Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Spring 2008

Tracing the Threads: A Curriculum Study of the Dialogue of Otherness in the Histories of Public and Independent Schooling

Kelley Jean Waldron

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd

TRACING THE THREADS:

A CURRICULUM STUDY OF THE DIALOGUE OF "OTHERNESS" IN THE

HISTORIES OF PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLING

by

KELLEY J. D. WALDRON

(Under the Direction of Marla Morris)

ABSTRACT

This work is a postmodern, historical analysis that seeks to trouble the private/public distinction that is traditionally drawn in educational history and theory by examining the histories of public schools and independent schools around the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization. Although there is much literature and research regarding these topics within the context of public schooling, much of it is ahistorical in many respects. There is much less scholarly work discussing these topics in the sector of independent schooling. The majority of the literature on the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization in schooling takes and either/or perspective, in which the interconnectivity of the histories of private and public schooling are isolated or dichotomized. This work is unique in its focus on the histories of independent schoolings as in dialogue with those of public schooling. Through a historical and theoretical examination of the dialogical space of the in-between of the private/public divide in education around these three interrelated topics, this work troubles the private/public distinction and explores the possibilities and futurities for curriculum work and education in the postmodern space in-between public schools and independent schools.

INDEX WORDS: Curriculum, History, Postmodern, Dialogue, Public Schools, Independent Schools, Public, Private

TRACING THE THREADS:

A CURRICULUM STUDY OF THE DIALOGUE OF "OTHERNESS" IN THE

HISTORIES OF PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLING

by

KELLEY J. D. WALDRON

Bachelor of Arts, Tulane University, 2001

Master of Science, Loyola University New Orleans, 2002

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2008

TRACING THE THREADS:

A CURRICULUM STUDY OF THE DIALOGUE OF "OTHERNESS" IN THE

HISTORIES OF PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLING

by

KELLEY J. D. WALDRON

Major Professor:	Marla Morris
Committee:	Petra Munro Hendry
	Marla Morris
	William Reynolds
	John Weaver

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: TAPESTRIES OF MEANING: A POSTMODERN CURRICULUM HISTORY OF THE INTERCONNECTEDNESS AND OTHERNESS OF PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLING

"If there's no meaning in it," said the King, "that saves a world of trouble, you know, as we needn't try to find any. And yet I don't know,"… "I seem to see some meaning in them, after all…" (Carroll, 1992, p.95)

The field of education is not surprisingly ahistorical in many respects. Movements and policies in education are often old paradigms of thought dressed up in new clothes. Like the King in *Alice in Wonderland*, perhaps multiple contemplations of the meaning in our histories will hold some import for the present situation. Huebner (1991) stated that educators notoriously live in the present and look towards the future, while disregarding the past. We are primarily concerned with the present welfare of our students and their preparation for the future. Whereas education has often employed sociology or psychology as a framework for exploration, Huebner emphasized the importance of utilizing history as a lens for understanding the present educational moment.

> History, not sociology, is the discipline which seems the most making to the social study of education. The historian can be interpreted as looking back to where a society has been to determine how it arrived at a given point. In so doing, he identifies certain threads of continuity to unite diverse moments in time. (p.325)

I believe that Huebner rightfully advocates for more emphasis on the historical exploration of education and curriculum. Our present is not an isolated moment, one that can be understood as singular, but rather is reflective of the compilation of all past and

future experiences as well. Histories act as threads, and when we look at the current

seams of the present, they are impossible without the stitches of the past. It is only

possible to understand fully the present by understanding the past within it, as well as the

futurity.

Huebner is reminiscent of Dewey (1997), who emphasized that any movement

forward in education should be aware of that out of which it grows, to avoid the

oscillation of reactionary movements.

> There is always the danger in a new movement that in rejecting the aims and
>
> methods of that which it would supplant, it may develop its principles negatively
>
> rather than positively and constructively. Then it takes its clew in practice from
>
> that which is rejected instead of from the constructive development of its own
>
> philosophy. (p.20)

The historical orientation reminds us that our present and future grow out of and

are connected to our past. To explore our present moment in curriculum, we must

understand how it is connected historically and futurally to other movements.

The historical moment in which education finds itself further reinforces the need

for reflection on the past. Like the social climate in which Dewey lived, we are living

within a changing moment where the way we understand ourselves and the world around

us is rapidly shifting.

The time in which John Dewey lived and worked, the early 1900s, was one of

change in a still young country. The fabric of a newly formed American society was

being torn and re-sown by a sweeping revolution of industrialism and immigrations. This

society not only inspired Dewey and shaped his ideas on education, but also gives us

reason to revisit many of his writings. We find ourselves in a similar situation as a technological revolution not only sweeps across our nations, but also erases and redefines the boundaries of what we have understood a nation or society to mean. Dewey would agree that his place in time and space influenced his understanding of education. It is a central point of his educational philosophy that the individual is never divorced from the society and that to understand anything in education; we must consider the individual, their environment, and the interrelationship between the two as being an inseparable trilogy.

It behooves the educator to reflect on the history of schooling in the United States at the present moment. Dewey warned of the dangers inherent in reactionary movements in education. A historical exploration of educational and curricular policy affords an expanded perspective on the past that is present now and in our future. Rather than adhering to the cyclical pattern of reactionary policy, we must look for policies that open spaces and allow forward movement. Ironically, that forward movement is only possible and lasting when it is cognizant of its past movement.

Doublespeak: the dialogical histories of independent and public school

> *What is fundamentally curricular and what is*
>
> *fundamentally human are of the same fabric.*
>
> *~William Schubert*

This work seeks to examine the dialogical histories of public schools and independent schools through a postmodern perspective. While chapter 2 explores the concepts of postmodern histories in more detail, it is necessary to state that this

perspective utilizes the freedom and play of discourse within postmodernism to trouble the concepts of private and public.

As will be seen, this work is necessarily political. Despite criticisms, postmodernism is anything but politically neutral. Although postmodernism argues for the opening of spaces and the looking beyond the dichotomies of modernism, it must stand for something if it is to be philosophically or personally meaningful. It is a philosophic position that creates discursive spaces and positions. And in moving past modernisms, it argues for just that, the movement past modernist paradigms that box in and shut down the space of freedoms. It does not negate modernism, but renegotiates the modern understanding of "reason" as universal. Yeatman (1994) outlines this renegotiation in the following,

> …[P]ostmodern thought develops a thoroughgoing epistemological politics, which insists on the always embodied and always particularized nature of knowledge claims. The consequence of this for how reason actually operates is, as Lyotard…put it: "There is no reason, only reasons." (p.1)

This is political, in that we think and live in a postmodern society that often refuses to recognize itself as such. Statements that seek to dismantle the power structures and institutions that continue to ignore our postmodern condition and propagate a modern worldview, including schools and educational institutions, are political. As Pinar et al. (2004) states,

> Understood poststructurally [read as a subfield of the postmodern], political struggle is discursive; it involves destabilizing patterns of thought which cannot, finally, be separated dualistically from physical behavior or "action." (p.309)

In postmodernism, the spoken word is not separate from or a representation of action, (re)presentation is simultaneously action. Therefore, in dialogical history, the dialogue between public and independent schools creates a discursive space, and this is a political space in the postmodern sense. While disputes arise over the (im)possibility of dialogue in postmodernism, I take up the argument in the subsequent chapter that dialogue is not impossible in postmodernism, but requires a radical revision of how we understand the nature of dialogue by incorporating and examining the ways in which language always incorporates the other, employing the thoughts and Foucault, Derrida, and Bakhtin. This being said, postmodernism is not a unified political front, but rather represents a philosophic position from which different political (discursive) perspectives are built. This philosophic position, because of its desire and acknowledgement of our movement beyond modernism, which is the philosophic camp in which most institutions and places of power find or locate themselves, is political. How this political nature of postmodernism applies to Curriculum Studies and curriculum work is woven throughout this text and will be revisited in the conclusion.

This work is also necessarily personal. As someone who has been educated in both public and independent institutions, as well as an educator who now teaches and does administrative work in independent schools, I do not pretend that my own perspective will not weave its way into the history I present. The historical work that ignores the perspective and lived experiences of the author is fallacious in my opinion, this also being a postmodern perspective. However, I want to state at the beginning that I have been and continue to be deeply aware of my own experiences and how these influence the histories I read and include in this text. I consciously choose to work in the

independent school sector, the reasons for that choice also being fleshed out in this work through an exploration of the historical dialogue between independent and public schools.

This work seeks to trouble the dualistic public/private distinction that is often employed in works that argue for or against school choice using an exploration of discourse in postmodernism. The troubling in which I seek to engage is not limited to schooling institutions, but to the breakdown and confusion of this distinction in our larger culture which finds expression in the way in which we structure and understand schools. The specific meanings of what is included in the category of public schools and the category of independent schools is explicated in more detail in chapter 3, through historical definitions (and as will be seen their respective categories have been redefined throughout history), a brief distinction based on current usages and the usage as employed in this work will serve to divert some misconceptions from the outset. The most superficial distinction between these two types of schooling is mostly concerned with infrastructure rather than curriculum, although the inseparability of these elements of schooling will become more apparent through dialogues of their histories around specific topics. The term or category of public schools in this work points to the institution of schooling that is historically derived from the Common School movement, and is funded predominantly by public monies or taxes (although as will be explored later the source of funding continues to blur lines of public and private). The term independent school, as a specific subset of private schooling, refers to schools that are non-profit organizations funded predominately through private monies, tuition and donations, and are independent from other educational or other social institutions in

governance, having their own board of trustees that operates as the highest level of authority in the school community.

The difficulty in researching on this topic is that the terms "private" and "independent" are often used interchangeably in the historical literature on the subject. Many statistics that pertain solely to independent schools are simply non-existent. The National center for Education Statistics (NCES) does not use this term at all. Rather, they make a distinction amongst private schools between catholic, other religious, and non-sectarian. In this work, I use the definition of an independent school that is employed by the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS).

> Independent schools are distinct from other schools in that they are primarily supported by tuitions, charitable contributions, and endowment income rather than by tax or church funds… school must be independently governed by a board of trustees. (NAIS web site- http://www.nais.org)

In exploring independent schools, I mean only to refer to schools serving the elementary and secondary levels, rather than higher educational institutions that also meet the criteria of NAIS.

While important studies and explorations of the histories of both of these types of schooling have been done, it is rarely done in a dialogical manner, with the intention not of promoting one type of schooling over the other, but with the intention of better understanding how each has developed in relationship to the other. Their histories and positions are not as simple and clear as the often uninformed sound-bites that we hear in common discourse about education and types of schooling. There are perceptions and

misperceptions promoted about each of these types of schooling. These perceptions at times take the form of self-promotion, at times by the other.

Situating

This work is written in the tradition of Curriculum Studies. What exactly Curriculum Studies entails is a question I asked myself before becoming and as a doctoral student of Curriculum Studies. It is not always readily apparent how to define Curriculum Studies, nor should it be. It is appropriate, before divulging further into this work, to situate my own historical exploration within the history of the field of Curriculum Studies.

The field of Curriculum Studies, understood within the Reconceptualization Movement, shifts the emphasis from the development of curriculum, a preoccupation with the instruction, methods, and materials of curriculum, to an emphasis on studying the philosophical, historical, socio-political, and cultural connections between schooling and the lived experiences of individuals. The reconceptualized understanding of curriculum takes as its starting point the Latin infinitive of curriculum, *currere*, "to denote the running (or lived experience) of the course" (Pinar, 2004, p. xiii).

The Reconceptualization has yet to fully penetrate the study of curriculum more generally, and debates in curriculum are often erroneously understood by the larger public as simply being a battle between conservatives and liberals, or traditionalists and progressives. Kliebard (1995) notes one such explication of the field in the opening of his text, *The struggle for the American curriculum*.

In a recent review of two historical studies in education, Carl Kaestle (1984)…

describe[s] these two competing schools of thought as to the course of education

in the United States: "School systems exemplify democratic evolution, said the traditionalists. No, responded the radical revisionists, school systems illustrate the bureaucratic imposition of social control on the working class. Recently, some historians have emphasized that public school systems are the result of contests between conflicting class and interest groups." (p. xiii)

This reductive history hardly does justice to the historical and philosophical movements that coincided with and influenced the Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies. Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (2004) mark the Reconceptualization proper as beginning formally in the 1970s. This reconceptualization grew out of the dead-end that the curriculum field reached in structuralism and positivism, which culminated in the Tyler Rationale. Such approaches were failing to move education forward, or to reach its desired ends in affecting social character by deepening our understanding of our learning and ourselves. The emphasis on the Tyler Rationale neglected the humanistic aspects of schooling, leading to a dull and technical approach to curriculum development and teaching (p.187). The Tyler Rationale reduced curriculum to a technical procedure, and its employment denied the development of new ways of thinking about teaching and learning.

The emphasis on technical rationality did not occur apart from larger social, historical, and philosophical movements. From its inception, the field of curriculum was concerned with practical matters. Pinar (1999) identifies this inception circa 1920, and its development as a field coincides with the need to develop and manage curricula for the rapidly expanding public school system at this time.

The main function of curriculum studies, beginning in the 1920s, "was to develop

and manage curricula for a public school system in a period of rapid expansion.

Consequently the early texts of the field addressed issues of development,

including curriculum planning and evaluation." (p.484)

The early texts and the way in which curriculum was developed with an emphasis

on scientific and positivistic methodologies was connected to the larger philosophical

movement of structuralism, and with the historical efforts to develop war and space

technologies in the international competition in arms and space technologies that

occurred from the 1920s to the 1960s.

Whereas a traditional approach to curriculum and instructions focuses on the *what*

of curriculum, Curriculum Studies focuses on the *why* of curriculum. Curriculum Studies

reconceptualized is an approach to curriculum that seeks to understand through

questioning, the different nature of the questions leading to different types of

understandings. These understandings do not stand definitively, but point to more

questions, representing approaches rather than stagnant sectors of the field. It is this

emphasis on understanding and the questioning that the field necessarily involves that

opens spaces; that allows the circularity of life to exist within the field of curriculum.

The approach to studying curriculum, while focusing in part on schools, is not ignorant of

the interconnectedness between schools and society. Curriculum Studies differs from

Curriculum and Instruction in that it is focused on lived experiences. While Curriculum

and Instruction was and is concerned with developing theories about best practices,

Curriculum Studies is often critical of these because they are developed in isolation of

and disregard for the larger cultural and societal factors that are, in fact, lived experiences of those who will be learning under particular pedagogic methodologies and those who will be employing them. As Apple (1995) states,

> We should be cautious about technical solutions to political problems. We should be cautious about fine-sounding words that may not take account of the daily lives of the people who work in these institutions. Any attempt at bringing coherence to the curriculum that does not begin with the role of the school in the larger society …should make us a bit nervous. And any suggestion for transforming curriculums that is not grounded in a recognition of the texts and tests that now provide the hidden principles of coherence for schools… should make us equally nervous. (p. 134)

The disconnect in traditional curriculum development between the lived experiences both within school and within society and culture often results in short-lived or ineffective practices and reforms. Traditional curriculum practices and perspectives that intend to achieve reform focused solely on schools are often simplistic and naive. In exploring the histories of public and independent schools, I plan to show that issues of great importance at present in education- identity politics, accountability, and globalization- have been historically issues around which educators and community members have focused their attention and reform efforts. This continuity suggests that these issues are societal and not just educational. Therefore, traditional approaches in curriculum that search for a singular or narrow vision of change that will "cure" educational problems will always be ineffective. These three topics- identity politics, accountability, and globalization- are explored because of their connectivity with each

other and their relevance for informing our practice today. The exploration of these three topics shows how the troubling of the private/public divide has and is still present within the histories of public and independent schooling, simultaneously emphasizing the connectivity between all areas of schooling and our lived experiences inside and outside of the school walls.

The complexity of educational history is often overlooked for the pragmatic purposes of simply "fixing" what is seen as broken. However, education, in its reflections of both our public and private lives, is not reparable with simple "solutions" that focus solely on schooling. Graubard (1972) expressed this observation in his study of Free Schools, an institution discussed in Chapter 4.

> A point worth making is that education is not the sort of problem amenable to a sudden new discovery, either of theory or of new techniques. This is crucial to understanding the differences among the various reform perspectives. If problems of education and youth were like the problems of finding a cure for cancer, then the search for a new idea or new technique or a new theory or a new discovery in psychology would make sense as a path of reform. This is the preferred American way of seeing problems- as accessible to a concentrated input of new ideas and new technology. (p.32)

A focus in Curriculum Studies on lived experiences "complicates the conversation" (Pinar, 2004) about education and schooling greatly, and prevents in many ways a reductive approach to thinking and talking about schools and curriculum. This is the focus and intent within the Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies and this work seeks to continue in this line. As Schubert (1995) emphasizes, the diversity that is

necessarily in this approach allows curriculum and education to be enriching and fulfilling experiences.

> It may seem strange that diversity could bring a kind of coherence. However, the awareness of the diverse cultures, norms, ways of knowing, and ways of being in the world augments repertoires of possibility and enriches our capacity for creative lives worth living and worth sharing. (p.153)

In the sections that follow, I will explore some of the voices that complicate this conversation, as well as include my own voice and thoughts on the increasingly polarized understanding of the still interrelated histories and present moments of public and independent schools in the United States. As mentioned earlier, our present moment harkens back to that of Dewey, a time in which technological revolution, similar to the industrial revolution, tears through the fabric of our daily lives and reeks of uncertainty about the present or future. However, the present moment is also different than that of Dewey, in which we find ourselves amidst ethnic and cultural plurality that often defies categorization. The technological revolution spurs this defiance, as it allows us to transgress and digress across former structures around which we organized our lives- family units, national boundaries, categories of identity and selfhood. These transgressions and digressions trouble boundaries and distinctions. In this work, I trouble the traditional private/public distinction by tracing the histories of public schooling and independent schooling around the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization.

This piece is a work within the young field of Curriculum Studies. It seeks to open new spaces for exploration and speech in curriculum work, and education more

generally. Little is written or read about independent schools. This work is not intended to promote a singular vision of education, but rather to argue for the non-standardization of curriculum for postmodern curricula, curricula that includes both private and public spaces and seeks out and utilizes both to continue forward. Through a historical exploration of the dialogue between independent and public schools, I seek to show how spaces in curriculum, or the lived experiences of those in education, are rapidly shut down in the face of standardization and conformity. The way in which we conceive of, design, and implement curricula in education often has this unintended (or is it intended?) effect.

This work reflects a situatedness of my position and perspective from the Southern portion of the United States. While the perception of a private/public divide is present throughout the country and educational discourse, it is particularly acute in the southern states. This is in part due to the remains of antagonistic feelings leftover from the Civil Rights Movement and integrations, as well as a large disparity in social class divide. Schools within the South, both private and public, are not isolated from these aspects of southern culture, and the ways in which they are reflected in schooling lead to a particularly acute attempt to build barriers between the private and public sectors.

This work is not intended to criticize teachers, administrators, students, or parents in public or independent schools. Too often, the discourse surrounding public/private debates seeks to commend and condemn groups of individuals. Students, teachers, scholars, and the spaces to imagine new, viable, and sustainable ways of thinking about education, and therefore the living out of that, are shut down and closed out. This work looks at deeper and more connected issues related to historical conceptions of schooling

within and about both types of institutions- their similarities and differences over time with regards to particular issues; the conception and purpose of the concept of "other" in the ways in which private spaces can be used to open public discourse and theorizing about schooling; and a continued expansion of the ways in which we think about curriculum in theory and in practice.

Weavers: Past-present-future

Within the field of Curriculum Studies, there have been many who have approached curriculum from a historical orientation. Curriculum history constitutes a significant area of study within Curriculum Studies. Understanding Curriculum Studies as lived experiences indicates that we cannot understand our present curricular moment without understanding the past and future that are integrally connected to it. Huebner (1991) emphasized the appropriateness of history as a theoretical orientation to the study of education. Huebner emphasized that history, more than any other discipline or social science, was an appropriate framework through which we can understand our present moment in education.

> From his finite temporality, man has construed his scientific view of time as something objective and beyond himself, in which he lives. The point is that man is temporal; or if you wish, historical. There is no such "thing" as a past or a future. They exist only through man's existence as a temporal being. This means that human life is never fixed but is always emerging as the past and future horizons of a present. (p.328)

Huebner advocated for this theoretical orientation during the same time period which spurred the Reconceptualization. The historical study, for Huebner, was important

in that we are "temporal beings". We can only understand our lives as "always emergent as the past and future horizons of a present" (p. 328). While there are many scholars who have explored Curriculum Studies from the historical orientation, a few stand as representative for the ways in which they emphasize the connectivity of our past and future to our present moment. These scholars use history to bring unique and important perspectives to Curriculum Studies, and their work emphasizes the importance of history in opening up new ways of understanding education more generally. These scholars all share Huebner's passion for understanding curriculum historically, recognizing our temporality.

Kliebard has also dedicated his scholarship to the historical study of the field. Kliebard has done much to make history a respected theoretical orientation to the study of curriculum.

> Early in his career Kliebard chose history as the best vehicle for uncovering the errors and misconceptions of the curriculum field…. Clearly, no contemporary scholar has done more to make curriculum history a recognized field of inquiry than has Kliebard. (Franklin, 2000, p.1)

Kliebard's (1995) *The struggle for the American curriculum* represents another monumental contribution to the field of Curriculum Studies. This book includes and multiplicity of perspectives on the forces and factors that have shaped the ways in which we understand curriculum in American schools.

Pinar serves as a major contributor to historical orientations in Curriculum Studies, writing substantially on the history of the field of Curriculum Studies, his work documenting the history, present, and future of the Reconceptualization. Pinar et al.'s

(2004) comprehensive text, *Understanding curriculum*, presents a very comprehensive exploration of the history of the Reconceptualization of the field of curriculum studies, as does his work entitled *What is curriculum theory?* (2004). These texts contribute to the field in Pinar's personal accounts of his understanding and work in the Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies, and help the current student of curriculum to understand the movement of the field within the present.

