

## *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*

Continuing its calling to define the field and where it is going, the Second Edition of this landmark handbook brings up to date its comprehensive reportage of scholarly developments and school curriculum initiatives worldwide, providing a panoramic view of the state of curriculum studies globally. Its international scope and currency and range of research and theory reflect and contribute significantly to the ongoing internationalization of curriculum studies and its growth as a field worldwide.

Certain concepts reverberate through the chapters—among them technology, assessment, globalization—but are sounded through structures (schools, policies, practices) specific to each nation. However hounded it may be by globalization, the curriculum remains nationally based, locally enacted and experienced in concrete classrooms in specific nations, regions, and localities; its tendencies toward cosmopolitanism or provincialism cannot be ascertained apart from studies of national context: historical, social, cultural. That is why this handbook is organized by country and emphasizes history. At a time of both consolidation and expansion, it captures the rapidly accelerating internationalization of curriculum research as nationally distinctive fields engage in disciplinary dialogue with each other.

Changes in the Second Edition:

- Five new or updated introductory chapters pose transnational challenges to key questions curriculum research addresses locally.
- Countries absent in the First Edition are represented: Chile, Colombia, Cypress, Ethiopia, Germany, Iran, Luxembourg, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, and Switzerland.
- 39 new or updated chapters on curriculum research in 34 countries highlight curriculum research that is not widely known in North America.

As the main text in courses devoted exclusively to internationalization and globalization in curriculum studies or a supplemental text in general curriculum courses, this Handbook contextualizes national school reform efforts for prospective and practicing teachers in the United States and elsewhere. As a personal and pedagogical resource, it is an indispensable volume for curriculum studies scholars and students around the world.

**William F. Pinar** is Canada Research Chair in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, Canada.

[INSERT SERIES PAGE HERE]

*International Handbook of Curriculum Research*  
Second Edition

Edited by

William F. Pinar

First published 2014  
by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Simultaneously published in the UK  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2014 Taylor & Francis

The right of the editor to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*  
[CIP data]

ISBN: 978-0-415-80429-5 (hbk)  
ISBN: 978-0-415-80430-1 (pbk)  
ISBN: 978-0-203-83169-4 (ebk)

Typeset in [font]  
by [Typesetter]

Printed and bound in the United States of America on acid-free paper.

Contents

Acknowledgments

Introduction

William F. Pinar

Section I

*Five Essays of Introduction*

Chapter 1

*The Internationalization of Curriculum Research*

Tero Autio

Chapter 2

*Race and Education in the Age of Digital Capitalism*

Cameron McCarthy, Ergin Bulut, Rushika Patel

Chapter 3

*Wisdom Responses to Globalization*

David Geoffrey Smith

Chapter 4

*The Globalization of Curriculum Research:*

*Lessons from Europe*

Daniel Tröhler

Chapter 5

*A Nonviolent Perspective on Internationalizing Curriculum Studies*

Hongyu Wang

Section II

*39 Essays on Curriculum Research in 34 Countries*

Chapter 6

*Curriculum Studies in Argentina: Documenting the Constitution of a Field*

Silvina Feeney and Flavia Terigi

Chapter 7

*The Curriculum Field in Brazil since the 1990s*

Alice Casimiro Lopes and Elizabeth Macedo

Chapter 8

*Curriculum Tendencies in Brazil*

Silvia Elizabeth Miranda de Moraes

Chapter 9

*Curricular Landscapes, Neoliberal Densities: Curriculum Reform and Research in Chile*

Claudia Matus Cánovas

Chapter 10

*Curriculum Studies in China: Retrospect and Prospect*

Zhang Hua and Zhenyu Gao

Chapter 11

*Curriculum Studies in Colombia*

Juny Montoya-Vargas

Chapter 12

*Curriculum Studies in Cyprus:  
Intellectual History and Present Circumstances*

Nikoletta Christodoulou

Chapter 13

*Curriculum Development and Research in Ethiopia*

Woube Kassaye

Chapter 14

*Governing Autonomy:  
Subjectivity, Freedom, and Knowledge in Finnish  
Curriculum Discourse*

Antti Saari, Sauli Salmela, Jarkko Vilkkilä

Chapter 15

*Curriculum, Evaluation, and Control in Germany*

Wolfgang Böttcher

Chapter 16

*Competence-Oriented Curriculum Reform in the Federal Republic of Germany*

Charlotte Röhner

Chapter 17

*In Search of a Diverse Curriculum:  
Toward the Making of a Postmodern Hong Kong in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

Edmond Hau-Fai Law

Chapter 18

*The Iranian Curriculum Field Recounted:  
Understanding the Multiplicity of Discourses*

Mahmoud Mehrmohammadi

Chapter 19  
*Curriculum Inquiry in the Republic of Ireland*  
Kevin Williams and Elaine McDonald

Chapter 20  
*Curriculum Planning from the  
National to the Glocal: The Israeli Case*  
Yehoshua Mathias and Naama Sabar

Chapter 21  
*“Cities and Signs”:  
Understanding Curriculum Studies in Italy*  
Paula M. Salvio

Chapter 22  
*Educational Reform in Contemporary Japan*  
Tadahiko Abiko

Chapter 23  
*Japanese Educational Reform for the Twenty-First Century:  
The Impact of New Course Studies  
towards the Post-Modern Era in Japan*  
Shigeru Asanuma

Chapter 24  
*Political Change and Development of Centralized Curriculum Policy in South Korea*  
Yonghwan Lee

Chapter 25  
*Curriculum Studies as Reconceptualization Discourse:  
A Tale of South Korea*  
Young Chun Kim, Dong Sung Lee, and Jae Hong Joo

Chapter 26  
*Tomorrow Never Dies A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Luxembourgish Curriculum*  
Thomas Lenz, Anne Rohstock and Catherina Schreiber

Chapter 27  
*Curriculum Research in Mexico*  
Frida Díaz Barriga

Chapter 28  
*Curriculum Research in the Netherlands*  
Willem Wardekker  
Monique Volman  
Jan Terwel

Chapter 29  
*Curriculum Studies in Nigeria*  
Rosita Okekenwa Igwe

Chapter 30  
Curriculum Theory and Research in Norway:  
Traditions, Trends and Topics  
Kirsten Sivesind and Berit Karseth

Chapter 31  
*Theoretical Approaches Underlying Primary Education Curricula in Peru*  
Lileya Manrique, Diana Revilla and Pilar Lamas

Chapter 32  
*Poland: Through Golden and Dark Ages of History and Education*  
Aleksandra Łuczak

Chapter 32  
*Curriculum Research in Portugal: Emergence, Research, and Europeanization*  
José Augusto Pacheco  
Filipa Seabra

Chapter 34  
*Curriculum: A Constant Concern in Romania*  
Rodica Mariana Niculescu

Chapter 35  
*The History of Curriculum in Russia*  
Vladimir Blinov

Chapter 36  
*Curriculum in Singapore*  
Viniti Vaish

Chapter 37  
*Curriculum Reform and the Field of Curriculum in Spain*  
César Coll and Elena Martín

Chapter 38  
*Curriculum Research in South Africa*  
Lesley LeGrange

Chapter 39  
*From Rationalist Autonomy to Scientific Empiricism:  
A History of Curriculum in Switzerland*



Rebekka Horlacher

Chapter 40

A Review of Curriculum Study in Taiwan  
Hwang, Jenq-Jye, Chang, Chia-Yu, Chen, Derwen

Chapter 41

Curriculum Research in Turkey:  
From the Ottoman Empire to the Republic  
Sümer Aktan

Chapter 42

*Curriculum Studies in Turkey since 2000*  
Dilek Gözütok

Chapter 43

*Developing Curriculum History: A British Perspective*  
Ivor F. Goodson

Chapter 44

*Curriculum Research in the United States:  
Crisis, Reconceptualization, Internationalization*  
William F. Pinar

Contributors

## Acknowledgments

I thank my extraordinary editor Naomi Silverman who persuaded me to undertake a second edition. Joel Spring and Tero Autio helped me secure chapters (Singapore and Finland, respectively): my thanks to each of you. Thanks also to Jung Hoon Jung, who searched online for contributors from countries not often associated (at least in North America) with curriculum research. Finally, I express my gratitude to each of the contributors to the handbook.

William F. Pinar

## Introduction

William F. Pinar

I suggest that internationalizing curriculum inquiry might best be understood as a process of creating transnational “spaces” in which scholars from different localities collaborate in reframing and decentering their own knowledge traditions and negotiate trust in each other’s contributions to their collective work.

Noel Gough (2003, 68)

Readers of the first edition (2003) will notice that a number of countries absent in that volume are represented here: Chile, Colombia, Cypress, Ethiopia, Germany, Iran, Luxembourg, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, and Switzerland. There are new chapters of introduction by Tero Autio, Daniel Tröhler, and Hongyu Wang, updated or new chapters by Cameron McCarthy (co-authored with Ergin Bulut and Rushika Patel), and David Geoffrey Smith. All other essays are updated or written anew: chapters on Argentina, Brazil, China (with a separate chapter on Hong Kong), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Romania, South Korea, Sweden, Taiwan, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.A. Due to space limits, those chapters<sup>1</sup> that were not updated do not appear here.

