporatization of society marches forward. This being the case, teachers and students must consider their activities as equally political, as they resist standardization. It is not enough to simply educate students to recognize opportunities for critical reflection and instances of oppression later in life. By then the damage has been done, and it is near impossible to reverse the indoctrination students experienced in their national history courses. Teachers must encourage students to engage the official curriculum now, in a critical manner. This investigation suggests globalizing the national history curriculum in the face of the official curriculum, as a way for students and teachers to resist oppressive measures in education. Teachers must not be afraid to make this part of their daily advocacy of students and educational justice, despite the pressures of high stakes assessment and standardization.

Michael Apple (2003; 2001) and others (Smith, 2004; Spring, 2002; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Hursh, 2000; Lipman, 2000; Taylor & Henry, 2000; Carnoy, 1998; Whitty, 1998; Carlson, 1996; Giroux, 1993; Bowels & Gintis, 1986) also see neoliberal policy making towards education as hurtful to the democratic project of schooling and one that must be met with continued resistance, critique and attack. "Education may indeed be in crisis, but it is a crisis over resources, power, and voice" (Weiler & Mitchell, 1992, p. 1); this being the mantra of critical pedagogues whose aim is to promote teacher and student empowerment, social transformation, and schools as locations of social production, rather than reproduction. As Cole (2005) states, "Education should not exist for the glorification of capital, of consumption, of

commodification. Teachers at all levels of the educational system need to foster critical reflection” (p. 16). Neoliberalism can inspire revolution, by its mere disregard for teachers and students as cultural workers. It is teachers and students who must rise to the occasion of finding space within the neoliberally inspired official curriculum for the insertion of critical pedagogies, especially with regards to national history education.

It is the official curriculum that best illustrates the authority of neoliberal policy making over education. The literature that comments upon the current shape and status of official curriculum is abundant. Authorship that examines the design and impact of official curriculum and knowledge (Hursh, 2001; Ross, 2001; Gabbard, 2000; Apple, 2000, 1982, 1979; Granatstein, 1998; Kliebard, 1986) offer explanations of the official curriculum’s impact on teaching and learning. Hursh (2001) describes the damaging nature of the official curriculum when he writes,

The hegemony of globalized neoliberal economic policies has contributed to redefining education in terms of its contribution to the economy. Consequently, states are developing subject area standards and then aligning the standards with statewide standardized tests. The neoliberal states, through the use of standards, assessments, and accountability, aims to restrict educators to particular kinds of thinking, thinking that conceptualizes education in terms of producing individuals who are economically productive. (p. 2-4)

The official curriculum, as defined in this research report, is any aspect of schooling that falls in line with this ideology of oppression. North American critical commentaries describing the state of textbooks (Clark, 2004; McClintok, 2000; Spring, 1996; Altbach, et al, 1991; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Beyer & Apple, 1988; Cherryholmes, 1992; McCarthy, 1992; Down, 1988; Luke, 1988; Tyson-Berstein, 1988; Schipper, 1983), standards based curriculum (Symcox,

2002; Finn & Petrilli, 2000; Vinson, 2000; Karlson, 1999; Hoff, 1998), and assessment (Glegg & Fleming, 2004; Ross, 2003; Graves, 2002; Popham, 2001; McNeil, L.M., 2000; National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2000; Sandham, 2000; Sacks, 1999) reflections upon the pervasive nature of the neoliberal ideology in all facets of education. An important contributor to the official curriculum has become the adopted textbook. Cherryholmes (1992) writes, "In the case of social studies education, power resides in the state and its textbook adoption procedures . . . [that] . . . define what can be written in social studies textbooks" (p. 99-100). Textbook production takes place within the perimeters of the economic market, and therefore is not immune to the politics of neoliberal policy making. The knowledge that textbooks proclaim is important, as well as the hidden curriculum it decides is not so important, is dictated by a neoliberal mandate to standardize students and teacher performance and to regulate and limit critical inquiry. Often aligned to the standards and frameworks of a particular state or province, textbook publishers must fall in ideological line if their book is to be approved and purchased. These concerns are far more important to the textbook publishers and often results in the production of apolitical and uncritical textbooks.

Vinson (2000) defines standards as "...authoritative policies seeking to prescribe curriculum or content, that is to determine and limit what teachers can and should teach and what students can and should learn....national curriculum standards imply some means of assessment by which teacher and student achievement or performance can be gauged" (p. 298). High stakes assessments and punitive consequences for schools, be it loss of funding in California or a public record of performance published in newspaper reports in British Columbia, are in place not to improve the skills of students as the rhetoric announces. Rather, the market requires workers at all levels, as such assessment guarantees that there will be those who will succeed and take high

paying jobs and those who will not succeed and these individuals will take low paying jobs in the national economy. Part and parcel to this notion is the lack of any opportunities for students to critique the knowledge presented to them, as this activism works against the finely tuned market machine. "Underpinning this position is a vision of students as human capital. In the neoliberal view, the world, primarily an economic world, is intensely competitive and students – as future workers – must be given the requisite skills and dispositions to compete efficiently and effectively" (Apple, 1992, p. 263). To take the idea one step further, students are thought of as workers, and as potential consumers, and certainly not adult critics of the workings of capitalism.

As well, formative educational initiatives in the United States (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001; United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, 2000; Bradley Commission on History in the Schools, 1989; NCSS, 1989; Taskforce on International Education, 1989; Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee, 1988; Gagnon, 1987; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) have announced content standards and frameworks, high stakes assessments, and punitive systems of accountability for states, schools, teachers, and students. Educational reform in the United States "has been linked to the imperatives of big business. Schools in this perspective are training grounds for different sectors of the workforce; they are seen as providing knowledge and occupational skills that are necessary for expanding both domestic production and foreign investment" (Giroux & Simon, 1992, p. 217). Akin to the corporatization of schooling, these measures enforce striking neoliberal ideologies aimed at organizing public schooling into profitable sectors. Backed by government, and in essence by business, school reform illustrates neoliberal ideology at its very worse.

In brief, the No Child Left Behind Act (2001) claims center stage as the most egregious display of neoliberal politics towards education. Bracey (2005), in a piece entitled: *The seven deadly absurdities of no child left behind*, argues that the force with which the federal and state governments have come down upon local schools and school boards with the mandating of a curriculum that exhibits no critical basis and is uniform in its objective to produce workers and consumers, is completely misplaced. Bracey cites the unreliable research methods, harsh sanctions against underperforming schools, wildly optimistic if not misunderstood hopes for widespread proficiency as the project of schools exclusively, illusions of choice, and unfunded mandates as only a few of the problems associated with this type of policy making. "Behind the cover of its idealistic-sounding moniker, *No Child Left Behind* really intends to increase the use of vouchers, increase privatization of public schools, transfer large sums of public funds to the private sector, reduce the size of the public sector, and weaken or destroy the teachers' unions. It is working" (p. 6). Along with numerous other standards-based projects going on the United States in support of this notion of uniformity and accountability, *No Child Left Behind* exemplifies how education is most traumatically effected by a neoliberal ideology that is unwilling to recognize the root causes of academic decline and student underperformance. These are the answers provided for in the private sector, why shouldn't they work for public schools? This rather ignorant and misleading assertion nags at government, and government has responded in kind. Commentary offered to explain the historical and current implications of the California curriculum and of standardization and assessment (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2006; Pepper, 2006; Haertel & Herman, 2005; Edwards, Kirlin, 2004; Koski & Weis, 2004; Oakes & Saunders, 2004; Timar, 2003; Sleeter, 2002; Jago, 2002; American Federation of Teachers,

2000; Darling-Hammond, 1992-93; Herman & Golan, 1993) illustrate the dire consequences of continuing to enforce neoliberal educational policies in this most populous and diverse state.

In an article by Pepper (2006) titled *No corporation left behind: How a century of illegitimate testing has been used to justify internal colonialism*, is specifically critical of the *No child left behind* legislation as culturally bias, damaging to students, contributing to maintaining an uneducated labor force, and as being used to lend legitimacy to policies which lead to cheap labor and larger profits for the private sector (p. 39). The author discusses a notion commonly described by more leftist critics of school privatization and standardization: that standardized exams such as the ones implemented in California, as providing teachers with not crucial information about their students' skill or potential, but rather what socioeconomic and language level the students maintain. McLaren and Farahmandpur (2006) argue for a strong, organized, and widespread resistance to the standards based learning and high stakes exams in California, "A crucial part of every movement needs to be a critical pedagogy, one that pushes the participants in every movement, including the radical education movement, to think and act critically" (p. 99). It is clear by the circumstances in California. To suggest that a critical pedagogy as severe as the ones mentioned here is required to implement change is to also suggest that neoliberally inspired official curriculum and examinations have become deeply embedded in the fabric of schooling and will become harder and harder to contest.

In Canada, the standards based reform movement has seen a less severe force, however, the dangers that are present in the United States may also prey upon the provinces of Canada. As education is organized strictly provincially, education is rarely a national campaign issue. Commentary specific to British Columbia and the province's installation of neoliberal policies towards education (Glegg & Fleming, 2004; MacQueen, 2002; Society for the Advancement of

Excellence in Education, 1997; Carbol, 1988) (less extensive than in the California - the Ontario educational system tends to garner more press, it seems, see Robertson, 2002, 2001), demonstrate the presence of concern for an elite educational program taking shape in British Columbia, as it has across the United States. A recent article in *Teacher* magazine, had secondary school teacher Stephanie Tarr (2006) describing her disappointing trek through the Social Studies 11 curriculum in British Columbia, faced with a looming provincial exam at the end of the course. Tarr illustrates the oppressive conditions of the standardized exam in British Columbia, when she writes, "I am angry because my hopes for lively and engaging debate of the issues, critical thinking, simulation activities, research, document study and video analysis have been largely forfeited in the interests of time and the requirements of the standardized test" (p. 5). The provincial examination is calculated as twenty-percent of a student's mark in that course. With no punitive punishments, such as loss of school funding, resulting from low school performance, a provincial examination cannot be named "high-stakes" as in California. Interestingly, public scrutiny of school performance is a motivator for schools in British Columbia to out-perform another school, as individual school statistics are published through the work of private institutions interested in quantifying the quality of schooling around the province. While models of standards based reform across Canada are being similarly received, the oppressive nature of these mandates does not take on the strikingly do or die mentality of the same conversations in the United States, and yet, teachers and educationalists are becoming increasingly aware of these conditions in Canada.

Ross (2005) acknowledges the similarities in an article describing the governmental unfunded intrusion into public schooling in British Columbia. "As in the U.S., the current situation in B.C. is a reflection of neoliberalism – the policies and processes that permit a handful



of private interests to control as much as possible of social life in order to maximize their personal profits" (p. 3). After a study was published by the right-wing Fraser Institute that rated and ranked the high schools of British Columbia based upon standardized test scores, fallout over the past seven years has resulted in, "...evidence of a swing back towards greater emphasis on formal testing and assessment, something which it seems much of the public wants, not necessarily for its own sake, but as a measure of accountability that can serve to monitor both the school system and the achievement of individual students (Glegg & Fleming, 2004, p. 36).

Education has always been a site of contention for the public and for provincial legislators, and yet it seems as though the private sector will continue to concern itself with school performance.

The educational initiatives of reform in Canada and the United States each have their respective critics (Anderson, 2005; Linn, 2005; Meier & Wood, 2004; Wright, et al, 2004; Levin, 2000; Kelly & Laing, 2000; Soucek, 1999; Ross, 1996; Martell, 1995; Ovando, 2004; Glegg & Murphy, 1993; Giroux & Simon, 1992), whose arguments are grounded in the arguments against standardization and in favor of schools as emancipatory sites, as describe throughout this report. Even so, supporters of neoliberal influenced educational policy making in the United States (Ravitch, 1995; Ravitch & Finn, 1987; Chubb, 2005) and in Canada (Phi-Delta Kappan, 2004; Doherty, Hilberg, Epaloose, Thorp, 2002) consider non-invasive and beneficial policies towards schooling, certainly, teachers and students cannot accept these claims and must work to become less blinded by conservative rhetoric. As McLaren and Farahmandpur (2005) suggest, "The idea here is not to adapt students to globalization, but make them critically maladaptive, so that they can become change agents in anti-global capitalist struggles" (p. 290). The politics of neoliberalism are pervasive and continue to invade schooling and the lives of teachers and students on a daily basis. They must be halted, with whatever means necessary.

In posing the question “Is it possible to alter these politics?” Apple (2003) suggests progressive rhetoric must be turned into action, and while the literature inspires action on the part of academes, teachers and students, rarely mentioned are specific notions of how to carry out that action or where this action should be specifically directed. It is significant to note here, that the majority of the literature that identifies neoliberal policy making as destructive to progressive education practices tends to define these issues very broadly. It is only on occasion that attacks on neoliberalism in education are specifically grounded in an academic subject or discipline or pedagogy. This investigation endeavors to apply these broad theoretical strokes to the specific interests: the documents in California and British Columbia that govern the official secondary national history curriculum in each jurisdiction, and the advancement of the field of global education.

### **National history curriculum and global education**

Neoliberalism has grown so strong in its infestation of the secondary curriculum in North America that subject specific concerns have begun to emerge, especially in and around the social studies (Myers, 2006; Thorton, 2005; Brown & Patrick, 2004; Evans, 2004; Savage, 2003; Vinson & Ross, 2001, 2001a; Pike & Selby, 2000; Merryfield, 1998; Organization of American Historians, 2000, Cherryholmes, 1992). The official secondary national history curriculum in California defends a version of the past that contextualizes historical events and the actions of historical actors in a primarily economic manner. That is, national history teaching becomes a story of national economic progress toward processes of globalization, one that is threatened by critical pedagogy. This is certainly not the case in British Columbia. Hence, a discussion of neoliberal influence upon curriculum in that jurisdiction must halt here.

A critical global education, as this investigator has described, consists of four vital elements: global future, global activism, global citizenship, and anti-globalization sentiments. These are not curricular objectives favored by any neoliberally inspired curriculum. Neoliberalism discourages these distinguishing features of critical, progressive national history education. In forwarding a primarily economic view of national history, one wrapped in the rhetoric of progress and prosperity against and despite all odds, the official curriculum does not offer teachers and students much opportunity to teach and learn contrary to this version of national history. The findings of this research report demonstrate these tendencies and is supported by the only other investigation of its kind, the work of John Myers (2006) as described in his recent article *Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the United States* that reports upon case studies researched in the United States.