Kridel (1989, 2007) and Short (1984, 1991) have both written on the historical orientation within the curriculum field and its position as a worthwhile perspective in the study of curriculum. Kridel's (2007) scholarship on the Eight Year Study and its relevance to the examination and understanding of curriculum and secondary education in the present is particularly pertinent in this work to discussion of accountability.

Munro (1998, 1999) has done much work to explore and communicate the positions of women within education more generally and curriculum as a specific field within it. She has explored the ways in which feminine perspectives have defined and redefined ways of learning and living within education. In a discipline such as history, her work stands definitive in its commitment to interjecting feminine perspectives and lived experiences as histories among many accounts from a masculine perspective in education. This diversity of perspective is of import in the field of curriculum studies, where curriculum is understood as the "lived experience". It continues to open new avenues for exploration as it continuously questions whose lived experiences are valuable and how is this value made manifest in the field.

Baker (2004) has advanced the ways in which curriculum inquiry can be achieved through a postmodern historical perspective. Her edited work on the uses of Foucault in

educational and curriculum scholarship, *Dangerous coagulations*, traces the way in which postmodern positions have been employed in educational scholarship, as well as they ways in which it presents both possibilities and dangers. Baker (2002, 2004) has also employed a postmodern historical orientation in her studies of the development of "(dis)abilities" and categorizations in the historical development of public schooling and the historical relations to larger societal movements of eugenics.

As the work of Huebner, Kliebard, Pinar, Kridel, Short, Munro, and Baker point out, Curriculum Studies can be understood and explored in meaningful ways through a historical orientation. Their historical works point to the necessity of understanding the ways in which the present and future struggles within the field, and in the more public discourse about curriculum, are tied to their pasts. The historical orientation emphasizes our temporality, and that as we look back on the past, we are also looking at our present and towards our future.

Among these, Baker (2004) is particularly beneficial because of her postmodern understanding of history. She employs what she terms a "glancing history", in which she recognizes the incompleteness inherent in any singular history. She employs the idea of a "glancing" because it "problematizes the assumed relationship between seeing directly, knowing completely and uttering with confidence" (p. 10). The acknowledgment of the incompleteness of any singular history, as well as the emphasis that she places upon using history to broaden the context through which we understand and approach present topics of conversation in education are both concepts employed within this work.

Each of these scholars above has paved important inroads into the understanding of Curriculum Studies from a historical perspective without which further openings and spaces would not be easily accessible for historical studies.

Outside of the field of Curriculum Studies, a number of scholars have done tremendous work in documenting the different histories of public school. Joel Spring has also contributed greatly to our understanding of curriculum, and more generally education, in his radical revisionist writings of the history of American schooling. Spring (2001) presents different and competing histories of American education in his text, *The American school*, with the purpose of providing "a variety of ways of viewing educational history" (p.2). This approach emphasizes the subjective nature of historical studies of curriculum. In various works, Spring (1993, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2001) presents the histories of majority and marginalized groups side by side to emphasize the ways in which these histories connect and disconnect at different moments, and how they inform our present understanding.

Lawrence Cremin has also done tremendous work in documenting the history of public schooling in the United States. Cremin (1964, 1988, 1990) has published several volumes of work documenting different time periods and aspects of the concept, formation, and implementation of public schooling in the United States. His work speaks to the importance of understanding schooling historically and is employed throughout this work to present dialogue about and from the institution of public schooling.

David Tyack (1974) has also done important and insightful historical work on public education in the United States. In his work, *The one best system*, Tyack traces the ways in which the development of the public school system has been intertwined with

differing conceptions of the means, ends, and societal purposes of public education. This work is important in its focus between schooling and society, in its refusal to divorce one from the other. Tyack (1967, 2003) has written several works that have examined the interconnectedness of the larger culture in the United States and the development of the public school system.

The histories of schooling in the United States written by Spring, Cremin, and Tyack are beneficial in their inclusion of perspectives of different voices and the issues of power relations that are inherent in the curriculum as well as their attention to the ways in which larger societal and cultural movements have and continue to influence our perceptions and constructions of public schooling.

The above mentioned authors have focused much on public schooling. There are a few leading authors who have focused on independent schooling as a distinct subset of private schooling.

Pearl Rock Kane has written and edited several works that address the lived experiences of students and teachers within independent schools. In her work, *Independent schools, independent thinkers*, Kane (1992) edited and compiled reflections from alumni, teachers, and administrators on their experiences in different types of independent schools and from different time periods. These pieces serve to paint a picture of the experiences that are lived within independent schools, as well as emphasize the diversity in missions, curricula, and patrons. In *The colors of excellence*, Kane and Orsini (2003) document and discuss the lived experience of faculty and staff of racial minority backgrounds in independent schools, as well as their valuable contributions to the independent school community at large.

In addition to Kane's works, Patrick Bassett (the current president of NAIS) and Louis M. Crosier (1994) are editors of another anthology on independent schools. In *Looking ahead: Independent school issues & answers*, current educators involved in independent schools offer reflections on past, present, and future challenges to education in independent schools. Some of these challenges are unique to independent education, while others are indicative of the field of education more generally. This work serves to emphasize that independent schools are not worry-free environments where everything always runs smoothly. It documents the unique challenges of the present, but the past and future as well, that independent schools face because of their unique structures as institutions.

Independent School magazine, published quarterly by NAIS, represents and provides an ongoing documentary of the lived experiences of students, faculty, administrators, and researchers of independent schools. The magazine, founded in 1946 as Independent School Bulletin, has published thematic issues that feature contributions from stakeholders involved in independent schools. These pieces provide personal narratives and histories of independent schools, and are invaluable source for understanding the present moments as lived in independent schools.

Otto Kraushaar's (1972) work, *American nonpublic schools*, serves as one of the only historical texts that focuses solely on nonpublic forms of schooling and traces their unique histories from the time of colonial period until the 1970s. This work is indispensable in understanding the unique histories of nonpublic schools, as well as the intricate differences among nonpublic schools. He focuses on the histories of

independent schools in one chapter, representing one of the only unified and cohesive histories of independent schools from the colonial period onward.

These authors have done well to document parts of the history and approaches to education in independent schools; however they are rarely examined in relation to the larger societal and cultural movements in the United States or in their relation as an other to public schooling. This work is unique in its juxtaposition of public schooling and independent schooling in a postmodern historical orientation.

This work is also cognizant of the works of cultural critics that include commentary and critiques of schooling and its connections with culture such as Foucault (1970, 1972, 1994), Jacoby (1994), and Lasch (1995). The perspectives of these authors will be incorporated throughout this text with relation to the various topics of study- the inability to separate and differentiate the public/private divide and how this is interwoven in our debates and understandings within the institutions of public schooling and independent schooling around the issues of identity politics, accountability, and globalization. I maintain that this divide can only be understood around the concept of "otherness".

Politically incorrect: postmodern positions, self, and histories

Through a postmodern historical orientation, I plan to explore the histories of public schooling and independent schooling (as a distinct subset of private schooling) around the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization. By examining the various histories that have been written about these institutions, and in exploring them in conjunction with one another, I hope to expose the different and complex make-up of voices that compose the histories of these types of schooling, and make points of relation

in how one is not fully possible without its relationship to the other. This work opens

spaces for the understanding of curriculum reconceptualized, as lived experience, in that

it shows the different approaches and experiences of different notions of schooling.

The way in which history is understood in the postmodern shapes the way in

which I explore the histories of public and independent schools. The postmodern account

of history addresses the multifaceted nature of history. Like language, it deconstructs the

structures that were previously and continue to be employed to make it a monolithic,

scientific, and positivistic institution. Any responsible historical account of schooling

must take into account this deconstructing, and recognize the subjective nature of the

voice with which it speaks.

In this work, I will explore the ways in which the postmodern, multifaceted

understanding of schooling can be understood as history as an art.

There are a number of authors who have explored well the issue of postmodern history,

an awareness of the power and authority relationships that are vested in a modernist

approach to history. The works of these authors, as well as the concept of postmodern

history, will be explored in detail in Chapter 2.

Possibilities…

The approach of the topics of public school and independent schools from a

postmodern historical orientation raises many important questions. Through the body of

this work, I plan to examine some of these questions from a postmodern, historical

orientation. This exploration is a dialogical history. It approaches histories as threads and

voices of meaning, which can be woven and unwoven together to create different

tapestries or weavings. The threads that one chooses to follow and weave together create

dialogues amongst different voices, each being understood as a thread of the past. By tracing and combining threads around the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization, I hope to create a weaving of sorts. The "dialogue" which the weaving of these threads creates represents a personal interpretation, and I intentionally invite others to join in this dialogue, knowing that these threads can be woven and unwoven to create more than one tapestry or (un)finished product. This continual tracing of threads and weaving and unweaving is fitting for the movement and exploration of the "lived experiences" as understood through the curriculum.

As the epithet by Schubert used above suggests, the curricular and human are of the same fabric. The concept of dialogical history suggests that we each create our own fabrics of meaning and purpose. However, our shared and communal experiences in history suggest that we share many threads, and it is our placement of these within constructs of meaning that are what create spaces for new tapestries and understandings. Recognizing that there is still much work and weaving to be done in and around each of the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization, this work begins a tapestry of understanding within each. I invite you to weave and unweave the threads of histories of public and independent schoolings around each of these topics.

The concept of a dialogical history work raises questions about the nature of dialogue in a postmodern world, as well as what this dialogue looks like when examined historically from the postmodern perspective. This is related to the concepts of otherness that are within public schooling and independent schooling and how these have developed historically as others. This topic is also related to the way in which otherness can be understood as a concept that has much to do with the public/private distinction. It

beckons inquiry into the presence of otherness in identity, and how this otherness can be used in both empowering and disempowering ways.

These topics are the focus of chapter 2. In this chapter, I discuss the notion of a postmodern historical perspective and the ways in which this can be used to trouble the notion of the traditional distinction between private and public beginning with an exploration with an emphasis on the works of Ankersmit (1998, 2001) and Mikhail Bakhtin (1981, 1986). Ankersmit explores the ways in which history from a postmodern perspective emphasizes the idea of representation, in contrast with a modernist approach to history focusing on description. Bakhtin introduced the idea of dialogism in understanding in relation to linguistics and art. I suggest that Bakhtin's notion of dialogism is revised and understood differently in postmodernism, where there is a movement from binary dualisms and permanent structure, and movement towards a conceptualization of understanding as being embodied. This does not negate the possibility of dialogue, and therefore dialogism, in the postmodern, but suggests that it is of a different nature, more celebratory than communicative. I employ the works of poststructuralist philosophers Foucault (1970, 1972, 1994), Deleuze and Guatarri (1987), and Derrida (1977, 1995) to explore the understanding of the possibility of dialogism in a postmodern history.

I will use this celebratory concept of dialogue and discursive space to explore the breakdown between private and public spaces and how they cannot be understood dualistically or apart from the other. This troubling between the traditional private/ public binary is explicated in this work through a postmodern, historical exploration of the positions of public schools and independent schools around the topics of identity

politics, accountability, and globalization in subsequent chapters. The way in which their positions can be viewed as discursive spaces in which they have formed and (re)form their institutional understandings relationally to the other. This troubling is beneficial in its unique position to not pitch one type or institution of schooling against the other or complete a comparative history, but to explore the mutual benefits and the celebratory possibilities in their positions as others.

This troubling permits probing at the question of whether the current debates over school choice, standardization, and general critiques of different types of institutional schooling are not indicative of a larger philosophical breakdown between the definitions and boundaries of public and private in postmodernity. I thread this troubling of public/private distinctions throughout this work around specific topics in the history of schooling and seek to discourage debate that is nearsighted in its focus on schooling.

I then apply this troubling uniquely to the general histories of the development of public schooling and independent schooling in Chapter 3. The purpose of this chapter is to give a general overview of what is defined as an independent school. This definition cannot be articulated well outside of independent schools' relational development to public schooling in the United States. As stated earlier, public school histories have been articulated by many, but are rarely examined in their relationship of otherness to independent schooling. I will draw heavily on historians of public schooling such as Spring (2001), Randall (1994), and Kaestle (1983), as well as the work of Kraushaar (1972) on independent school development, to develop a picture of the interdependent historical development of both types of schooling. In this chapter I also trouble the notion of elitist education understood as being solely a problem of the private sectors,

examining and incorporating the works of cultural critiques such as Lasch (1995) and Jacoby (1994). I then examine the interdependent historical development through the framework of troubling presented in Chapter 2 to suggest the ways in which independent schools and public schools have developed as others drawing on the scholarship explored in the previous chapter.

In Chapter 4, I investigate the understandings of identity from a postmodern historical approach in weaving together the various understandings of public schooling and independent schooling of what composed/composes identity. I explore how these understandings of identities have affected the ways in which students were/are categorized and their lived experiences, understood as the curriculum. This approach contributes to the troubling of the private/public distinction in the ways in which private experiences are brought into the realm of what is generally considered public, the curriculum. This chapter employs the term identity to explore how differences have been categorized and marginalized throughout the histories of education, while also troubling the notion and (im)possibility of the concept of identity from a postmodern perspective. I will argue that identity, like dialogue, is not an impossibility but rather requires a revision in understanding within postmodernism. By weaving together these various approaches, we see how there are more complex relationships of identity in schooling than commonly espoused. The intent of this chapter is also to trouble the notion that public schools are inherently democratic because they must supposedly teach all, and troubles the notions that independent schools, as a unique subset of private schooling, is necessarily exclusive or unable to be an inclusive, democratic community. The histories of public schooling and independent schooling reveal how they have developed their understandings of

identity in relationship to each other, and why their histories have led to assumptions

about how they understand identity and the relations of power. I draw on the works of

Castenell & Pinar (1993), Haymes (1995), McCarthy (1990), Lei and Grant (2001),

Delpit (1995), hooks (1994), Alexander, B., Anderson, L., and Gallegos, B. P. (Eds.)

(2005), Kraushaar (1972), Kozol (1972), Kane (2003), Tyack (1967, 1995) and excerpts

from various publications from the National Association of Independent Schools.

These relations of power and identity are closely tied to the topic of

accountability. Accountability is always a reflection of who holds power and their

understanding of what/whose knowledge is of most worth, defining to what standards

students are held and to what purpose. Chapter 5 will investigate the different threads of

accountability in a dialogical history of accountability in public and independent schools,

continuing to trouble the private/public notion. I will examine the various histories of

these two types of schooling through different movements of accountability, beginning

with the work and recommendations of the National Education Association's Committee

of Ten and surveying various movements to the No Child Left Behind Act. The

examinations of these different movements explores the ways in which private values are

inseparable from policies that stretch out of the realm of the private into the public, and in

turn stretch into the realms of other privates. This position reinforces the inability to

create a value free curriculum, despite such attempts, or so rhetoricized attempts, present

in many current reform efforts.   I will draw heavily on the documents contained in the

edited documentary history, *The American curriculum*, of Willis, Schubert, Bullough,

Kridel, and Holton (1993). I will also employ the works of Dewey (1954), Counts (1969)

Apple (1995), Pinar (2004), Kridel (2007), Spring (2001), Cremin (1988), and others that

have explored the histories of the ways in which accountability movements have developed and been lived out through the curriculum.

Bringing this conversation into the present, Chapter 6 will examine the ways in the threads of the past continue to be woven and unwoven in the future as we are increasingly told to understand our world more globally. Globalization is shaping, influencing, and changing the standards to which public schools and independent schools are held under the weight of an increasingly global understanding of the world, and the ways in which each type of schooling offers possibilities and limitations. Through an exploration of the various positions, reactions, and discursive spaces produced by and about each public and independent schools with relation to the topic of globalization, I trouble the private/public distinction through the ways in which globalization is erasing and rewriting many of the boundaries by which we understand ourselves, the world around us, and the relationship between the two. I will employ the works of Spring (1998, 2001, 2006), Apple, Kenway, and Singh (2005), Lasch (1995), Jacoby (1994), Deleuze and Guatarri (1987).

Chapter 7 will conclude by revisiting the ways in which the private/public distinction is troubled by a postmodern, dialogical history of public schooling and independent schooling around the issues of identity politics, accountability, and globalization. I will revisit many of the postmodern writings of the first two chapters to draw some conclusions and insights from the historical exploration of previous chapters. However, in the spirit of postmodernism, I recognize my own positionality and the impossibility of a "complete" work. Therefore, I will offer questions more than conclusions and invite questioning more than concluding.

Deleuze and Guatarri (1987) state,

> [T]here is no question, answers are all one ever answers. To the answer already contained in a question… one should respond with questions from another answer…(p.110)

Through a historical study of the dialogue between public and independent schools, spaces are opened to deepen and expand understandings of schooling proposed in current policy, what attempts to portray the history of schooling unitarily. It deconstructs the discursive space that forms around a public/private divide, to suggest and question the (im)possibility of this divide. The multiplicity of narratives within the public and independent schools serves to deconstruct and discredit unitary history. It validates the experiences of the other, and recognizes the need for open spaces in which to tell narrative and develop new questions and conversations.

CHAPTER 2: TROUBLING THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE DISTINCTION: THE IN-BETWEENS OF (NO)WHERE

The word lives, as it were, on the boundary between its own context

and another, alien, context. (Bakhtin, 1981, p.284).

William Schubert (1995) stated that we could/should view the history of

curriculum and the search for curriculum coherence as a debate over which of three

competing factors should have primacy: the individual, the society, and the subject matter

(p.151). Schubert's analysis is accurate in many respects, but could be restated as a

debate over whether private (the individual) or public (the society) interests should have

primacy in the curriculum. The third factor, the subject matter, brings to light an

interesting problematic in that it does not lend itself to an easy classification as either

private or public. Where we might place this in a traditional (read modernist)

public/private divide might depend upon from where this subject matter originates, who

is advocating its employment in the curriculum, and what the actual subject matter is. In

curriculum reconceptualized, the question regarding this aspect of the curriculum has

changed from "what knowledge is of most worth" to "whose knowledge is of most

worth?"

However, if we reevaluate Schubert's comment from a postmodern perspective,

the history of curriculum as a debate over the primacy of the individual (the private), the

society (the public), and the subject matter (private or public), an analysis and even an

understanding of such an analysis becomes infinitely more complex. The third factor of

subject matter hints at this complexity, in that this analysis questions the place and

understanding of the private and the public within the curriculum. In a reconceptualized

reading of this analysis, the question is asked whether it is actually possible to separate

the private and the public, to identify and categorize certain aspects of the curriculum as such if we understand the curriculum as "lived experience." Is it possible to categorize different aspects of the "lived experiences" of students, teachers, parents, members of society, etc. as either private or public? Postmodernism moves this question forward asking, what do private and public signify? Can they signify anything? What does it mean to signify and to what does the signifier refer?

The intention of the discussions in this chapter is to explore these questions, to trouble the notion of the public/private divide that exists within modernism and is essential to a further reading and dialogue about independent schooling (traditionally classified under the umbrella of private) and public schooling. These questions also relate to and are part of the larger rhetoric regarding curriculum and schooling more broadly. While it is impossible to answer these questions definitively, an exploration and troubling of the private/public divide serves as a framework for the topics in the later chapters in this work, as well as providing a unique perspective from which to explore the dialogical histories of independent schools and public schools.

I intend for this work to be a dialogical history of independent and public schooling. Therefore, I also use this chapter to examine the ways in which this troubling, particularly of signification, is tied to the notion and possibility of dialogue in the postmodern. While some may argue for the impossibility of dialogue in the postmodern, and therefore a dialogical history, I argue that the nature of dialogue does change, perhaps radically, but that to insist on its impossibility would be contrary to postmodern thought in many respects.

It is not difficult to find instances in the present where it seems troubling to distinguish between the public and the private. An exemplary task in this troubling is an attempt to simply define what one means when referring to the "public" and the "private", a task I stumbled upon unsuccessfully. What does "public" signify? Is it that which is accessible to everyone? We generally think of government as public. Is government accessible to everyone? I assumed earlier that society was public. Is society accessible to everyone? I suppose it depends upon what it means to be "accessible"? And who is "everyone"? Perhaps government is accessible in one form or another to citizens, but what about foreign aliens? Are they everyone? Who makes up "everyone"?

Perhaps it is easier to understand "private"? What does "private" signify? Is it that which is accessible only by select criteria? We generally think of businesses and corporations as private. Businesses and corporations are usually only accessible by select criteria, either employment by such organizations or employment of such organizations. But, what happens when private corporations use public monies or legislature for their gain? Are they still private? The reverse can be asked, what happens when public institutions use or are influenced by private monies? Are they still public? Can public exist without private and vice versa?

I do not intend to answer these questions definitively, or even to suggest they are the only way in which to understand private and public. Rather, they serve as examples of what postmodernism explores as problematic in the distinction between signifier and signified. I approach the troubling of the private/public distinction from a postmodern, linguistic perspective. To accomplish this task, it is necessary to trace the evolvement of the postmodern understanding of language from the structures out of which it grew. This

tracing exposes the ways in which language compares and contrasts with a modernist or structuralist perspective, what was referred to earlier as traditional. This tracing allows for a better understanding of the inability in postmodernism to make concrete the difference between signifier and signified, which I will employ to further trouble the notion of public and private. As stated earlier, this troubling is essential to the consequent approach I take to understanding the dialogues between public and private schools historically. I also use the discussion of the postmodern perspective of signifier and signified to explore the nature and possibility of dialogue in the postmodern.