For this second edition I sought reports from countries whose curriculum research is not widely known in North America. I sought additional chapters from Europe where curriculum research has a long (if differently formulated) history. Today, as the chapters on Brazil, China, and South Africa suggest, North America is not necessarily the epicenter of curriculum research. Contemporary curriculum research may have originated in the U.S.A, but its recontextualization worldwide in nations with distinctive histories

and cultures underline its localized and reconstructed character.<sup>2</sup> The particular – here the national and regional – remains primary despite globalization and its common denominators: technology, science, and the myth of progress. The distinctiveness of national history and culture continue to structure the curriculum as it is enacted in concrete classrooms in specific nations, regions, and localities.

Due to this situatedness of curriculum research I wanted introductory chapters that challenge the provincialism that localism can invite. These chapters pose transnational challenges to key questions curriculum research addresses locally. I intended no alignment between the two sections – the introductory essays and the chapters on countries – but instead what the great Canadian curriculum theorist Ted Aoki called “creative tensionality.”<sup>3</sup> From that generative unstable state concepts can be reconceived according to – perhaps in contradiction of – local circumstances, calling on intellectually and ethically engaged researchers to critique the course on which their field and their nation’s school curriculum is moving.

While the handbook originates in North America and is published by a British company, it encourages “postcolonial” networks that ignore bifurcations such as “center-periphery.” Intellectual liaisons across the South and East would produce handbooks in multiple languages emphasizing concepts theoretical and practical that report and recommend curriculum research far from London or Vancouver. The creation of such networks is already underway within the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies ([www.iaacs.ca](http://www.iaacs.ca)), with its affiliated organizations, the IAACS journal, and triennial IAACS meetings.<sup>4</sup> This handbook represents, then, a moment of both consolidation and expansion, indicative of a rapidly accelerating internationalization

of curriculum research as nationally distinctive fields engage in disciplinary dialogue with each other.

### Five Chapters of Introduction

More and more, young people will have to negotiate a world that is truly cosmopolitan—a world where one must co-exist with difference—not simply control it.  
Cameron McCarthy, Ergin Bulut, Rushika Patel (this volume)

Informing such disciplinary dialogue are politics, culture, and history, each of which complicates the conversation and often in welcomed ways. Engaging in complicated conversation is our professional calling. The concept of calling informs our profession's ethics, our commitment to study and to teach as we engage in academic research to understand curriculum. Such a situated sense of professional ethics incorporates the concept of the "moral," a term so often "atrophied," Tero Autio points out, when translated into English as "moralistic." In his opening chapter, Autio suggests that it is the "moral" that "makes education educative," as students and teachers engage in ongoing judgment of what knowledge is of most worth, when, and why."<sup>5</sup> "At best," Autio continues, "the moral shifts teaching from transmission to transformation," as the curriculum is no longer test preparation but a "complicated conversation where all the participants at every level think about the basic curriculum question of the worthwhileness of the content and subject matter just taught and addressed." Autio locates this conception of curriculum within the various *Didaktik* traditions in Europe, suggesting that their aim is "to encourage thinking, to make subjective yet knowledgeable judgments and decisions, to think against the subject matter, to think against oneself, to transcend, to transform."

“This is the moment in which we live,” Cameron McCarthy, Ergin Bulut, and Rushika Patel point out; it is one of “radical reconfiguration and re-narration of the relations between centers of power and their peripheries.” Especially within systems of surveillance, globalization accelerates. To illustrate, McCarthy and his colleagues point to “new biometric technologies of information” - face scanning, finger printing and DNA sampling - now “techniques of immigration control, surveillance and policing.” Economic data gathering can also function surveillance and there is a “feverish rise” of “economic speculation, risk and economic deregulation.” Focused on race, McCarthy and his colleagues suggest “thinking about race in isolation remains counterproductive.” Indeed, their “central purpose” in this chapter is to reflect on the “present historical conjuncture” within which “race” is structured through contradictory processes of globalization, localization, migration, and technologies of surveillance. McCarthy and his colleagues identify “three neoliberal tendencies” that characterize the present moment: 1) virtualization, 2) vocationalization, and 3) fiscalization. While underway worldwide, these three tendencies achieve actuality locally, as the essays in his handbook demonstrate.

Today “race” is organized, McCarthy and his co-authors suggest, through “popular culture, identity, and state-public policy.” Any conception of racial identity restricted to “origins,” “ancestry,” “linguistic” or “cultural unity” is now shattered, disintegrated by “hybridity, disjuncture, and re-narration.” Culture is now severed from place, as “migration, electronic mediation, and biometric and information technologies” proliferate and intensify. Given the “existential complexity” of the “lived” experience of

“real existing racialized subjects,” McCarthy and colleagues conclude, “our research imaginations on race are in sore need of rebooting.”

For David Geoffrey Smith, the “debacle” of neoliberalism – privatization, standardized tests, instructional technologies, all rationalized by the concept of “development”<sup>6</sup> - leaves educators with the resounding pedagogical question: “how can the shape and character of education be re-imagined ... in the face of the dissipation of its basic operating assumptions?” It is this question Smith posed to his students at the University of Alberta, and in this chapter he details the issues and readings through which he and his students addressed it.<sup>7</sup>

Smith invited his students to confront the crisis of the present through consideration of the wisdom traditions, East and West. These we study, he points out, within a culture of *distraction*, a self-undermining tendency encouraged by capitalism. “Within the operation of capital,” Smith explains, “cultivating distraction is foundational to all marketing psychology, and the maintenance of distraction is an absolute requirement for product innovation and production.” Distraction is built into the technological infrastructure of so-called school reform.<sup>8</sup> Smith discusses the demands to devalue face-to-face teaching in favor of online learning, a presumably “progressive” and “student-centered” recasting of teaching that undermines the very concept of professional identity. Erudition – having something to “profess,” Smith reminds, takes years of ongoing study – is replaced with the acquisition of “skills” and provision of “simple facilitation.” Indeed, “if learning means only the acquisition and accumulation of information,” Smith points out, “teaching in the traditional sense becomes superfluous.”

Ongoing analysis of neoliberalism is imperative, but for David Geoffrey Smith so is the “postcritical” moment when one labors to work through the current crisis, and, crucially, on a human scale. “It is precisely here,” Smith reminds us, “that wisdom traditions have the most to say, and their voice is virtually univocal: To heal the world I must engage in the work of healing myself. To the degree that I heal myself, so will my action in the world be of a healing nature.” Such healing means “becoming mindful,” what Smith regards as “the ultimate condition of our freedom as human beings.” A “turn” to “wisdom,” he continues, “is a deeply political act, an act of cultural insurrection, because it refuses to take seriously the seductions of secondary gods.”<sup>9</sup>

While not always a political undertaking, attentiveness to our “inward freedom” is one lasting legacy of German educational thought, as Daniel Tröhler reminds. Nationally specific genealogies are integral to understanding curriculum research internationally, Tröhler demonstrates, as present-day schools and educational policies become intelligible only when their (sometimes religious) prehistories are excavated. He makes the contrary case as well: “in order to reconstruct the past (as key to self-awareness) comparison is a precondition.” Indeed, Tröhler continues, “probably the most noble effect of learning other systems of reasoning across times and spaces is this chance of becoming aware of ourselves as historical and cultural constructions.”<sup>10</sup>

In her reflection on the marginalization of “nonviolence,” Hongyu Wang reminds us of “our own implication in the logic of control that renders nonviolence unthinkable and unimaginable.” It is, she notes, “long overdue” for the field of curriculum studies “to embrace nonviolence as an educational vision.” It is a vision that could inform our daily practice as educators, including, Wang notes, our intellectual and organizational work in



curriculum studies.<sup>11</sup> Wang addresses the “nonviolent relational dynamics” of the intersecting domains of local, the national, and the international.<sup>12</sup> Like David Geoffrey Smith, Wang draws upon wisdom traditions as well as examples of international nonviolence activism in envisioning “nonviolence as a guiding principle for internationalizing curriculum studies.” Central to the conception of nonviolence that Wang elaborates is an embodied sense of “interconnectedness” that affirms “compassionate” and “affiliating” aspects of humanity. Such affirmation of “fellowship” and “shared life” she finds in several philosophical, religious, and ethical traditions, including the Christian principle of “love your enemy,” the African notion of *ubuntu*, the Chinese notion of *Tao*, as well as in indigenous peace-making traditions in North America. Referencing the role of gender in violence and nonviolence, Wang cautions that we must not now resort to another mode of “domination” to destroy violence, “but we must work *through* it.” Recalling the simultaneity of self-healing and political insurrection Smith invokes, Wang asserts that nonviolent activism is “*both internal and external*.” It is “fundamentally an educational project.” Wang emphasizes that “inner peace is the basis for outer peace.” “Ultimately,” she notes, “violence and nonviolence are felt by the individual body, and the fundamental task of education is personal cultivation.”<sup>13</sup>

That education is simultaneously personal and collective is a point Wang affirms by quoting David Geoffrey Smith’s call, in his chapter in the first edition of this handbook, for engaging “a new kind of global dialogue regarding sustainable human futures” and for forming “a new kind of imaginal understanding within human consciousness” (2003, p. 35). “Responding to such a call,” Wang suggests that the

“grassroots movements and organizational efforts of nonviolence education locally, nationally, and internationally provide such a vision for internationalizing curriculum studies.” Through such multi-placed multi-tiered “grassroots” and “organizational” efforts to enact such an “imaginal understanding,” we can internationalize curriculum research in nonviolent ways.