Looking at the history of global education and the current role of patriotism in social studies education, we can surmise that politics – here referring to the pressure and influence of various groups of the way that education is practiced – may have indirectly limited the school's curricular choices. In this context, it is unsurprising that programs would not directly address the most controversial elements of global studies. (Myers, 2006, p. 387)

*Learning about the world and learning to live in the world* reflects a minimalist application as evidenced in the first two models of global education, supportive of worldwide economic globalization, and incapable of bringing a legitimate challenge to the neoliberal policy making that drives this type of economic globalization. John Myers (2006) writes, "...learning about the world is necessary because competition in the market is global and corporations are

multinational” (p. 373). *Learning to compete in the world* mirrors the notion that neoliberal policy making encourages a global education that is based in market strategy. That is, students and teachers are encouraged to accept national economic progress as part and parcel to worldwide economic globalization. Meyers articulates this notion, “. . . preparing students for the global economy has been linked with neoliberal education reforms that make schools subservient to economic needs and market mechanisms” (p. 373). Finally, the status of *learning to transform the world* in the official curriculum reflects a neoliberal disdain for a critical model of global education that endorses opportunities for students and teachers to resist worldwide economic globalization and the neoliberal policies that drive it.

The question remains, how has neoliberalism, through an economic rendering of national history education, discouraged the elements of a critical global education from emerging in the official curriculum? To begin with, the notion of global citizenship runs contrary to the neoliberally informed patriotism that emerges in the official curriculum. Specifically, this patriotism promotes acceptance of whatever a western power does and has done to promote economic prosperity for its citizens over the course of its history. As Myers (2006) notes, “To propose that the educational system should develop global as well as national citizens is controversial...because it appears to undermine patriotism to the national state” (p. 371).

In California, students are asked to “examine the effects of . . . the industrial revolution, including demographic shifts and the emergence in the late nineteenth century of the United States as a world power (CDE, 2005, Standard 11.1). Students are not asked to examine the effects of the industrial revolution in any way other than in the context of appreciating the United States as a developing nation. Students are not asked to evaluate what was essentially the origin of the market economy and of corporatization in ways that could draw out a more critical, if not

balanced, historical perspective. Similarly, students are asked to “trace the rise of the United States to its role as a world power in the twentieth century” (Standard 11.4). In both cases, the historical content the students engage is entirely economic. Five out of nine benchmarks within Standard 11.2 included economic content that is couched in terminology such as “Trace the economic development of the United States . . . ” (Standard 11.2). Therefore, the official curriculum encourages an uncompromising faith in the United States as a world economic power in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Students “learn that the United States has served as a model for other nations and that the rights and freedoms we enjoy are not accidents” (Introduction to Standards 11). Students are made to understand American history has an ongoing march towards progress and protections that are predominantly economic in nature, to which the students are indebted. This pattern is replicated throughout the standards and framework documents for the remaining historical eras, and ignores critical global implications of American economic policies during these times.

A critical global education would also allow notions of a global future to emerge in national history education, if it was allowed the curricular space to do so. Instead, a neoliberally stimulated official curriculum often focuses primarily on the future economic conquests of the nation state and of western corporations, within the context of a globalized economy, and rarely provides opportunities for students and teachers to imagine the detrimental effects of such conquest on the peoples and environs of the world’s future. Myers notes the difficulty of offering a pedagogy that challenges the direction of a western nation and one that offers alternatives to the status quo. “At question is whether learning about the world will develop into a sustainable pedagogical project aiming to improve society, or if it will continue as temporary impositions on schools following U.S. foreign policy and the tide of world events” (p. 373).

Discuss the establishment of the United Nations and International Declaration of Human Rights, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and General Agreement on Tariffs and their importance in shaping modern Europe and maintaining peace and international order.

(Standard 11.9)

Here, students are required to reflect uncritically upon the work of international organizations that, arguably, have very different purposes, be it political or economic. To group the United Nations unquestionably with institutions such as the World Bank, is to disallow students and teachers any opportunity to reflect upon a global future that is not tied to the economic structures of the global economy. The mechanisms that support Western economic progress are presented as equally important to the operations of the United Nations, in the context of global society.

Thirdly, a critical global education would require students and teachers to imagine the possibilities of global civic action in pursuit of a better world. A neoliberally mandated course of study encourages a sort of passivity of the mind and body, by excluding critical opportunities for students and teachers to gain moral outrage and a sense of responsibility for the ills of world society. Neoliberalism would never encourage a slow-down of the economic progress of the nation on the global front, so that projects of sustainability, human rights, or debt relief could be forwarded. Myers describes the potential of teaching and learning for political action beyond the nation state, "This dimension addresses key ideas and theories about ways that politics is changing in light of globalization and how individuals can work for a better world, particularly around issues in which one's government and other entities, such as corporations, are complicit" (p. 378). Standards 11.9, 11.10, and 11.11 provide no opportunities for students to challenge the global status quo with visions of global civic action. Couched in completely domestic terms, the American civil rights movement is the only opportunity students would have to envision any sort

of civic action at any level. This is absurd when these standards are situated around contemporary issues such as war, the Middle East, Mexico, and international migration that should encourage a critical view of American foreign policy, if not domestic policy.

Finally, a critical global education ought to maintain an anti-globalization mantra. The evils of world wide economic globalization, as opposed to the potential positive opportunities available at the hands of increased worldwide cooperation, must be challenged on a daily basis. Again, neoliberalism presents an affront to any pedagogy that disrupts the processes involved in maintaining citizens' allegiance to the global economy and national prosperity. Myers argues, "Largely missing from the conceptualizations of global education in the United States are the controversial debates and critiques surrounding globalization, especially those that contain universal ideas [i.e. human rights]" (p. 374).

In British Columbia the term globalization arises on three occasions and always in a critical context. The California official curriculum makes no mention of globalization, and therefore no mention of anti-globalization trends. With globalization functioning as such a powerful economic force in the world today, and with anti-globalization movements exhibiting powerful resistance around the globe, it is difficult to understand why either term does not enter into the verbiage of California standards, frameworks, text books, or other curriculum documents. If standardization is promoted as a means to have students learn and think critically, the absence of globalization as subject matter seems to leave out what could be enormous opportunities for students to learn about the world, and to exhibit valuable critical thinking skills as they debate, discuss, and assess world wide economic globalization and America's participation to that end.

In conclusion, neoliberalism has stimulated the official curriculum in such a way that the tenets of critical global education have very little chance of finding real estate in the mandates

that govern national history teaching in California. The official rhetoric of national history education provides limited opportunities for critical reflection upon the economic ways and means of the nation. A controversial dichotomy exists between the tenets of critical global education and the corresponding influences of neoliberal policy making towards education under the banner of economic national history teaching and learning. These are the locations of discourse and debate that will inspire a Freirean application in favor of the placement of a critical global education into the official curriculum that mandates the teaching and learning of national history. First, global citizenship is antagonized by national economic patriotism. Second, the global future engages national economic progress in the global market. Third, global activism exists up against an uncritical and uninspiring economic status quo. Fourth, anti-globalization confronts pro-globalization.

It is at these intersections of debate around the nature of the official curriculum that the revolutionary nature of Paulo Freire's writings, become apparent. In order for teachers and students to find space within the neoliberally inspired official curriculum for the rooting of a critical global education, each of these disputes must be provoked by critical pedagogy and the theories that stem from a vision of education that emancipates the mind for critical reflection upon the economic nature of national history in California, and the existence of mandated curriculum and assessment in British Columbia.



## **Chapter VII: Finding space within the official curriculum for a critical global education**

Neoliberal policy making toward education is responsible for the mediocre status of global education in the official secondary national history curriculum of California and to a much lesser extent, British Columbia. The elements of a critical global education which include notions of global citizenship, the global future, global activism and anti-globalization, are stymied by elements of a neoliberally inspired curriculum which forwards principally economic ideals, such as national economic patriotism, national economic progress and prosperity, an uncritical assessment of the global economic status quo, as well as pro-globalization sentiments. Gale and Densmore (2000) explain this oppressive view of neoliberal influences over education as grounded in the marketing of human capital. "Neoliberal ideology and its attendant market discourse have gained prominence in recent years, as has the monetary valuing of human relationships in the same way as inanimate products" (p. 139). Arguably, a critical global education would effectively globalize and re-humanize the teaching and learning of national history. Educationalists must be careful of imposing any one curricular ideology on jurisdictions as large and diverse as the one's included here. Constructed as a critical pedagogy a critical global education provides for a logical antithesis to the oppressive demands of the official curriculum and an opportunity to contest the neoliberally inspired story of economic progress that is pervasive in national history education. Therefore, the final purpose of the this research report is to provide insights into how space might be found within the official secondary national history curriculum for the rooting of a critical global education.

Critical pedagogy, specifically the theorizing of Paulo Freire, will be maintained as a conceptual framework for this politically charged project of finding space within the official curriculum. Working from within the neoliberal ideology, from within the confines of the official

secondary national history curriculum, this investigation will provide a necessary political context from which the official curriculum might be challenged. Les Levidow (2001) suggests, "... students and staff often succeed in creating spaces for critical citizenship, even for overt challenges to capitalist agendas" (p. 1). This author recognizes the strong possibility for success at this project; teachers and students must act quickly to globalize the teaching and learning of national history so that the corporatization of knowledge and schooling might not endure. "Education does indeed have a significant degree of relative autonomy. One of the dangers we face has been a tendency to ignore the space education does have to maneuver within the institutional complexes of the state, the economy, and cultural forms" (Apple & Whitty, 2002, p. 75). World wide economic globalization must inspire critical praxis, not merely passive acceptance of globalization.

Neoliberalism must be assessed for the danger that imposes to those who work to free students from the authoritative bonds that restrain their minds and restrict their access to critical inquiry. "Citizenship through schooling means very little in terms of the project of social justice so long as the subject of history (the student as citizen) remains mystified in terms of the way power is inscribed in relations of domination and exploitation" (McLaren & Gutierrez, 1998, p. 330). The social studies, and particularly history education, are presently sites under attack by neoliberal policy makers and their corporate financiers. Teachers and students must not stand by without taking a significant stand against these privately motivated measures, even if it means politicizing their pedagogical routines. In a world where the very idea of "public" is being threatened, for educators to feign neutrality is irresponsible (Bigelow & Peterson, 2002, p. 5). Freirean-inspired critical pedagogies suggests a sort of solidarity between teachers and students, built upon the principles of love and humility, and struck against a political foe: the destructive

nature of capital. Teachers and students might possibly be conceived as agents of change, risking intellectual imprisonment for the purpose of instilling values of within, while hoping to replace, the official curriculum. While accepting of Freire's assertion around teachers as professionals rising above the status of students as young learners, this researcher would argue for teachers and students sharing much the same political plane, as authentic dialogue and concerted listening work to attack an official curriculum that lacks respect for both students and teachers, accept as willing participants in a global capital market. In short, the target of Freirean critical theory is the economic nature of the national history narrative. The most significant implication of this work is the insertion of a critical global education into the official curriculum, making for a course of study that encourages critical assessment of the historical narrative.

This analysis of Freire's critical theory begins with a comprehensive assessment of his foundational work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). Here, the fundamental themes of Freire's work are explicated in terms of neoliberal policy making towards education. These three themes are employed in order to demonstrate the restrictive nature of neoliberal policy-making in education and to inspire critical opposition to those inhibitive measures. Freire writes, "Any educational practice based on standardization is predetermined, is bureaucratizing and anti-democratic" (quoted in Shor, 1993, p. 28). Freire posits *oppression, the student-teacher relationship, and dialogics* as instrumental in understanding what can both be gained and lost at the hands of the neoliberal regime. It would be inadequate to only employ Freire's most quoted project. As Freire wrote, "If I were the same that I was 40 years ago, I would be profoundly disappointed. But at the same time, if I was nothing of what I was 40 years ago, I would be profoundly sad" (Freire, 1994, p. 6). Consequently, Freire's later work around the notion of *colonialism* frames a set of implications for teachers and students as they prepare to embark upon

this very modern project of globalizing the national history curriculum in the face of official curricular mandates. So, in introducing Freire's theoretical basis, as well as one of his most nurtured conclusions, this author is able to demonstrate fair, relevant, and strong use of Freirean critical theory as a means for teachers to reflect and act upon the current status of global education.

### **Freirean critical theory**

It is important to establish a foundational understanding of Freirean critical theory as it was first, and so impressively so, described in Freire's (1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. From here, teachers and students might be willing to consider later, and more complex applications of Freire's theorizing, as will be done in this research report. Before a critical global education might be inserted into the official curriculum, teachers and students must first find inspiration for this politically involved enterprise, inspiration that pours from the pen of Freire in *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Motivation of this sort is required when the objective is as grand as challenging the powerfully pervasive neoliberal ideology.

The first theme taken up by Freire, oppression, impressively translates to the roles of students and teachers as the oppressed, neoliberally inspired curriculum and assessment as the conduit of oppression, and the market driven educational policy as oppressor. The second theme, the student-teacher contradiction, may be understood as the dialectical relationship between teachers who must bend, and students who must submit, to the oppression cast down upon schools in the form of neoliberal policy directives, and the possibility for those roles to be reversed. The third theme, dialogics, illustrates the grand omission of dialogue from the practices of teaching and learning that occur in this current edu-political context. Freire (1983) writes, "...the pedagogy of the oppressed...must be forged *with*, not *for*, the oppressed in the incessant

struggle to regain their humanity” (p. 33). A difficult task, a difficult application, and a difficult context; at the very least, a precise investigation of Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is required before further research involving a re-imagined global education or national history teaching is worthwhile. As Freire himself commands, “The progressive educator must always be moving out on his or her own, continually reinventing me and reinventing what it means to be democratic in his or her own specific cultural and historical context” (quoted in Darder, 2002, dedication). Who can resist such a request?