The exploration of signifier and signified is a linguistic task. It is a difficult task to explore language within the object of study. Therefore, I proceed with a certain sense of humility. Through a survey and exploration of various linguistic theories that contain insight into this question, I will highlight the manners in which the way one understands the purposes and (de)constructions of language contribute to a postmodern perspective of the signifier and signified, the public and the private, and the (im)possibilities of dialogue. Through this dialogue on dialogue, I trouble the notions of private and public, humbly knowing my conclusions cannot be very conclusive at all.

Digging into the present of the past

The philosophies of language and hermeneutics are epistemic, in that they study the ways in which we know through language, as well as what we can know about the knowledge of language. These are complex in that, as stated above, one cannot move outside of language in order to study it from some objective standpoint. The work that is done in this philosophical area must use the subject of study as the tool of study.

Postmodernism is related ultimately to the movements that preceded it. "After structures are in direct relation to overturning structures" (Morris, 2005, p.3). Therefore, in order to understand the relationships concerning language within postmodernism, and thereby trouble the private/public distinction and understand the (im)possibilities of dialogue in a postmodern era, an understanding from where these concepts have evolved is insightful. These insights help in understanding the troubling of the distinction between signifier/signified, as well as what is and is not possible for dialogue in the postmodern era; why postmodernism holds certain tenets about the nature of language and dialogue.

The modernisms of Post: structures and experience

As stated above, the philosophic and revolutionary discourses within postmodernism are related and best understood as outgrowths of the structures that they overturn. Therefore, in order to explore the topics outlined above in postmodernism, an understanding of the purposes and possibilities of language within the overturned movements of structuralism and phenomenology is necessary.

In its current usage, postmodernism is an umbrella term that also generally incorporates poststructuralism and deconstruction. Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (2004) note the evolution of postmodernism,

> Postmodernism initially referred to radical innovations in the arts, in technology, and in science… Recently it has been used to refer to an epistemic and cultural break with modernism. In this version of postmodernism, deconstruction and poststructuralism are subsumed as theoretical and cognitive modes consistent with the cultural logic of the postmodern. (p.451)

The heritage of postmodernism, and its two constituent parts, poststructuralism and deconstruction, gives insight into the ways in which the claims of postmodernism are responses to earlier claims. An understanding of the claims of the prior discourses of structuralism (of which constructionism belongs) and phenomenology with regards to the purposes and uses of language informs us as to the reasons for and the responses themselves in postmodernism.

The theory of linguistics as outlined by Saussure is perhaps the most representative example of structuralist linguistics. Saussure's (1997) interpretation of what the object of linguistic study was reflected his entrenchment in structuralist thought, "The linguist must take the study of linguistic structure as his primary concern…" (p.9). For Saussure, the way in which to understand language was as a system of natural rules and orders, rather than as its manifestations in speech and practice. These elements, of course, were important and helped us to understand an aspect of language, but were secondary to the study of the actual structure of language, which made speech and other manifestations of language possible.

> A language as a structured system, on the contrary, is both a self- contained whole and a principle of classification. As soon as we give linguistic structure pride of place among the facts of langue, we introduce a natural order into an aggregate which lends itself to no other classification. (p.10)

In Saussure's linguistics, there are culturally agreed upon meanings that create the linguistic. These are paradoxical in that meanings are originally arbitrary yet still unalterable by the individual community member. This paradox is rooted in the idea that language is created historically and collectively, and therefore no individual has the right

or the ability to alter the past that is present in language. However, because individuals also share in the society that contains the past in the present, they have access to the system and structure of their language, and can understand the collective meanings present within the linguistic sign.

> All individuals linguistically linked in this manner will establish among themselves a kind of mean; all of them will reproduce- doubtless not exactly, but approximately- the same signs linked to the same concepts. (p.13)

Saussure's linguistics, and other structuralist understandings of language, are reflective of the Western heritage of *logos*, in which it is thought that there is an objective relationship between the signifier and the signified, one which is knowable. This follows from the Platonic concept of the ideal form, the signified, of which we have indications and referent shadows, the signifiers. In Saussure's linguistics, language, the structure, is the ideal form while speech is its shadow.

Although there are variances and individual alterations within speech, the affects of these collectively do not alter the structure except through the long passage of time. Therefore, there is a public (commonly acknowledged) "signifier" which always refers to a specific "signified". While the signified may be considered private in that each individual may experience the signified in a personal way or context, this does not alter the relationship between it and the signifier, according to Saussure. Dialogue from a structuralist perspective would be understood more as the use of language by more than one individual to communicate a knowable meaning, in which each participant is both listener and speaker. The listener can understand that which the speaker states because the signifiers point to the same signified objects, external and collectively understood

objects, for all participants. None of the participants can alter the collective meanings or understandings of signifiers individually.

Structuralism was in some respects a response to the humanism and sovereignty of the individual in phenomenology. Phenomenology privileges the experience of the individual over all else. Structuralism's use of systems and rules was in some ways an attempt to bring a collective coherence, a way of understanding, how individual experiences can be understood collectively to make sense of the disciplines and bring order to produce more structure in the social sciences. Pinar et al. (2004) remind us, "Merleau-Ponty regarded the world as the answer to the body's question" (p.453). In such an understanding of our relation to the world, Pinar et al. quote Descombes,

> And so, perspective, for example, should not be considered as the perceiving subject's point of view upon the object perceived but rather as a property of the object itself. (p.454)

This understanding of perspective was advocated by Heidegger (1993) in his phenomenology and in his understanding of language. In basic concepts, Heidegger outlines the way in which being is completely present in language. When we speak, we do not simply state our perspective or opinion, but are actually exerting our existence and the existence of the object of which we speak. Being and language are intimately tied together.

> Being is said along with every word and verbal articulation, if not named each time with its own name. Speaking says being "along with," not as an addition and a supplement that could just as well be left out, but as the pre-giving of what always first permits the naming of beings…(p.53)

For speaking… is not some arbitrary appearance and condition that we discern in

man as one capability among others, like seeing and hearing… For language

stands in an essential relation to the uniqueness of being. (p.54)

Heidegger's (1993) understanding of language is one that is concerned with the

ways in which we experience language, in speaking and in hearing. Language, according

to Heidegger can be understood as a pointing, a way of showing reality. In our speech

we show that of which we are speaking.

The saying is showing. In everything that appeals to us; in everything that strikes

us by way of being spoken or spoken of; in everything that addresses us; in

everything that awaits us as unspoken; but also in every speaking of ours-

showing holds sway. It lets what is coming to presence shine forth, let what is

withdrawing into absence vanish. The saying is by no means the supplementary

linguistic expression of what shines forth; rather, all shining and fading depends

on the saying that shows. (p. 414)

The phenomenological understanding of the individual's relation to the world has

several implications for the purposes and possibilities of language. First, it means that

experience and language are primary. The employment of language is an exertion of our

existence. Second, such an understanding means that language is a subjective synthesis

between the object and the subject. In such an understanding of language, dialogue

validates the claims of all speakers, but also creates the impossibility of the listener fully

understanding the reality within the claims of the speaker. The concern in

phenomenology is within the experience of speaking and saying.

Therefore, in phenomenology, individual reality and language is a subjective experience, language is a manifestation of that reality. Structuralism rejects the humanism and idealism of phenomenology, yet remains within the Western tradition of the ability of the human to create through the act of naming, logos. However, in structuralism, this is done collectively, and these systems reflect a natural order that exists outside of and above the individual. Structuralism attempted to account for the ways in which the collective body of language restricts its subjective applicability in the phenomenological sense, as the signifier and signified carry the historic roles assigned to them in their opposition to what they are not.

Deconstructing: Posting on experience and structure

In exploring the signifier/signified relationship and the possibility of dialogue in the postmodern era, it is important to realize the breadth of disciplines, theorists, and individuals referred to as postmodern. Therefore, any attempt to speak of the postmodern more generally inevitably does not describe some of these accurately. Furthermore, any attempt to speak of the postmodern in general terms speaks against the postmodern project, which privileges the subjective and avoids generalizations and categorizations.

As mentioned earlier, each philosophic paradigm is an outgrowth of the previous schools of thought. Postmodernism stands as the child of structuralism and early phenomenological thought. As such, it contains remnants and interpretations of both movements. However, it also stands as a response to the inability of these movements to provide a paradigm for understanding the present in which we live.

With regards to language, the critique of the understanding of linguistics in earlier movements is linked with these understandings as perpetuating the Western concept of

logos. Postmodernism rejects the Saussurean linguistics belief in the direct and unchanging relationship between the signified and the signifier. It also rejects the hierarchical pattern of language, speech, and writing, claiming these to be manifestations and acts of equal importance. These hierarchical and structural claims are to the postmodern an act of power, rather than an explanation of reality. Postmodernism rejects the didactic relationship between experience and language, understanding them as one and the same.

Foucault (1970) understands the classical version of language as an attempt to create a structure to remove the risk in language. This risk consists of a "slipping" between the links, what Foucault terms "roots" and "representations", these concepts being referred to in Saussurean linguistics as "signified" and "signifiers" respectively.

The theory of derivation indicates the continuous movement of words from their source of origin, but the slipping that occurs on the surface of representation is opposition to the single stable bond that links one root to one representation. Finally, derivation leads back to the propositions, since without it all designation would remain folded in on itself and could never acquire the generality that alone can authorize a predicting link; yet derivation is created by means of a spatial figure, whereas the proposition unfolds in obedience to a sequential and linear order. (p.115)

Foucault's understanding of the classical, and thereby structural, account of linguistics is one which attempts to use the two dimensions of time and space to structure and regulate language, preventing its subjectification. Rather than a risky endeavor, Foucault believes that this subjectivity privileges language as a human institution.

Once detached from representation, language has existed, right up to our own day

only in a dispersed way: for philologists, words are like so many objects formed

and deposited by history; for those who wish to achieve a formalization, language

must strip itself of its concrete content and leave nothing visible but those forms

of discourse that are universally valid; if one's intent is to interpret, then words

become a text to be broken down, so as to allow that other meaning hidden in

them to emerge and become clearly visible; lastly, language may sometimes arise

for its own sake in an act of writing that designates nothing other than itself. This

dispersion imposes upon language, if not a privileged position, at least a destiny

that seems singular when compared with that of labor or of life. (p.304)

The privileged status of language, for Foucault, opens its possibilities, and

therefore our possibilities, for new realms of thought and creativity. Unlike the fear in

earlier philosophical movements of the disconnection between signified and signifier,

Foucault (1972) and postmodernism celebrate this freedom in certain respects.

Language, in the postmodern sense, consists of signifiers that point towards other

signifiers, with no signified to anchor this chain. This lack of anchoring, a fixed

meaning, provides space for new creation and understanding.

In the examination of language, one must suspend, not only the point of view of

the 'signified' (we are used to this by now), but also that of the 'signifier', and so

reveal the fact that, here and there, in relation to the possible domain of objects

and subjects, in relation to other possible formulation and re-uses, there is

language. (p.111)

While celebrating the opening and possibilities in language, Foucault also warns against the attempts to anchor and restrict it. Any such attempt "reveal its links with desire and power" (1972, p.216). The attempts of the structuralism and Western thought more generally to secure the objective relationship between signifier and signified represent a desire to harness the other, the possibilities and freedoms that are potentialities of language. Foucault (1984) believes,

> …[T]he real political task in a society such as ours is to criticize the working of institutions which appear to be both neutral and independent; to criticize them in such a manner that the political violence which has always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight them. (p.6)

Language, understood as an institution, is often regarded as "neutral." The understanding of language as neutral is hazardous in its openness to being used for the political and personal exercise of power. This, for Foucault, and postmodernism, is what the individual must guard against. The individual must be very aware of their own intentions in speaking/writing, and in exploring the writings of others. Any attempt to make permanent or a claim to Truth is an attempt to exercise power over the other. Deleuze and Guatarri (1987) share this perspective stating, "[t]he unity of language is fundamentally political" (p.101).

Derrida has worked in his texts to carry out the task Foucault outlines above, to subvert the use of language for political power and oppression. Derrida (1977) shares in a critique of Saussurean linguistics, linking its claim to structure as a claim to be recognized as a science, a positivistic claim for validation.

Saussure thus begins by positing that writing is 'unrelated to [the]..inner system'

of language. External/internal, image/reality, representation/ presence, such is the

old grid to which is given the task of outlining the domain of a science. (p.33)

Derrida's linking of classical linguistics' structural and positivistic claims

exemplifies Foucault's insistence of the relations between structural linguistics and

power. As Derrida points out, this attempt to be recognized as a science is an attempt to

gain power and legitimacy in modernism.

With Foucault, Derrida critiques the concept of the sign, logos, in Western

thought, as an objective reality.

We are disturbed by that which, in the concept of the sign- which has never

existed or functioned outside the history of (the) philosophy (of presence)-

remains systematically and genealogically determined by that history. It is there

that the concept and above all the work of deconstruction, its 'style', remain by

nature exposed to misunderstanding and nonrecognition. (p.14)

Logos, understood by Derrida (1981), represents an appeal to a "transcendental

signified." In the questioning of the possibility of knowing this transcendental signified

in postmodernism, "one recognizes that every signified is also in the position of a

signifier, the distinction between signified and signifier becomes problematic at its roots"

(p.20).

Derrida further critiques the Western privileging of language, as a set structure or

system, over its manifestations in speech and writing. For Derrida, there is no possibility

of language without an exteriority, its manifestations constitute its existence.

Foucault and Derrida's critiques of classical linguistic understandings of language connect on many points, however they diverge in purpose. Foucault most comfortably sits amongst the poststructuralist, and his rejection of structuralism is a critique of its insistence on structures as "foundational and invariant" rather than recognizing that their discourses were "historically and socially contingent" (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 462). Derrida furthers this critique, and works not only to expose the way in which these structures or forms exert and vie for power, but works to deconstruct them. Derrida accepts the premise of post-structuralism, but then moves further to say that the history or meaning of a signifier, and therefore any attempted structures, is never attainable.

[W]hat it seeks to express or represent, and its meaning will always be necessarily deferred. Such a challenge results not in negating history but in replacing the meaning of history with the history of meanings. (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 468).

Therefore, both Derrida and Foucault critique the Western concept of logos. Foucault enters this critique from a poststructuralist perspective, seeking to expose classical linguistics ties with social and historical forces and wills to power. While Derrida agrees with this critique, he furthers it in continuing to deconstruct the power structures around logos, revealing the constant deferral of the signifier, disallowing meaning to be anything other than subjective.

However, for Derrida (1995), there is also the impression of the signifier, which he refers to as the archive. This archive leaves a "notion," or imprint. This imprint does not fix or make permanent the meaning, but rather points to the future of a notion.

To the rigor of *concept*, I am opposing here the vagueness or the open

imprecision, the relative indetermination of such a *notion*. "Archive" is only a

notion… We only have an impression, an insistent impression through the

unstable feeling of a shifting figure… Unlike what a classical philosopher or

scholar would be tempted to do, I do not consider this impression, or the notion of

this impression, to be a subconcept, the feebleness of a blurred and subjective pre-

knowledge… but to the contrary… I consider it to the possibility and the very

future of the concept, to be the very concept of the future… (p.29)

The idea of "archive" points back to the celebratory nature in postmodernism of

the flexibility and creativity once the signifier is freed from the permanence of the

signified. Meaning is not and cannot be made permanent, or completely understood

inter-subjectively. However, the notion of the archive can carry and communicate

temporary meaning, pointing to the future possibilities of language. Therefore, while

there is a skepticism and cautionary approach in postmodernism to language as an

institution, there is also a celebration and privileging of language. It represents in the

postmodern a simultaneous pointing to and away from ourselves, and the freedom of the

signifier thereby points to our freedom and possibilities.

Privatization publicized- Public privatization

As explained above, in a modernist, structuralist perspective, discourse is used to

communicate experience. It is assumed that experience can be clearly communicated

because of the existence of socially constructed signifiers that refer to particular objects

or events, known as the signified. While structuralism does not deny that their can be

individual or personal variability in the experience of the signified, this variability does

not alter the meaning of the signifier substantially because of the hierarchy and divide of structure to manifestation in language, a logo centrism. Put in other terms, from the structural account of language, there is a clear divide between discourse-the signifier-that which is public, and the experience-the signified-that which is private. It is possible to communicate the experience-the signified-the private because of the existence of independent discourse-the signifier-the public.

This divide or distinction becomes substantially troubled within the postmodern perspective. There is no longer the distinction between discourse and experience. Discourse is experience. Experience is discourse. Signifiers point to signifiers, there is no transcendental signified to root or ground the signifier. The earlier questions about what private and public signify point only back at themselves, because any attempt to make a clear distinction between the two would require a transcendental signified to which they would refer. Any attempt to define them only points to more signifiers, and so on. Examples of this troubling abound in the current present of our schools. What are commonly signified as "public" schools and colleges are employing and being influenced by the acquisition of what are commonly signified as "private" funds from corporations and donors. Similarly, what are commonly signified as "private" schools and colleges receive what are commonly signified as "public" funds. If we use the traditional definitions to classify and sort between "public" and "private" schooling based upon the source of funding, this distinction becomes problematic when both types of schooling employ both types of funding and we cannot point to a signified for either public or private.

To remain here would be to be left in a conundrum without much hope for the possibility of communication or understanding. This is indeed where some postmodernists reside. However, I believe that Derrida's (1995) concept of the archive provides some illumination about the possibility of communication and/or dialogue. The archive is a "notion" or an "impression", the "possibility of the concept" (p.29). With regards to how this relates to communication, Derrida (1981) states,

> I try to write the question: (what is) meaning to say? Therefore it is necessary in such a space, and guided by such a question that writing literally means nothing. Not that it is absurd in the way that absurdity has always been in solidarity with metaphysical meaning… To risk meaning nothing is to start to play, which prevents any word, any concept, any major enunciation from coming to summarize and to govern from the theological presence of a center the movements and textual spacing of differences. (p.14)

The free play of the signifiers within postmodernism, without the anchorage of the transcendental signified, disallows a "meaning", and therefore Derrida suggest that writing "means nothing." However, this nothing is itself a signifier, an impression or archive, and therefore does point to something. This allows for a playful and celebratory approach that prevents the anchoring of the signifier to the signified, which is sought after and seen as necessary in modernism. The notion of the archive is helpful here, in that the signifier does leave an impression, it points to the possibility of the concept without demanding a permanent meaning.

Exploring the troubling of the private/public distinction from this perspective allows us to see the ways in which private and public can be archives that leave the

impression of the other in postmodernism. While we can employ the terms private and public, they are signifiers that point to the possibility of concepts while evading a permanent meaning or understanding. An example of this evasion in the postmodern might be the concept of privatization in consumer capitalism. Consumer capitalism encourages that which is generally termed public to be co-opted/taken over by the private assignment of meaning/ownership. However, for its survival as a privatized entity, it requires that it is then projected back onto/into the public in order to be recognized as an entity. As it is points back to the public for recognition, it is already imbued with private meanings (which are simultaneously tied to other notions or impressions from other signifiers), which are then projected back onto the privatized entity. In other words, the signifier is privatized, turned into the signified, and then reformed into a signifier, a necessary step for the signifier to remain in existence as either. The signified then becomes a signifier again- so this entity is, and must be, at once a signifier and signified, public and private, each pointing to other signifiers with no permanent signified. The signifier does leave/produce an archive, an impression, but this impression is a rather fleeting signified that evades anchorage for any permanent definition.

Dialoguing on dialogue

The writings of Bakhtin (1981, 1986) on the concept of dialogue stand somewhere in between a structuralist perspective and a postmodern perspective. Bakhtin adheres to some structuralist understandings of language, such as the belief in the universality of the basic elements of language in the abstract, but distinguishes between these elements and that which he defines as an utterance. The utterance is the employment of language, the manifestation of that language, and leans toward the

postmodern in many respects. The utterance is the basis of dialogue, and as the

employment or manifestation of language, recognizes the always present other within

language. Bakhtin (1986) states,

> Thus, addressivity, the quality of turning to someone, is a constitutive feature of
>
> the utterance; without it the utterance does not and cannot exist.

The utterance is always addressed to some other, even if that other is the speaking

subject. It has a paradoxical quality about it, it is always original and addressed to the

other, but also already contains the other within it.

> Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal
>
> as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear. The processes for centralization
>
> and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance;
>
> the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as an
>
> individualized embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of
>
> heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participation in such speech
>
> diversity… Such is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a
>
> school and so forth. (Bakhtin, 1981, p.272)

While Bakhtin is not willing to succumb to a completely postmodern perspective

in his unwillingness to surrender the ability to study language as a structured system in

the abstract, his understanding of the utterance as the manifestation of that language is

very similar to the fleeting nature of language in the postmodern. The simultaneous

"centralization and decentralization", "unification and disunification" are similar to the

notion of the archive in Derrida. For Bakhtin, the word spoken, and utterance, enters into

a unique environment where it is simultaneously in a dialogical relationship with itself and other.

> Dialogue is studied merely as a compositional form in the structuring of speech, but the internal dialogism of the word… the dialogism that penetrates its entire structure, all its semantic and expressive layers, is almost entirely ignored. But it is precisely this internal dialogism of the word, which does not assume any external compositional forms of dialogue, that cannot be isolated as an independent act, separate from the word's ability to form a concept of its object- it is precisely this internal dialogism that has such enormous power to shape.
> (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 279)

It is Bakhtin's notion of the dialogue that I think is most useful within a postmodern perspective. This dialogue can be between speakers, but takes place even within the word itself, which is always necessarily populated with the other.

The radical interpretation of the signifier in postmodern accounts of linguistics as having no permanent signified that it claims has implications for the notion of dialogue. Contrary to an understanding of dialogue in the structural linguistics, there are not collective understandings of the signified in postmodernism. Therefore, the use of language is a completely heterogeneous and subjective experience. It is this that gives the word its "power to shape" as Bakhtin states.