#### Forty-One Chapters on Thirty-Four Countries

[C]urriculum must address identity and nationalism directly in a way that is invested with, rather than divested of, emotion and passion.<sup>14</sup>  
Cynthia Chambers (2003, 246)

In her updating of the 2003 chapter on Argentina, Silvina Feeney acknowledges that the “almost uninterrupted succession” of curriculum reforms imposed by the State since the 1990’s has “not been matched” by a corresponding increase in theoretical research. But empirical research has proceeded, focused on the “impact” of curricular reforms in Argentine schools, especially on the daily labor of teachers and principals. The curriculum is the site of schools’ daily activities, “determining their aims and providing guidelines for teachers’ action.” Sociology - specifically the contributions of Bernstein<sup>15</sup> and Bourdieu – has been influential, but curriculum history is also present in the Argentine field. Mainstream curriculum research, however, follows state policy and exhibits a “technical” orientation. Perhaps distinctive to Argentina, there are what Feeney terms “outreach magazines” – she names *Novedades Educativas* as an example - that feature “recommendations on how to implement the new curricula” or “research findings” that address teaching problems. Perhaps this apparent “democratization” of curriculum research will support not only state-sponsored “reform.”

In their chapter in the first edition, Alice Casimiro Lopes and Elizabeth Macedo emphasized the Brazilian field's porous boundaries and its hybrid character. Curriculum research focused on literacy, knowledge, interdisciplinarity, and culture as well as on specific curricular innovations, specific subjects (often informed by varieties of constructivism), as well as the new technologies. Today, Lopes and Macedo report, this multiplicity of theoretical approaches remains the case. There continues to be what they term a "theoretical dispersion," including a "crossover" of research "aiming at improving teacher activity" in classrooms, in "specific subjects" but also encompassing "school culture or schooling as a whole," as well as theoretical studies of politics, culture, history, daily life, and the dynamics of knowledge. Lopes and Macedo view this plurality as the "appropriation" and "reinterpretation" of a wide range of scholarship (including that in sociology and philosophy). They conclude that there is no epistemological consensus concerning what constitutes knowledge about curriculum.

The "incorporation" of post-structuralism in the Brazilian field precipitated a "hybrid process" with "critical perspectives." Lopes and Macedo do not judge this "hybridity" as a problem to be overcome. In political terms, the "subject" is construed as "capable of transcending the structure, while it can only act because this same structure constitutes itself." Because the subject is constituted by lack, it is compelled to undertake "political action for social transformation." In this formulation, "politics is not designed by centrality of the utopian project, with a pre-defined meaning. Politics is the terrain of conflict, contingency, and undecidability." Rather than foreshadowing the end of politics, Lopes and Macedo predict a "hyper-politicization" of curriculum research. No longer a "project of knowledge to be universalized," the curriculum becomes the "space-time of

cultural boundaries in which one disputes the significance of the world.” What “hyper-politicizes us,” they conclude, “is the possibility of inventing today, without guarantees, what will be the past for the future that we desire, without much clarity on where this desire will be. This ability empowers us as agents of this invention, in which the meaning of who we are as subjects is always postponed.”

In her chapter for the first edition, Silvina Moraes focused on the 1996 Brazilian curriculum reform. In her updated chapter, Moraes reflects on what has happened during the last decade. “[W]e can say,” she reports, “that there has been effort in overcoming the positivistic, fragmented and alienated conception of science that dominated the school curriculum.” The “traditional, obsolete” curriculum – in which students worked only individually memorizing concepts that had “no connection with their lives or even their remotest interests” - is being “replaced by a more contextualized, integrated, interdisciplinary curriculum.” The reform is “slowly (and painfully) being accepted.”

Globalization, Moraes asserts, “incorporates the concepts of diversity and sustainability, conceiving the world as an interconnected whole.” It affirms the “fundamental interdependence of all phenomena, and the fact that, as individuals and societies, we are all connected and depend on the cyclical processes of nature.” Moraes has found Habermas's conception of dialogical rationality useful in addressing issues of cultural and epistemic complexity, as “intense dialogue” is prerequisite to understanding curricular questions of “integration, inclusion, multiculturalism, empowerment, critical thinking, intersubjectivity and interdisciplinarity.” Only through such complicated conversation can one “contemplate” the multiplicity of “interests” and “voices” that comprise the curriculum in Brazil.

In Chile, Claudia Matus Cánovas reports, neoliberalism has been associated with educational reform since the Dictatorship. Then the Chilean system was remodeled after the so-called free market, shifting funds, oversight, and accountability from government to individuals and corporations. For-profit education, high-stakes testing, and accountability now dominate discussions. At present there are three major curriculum reforms operating at the same time, Cánovas continues, organized around “abilities, themes, and attitudes.” The latter, she argues, represents a form of “affective regulation” in the service of the State’s strategy “to secure its economic future, and at the same time to secure the well-being of its population.” This regulation risks rendering the school another “totalizing” institution. In such circumstances Cánovas is clear that “we must recognize and act on connections between classrooms and societies in a critical and creative way, particularly in these neoliberal times.”

In China it seems the future will be achieved through the reactivation of the past, a view I embrace (2012). In conducting curriculum research in China, Zhang Hua and Zhenyu Gao explain, one seeks “curriculum wisdom embodied in the true, the good, and the beautiful, and understanding curriculum history, reality and process.” History and wisdom are thus intertwined: “Curriculum wisdom is also a historical being.” Historicity becomes crucial because the “history of curriculum discourse dwells in the reality of curriculum.” Zhang and Zhenyu draw upon three wisdom traditions in China – Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism – to provide visions of “society, nature, and self respectively.” These traditions surface in the “dominant paradigm” of curriculum research in China, that of “curriculum development.” The dominance of curriculum development is due in part to China’s present engagement in “an unprecedented

curriculum reform.” Given these present circumstances, they conclude, “how to develop curriculum effectively is an urgent call for Chinese scholars.”

The present may be focused on curriculum development but the future of the Chinese field will include “understanding curriculum.” To understand “what it means to know” and “to be educated” in China will follow, Zhang Hua and Zhenyu Gao suggest, from sustained reflection on “our own traditions” as well as “international conversation.” Neither can be conducted, they continue, “without cultural, political, economical, global, and spiritual understandings of curriculum.” Such understandings incorporate immersion in the everyday life of schools but, Zhang and Zhenyu appreciate, “to understand curriculum at a deeper level must be accompanied by the difficult task of transcending the direct and instant needs of curriculum practice so that the critical and creative potential of theory can be released.” The future of curriculum research in China is promising, as “the Chinese curriculum field will keep up with its good tradition of historical studies, attempt to inform curriculum research by traditional curriculum wisdom, participate and contribute to worldwide curriculum discourses, reflect on the reality of curriculum practice, and construct its own distinctive curriculum theories.” Zhang and Zhenyu conclude: “China has now entered into a ‘golden age’ of curriculum studies.”

The situation is quite different in Colombia, as Juny Montoya-Vargas makes clear. There, curriculum as a concept was discredited by its association with “foreign interests” and the “industrial era and its preoccupation with efficiency.” Despite the shift in the U.S. field – from curriculum development to understanding curriculum – many scholars prefer the concept of “study plan” to “curriculum,” as the latter term still implies

the “technical control of education.” Despite this legacy, Montoya-Vargas believes that the concept of curriculum has a “promising future” in the work of those teachers and researchers devoted to the “development” of “participatory forms” of curriculum design, “socio-culturally relevant curricula,” “problem and project-based” curricula, and curriculum structured by flexibility, interdisciplinarity and integration.

In Cyprus, Nikoletta Christodoulou acknowledges, history and politics have also been formative in curriculum thought and research, both which developing “rapidly within periods of turmoil.” A formalized field remains absent and, as a result, curriculum continues to be regarded as a “set of technical guidelines,” objectives and strategies for teaching and learning. There is no systematic effort to “understand curriculum” in its various dimensions and “explore the ways in which ‘what knowledge is of most worth’ can be answered.” Despite this history and present circumstances, Christodoulou’s presence promises a more complicated future for the Cyprian field.

The Ethiopian tradition in education includes indigenous education, Woube Kassaye explains, evident in both *Church* and *Quranic* schools, wherein the curriculum is “unchanged and uncontested.” The medium of instruction in the *Church* curriculum was *Geez*, while in *Quranic* schools it was Arabic. After modernization English has predominated, but more recent policies have endorsed a multilingual curriculum. Kassaye provides not only a history of these developments but focuses on the 2010 *Curriculum Framework for Ethiopian Education: KG-Grade 12*. Kassaye draws a map of the contemporary field, identifying sites of support for curriculum development and research at universities, research centers, and government agencies. The Ethiopian Curriculum Studies Association also provides crucial support and advocacy for scholars and

researchers. With such infrastructure in place, the future of curriculum research seems promising.

Education in Finland, Antti Saari, Sauli Salmela, and Jarkko Vilkkilä explain, represents a “singular concoction” of *Bildung* from Germany and (after World War II) the Tyler Rationale from the United States. The latter emphasized behaviorally defined, measurable aims of education, easily incorporated in capitalism’s market model. The “challenge” today, Saari, Salmela, and Vilkkilä assert, is constructing a “new communal and collective public space for free self-expression.” The past may provide passage, as they suggest “we might extract from what is still powerful in the *Bildung* - tradition, a vision of an autonomy that is aware of historical traditions, while being able to transform them into something new. This understanding might open up a space for freedom.” The liberty sustained study of the *artes liberales* enables is, Saari, Salmela, and Vilkkilä suggest, an “inner freedom.” “An individual controlled and regulated by the economy, they warn, “will never be free, and no educational system governed by the economy can produce freedom.”