### **Oppression**

For Freire, the essential concern is for human dignity, or efforts to humanize as opposed to de-humanization the schooling experience. Freire points out youth movements of his time that demonstrated a frustration with not knowing how to humanly exist in what was becoming a being-is-consuming-and-not-questioning, dehumanizing experience of life and schooling. Freire describes the impossible task of revolting against such pervasive forces as those that commit dehumanizing practices against the oppressed, “It is thwarted by injustice, exploitation, oppression, and the violence of the oppressors; it is affirmed by the yearning of the oppressed for freedom and justice, and by their struggle to recover their lost humanity” (p. 28). The oppressed are “submerged in reality,” they are lost in a “self-deprecation,” and lacking the confidence necessary for a revolution of sorts to be enacted. There exist great parallels between what Freire describes as the plight of the illiterate, oppressed people’s of Latin America and that which is considered an equally formidable plight of children today whom have no other alternative other than accepting the grand narrative that is taught them. The official curriculum and related assessment procedures developed in North American countries is suffocating; it is a neoliberally inspired tool of oppression cast down upon what otherwise could be independent and critically

thinking students of the word, and the world. Neoliberal policy is one of the vehicles upon which rides the force of capitalism, and in this case, is specifically geared toward schooling and schools and the production of “good little” capitalist workers and consumers. In opposing these policies, students and teachers are not just saving the schools they are saving humanity, or at least what is gained from an attack upon the official curriculum in context of teaching and learning. “The development of capitalism coincides with the capitalization of humanity” (Rikowski, 2002, 111); students and teachers are becoming something other than human-beings, perhaps human-consumers. Teachers and students have become mere cogs in the capital machine, greased by the oppressive policies of neoliberal politics. Hope lies in the realization by students and teachers of the possibility of human life as a project, rather than a resource (Neary, 2002, p. 149). The teacher and the student, as the only ones who can truly know the feeling of oppression in this sense, have great potential for observing and revolting against such circumstances, and to restore their own humanity, and perhaps that of their oppressors, while avoiding the temptation to become an oppressor. As Freire (1983) comments, “Who can better understand the necessity of liberation? They will not gain this liberation by chance but through the praxis of their quest for it, through their recognition of the necessity to fight for it” (p. 29). A challenging proposition to say the least.

Reality must be transformed, in order for the restoration of humanity to occur, as students and teacher must find ways to move out from the center of an oppressive experience and find freedom and liberation out of reach of that influence. The status quo relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed allows for no action on the part of the oppressed, no opportunity to question the conditions of teaching and learning in the first place. It is this domesticated reality, which Freire imagines transformed by the oppressed people. “. . . the oppressed must be their

own example in the struggle for their redemption” (p. 39). In a present-day sense, there exists no obvious space within the official curriculum for this transformation to take place, the neoliberal powers that be offer no support for such a transformation of reality because the very notion of independent schooling and thinking threatens the production of capital and neoliberal interests. Gabbard’s (2004) notion of curriculum as enforcement comes into play here: “In the final analysis, the economization of social space effected under the hidden corporatism and militarism of compulsory schooling transposes the relations of colonial domination typically associated with the international arena to the domestic scene” (p. 78). Freire’s *systemic education* in contrast with *educational projects* demonstrate the duality of policy that remains unchanged, and policy that has a chance for transformation, respectively. Therefore, the seeking of liberation from a curricular strangle hold, must include teachers and students finding ways to recognize vulnerabilities that exists within the official curriculum, and move out of the oppression that is teaching and learning bound by neoliberal policies towards education.

The pedagogical solution for first humanizing and then transforming the conditions of oppression is understood as Freire’s first stage of the *pedagogy of the oppressed*: through liberation, the oppressed may very well be capable of freeing their oppressors. Instead of merely reversing the terms of the social contract to benefit them, the oppressed must move to include their oppressors in the transformation of the reality. This too is a difficult task, as the oppressors will surely view any attempt to revise the status quo as threatening to their own peace and security, and in a present-day sense, neoliberal influences are pervasive throughout all sectors of society, and as Freire states, “money is the measure of all things and profit the primary goal” (p. 44). The neoliberal influences that drive the habits of the modern institution are not easily turned away, primarily because those who support and espouse neoliberal ideals cannot perceive they

advantage as a disadvantage to another human being. In this sense, teachers must be held accountable for the work they do that promotes the neoliberal agenda. An understanding of teaching as transformative, intellectual, ideological also must include a comprehension of teaching as potentially damaging. Giroux (1985) offers up the notion that "... the role teachers play in producing and legitimizing various political, economic and social interests through the pedagogies they endorse and utilize (p. 378). Furthermore, the most transformative, the most humane projects students and teachers can contribute are those that do not merely uncover space in the official curriculum, but rather use the space to transform the societal ills that are neoliberal in character.

Furthermore, those who recommit themselves to the plight of the oppressed, perhaps once perched above said oppressed as an oppressor, must be honest and forthright in their realization of what has been said here of humanization, transformation, and the reform of the conduits of oppression. Here, the concerned citizen must acknowledge the humanness of the oppressed and begin work to examine their own reason for taking the role of oppressor. The convert who approaches the people but feels alarm at each step they take, each doubt they express, and each suggestion they offer, and attempts to impose his 'status,' remains nostalgic towards his origins. No longer must it be accepted that, They [the oppressed peasant] themselves ignorant and say the "professor" is the one who has the knowledge and to whom they should listen" (Freire, 1983, p. 49). While Freire argues it is best for the oppressed to teach themselves the way of the world, in a present-day sense, it is best to conceive of this revolution in teaching and learning as happening with both teacher and students involved. The teacher is capable of administering her autocratic pedagogy knowing full well the support she has for such a decision. If a teacher should consider a part in the activities around subverting the curriculum, and co-opting the institutional



neoliberalism touted by the schools, then she must be fully on board. Unfortunately, "... as social agents within a neoliberal capitalist regime, one whose link between international competitive forces and neoliberal state policy tightens as market forces gain strength, we seem to lack substance" (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2002, p. 240). Teachers, as potential agents of change, must consider the power of the student teacher relationship, for good and for bad, when they immerse themselves in the profession. This is demonstrated when the teachers realizes what transformative actions students are capable of inside and outside the classroom, and gives herself up for a project that has teacher and student standing upon an even platform of agency.

Lastly, Freire lays great emphasis around the idea of praxis as essential to the practice of liberatory pedagogy. Freirean *praxis* involves taking all of what has been discussed thus far and adding the second stage of *Freirean pedagogy*, that is emancipatory action. Praxis will be further investigated later in this paper, so perhaps another way of describing this intersection of reflection and action is through Freire's *conscientização*, or "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (p. 19). The neoliberal eye cannot see what harm is being done as it does not even see the contradictions Freire asks us to uncover. A certain consciousness, or awareness must prevail so that the structure of this invasion upon schools might be addressed by the most probable of agents of change, that is the students and teachers. This however is a difficult task, given the "...language of bureaucracy, of the colonization of all of our lives by the metaphors of markets, profit, and the accountants bottom line" (Apple & Whitty, 2002, p. 72). Students and teachers must see past this 'progress-forward-only' mentality to observe what ails society and as such accept the notion that they – students and teachers – are engaged in a special endeavor. Teachers and students, newly emancipated, are free to go back and forth between realms of practice and

theory, constantly questioning and constantly addressing reality for what it is, so avoiding the “armchair revolution” Freire speaks of.

So, with praxis as the goal, teachers and students, converts alike, are imagined by Freire to have the ability to transform and humanize the schooling experience, all the while emancipating themselves and the curriculum from dictative neoliberal policies towards education. Freire (1983) writes, “In this way, the presence of the oppressed in the struggle for their liberation will be what it should be: not pseudo-participation, but committed involvement” (p. 56). Students and teachers must question assumptions, get critical, they must run the risk, and they must not be afraid (Introduction) to engage in this liberating praxis of seeing, believing, and doing something about the present nature of curriculum and assessment in schools.

### **The Student-Teacher Relationship**

In a second theme, Freire’s conceptualization of the student-teacher contradiction is associated with the potential role students and teachers have in furthering neoliberal policies in education if a consciousness is not achieved that realizes the harm these mandates present. How might teachers and students re-position themselves in the classroom, so as to provide opportunities for inquiry into the ill effects neoliberal policy-making has on their professional lives as students and teachers?

Freire names as a grave threat the ‘narrative teacher’, or by the well-known descriptor the “banking of knowledge” which sees students as mere depositories, full when learning has completely trained these individuals for their prescribed contribution to the equally oppressive, capitalist society that lies beyond the walls of the school. Freire holds that if oppressive measures of teaching are mandated by the nature of the governance that oversees schools, then students will lose any possibility of a critical consciousness that is capable of questioning the status quo.

Instead, Freire argues, teachers must strive to transform their entire notion of the student-teacher relationship. "If men are searchers and their ontological vocation is humanization, sooner or later they may perceive the contradiction in which banking of education seeks to maintain them, and then engage in the struggle for their liberation" (p. 62). Students must be considered as occupying space in the world, as well as with the world, and teachers must regulate the way the world enters the student (p. 62). Here, the tentacles of neoliberal policy making reach out and impressively sway teachers, and for that matter students, away from a more naturalistic approach to teaching and learning. Under the scrutiny of a data driven administration at all levels, teachers are beginning to accept, for example, assessment procedures as central to their curricular efforts. This is, in fact, the goal of these policies, to standardize the institution to the point where no one questions this capitalist-affirming conduit that is thirteen years in the public school system.

William F. Pinar (2003) approaches this question from the international perspective when he writes, "Within the dominant mode of globalization theory, neoliberal market theory, Herbert Spencer's classic question of the nineteenth century – what knowledge is of most worth? – has been displaced by another: how much is knowledge worth" (p. xii)? Teachers, and students, must realize the scope of their complicity to this end. As transformative an experience a teacher can give students without employing the banking of knowledge model, another teacher can do as significant an amount of damage when they do. Giving themselves over completely to this neoliberally inspired pedagogy (if you can even call it that), will have teachers falling in line, and their students falling farther behind.

Under the heading of the teacher-student contradiction, Freire (1983) presents another premise that demonstrates the notion of oppression and the antithesis, liberation. "Liberation is praxis; the action and reflection of men upon their world in order to transform it" (p. 66). Here,

the banking of knowledge method is discarded, replaced by a question-posing framework for all, that is experienced in and outside of the classroom, and that will lead to possibilities of meaningful dialogue later in the process of transformation. Freire names the roles of teachers and students as “co-investigators” who cognitively experience teaching and learning opportunities, and who regard the banking of knowledge as grounded in the submersion of un-consciousness. It is Freire’s notion of “...education is the practice of freedom” (p. 69) that is obviously not recognized by the neoliberal agents that oversee the design of a curriculum that dominates teachers and students. This then being an impossible terrain over which students and teachers must tread to discover any critical space, so it does not happen for these well-meaning individuals, especially considering the assessment based obstacles that block the way of teachers and students taking back the classroom. Neoliberally inspired curriculum, for example, will not inspire students to think in ways that will emancipate them from what binds them in school: perhaps, acculturation as a consumer of capitalist society. Pauline Lipman (2002) imagines an alternative discourse rooted in social justice, one that would:

... call for schools that encourage students to ask questions as well as answer them; that requires students to use knowledge to work on real world problems of personal, social, and ethical significance; that respect and build on student’s cultures, languages, experiences; schools that give them the tools to survive and struggle against race and class opposition. (p. 58)

Liberation, for Alberto Torres (1999) comes only after a transformative action is taken by students and teachers on behalf of the schools: “In doing so, critical intellectuals highlight the role of education as enlightenment, empowerment, and helping to achieve levels of human freedom in societies that have become subject to commodity exchanges to the benefit of

privileged few” (p. 109). Ways must be discovered for teachers to use schools to turn back the wave of official curriculum; teachers must realize their place in the reality they fail to admit exists, when they teach to the testing and to the standards. Once realized, teachers now as self-actualized objects of oppression, may become subjects of their liberation where better resources are put to the task of finding that elusive space within the official curriculum.

Lastly, in respect to the student-teacher contradiction, Freire emphasizes the importance of problem-posing education. Freire asserts that men are capable of recognizing their human growth as on going, and therefore can problematize this process as they see fit. Opportunities to problem-pose is empowering, and in this manner students and teachers might realize their own liberation from oppression, but can assist others to that same end – hence, a revolution in the making. Alas, the policies that dictate the educational experiences students and teachers will “share” are not impressed with all of this talk of a problem posing method. In fact, because of the neoliberal effort to stagnate the social mobility of the lower classes, or younger minds, it is very difficult for teachers to find ways to break free of this oppression. And yet, this must be done, and such a task is possible when the nature of the modern nation, and world, is exploited. Students and teachers must be able to problematize the neoliberal influences that have impacted their lives as local citizens and as citizens of the world. Space must be found for opportunities to discuss what our nation, and our world has become. As many will agree, “Inequalities both between states and within states have increased dramatically during the era of global neoliberalism” (p. Hill, Sanders & Hankin, p. 161), and this is where students and teachers can discourse, by example, the economic disparity, and relative poverty, which exist in the world. Teachers must not stand back and allow these policies to dictate the question-posing atmosphere of any liberating classroom where teachers enter into a critical space with their students.

Otherwise, as Freire suggests, neoliberal thugs and teachers alike are guilty of a different sort of violence against the humane student. "Any situation in which some men prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence. The means used are not important; to alienate men is to change them into objects" (Freire, 1983, p. 73). Teachers must not serve the oppressor, nor what seems to be the placated demeanor of defeatist students who have melted in the heat of examination; teachers must realize these behaviors to be a sign of a need for revolutionary praxis, beginning with revolutionary dialogue.

### **Dialogics**

A third theme, Freire's assertion of *dialogics* - and the antithesis *anti-dialogical* - are key to the notion of education as the practice of freedom as it is associated to the potential space students and teachers together might actively pursue to overcome oppressive neoliberal strategies toward education that exists today. How might conversations between teachers and students, both formal and informal, be re-imagined as so powerful that they are capable of transforming the ability of official curriculum to withstand the expansion of curriculum that is truly owned and operated (as in the means of production in the school context) by the students and teachers. If education is the practice of freedom, then dialogue between teacher and student are the very essence of that practice and therefore the genetic origin of true liberation.