This does significantly change the nature of dialogue, but does not, in my opinion, negate the possibility of dialogue. Any attempt to negate the possibility of dialogue in the postmodern would mean that there was an attempt to make permanent the meaning of dialogue, which in itself would be a manifestation of the "will to power", in the words of

Foucault. It is this deconstructing of permanent meaning that the postmodern attempts.

Rather than negate the possibility of dialogue, a postmodern understanding of language

comes much closer to that which Bakhtin describes as dialogue, where the presence of

the other within each word creates a playful, dialogical space.

The singular message achievable in a structural understanding of language, and

the assumption that a collective meaning can be communicated between individuals, is

denied in postmodern dialogue. The emphasis shifts towards an understanding of

dialogue as interpretations of interpretations. The participants within dialogue can still be

considered speakers and listeners, which can also be one and the same, but it cannot be

assumed, and is actually negated, that the listener can clearly understand the intention of

the speaker. Paradoxically though, it is only in the existence of the other, in language and

in body, that this subjective freedom is a possibility.

Several postmodern philosophers and scholars employ the idea of a third space,

which is understood as an in-between space. This space is somewhere between the

signifier and signified, between self and other, between private and public. This is the

space where creativity and freedom are possible, precisely because this space is not made

concrete through fixed and permanent relationships.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) understand this in-between space as a plateau, and

that knowledge is made of many such plateaus, constituting a rhizome. "A plateau is

always in the middle, not at the beginning or the end. A rhizome is made of plateaus (p.

21). This middle space is not fixed in location or meaning, but is always in free play

between dichotomies.

The middle is by no means average; on the contrary, it is where things pick up speed. *Between* things does not designate a localizable relation going from one thing to the other and back again, but a perpendicular direction, a transversal movement that sweeps one *and* the other way, a stream without beginning or end that undermines its banks and picks up in the middle. (p.25)

For Deleuze and Guattari, concepts are expressions of events, they do not aim to express the essence of something (Deleuze, 1990, p.25). In this way, the meaning of concepts does not become dictating, but always allows for movement and creativity.

Serres (1991) also explores this in-between space for its possibilities in birthing knowledge, referring to it as a third space of knowledge.

The swimmer… knows that a second river runs in the one everyone sees, a river between the two thresholds after or before which all security has vanished: there he abandons all reference points… The real passage occurs in the middle. (p.3)

Serres describes this third space as "slippery" and outside of time, easy to overlook in a modernist outlook and approach to understanding and knowledge. Whereas equilibrium is normally desired, Serres promotes the disequilibrium of the third space to find new ways of knowing.

In the course of these experiences, time springs neither from assuming a position (the equilibrium of the statue) nor from opposition, a second stability from which nothing can come, nor from their relation – an arch or static arc of perpetual immobility- but from a deviation from equilibrium that throws or launches position outside of itself, toward disequilibrium, which keeps it from resting, that is, from achieving a precarious balance…(p.12).

The notion of the in-between is useful in the postmodern for the creativity and freedom it proposes. Whereas modernism attempts to achieve meaning through the fixation of signifier and signified, postmodernism critiques this dichotomy in its shutting down of spaces to create new meanings and new knowledge. Rather than prevent meaning from becoming, as its critics might imply, postmodernism celebrates the possibility of new meaning in this dynamic space of the in-between.

History chameleons: history as science, history as art

In the quest to be recognized as valid field of study, a modernist approach to history has evolved within the framework of structuralism, seeking to validate the discipline as an objective social science. Like many other disciplines, education included, this quest for acceptance as a social science was a quest for validation, and therefore a discipline with the power to speak and be heard. Foucault (1994) notes this heritage in the discipline of history.

> The first thing to note is that structuralism, at least in its initial form, was an undertaking that aimed to give historical investigations a more precise and rigorous method. Structuralism did not turn away from history… it set out to construct a history, one that was more rigorous and systematic. (p.420)

This rigorous and systematic view of history is criticized in postmodernism, as it requires that the disciplinarians of history attempt to speak anonymously, with one voice, in order to present "objective" facts that constitute the actuality of the world. Hebdige (1996) describes it as aspiring towards "omnipotence," and the desire for "supposedly full knowledge, when people feel fully present to themselves and their destiny" (p.191).

Kellner (1987) warns of the problems of rejecting postmodern history because of subjectivity.

> To champion or reject a certain kind of story as the model of historical studies, and to overlook the implicit narrativity of virtually all forms of historical writing leads to problems. (p. 12)

The quest for a unanimous, anonymous voice is criticized in its aspirations for dominance, in its oppression of individual subjectivities. This is linked with postmodernism's critique of Western logo centrism, a critique of structural linguistics, and the attempt to create definite and rigid patterns of meaning.

In *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*, Foucault (1972) traces these patterns of domination through the representation of history, which is closely linked with logo centrism in linguistics. Foucault comments on the preeminence of language in the study and telling of history.

> …[H]istorians have constantly impressed upon us that speech is no mere verbalization of conflicts and systems of domination, but that it is the very object of man's conflicts. (p.216)

Speech, and therefore linguistics, is not merely the voice with which we tell of conflicts in history, it is the very source and object of conflict. It is the "will to power", in which humans have struggled to have their voice considered valid, to establish their patterns of meaning as correct.

There is great resistance to understanding the history of history as a subjective act, in the manner that Foucault explains. Many historians (Hobsbawm, 1977 & Zaggorin, 1998) call the postmodern understanding of history a relativistic attempt to destroy the

field, a call for the end of history. Foucault (1972) is aware of this resistance, which he identifies as a resistance against the dismantling of ideology, which gives a sense of security and order.

> But one must not be deceived: what is being bewailed with such vehemence is not the disappearance of history, but the eclipse of that form of history that was secretly, but entirely related to the synthetic activity of the subject; what is being bewailed is the 'development' (devenir) that was to provide the sovereignty of the conscious with a safer, less exposed shelter than myths…. What is being bewailed, is that ideological use of history by which one tries to restore man everything that has unceasingly eluded him for over a hundred years. (p.14)
>
> Kellner (1987) echoes Foucault commenting,
>
> The reasons for these misunderstandings are easy to see. The debate is not really over narrative and "science." It is about power and legitimation with the profession, not how best to present or conduct research. (p. 13)
>
> Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (2004) defend Foucault's statement,

calling not for the end of history, but a refocusing within the discipline. With the deconstructionist view of language in postmodernism, in which there is no fixed relationship between signifier and signified, and therefore the elimination of the signified, there is only a string of signifiers (Derrida, 1977). This understanding of language, with its fluidity, if applied to Foucault's (1972) understanding of speech as the object of history, gives us a very different focus in historical study. Pinar et al. (2004) articulates this refocusing well.

[W]hat it seeks to express or represent, and its meaning will always be necessarily deferred. Such a challenge results not in negating history but in replacing the meaning of history with the history of meanings. (p. 468).

This work traces the history of some of the articulations of the private/public divide as manifested in schooling, seeking to trouble this divide through these articulations.

Kuan-Hsing (1996) also articulates a postmodern understanding of history. Kuan-Hsing recognizes the critique of postmodernism as the "end of History," but not the end of the historical study. With the refocusing of the field in view of the postmodern understanding of language, instead of having a "History," we have "the beginning of histories" (p.311). Fay, Pomper, and Vann (1998) phrase the postmodern reframing of history as a move away from the question of "how is history like and unlike science?" to the question of "how is history like and unlike fiction?" (p.2).

The deconstruction of language as being an objective description of reality, and the move towards understanding language to be a tool through which we describe our subjective perspective and experiences, leads us towards an aesthetic understanding of language, and therefore history.

Because of the relation between the historiographical view and the language used by the historian in order to express this view- a relation which nowhere intersects the domain of the past- historiography possesses the same opacity and intensional dimension as art. (Ankersmit, 1998, p.183)

While this aestheticism of history is lamented by some, it is celebrated by postmodernism. It marks an opening, the possibilities for histories, for multiple voices to

tell their stories. Postmodernism is a useful philosophic lens with which we may view different types and genres of history. To claim the authority of one particular view, or the postmodern perspective of history in general, as the authoritative and only true vision of the discipline would be to establish a metanarrative, a concept that is rejected within postmodernism. Rather, the postmodern celebration of histories cannot make absolute truth claims, but explores and expresses the subjective. History from the postmodern perspective invites the disruption of chronology and strict disciplinary formalities. Ankersmit (2001) describes the shift in emphasis from a modern approach to history where the focus is on establishing a coherent and organized truth that is consistent with previously established thought, to a postmodern approach where truth is not the stake to which history should be measured against. "And truth thus is not at stake in the disagreement about such definitions- what is at stake is what truths are more helpful than others for grasping the nature of the period in question" (p.38). Put in other terms, Ankersmit describes the shift from modern to postmodern history as one that approaches history not in terms of a description, but in terms of representation. He distinguishes between the two in the following manner:

> In a description… we can always distinguish a part that refers and a part attributing a certain property to the object referred to… No such distinction is possible in a representation… We cannot pinpoint with absolute precision in a picture those parts of it that exclusively refer to… and those other parts of it that attribute to it certain properties… as is done with the predicative part of the description. Both things, both reference and predication, take place in pictures at one and the same time. (p. 39)

Whereas the modernist historical project aimed at history as a description of the past, Ankersmit and others point to the fallacy of this perspective. He notes that whereas a description "refers" to some "real" object to which we can make reference, representation "is about" something, acting as a substitute or replacement for that which is absent. Postmodernism does not deny temporality, but as Ankersmit points out, denies truth as a criteria for the validity of history, just as truth would not be a criteria for the validity of an artistic representation. The proliferation of various representations in a postmodern approach to history represents an advantage, as representations can only be judged in reference to one another, as substitutes or replacements for that which is absent, rather than some empirical criteria.

> There is no a priori scheme in terms of which the representational success of individual narrative representations can be established; representational success always is a matter of a decision between rival narrative representations. It is a matter of comparing narrative representations of the past with *each other*, not of comparing individual narrative representations with *the past itself*. (Ankersmit, 2001, p, 96)

The criteria that Ankersmit encourages us to employ in such comparisons is the one which challenges us to think about the past in new and broader ways. He notes that this is often the one that is seen as most risky in terms of existing representations. For Megill (1995) this signals a turn from attempts at descriptions of the past to a use of historical space to address theoretical issues.

> In a world that no longer believes in a single History, historians can awaken universal interest only insofar as their work addresses theoretical issues….

Accordingly, one envisages a historiography capable of bringing (localized) aid to theory…. A more self-ironic historiography than the current style, having a greater humility and reflexiveness concerning its own assumptions and conclusions. (p. 172)

Postmodern histories celebrate the subjective, and eludes the pinning down of signification that shuts spaces down and pushes out a multiplicity of voices. This freedom is what Greene (1995) celebrates in the arts.

When we hold an image of what is objectively "the fact," it has the effect of reifying what we experience, making our experience resistant to reevaluation and change rather than open to imagination. (p.126)

The understanding of history as a representation denies this reification, and allows for the telling of many histories, each of which opens our understandings, or at the very least our recognition, of the other. I will subscribe to the two characteristics that Ankersmit (1998) points to, "opacity" and "intensionality." These characteristics view art (and representation) as a sort of practice in which the artist expresses their subjective views through the medium with which they work, the observer only being able to interpret the intensional nature of the work in a somewhat opaque fashion. Just as it is never completely clear to the observer the inner thoughts or expression of the artist, so the author or reader of history cannot be completely clear either. Such an understanding of postmodern history as art does, however, make us aware that history is authored, and as such has a subjective voice.

Through an exploration of the historical dialogue of the histories of public and independent schooling from the postmodern perspective, spaces are opened to expand

understandings of schooling proposed in current policy. The multiplicity of narratives within public and independent schools serves to deconstruct and discredit a unitary history. Further, this work stands as a unique representation of the histories of public and independent schools by standing in the juxtaposition of dialogue between the two institutions around the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization. Through this juxtaposition, this work is guided by and attuned to the theoretical and philosophical in the troubling of the private/ public distinction. It validates the experiences of the other, and recognizes the need for open spaces in which to tell those narratives. As the quote from Huebner (1991) at the opening of this work states, this exploration is primarily historical, in that we create our past and future through our present.

Like a weaver creating a tapestry from individual strings, we weave our present moment in education. The weaving can take on different styles, shapes, and patterns, depending upon the strings, knots, and braids to which we choose to listen and let speak.

To understand curriculum as deconstructed (and deconstructing) text is to tell stories that never end, stories in which the listener, the "narratee," may become a character or indeed the narrator, in which all structure is provisional, momentary, a collection of twinkling stars in a firmament of flux. (Pinar et al, 2004, p.449)

Within the exploration of schooling historically, a recognition of this creative voice in history works to deny a unitary understanding of history. This opens spaces for the subjective histories of the other, and validates the right to (re)present their own lived experiences. Therefore, in a historical exploration of public and independent schooling, there is the acknowledgement of voices of authors, rather than unitary realities that all

have experienced. It is recognized that historical, and therefore present, accounts of the

history of schooling create and (re)present subjective experiences.

Such an acknowledgement is important, in that it denies a "right" interpretation of

the dialogue between public and independent schooling. Rather, this dialogue can be

seen as a "series of narratives superimposed upon each other" (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 449).

To participate in such weaving, in such story telling, is to participate in the art of history

from a postmodern perspective that continues to give education, and curriculum theory

more specifically, a present moment, a continual movement, and as such, a freedom.

The celebratory, subjective understanding of dialogue is the understanding

employed in this work as a dialogical history. It troubles the notion of the traditional

public/private distinction in schooling and curriculum more generally. As a dialogical

history, it aims as at *representation*, in the sense attributed to the work of Ankersmit

(1998, 2001). Description can be understood as a modernist approach, in which the

historian aims to describe the past, to assign signifiers to point to signified entities of the

past in a fixed and permanent manner. Representation, however, stands as a re-

presenting of that which is acknowledged as absent.   Here the signifier points to other

signifiers, each always competing and never permanent.

This notion of a postmodern, dialogical history and its inability to create fixed

meaning does not invalidate or undermine this work. Rather, it recognizes that the voice

with which I, public, or independent school speak or have spoken creates *a*

representation, but is not completely representative of all understanding and perspectives.

Importantly, it calls for attending to the relations of power in which different voices in the

history of public schooling and independent schooling have attempted to speak

authoritatively for the whole of education. It requires an attentiveness to that ways in which different voices have attempted to speak. It also means paying attention to which voices have been silenced, underrepresented, in this dialogue, which voices have not been allowed to speak or have been ignored.

By exploring the dialogical histories between public and independent school, I hope to add to the larger discourses within education, and the curriculum theory field more specifically. An exploration of this dialogue will further an understanding a representation, of the differences and divergences of our interpretations (of interpretations) of the way in which the issues surrounding identity politics, accountability, and globalization are and have been lived in both public and independent schools today. The focus and exploration of these topics has centered primarily on those experiences within public schools. However, the existence and histories of these issues within both types of schooling are only possible as the existence of the other, and as such, their "utterances" on these topics are intimately connected to and already contained within the other.

The postmodern exploration of the dialogical histories between public and independent schools serves as a representation to explore the relationships and answers to the issues surrounding identity politics, accountability, and globalization, in order to open space for more questions. It troubles the distinction that is often placed between public and private, and points to the way in which the otherness of each is already contained within itself, and necessary for its existence. Such an exploration takes to heart the celebratory possibility of dialogue in the postmodern, and allows for further representation and possibility with the field of curriculum studies.

CHAPTER 3: PAVING THE WAY: A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS AS INTERDEPEDENT IDENTITIES

The history of American schools has been replete with criticisms. It is an undocumented but accepted premise that in no other previous or contemporary society has so much been hoped for, asked from, or given to, or taken on by the schools. Under such an assumption it is not difficult to understand why schools in America have been a focal point for criticism. (MacDonald & Zaret, 1975, p.12)

As an educator in an independent school, I find myself reflecting on the issue of the place of private education in American society, particularly its validity and purpose in a democratic country with a national system of public education. Through my personal experience as a product of a private high school, undergraduate, and graduate education, I have found and find the relative freedoms from state and federal regulations and the power to develop my own style within the classroom invigorating. However, I find myself asking the question: what significance does this have for society at large? Am I doing a disservice to my students and myself by subscribing to an system of education that is sometimes accused of serving only those from privileged backgrounds and perpetuating the status quo?

This chapter explores the historical development of independent schooling throughout the history of education in the United States in an attempt to explore these questions. The historical development of public schooling and private schooling in the United States are intimately related. Their historical discourse contains "utterances" that simultaneously act as the other while simultaneously containing the other. Public schooling evolved in response to a multitude of independently run and governed schools.

As public schools evolved, the independently run schools that wished to maintain their independence reformed in response to the evolving public schooling, maintaining their own governance and finding their own funding. At the beginning of this evolution, there was not a clear distinction or labeling as public or private, nor of independent as a subtype of private schooling. Rather, these terms also evolved, not being employed or denoting different things at different times, throughout the history of schooling in the United States into their present usage.

Dividing spaces: public/private others

In this chapter, I briefly trace this evolution in order to show the ways in which there has been a dialogical relationship between the development of both public schools and independent schools throughout their history. This chapter serves as a general introduction to the historical development of independent schooling, as a particular subtype of private schooling, a structure of schooling that is not widely recognized or understood apart from being private. I hold that the present usage of the terms public and independent schooling are still troubling given the current status of schooling at present. I also propose a manner in which each type of schooling simultaneously serves as an other while containing pieces of the other within its own development and present state. I also trouble the criticism of elitism and perpetuation of the status quo as solely a problem of private schooling, and therefore independent schools. This chapter serves as a framework for more in-depth and detailed positioning of public and independent schooling around the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization in the subsequent chapters. Therefore, these topics may be alluded to in this chapter while further exploration follows in subsequent chapters.

An exploration of the dialogical histories of public and independent schooling is of particular import at present as public schooling is coming under attack as being an ineffective educational institution for our youth and neglecting the marginalized child. In several areas of the country, the public education system seems to be failing as students and citizens look towards alternative types of schooling that better serve the individual student. Randall (1994) discusses the importance of the current educational debates over the role and functions of different types of schools.

> Although the importance of education is universally recognized and the strategic position it occupies in our republic is clear, the specific character it should assume has always been a matter of debate and controversy. The national polemic over the conditions of education in America is current evidence of our continued commitment to education and our inability to reach an agreement as to its structure and its substance… How does a democracy simultaneously promote two inherent principles- ideological pluralism and public values? (p.2)

This work is primarily historical in the exploration of the ways in which public and independent schools are historically interrelated and have answered the question posed by Randall in different manners during different periods of history. Before diverging into these histories, it is necessary to define the term "independent school" as it is employed in this work. The term itself has an important history.

As stated in chapter 1, there is a difficulty in researching on this topic in that the terms "private" and "independent" are often used interchangeably in the historical literature on the subject. There are few places where statistics on independent schooling as distinct from private schooling are available. To repeat from Chapter 1, I use the

definition of an independent school that is employed by the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS).

> Independent schools are distinct from other schools in that they are primarily supported by tuitions, charitable contributions, and endowment income rather than by tax or church funds… schools must be independently governed by a board of trustees. (NAIS web site- http://www.nais.org)

In this chapter, "private" schooling is any educational institution generally outside of the regulation of public school system, although this differentiation is not clearly defined throughout the historical development of public and private schooling. Independent schools serve as one type of private education.

The independent school was not formally recognized as distinct from other types of schooling until around the time of the Civil War. During the colonial era, schools received funds from a mixture of private and public sources. Each town may have had a small, non-graded school to which the children of local townspeople went in order to be schooled in basic skills and Protestant religious ethics. "Towns and neighborhoods often decided to provide schools, funded in a variety of ways. Attendance was voluntary and usually involved some charges to parents" (Kaestle, 1983, p. 3). It is important to note in the literature that these town schools are sometimes called "public". This is not public in the sense in which we understand public schools today as federally mandated and controlled institutions, but rather schools that were funded by townspeople and served the general public in that area. In addition to these town schools, there were Latin grammar schools that served to educate the elite and talented past the elementary level, and were brought from the English tradition.

The Revolutionary War did not affect this state of education in the colonies. "Federal and state constitution merely confirmed or legalized the current state of education affairs" (Randall, 1994, p.20). However, a few pieces of legislature did have importance for the private educational sector. Article 1, section 10, of the United States Constitution made it illegal for states to interfere in contracts between private parties. Because private educational institutions did and still do enter into contracts with their patrons, this law made government regulation of these contracts illegal. A second piece of important legislation was the First Amendment, which mandated a separation of church and state. Although this did not have any significant effect on current private schools, as they were not state run, it would prove important with the development of common schools and the ability of non-common schools to attract those seeking an education alternative that include religious instructions (Randall, 1994, p. 20).

Rural schools continued to thrive, and made up the majority of schooling experiences for those living in communities throughout the United States. These schools reflected the nation's diverse population. Sometimes teachers taught in foreign languages and a school's religious instruction reflected the "local majority preferences" (Kaestle, 1983, p.17). These schools were attended well and supported by local communities, but were not seen as meeting the needs of the new nation would-be leaders. As Kaestle states,

> In the eyes of state education officials and other reform-minded commentators,
> district and old-field schoolteachers were not serving education needs very well.
> From the point of view of rural communities, however, it seems that these
> transient, low-paid, inexperienced teachers served local needs quite well. (p. 21)

It is interesting to note that in 1780, Jefferson proposed the Virginia School Bill, in which tax money would support the development of common schools. This bill was turned down upon its proposal and again in 1817 because of skepticism of government regulation of educational institutions.

> The very devotion to liberty that schooling was designed to protect also made local citizens skeptical of new forms of taxation by the state, and of new institutional regulation by central government. Furthermore, it was not clear to members of hard-pressed state legislatures that the republic would collapse without new systems of common schooling, or that the existing mode of local and parental initiative was insufficient. (Kaestle, 1983, p. 9)

After the Revolutionary War and during the Federalist period, academies arose to provide a more challenging academic curriculum to privileged white males. Kraushaar (1972) describes the purpose of these schools.