In Germany, curriculum, evaluation, and control are interrelated. Wolfgang Böttcher’s title summarizes present circumstances – dominated by “standards” and a new governance structure following participation in PISA<sup>16</sup> – but he reminds readers of the past. In the 1960s Saul B. Robinsohn had re-introduced the term “curriculum.” While Robinsohn acknowledged the worth of ancient thinking and ancient languages, it was “change” that drove reform, especially in science, technology, and globalization. Böttcher recalls Wolfgang Klafki’s emphasis upon “global and epochal key problems,” among them peacekeeping and international understanding, human rights, social inequity,



technology assessment, equality between men and women, labor, environment protection, and the pursuit of happiness. After PISA, the curriculum debate has become “trivial,” inadequate to the “complexity” of “global problems to be solved.” The test-driven curriculum not only trivializes but contradicts what Böttcher points out is the very rationale for “standards-based reform,” namely the reduction of inequality. It is not the students’ purposes “reform” serves, “but, rather, the purposes of testers and politicians who can, after Germany has gained a few places in the education rankings, fool an innocent public believe that this was the effect of smart politics.”

In her analysis of “competence-oriented curriculum reform” in Germany, Charlotte Röhner works historically as well. But it is the present that compels her attention, and so it is curriculum debates after TIMMS<sup>17</sup> and PISA on which she dwells. “All efforts,” she writes, focus on how the “skills” children bring to school can be improved. “In particular,” Röhner continues, “the initial language skills of children from families with a migration background ... have become a focus and have resulted in extended language support measures at the prep-school institutions of all federal states.” While enjoying only “average” success, these measures served as the “starting point for a comprehensive reorientation of elementary education.” In 2004 there was for the “first time” a “binding agreement among all federal states and the field of schooling and youth aid on the tasks of prep-school teaching and support.” Also referencing Klafki’s key contribution and continuing relevance, Röhner points out that contemporary concepts of competence emphasize “cognitive” tasks and problems of “learning,” in sharp contrast to Klafki’s more sophisticated and multi-modal formulation. Such a constricted conception has been accompanied by curriculum development as “informed arbitrariness” in the

service of a “nationwide orientation” and “standardization.” A “critical analysis” of “curriculum discourse,” Röhner concludes, “must still be developed.”

“What makes Asian countries successfully produce children with high aptitude for science, reading, and mathematics?” asks Edmond Hau-Fai Law. Countries with a “Confucian heritage over-emphasize examinations, accord excessive priority to rote learning and memorization,” and they “depend heavily on teacher talk and transmission models.” This is a paradox, Law notes, as Confucian perspectives in fact contradict these practices, valuing, instead, “thinking, investigation, authentic learning, the experimental nature of learning, self-reflection, application, and a personal attitude toward learning.” Law associates these ancient concepts of learning and pedagogy with “modern” progressive education.

In contrast to those Western countries where public debates over curriculum have been absent, Law reminds readers of the July 29, 2012 protest against Beijing’s 2013 curriculum reform. Approximately 90,000 protestors - including students, parents, and teachers - took to the streets to decry what they perceived to be an ideological assault on the historic diversity of the Hong Kong curriculum. Because Beijing wants to “engineer a strong sense of national identity with Mainland China,” including “recognition of the Communist Party as the legitimate and sole representative of the Chinese people,” the school curriculum in Hong Kong is now a “battleground” between “contrasting ideologies that are deeply rooted in two different cultural and political traditions.” Perhaps paradoxically, curriculum research in Hong Kong, while it tends to be “closely related with key policy directions and reform agendas,” is not openly “political.” It is instead preoccupied with “learning and assessment, decentralization, and distributed

models of teacher curriculum deliberation and empowerment.” Started in the 1970s, this “search” for an “effective and quality” curriculum “continues to the present.” The standardization implied in this research tradition is mediated, Law suggests, by “negotiating” a curriculum for the “diverse needs of different ethnic and cultural groups.” He concludes: “I believe that the search for a diverse curriculum is the search for a curriculum that allows for a postmodernist Hong Kong.”

Curriculum research in Iran, Mahmound Mehrmohammadi reports, proceeds with the “intention of detecting, disclosing and codifying the seemingly strong curricular current that exists at the deeper layers of education.” Efforts are now underway that “would give voice to the now silenced practiced curriculum discourse.” In a nationally recognized project known as the Iranian Curriculum Encyclopedia (ICE) - an initiative of the Iranian Curriculum Studies Association (ICSA) – an entire section is devoted to reflecting on “schools’ innovative curricular experiences.” As is the case in the United States and elsewhere, in Iran curriculum specialists’ “participation in policy formation and policy evaluation is quite negligible.” The “centralized curriculum system” has a “negative structural impact” on the “development of the curriculum field.” It appears that in Iran, the paradigm of the field is “understanding curriculum” rather than systemic “curriculum development.” Mehrmohammadi appreciates this issue as one of “disciplinarity.”

In recent decades, Kevin Williams and Elaine McDonald report, curriculum inquiry in Ireland has been “vigorous and extensive.” As elsewhere, curriculum research in Ireland is interdisciplinary, with contributions coming from curriculum specialists, philosophers and sociologists as well as from those “not directly involved in the

academic study of education,” including industry representatives. “One irony of curriculum inquiry,” Williams and McDonald note, is both left and right “share the same critical view of the ‘system’.” It fails to do enough for the disadvantaged, the left complains; it fails to be responsive to the needs of industry, complains the right. Williams and McDonald focus on the former, and specifically the issue of “inclusiveness,” a concept that underpins the five themes they examine.

In Irish curriculum inquiry, Williams and McDonald report, there is a “commendable emphasis on research evidence rather than anecdote and impression in policy development.” Inquiry is “seeking to analyze how the curriculum is defining and giving practical content to cultural identity and aspirations.” Indeed, the school curriculum is “theorized” as an “instrument of public policy through which the country’s self-understanding is expressed and communicated to the young generation.” In studying curriculum, Williams and McDonald conclude, “we are therefore also studying ourselves.”

In their updated chapter on curriculum research in Israel, Yehoshua Mathias and Naama Sabar acknowledge that curriculum is often the reflection of power struggles among various groups. But it is not only a “reflection” they note: “curricula are not merely reproductions of what is taking place in other sectors, but are also influenced by autonomous educational factors.” While its cultural, religious and political elements are obvious, the state curricula have not been “uniform,” as the State Education Law “recognized that the religious had the right to pedagogic autonomy.” As a consequence there have been “differences” between state elementary school curricula and those in

religious schools, “particularly in regard to the scope and content of the study of Jewish Law (written and Oral).”

Even in its early years the state acknowledged “the need to adapt curricula to the special needs of the Arab population.” While the language of instruction in schools in the Arab villages may have been Arabic, Mathias and Sabar report, the state “refused to recognize the right of Israeli Arabs to nurture their national culture.” Reform followed in the mid-sixties, influenced by trends in the U.S.A. “following the launch of the Sputnik,” and “intensified by The Six Day War in 1967.” From this time onwards, the curriculum emphasized economic and technological topics.

Investments in science, technology, and economics are insufficient. Ideological “polarization” as well the “strengthened status” of “national and cultural minorities” underline, Mathias and Sabar point out, the “political shortcomings of a uniform curriculum.” Now the Ministry of Education is attempting to expand its attention to “cultural disparities.”<sup>18</sup> Indeed, the “new core curriculum,” they report, attempts to “instill” the “knowledge” and “skills” youth need in a “technological globalized economy” as well as “nurture a cultural platform based on the perception of Israel as a modern, national, Jewish and democratic State.” The question of its success, Mathias and Sabar acknowledge, remains “open.”

Despite an “unusual diversity” of people, Italy, Paula Salvio points out, has “fallen into step with what is perceived as a global market demand for a unified curriculum that is homogeneous with the rest of the continent, as made evident, to provide one example, by its participation in the PISA program.” How will such standardization impinge upon the evolving “idea” of Italy? Salvio recalls the *Riforma*

*Gentile* of 1923, set in motion by Mussolini's first Minister of Public Instruction, Giovanni Gentile. Gentile abolished instruction in all languages other than standard Italian: "The belief that the individual practices his or her individuality by merging with the state, Italy, was, of course, a hallmark of Italian fascism." With Italy's defeat in World War II and a subsequent sense of "lost greatness" associated with memories of a "mythic Roman past," the post-war Italian curriculum communicated a "heroic victimhood" that effaced the facts of Italy's colonialist past. Not until the student protests of the 1970s were high-school textbooks revised. As elsewhere, in the 1980s neoliberalism arrived, embraced by right and center-right political parties. "No one is quite sure what PISA measures," Salvio sagely asserts, "but what we do know is that PISA is a private corporation sponsored by the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) and supports the OECD's promotion of STEM curricula (science, technology, engineering and mathematics)." What is not valued by such "corporate auditing systems," Salvio continues, is the "art" of "cultivating historical consciousness ... that would illuminate rather than obscure aspects of Italy's history of colonization."

Competition has once again intensified in Japanese school culture. Tadahiko Abiko cites the 2003 PISA scores as cause. National standards were revised and what had been the maximum number of the school hours became a *recommended minimum*. Since reform violence has escalated in schools, including bullying. Reforms now follow one after the other. The fact remains, Abiko rues, that university entrance examinations still convert the school curriculum into test-preparation. It is no occasion for the "healthy

growth and development of students.” Perhaps the disasters of 3/11 will prompt people to “think about formal education more deeply,” Abiko hopes.