Here, Freire presents his well-known notion of dialogue whose purpose is to use the word to name the world in an effort to change that world. "Men are not built in silence, but in word, in work, in action-reflection" (p. 76). Freire returns to *praxis* at this juncture, a revolutionary discourse that belongs to every man and is obstructed by neoliberal educational policy making. Freire emphasizes the need for *love, humility, an intense faith, hope, and critical thinking* to dictate a co-dependent approach of this sort, one where the student seeks out meaningful

discourse with the teacher in order to transform the world that provides them no opportunity to be human in and with the world. In fact, present day manifestations of neoliberal policies in education account for none of these principles of human interaction and revolutionary pedagogy. In contrast, the school must be imagined as a place where "...a revolution of everyday life requires that we consider schooling and its various representations according to their complicity in reinforcing the effects of creativity, love, and playfulness" (Ross & Vinson, 2004, p. 21). The administration of standards based teaching and learning, and the implementation of the examinations that follow, prescribe educational practices in such a manner that the word is not allowed this "liberal" connotation. Freire (1983) states, "To glorify democracy and to silence the people is a farce; to discourse on humanism and to negate man, is a lie" (p. 80). While Freire's theories are grounded in the very real plight of an illiterate peasantry, this paper has posited an equally illiterate student sits before us today, fully indoctrinated to the word as grand narrative, and not as a tool of revolution and realization of self-worth. Teachers and students must devise the content of their own questions, curriculum, and educational practices so that truth might emerge and humanness is restored to all those dedicated to the ideal of a free, public education that bares the fruit of a critical citizenry.

The anti-dialogical educator makes programmatic her instruction in that the pre-organization of the lesson assumes for the student all that is necessary to know. The anti-dialogical instructor denies the student active participation in both theirs and the teacher's reality, imposed on them from above. "The oppressors are the ones who act upon men to indoctrinate them and adjust them to a reality which must remain untouched" (p. 83). Passivity is a condition imposed upon the peasantry through the illiteracy that dominates their will to learn more and to become aware. In a manner of speaking this very condition is found rampant throughout public

schools today. Students, in all different manners of conditioning, and at sometimes very different levels of academe, find the content of their studies to be irrelevant and indistinguishable.

Students are bored into submission as one world-view begins to take formation at a very early age and little is done to offer up counter-views during the tenure of students' studies. Neoliberal policy-making has this effect on students and teachers; an effect of almost paralyzing the minds and bodies of students, certainly submerging them, and preventing notions of inquiry from every taking hold or from seeming important. McNeil (2000) describes the devastating nature of the efforts to impose standards, assessments, and accountability upon teachers and students when he writes,

...the role of students as contributors to classroom discourse, as thinkers, as people who brought their personal stories and life experiences into the classroom, was silenced or severely circumscribed by the need for the class to 'cover' a generic curriculum at a pace established by the district and the state for all the schools. (as quoted in Hursh, 2000, p. 42)

Freire (1983) argues, "It is not our role to speak to the people about our own world view, nor to attempt to impose that view on them, but rather to dialogue with the people about their view and ours" (p. 85). Teachers must create for students opportunities for "generative themes" to emerge from discourse, opportunities that illuminate the natural side of the human existence; an existence that holds important notions of curiosity and man as aware of himself as part of the history of the present, a present that can be manipulated and crafted, instead of one stagnate and unchangeable. As Freire suggest, students are obviously different than the animal they are made out to be:

...men, aware of their activity and the world in which they are situated, acting in function



of the objectives which they propose, having the seat of their decisions located in themselves and in their relations with the world and with others, infusing the world with their creative presence by means of the transformation they effect upon it. (p. 88)

Freire comments that in order for students to realize and appreciate, if not use, generative themes in their approach to the world, critical thinking as essential to understanding the “abstract” and the “the concrete – or reality-based” constructions of their world. This is the true goal of fulfilling conscientização in an oppressed person. Knowledge must be decoded, as Freire describes, “...this requires moving from the part to the whole and then returning to the part” (p. 96). It is here critical thinking is required so that what seems concrete at first can be considered in its abstract form, and that students remain conscious of this dialect. The alternative is silence. If students are meant only to think of knowledge as terminally necessary, then they are silenced; in fact, their natural instinct to place themselves inside of the knowledge and relate to it and the circumstances of the world is made absent; no praxis would exist for the student. As Burbules and Berk (1999) write, “Decodification is the attempt to ‘read the world’ with the same kind of perspicacity with which one is learning to ‘read the word.’ In this important regard, critical pedagogy shares with critical thinking the idea that there is something real about which they can raise the consciousness of the people” (p. 53). What is most difficult here, is that the investigator, or teacher, cannot provide a program of study, nor even map the universe of themes for their students. If space is found for critical thought, then perhaps students are empowered enough so to discover this reality themselves and are able to act upon it. Freire (1983) writes:

Men emerge from their submission and acquire the ability to intervene in reality as it is unveiled. Intervention in reality – historical awareness of itself – thus represents a step forward from emergence, and results from the Conscientização of the situation.

Conscientização is the deepening of the attitude of awareness characteristic of all emergence. (p. 100-101)

Silence is what is mandated, or limited thinking bound by the intent to standardize all school children's experience, both in the classroom and cognitively. It is here neoliberal policies towards education create the most harm for students. It is difficult for students to find the space for critical thought and the discovery of generative themes that they can then relate to. This space, I believe, exists, believe it or not, within the confines of the official curriculum that is cast down upon teachers and students, when the very nature of learning and teaching is seen as problematic and pedagogical resources are employed that demonstrate this contradiction. Here, it is useful to reinforce the dialectical, problem-solving potential embedded within, with the words of McLaren, Hill, Cole and Rikowski (2002) when they write,

Under layered by a conviction that inequalities are social and eliminable, critical pedagogy must remain amenable to arbitration and collective decision-making. We remain steadfastly committed to a dialectical approach; one can understand the parts only in relation to their totality. And once such an understanding is acquired, agency is possible, if we understand agency to be the ability of people to change social structures over time. (p. 279)

When students are attune to the concrete nature of the curriculum and assessment procedures they face, it is possible for them to see the other end of the spectrum and to realize the abstract of the knowledge they have been offered, and to now act between the two. Freire quotes Lucien Goldman here: "Real consciousness is the result of the multiple obstacles and deviations that the different factors of empirical reality put into opposition and submit for realization by the potential consciousness" (as quoted in Freire, 1983, p. 105).

In sum, Freirean theory can help to illuminate some of the contradictions of oppression played out in the current school arena in most North American jurisdictions. Freirean prose is best employed here to review the transferability of the theory to current neoliberal circumstances. Freire (1983) points out the most obvious of contradictions between ignorance and knowledge as it is understood in the neoliberal environment, when he writes, "Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry" (p. 58). Freire points out a discrepancy tied to the human condition and not just the institutions of neoliberal object, when again he writes, "Oppression – overwhelming control – is necrophilic; it is nourished by love of death, not life" (p. 64). Furthermore, Freirean theory can help to explain what a truly critical student-teacher relationship might look like in this day and age, when he says, "Education which is able to resolve the contradiction between teacher and student takes place in a situation in which both address their act of cognition to the object by which they are mediated" (p. 82). The content knowledge, the delivery apparatus and the assessment tools all reek of the Freirean notion of the banking knowledge, and yet perhaps the situation is worse than can be imagined. When Freire writes, "... banking theory and practice, as immobilizing and fixating forces, fail to acknowledge men as historical beings; problem posing theory take men's historicity as their starting point" (p. 71), what did that mean for educators in 1970, and what might it mean for present day teachers and students? It might very well be a worse thing to be making deposits, not just of prescribed curriculum, but useless knowledge as well.

This assertion points to the contribution of Freirean theory as a starting point in the application of critical theory to pedagogy, where of course much else will have to be taken into consideration if the theories will actually turn back the neoliberal influences that are so closely

tied to production. Freire might say the answer lies in meaningful and critical dialogue.

“Dialogue with the people is radically necessary to every authentic revolution” (p. 122); here Freire notes the significance of consciousness in the student, and “. . . consequently, any apparent dialogue or communication between the elites and the masses is really the depositing of ‘communiqués,’ whose contents are intended to exercise a dominating influence” (p. 126); here he clarifies the point that can be likened to present day issues of domination through curriculum care of neoliberal mandates. Specifically, Freirean theory illustrates this all-encompassing power of neoliberal politics. Freire writes of the oppressive entity, “The dominant elites . . . can – and do – think without the people – although they do not permit themselves the luxury of failing to think about the people in order to know them better and thus dominate them more efficiently” (p. 126). The official curriculum must be seen as both a conduit of neoliberally inspired rhetoric and practice, and it can be noted for the potential space that can be found within said curriculum for the critical work of students and teachers who wish to preserve humanity, and sanity, in their lives and at work in the schools. “We can legitimately say that in the process of oppression someone oppresses someone else; we cannot say that in the process of revolution someone liberates someone else, nor yet that someone liberates himself, but rather men in communion liberate each other” (p. 128). As Freire notes, a more difficult task lays before these students and teachers in trying to liberate themselves, than the much easier choice of allowing themselves to be oppressed.

### **Implications for teachers and students**

For teachers and students inspired by Freire's earliest and most foundational writings, the project of inserting a critical global education into the official secondary national history curriculum seems a logical final step in challenging neoliberalism in this specific educational context. This operation is essential in California, and becoming so in British Columbia. Revolutionary notions such as global citizenship, the global future, global activism, and an ideological predisposition to oppose world wide economic globalization challenge the economic nature of historical narratives. Neoliberalism encourages acceptance in the minds of students and teachers who turn themselves over to the official curriculum, of western colonialism as a prominent, if not necessary, component of world economic globalization. "For colonialism is a constant feature of the capitalist mode of production which is characterized by restructuring, and the search for new markets. Colonialism takes on different forms and the one that is assuming at present is predicated on neoliberalism with its comitant ideology of the marketplace" (Mayo, 2005, p. 179). It is colonialism, the most evil and destructive aspect of western economic hegemony, which must be identified as the reason d' être for national history education having taken on a substantially economically minded form. Freire often places the notion of decolonizing the minds of the oppressed in the context of a nation having received its independence, but not having thrown off the deep cultural scars of colonialism. "We made our liberation and we drove out the colonizers. Now we need to decolonize our minds" (Freire, 1985, p. 187). This investigation will argue that this framework may also be applied to the contemporary problem of American hegemony drawing its students of history into present day constructions of American colonialism upon the rest of the world. Peter Mayo (2004) writes, "We discover, in Freire, a continuous confrontation with the reality of colonialism, a recurring

feature of a capitalism constantly engaged in exploring new markets and drawing more of the world's population into capitalist social relations of production" (p. 109). McLaren (1997) explains is conception of anti-colonialism in the United States, as " . . . a pedagogy which challenges the very categories through which the history of the colonized has been written. I am certainly talking about not simply colonial countries, but also about groups who have colonized in this country (p. 230). As always, one must approach Freirean critical theory so as to avoid domesticating his work.

Freire's occupation in his later work was grounded in an anti-colonial assessment of neoliberal ideology, and efforts to decolonize the minds of students.

Freire acknowledges that decolonization is a project that knows no endpoint, no final closure. It is a lifetime struggle that requires counterintuitive insight, honesty, compassion, and a willingness to brush one's personal history against the grain of 'naïve consciousness' or commonsensical understanding. After engaging the legacy of revolutionary struggles of the oppressed that has been bequeathed to us by Freire, it remains impossible to conceive of pedagogical practice evacuated of social critique. (McLaren, 2000, p. 170)

At the outset, it must be said that the term colonial brings with it contestable orientations. This investigation will avoid the use of post-colonialism, as the term reflects a problematic assumption that previously colonized entities in the world have been allowed to or have been able to escape the influences of their oppressors reign. This has simply not been the case in so much of the colonized world. For this investigation, the object of a critical pedagogy will be to decolonize the minds of students. In other words, teaching and learning about national history, when globally oriented, might discourage acceptance of western processes of colonialism in the context of world wide economic globalization in the young minds of students. In a larger sense,

these pedagogical efforts are considered part and parcel to an ideology of anti-colonialism. In essence, decolonizing the minds of students by critically globalizing the national history curriculum they are taught is absolutely essential.

Peter Mayo (2005) in a chapter titled *Education for radical humanization in neoliberal times: A review of Paulo Freire's later work* is extremely helpful in examining Freire's notion of anti-colonialism. Paulo Freire was "... concerned with the number of persons who let themselves be deceived by neoliberal slogans and so become submissive and apathetic when confronted with their former dreams" (p. 164). Encouraged by the uprising of democratic movements in South America in the 1990's and through until his death, Freire began to employ a broad use of anti-colonialism. While the term can refer to larger national or geo-political circumstances where entire countries face implications stemming from colonialism, Freire also deems the term important to understanding the oppression of even one person, one gender, one sexuality or one race. A Freirean construction of anti-colonialism is built upon notions of humanization, hope, agency, and democracy as opposed to the fatalistic tendencies of neoliberal policy making towards education. Freire encourages actions on the part of cultural workers to encourage societal reform based upon progressive ideological positions. This project exists in opposition to a neoliberal, even postmodern, view of the status quo. "The quest for such a pedagogy by Freire, the anti-colonial or postcolonial pedagogue par excellence, is in keeping with his long search for the refinement of pedagogical approaches to confront colonialism in its different forms (Mayo, 2005, p. 180). Mayo goes on to explain that Freire was not allowed enough time on this earth to develop these ideas. However, Freire's disdain for neoliberalism made it possible for cultural workers to recognize the implications of world wide economic globalization, its relationship to neoliberalism, how western and northern nations embrace both,

and how the minds of student-citizens are indoctrinated to accept the oppression their nations' impose upon others in the world.

Students of American history, a history constructed around the United States as an economic power imposing its doctrines upon economically and culturally colonized nations around the world, must be engaged in a curriculum that liberates them from taking on the role of willing participant in schemes of globalization. If students are not awarded this privilege, they will become workers unconsciously complicit in the oppression of other workers around the globe, all the while becoming subjects of their own oppression as well. Peter McLaren (1995) describes the influence of this form of neocolonialism as severe. "Oppositional social movements are currently witnessing the dissolution of their public and collective voice; their capacity to engage counter-hegemonic war of position is rapidly diminishing (p. 172). Edward Said describes the same in the specific context of American involvement to this end, "the epic scale of United States global power and the corresponding power of the national domestic consensus . . . have no precedents (1993, p. 323).