> Public schools were available to most students living in larger communities, but those were usually only through the elementary level and students living in rural areas did not even have those. The only secondary schools were dwindling Latin Grammar schools and a few sectarian and private secondary schools. Therefore, the academies were created to fill this void. However, most had religious currents throughout the curriculum. (p.58-59)

Although many of these academies were privately funded and governed by a board of trustees, they were not commonly known as "independent". The term "independent" did not become widely used in the educational arena until the Civil War era, in the latter portion of the 1800s. At this time, the existence of a public system of

education was just becoming a national question. It was during the Civil War era that the term "independent" began to be used to refer to a particular type of private schooling, and this type of schooling soon came to constitute a dialogical relationship with the common school that was on the eve of implementation.

The late 1800s and early twentieth century was a time of rapid social changes in the United States. The Industrial Revolution was a major catalyst for many of these changes as large urban areas developed around major centers of production, destroying the traditional town setting. With this came the disruption of the traditional family unit, as many moved from rural areas to the city in search of a new lifestyle. Family members became more alienated from one another without the bond of sharing in common household duties, and as many luxuries such as public water and power systems were provided. There was also a surge of foreign immigrants to develop and work in these urban areas. These rapid changes to the character of society were received by many as threats to the domination that Anglo-Protestant values had long held in American culture. As a possible solution to these threats, the promotion of the common school became more relevant and important to many. Horace Mann began this conversation earlier in the century during the 1830s and 1840s and was one leader in this movement, campaigning for the need for a public educational system that would produce a unified vision of American culture and a responsible and effective citizenry with socially valuable and worthwhile morals. "The common school was to be administered by state and local governments for the purpose of achieving public goals, such as remedying social, political, and economic problems" (Spring, 2001, p. 103).

Some, however, saw this movement for the common school as an attempt by the socially elite to protect their power and instill what they deemed socially effective values in the masses. Randall (1994) explains the common school movement as "the imposition of a particular education ideology, with significant political and social implications, by a small group of astute and articulate advocates with their own vision of humankind and the good society" (p. 32). Spring (2001) states that "the common school movement of the 1830s and 1840s was, in part, an attempt to halt the drift towards a multicultural society. (p. 86)

Randall (1994) describes the effect of the common school movement on the private educational sector as a whole. Many private schools had to shut down because parents could not afford to pay taxes and tuition. Private school confronted the government over the use of state educational funds as many states had traditionally subsidized religious and non-religious schools (p.34). On the other hand, private schools that could remain open without public support posed a threat to the common school movement because they were free from state control and could teach values and perspectives that were inconsistent with the public schools' efforts to create a unified culture. They also enjoyed the benefit of being able to change their curriculum quickly to meet the needs of a rapidly evolving society whereas this was more difficult for the common school as it was a much larger bureaucracy.

Proponents of the common school movement were so hostile towards the private educational sectors that in many states there was an attempt to make such institutions illegal. Randall (1994) notes that Michigan was the first state to try, albeit unsuccessfully, and legally prohibit the existence of private schools (p.44). However, the

independent schools' right to co-exist alongside public schools was established legally in

1925 in the Supreme Court case Pierce v. Society of Sisters (Pierce v. Society of Sister;

286 U.S. 510, 1925).

It was during this case that the Supreme Court denied Oregon's appeal to shut

down all private schools in the state and require all students to attend the public schools.

Oregon had passed an amendment to the Laws of Oregon in 1922 known as the Oregon

Compulsory Education Act. This act required all guardians to enroll any child between

the ages of 8 and 16 in a state-run school (with the exception of children who were

handicapped or lived too far from a school). Two private schools, the Society of Sisters

and Hill Military Academy, sued in the district court, which ruled the amendment

unconstitutional because it deprived the school of their property without due process and

of the right to teach. The court also ruled that the amendment denied parents the right to

control the education of their children. Oregon appealed the decision to the United States

Supreme Court. Oregon argued that is was the state's duty to ensure that its citizens were

properly trained to be effective citizens. The Supreme Court denied Oregon's appeal,

judging that the amendment was an improper use of power by the state. It was ruled that

parents had the right to choose the educational institution to which they sent their

children. This case ensured the legality of private schools' right to exist (Randall, 1994,

p. 61-63).

It was in the midst of the common school movement and the rapidity of the

changing culture at that time that private schools began to take on distinct and purposeful

functions from the perspective of the larger society. It was during this time that

compulsory attendance laws came into affect. Levine & Levine (1970) note that until

1852, there was no state that mandated school attendance. It was between 1870 and 1890 that most states developed mandatory attendance laws, and not until 1912 that every state had a mandatory attendance law (p.38). Up until that time, parents had sent their children to schools of their choice that received funds from state and private sources. The government did not attempt to influence the decisions of parents as to which school to send their children. There was no legal governmental control over the curriculum in schools. Non-governmental organizations, such as the Committee of Ten, had released recommendations and regulations for curriculum in college preparatory schools, but the schools chose whether they would abide by these recommendations. Little competition existed among different types of private schools, each serving a mostly local population with distinct interest, with exception of the elite academies in the northeast. However, with the emergence and spread of the common school, it became necessary for the private educational sector to convince patrons of the uniqueness of their school in order to attract enrollees and stay financially stable. It was in this context that the independent school emerged as a very distinct type of educational institution.

Although the term "independent" gained popularity during the Civil War, to avoid criticism of being un-American or unpatriotic, there was not a conscious effort to categorize independent schools as such by certain criteria. During this time "public" schools came to be seen as patriotic and American, while "private" seen as aristocratic.

> '[P]rivate' acquired pejorative connotations such as 'elitist', 'undemocratic', and 'un-America'… 'Independent' is not only a less damning word, it is also a more accurate designation, because it conveys the autonomous, unaffiliated character of the schools in question. (Kraushaar, 1972, p.54)

It was during this period, the turn of the twentieth century that 'independent'

schools came to be recognized as a type of school sharing general characteristics.

Kraushaar (1972) outlines some of these characteristics, such as the derivation of

financial support from non-public funds; the practice of a selective admission process

based on varying criteria; relatively small schools enrolling a very manageable-sized

student body; and a variety in curriculums due to their autonomous nature (p. 9).

Kraushaar also states that the chief rationale of the independent school was to offer a

"better" education than what was available in the public schools- a claim that will be

examined throughout this work. Within the independent school sector, there were and

still are many varieties of school programs. These include day schools, boarding schools,

single-gender schools, progressive and experimental schools.

New independent schools developed in attempts to offer educational alternatives

to the common school. With the development of new and large urban areas, one type of

independent school that prospered and spread rapidly was the "Country Day" school.

The first Country Day school was founded in a suburb of Baltimore by a prominent group

of citizens. The Country Day school boasted that they provided and experiential

education in the nature of the countryside, outside of the noise and pollution of the city,

while boys received an education in the classroom equal to that of the eastern boarding

schools. The Country Day Movement spread quickly and in 1937, over 100 headmasters

joined the newly founded Country Day Headmasters' Association (Kraushaar, 1972,

p.76-77).

During the 1930s, independent schools had to overcome the obstacle of the

Depression as they struggled to stay open and patrons found it difficult to pay tuition

fees. "During the depression of the thirties, independent secondary school enrollment dwindled to 6 percent" of total secondary school enrollment nationwide (Walton, 1981, p. 65).

The emergence of independent schools accepting or founded for girls increased during the early twentieth century. Kraushaar (1972) notes that this growth in independent schools for girls was concurrent with the sexual revolution in education of the 1920s. "After the 1940s, more less-elite boarding schools for girls were founded as headmistresses and headmasters who took over and started schools in the forties or later placed more emphasis on demanding academic curriculums and a more liberal social atmosphere than on coming from an elite background" (p.73).

The 1950s and the Civil Rights Movement also had great effects on the character of independent schools. In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled in Brown v. Board of Education that students could not be denied admittance to public schools based on race (Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 1954). Although independent schools had traditionally enrolled white, Protestant clientele, this was a result of the fact that it was the population that could afford to pay the tuition. There was, also, a movement within the independent school sector prior to Brown v. Board of Education recognizing the benefits of promoting multi-racial environments as well as a small number of African-American independent schools. These aspects of the history of independent schools will be more fully explored in Chapter 4. Despite these small movements, there was a significant increase in the number of independent schools founded out of fear of interracial education and the end of segregation in the public school systems. The

establishment of these schools as segregationist societies allowed many southerners to

avoid having to be educated with racial minorities (Kraushaar, 1972, p.88).

However, the government did work to curtail and subdue this pattern. The U.S.

government claimed that based on the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Supreme Court case

decision in Green v. Connally, the International Revenue Service must require proof that

schools were engaging in nondiscriminatory policies in order to qualify for tax

exemptions (Walton, 1981, p. 81). Given that tax exemption in an important financial

consideration in the welfare of independent schools as non-profit entities, this decision

did curb the development of such schools in order to avoid integration and forced schools

that were founded with such a mission to either close or develop more racially tolerant

policy.

Another wave of growth occurred in the private school sector in general as well as

in independent schools as the United States Supreme Court passed several rulings

banning church or religious instruction in the public school system. Although the First

Amendment called for the separation of church and state, it was not until the 1960s that

this was strictly enforced. Up until that time, many public schools engaged in morning

prayer and bible reading. In 1962, the Supreme Court ruled that state encouragement of

public prayer in the public school system was unconstitutional in Engle v. Vitale (Engle

v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421, 1962).

The following year, in 1963, the Court ruled that it was unconstitutional for state

law to encourage bible reading and public prayer on school grounds under the

supervision of school employees during school hours, even if attendance is voluntary in

the case of Abington School District v. Schempp, Murray v. Cutlett (Abington School

District v. Schempp, Murray v. Cutlett, 374 U.S. 203, 2963). Although independent

schools are not necessarily religious in orientation, a significant portion do promote a

sectarian curriculum, although it must be independent of a church to be considered

independent. However, these Court rulings did restrict the public schools rather than

independent schools, making schools in which prayer and Bible study more appealing to

another segment of the market that thought this to be an important element in their child's

education.

These developments within the national character and demographics of the

country had significant impacts on the ways in which both public and independent

schools evolved. As the character and face of society changed, schools were called upon

to meet the changing social needs. All of these historical developments have impacted

and been an integral part of what independent schools are today.

By the numbers: The current character of independent schools

The NAIS serves as a peer community for modern independent schools. It is a

self-regulated organization with the following mission statement.

> The National Association of Independent Schools acts as the national voice of
>
> independent pre-collegiate education and as the center for collective action on
>
> behalf of its membership. It serves and strengthens its member schools and
>
> associations by articulating and promoting high standards of educational quality
>
> and ethical behavior by working to preserve their independence to serve the
>
> democratic society from which that independence derives and by advocating
>
> broad access for students in affirming the principles of equity and justice.
>
> (http://www.nais.org/about)

The NAIS report that approximately 25 percent, or 27,700, of all schools in the

United States are private. About 5 percent, or 1,500, of those private schools are

independent, or one percent of schools nationwide. About 1,145 of these are members of

NAIS (http://www.nais.org/about/what/cfm). In 2002, the National Center for Education

Statistics (NCES) reported that of the 53 million elementary and secondary students in

the United States, 11 percent of them, or 5.9 million, attend a private institution

(http://www.nces.ed.gov/quicktable/Detail.asp?Key=692). This indicates that

independent schools education only about 0.8 percent of al students in the United States.

Of NAIS member schools, 89 percent are day schools, 11 percent are boarding schools.

Within both types of NAIS schools, enrollment of students of color is 21.9 percent and

international students is 2.6 percent (http://www.nais.org/about/what.cfm). These

statistics give a current picture of who independent schools are and what portion of the

population they are serving.

The paradox of the public space within the private of education

Independent schooling, as a constituent part of private education, is not without its

criticisms. Since the rise and popularization of public, state-funded schooling,

independent schools have been charged as being elitist and perpetuating the status quo.

They are often viewed as a relic of the Latin grammar schools of the Colonial Period,

where only the wealthy, elite, white sent their sons. Jacoby (1994) is one such critic,

stating,

> Tomorrow what? Gated schools for the elite, and barracks for the rest?
>
> Meanwhile in one of the world's richest societies high school students
>
> increasingly work part-time in service industries, relinquishing studies for cars

and designer clothes. To reflect on liberal education today is to consider not its demise but the reason for its demise, an illiberal society. (p. xvii)

Jacoby criticizes these schools for what he perceives as their isolation from the larger society and the communities that surround them. The flight to these institutions is characterized by Jacoby as abandonment and loss of commitment to the larger society and community.

A worsening situation spurs an elite- chosen and self-chosen- to redouble efforts to gain access to the few educational oases. This accelerates the free fall of the rest of the system. As the most ambitious, moneyed, and talented depart, they abandon public education and the bulk of higher education to their own, diminishing resources. The democratic promise of education, always a partial tease, turns cruel and mocking. (p.196)

Lasch (1995) echoes the criticisms of Jacoby, seeing institutions such as independent schools as a way in which the elite can avoid contact and interference from the "unenlightened".

The culture wars that have convulsed America since the sixties are best understood as a form of class warfare, in which an enlightened elite (as it thinks of itself) seeks not so much to impose its values on the majority (a majority perceived as incorrigibly racist, sexist, provincial, and xenophobic), much less to persuade the majority by means of rational public debate, as to create parallel or "alternative" institutions in which it will no longer be necessary to confront the unenlightened at all. (p.21)

More thorough responses to aspects of Jacoby and Lasch's criticisms will be addressed throughout the following chapters through more in-depth investigations of both public schools and independent schools in their response to meeting the needs of their students. However, it seems appropriate to state here that Jacoby and Lasch's understandings of the position of independent schools within the educational systems of the United States seem to be ill-informed with regard to the interdependent development of public and independent schools throughout their histories, as well as the diversity in mission and demographics of independent schools, and the more recent focus of independent schools on social justice. Independent schools have been present throughout much of the country's history, and are not a recent development. Subsequent chapters show how independent schools are working against these stereotypes and also serve a space to speak back against the standardization inherent in public schools. Although independent schools have been, and some admittedly remain, exclusive and elitist, this is not the way in which NAIS nor do most independent schools see their place and purpose within the educational system in the U.S. As Seybolt (1971) notes,

> In the extension of educational opportunities, the private school played a unique part in colonial America. They were free to originate, and put into practice ideas that might effect improvements in their curricula and methods. The masters sought always to keep strictly abreast of the needs of the times, for their livelihood depended on success with which they met these needs. No such freedom or incentive was offered the masters of town schools… Our indebtedness to private schools of colonial America has not been fully appreciated. First, to

recognize and respond to the educational needs of the people, they were pioneers in the making of a secondary curriculum of the present day. (p.100-102)

In the histories of education in the United States, the semi-private sector was the first form of education. It was not until the turn of the 20th century, with the rapidly changing face of society resulting from immigration and industrialization, did the nation feel the need to develop a formal system of public education. This system developed as part of an attempt for the control and management of cultural values in a rapidly changing and evolving country. Although the topic of identity politics will be explored in more detail in the following chapter, it is appropriate to state here that when faced with the threat of cultural plurality and heterogeneity, advocates of the common school movement wanted to use public schools to develop a unified culture that produced productive citizens. As the public school system developed, private schools that remained open did so as an alternative to government-controlled education.

The function of many of these private schools changed during the Civil Rights Movement and as religious instruction was removed from the public school curricula. Some became suburban havens for the predominant class to continue to school their children in an environment without racial or religious plurality. However, with state regulation of these institutions and certain criteria to receive a license to operate from accrediting agencies or a non-profit status, most of these schools have been forced to accept multiplicity. Increasingly, as educators that were raised during or after the Civil Rights Movement accept and hold positions in these institutions, the character of these schools is becoming more diverse in their missions and approaches to education. The value of independent schools for many educators is not in their ability to be made into

isolated havens from multiplicity, but rather that they are havens from government and state control and surveillance in the way in which they develop their mission and curricula as well as they try to meet the needs of their student populations.

Independent schools currently serve as an 'other' to the national, public educational institution. It is my contention that this identity as an 'other' is what makes independent schools powerful in the educational dialogue about what constitutes learning and knowledge. The other always serves to discredit the norm, to show that there is a different option. This is the power of independent schools in the dialogue on education. The space of the "other" is necessarily paradoxical in that it already contains the other in its response and anticipation. The approaches to education found in independent schools more specifically, open space for new ideas that create opportunities for freedom from the standardized content of curriculum that is advocated by proponents of accountability and national standards in education.

Bakhtin (1986) maintains that utterances always already contain the other and is always a response to the other.

> …[V]ery frequently the expression of our utterance is determined not only- and sometimes not so much- by the referentially semantic content of this utterance, but also by others' utterances on the same topic to which we are responding or with which we are polemicizing. (p.91)

The utterance cannot exist without this other, it is always a communication in response to and in anticipation of the other.

Thus, addressivity, the quality of turning to someone, is a constitutive feature of the utterance; without it the utterance does not and cannot exist. (Bakhtin, 1986, p.99)

This interdependence of the other can be seen in the utterances, the dialogue, between the histories of public and independent schooling in the United States. The first schools to develop in the country were rural, community run, patron-funded schools. Alongside of these schools developed the more traditional Latin grammar schools and academies. As plurality of lifestyle and culture increased, advocates of the Common School Movement advocated a system of education that was compulsory in order to ensure a fairly homogenous set of values and understanding of citizenship. While public school was open to most in its attendance policy (although segregation and unequal distribution of resources were present and will be addressed in the subsequent chapter), its curriculum was developed within and dictated by a rather narrow group of educators and politicians. Private education offered an alternative to the dictated curriculum, and although tuition was required in most private institutions, parents were free to choose the school of their choice, and therefore, in most cases played an active role in the direction of the school. During the Civil Rights Movement, the positions of public and independent schools again evolved in response to and anticipation of each other. Under mounting public pressure, public schools integrated and became more egalitarian in their attendance and governance while many independent schools became safe havens from the increasing diversity in public schools. At present, the positions of each type of schooling have again evolved as national standards and accountability movements produce increasingly rigid and top-down curriculum implementation, independent

schools offer a place in which patrons and community members can still be active participants in the development of mission and curriculum.

The space of independent schooling is necessarily paradoxical in that it is a traditionally private space. However, if it were to become public, it would no longer stand as an alternative and would become subject to the regulation of corporate and government influence. Independent schools, as opposed to private schools more generally, provide this space and the voice of an other that is valid and supportable in the public because of their unique structure and mission.

It is in their very structure and organization that independent schools have power in the discourse of education that allows them the freedom to be an "other." Because independent schools are funded privately, they are free from government regulations concerning curriculum design and instruction. There are some regulations that they must meet in order to be licensed and accredited educational institutions, but many of these have to do with safety and health regulations. They also have an intrinsic interest in preparing their students for the next stage in their life, whether that is a postsecondary education or a certain vocational path. However, it is determined by individual schools what is needed in this preparation. Because these schools are on average much smaller than public school districts, this is decided on a much more individualized level. Furthermore, attendance at these institutions is voluntary, so that no student is required by law to submit to the curriculum in order to be considered educated.

Independent schools are run independently and are not owned by any particular body. They are relatively small, and are non-profit organizations. They must act in accordance with national policies that demonstrate that they are an institution whose

primary purpose is not to acquire excess revenue for the purposes of making a profit.

Therefore, their goals in proposing and abiding by particular educational philosophies are

not primarily in an attempt to make money or profit.

Independent schools' ability to design their own curriculum allows them to design

one that is meaningful to their particular student bodies. This is an important

acknowledgement about the value of varied systems and types of knowledge. It implies a

belief that not every student comes to school needing or wanting the same types and

outcomes of education. Commenting on this, Kane (1992) states,

> Self-governance results in responsiveness to the particular needs of the individual
>
> school and freedom from the bureaucratic intrusion by local, state, and federal
>
> governments… (p. 7)

Relic (2000) has commented on the possibilities within independent schools that

act as a space to address issues in education and provide an "other" to the dominant

discourse.

> Opportunities to seek understanding and collective action among private and
>
> public schools are increasing. Just as educators and trustees are concerned about
>
> the intrusion into independent school governance by the imposition of the state
>
> assessment movement, so are the public schools threatened by the tyranny of
>
> standardized tests. With the demands of politicians for students to achieve high
>
> test scores, public school principals and teachers have been forced to teach to the
>
> test… Independent school boards and heads can be involved in the political
>
> debate as private and public school people attempt to preserve the integrity of
>
> education against those who would reduce everything to a test score…. We, in

independent schools, have a responsibility to work on the cutting edge of teaching

and learning and to collaborate with educators from other levels and sectors…"

(p.8)

Precisely because they are private institutions, independent schools can educate and act publicly to address the ruptures within the argument over the place and shape of accountability in education that results in knowledge being deduced to that which can be measured on test scores. Independent schools have claimed this unique site of privilege historically and continue to do so in the current standardization of education. Stettler and Algrant (2003) express the possibilities that this position presents currently.

Independent schools are privileged. We do not have to respond to the whims of

the state, nor to every or any educational trend. We can maximize our time

attuned to students and how they learn, to the development of curriculum that

enriches them and encourages the skills and attitudes of independent thinkers….

(p.42)

Independent and private schooling historically has been seen as a site of cultural reproduction for the economic elite. This claim cannot be denied in the foundation and roots of many types of independent schooling. However, as Kane (1992) notes, independent schools are recognizing the benefits for students and schools alike to make the school population more reflective of the general population in society at large, and opening their doors and providing the means for students from different backgrounds to attend independent institutions. The missions and curricula of independent schools have been altered and adapted to address the needs and talents of a diverse student body.