Controversies over the curricular treatment of Japanese history and minority groups, Shigeru Asanuma acknowledges, couple with strict discipline and intense pressure to excel in university entrance examinations to create an image of education in Japan. Less known internationally is the “very flexible” and “progressive curriculum policy” that has been administered in recent decades. Three concepts - Living Power, Relaxation, and Education for Mind – informed Japanese curriculum reform in 1990. These concepts continued those 1980s reforms that emphasized individual development (*Koseika*) and globalization (*Kokusaika*), reforms contesting “traditional” conceptions of curriculum and instruction emphasizing “rote learning” and “factual knowledge.” Since 2011, however, it has been “Back to the Basics” in Japan. “There is no rationality in this transition,” Asanuma observes.

In the aftermath of PISA, Thomas Lenz, Anne Rohstock and Catherina Schreiber report, curriculum deliberation in Luxembourg became centralized and more “scientific.” Both developments represented a “rather radical break with the past,” as during the past two centuries curriculum research in Luxembourg occurred in schools and had not been “scientific.” Indeed, practitioners conducted curricular discussions in Luxembourg. Subsequent efforts to follow international reforms were “contradicted” by “national and local” classroom practices “prevalent at least since the founding of the nation in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.” Trilingual, the state recognizes Luxembourgish, French, and German as official languages, and the school system incorporates all three. A distinction between “realistic” *Volksbildung* and “humanistic” *Bildung* is inscribed in the Luxembourgish

curriculum and structures curricular debates. From the beginning, Lenz, Rohstock and Schreiber report, the authorities have “fostered differentiation: social and regional, in language teaching and in moral and science education.” Since Sputnik, conservatives have fought to preserve the “humanistic educational ideal,” emphasizing the “dangers” of new technologies and hoping to avoid the “American way.” Now a multicultural society, Luxembourg struggles to integrate migrant children into the trilingual education. “It is yet uncertain,” Lenz, Rohstock and Schreiber conclude, “how the PISA studies will affect the Luxembourgish curricula and the school system as a whole.”

There have been three phases in the history of curriculum research in Mexico, Frida Díaz Barriga reports. In the 1970s the work of Tyler and other Americans espousing a “technologic-behaviorist approach” was “imported.”<sup>19</sup> In the 1980s a complication of the field occurred, as critical pedagogy, constructivism, interpretative school studies, and studies of professional training and practice displaced technologic-behaviorism. The third phase started in the 1990s and is characterized, Díaz Barriga explains, by globalization-associated curriculum reforms and models, including neoliberal notions of innovation and accreditation. There are now theoretical interests in postmodernism and post-structuralism as well. “This last phase,” she concludes, “seems to have reached a stage of internationalization with important strains among the global, national and local spheres.” After García-Garduño (2011), Díaz Barriga references processes of “acculturation” and “satellization,” concepts denoting legacies of colonization.

As in South Korea and elsewhere, there is an ongoing recontextualization of imported theories. In Mexico, Díaz Barriga reports, a “hybridization” occurs as



“structures and practices that stem from diverse origins can combine in order to create new entities in a kind of crossbreeding process which is never free from contradictions and exclusions.” Such hybridization encourages “cosmopolitanism” that, within the Mexican field, is associated with “multicultural perspectives, openness to diversity and the balance between local and universal values.” Díaz Barriga concludes: “Despite the acknowledged polysemy of the term ‘curriculum,’ this term is still the intellectual and organizational focus of educational processes in the teaching institutions, the ground where goals, contents and processes are defined and discussed and is, after all, the space where groups and actors compete for the power.”

Wedged between Continental and Anglo-Saxon spheres of influence, the Dutch, Willem Wardekker, Monique Volman, Jan Terwel remind, have found their own way. Dependence on foreign trade has translated into a curriculum emphasizing foreign languages, not nationalism. “Dutch thinkers,” Wardekker, Volman, and Terwel write, “seem to have engaged mainly in connecting and ‘trading’ in ideas formulated elsewhere.” This “commercial” history may also explain why curricular conflicts have tended to be resolved “by pragmatic compromise rather than by open conflict.” Conflicts have tended to be more religious than class-based, as Protestants and Catholics each comprise approximately one third of the Dutch population. Only in the second half of the twentieth century has secularization provided a third alternative. Today there are state-funded Islamic schools.

The Dutch state cannot prescribe detailed curricula or textbooks, and so schools are largely autonomous in their choice of books marketed by independent commercial publishers or created by the teachers themselves. There is a state institute for curriculum

development but, Wardekker, Volman, and Terwel note, its influence is limited to creating examples of curriculum; it has no power of enforcement. In recent years the institute has gained influence by coordinating and directing curriculum deliberations, the educational publishing houses remain powerful. Curricular change occurs by changing the content of examinations. When the PISA ratings dropped, fears of economic decline were invoked, and this campaign translated into an increased curricular emphasis on Dutch, English, and math.

For 150 years the curriculum in Norway served the cause of nation-building, Kirsten Sivesind and Berit Karseth explain, but in recent decades this “tradition” has been “challenged” by Europeanization and globalisation. Curriculum guidelines have shifted from being “content-oriented” to being “learning-oriented,” evident in the 2006 “Knowledge Promotion” reform which, Sivesind and Karseth report, “aimed to strengthen the core aspects of learning rather than detailing curriculum content.” Despite present circumstances, one strand of curriculum research in Norway is “historical-descriptive,” focused on both the history of educational movements and ideas as well as systems and institutions. Contemporary Norwegian research also focuses on the school subjects and on curriculum development. In addition, there are studies that link specific questions of curriculum reform to a “wider societal, cultural and educational frame of reference.” Curriculum research in Norway has, to a “high degree, been open to international influences.” As in other countries, this openness has its dangers; in Norway the “restrictive function of assessment in education hinders the use of differentiated theoretical perspectives.” Sivesind and Karseth “question how new policies reduce the complexity that has characterized the curriculum for decades. For this reason, we

question how much knowledge and learning can be standardised without losing meaning and purpose.”

In Nigeria the concept of curriculum remains “narrowly conceived,” Rosita Okekenwa Igwe reports, “associated with design, planning, implementation and evaluation.” Researchers labor to implement Universal Basic Education (UBE), dedicated to “eradicate illiteracy, ignorance and poverty as well as stimulate and accelerate national development, political consciousness and national integration.” The Nigerian curriculum is conceived to enable children to achieve appropriate levels of literacy. “Each graduate,” Igwe summarizes, “should be useful to himself and to society at large by possessing relevant ethical, moral and civic values.” These “expansive” objectives have extended the curriculum, now including woodwork, home economics, electrical electronics, agricultural science, and technology. Especially technology is emphasized, and Igwe reports that Nigeria’s “huge” investment in science and technology is reflected in enrollments in tertiary institutions, where 60 percent of students are studying one of the sciences. Questions of gender and sustainability also inform curriculum development. It is “culture,” Igwe asserts, that “is the substance of education.”

Affirmations of culture are present in Peru, Lileya Manrique, Diana Revilla and Pilar Lamas report, even if reforms have emphasized economic modernization. Despite these circumstances, the curriculum remains committed to principles of “ethics, equity, inclusion, quality, democracy, interculturality, environmental awareness, creativity and innovation that promote the production of new knowledge in all the fields of knowledge, art and culture.” As in Mexico, the concept of “study plans” takes precedence, as the concept of curriculum kept “its regulatory character.” During the 1990s curriculum was

defined as “competencies” regulating teaching practice. “Curricular sustainability requires certain conditions,” Manrique, Revilla and Lamas appreciate, and “one of them is not to be subject to the continual changes of government.” They supplement that important insight with an affirmation of “the participation of the different social stakeholders to ensure a consensually-built proposal.” Also crucial to curriculum is clarity for teachers. “Finally,” they affirm that “the curriculum needs to have a sense of pertinence that will decisively incorporate the perspective of intercultural education, so needed in this country.”

During the first decades of the last century, Aleksandra Łuczak, reports, the Polish school curriculum stressed young citizens’ obligations to the nation. These were not narrowly conceived but asserted a “comprehensive” education that emphasized “social, artistic, academic and physical development as well as self-development.” After 1939, Łuczak reminds, “education in Polish was banned and punished with death.” Despite this disaster, “during the war clandestine classes were organized all around the country.” Today economic issues influence education in Poland “to a great extent,” and technology is emphasized. Officials demand closer relationships between education and business.

Polish students seem to prefer the liberal arts, however. History courses have been bleached of Soviet influence and once again feature Polish content. Religion returned and PISA scores improved. Citing the problem of unemployment, the Ministry is now emphasizing vocational subjects: information technology (IT) studies, physics, mathematics, environmental protection, biotechnology, chemistry. Study of these subjects promises “mobility,” but “internationalization at home” is also important, expressed in

“international curricula, foreign visiting academics, the requirement for Polish students to take some courses in a foreign language, the development of an European dimension in curricula.” Łuczak is optimistic: “New curricula that are being at the moment introduced will definitely serve the students well preparing them for the challenges of the job market and enabling offering them the advantages of mobility and internationalization across Europe which draws on the best European tradition going back to Golden Ages and the times of Nicolaus Copernicus when the value of obtaining knowledge and experience at several academic centers was appreciated.”