Consequently, this investigation posits three Freirean-based theoretical foundations upon which to construct pedagogies of decolonization within the jurisdiction of national history education: First, critical global educationalists who teach national history must be prepared to address the historical notion of the past as a struggle for economic progress and prosperity fought and won by all, for all, as flawed. Freire is often criticized for his use of the term "the oppressed" as not specific enough to the realities and differences present betwixt and between social classes. It is not difficult to imagine that Freire thought of the oppressed as a wide breadth of people's, and the oppressors as a minute, yet all-powerful group of elites, although Freire did not forward class as exclusively important. Donaldo Macedo (1999) writes an excellent expose around the



difference between what every American needs to know, as constructed with the *Dictionary of cultural literacy: What every American needs to know* (Hirsch, Kett, & Trefil, 1988), and what Macedo offers as what every American needs to know but is prevented from knowing (p. 121). Macedo posits a laundry list of examples from American history where the content of what is taught lacks in opportunities for critical reflection simply because the facts and context are intentionally left incomplete and watered down. Macedo describes the historical interpretation wrapped up in the battle cry *Remember the Alamo*, as often absent of any reflection upon the United States' history of expansionism and conquest, and the instigation of a war with Mexico so as to later claim half off Mexico's land (p. 124). Another example is American involvement in the war in Vietnam, where the official curriculum requires an analysis by students that is rooted in a description of the war as a fight to halt communism. The official curriculum does not allow room for an interpretation that the halting of communism was used to justify the bombing of peasant villages, the chemical poisoning of millions of crops, the search destroy missions, the laying waste of an entire country (p. 126). Numerous other examples exist where students lack a global perspective to these and other issues of American economic and cultural conquests over time. A critical global perspective would allow students the opportunity to engage American history in a way that would emancipate them from that history and encourage a more useful approach to analyzing present day history making.

Second, critical global educationalists working in the field of national history education must allow the present everyday experiences of their students to illuminate contradictions in the official historical narrative; inconsistencies that are also present in the context of world wide economic globalization. An historical narrative that evokes progress and prosperity as products of western colonial exploits in the world, must be challenged by the presence of want and

adversity, if not poverty and oppression, in the lives of students and their peers, as well as those that live elsewhere in the world.

Jill Haunold (2002) has written a chapter detailing the depiction of child labor in American history narratives and argues that the oppression that was faced by young people then is no different than today. Students are faced with intellectually crippling experiences in school, dehumanizing incidents at work in the fast food industry, and lies told by officials interested in drafting them into the military. When students learn about the horrific experiences of children living one hundred years ago during industrialization, the official curriculum does very little to encourage students to think of themselves in a similar contemporary bind, and certainly the curriculum does not offer opportunities for students to act on their own behalf or of any other child living anywhere around the globe. Haunold writes, "The history of child labor demonstrates that children's marginalization is so institutionalized and complete that their invisibility and lack of consideration in their own history is unnoticed and considered a demonstration of peaceful change, a change that took over one hundred years to move in what is, arguably, a circle" (p. 101). This being just one example, it is clear that the official curriculum, moreover the neoliberal inspiration for said curriculum, does not authorize this type of critical reflection as it might undo conventional wisdom around work and progress.

To this end, Wallerstein (1987) writes, "Human liberation occurs to the extent that people reflect upon their relationship to the world in which they live . . . In conscientizing themselves, they insert themselves into history as subjects . . . Learners enter into the process of learning not by acquiring facts, but by constructing their reality in social exchange with others" (p. 34). Freirean based critical theory encourages this sort of reflection, where students and teachers engage in dialogue to achieve a critical consciousness that will assist them in realizing the

sources of their own oppression as rooted in historical narrative. Students will also be able to imagine a world without oppression, one that instead of working in the interests of the market, works for the liberation of mind and body. When students realize this to be their own fate, as well as the fate of millions like them around the world, the historical narrative is defeated and national history education is effectively globalized.

Third, global educationalists must promote a national history education that illuminates possibilities of reform and transformation of the global future. An historical narrative that never presents opportunities for critical reflection will not encourage students to imagine a different future; in fact, it is not intended to do so. Reflection upon the economic conditions of the local and the global allow students and teachers to conceive of future actions they might take to resist the propagation of an increasingly severe application of neoliberalism, or globalization, wherever it may take form. Freire (1984) writes, "The future is something that is constantly taking place, and this constant taking place means that the future only exists to the extent that we change the present. It is by changing the present that we build the future, therefore history is possibility, not determinism" (p. 34). Students can get excited for the potential their learning could have in transforming future generations, although this is not the case today under the mandate of an oppressive official curriculum. "We need an education that does not dichotomize the act of knowing the existing knowledge from the act of creating the knowledge not yet created. This dichotomy is an old dichotomy; it began precisely with the system of power created by the evolution of capitalism" (Freire, quoted in Darder, 2002, p. xii). An official curriculum inherently does not seek to discover new, and certainly not transformative, knowledge. Its nature is to impose a pre-conceived knowledge that is neoliberal in its tendencies. The possibility for hope has been removed from the national history narrative.

That is, a hope based upon liberation and social justice has been discouraged. Freire sees history as defined by hope. "Hope is an indispensable seasoning in our human, historical experience. History exists only where time is problematized and not simply a given" (Freire, 1997, 69). This conceptualization of history as the possibility and hope for a transformative future may become the primary project of an educationalist interested in globalizing the national history curriculum. This project is political and it may take on anti-globalization nuances as envisioning a different future entails challenging present global economic structures. "Different tomorrows are possible . . . It is necessary to reinvent the future. Education is indispensable for this reinvention" (Freire, 1997, p. 55).

Decolonizing the minds of students exists as an impressive implication of the insertion of a critical global education into the national history curriculum. While running in contrast to the economic purposes of national history education discussed above, decolonization orients students and teachers in such a manner that they might very well seek out opportunities to combat neoliberal influences in future local, personal, or professional contexts. If nothing else, national history education as a path of indoctrination for neoliberal ideologies is effectively dismantled and deemphasized. Paulo Freire's edu-political theorizing inspires labors that produce these enormous societal effects, these efforts being a revolutionary contribution on the part of students and teachers to the anti-globalization, and anti-standardization cause.

## **Chapter VIII: Conclusion and recommendations for further research**

To challenge the geo-political nature of our times is both an inspirational and a daunting endeavor. To do so in terms of state or provincial education is absolutely necessary. I would offer a number of challenges to those who read this thesis, challenges which I myself have taken up and which have become the foundation for the purpose toward which I teach. These declarations are based upon my practical experience as a classroom teacher and the theoretical findings that have evolved from my research. It has taken both practical and theoretical experience to develop a living, evolving, rationale for my work as a secondary social studies teacher. I am confident that my purpose will serve my students well and I am hopeful that others will take up the activities I have described. I believe that teachers who work under the demands of an oppressive official curriculum must defend a better way. It is not enough to teach students the critical skills they require for adult life and ignore the oppression they face today. The indoctrination school aged children face is too powerful a force for most to overcome later in their adult lives. As Giroux (2006) recently wrote, "throughout the world, neoliberalism functions to decouple learning from the most important elements of civic education, transforming education into training and students into consumers" (n.p.). In addition to the standardization and assessment characteristic of the official curriculum and of schooling in general, national historical narratives must be identified as vehicles for the propagation of a misleading story of unbridled economic progress. The outrageous curricular experiences of students in California must be challenged, disrupted and replaced with an emancipatory pedagogy inspired by students discovering their intellectual potential, not simply identifying the market niche they are socio-economically meant to fill. National historical narratives must be tempered with critique and students must be made aware of the influences that prey upon

national history education. In British Columbia, concern may be muted around these issues; however, anticipating the destructive influence of business and politics in provincial education is a reasonable pursuit.

The creation of mandated curriculum, suggested resources, and provincial examinations in British Columbia illustrates processes of centralizing control over the curriculum, or the production of knowledge. The teacher becomes a cultural transmitter, far removed from the means of production. While further research is required to say for sure, the content of the secondary social studies curriculum reflects Canada's geopolitical status and commitment to international norms, which aligns with the goals and aspirations of the critical global education pictured in this investigation. However, teachers and students in British Columbia must work to preserve their right to design and deliver their curriculum. I believe the public school classroom is one of few sites that may still be capable of hosting a revolution against the ill effects of global capitalism at play in both jurisdictions. While directly attacking world economic globalization from the classroom might prove fruitless, upsetting the neoliberal authority, which delivers global capitalism to our schools, is the strategy offered here.

I have chosen national history education as the subject of my teaching and research. Identifying ways to globalize the world history curriculum seemed a wholly inadequate approach. Confronting neoliberalism with notions of a critical global education was to seek out and infiltrate the most apparent neoliberal stronghold: the official secondary national history curriculum. Students and teachers must be encouraged to imagine a global future devoid of economic inequity caused by the same mechanisms responsible for producing wealthy western and northern nations and corporations. As global citizens first, and as national citizens second, they must work and learn to protect the basic interests of humanity above their own or their

nation's economic welfare. Moreover, observation must lead to action and to visible protests against the everyday representations of neoliberalism and global capitalism. Ultimately, this should take the same form as anti-globalization rhetoric, as students and teachers reflect upon and modify their own participation in a fatalistic system that dehumanizes so many in the world. The teacher is asked here to participate in a political endeavor. I do not consider this an unreasonable charge in California, as standardization and assessment procedures in the state are paramount to oppressive. In Canada, the question remains, to what extent will the loyalty Canada has to its international obligations, be eroded by national economic interests in the global market?

Neoliberalism, with its exploitation of a global labour market, its sustained assault on the economic status of all workers, and powerful mechanisms of ideological manipulation, has provided a bulwark against the complete collapse [of capitalism] predicted by Marx. However, neoliberalism has achieved this objective only at the expense of exacting a tremendous price from the quality of life experienced by working class citizens. (Hyslop-Margison and Sears, 2006, p. 2)

Hyslop-Margison and Sears (2006) accentuate the powerfully ideological and destructive economic nature of neoliberalism in their text *Globalization, Neoliberalism, and human capital learning: Reclaiming education for democratic citizenship*. Throughout these authors' nation of Canada, and in the province of British Columbia, neoliberalism has been identified as an emerging force in opposition to critically minded and civil societal educational pedagogies. Hyslop-Margison and Sears argue, "that contemporary neo-liberal ideology, with its de-historicizing and de-politicizing impact on education policy, seriously erodes the opportunity for students to entertain alternative social visions. These alternative visions include democratic

societies that emphasize social justice, economic equality and sustainable development rather than rampant individualism, unbridled consumerism and systemic competition” (p. 8). Recent Canadian authorship (Bello, 2006) and writers from the past decade (Repo. 1998) have kept a close eye on the march of neoliberalism in educational circles. Bello (2006) summarizes the Canadian context as follows:

There are two competing reform movements in Canadian education today. One is driven by cost cutting governments, flanked by business advisory councils. It is centralized, top-down, geared towards accountability and testing. This "official" reform movement is preoccupied with how to produce students that fit the needs of what it refers to as the global market place. The other reform movement is not oriented towards testing, surveillance, and global competition. It is rooted in a solid curriculum and inspired classroom teaching. It is teacher-driven, grassroots, bottom-up, a democratic movement which believes that schools should help to develop well-rounded individuals, good citizens, and a just society. (p. 8)

This being said, the official secondary national history curriculum of British Columbia continually provides opportunities for a critical global education to be employed by teachers and on behalf of students. The project for Canadian educationalists is to preserve openings such as these and work to dismantle oppressive structures that threaten opportunities for critical teaching and learning so that teachers and students might recognize and oppose harmful ideological influences in their own lives and especially in their national history education. Hamalin (2006) charges Canadian schools and educators with the task of providing “students with a deeper understanding of the historical context in which they live to recognize the ideological threats posed to democratic institutions, political liberty and intellectual autonomy” (p. xii). National



history content should not be mandated around national global economic goals and aspirations as it has in the United States. History education should remain a place where a critical assessment of a nation's past, present and future policy-making may take place.

This undertaking required that I look to the writings of Paulo Freire for inspiration and direction for finding space for the rooting of a global catalyst that would allow students and teachers to challenge the historical narrative that is so easily accepted in the spirit of globalization and national economic progress. Teachers have got to work from within the system of their own oppression, half the time as traditional teachers and bearers of knowledge and learning, and half the time as critical theorists who challenge the traditions of the profession. In balancing the freedom and authority inherent in education (Freire, 1998), teachers must avoid the extremes of *laissez-faire* pedagogy and authoritarianism (Freire, 1987) as they work to illuminate spaces for counter-hegemonic activity. It is my opinion, supported by the findings of this research, that teachers ought to consider themselves participants in a larger social movement against capital and for democracy, as well as humble practitioners working in the best interest of their students. This places teachers at a difficult cross roads in deciding what teaching is enough to insulate students from neoliberally inspired school reform. Teachers must determine the extent to which they believe standardization and assessment policies have impacted their jurisdiction and from there decide what level of pedagogical action to take. Teachers in California and British Columbia must recognize the endangered nature of critical global pedagogies, whether it is an immediate concern as in California, or one that is in the earliest stages of development as in British Columbia. School reform should strive to build relationships and political solidarity to these ends, and must not continue to standardize, test, and place students at the mercy of the market economy.

Perhaps most significant here is the notion of teaching and learning as a political endeavor. Teachers should not reject the idea that they are political participants. Teachers should not fear abusing their position of authority, for neoliberal mandates have already accomplished this task. They must not be anxious about the effect a politically inspired curriculum will have on their students, as this is already the case and in ways destructive to students' minds'. To ignore the political nature of education is to be naive and to do nothing to contest this reality is to allow a most damaging element to continue to grow within our schools and classrooms. For students the same may be said. Students ought to be encouraged to view their nation, the world, and actions of politicians and businesses as political. They must be introduced to means that allow them to critically analyze and act upon what they know and what they learn about the world. Finally, authentic dialogue between teachers and students ought to be recognized as an effort to create solidarity between similarly oppressed groups and not attacked for what it does to challenge the status quo. A globally situated national history education can help to achieve these goals.