Ravitch (1992) notes the public space and benefit of private, specifically independent, schools in education open dialogues that counter the hegemonic discourse on what "works" in education.

> The public schools benefit by the diversity that private education encourages. We look to private education for the off-beat schools, for schools that are out of step with conventional thinking. Some private schools will be experimental and take risks. Some will offer a kind of rigorous academic curriculum that has virtually disappeared from public education. Others will find their own way of diverging from the mainstream. (p.26)

The diversity in composition, curricula, and mission of independent schools suggest that there are multiple ways to educate children. These schools demonstrate that there are certain and specific aspects of populations of students that need to be attended to in the education, and that a standardized, one size fits all approach to schooling will not result in positive benefits, economic or otherwise, for every student or school.

I am not advocating that all public schools should model themselves by the general principles and structures of independent schools. Nor am I denying that independent schools do not face many of the challenges that are present in public education that serve as obstacles to transforming the way we educate. I am, however, advocating for a closer working relationship between educators who are committed to problematizing the notion of learning and pointing out the ruptures within many of the current arguments and criticism within the field of education. Paradoxically, the private of independent schools is an opportune site within which this work can publicly take place. They open and serve as a public space in which the dialogue about what

constitutes education and learning can remain open and show the possibilities outside of

the current criticisms and options of public education.

CHAPTER 4: THE IN-BETWEENS OF IDENTITY: LOOKING AT INDENTITYT POLITICS IN THE OTHERNESS OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF SCHOOLING

Today, I must stand there aware of how children come up against possibility, recognize it

as such, and accept it or reject it as their possibility. This requires awareness that the

concern for the possibilities of the individual without equal concern for the social-

political-economic conditions within which we all live is hollow and meaningless.

(Huebner,1975, p.37)

Any discussion of identity in schooling and curriculum necessarily involves issues of power and is political. It involves issues of how curriculum, understood as lived experience, is instrumental in shaping our conceptions of identity in general and personal identities in particular. The whole of education as an institution informs how we understand others and ourselves. What is and is not included in the curriculum are decisions that are related invariably to identity politics. These politics involve who benefits from and who is victimized, whom gains power and from whom power is denied or taken.

While postmodernism states that we cannot truly know or understand the identity of the other, only that of ourselves, it does not deny that we can influence the identity of the other. Yeatman (1994) explains that postmodernism does not categorically deny "meaning, truth, right and community," but that these are concepts that are recognized as always embodied, that must always be recognized within a context.

The hallmark of a postmodern emancipatory politics is taken to be its insistence

that meaning, truth, right and community are all values that lie *within* a politics of

representation. Thus these values do not precede representation- as classical

theorists of representation would have it- but are constituted within the domain of representational praxis. (p. x)

Any time we assume influence over the other, we are assuming a position of power. Within postmodernism and the discussion of identity, it is not that issues of power disappear. Rather, it is where we look to examine how power is being exercised and played out that shifts. It is not assumed that power naturally resides within certain realms in a universalistic or predetermined fashion, but that politics resides squarely within the way in which representation is manifested. If we refer back to the historical philosophy of Ankersmit (2001), the distinction lies between an examination of "description," which refers to some "*real object*" (read *universal*), and "representation," which "refers to" something. The focus in postmodernism is on the ways in which power resides within and plays out in the references, rather than trying to describe some a priori or universal relationships. Any time that power is employed, the moment is political. Therefore, even in a postmodern understanding of curriculum, there is the issue of power and curriculum is still political. It is perhaps even more reason to be cautious in wielding the influence and power that comes when one is involved in shaping and implementing the curriculum.

In this chapter, I explore how these issues of power are experienced in terms of identity politics within both independent and public schools, further troubling the distinction between the private/public divide. I focus primarily on the issue of race, while recognizing that race is a social construction, and one that cannot be understood fully separated or understood apart from socioeconomic status, gender, and other variables of identity. Race, although socially constructed, is still understood and lived by students in

both public and independent schools. It is an appropriate identity construct from which to examine the histories of public and independent schools because the conception of race and the drawing of racial lines can be explored historically. The changing attitude and conceptions of race and identity formation within these two forms of schooling gives insight into their regard for and approach to difference, historically and presently. While representing only one sector or aspect of identity politics, the historical and present approaches to issues of race in public and independent schools illuminates the ways in which the curriculum of each respects or disregards their respective acknowledgement of issues of power, and therefore politics, in curriculum. In any discussion of race, there is the interweaving and presence of all aspects of identity, a social construction of which race may play one part. This discussion illuminates the benefits and drawbacks of standardized and non-standardized approaches to curriculum with respect to identity politics.

Race and education

Education represents a human activity in which our entire being is present in everything we do. Our identity and our understanding of ourselves both affects and is affected in the activity of education, as teachers and as students. Who we are affects the way in which we approach, create, and understand in the activity of learning. Arguments over what is taught, how it is taught, how and what is learned, and what pedagogy or methodology is best are all arguments that intimately involve the concern over what and how human identity should be understood.

Curriculum is one highly significant form of representation, and arguments over the curriculum, we suggest, are also arguments over who we are as curriculum,

we suggest, are also arguments over who we are as Americans, how we wish to represent ourselves to our children. (Castenell & Pinar, 1993, p. 2)

An often silenced aspect of this identity work in education and curriculum is that of socially-constructed categories. This is especially true of the category of race. There is often the belief that by not paying attention to the category of race, we are avoiding the danger of discriminatory practices and treating our students more equally, as if we are all the same. This approach has done much to silence the voices of youth who understand themselves as racial minorities. Dewey (1997) alluded to the long-term effects of the view when the teaching of material and the practice of schooling is isolated or abstracted from the experiences of the students. While not referring specifically to race, Dewey states,

> Failure to take into account adaptation to the needs and capacities of individuals was the source of the idea that certain subjects and certain methods are intrinsically cultural or intrinsically good for mental discipline. There is no such thing as education value in the abstract. (p.46)

An approach which denies the reality that we are different people with different experiences and voices opens the risk that by pretending we are all the same, that there is a standard sameness to which we should all aspire. It denies the cultural and ethnic differences of students who understand themselves in racial terms, who believe that they are and understand themselves as different because of their racial identities.

While race cannot be defined biologically and constitutes a social phenomena and attitude more than any clear and definite reality, it is often treated as permanent and fixed. There is a discrepancy in our ability to define race biologically and in our ability

to judge and discriminate based on color. This is apparent in the mirrored discrepancy in the lip-service that we give to the lack of definition of race and the lived experiences of students and faculty that are judged as racially different or silenced in an approach to avoid such differences. Race becomes a slippery signifier. It is dangerous precisely because it cannot be defined and is always tied with other concepts of identity, and is thereby used to categorize various groups of people in different ways, depending upon the desired consequences. However, this lack of definition also allows those who are marginalized under the banner of race to find spaces for movement towards freedom.

In arguing for a pedagogy of place, Haymes (1995) emphasizes the importance of challenging the color-blind approach in order to incorporate our "multiple identifications" into education.

> More specifically, it has to challenge the colonizing logic of white supremacist culture by first acknowledging the multiple identifications and experiences of the black subject; it must understand that locations in gender, class, race, ethnicity and sexuality complicate one another not merely additively. (p. 135)

Race is a complicated construct that must be attended to in the work of education. It has been a troubling construct for schools that exist under the banner of educating for equality and democracy. In this chapter, I will explore the ways in which race, as a one example of a socially-constructed category of identity among many, informs and affects the process of education; how race is a complicated category that cannot be understood as skin color and is intimately related to other aspects of identity; and the ways in which independent schools and public schools have approached the issues of diversity and race historically in order to further trouble the public/private divide.

The complicated conversation

To speak about race in education is to enter a complicated conversation. Race is a socially constructed category that is also tied to many other categories, such as socioeconomic class, gender, language, and sexuality. Race is never a distinct entity that defines the entire individual, but a part of a whole. As McCarthy (1990) reminds us, different categories intersect and are understood in an individual's identity uniquely.

> I have maintained throughout that the multifaceted nature of race and its operation in education and society requires a many-sided response- one that recognizes that minorities are not simply oppressed as racial subjects, but are positioned as classed and gendered subjects as well. These dynamics of race, class, and, gender are interwoven, in an uneven manner, into the social fabric of institutions and structures of American society- in the educational system, the economy and the state. This uneven interaction of race with other variables, namely class and gender- a process that I have called nonsynchrony- is a practical matter that defines the daily encounter of minority and majority actors in institutional and social settings. (p. 117)

The concept of nonsynchrony reminds us that there is not a way in which to separate racial identity from class, gender, and other variables of identity, intersecting differently within each individual. In addressing the issues in education that are connected to race, we are also addressing the socially constructed categories of identity that are connected to it, which are interwoven throughout all aspects of society.

Although the concept of identity is sometimes denied within postmodernism, McCarthy's approach to understanding race and identity is compatible with Yeatman's

(1994) definition of a postmodern, emancipatory politics in that resides within "representational praxis," recognizing the always embodied nature of claims to truth and reason. Nonsynchrony does not assume that there are pre-existing or abstract qualities to identity, but that our many experiences as so many different identities cannot be subsumed into a universal category or description. Exploring the concept of race within postmodernism is an exploration of the ways in which an identity of an individual is represented intra- and interpersonally; the ways in which we understand and represent our identity to others and ourselves. Again, the concept of representation indicates being "about" something that is absent and is in juxtaposition to a description that predicates particular qualities to an individual.

The timidity with which we approach race as a nonsynchronous entity is apparent in the historical manner in which we have treated race relations in society and education. We often shy away from the complex construct of race and race relations because it involves confrontation and conflict. Collins (1993) believes that this avoidance results from our negative perspective of social conflict.

That both cultural differences and social conflict are inherent features of any pluralistic society is a perspective that remains at odds with the mainstream perspective which treats social conflict as a social disease. (p.202)

Instead of embracing social conflict as a healthy representation of change, society has rejected it as a rebuttal of the norm and a threat to the power of the majority. Our historical tendencies reveal a reductive perspective of race in which we have tried to address the issue of diversity in education and society in an essentialist manner, where we define all aspects of race in terms of one understanding.

Lei and Grant (2001) understand these perspectives as being categorized into three groupings- *essentialist racism*, *color-/power- evasiveness*, and *race-cognizance*. Each of these understandings of race has impacted the way in which the construct of race has been addressed in education. *Essentialist racism* was prevalent through the early twentieth century, and understood differences in races as being biologically determined, people of color being inferior to Whites. This translated in education into the belief that blacks and other racial minorities were simply less intelligent that Whites and did not/ could not benefit from the same type of education. Tyack (1967) describes that even as this view evolved and there was some feeling that African-Americans should have access to education, the perspective of an innate inequality remained.

> Following the precedent set by the Peabody Fund, northern philanthropists accepted the southern view that public education had to be segregated. Sometimes the agents of the foundation accepted without question the common view that Negro schools should be not only separate but also unequal; one agreed to pay less to teachers in Negro schools, explaining that "it did not cost so much to operate a Negro school as it did a white school." (p.267)

The *color-/ power-evasiveness* perspective began in the 1920s, and understood belonging to an ethnic group as more behaviorally than biologically determined. The *color-/power-evasiveness* perspective was color-blind and meant that students of color should be assimilated behaviorally into the norm of those with power in order to be educated. However, this still took place on a national level within segregated schools. The perspective of some who espoused a desire to work towards equality was that first everyone must be educated to the norms (read *white* norms) before integration could be a

successful reality, a view that was considered by others as somewhat disingenuous.

Tyack (1967) quotes a correspondence between one such white philanthropist when

petitioned by an Africa-American for funds for integrated education.

> If we begin by education of the masses, we end by overcoming their prejudices.
>
> But if we begin by attempting to overcome the prejudices by force and educating
>
> them afterwards, I am convinced that the whole plan will result in a failure.
>
> (p.282)

The perspective among others was that schools should be based within and

educate students only within their communities. Given that the majority of communities

were segregated, this meant that schools would also be segregated. Additionally, the

schools within minority communities were regularly more poorly funded and maintained

less well. This was the perspective given in a report from the New York City School

Board in 1954 as it faced increasing pressure from minorities for equal access and

integrated educational institutions.

> The report held that the makers of zoning policy attempted to be color-blind;
>
> zoning policy sought to minimize the distance from home to school, to avoid
>
> traffic hazards and topographical features, and keep districts similar in size….
>
> Compared to schools which were more than 90 percent white, the predominantly
>
> Negro and Puerto Rican schools were older and less adequately maintained, had a
>
> higher rate of teacher-turnover, and had a smaller proportion of tenured teachers.
>
> (Ravitch, 1974, p. 253)

The *race-cognizance perspective*, becoming prevalent beginning in the 1970s,

argued for cultural plurality, in which differences were recognized but individuals were

treated with equality. Lei and Grant note that it was within this perspective that

multiculturalism began as an educational and social discourse.

Within the discourse of multiculturalism, the explanation for differences in

aptitude and/or behavior between races has been articulated against a belief in norms,

within a dichotomy of behavioral expectations. Manifestations of these explanations

have included the "genetic explanation, the cultural deficit explanation, the social

reproductions theory, the cultural difference approach, and the cultural discontinuity/

cultural ecological framework" (Grant & Lei, 2001, p.216). These explanations are

reductive in that they attempt to essentialize the way in which race affects and defines

identity in education. They attempt to provide a one-size fits all approach to the issue of

race in education that includes all students.

McCarthy's (1990) concept of nonsynchrony questions these explanations of

racial difference and approaches to understanding and practicing multicultural education

for their neglect of the ways in which all social categories interact uniquely in each

individual and his/her context of lived experiences. The concept of nonsynchrony brings

to light the complexity of the concept of race in education, and the inability to create a

unified approach to socially constructed categories of identity.

Nonsynchronous approaches to race

Several educators and authors have explored the complexity of the relationships

of race and education, helping to explore and provide examples of the ways in which the

concept of nonsynchrony applies to our approaches to race in education. Delpit (1995)

approaches race relations in education within the framework of the "culture of power."

This framework assumes that there is a certain culture that represents the culture of those

who hold power, the culture that represents the norm. It is necessary to know the codes

of the culture in order to access power. The framework of the culture of power is

nonsynchronous in that it does not attempt to assimilate those outside of the culture of

power within it, nor does it assume that everyone outside of the culture of power have

some essential difference or deficiency.

Delpit does not recommend one particular pedagogical approach, but suggests

that we make explicit to our students the ways in which the culture of power work, and

give them the tools to access the power within this culture. Such an approach also means

knowing each student as an individual and being connected to resources that represent

their culture.

> I propose that those of us responsible for teaching them realize that they bring
>
> different kinds of understanding about the world that those whose home lives are
>
> more similar to the worldview underlying Western schooling. I have found that if
>
> I want to learn how best to teach children who may be different from me, then I
>
> must seek the advice of adults- teachers and parents- who are from the same
>
> culture as my students. (p. 102)

This may mean explaining the difference between traditionally spoken English

and slang, that traditionally spoken English represents the language of the culture of

power. This explanation would include an explanation of the ways in which different

cultures speak in different ways, none of which are incorrect or inherently wrong.

Rather, the need that students need to know how to operate within and utilize traditional

English to access the culture of power. Once they have accessed pathways into the

culture of power, they may use their own identities and cultural differences to discredit

and change the norms of this culture, to open it to more diverse understandings of identity.

In *Teaching to transgress*, hooks (1994) follows a similar framework for understanding race relations. In this text, hooks addresses the issue of color-blindness in schools and how this helps to perpetuate what Delpit (1995) names as the culture of power.

It is apparent that one of the primary reasons we have not experienced a revolution of values is that a culture of domination necessarily promotes addiction to lying and denial. That lying takes the presumably innocent form of many white people (and even some black folks) suggesting that racism does not exist anymore, and that conditions of social equality are solidly in place that would enable any black person who works hard to achieve economic self-sufficiency. (p.29)

In this quote, hooks suggests, much like Delpit, that we recognize our differences in the classroom. She calls for the embodiment of knowledge in the classroom, that individuals internalize and embody knowledge, and therefore produce it, in different ways according to their personal identities. These identities are composed of race, class, gender, and other social constructions. Acknowledging these differences in the embodiment of knowledge, hooks maintains, allows us to transgress boundaries that exist when we pretend that knowledge is value free.

Acknowledging that we are bodies in the classroom has been important for me…

The erasure of the body encourages us to think that we are listening to neutral,

objective facts, facts that are not particular to who is sharing the information.

(p.139)

In providing accesses to education across the social constructions of identity,

Ayers (2001) suggest that teachers become "bridge-builders", in which we come to

recognize each child individually. By forming this relationship with each individual

student, we know where to "lay the first plank" in order to help students learn the skills

and rules that will allow them access to the culture of power. In taking the time to

recognize that each student comes from a personal set of lived experiences and forming a

personal relationship with each student, rather than assuming a certain set of

characteristics, we validate their nonsynchronous identities, while at the same time giving

them the skills they need to access power. Like Delpit (1995), Ayers does not advocate a

particular approach to this process, but further recognizes the nonsynchrony of students

in each school and place in advocating for a community approach.

> Good schools do not follow a generic, one-size-fits-all approach to education, but
>
> rely instead on a community of people working together, figuring out how to
>
> solve problems and improve their school on a daily basis, and then gathering the
>
> freedom to act on their conclusions. Reform must be crafted school by school,
>
> from the bottom up, and school improvements is generally a matter for the school
>
> community itself. (p. 129)

The relationships between race and education serve as exemplars of the ways in

which power, identity, place, and school interact. Race, in its connectedness to other

aspects of identity, as well as its salience as an issue in identity politics, serves as a

valuable concept of identity through which to understand identity politics within school.

Historical and current approaches, such as those outlined above by Grant and Lei (2001),

reveal the different relationships between the ways in which identity politics in education

are directly related to experiences and exertions of power.

Opportunities and challenges to diversity in independent schools

The work of authors and educators such as Delpit (1995), hooks (1994), and

Ayers (2001) exemplify the benefits of approaching and exploring issues of race in

education from a nonsynchronous perspective. While public schools are more dependent

upon the national sentiment and politics of the moment, independent schools hold a

unique position in their potential to embrace a non-synchronous perspective. Their

structure and autonomy emphasize an individual and community-based approach to

pedagogy. Their recognition of the ways in which the lived experiences of students

affect and are affected by the school community already embraces many of the elements

advocated by the authors above.   However, a survey of their history and present

approaches to diversity reveal other barriers to becoming inclusive communities. The

current efforts of independent schools to become more diverse and inclusive reveal a

serious self-reflexivity and attention to these barriers.

The 1950s and the Civil Rights Movement had a profound effect on the character

of independent schools. In 1954, the Supreme Court ruling in *Brown v. Board of*

Education ended legal segregation. Although independent schools had traditionally

enrolled white, Protestant clientele, this was a result of the fact that it was this population

that could afford to pay tuition. However, during the Civil Rights Movement, there was a

significant increase in the number of independent schools founded out of fear of

interracial education and the end of segregation in the public school systems. The

establishment of these school as segregationist allowed many Southeners to avoid having

to be educated with racial minorities (Kraushaar, 1972, p.88). Walton (1981) notes that

between 1956 and 1971, a total of 92 new independent schools opened in the state of

Florida (p.75). However, the government worked to subdue this pattern. The U.S.

government claimed that based on the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Supreme Court

decision in *Green v. Connally*, the Internal Revenue Service must require proof that

schools were engaging in nondiscriminatory policies in order to qualify for tax

exemptions (Walton, p.81). Given that tax exemption is an important financial

consideration in the welfare of independent schools, this decision did curb the

development of such school in order to avoid integration and forced schools that were

founded with such a mission to either close or become inclusive of racial diversity.

Despite the establishment of some independent schools as an avoidance of

integration, there was acknowledgement of the benefits of racial diversity in many

independent schools during the 1950s and 60s. Orsini (2003) sites the findings of the

landmark study of independent schools by Kraushaar (1972) that investigated diversity

and inclusivity.

> …[I]n the NAIS "Minority Group Survey" for 1969-70, out of 770 member
>
> schools, 752 responded, and 730 stated they had an open enrollment policy,
>
> although of these, 99 had never enrolled a Black student. The 595 member
>
> schools with Black students admitted 7,617 Black students. It is significant and
>
> hopeful that the number is more than twice the number admitted in 1966-67. (p.
>
> 42).

A review of early editions of the publication *Independent School Bulletin* reveal an attention to the issue of race and diversity. An excerpt from a 1949 edition advertises a conference entitled, "Colored Students Are an Asset" (Barbieri, 2006, p.77). There are also specific comments on the difficulty of including racially diverse students within independent schools. Barbieri points out an excerpt from a 1969 edition that expresses these difficulties.

> As everyone else did, we assumed that a black could fit into our school in much
> the same manner that other minority or disadvantaged students would… What we
> did not understand was that this involved a tremendous sacrifice on the Negro's
> part (unbeknownst even to him) in terms of his own psychology and his search for
> identity… We thought we were doing them a favor. In reality, we probably did as
> much harm as good. (p.79)

As these excerpts point out, independent schools have long been attentive to the benefits and difficulties associated with diversity. They reflect the previous attempts of independent schools to approach race from a multicultural approach that was essentialist. While not so naïve to the difficulties and barriers that accompany diversifying a traditionally white institution, independent schools continue to express the responsibility to open their doors and invite a diverse student body. The next section explores the creation and existence of Historically Black Institutions and Free Schools, particular types of independent schools, although they do not usually recognize themselves within the terms or in affiliation to NAIS. Their history can be seen as one result of the ways in which African-Americans striving for educational equality have sought to overcome some of the above-mentioned obstacles in public and independent schooling.