The Portuguese curriculum, José Augusto Pacheco and Filipa Seabra report, is a “broadly political project disguised as a shared technical consensus.” The academic field of curriculum studies consolidated in the 1990s, especially at the Universities of Lisbon, Minho, and Porto. While there is a “significant theoretical production,” the predominant discourse of curriculum research is “technical” and “school-based,” focused on politically motivated “reforms.” Neither Pacheco nor Seabra is submerged in present circumstances; they imagine a future when the curriculum serves “as a point of departure rather than a destination, implying a conversation, namely a national and international conversation, supported by Portugal’s membership to the European Union.”

In Romania, Rodica Mariana Niculescu explains, the curriculum is based on “borrowed, transformed and assimilated models” with “many hybrid features, but still very Romanian.” Like the nation itself, Niculescu continues, the curriculum contains traces of Latin and Greek cultural influences on one hand, and of Slavonic culture on the other. The recent history of curriculum in Romania has been marked by a series of reforms, of which Niculescu is quite critical. “In spite of several good points,” she writes,

the National Education Act (2011) “does not offer a sound educational policy base for an adequate curriculum reform.” Institutionalized during the last two decades, curriculum theory, Niculescu worries, is insufficiently internationalized and is too often only “added” to traditional studies in “pedagogy.”

Russia’s renowned writers, Vladimir Blinov reminds, addressed questions of education. Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, and Tolstoy “departed” from official pronouncements and endorsed “being open to the world.” After 1917, communism superseded humanitarianism, “subjecting the school to a new ideological setup,” converting Russian “schools of study” into Soviet “schools of labor.” In the first few years after the Revolution there remained an openness to the world, including to U.S. progressive ideas. (The Dalton plan and Kilpatrick’s project method were imported and adapted.) In post-Soviet Russia, Blinov reports, the curriculum has become increasingly aligned with “structures of the shifting economy,” emphasizing technology. There have been efforts to redress this imbalance; Blinov cites the 1990s prioritizing of the humanities, a curricular response, he suggests, to the “facelessness” of Soviet schools. Today, the Russian curriculum is faced with two challenges: the creation of a “civil society” and contributing to an economy not based on the oil and gas sector. “At the heart of these processes,” Blinov explains, “lie the actions aimed at coping with the consequences of totalitarianism, the psychology of which has wormed its way incredibly deeply into the national consciousness, assimilating all forms of mimicry and touching on the moral values of both adults and children.” There is an optimistic scenario, Blinov concludes, one derived from Russian history, one that encourages Russians to “learn now from other countries, selecting and then implementing the best examples and practices.”

Singapore faces a past it wishes to supersede as well. The “centralized, standardized, top-down system,” with its emphasis on “socialization” and “rote learning” and its “quiescence of students” – once considered “crucial” to the “state’s agenda of economic growth and nation building” – is now, Vinita Vaish reports, an “impediment.” In the present post-industrial moment, policy-makers agree that a radical transformation is required, one marked by a shift from an “efficiency” to “ability-driven” school system. Now conducting research where “the old efficiency-driven system is still in place,” Vaish is confident that “holistic” reform can transform “every single aspect of the school ecology,” taking Singapore’s school system from “good” to “great.”

Recounting the recent history of curriculum research in South Africa, Lesley Le Grange emphasizes the early 1990s National Education Policy Initiative (NEPI). Twelve reports were produced, including one on curriculum. These were followed by three iterations of outcomes-based education (OBE): Curriculum 2005; the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS); and the National Curriculum Statement (NCS). The introduction of OBE generated a broad public debate and stimulated curriculum research.

OBE was wholeheartedly embraced and severely criticized; the Minister of Basic Education signed its death certificate in 2010. In the new national curriculum - the Curriculum Policy and Assessment Statement (CAPS) - “outcomes have been removed.” In Le Grange’s judgment, outcomes-based education has been a “red herring” and its removal will not guarantee that classroom practices will improve. He provides a map of the South African field, noting, in particular, those whose research is informed by Basil Bernstein and those committed to decolonization. Invoking Deleuzian language, Le Grange expresses hope that the “tribes and their territories” will become

“deterritorialized” in order to “enable complicated conversations to occur between South African curriculum scholars on local soil that will invigorate lines of flight and the transformation of the field.”

South Korea, Yonghwan Lee reminds, enjoyed its own “unique” educational system for thousands of years. In this system the humanities – not vocational or technical subjects – were prized. Western missionaries changed everything, as they communicated their “belief not only in God but also in the superiority of their own culture.” Western style schools followed. One of the most “noticeable features” of 20<sup>th</sup> century curriculum reform is, Lee emphasizes, that “major political transitions were always followed by reforms of national curricula.” Curriculum reforms legitimized new governments and reflected changing curricular theories. “Every national curriculum since 1945,” Lee argues, has been the “result of the subtle, sometimes very odd, combination of these two purposes.” Given the centralized, authoritarian assertion of school reform, Lee concludes, “there was, and still is, little room for teachers, students, parents, and even curricular theorists.”

Young Chun Kim, Dong Sung Lee, and Jae Hong Joo start their story in 1945 when Korean scholars were sent to the United States to study curriculum. Upon their return, curriculum studies was established. “Since then,” Kim and his colleagues report, the South Korean field has been influenced “principally” by the U.S. From Tyler, Taba, and Bruner in the 1970s to “reconceptualist” discourses in the 1980s, U.S. curriculum research has been determinative. More recently, however, Korean scholars have not only translated U.S. research, they have been reconstructing it according to Korean traditions and circumstances. Kim and his colleagues call for post-colonial curriculum research, encouraging teachers, researchers and students to “decolonize” consciousness. Post-



colonial curriculum research requires the formulation of new curriculum languages that address the unique legacies, present circumstances, and future prospects of the Korean nation. While focused on the nation, the post-colonial Korean research will not be nationalistic, Kim and colleagues insist. It will embrace internationalization. They suggest the Korean experience of colonization and decolonization might inspire colleagues worldwide to undertake their own post-colonial campaigns to reconstruct curriculum research.

In Spain, César Coll and Elena Martín explain, the curriculum has proved pivotal in adapting the education system to the “new democratic order.” Most curriculum research has been focused on “curriculum change in pre-university teaching.” The curriculum model adopted there was “based on a set of social constructivist-oriented psychopedagogical principles” focused on the “abilities” of students that the curriculum should cultivate. These abilities, involving “all areas” of human development, constitute the “starting point” for choosing curriculum content. What is to be incorporated into the school curriculum is that knowledge that contributes “most” to developing abilities with the “greatest social relevance.” This model means a “more open curriculum” offering teachers “greater autonomy” but accompanied by intense assessment. The *Instituto Nacional de Calidad y Evaluación* (National Institute for Quality and Assessment) was established in 1993.

Spanish schools have seen an increase in students' ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity. This fact has strengthened the link between curriculum revision and regulatory policies. Citing the first edition of this *Handbook*, Coll and Martín acknowledge a “similar association” in other countries and regions, but, they add, “this relationship is

particularly strong in the case of Spain.” In addition to the “huge increase in immigrant students,” Coll and Martín reference “the increased use of digital information and communications technologies (ICT),” requiring the incorporation of new content and competencies into the school curriculum. Interculturality and ICT are “two central themes shaping the field of curriculum in Spain,” but for Coll and Martín three other research areas may prove more significant: 1) assessment, 2) competency-based curriculum, and 3) what to teach and learn in schools.

Understanding curriculum research in Switzerland, Rebekka Horlacher and Andrea De Vincenti note, is complicated by terminology. The two common terms used in German, “*Lehrplan*” (instruction plan) or “*Lehrplanung*” (instruction planning), are included in the concept of curriculum, but they do not exhaust its meaning. Never mind that Switzerland is officially quadrilingual (German, French, Italian, and Romansh) and that even German terms in Switzerland may not coincide “fully” with their meanings and historical resonance in Germany. Horlacher and Vincenti remind that the *Lehrplan* is “strongly tied” to German culture, linked with German understandings of “good life” and the “good citizen,” concepts that cannot be comprehended apart from *Bildung*.

The curriculum movements of the 1970s and 1980s shifted the emphasis from “inputs” to “outcomes,” rationalized by theories of “human capital” and conceived in terms of “standards” and “competencies” that made “measurement” a “core mission.” Efforts to supersede the “humanistic *Lehrplan* discourse,” Horlacher and Vincenti report, “must be given a failing grade.” “It is precisely in this thematic area,” they conclude, “that curriculum research has the opportunity to establish itself as a competent interlocutor in questions that relate to education, schooling and the future of our society,

without the need for a moralistic discussion or one that is confined to the logic of numbers.”

During the last decade in Taiwan, Hwang, Jenq-Jye, Chang, Chia-Yu, and Chen, Derwen report, a “localization-indigenization movement” has affirmed the inclusion of Taiwanese culture in the curriculum. With the prominence of multiculturalism, curriculum research is now forefronted among the education sciences in Taiwan. “At present,” Hwang, Chang, and Chen explain, “how to design models for multicultural curriculum from kindergarten to university ... are all on the agenda of curriculum study.” Multicultural models must also address the concerns of the aboriginal Taiwanese. Commitments to gender equity challenge gender stereotypes and prejudice in schools. As in Korea, the fact of “international marriages” poses curriculum questions, as do continuing concerns for “environmental protection, sex education, parents’ education, human rights education, drug education, information education, moral education, career education, marine education, etc.”