In the name of respect I should have toward my students, I do not see why I should omit or hide my political stance by proclaiming a neutral position that does not exist. On the contrary, my role as teacher is to assent to the student's right to compare, to choose, to rupture, to decide. (Freire, 1998, p. 68)

## References

- Alger, C. (1998). Global connections: Where am I? How did I get here? Where am I going? *Social Education*, 62(5), 282-285.
- Alger, C. F., & Harf, J. E. (1986). Global education: Why? For whom? About what? In R. E. Freeman (Ed.), *Promising practices in global education: A handbook with case studies* (pp. 1-13). New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.
- Alladin, I. (1989, May/June). Teaching for global awareness. *The ATA Magazine*, 6-11.
- Altback, P. G., Kelly, G. P., & Kelly, D. H. (1981). *International bibliography of comparative education*. New York: Praeger.
- American Federation of Teachers. (2000). *Making standards matter 1999*. New York: American Federation of Teachers.
- Anderson, C. (1982). Global education in the classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 21(3), 168-176.
- Anderson, C. C. (1990). Global education in the community. In K. A. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action: The ASCD yearbook* (pp. 125-141). Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum Development.
- Anderson, L. F. (1990). A rationale for global education. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action* (pp. 13-34). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for supervision and curriculum development.
- Apple, M. (2003). *The state and the politics of knowledge*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Apple, M. (2001). Comparing neo-liberal projects and inequality in education. *Comparative Education*, 37(4), 409-423.
- Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1982). *Education and power*. Boston: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. Boston: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. (Eds.). (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & Oliver, A. (2003). Becoming right: Education and the formation of conservative movements. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *The state and the politics of knowledge* (pp. 25-50). London: Routledge Farmer.

- Ashford, M. (1995). Youth actions for the planet. In Fowler, R. & Wright, I. (Ed.), *Thinking globally about social studies education* (pp. 75-90). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC: Research and Development in Global Studies Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction.
- Au, W. (2006). Fighting with the text: The dialectical materialist epistemology of Paulo Freire. *AREA Conference*, San Francisco. 1-35.
- Avery, P., & Armstrong, J. (1991). Student's geopolitical perspectives. *Social Education*, 20(9), 320-324.
- Bailey, T., Kennedy, D., Cohen, L. (2005). *The American Pageant (12<sup>th</sup> edition)*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Baker, D., & LeTendre, G. (2005). *National differences, global similarities: World culture and the future of schooling*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Becker, J. (2002). Globalization and global education: Ever the twain shall meet? *The International Social Studies Forum*, 2(1), 51-57.
- Becker, J. (1985). Goals for global education. *Theory into Practice*, 23(3), 228-232.
- Becker, J. (Ed.). (1979). *Schooling for a global age*. New York: Institute for the Development of Educational Activities.
- Becker, J. M., & Anderson, C. (1969). *An examination of objectives, needs and priorities in international education in US secondary and elementary schools*. New York: Foreign Policy Association.
- Begler, E. (1998). Global cultures: The first step toward understanding. *Social Education*, 62(5), 272-275.
- Bennett, W. J. (1988). *Our children and our country*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Berger, P. L. (1974). *Pyramids of sacrifice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, S. (Ed.). (in press, 2007). *Narrating the Nation*. New York: Berhgan Books.
- Beyer, L., & Apple, M. W. (Eds.). (1988). *The curriculum: Problems, politics and possibilities*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Bickmore, K. (2004). Education for peace-building citizenship. In A. Sears, & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects in Canadian social studies* (pp. 187-201). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

- Bigelow, B., Peterson, B. (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Rethinking Schools Press.
- Blaney, D. L. (2002). Global education, disempowerment, and curricula for a world politics. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(3), 268-282.
- Boulding, K. (1985). *The world as a total system*. Beverley Hills, California: Sage.
- Bowels, S., & Gintis, H. (1986). *Democracy and capitalism: Property, community, and the contradictions of modern social thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowers, K. (1986). Review of the politics of education. *Educational Studies*, 22(2), 86-92.
- Bracey, G. W. (2004). The seven deadly absurdities of no child left behind. [Electronic version]. Retrieved on March 15, 2006 from *NoChildLeftBehind.com*
- Bradley Commission on History in Schools. (1988). *Building a history curriculum: Guidelines for teaching history in schools*. No. ED 310 (008). Washington, DC: Educational Excellence Network.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2005b). *Grade 11 provincial examination specifications: Social studies 11*. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/exams/specs/grade11/ss/welcome.htm>
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2005c). *Social studies curriculum overview*. Victoria, BC: British Columbia Ministry of Education.
- Brown, S. D., & Patrick, J. J. (2004). *History education in the United States: A survey of teacher certification and state-based standards and assessments for teachers and students*. Washington, DC: American Historical Association and Organization of American Historians.
- Burbules, N., & Torres, C. A. (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Burbules, N.C. & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, difference and limits. In T. S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Ed.), *Critical theories in education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics* (pp. 44-65). New York: Routledge.
- Byrnes, R. (1997). Global education's promise: Reinvigorating classroom life in a changing, interconnected. *Theory into Practice*, 36(2), 95-101.
- California Department of Education. (2006f). *Testing and accountability*. Retrieved April 2, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstmain.asp>

- California Department of Education. (2006e). *Standards map*. Retrieved April 24, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstmain.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2006d). *Instructional materials: History-social science*. Retrieved March 23, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstmain.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2006c). *Family involvement and partnerships*. Retrieved March 22, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstmain.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2006b). *Data and statistics*. Retrieved March 22, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstmain.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2006). *School wide programs*. Retrieved March 22, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstmain.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2005). *History-social science curriculum frameworks: K-12*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Education.
- California Department of Education. (2002b). *California: To statehood and beyond*. Sacramento, California: Department of Education.
- California Department of Education. (2006). *Aiming high: High schools for the 21st century*. Retrieved March 22, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/ahgen.asp>
- California Department of Education. (1998). *History-social science content standards: K-12*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Education.
- California Department of Education. (2000). *Strategic teaching and learning: Standards-based instruction to promote content literacy in grades four through twelve*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press.
- Carbol, B. C. (1988). Curriculum and assessment trends in British Columbia. *ECS/CDE Conference on Assessment and Curriculum Reform*, Boulder, CO.
- Carlson, D. (1996). Education as a political issue: What's missing in the public conversation about education? In J. L. Kincheloe, & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Thirteen questions: Reframing education's conversation* (2nd ed., pp. 281-291). New York: Peter Lang.
- Carlsson-Paige, N., & Lantieri, L. (2005). A changing vision of education. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 107-123). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know*. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

- Case, R. (1999). Global education: It's largely a matter of perspective. In R. Case & P. Clark (Ed.), *The Canadian anthology of social studies* (pp. 5-82). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education*, 57(6), 318-325.
- Case, R. (1996). Promoting "global" attitudes. *Social Education*, 62(8), 122-128.
- Castells, M., Flecha, R., Freire, P., Giroux, H., Macedo, D., & Willis, P. (1999). *Critical education in the new information age*. Boulder, Colorado: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Caulfield, P. J. (1991). From Brazil to Buncombe County. *Educational Forum*, 55(4), 307-317.
- Cherryholmes, C. (1992). Knowledge, power, and discourse in social studies. In Weiler, K., Mitchell, C. (Ed.), *What schools can do: Critical pedagogy and practice* (pp. 95-116). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Chubb, J. E. (2005). *Within our reach: How America can educate every child*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Clark, P. (2004). The historical context of social studies in English Canada. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Ed.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies*. (pp. 17-36). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.
- Clark, P. (1999). All talk and no action? The place of social action in social studies. In R. Case (Ed.), *The Canadian anthology of social studies: Issues and strategies for teachers* (pp. 265-274). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Cleveland, H. (1986). The world we're preparing our school children for. *Social Education*, 50(6), 416-423.
- Cole, D. (1984). Multicultural education and global education: A possible merger. *Theory into Practice*, 23(2), 151-154.
- Cole, M. (2005). New labour, globalization, and social justice: The role of education. In G. Fischman, P. McLaren, H. Sunkler & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and global conflicts* (pp. 3-24). New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Cole, M., & Hill, D. (2002). 'Resistance postmodernism' - progressive politics or rhetorical left posturing? In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole & G. Rikowski (Eds.), *Marxism against postmodernism in educational theory* (pp. 89-110). Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Conversation with Edward Said. (1993, Fall). *Queen's Quarterly*, 100(3) 665-674.

- Coombs, J. (1989). *Key elements of a global perspective (EDGE series)*. Vancouver: Research and Development in Global Studies, University of British Columbia.
- Couture, C. (2000). Global issues and activated audiences. *Social Education*, 70(2), 74-79.
- Cranny, M., Moles, G. (2001). *Counterpoints: Exploring Canadian issues*. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.
- Cross, B., & Molnar, A. (1994). Global issues in curriculum development. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 69(4), 131-140.
- Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, Department of Education. (2001). *Standards for evaluating instructional materials for social content*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Education.
- Czarra, F., Collins, T., & Smith, A. (1998). Resources on global education. *Social Education*, 62(5), 306-310.
- Dale, R. (2000). Globalization and education. *Educational Theory and Research*, 50(4), 246-262.
- Dale, R. (1989). *The state and educational policy*. Toronto, Ontario: OISE.
- Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Westview Press.
- Darling, L. (1989). *The rise of global education in North America (EDGE series)*. Vancouver: Research and Development in Global Studies, University of British Columbia.
- Darling, L. (1995). Empathy and the possibilities for a global perspective. In R. Fowler & I. Wright (Ed.), *Thinking globally about social studies education* (pp. 35-50). Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, University of British Columbia.
- Darling, L. (1994). *Global education as moral education*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1992-1993). Creating standards of practice and delivery for learning centered schools. *Stanford Law & Policy Review*, 4, 37-48.
- Dewey, J. (1935). *Liberalism and social action*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Doherty, R. W., Soleste, H. R., Epaloose, G., & Tharp, R. G. (2002). Standards performance continuum: Development and validation of a measure of effective pedagogy. *Journal of Educational Research*, 96(2), 78-89.
- Elias, J. L. (1994). *Paulo Freire*. Huntington, NY: Krieger Publishing.



- Evans, R. (1996). A critical approach to teaching United States history. In R. Evans, & D.W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues: NCSS bulletin 93* (pp. 152-160). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Evans, R., & Saxe, D. (1996). *Handbook on teaching social studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Evans, R. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York: Columbia University Teachers College.
- Evans, R. (2001). Teaching social issues: Implementing an issues-centered curriculum. In W. Ross (Ed.). (pp. 78-84). *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and possibilities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Finn, C., & Petrilli, M. T. (2000). *The state of state standards 2000*. New York: Fordham Foundation.
- Fleming, D. (1991). Social studies reform and global education. *Social Studies*, 82(1), 23-28.
- Fowler, R. & Wright, I. (1995). *Thinking globally about social studies education*. University of British Columbia: Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction.
- Fowler, R. (1978). *Global education: A decision-making instructional model*. Toronto: Educational Press.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Freire, P. (1994). *Paulo Freire: Pedagogue of liberation*. Malabar, Florida: Kriegar Publishing Company.
- Freire, P. (1993). Foreward. In P. McLaren, & P. Leonard (Eds.). *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (pp. ix-xii). New York: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1985). *Politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. New York: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
- Freire, P. (1984). *Pedagogy of the city*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1983). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

- Gabbard, D. (2004). Education is enforcement. In K. Saltman, & D. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement: The militarization and corporatization of schools* (pp. 61-80). New York: Routledge.
- Gabbard, D. (2000). *Knowledge and power in the global economy*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gadotti, M. (2003). Education, globalization and planetarization. *Globalization and Education Research Conference*, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Gagnon, P. (1987). *Democracy's untold story: What world history textbooks neglect*. No. ED 313 268). Washington, DC: Education for Democracy Project of the American Federation of Teachers.
- Gale, T., & Densmore, K. (2000). *Just schooling: Explorations in the cultural politics of teaching*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Gandin, L. A., & Apple, M. W. (2003). Educating the state, democratizing knowledge: The citizen school project in Porto Alegre, Brazil. *The state and the politics of knowledge* (pp. 193-220). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Gaudelli, W. (2003). *World class: Teaching and learning in global times*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gilliom, M. (1982). Global education and the social studies. *Theory into Practice*, 20(3), 170-174.
- Giroux, H.A. (1993). *Living dangerously: Multiculturalism and the politics of difference*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Giroux, H.A. (1993). Paulo Freire and the politics of postcolonialism. In P. McLaren, & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (pp. 177-188). New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H.A. (1985). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. *Social Education*, 49(5), 376-379.
- Giroux, H. A., Simon, R. (1992). Schooling, popular culture, and a pedagogy of purpose. In Weiler, K., Mitchell, C. (Ed.), *What schools can do: Critical pedagogy and practice* (pp. 217-236). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature Review*, 32(1), 1-19.
- Giroux, H. A. (2004). *Neoliberalism and the demise of democracy: Resurrecting hope in dark times*. Retrieved March 17, 2006, from [www.dissidentvoice.org](http://www.dissidentvoice.org)
- Giroux, H. A. (1993). *Border crossings*. New York: Routledge.

- Giroux, H. A. (1993). Paulo Freire and the politics of postcolonialism. In P. McLaren, & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (pp. 177-188). New York: Routledge.
- Glegg, A. & Fleming, T. (2004). Teaching to the test or testing to teach: Educational assessment in British Columbia. *Historical Studies in Education*, 16(1), 115-137.
- Good, R. & Prakash, M. (2000). Global education. In D.A. Gabbard (Ed.), *Knowledge and power in the global economy* (pp. 271-277). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Granatstein, J. L. (1998). *Who killed Canadian history?* Toronto, Ontario: HarperCollins.
- Graves, D. H. (2002). *Testing is not teaching: What should count in education*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.
- Green, A. (1997). *Education, globalization and the nation state*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Griffith, A. (2001). Texts, tyranny, and transformation: Educational restructuring in Ontario. In J.P. Portelli & R.P. Solomon (Eds.), *The erosion of democracy in education: From critique to possibility* (pp. 83-98). Calgary, Alberta: Detselig.
- Gulledge, S. (2006). *Global education as good pedagogy*. Retrieved September 9, 2006, from [www.learnnc.org](http://www.learnnc.org)
- Gutok, G. (1993). *American education in a global society*. New York: Longman Press.
- Haertal, E., Herman, J. (2005). A historical perspective on validity arguments for accountability testing. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 104(2), 1-34.
- Hammond, M., & Collins, R. (1993). *One world one, one earth*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- Hanvey, R. G. (1976). *An attainable global perspective*. New York: Center for War/Peace Studies.
- Hargraves, S. (1999). Peace education: Politics in the classroom. In R. Case (Ed.), *The Canadian anthology of social studies: Issues and strategies for teachers* (pp. 109-121). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Haunold, J. (2002). Idel hands are the devil's workshop: A history of American child labor and contemporary education: Emancipation or reconstituted oppression? In J. Slater, S. Fain & C. Rossatto (Eds.), *The Freirean legacy: Educating for social justice* (pp. 95-103). New York: Peter Lang.