The Free School movement and Black Independent Schools

There exist independent schools which are distinct types of independent school, often not affiliated with NAIS or not desiring to be so affiliated. Two types of these that are pertinent to the discussion of race are Historically Black Institutions (HBI) and Free Schools. Historically Black Institutions began in the early 1800s, as freed slaves searched for ways to gain quality educational opportunities for their children that also did not require they assimilate to European-American values. Many HBIs in existence today have their roots in these schools started in the early and mid nineteenth century. However, there was also a resurgence of HBIs during and after the Civil Rights Movement, as integration efforts often meant a loss of the benefits of community schools that met the particular needs of African-Americans and provided students with African-American teachers and role models (Ravitch, 2000). Free Schools were founded with a similar purpose, beginning during the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s and desegregation movements. Often when school districts were desegregated, African-American and other minority children did not receive fair and equal treatment, and were often treated worse than in segregated public schools in which they were taught by African-American teachers who sought to empower their students.

Jonathan Kozol (1972) began a Free School in 1966 and discusses the purposes, benefits and difficulties in such schools in his text *Free schools*. Kozol defines these schools as an ideological counterpart to the independent schools in rural areas, which he viewed as a retreat from urban life and its problems. Criticizing these institutions, Kozol states,

Least conscionable is when the people who are laboring and living in these

schools [country, rural Free Schools] describe themselves as revolutionaries…

They would do well in fact to subsidize these schools and to covertly channel

resources to their benefactors and supporters, for they are an ideal drain on

activism and the perfect way to sidetrack ethical men from dangerous behavior.

(p.12)

Whereas Kozol envisioned such rural, independent schools as evading social

reality, the Free School movement developed in direct response to the difficulties and

troubles in an increasingly pluralistic society and school system, intending to address

these social realities directly. These schools were originally developed in order to

address the needs of African-American, mainly poor, students who were not being served

well in the public schools.

I am, then, speaking for the most part about Free Schools – outside the public

education system, outside of the white man's counter-culture, inside cities, in

direct contact with the needs and urgencies of those among the poor, the black,

who have been most victimized by public education, as little publicized as

possible, and very small. (p.16)

These schools, independent from the public school system, sought to address the

needs of urban, minority youth. Their experiences in public schooling indicated a

disregard for cultural differences and an expectation to conform to "white-people"

standards that were seen and understood as damaging in the eyes of many African-

American students, parents, and educators.

Ironically, those involved in the creation of Free Schools were often ideologically opposed to the idea of private education. Graubard (1972) describes this irony in that Free Schools were seen by their founders as the only way to ensure that they would be free from governmental interference.

> The people who start free schools are generally not in the group that traditionally has supported private schools for reasons of social position or social mobility. By the very nature of the free school philosophy, it could be safely inferred that most people drawn to free schools are liberal to radical in their political, social, and /or cultural orientations. (p.44)

Despite the irony of the lack of support of public education and the disdain for traditional private education amongst the founders of Free Schools, the structure and philosophic foundations of these schools share some similarities with other types of independent schools that are important in understanding their creation and success.

Free Schools were and are founded most frequently by groups of individuals who feel that they are unjustly served by public education and that in order to address the educational wants and needs of their students, they must create an independent institution in which they will be free from governmental interference. This group of individuals is usually relatively small, and wishes to keep their community small in order to insure shared and common values and perspectives. These institutions are set up as non-profit organizations and operate from tuition and donations, much like traditional independent schools and those part of NAIS. However, as Graubard (1972) describes, the effort to be as inclusive as possible led to tuition often being based upon a sliding scale in order to avoid exclusion based on class.

The main source of income, as one would expect, is tuition… mainly on a sliding

scale… Usually people pay what they say they can afford and the hope is that

there will be enough high tuition payers to balance the people who can pay little

or nothing. This is important since free schools do not want to be elite private

schools providing a special form of education for the class of people who can

afford to pay the very high expenses characteristic of most traditional private

schools. The normal sliding tuition range is about 0 to $800. (p.42)

Due to their independent structure and philosophy, Free Schools have met and

continue to meet the needs of many of their patrons. Graubard quotes an African-

American student describing his experiences during the second week of attendance at a

Free School in Oakland California in the 1960s stated,

Racism is a heavy thing and so far this has occupied the main interest in this new

school. People on their own trip were many times forced to let reality come to

their heads. Brothers and sisters ran-it-down since from here is where revolution

began, comes and will come, jive, bullshit, put-ons, fronts, and other devices for

surviving in today's society exist prevalently and will continue to exist but the

communication is becoming more down-to-earth and hopefully will continue to

do so. (p.59)

A teacher in the same school compared the perspectives and experiences of

students in public schools and the Free School stating,

These students in general feel cramped, stifled, or overprotected by restrictive

public high schools. They feel denied a "real" or relevant role in society, and

reject the "abstractions" and academic focus of high school…

Such students demand a holistic approach to their education, and involvement and

depth in their learning experiences and personal relationships. Eager to

experiment and engage in real tasks, they prefer to do their own thing rather than

study what others have done or made. (p.70)

Although different in their origination from many of the traditional private

schools, Free Schools represent a sector of independent schools, and are similar in

structure and governance. These schools demonstrate the ways in which independent

schools, due to their communal connections and involvement, as well as to shared desires

for and perspectives of education among patrons, often address student needs and serve

students more individually and justly than large public schools that are more standardized

and bureaucratic in their approaches to curriculum and education.

Freedoms to overcome

Presently, like all institutions and schools more specifically, independent schools

face many obstacles in creating inclusive environments that honor and use their power

respectfully with regards to issues of identity politics. However, independent schools

embody a unique position in their ability to approach and explore the relationships

between race and education. Their autonomous structures, sense of commitment to their

community, and relatively small student bodies allow them to approach race from a

nonsynchronous perspective. Indeed, this is the current approach to race and diversity

within independent schools and represents a move away from previous essentialist

approaches to multiculturalism. Taking note of this transition, Patrick Bassett (2003),

current president of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS), explains

the different between previous approaches and the current approach advocated by the

agency, Appreciative Inquiry (AI).

>The essence of the approach is to forsake the old way of assessing strengths and
>
>weaknesses, what AI calls the "deficit discourse"… It seems to me that this AI
>
>approach- this emphasis on appreciative inquiry- can be applied to our efforts to
>
>improve the experience of students of color. Independent school educators have a
>
>great deal of knowledge regarding every aspect of education. Still, we have much
>
>to learn from students, particularly students of color whose experiences don't
>
>always match our intent. (p.8)

The approach of appreciative inquiry seems to contrast substantially with the

movement towards national standards and testing within public schools. As will be

explored in the next chapter, national standards seem to disregard the particularities of

students' individual lives, needs, and experiences. The movement towards Appreciative

Inquiry in independent schools points towards a very different philosophy and approach

to schooling. It also points to a postmodern understanding of identity. The approach

does not assume the pre-existence of a particular set of views or behaviors based upon

some measurable or observable criteria. Rather, it advocates an openness to simply listen

to the perspective of the other, understanding that the characteristic is always embodied

within the individual and his/her lived experiences. Yet, as Bassett notes, independent

schools do still have much to learn about inclusivity and diversity of its racially and

ethnically diverse students. There are barriers to achieving diversity that are appreciated

and respected in independent schools. Just as their structure and organization permits a

nonsynchronous approach to issues of race, it also presents certain barriers. Barriers such

as tuition, financial aid, student body composition, ethos, and cultural norms all interact

to make access to independent schools difficult and/or undesirable for many non-White

students. These barriers are an inherent part of independent schools that interact in

unique ways within each school, and make it difficult for those who are not already a part

of such communities to transition into them.

Independent schools are independent because they receive all their funding

privately, mainly through tuition. While many schools offer substantial financial aid

packages, some specifically to recruit minority students, the presence of a tuition-paying

body impacts the ethos of the school community. Brand-name clothes and nice cars are a

common sight on many independent school campuses. Even if students do not exclude

other students who do not/cannot have these commodities, those without often do not feel

comfortable because of their profound differences. There is also a culture of traditional

norms on many campuses, most students coming from traditional homes where these

norms are instilled from early childhood. Students from other cultures and non-

traditional homes can feel as if their origins are deficient simply by being present in a

somewhat homogenous environment.

Arrastia (2003), an African-American independent school teacher reflects on her

experiences as a minority student in an independent school.

No matter how much I wanted to, I was never ever really able to master the sort of

complaisance that this polite society implicitly required and requested for its

proper functioning. And so often, because the messages about these sorts of

cultural rules were unspoken, I ended up feeling unsuited, inappropriate,

improper, and unbefitting of the kind of academic and social atmosphere of which

I was being granted the privilege to partake. (p. 102)

A recent study of the experiences of African-American (Arrington, Hall &

Stevenson, 2003) students in independent schools reveal similar experiences to those of

Arrastia stated above. While most felt that educators and peers did not intentionally

perpetuate racist attitudes or intentions, 75% still felt that "they had to make a special

effort to fit into their school communities" (p.12). Some minorities choose not to pursue

alternative avenues to access independent school education because of this relative

cultural homogeneity in many schools, however unintentional it may be. Some

minorities feel that public schools, especially those that draw from integrated and

districting policies that cross socio-economic borders, allow students to experience a

wide variety of diverse cultures and backgrounds.

Independent schools, as a group, are cognizant of the way in which the

administrators and teachers at each school help shape the community and curriculum.

This is one of the unique characteristics of the autonomy of independent schools. Being

aware of this, as well as the barriers to helping students from racially diverse background

feel comfortable and supported, are attempting to recruit more racially diverse teachers.

White teachers in independent schools were often raised within homes and come

from backgrounds similar to those of their students. This is, in part, why they are

attracted to independent schools. However, this often leads to an unintentional

perpetuation of racist practices by a color-blind attitude that avoids addressing the issue

of student diversity.

From our interviews with white teachers, it seemed clear that, in the interest of

treating all students equally, many of them don't want to focus on racial and

cultural diversity. But, ultimately, this view tends to trivialize diversity as being

something that is just "skin deep,"… These messages the "myth of sameness",

which discourages a critique of how race may impact who is deemed to be

successful in school, how school may be experienced differently by students

based on the community membership, and what members of the entire school

community learn about people different from themselves. (Arrington, Hall, &

Stevenson, 2003, p.14).

Kane (2003) has studied the movement to recruit and retain a more diverse

teaching staff in independent schools and comments on the crucial presence these

educators have in creating more accepting and diverse communities.

One frequently noted fact is that teachers of color are crucial as role models for

students of color. Their presence can prevent students of color from experiencing

diminished levels of aspiration or from feeling that the entire educational

endeavor is driven by White values and focused on White students. (p. 10)

However, independent schools often have trouble recruiting and retaining racially

diverse teachers for much of the same reason that they do with students. As Kane

documents, these teachers often feel as those the exemplar or poster-child of diversity

efforts, a role that is difficult to carry. Many teachers of minority or diverse backgrounds

often choose to serve within public schools for the same reasons that many students

choose not to access alternative entrance to independent schools. Teachers who do carry

these roles as exemplars of diversity within independent schools do so out of

commitment to opening an avenue of a (sometimes) privileged education to students who are racially diverse. Conferences such as the NAIS People of Color conference help to provide such collegial support in an environment that can be isolating at times for racially diverse educators.

The lived experiences of students and faculty in independent schools represented above highlight both the progress of and obstacles to progress these schools encounter with regard to curricular respect and attention to identity politics. These efforts demonstrate the desire of independent schools to diversify their school communities in ways that are supportive to all members. There are schools that have made great strides in becoming inclusive communities. Kane and Orsini (2003) highlight one such school, Heights Academy, in New York City. The school is committed to "match the dream" of Martin Luther King, Jr. The school has a student body that is 30% African-American, and 23% of the student body is composed of other minorities.   The school has a faculty that is 35% that are of color, and a diverse board of trustees. Through faculty development and a diverse curriculum (p. 121-123).   However, schools such as Heights Academcy also point to the many places in which independent schools still have much work to do.

The power in independent schools is that they represent a site of opportunity for exploring relationships of race and education. They are autonomous, small, closely knit communities that can personalize curriculum to help support each student. Their smallness allows them the organization and size to get to know each community member as an individual with unique characteristics. As demonstrated through the studies and attention to diversity and inclusiveness, independent schools are aware of these unique

features and their ability to approach race relationships from a nonsynchronous

perspective. More importantly, these studies and works show a willingness to attend to

the issues of power and identity politics within independent schools, a willingness that is

denied in many ways in the standardized approaches to education present in the

accountability policies and movements of public schools, specifically the No Child Left

Behind Act.

Studies of approaches to race, identity, and education also continue to trouble the

private/public divide. They call attention to the ways in which the private of identity is

entangled within the public of curriculum and communities in schools, independent and

public alike. They emphasize the interdependency of private and public noted by Bakhtin

(1986).

Utterances are not indifferent to one another, and are not self-sufficient: they are

aware of and mutually reflect one another. These mutual reflections determine

their character. Each utterance is filled with echoes and reverberations of the

other utterances to which it is related by the community of the sphere of speech

communications. (p.91)

Students and teachers carry their private experiences into the public of the

curriculum when they enter schools, independent or public. The private organization of

independent schools is situated within the larger communities and public and have a

mutually influential relationship. Public schools intersect with the private lives of

individuals. These studies (re)present ways in which the influence of the other is always

and already present in our experiences, and the mutual influence on the privately and

publicly lived experiences of students and teachers, making it difficult to draw lines where one ends and the other begins.

Independent schools, as private institutions, have much to offer to all members of their public community as a result of their unique and autonomous characteristics as schools. The work of various independent schools, educators, and the NAIS demonstrates a commitment to diversity and inclusiveness that does approach race from a nonsynchronous perspective. This work also points to the many barriers to achieving diversity, and with time these barriers will undoubtedly change form yet still remain present. The continued commitment of independent schools to attention through an approach of Appreciative Inquiry between race and education is promising. The approach of independent schools within their history reveals a pattern of understanding of race that is not divorced from society, and attention to this pattern will help to maintain a nonsynchronous approach that does not reduce race and diversity to an essentialist understanding. Such an approach will never result in a work that is done, but will help to maintain an open dialogue about the relationship between race and education. The nonsynchrony of this dialogue ensures that it will never be finished, evading a permanence of the public/private divide. The troubling of this divide is continued in the next chapter in examining the intersection of independent and public schools around policies of standardization historically and presently, and the ways in which nonsynchrony is addressed and ignored within movements of accountability.

CHAPTER 5: THE PRIVATE VALUATION OF THE PUBLIC AS LIVED IN CURRICULUM

But standards involve much more than determination of what knowledge is of most worth; they also involve social and cultural differences, and they frequently serve as symbols and surrogates for those differences. (Cremin, 1990, p.9)

Accountability is an oft-employed term in the present day rhetoric inclusive of criticisms and discussions around the potential, or lack thereof, of education in the United States. Accountability seems like the new buzzword in education, taking on a multiplicity of meanings and connotations depending upon the purposes for which it is employed. Despite the multiplicity of meanings that the term can communicate, the opening quote reminds us that the meanings of accountability, as well as its usual partner in crime, standards, is often used as an ill-disguised representation of a certain set of values and/or beliefs that extend well beyond the schoolyard.

Accountability, and the desire or attempt to achieve it through a set of standards, is always tied to larger societal issues about what the purpose of education is within society, and how those outcomes can be best achieved. Implicit in the discourse surrounding accountability in schools is an expression of what the purposes of schools are, how these purposes are expressed and the imagined results in achieving these purposes, and how these results are measured or demonstrated. As Cremin (1990) notes in the opening quote, these implicit expressions do not originate solely within or from the four walls of the school building, but are tied to larger differences and beliefs within different sectors of society and different cultures.

Although accountability has become a more utilized term in common rhetoric surrounding education recently, it is and always has been an integral aspect of education,

whether recognized or not. Its manifestation within education in the United States has been evidenced since the inception of formalized education, beginning with the local town schools. As noted in Chapter 3, these schools were accountable directly to their patrons for the content and methodology of their curriculum. In this chapter, I examine and explore some of the different ways in which public schools and independent schools have been held accountable, to whom they have been accountable, and the values that are communicated through these movements. This exploration spans various movements from the recommendations of the Committee of Ten to the No Child Left Behind Act.

> For all the centralizing tendencies in American schooling- from federal mandates to regional accrediting association guidelines to standardized tests and textbooks- the experience students have in one school will differ from the experience they have in another, whatever the formal curriculum indicates might be going on; and the standards by which we judge those experiences will from local realities… The good school…is good in its context. (Cremin, 1990, p.44)

As noted by Cremin, the good school is only good within a particular context. The definition of "good" and how this "good" is achieved are derived from and reflective of, as well as upon, a particular culture within the school and larger society. In this chapter, I continue to trouble the private/public distinction by exploring the ways in which accountability, standards, values, and cultures are intertwined and interrelated. Through an exploration of the values manifested within the calls for and implementation of various accountability movements, as well as the standards implemented to achieve accountability, I reflect upon the ways in which private values are inseparable from and revealed within both the public and the private realm. As these private values are

expressed in *utterances* in the Bakhtinian (1981) sense, they serve "as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear. The processes for centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect" (p. 272) and the private becomes public, which then becomes private. This exploration and troubling of the private/public distinction points to the inability to create a value free curriculum, despite the arguments for that in the most recent national accountability movements. It argues for an examination of curricula and the development of curricula with an acute awareness of the context in which they are developed.

Crisis or continuum?

If there is a crisis in American schooling, it is not the crisis of putative mediocrity and decline charged at the recent reports but rather the crisis inherent in balancing this tremendous variety of demands Americans have made on their schools and colleges- of crafting curricula that take account of the needs of a modern society at the same time that they make provisions for the extraordinary diversity of America's young people...

(Cremin, 1990, p.45)

The current discussions surrounding accountability are often associated with a sense of a present or impending crisis- schools are "failing", students are unprepared, reform is imperative. As Cremin alludes to above, these discussions of accountability and the judgment that there is (or will be in the near future) a crisis within our nation's schools has much to do with what is expected from schools, that is how the purposes of school are understood within their relationship to the larger culture and other social institutions. Accountability has everything to do with how we define and understand those purposes, as this delineates exactly what schools are held accountable or

responsible for achieving. The means by which to achieve these purposes is another component of accountability, and these reflect beliefs about how students learn and human nature more generally. The defining and understanding of the purposes of school, as well the ways in which we can achieve these purposes, become infinitely more complex when we reflect on the intricate ways which this is and has been tied to current social and cultural movements and goals.

One could easily replace "modern" in the quote above with our now postmodern society, and the predicament would still be present, perhaps more so. Schools and colleges are called to create curricula (or mandated to implement it) that is in preparation for student's adult lives in a postmodern society. However, more than in modernism, this seems a paradoxical task at best, in that there is no one postmodern ideal or social perspective, but it is rather represented as a plethora of ideals and perspectives. In this chapter, I will explore and trace the ways in which the purposes of schools have been understood in various accountability movements during the formation of formal schooling in the United States, and how these have incorporated an understanding of how students learn. The discussions below center primarily on secondary education, as this is the last stage of education truly open and public (in a monetary sense) to all students. It is therefore a capstone of sorts, and is where the demand for certain achievements is focused. However, it is recognized throughout the discussion that accountability measures and policies always have a trickle-down effect and an implementation or demand for a certain result is always the culmination of every stage leading up to that point.

Schools have always been held accountable. During the colonial period, with the development of local town schools, as well as the rarer academy or grammar school, schools were accountable to their patrons. The local communities in which these schools existed determined the purpose of their school, molding the curriculum and expectations of each school to the local community's needs and desires. However, as independence ensued and the Revolutionary War transpired, there was growing discussion of schools as one of many vehicles to achieve many of the goals for the new nation. Debate about how schools might be used to achieve a sense of national identity occurred, and different texts and materials were distributed and employed in schools to create in students some of this patriotic affiliation.

> Political theorists and policy makers were therefore concerned not only with protecting liberty, for which the Revolution had been fought, but also with maintaining order, without which all might be lost. Education could play an important role in reconciling freedom and order… A thoroughly American curriculum would help unify the language and culture of the new nation and wean America away from a corrupt Europe. (Kaestle, 1983, p.5-6)

A number of national leaders during this era proposed initiatives to create a system of schools for the nation that were systematized to a certain extent in order to protect the freedom of the country as well as confer the new American culture and values to the young.   In 1749, Benjamin Franklin expounded upon the potential benefits of using school to improve and produce a citizenry with a particular set of characteristics.

> With the whole should be constantly inculcated and cultivated that benignity of mind, which shows itself in search for and seizing every opportunity to serve and

to oblige; and is the foundation of what is called good breading; highly useful to the possessor, and most agreeable to all. (Franklin, 1993, p.23)

In 1780, Thomas Jefferson proposed the Virginia School Bill to use tax money to fund schools in the state in order to support what he viewed as one of the most powerful means by which to create an "educated" citizenry, producing the rational thought and intellectual tools to participate in a democracy (Kaestle, 1983, p.9). Although the bill was turned down then and again in 1817, the proposals and testimonies of Jefferson and Franklin are representative of an important change in the ways in which schools were regarded on a national level. The Revolutionary Era served as a turning point during which the relative disregard for the character and curriculum of locally run and governed schools dissolved and there was a national focus on the ways in which education could help achieve national goals and unity. It is within the proposals of Franklin and Jefferson that we see a connection between accountability and the larger societal goals, as well as the understandings of human nature. Implicit within both proposals is a communication that one of the primary purposes of schools ought to be to create educated citizenry capable of participating in a democracy. Each of these leaders, as well as others at the time, had differing views of what particular skills or subject matter might create that citizenry, but the general belief that schools possessed the ability to achieve this purpose reflected a belief an Enlightenment view of youth. The belief that youth had a general desire to want the "good" in society, as well as that youth were born with an innate ability for reason and rational thought that simply needed to be developed, were also implicit understandings within the proposals of Franklin, Jefferson, and other national leaders.