There is considerable infrastructure in support of such curriculum research and development. Hwang, Chang, and Chen report that there are several institutes and centers of curriculum and instruction. There is as well the Association for Curriculum and Instruction, a national and nongovernmental academic organization that has published the *Curriculum and Instruction Quarterly* since 1998. Envisioning the future, Hwang, Chang, and Chen suggest that curriculum study in Taiwan still needs to: 1) establish more research organizations to coordinate national, local and school-level projects; 2) coordinate the efforts of existing institutes, schools and nongovernmental agencies; 3) invite more colleagues for international and interdisciplinary collaboration; and 4) form

systemic and integrated research projects through teamwork. “The task of curriculum study belongs to not only learned scholars, but also to teachers,” Hwang, Chang, and Chen conclude, as the “aim of curriculum study is to establish theory and improve practice.”

In his chapter on curriculum research in Turkey before 2000, Sümer Aktan reports that religion informed education in the Ottoman Empire. “The verses of the sacred scripture of Islam,” Aktan reminds, “emphasize the importance of knowledge, wisdom, reading, intellectuality and comprehension.” The “sayings of the Prophet Muhammad,” he continues, which “praise reading and learning, provide rationale for the importance attached to education in Islam.” Despite nineteenth-century demands for socioeconomic development, Islamic influence remained strong, indicated in Regulations introduced in 1892 emphasizing Islamic curriculum. “The duties of the teacher were not restricted to instruction,” Aktan explains, as “the teacher was also required to serve as a role model to the students,” teaching “obedience” to the sultan and the state as well as to one’s parents, elders and teachers. Aktan concludes that the “predominant force in curriculum theory through the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was Islam.”

After the establishment of the Republic in 1923, Aktan continues, “the answer given to the curriculum question ‘What knowledge is of most worth?’ changed, now informed by positivism and secularism.” No longer ethical exemplars, teachers constituted “a scientific and cultural army,” considered even “more important than the military.” This association of education and military training was reflected in the curriculum. Despite this militarization of education, the Republican government invited John Dewey to study Turkish education. Dewey arrived in Turkey on July 19, 1924 and

remained four months, after which he filed the report he had prepared for the Ministry of National Education. Dewey's influence was discernible, but the 1936 curriculum, while claiming a pragmatist perspective, was, Aktan judges, "more ideological than democratic."

World War II was a "turning point" for curriculum research in Turkey, Aktan writes. During the first years of the Republic, concepts originating in the Continental Europe – especially in Germany - had dominated. After 1945 Turkish attention turned toward the U.S.A., where students were sent for advanced study in education. U.S. experts traveled to Turkey and positivist models of the social and behavioral sciences became prominent. "Curriculum," Aktan notes, "became a technical field composed of curriculum development and assessment rather than an academic field of study." Micro-curricular topics - among them teaching and learning, technology, and assessment - preoccupied the now "technical-scientific-rationalist" field. Macro-curricular concerns – such as gender, ideology, curriculum history, the role of government – were exported to other specializations.

This exclusion of macro-curricular concerns remains the case today, Aktan complains: "Tyler's Rationale and its variations remain to be the predominant paradigm." He blames the training post-War World II students received in the U.S.A. While the 1970s reconceptualization of U.S. curriculum research installed the significance of macro-curricular perspectives there, not so in Turkey. Key curriculum questions – especially historical and theoretical questions – remain the province of other specializations, even other academic disciplines such as political science, history, and philosophy. There are hopeful signs, Aktan suggests, among them the 2009 founding of

the Turkish Curriculum and Instruction Association. As well, “criticism of the educational sciences in general and the fields of curriculum and teaching in particular may provoke a reconstruction of the curriculum field in Turkey.” Aktan looks to a redefinition of the Turkish field as “multidimensional” and no longer exclusively a “subspecies of the school and of teaching.”

The 2005 curriculum, Dilek Gözütok reports, failed to “serve the general objectives of Turkish National Education.” In that document nationalism is condemned, nor is there adequate appreciation for Turkish language, history, and culture. “No matter which globalization process we are experiencing,” Gözütok reminds, it is “the nation” that provides its history and present circumstances. The 2005 curriculum was the first national curriculum prepared in Turkey without the participation of curriculum specialists. The education law of March, 30, 2012, Gözütok continues, “passed by the government using repressive methods, was harshly criticized by academics of educational sciences, teacher associations and the Opposition party.” Since 2000, Turkey has deemphasized its own distinctiveness by adopting “other countries’ programs” while inserting “religious values” into the curriculum. “Unable to resist these developments,” Gözütok laments, “leaves scholars uneasy.”

In his reflection on curriculum research in the United Kingdom, Ivor F. Goodson points to the “obsessive contemporality” of our time, “allied with a belief that past curriculum traditions could, given conviction and resources, be transcended.” There has been, Goodson continues, the refrain of “innovation”, endless endorsements of “radical change in education” and repeated promises of “revolutionizing classroom practice,” all accompanied by constant confidence in “redrawing the map of learning.” Not only is the

past effaced in such phraseology, so is the present, including the power of the teacher, often inflated to ensure her or his culpability should test results disappoint. These circumstances have histories, as Goodson's crucial contribution makes unmistakable.

The history of curriculum research in the U.S.A. is structured by three paradigmatic moments: 1) the field's inauguration as and paradigmatic stabilization as curriculum development (1918-1969), 2) the field's reconceptualization (1969-1980) from curriculum development to curriculum studies, its research organized around understanding curriculum (1980-2001), and 3), most recently, the field's internationalization (2001-), which I construe as ethical engagement with alterity, accenting the concept of "understanding" with history, activism, and the forefronting of difference.

Epilogue:  
The "Obsessive Contemporality" of Our Time<sup>20</sup>

Historical study has a valuable role to play in challenging, informing and sometimes generating theory.

Ivor F. Goodson (this volume)

While certain concepts reverberate through these chapters – among them technology, assessment, globalization – these are sounded through structures specific to each nation. These structures – schools, policies, practices – become intelligible to researchers when studied historically. However hounded by globalization, the curriculum remains nationally based, locally enacted and experienced. Whether that fundamental fact supports tendencies toward cosmopolitanism or provincialism cannot be ascertained apart from studies of national context: historical, social, cultural. That is why this handbook is

organized by country<sup>21</sup> and emphasizes history. In political terms, such an organization challenges the “obsessive contemporality” that effaces history and thus renders globalization “reasonable.”

Globalization is rationalized, Stephen Carney, Jeremy Rappleye, and Iveta Silova explain, by technology, science, and the myth of progress,. One such rationalization - “world culture theory” - is challenged by the evidence, e.g. the “local enactment” of global demands (Carney, Rappleye, and Silova 2012, 367). The “evidence” cited by world culture theorists does not support claims of a “world culture,” Carney, Rappleye, and Silova (2012, 368) conclude, instead it tends to “*produce* them.”<sup>22</sup> What the evidence makes clear is not the achievement of globalization that world culture theory imagines but the “incompleteness, pragmatism, and chaos of so much education reform” (Carney, Rappleye, and Silova 2012, 385). These present circumstances represent not failures of implementation but recontextualizations of imported<sup>23</sup> models of “reform.” Future research, Carney, Rappleye, and Silova (2012, 387) recommend, is better focused on “how” and “under what conditions ideas travel, transfer, and take form as practices.” Several of the chapters in this handbook do just that.

Not only does the local contradict world culture theory, so does the theory’s retrospective historiography. This “harmonizing” method, Daniel Tröhler (2011, 182) points out, starts with positing a globalized world, then works from present to past: from modernity and secularity backward to Christianity (see Tröhler 2011, 188-189). Another form of “Whig” history, Tröhler (2011, 182) notes, this grand narrative displays a “teleological progression” towards ever-increasing “individual liberty” and



“enlightenment,” formulated as liberal democracy and scientific progress. If the present is posited as following the past, however, a more complicated reality is revealed.

Working retrospectively, however – as Daniel Tröhler (2011, 183) explains - world culture theory misconstrues globalization as a “linear process” that became evident during the nineteenth century, when the various nation-states emerged not from internal or indigenous processes but from “exogenous” ones instead (2011, 184). Rather than embedded in national histories and cultures, national education systems were – in this tale told backwards - “homogenized” by global models that became institutionalized through projects of “development.” These processes of homogenization and standardization accelerated and expanded through technological means, including organized international networks of communication (see Tröhler 2011, 184). This “transnational process,” Tröhler (2011, 185) notes, “was accompanied by universalization of the notion of development,” which by the 1970s became the “core concept of modernity par excellence.”

Modernity is now construed, Tröhler (2011, 185) observes, as the “permanent” obligation of “continuous self-development,” an national undertaking that (over)relies on the educational system. Although crippling questions remain concerning the alleged link between educational and economic-social-political development<sup>24</sup>, these have not been acknowledged in demands for “development.” The one world society, Tröhler (2011, 185) argues, “requires both the nation-state and its overcoming in the age of globalization.” Perceiving this apparent paradox requires bifocality, conveyed in the concept of “glocal” (see Mathias and Sabar, this volume).

The paradox of “glocal” is evident in Hongyu Wang’s theorization of the term

“international” as “in-between” and as “fluid spaces” wherein “multiplicity” and “differences” are neither “excluded” nor “self-contained.” In contrast to “globalization,” the “internationalization” of curriculum studies, Wang underscores, “supports the decentering of both the national and the global through a focus on interaction and relationship that leads to the transformation of both locality and globalness.” The “shared meaning” world culture theorists project on the actually existing world of endless difference is, as these chapters testify, enacted locally through academic study, teaching, and research. Shared meaning is not enforced by standardized testing but constructed in complicated conversation informed by our expertise – theoretical, practical, historical – and animated by our professional ethics.