- Henderson, J. G., & Kesson, K. R. (2004). *Curriculum wisdom: Educational decisions in democratic societies*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey and Columbus, Ohio: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Hendrix, J. C. (1998, May). Globalizing the curriculum. *The Clearinghouse*, 1(2), 305-312.
- Herman, J., Golan, S. (1994). Assessing the effects of standardized testing on schools. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54(2), 471-482.
- Hill, D., McLaren, P., Cole, M., Rikowski, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Marxism against postmodernism in educational theory*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Hill, D., & Sanders, M. & Hankin, T. (2001). Marxism, social class and postmodernism, forthcoming. In D. Hill, P. McLaren & G. Rikowski (Eds.), *Marxism against postmodernism in educational theory*. Lanham, Massachusettes: Lexington Books.
- Hoff, D. J. (1998). At long last California board adopts standards for all core disciplines. *Education Week*, 18(8), 12-13.
- Hursh, D. (2000). Neoliberalism and the control of teachers, students, and learning: The rise of standards, standardization, and accountability. [Electronic version]. *Cultural Logic*, 4(1).
- Hyslop-Margison, E.J., & Sears, A. (2006). *Neo-liberalism, globalization and human capital learning: Reclaiming education for democratic citizenship*. Montreal: Springer Publishing.
- International Forum on Globalization. (2002). *Alternatives to economic globalization*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Iowa Department of Education. (1989). *A guide for integrating global education across the curriculum*. Des Moines, Iowa: Author.
- Jago, C. (2002). Standards in California: A magical realist view. *Voices from the Middle*, 10(1), 27-30.
- Johnson, D. (1993). Academic and intellectual foundations of teacher education in global perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 32, 3-13.
- Johnson, P. (1993, April 18). Colonialism's back - and not a moment too soon. *The New York Times Magazine*, 22 43-44.
- Joyce, B., & Nicholson, A. (1979). Imperatives for global education. *Schooling for a global age* (pp. 95-110). New York: Institute for Development of Educational Activities.
- Karlson, G. E. (1999). "Decentralized-centralism" governance in education: Evidence from Norway and British Columbia, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 15(5), 525-538.

- Karp, B. (1992). Teaching for global perspective in American national government. *Teaching for Global Perspective*, 23(12), 703-705.
- Kellner, C. (2005). *Media, spectacle and the crisis of democracy*. Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.
- Kelly, F., & Laing, P. (2000). The politics of curriculum. *Education Canada*, 40(3), 40-43.
- Kerr, C. (1979). Education for a global perspective. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 442(3), 109-116.
- Khamisi-Steiner, G. (Ed.). (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kincheloe, J. (Ed.). (2001) *Getting beyond the facts*. New York: Peter Lang.
- King, D. C., Branson, M., & Condon, L. (Eds.). (1976). *Education for a world in change: A working handbook for global perspectives*. New York: Center for Global Perspectives.
- Kiplinger, A. H., & Kiplinger, K. A. (1989). *American in the global 90's: The shape of the future how you can profit from it*. Washington, DC: The Kiplinger Washington Editors.
- Kirkwood, T. (2001). Our global age requires global education: Clarifying definitional ambiguities. *Social Studies*, 92, 1-16.
- Kirkwood, T. (1990). Global education as a change agent. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action* (pp. 142-156). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kirlin, J. J. (2004). Pursuing equity in K-12 education in the context of high immigration and the federal no child left behind act. *Annual Meeting American Political Science Association*, Chicago, IL. 1-38.
- Kliebard, H. (1986). *The struggle for American curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Kniep, W. (1989). Global education as school reform. *Educational Leadership*, 12(8), 43-44.
- Kniep, W. (1986a). Global education: The road ahead. *Social Education*, 50(6), 4-15.
- Kniep, W. (1986). Defining a global education by its content. *Social Education*, 22(10), 437-444.
- Kniep, W. (1985). Global education in the eighties. *Curriculum Review*, 9(4), 27-31.
- Kniep, W. (1987). *Next steps in global education: A handbook for curriculum development*. New York: Global Perspectives in Education.

- Kazepides, T. (1989). Programmatic definition in education: The case of indoctrination. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 14(3), 387-396.
- Kobus, K. (1992). Multicultural/global education: An educational agenda for the rights of the child. *Social Education*, 28(3), 224-227.
- Koski, W. S., & Weis, H. A. (2004). What educational resources do students need to meet California educational content standards? A textual analysis of California educational content standards and their implications for basic educational conditions and resources. *Teachers College Record*, 106(10), 1907-1935.
- Kuehn, L. (2000) Responding to globalization of education in the Americas: Strategies to support public education. *IDEA Conference*, Quito, Ecuador.
- Lamy, S. (Ed.). (1988). *Contemporary international issues: Contending perspectives*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Lamy, S. (1987). *The definition of a discipline: The objects and methods of analysis in global education*. New York: Global Perspectives in Education.
- Lamy, S. (1983). Defining global education. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8(1), 9-15.
- Lamy, S. L. (1989, May/June). The national interest or global interest? *The ATA Magazine*, 40-46.
- Lamy, S. (Ed.). (1988). *Contemporary international issues: Contending perspectives*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Leetsma, R. (1979). Looking ahead: An agenda for action. In J. M. Becker (Ed.), *Schooling for a global age* (pp. 233-243). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leistyna, P. (1999). *Presence of mind: Education and the politics of deception*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Levidow, L. (2001). Marketizing higher education: Neo-liberal strategies and counter-strategies. [Electronic version]. *Cultural Logic*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Levin, B. (2000). Democracy and schools: Educating for citizenship. *Education Canada*, 40(3), 4-8.
- Linn, R. L. (2005). Conflicting demands of no child left behind and state systems: Mixed messages about school performance. [Electronic version]. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(33), 1-6.
- Lipman, P. (2000). Bush's educational plan, globalization, and the politics of race. [Electronic

version]. *Cultural Logic*, 4(1), 1-6.

Lipman, P. (2005). We're not blind: Just follow the dollar sign. *Rethinking Schools*, 19(4), 54-58.

Luke, A. (1988). *Literacy, textbooks and ideology: Postwar literacy instruction and the mythology of Dick and Jane*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Macedo, D. (1994). Our common culture: A poisonous pedagogy. In M. Castells, R. Flecha, P. Freire, H. Giroux, D. Macedo & P. Willis (Eds.), *Critical education in the new information age* (pp. 117-138). Boulder, Colorado: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

MacEoin, M. (1972, March 17). Conscientization for the masses. *National Catholic Reporter*, pp. 4-5.

MacQueen, K. (2002). Education politics. *MacLean's*, 115(4), 24-26.

Magnusson, J.L. (2001). Examining higher education and citizenship in a global context of neoliberal restructuring. In R. Bruno-Jofre & N. Aponiuk (Eds.), *Educating citizens for a pluralistic society* (pp. 95-114). Calgary, Alberta: Canadian Ethnic Studies.

Martell, G. (1995). *A new education politics: Bob Rae's legacy and the response of the ontario secondary school teachers' federation*. Toronto, Ontario: J. Lorimer.

Massiales, B. G. (1991). Education for international understanding. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook on research on social studies research and learning* (pp. 448-458). Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Rethinking Schools Limited.

Mayo, P. (2004). *Liberating praxis: Paulo Freire's legacy for radical education and politics*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Mayo, P. (1993). When does it work? Freire's pedagogy in context. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 25(1), 47-53.

McCarthy, C. (1992). *Race and curriculum*. London: Falmer.

McChesney, R. (1999). *Rich media, poor media*. New York: The New Press.

McClintack, D. (2000). The great American textbook scandal. *Forbes*, 166(12), 178-183.

McConaghy, T. (1990). Global education: Learning to think in a new way. *Phil Delta Kappan*, 42(2), 646-648.

McKinney-Browning, M., & Barth, J. (1994). Social studies: Citizenship education for building nations and educating global citizens. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 6(4), 30-32.

- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the pedagogy of revolution*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (1994). Traumatizing capital: Oppositional pedagogies in the age of consent. In M. Castells, R. Flecha, P. Freire, H. Giroux, D. Macedo & P. Willis (Eds.), *Critical education in the new information age* (pp. 1-36). Boulder, Colorado: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- McLaren, P., Farahmandpur, R. (2006). The pedagogy of oppression: A brief look at no child left behind. [Electronic version]. *Monthly Review*, 58(3)
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). Paulo Freire and digital youth in marginal spaces. In G. Fischman, P. McLaren, H. Sunker & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and global conflicts* (pp. 263-292). New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P., & Gutierrez, K. (1998). Global politics and local antagonisms: Research and practice as dissent and possibility. In D. Carlson, & M. W. Apple (Eds.), *Power/Knowledge/Pedagogy: The meaning of democratic education in unsettling times* (pp. 305-333). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- McLaren, P., & Leonard, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P., & Tadeau da Silva, T. (1993). Decentering pedagogy: Critical literacy, resistance and the pedagogy of memory. In P. McLaren, & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (pp. 47-89). New York: Routledge.
- McNeil, L. M. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Meier, D., & Wood, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Many children left behind*. Boston: The Forum for Education and Democracy.
- Menchions, C. (1997). *Global illiteracy in the age of the Internet or what we fail to tell our children*.
- Merryfield, M. (2001). Moving the center of global education: From imperial world views that divide the world to double consciousness, contrapuntal pedagogy, hybridity, and cross-cultural competence. In W. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 179-208). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.



- Merryfield, M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342-379.
- Merryfield, M. (1992). Getting started in global education: Essential literature, essential linkages for teacher educators *School of Education Journal*, 4(1), 56-66.
- Merryfield, M. (1992). Preparing social studies teachers for the twenty-first century: Perspectives on program effectiveness from a study of six exemplary teacher education programs in global education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 20(1), 17-46.
- Merryfield, M., & Kasai, M. (2004). How are teachers responding to globalization? *Social Education*, 68(5), 354-359.
- Merryfield, M., & Subedi, B. (2006). Decolonizing the mind for world-centered global education. In W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and possibilities* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 283-295). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Merryfield, M., & White, C. (1996). Issues-centered global education. In R. Evans, & D. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp. 177-187). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Merryfield, M. (1997). A framework for teacher education in global perspectives. In E. Jarchow, & S. Pickert (Eds.), *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators* (pp. 1-24). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Meyer, H. D., & Boyd, W. L. (Eds.). (2001). *Education: Between states, markets, and civil society*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Millwood, D. (1974, June). Conscientization and what it's all about. *New Internationalist*.
- Ministry of Education, British Columbia. (2006). *Sample exam and answer key*. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/exams/search/searchresults.php>
- Ministry of Education, British Columbia. (2005a). *Social studies 11, integrated resource package 2005*. Victoria, BC: Author.
- Ministry of Education, British Columbia. (2005b). *Civics 11, integrated resource package 2005*. Victoria, BC: Author.
- Ministry of Education, Department of Assessment. (2005). *Social studies 11: Table of specifications for the provincial examination*. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Education.
- Monahan, T. (2005). *Globalization, technological change, and public education*. New York: Routledge.

- Muessig, R. H., & Gilliom, M. E. (Eds.). (1981). *Perspectives of global education: A sourcebook for classroom teachers*. Columbus, OH: The College of Education, The Ohio State University.
- Myers, J. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the United States. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(2), 370-394.
- National Center for History in the Schools. (2004). *National standards for history*. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/nchs/standards/>
- National Center for History in the Schools. (1996). *Bringing history alive: A sourcebook for teaching US history*. New York: Author.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (2000). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1982). Position statement on global education. *Social Education*, 46(1), 36-38.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1981). *Position statement on global education*. Washington, DC: NCSS.
- National Council on the Social Studies. (2006). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Retrieved June 15, 2006, from [www.ncss.org/standards/](http://www.ncss.org/standards/)
- National Governors' Association. (1989). *American in transition: The international frontier* (Special Issue ed.). Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.
- Neary, M. (2002). Youth, training, and the politics of 'cool'. In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole & G. Rikowski (Eds.), *Marxism against postmodernism in educational theory* (pp. 159-194). Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Nelson, J. (1976). Nationalistic vs. global education: An examination of national bias in the schools and its implications for a global society. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 4(1), 33-50.
- Neubauer, D. (2005). Globalization, interdependence and globalization. *International Seminar on "Education in China: The Dialectics of the Global and the Local"*, Peking University, Beijing, P.R. China.
- Noddings, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Oakes, J., & Saunders, M. (2004). Educator's most basic tools. *Teachers College Record*,

106(10), 1967-1988.

- O'Connell, J. (2006). Preparing students for a rapidly changing global economy. *California Curriculum News Report*, 31(4), 1.
- Oliver, H. (1987). *Sharing the world: A prospect for global learning*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Osborne, K. (1999). Why do we have public schools? In K. Osborne (Ed.), *Education: A guide to the Canadian school debate* (pp. 3-12). Toronto, ON: Penguin Books.
- Osborne, K. (1995). *In defense of history: Teaching the past and the meaning of democratic citizenship*. Toronto: Our School/Our Selves Education Foundation.
- O'Sullivan, B. (1999). Global change and educational reform in Ontario and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 24(3), 311-325.
- Ovando, C. (2004). Teaching for social justice: A critique of the no child left behind. *California Association of Freirean Educators*, Paulo Freire Institute, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Pepper, M. (2006). No corporation left behind. [Electronic version]. *Monthly Review*, 58(7), 1-4.
- Pike, G. (2000). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory into Practice*, 22(2), 64-73.
- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1999). *In the global classroom*. Toronto: Pippen.
- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1995). *Reconnecting from national to global curriculum*. Toronto: International Institute for Global Education, University of Toronto.
- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1988). *Global teacher, global learner*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Popham, W. J. (2001). *The truth about testing: An educator's call to action*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Popkewitz, T. (1980). Global education as a slogan system. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 10(3), 303-316.
- Public Law Number 107-110, 115 no Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), Stat 1425 (2001).
- Quashigah, A., & Wilson, A. (2001). A cross-national conversation about teaching from a global perspective: Issues of culture and power. *Theory into Practice*, 40(1), 55-64.
- Rambler, S. (2002). Teaching and learning in a global society. *Independent School*, 61(3), 100-106.