Contesting the neocolonialism of globalization, such cosmopolitan curriculum research is “glocal” and is characterized by nonviolence, “a thread,” Wang reminds, “that weaves through many non-Western and Western countries and cultures,” and in so doing “may heal the divide between East and West, North and South, or the first, second, or third world.” Expressive of the “vital, life-affirmative, and best part of each culture,” nonviolence, she suggests, “may have the potentiality to unite us across differences to co-create more compassionate and creative expressions of humanity.” *That* “shared meaning”<sup>25</sup> would surely be knowledge of most worth.

## References

- Aoki, Ted T. 2005 (1986/1991). Teaching as Indwelling Between Two Curriculum Worlds. In *Curriculum in a New Key: The Collected Works of Ted T. Aoki*, edited by William F. Pinar and Rita L. Irwin (159-165). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carney, Stephen, Rappleye, Jeremy, and Silova, Iveta. 2012, August. Between Faith and Science: World Culture Theory and Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review* 56 (3), 366-393.
- Chambers, Cynthia. 2003. "As Canadian as Possible under the Circumstances": A View of Contemporary Curriculum Discourses in Canada. In the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*, edited by William F. Pinar (221-252). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Coyle, Diane. 2007. *The Soulful Science: What Economists Really Do and Why It Matters*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Garduño, José María García. 2011. Acculturation, Hybridity, Cosmopolitanism in Ibero American Curriculum Studies. In *Curriculum Studies in Mexico: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances* (137-163). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gough, Noel. 2003. Thinking Globally in Environmental Education: Implications For Internationalizing Curriculum Inquiry. In *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* Edited by William F. Pinar (53-72). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kumar, Ashwani. In press. *Curriculum as Meditative Inquiry*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, William F. Ed. 2003. *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pinar, William F. 2011. Ed. *Curriculum Studies in Mexico: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, William F. 2012. *What Is Curriculum Theory?* [Second Edition.] New York: Routledge.
- Pinar, William F. 2013. *Curriculum Studies in the United States. Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, David Geoffrey 2003. Curriculum and Teaching Face Globalization. In the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*, edited by William F. Pinar (35-51). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tröhler, Daniel. 2011. *Languages of Education. Protestant Legacies, National Identities, and Global Aspirations*. New York: Routledge.





---

<sup>1</sup> I was unable to secure updated reports from Australia, Botswana, Canada, Estonia, France, Malaysia, Namibia, New Zealand, Sweden, and Thailand.

<sup>2</sup> This fact is evident in the chapters organizing curriculum research by country, but even these chapters are “local,” as somewhat different portraits would be painted by different individuals. These reports would also shift if aligned with regions or linked with other countries. As in currency exchange markets for instance, it would be valuable to map the Portugal-Brazil “cross,” or a Switzerland-Singapore “cross” and not only in English. If UNESCO honored dialogical encounter rather than authoritarianism through standardized testing, it would sponsor a series of conferences and translate into various languages studies of these nationally distinctive fields and their “crosses” with others. “Resonance” is a more appropriate concept for me than “cross,” as I am less interested in determining an “exchange value” of concepts than their localized recontextualization and reconstruction.

<sup>3</sup> See Aoki (2005 [1986/1991], 161-165).

<sup>4</sup> The last meeting was held in Rio de Janeiro in July 2012, chaired by Professors Elizabeth Macedo and Alice Casimiro Lopes. In 2015 the meeting moves north to Ottawa – to be chaired by Professor Nicholas Ng-A-Fook - before returning to Asia in 2018.

<sup>5</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all quoted passages come from this handbook.

<sup>6</sup> Daniel Tröhler also acknowledges the central role this concept has played in rationalizing neoliberalism (see Tröhler 2011, 184).

<sup>7</sup> This is a unique form of curriculum scholarship, composing essays in the form of elongated syllabi, theorizing a course – an instance of curriculum – and specifying its answers to the canonical curriculum question: what knowledge is of most worth? It is an innovative example of the synoptic text, a genre specific to curriculum studies in North America (Pinar 2012, 61). Smith juxtaposed two courses – one on globalization and one on the answers to the questions it poses, e.g. the wisdom traditions – into one, as he describes in his chapter.

<sup>8</sup> “The curriculum,” Silvia Moraes points out in her chapter, “always has its feet in a nation/country and today, more than ever, it also means having eyes and ears outside frontiers. We are all situated in a particular culture, speaking a particular language, belonging to a certain family and at the same time we are connected to a larger world, portrayed in the daily news, Facebook, Twitter, e-mail.”

<sup>9</sup> For curriculum as meditative inquiry see Kumar (in press).

<sup>10</sup> As Tröhler (2011, 192-193) writes elsewhere: “As there seem to be no Archimedean point from which we can perceive the subject of inquiry objectively, the inquiry needs to

---

address the researcher as well – not in order to eliminate the researcher’s own worldview and epistemological frame but in order to become aware of it.”

<sup>11</sup> “Because curriculum is the heart of education,” Wang explains, “nonviolence needs to be at the center of curriculum studies.” If we affirm a “new internationalism,” she continues, “then nonviolently mobilizing organic relationships *within* and *across* the local, the national, and the international becomes important.” Wang asks us to “envision nonviolent relationality as the central thread of internationalizing curriculum studies.”

<sup>12</sup> Indeed, “the simultaneity of the local, the national, and the international dynamics is important for orienting curriculum studies towards nonviolence education,” Wang suggests.

<sup>13</sup> Not only is social justice intertwined with subjectivity, so is history, as Tröhler (2011, 193) appreciates: “I see no other way than to historicize not only a topic but the construer of the topic as well.”

<sup>14</sup> This passage occurs in a paragraph wherein Chambers has referenced Canadians’ discomfort with nationalism. The complete sentence reads: “Richardson (1997) ironically suggests that nationalism has become the ‘new love that dare not say its name,’ and argues that if Canadians are to create a shared public space, that is tolerant of difference and inviting to youth, curriculum must address identity and nationalism directly in a way one that is invested with, rather than divested of, emotion and passion” (2003, 246). The Richardson reference is: Richardson, G. 1997. *The Love That Dare Not Speak Its Name: Nationalism and Identity in the Alberta Social Studies Curriculum*. *Canadian Social Studies* 31 (3), 138-141.

<sup>15</sup> As in South Africa, if there in racialized ways. See the Le Grange chapter (this volume).

<sup>16</sup> Program for International Student Assessment.

<sup>17</sup> The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) provides (presumably) reliable and timely data on mathematics and science achievement.

<sup>18</sup> Since the late 1980's, Mathias and Sabar report, “it has become common knowledge within the educational field that the recognition of the civil and cultural rights of Arab Israeli citizens is one of the decisive tests of the country’s democratic-pluralistic character. This recognition has mainly become manifest in Civics studies, where educational efforts in Israel are concentrated on nurturing universal, democratic values.”

<sup>19</sup> Such work was imported forcibly, part of the U.S. campaign to “re-educate” Mexicans away from the Communist threat the Cuban Revolution posed. See Pinar 2011, 209.

<sup>20</sup> The phrase is Ivor Goodson’s (this volume). My term is “presentism” (2012, 58-58) but both reference the same phenomenon.

---

<sup>21</sup> <sup>21</sup> It is “too early to mourn the Nation-State's demise,” Mathias and Sabar appreciate, “since it is quite often the driving force behind standardization and reforms” (this volume). Because the State continues to play a “dominant role in defining the educational curriculum, allocating hours, mobilizing pedagogical and organizational reforms, evaluating achievements and training and supplying the educational system's workforce,” it is the State, Mathias and Sabar point out, that maintains the power to “interpret” what is meant by “global educational reform.”

<sup>22</sup> First outlined by John Meyer in the 1970s, world culture theory's central theoretical claim, Carney, Rappleye, and Silova (2012, 368) explain, was that educational “expansion” was not especially responsive to the political, economic, and social structures of individual nation-states, but to global demands for world society. Carney, Rappleye, and Silova (2012, 371-373) outline the intellectual history of world culture theory, working from Weber through Parsons, referencing its revisions and additions (such as globalization as “shared meaning”: see 2012, 374). As have Daniel Tröhler (see 2011, 184) and others (including myself: Pinar 2011, 51-52), Carney, Rappleye, and Silova (2012, 377, 379) are critical of the research of Ramirez and his colleagues, not only methodologically but also due to its apparent endorsement of standardization as effective, efficient, and equitable (see Carney, Rappleye, and Silova 2012, 383). Carney, Rappleye, and Silova (2012, 387) advise “all scholars to look inward and question the values embedded in their own science.” Interesting, that admonition – “look inward” – coincides with Tröhler (2011, 193) conclusion: “Doing history is essentially the self-discovering of one's own standpoint.”

<sup>23</sup> Sometimes forcibly so, as in Mexico in the 1960s: see Pinar 2011, 209.

<sup>24</sup> See Coyle 2007, 51.

<sup>25</sup> How would such shared meaning come about? “We believe the study of the genesis and consolidation of an international curriculum field may contribute not only to analyses focused on specific settings,” José Augusto Pacecho and Filipa Seabra ( this volume) write, “but also for the construction of an international field built upon the diversity and the recognition of realities, that, in many ways, are intersected. The internationalization of curriculum studies represents the contestation of globalization, defined as common parameters through which national governments predict educational policies and practices of curriculum control or as circuit for the global flow of commodities, culture and communications.”