- Ravitch, D. (1995). *National standards and American education: A citizen's guide*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Ravitch, D., & Finn, C. (1987). *What do our 17-year-olds know? A report on the first national assessment of history and literature*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ravitch, D. (2002). *Should we be alarmed by the results of the latest U.S. history test? (yes)*. Retrieved November 10, 2005, from <http://hnn.us/articles/755.html>
- Reardon, B. (1988). *Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reynolds, C., & Griffith, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Equity and globalization in education*. Calgary, Alberta: Detselig Enterprises.
- Richardson, G. (2004). Global education and the challenge of globalization. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Ed.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 138-149). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Rieff, D. (1993, August). Multiculturalism's silent partner. *Harper's Magazine*, 287(1719), 62-72.
- Rikowski, G. (2002). Education, capital, and the transhuman. In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole & G. Rikowski (Eds.), *Marxism against postmodernism in educational theory* (pp. 111-144). Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Robertson, H. J. (2002). Getting back to essentials. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(7), 495-497.
- Rosenau, J. (1983). Teaching and learning: In a transnational world. *Educational Review Quarterly*, 8(1), 29-47.
- Ross, E. W. (1996). Diverting democracy: The curriculum standards movement and social studies education. *The International Journal of Social Education*, 11(1), 18-39.
- Ross, E. W. (2005). The resistance: Public schools and neoliberal madness in Canada. [Electronic version]. *Substance*. Retrieved March 15, 2006 from [www.substancenews.com/content/view/174/81/](http://www.substancenews.com/content/view/174/81/)
- Ross, E. W. (2003). *Resisting test mania*. Retrieved February 10, 2006, from [www.pipeline.com/~rgibson/rouge\\_forum/newspaper/spring1999/resisting.htm](http://www.pipeline.com/~rgibson/rouge_forum/newspaper/spring1999/resisting.htm)
- Ross, E. W. (2006). Remaking the social studies curriculum. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. pp. 319-332). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

- Ross, E. W., & Vinson, K. D. (2004). Social justice requires a revolution of everyday life. In C. Rossatto, R. L. Allen & M. Pruyn (Eds.), *Reinventing critical pedagogy* (pp. 75-100). Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.
- Sacks, P. (1999). *Standardized minds: The high price of American's testing culture and what we can do to change it*. Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus Books.
- Sandham, J. L. (2000). California schools get rankings based on tests. *Education Week*, 19(21), 16-18.
- Savage, T. (2003). Assessment and quality social studies. *The Social Studies*, 8(5), 201-206.
- Schipper, M. (1983). Textbook controversy: Past and present. *New York Educational Quarterly*, 14(Spring/Summer), 1-36.
- Schuyler, G. & Schuyler, P. (1989). Thoughts on education for global citizenship. In K. McLeod (Ed.), *Canada and citizenship education* (pp. 157-168). Toronto: Canadian Education Society.
- Sears, A. (2005, July). *Citizenship: Education or indoctrination*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Citizenship and Teacher Education, Toronto, Ontario.
- Selby, D. (2006). *Global education*. Retrieved August 10, 2006, from [www.citizens4change.org/global/intro/global\\_education\\_introduce.htm](http://www.citizens4change.org/global/intro/global_education_introduce.htm)
- Selby, D. (1995). Educational for the global age: What is involved? In R. Fowler, & I. Wright (Eds.), *Thinking globally about social studies education* (pp. 22-32). Chicago, Illinois: Foxworthy Press.
- Selby, D., & Pike, G. (2000). Civil global education: Relevant learning for the twenty-first century. *Convergence*, 33(1/2), 138-149.
- Shapiro, S. (1990). *Between capitalism and democracy*. New York: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
- Shaul, M. (1983). Introduction. In P. Freire (Ed.), *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (pp. ii-iv). New York: Continuum.
- Shor, I. (1993). Education is politics: Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren, & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (pp. 25-35). New York: Routledge.
- Shor, I. (1986). Equality is excellence: Transforming teacher education and the learning process. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(4), 415-420.
- Simon, R.I. (2001). Now's the time. In J.P. Portelli & R.P. Solomon (Eds.), *The erosion of democracy in education: From critique to possibilities* (pp. 11-13). Calgary: Detselig.

- Simon, R. I. (1992). *Teaching against the grain: Texts for pedagogy of possibility*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Slater, J., Fain, S., & Rossatto, C. (2002). *The Freirean legacy: Educating for social justice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Sleeter, C. (2002). State our stand and the shaping of student consciousness. *Social Justice*, 29, 62-72.
- Smith, A. (2002). How global is the curriculum? *Educational Leadership*, 28(10), 38-41.
- Smith, D. (2003). Curriculum and teaching face globalization. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 35-51). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smith, M. K. (2002). *Globalization and the incorporation of education*. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from [http://www.infed.org/biblio/globalization\\_and\\_education.htm](http://www.infed.org/biblio/globalization_and_education.htm)
- Smith, M. L. (2004). *Political spectacle and the fate of American schools*. New York: Routledge Farmer.
- Smith, P.J. (2004). The impact of globalization on citizenship: Decline or renaissance. In P. Boyer, L. Cardinal, & D. Headon (Eds.), *From subjects to citizens: A hundred years of citizenship in Australia and Canada* (pp. 301-328). Ottawa, Ontario: University of Ottawa Press.
- Sny, C. (1980). *Global education: An implementation plan and resource guide*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Soucek, V. (1999). Education in global times: Choice, charter, and the market. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 216(16), 22-26.
- Spring, J. (1998). *A primer of liberation education*. Chicago, IL: Black Rose Books.
- Spring, J. (1996). *American education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stanley, M. (1972). Literacy. In S. Grabowski (Ed.), *Paulo Freire* (pp. 76-92). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Publications.
- Study Commission on Global Education (U.S.). (1987). *The United States prepares for its future: Global perspectives in education*. New York: Global Perspectives in Education.
- Swift, J. (1980). Global education: What's in it for us? *English Journal*, 22(12), 47-50.
- Symcox, L. (2002). *Whose history: The struggle for national standards in American classrooms*. New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University.

- Tabb, W. (2001). Essay: Globalization and education as a commodity. *Clarion*, 4(5), 4-6.
- Tarr, S. (2006). Back to names and dates. *Teacher*, 8(4), 5.
- Taylor, S., & Henry, M. (2000). Globalization and educational policymaking. *Educational Theory and Research*, 50(4), 672-686.
- Thorton, S. (2005). Incorporating internationalism into the social studies. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 81-92). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Timar, T. B. (2003). The "new accountability" and school governance in California. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78(4), 177-200.
- Torres, C. A. (2004). No child left behind: A brainchild of neoliberalism and American politics. *New Politics*, 10(2), 38-46.
- Torres, C. A. (1999). Critical theory and political sociology of education: Arguments. In T.S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Ed.), *Critical theories of education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics*. (pp. 87-115). New York: Routledge.
- Townsend, T., & Otero, G. (1999). *The global classroom*. Melbourne, Australia: Hawker Brownlow Education.
- Trofanenko, B. (2005). On defense of the nation. *The Social Studies*, 96(5), 193-198.
- Tye, B., & Tye, K. (1992). *Global education: A study of school change*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Tye, K. (2003). Globalizing global education to nurture world citizens. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(4), 165-168.
- Tye, K., & Kniep, W. (1991). Global education around the world. *Educational Leadership*, 28(3), 47-50.
- Tye, K., & Tye, B. (1992). *Global education: A study of school change*. Albany, New York: State University of New York.
- Tye, K. (2003). Global education as a worldwide movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 23(10), 165-168.
- Tye, K. (1990a). *Global education: School based-strategies*. Orange, California: Independent Press.
- Tye, K. (Ed.). (1990). *Global education: From thought to action. the 1991 ASCD yearbook*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Tyson-Berstein, H. (1988). *A conspiracy of good intentions: American's textbook fiasco*. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Basic Education.
- United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. (2000). *The use of tests as part of high-stakes decision-making for students: A resource guide for educators and policy-makers*. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/ocr/testing/>
- Vinson, K. (2006). Oppression, anti-oppression, and citizenship education. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. p. 51-75). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Vinson, K. (2000). National curriculum standards and social studies education: Dewey, Freire, Foucault, and the construction of a radical critique. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 27(3), 296-328.
- Vinson, K. and Ross, W. (2001). In search of the social studies curriculum: Standardization, diversity, and a conflict of appearances. In W. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 39-48). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Wallerstein, N. (1987). Problem posing education: Freire's methods of transformation. In I. Shor (Ed.), *Freire in the classroom: A sourcebook for liberating teachers* (pp. 33-44). Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Boyton/Cook Publisher.
- Weiler, K., & Mitchell, C. (Eds.). (1992). *What schools can do: Critical pedagogy and practice*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Weiner, E. J. (2005). *Private learning, public needs: The neoliberal assault on democratic education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Werner, W. (1995). Teaching for hope. In Fowler, R. & Wright, I. (Ed.), *Thinking globally about social studies education* (pp. 51-60). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC: Research and Development in Global Studies Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction.
- Werner, W. (1990). Contradictions in global education. In D. Henly, & J. Young (Eds.), *Canadian perspectives on critical pedagogy* (pp. 77-93). Winnipeg, Manitoba: The Critical Pedagogy Network and Social Education Researchers in Canada.
- Werner, W., Case, R. (1997). Themes of global education. In Wright, I., Sears, A. (Ed.), *Trends and issues in Canadian social studies* (pp. 176-194). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Werner, W. (1996). Starting points for global education. *Canadian Social Studies* 30(4), 171-3.
- Western and Northern Canadian Protocol for collaboration in education. (2000). *Foundation*



*document for the development of the common curriculum framework for social studies kindergarten to grade 12*. Retrieved April 20, 2006 from [www.wncp.ca/](http://www.wncp.ca/)

- Whelan, M. (2001). Why the study of history should be the core of social studies education. In W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and possibilities* (pp. 87-95). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Whitty, G. (1998). Citizens or consumers? continuity and change in contemporary education policy. In D. Carlon, & M. W. Apple (Eds.), *Power/Knowledge/Pedagogy: The meaning of democratic education in unsettling times* (pp. 92-109). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Whitty, G. (1998). Interview with Geoff Whitty. In C. A. Torres (Ed.), *Education, power, and the personal biography: Introduction to dialogues with critical educators* (pp. 241-262). London: Routledge.
- Wilson, A. H. (1993). Conversation partners: Helping students gain a global perspective through cross-cultural experiences. *Theory into Practice*, 32(1), 21-26.

# GLOBAL EDUCATION

## DEFINITIONS

The global perspective  
Global interconnectedness  
Global knowledge  
Global systems  
Geo-political  
The global economy  
Global citizenship  
Critical global mindedness  
Global issues  
Global morality  
The global future  
Global activism  
Globalization

## CONCEPTUALIZATION

Global perspective  
Perspective consciousness  
State of the planet awareness  
Cross-cultural awareness  
Knowledge of global dynamics  
Awareness of human choices  
Spatial dimension  
Temporal dimension  
Human potential  
Local – global connections  
Discourse of imperialism  
Ideological orientation  
Multipolar imaginary  
Ecological and cultural awareness  
Global consumership  
Human and universal values  
Global systems  
Global challenges, issues and problems  
Global history  
Multiple perspectives  
Choice, action, and social change  
Interconnectedness and global connections  
Moral education and prejudice reduction  
Future view  
Manpower needs  
Citizenship and self-development  
Globalization

## MODELS

### Learning about the world

Perspective  
Interconnectedness  
Knowledge  
Systems

### Learning to live in the world

Multiple perspectives  
Global consciousness  
Geo-political  
Global citizenship  
Critical global mindedness  
Global issues  
Global empathy

### Learning to compete in the world

Global economy  
Global competitive  
Pro-globalization

### Learning to transform the world

Global future  
Global activism  
Global citizenship  
Anti-globalization

## Appendix B: Summary List of Curriculum Documents

### California

California Department of Education. (2005). *History-social science curriculum frameworks: K-12*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Education.  
(US History Curriculum Framework)

California Department of Education. (2005). *History-social science curriculum frameworks: K-12*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Education.  
(US Government Curriculum Framework)

California Department of Education. (1998). *History-social science content standards: K-12*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Education.  
(US History Content Standards)

California Department of Education. (1998). *History-social science content standards: K-12*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Education.  
(US Government Content Standards)

Bailey, T., Kennedy, D., Cohen, L. (2005). *The American Pageant (12<sup>th</sup> edition)*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.  
(United States History Textbook)

### California Official Standards Based Curriculum Resources and Additional Documents:

Example: California Department of Education. (2006). *Aiming high: High schools for the 21st century*. Retrieved March 22, 2006, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/ahgen.asp>  
(Aiming High: High Schools for the 21st Century)

Example: California Department of Education. (2002b). *California: To statehood and beyond*. Sacramento, California: Department of Education.  
(California Statehood and Beyond)

National Center for History in the Schools. (2004). *National standards for history*. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/nchs/standards/>

National Council on the Social Studies. (2006). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Retrieved June 15, 2006, from [www.ncss.org/standards/](http://www.ncss.org/standards/)

### ***British Columbia***

Ministry of Education, British Columbia. (2005a). *Social studies 11, integrated resource package 2005*. Victoria, BC: Author.  
(Social Studies 11 Integrated Resource Package)

Ministry of Education, British Columbia. (2005b). *Civics 11, integrated resource package 2005*. Victoria, BC: Author.  
(Civics Study 11 Integrated Resource Package)

Cranny, M., Moles, G. (2001). *Counterpoints: Exploring Canadian issues*. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.  
(Canadian Social Studies Textbook)

British Columbia Standards Based Curriculum Resources and Additional Documents:

Example: Ministry of Education, British Columbia. (2006). *Sample exam and answer key*. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from  
<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/exams/search/searchresults.php>  
(Sample Examination Documents and Resources)

Western and Northern Canadian Protocol for collaboration in education. (2000). *Foundation document for the development of the common curriculum framework for social studies kindergarten to grade 12*. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from [www.wncp.ca/](http://www.wncp.ca/)  
(Western Canadian Protocol Social Studies K-12 Foundational Document)