The interior design of schooling and the furniture of the mind

Concurrently, communities grew and schools proliferated, as well as colleges and universities. As immigration increased, schools remained a focal point for those who feared that new populations and their respective cultures threatened the continued development of a unified national culture.

This proliferation of schools and colleges coupled with the waves of immigration, reopened the discussion of how schools could be used to prepare citizens for democratic participation in a still young nation. Secondary schools, primarily Latin schools and academies, were beginning to explore the expansion of curriculum in order to meet the needs of a broader range of students. How this expansion could and should be guided, as well as its acceptance at the collegiate level, was an increasing concern.

> In response to an expanding population and national concerns with creating a citizenry worthy of participation in the new republic, local academies, which were the preparatory school at the time for the colleges, began to teach a variety of practical subjects, such as surveying, and new professional schools in commerce, agriculture, and mechanics likewise began to offer curricula much different from the traditional classical and scientific course of studies. The result was growing pressure on American colleges to expand their curriculum… (Willis, Schubert, R. Bullough, Kridel, & Holton, 1993, p.25)

Implicit in the discussion about schools' capacities to influence the national culture was the belief that a particular type of society could be attained through the intentional uses of schools and other institutions.

The acceptance of the notion of malleability of character provided the basis in the early nineteenth century for the belief that the good society could be created through schooling and other institutional changes. (Spring, 2001, p. 67)

This belief stemmed and drew support from the notion of faculty psychology or mental-disciplinarianism. The broadly accepted understanding of human development and learning held that there were various faculties, or furniture, of the mind that could be arranged and improved through the use of the environment and stimuli. Therefore, creating the proper learning environment for students and exposing them to the right stimuli was an essential step in shaping the future character and culture of a generation. With the right environment and materials, one could use schooling as an integral step in developing a particular culture and the ideal democratic society.

Also, discipline and exercise of the various faculties of the mind were considered necessary for their proper development. This type of reasoning would often appear in educational reports…. Faculty psychology in all its various forms reflected the growing belief in the perfectibility of the human being. (Spring, 2001, p. 68)

Initially, much of the discussion about the intentional purposes and uses for schooling on a national level came from colleges and universities. One of the most well-known of reports that addressed what schools and colleges should be teaching came in the form of the Yale Report of 1828. This report came in the midst of growth in the number of colleges and universities, as newly formed, as well as more established institutions, searched for a standard by which to develop and judge their programs in preparing graduates for participation in the democratic ideal in the making. The report

defended a traditional study (classical languages/studies and natural sciences) in response

to calls for more practical, specialized, or scientifically-oriented curricula. The belief in

faculty psychology or mental-disciplinarianism was the essential defense of the

traditional study at the post-secondary level.

> The most famous document of the nineteenth-century mental disciplinarianism
>
> was the report of the Yale faculty in 1828, essentially an impassioned defense of
>
> traditional education and humanistic values in the face of possible intrusions by
>
> the natural sciences and practical subjects. The report recognized two main
>
> functions of education, 'the *discipline* and the *furniture* of the mind'. (Kliebard,
>
> 1995, p.5)

The Yale Report defended the traditional course of study in colleges as the most

superior form of exercising and developing the different faculties of reason and the

furniture of the mind. This was to be done in a traditional environment, with the college

environment serving as a surrogate family environment.

> What then is the appropriate object of a college?... [I]f we have not greatly
>
> misapprehended the design of the patrons and guardians of this college, its object
>
> is to LAY THE FOUNDATION of a SUPERIOR EDUCATION: and this is to be
>
> done, at a period of life when a substitute must be provided for parental
>
> superintendence. (Faculty of Yale College, 1993, p.28)

The Yale Report serves as an early example for the influence of the

standardization of the curriculum. It provided a rather clear message to those at the

secondary level wishing to expand their curriculum without jeopardizing their students'

success at the collegiate level.   At the time of the report, the national discussion on the

purposes and potential of schooling in the development of a national culture or an ideal democracy left much to be articulated. What were the values and beliefs that would lead to an ideal democracy? Whose right was it to decide upon these values? How could/should these values be communicated and fostered within schools?

The Yale Report served as one of the first and more well-known of many such responses to these questions. It represented one articulation of the private values and beliefs of an institution. The report also demonstrated the inseparable link between the private and the public. The report demonstrates a private acceptance of Yale College of the publicly held faith in the notion of faculty psychology and mental-disciplinarianism. It served as a forceful and very public message about how collegiate curricula should be standardized and to whom the secondary should be held accountable on the basis of privately held beliefs, illustrating the lack of distinction and inseparability of the public and private arenas in curriculum development.

The Common School Movement

Despite its import and publicity, the Yale Report did not satisfy all those who were prompting the national discussion of questions pertaining to the uses and purposes of schooling. Only a few years after the publication of the document marked the beginnings of the Common School Movement. Leaders and proponents of the movement argued for a much greater extent of standardization and accountability in schools, to be implemented and regulated by a hitherto unprecedented amount of government involvement in schooling.

The Common School Movement incorporated earlier beliefs in the malleability of the human character as well as the basic tenets of faculty psychology. However, the

movement was important in its emphasis on the use of public regulation by the government to implement these beliefs in public institutions.

>During the 1830s and 1840s, the common school movement put into practice many of the educational ideas of previous generations… For common school advocates, education would be the key to creating the good society. The major difference between schools before and after the common school movement were their goals. The common school was to be administered by state and local governments for the purpose of achieving public goals, such as remedying social, political, and economic problems. (Spring, 2001, p. 103)

>Spring (2001) outlines three distinctive features of the Common School Movement. The first of these was the proposal to have students from various backgrounds and cultures within the same schools and classes. The second distinctive feature was the use of a public institution (schools) for governmental purposes. The last feature that was unique to the Common School Movement was the "creation of state agencies to control local schools in order to carry out government, social, political and economic policies" (p.104).

Leaders of the Common School Movement, notably Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, communicated the belief in the imperative for the creation of a common, national system of schooling for all students in order to achieve national goals. However, Mann had difficulty defining what type of schooling, aside from common and open to all, would achieve national goals. From the ambiguity and conflict inherent in some of his answers, one wonders whether he was not aware of the paradox in the goals of a free society of individuals in a democracy and the desire to shape individuals in governmental

and public interests. Mann envisioned the control of schools being left to public, representative agencies, a contrast from the earlier reliance on schoolmen. Cremin (1961) describes the ambiguity in the articulation of the process of common schools in meeting seemingly conflicting goals.

> Through state legislatures and local boards of education, popularly elected representatives rather than professional schoolmen would exercise ultimate oversight. The manifest reason was that public supervision must follow public support, and this, of course, was reason enough. Yet the relationship went far deeper. For by the artful device of lay control the public was entrusted with the continuing definition of the public philosophy taught its children. When Mann himself set out to define this philosophy, what emerged was a not uncommon nineteenth-century blend of natural law, faith in progress, capitalistic morality, and liberal Protestantism. But Mann's own definition is less important than the enterprise he set in motion… (p. 10)

Cremin notes that while Mann did much to articulate and publicize his own views, the idea of using schools to achieve governmental and public purposes had the more lasting impact than any particular personal beliefs of Mann in the content or shape of the curriculum. Cremin notes that the fight for a free and public system of education was bitter and was not resolved on a national level for nearly 25 years after Mann's first appeals (p.13).

Part of the debate that ensued around the development of public schooling involved the disagreement on what form and content was best developed and implemented for shaping the future character of students. Many felt uneasy about

relenting control to develop, implement, and supervise seemingly privately decided views in a democratic society to a publicly controlled institution. This was particularly important amongst various religious groups, and the Common School Movement and development of public schooling actually spurred the creation of additional forms of private schooling.

> In Horace Mann's grand design the public schools were to be all things to all kinds of children. The common school was not only to provide a good education in secular subjects, it was to shape in the minds of the young a religiously rooted common value system forming the moral bedrock of American republicanism. Mann… believed that the schools could instruct the young in religion without being sectarian. But as experience was to show, it was too thin a line to be held for long…. It was inevitable that the public schools could not satisfy families that believed deeply in the importance of brining up their children in the tenets and special culture of a particular faith…. And so the unsolvable issue of religion in the public schools became an added incentive for Protestants, Catholics, and, later, for Jews to build their own schools in which the true faith could be transmitted. (Kraushaar, 1972, p.21)

As noted in Chapter 3, many strong advocates of the Common School movement protested the co-existence of private and public schools. Those opposed to private schooling questioned how a unified, national culture could be shaped and formed in youth if they were not exposed to a common curriculum. Although the Dartmouth College Case of 1819 had set a precedent for the distinction between public and private schools on the grounds that privately owned institutions could not be made to serve

governmental purposes (Spring, 2001, p.80), the movement for and creation of public schooling seemed to reignite this debate. Several states tried to enforce laws outlawing private and denominational schools, with no permanent resolution until of the Supreme Court case of *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, in which it was ruled that parents had the right to send their children to private schools (Kraushaar, 1972, p. 22).

The Common School Movement and the creation of government-legislated public schooling was a monumental turning point in the understanding of school standardization and accountability. Schools, public and private, until this point had been held accountable largely only to their own constituents and localities. Secondary schools had been also held accountable to a certain extent by college entrance requirements, yet the degree to which they implemented the standards expected by various colleges was largely decided by the school. While there was a general understanding and belief in the use of schooling to serve the public good, the Common School Movement served as an impetus to make this conversation public on a national level. The debates and developments of the movement illustrate the ambiguity with regards to where the line can and should be drawn between public and private interests and values. Mann's ambiguity in being able to articulate particulars about the content of curriculum in public schools; the debates over how public control of schooling could and should be implemented; the question of the conflict between a free society and a common, dictated curriculum; and the battle over the place of private schooling in a democratic republic all were representative of the ways in which the public and the private arenas were mutually influential to the other and the unsuccessful attempts to draw distinctions between the two. The continuation of

these same debates into later years and movements in schooling, even into the present, indicates a inseparability between the private and public spheres.

The Committee of Ten and the Cardinal Principles Report

With the proliferation of public schools, the question of college standards and requirements, as well as the implications in secondary school curriculum, again prompted questions and discussions. In the 1890s, the National Education Association (NEA) put together the Committee of Ten on Secondary Education to address the growing disparity between different college and university expectations for students who matriculated from high school programs. Chaired by Charles Elliot, this committee could not advocate a certain curriculum or guideline for developing curriculum at the secondary level without articulating values and purposes of education to justify their guidelines.

> Although the National Education Association's Committee of Ten was appointed in 1892 originally to deal with another issue, the rather mundane problem of uniform college entrance requirements, their work and their recommendations inevitably were affected by the curricular implications of the growing demand by adolescents and their parents for a secondary school education. The immediate impetus for creating the Committee in the first place was that high school principals had been long bewailing the fact that different colleges were prescribing different entrance requirements and, since about half of the high school graduating classes went on to college… it became exceedingly difficult to prepare so many students differently depending on their choice of college. (Kliebard, 1995, p. 8)

The committee recommended that four courses of study be available to the

secondary education student. These could be understood as classical, Latin-scientific,

modern languages, and English. While not advocating matriculation to college for all

students, or even most students, the report did advocate that the best preparation for life

in a democratic society was the same curriculum that would prepare them for college

study.

> The secondary schools of the United States, taken as a whole, do not exist for the
>
> purpose of preparing boys and girls for colleges. Only an insignificant percentage
>
> of the graduates of these schools go to colleges or scientific schools. Their main
>
> function is to prepare for the duties of life that small proportion of all the children
>
> in the country… who show themselves able to profit by an education prolonged to
>
> the eighteenth year, and whose school program intended for national use must
>
> therefore be made for those children whose education is not pursued beyond the
>
> secondary. The preparation of a few pupils for college or scientific school should
>
> in the ordinary secondary school be the incidental, and the principal object. At
>
> the same time, it is obviously desirable that the colleges and scientific schools
>
> should be accessible to all boys and girls who have completed creditably the
>
> secondary school course… (NEA, 1993, p.93)

The major distinction between the Report of the Committee of Ten and that of the

Yale Report issued decades earlier was the acceptance of more variety in a college-

preparatory curriculum. While the Yale Report insisted upon the importance of a

classical or traditional course of study, the Committee of Ten recognized the need for

more variety in the secondary and collegiate curriculum as more students sought to attain high school and college diplomas for a variety of purposes.

Yet, the Committee of Ten's report did little to settle the question between the relationship of high schools and colleges, and the continuing disagreement between secondary school constituents and educators and those at the collegiate level led to another investigation by the Bureau of Education in the early 1900's. The result was the report of Cardinal Principles, issued in 1918. While acknowledged to some degree within the report by the Committee of Ten, the Cardinal Principles report thoroughly acknowledge the ways in which curriculum was an articulation and manifestation of values concerning human nature, the nature of learning, values, and the purposes of schooling.

> Unlike the Committee of Ten report, where the four programs of study represented the heart of the recommendations, the Cardinal Principles Report centered on something beyond the curriculum itself. The curriculum became the instrument through which the aims were to be achieved. (Kliebard, 1995, p.98)

The report recognized the inherent difficulties in curriculum development and curricular change given its intrinsic link with personally and privately held beliefs and values. It acknowledged the ways in which contestation and debate over how the private beliefs should be manifested in public policy has the tendency to make change difficult and stagnant.

> Secondary education, however, like any other established agency of society, is conservative and tends to resist modification. Failure to make adjustments when the need arises leads to the necessity for extensive reorganization at irregular

intervals. The evidence is strong that such a comprehensive reorganization of

secondary education is imperative at the present time. (Bureau of Education,1993,

p.155)

The report argued for the diversification of the high school curriculum, as well as

that of college entrance requirements, in light of the growing numbers of students

attending secondary school. It reflected the commonly and publicly held value of social

efficiency made popular in 1890s by Joseph Mayer Rice. The high school represented

the potential to be more efficiently designed in the purpose of preparing increasing

numbers of students for an increasingly diverse society.

> The commission also used the rhetoric of social efficiency to justify the
>
> comprehensive high school, which, the commission argued, allowed for what it
>
> called the "two components of democracy"- specialization and unification.
>
> (Spring, 2001, p. 261)

The Cardinal Principles Report had a much more lasting impact on the

development and diversification of curriculum at the high school and collegiate levels,

continuing to serve as a standard for curricular development for decades after its

publication (Kliebard, 1995). The reports of the Committee of Ten and Cardinal

Principles did not only delineate and dictate standards to the public schools, although the

growth within this sector of schooling and the question of curriculum development in the

public high school is what prompted the investigations and resulting recommendations.

The reports of the Committee of Ten and Cardinal Principles continue the illustration of

the inseparability of accountability and values, or the mutuality of influence between the

private and public spheres. These reports also did much to influence the character of

private education, many independent schools in particular being progressive and college-preparatory schools, an influence that contributed to the call by the Progressive Education Association for the Eight-Year Study shortly thereafter. While the reports were commissioned at the beckoning of public secondary schools for some uniformity in college-entrance requirements, their dissemination and implementation thwarted the efforts of many independent schools that existed as alternatives to the public school. Many of the schools were using and teaching alternative and progressive approaches to education that had up until that time implemented independent curricula while still being able to send their graduates to respected universities and colleges.

The Eight-Year Study: experimentation as a mode of curricular development

In the face of increasing uniformity and standardization, the Progressive Education Association (PEA) commissioned a series of investigations into curriculum development in secondary schools. The most famous of the studies generated by this commission was the Eight-Year Study, led by Wilford Aikin. Although typically characterized as more uniformly implemented, the Eight-Year Study was a loosely organized research project that evolved and changed course throughout its implementation (Kridel & Bullough, 2007). The study was to investigate the development of the curriculum in secondary schooling and to challenge the supremacy of the Carnegie unit as a standard for curricular structure.

> During the 1930s, exploration and experimentation were hallmarks of progressive schools as teachers sought ways to continuously improve the educational experience for all youth. Commission leaders realized that to experiment meant breaking the hold of the Carnegie unit of secondary school curricula… This goal

came to represent the underlying mission of the project: to design experimental

programs "without compromising any student's chances of a successful college

education." Select high schools would experiment with the curriculum, and as

later decided, hundreds of their graduates would be followed into college; yet the

overall effort to better articulate instruction between colleges and high schools

was initiated to help *all youth* and not just those moving onto postsecondary

education. (Kridel & Bullough, 2007, p.5)

The study and its goals were particularly important to many independent schools,

many having been founded in the early twentieth century in the progressive spirit

(Kraushaar, 1972). The difficulty of these schools was in maintaining their experimental

and exploratory curricula in light of the standardization of the college entrance

requirements. Roughly thirty schools participated in the study (although not the same

thirty throughout the entire study), public and private, during which they were

encouraged to take "dramatic departures from common curricular practices" (Kridel &

Bullough, 2007, p. 5). Most colleges agreed to take these students without holding them

to the routine course credits and/or entrance examinations. Students accepted from the

schools participating and their success in college was followed as part of the College

Follow-up Study.

The study represented the belief of the PEA that there could be a variety in forms

of schooling that allowed students to exercise and develop their individual rights and

freedoms, basic tenets of a democratic ideal, while at the same time preparing them for

the next level of education and life. In Aiken's (1993) report on the study, he describes

most of the participating schools as embracing this belief.

Most of the participating schools, in cooperation with home and church, are trying

to meet this need ["something to live by"]. There are marked differences in their

attempts to help young people to find meaning for their lives…. None of the

schools attempts to impose a set of beliefs upon its students, but every school

recognizes its responsibility for helping young people in their search for design in

living (p.287).

The schools chosen for the study were encouraged to develop new approaches to

learning that met these criteria through teacher involvement in curriculum development

and open dialogue between colleges and high schools. The study and the schools evolved

throughout the course of the Eight-Year Study (which lasted more than eight years) and

some were more experimental than others. However, in the "Study within the Study", a

group of graduates' success in college from the most experimental schools were

compared with matches from more traditional programs.

In this sampling, the college success of 323 students was compared to traditional

school matchees as well as to students from other "progressive" schools; college

achievements of those graduates from the six least experimental Aikin

Commission high schools were also compiled. The graduates from the six most

experimental schools substantially outperformed their peers in terms of academic

averages and honors, intellectual traits, and personal and social responsibility.

(Kridel & Bullough, 2007, p.7)

In his final reports, Aikin (1993) writes,

It is proof of the pudding lies in these groups, and a good part of it does, then it

follows that the colleges got from the most experimental schools a higher

proportion of sound, effective college material than they did from the more

conventional schools in similar environments. (p. 295)

Although the results of the Eight-Year Study were criticized for the study's lack

of definitive structure and were then overlooked during national developments and World

War II, the study represented a counter-claim to the standardization of curriculum and

argued for accountability to be developed within schools to their own constituents. The

study demonstrated the ability for variety and freedom amongst secondary schools to

develop and implement curricula while still preparing individuals for further education

and meaningful participation in society.

Articulating private-public values in schooling

[There have] been three abiding characteristics of American education- first,

popularization, the tendency to make education widely available in forms that are

increasingly accessible to diverse peoples; second, multitudinous, the proliferation and

multiplication of institutions to provide that wide availability and that increasing

accessibility; and third, politicization, the effort to solve certain social problems

indirectly through education instead of directly through politics… the three in tandem

have marked American education uniquely.   (Cremin, 1990, p.vii-viii)

The three abiding characteristics Cremin notes above have been established since

the popularization and implementation of public schooling, in the mid-1800s. The

movements described above are only a few examples of many ways in which

accountability has been an integral part of education and schooling in the United States

since its creation. With the proliferation of colleges and schools and increasing numbers

of students in such institutions, the leaders and policy-makers in education during the first

half of the history of the United States faced a multitude of decisions regarding how

schools should be operated and what purposes they should serve.

> The route between the knowledge a society values and its incorporation into the
>
> curriculum becomes infinitely more torturous, however, when we take into
>
> account the fact that different segments in any society will emphasize different
>
> forms of knowledge as most valuable for that society. Rarely is there universal
>
> agreement as to which resources of a culture are the most worthwhile. (Kliebard,
>
> 1995, p.7)

The Yale Report, the Common School Movement, the reports of the Committee

of Ten and Cardinal Principles, and the Eight-Year Study all represent different segments

in society emphasizing different values within the curriculum. Each of these movements

and reports wrestled with the multitude of variables of the curriculum: what is the

purpose of schooling, how best to achieve those purposes (including an understanding of

methodology and content), and how to supervise the fulfillment of those purposes. They

represent the articulation of values stemming from privatized understandings of the ideals

of a democratic republic that were made public through policy, influencing both public

and private schools and spheres of influence. They represent the struggle between how to

school children in mass in a democratic country that defends in law the rights of

individuals to have freedom in thought and opinion.

> Where the public political arena ends and the educational arena begins is a
>
> boundary that never existed… Schools are physically bounded structures. In all
>
> other respects their boundaries are porous to a degree their physical appearance
>
> and the traditional concept of a school system obscure. (Sarason, 1996, p.3)

This struggle in the curriculum, articulated in accountability movements early in the country's history, persisted into the late twentieth century as the landscape of the United States continued to change. Due to the "porous" nature of schooling, such movements articulate the inability of schooling to be separated from either the public or the private arena. Schools, public and independent, continued to stand somewhere in the liminal space of the in-between of private and public as the United States faced new challenges and invested evermore responsibility in schools to meet social and governmental needs.

Dollar and sense: Federal funding and the reduction of knowledge to the quantifiable

If the break between present and past that informs the current view is only one of many perceived breaks in the history of our schools, does not that require us to redefine our present view? Does that not suggest that we ask why we are so set to see discontinuities rather than continuities with the past? If the continuities are far greater than we have believed, does that not suggest the possibility that there is something about our society and culture that not only has made for tensions and conflicts between schools and the communities they serve, but has also been a source of strong and relatively constant pressure on schools to change? (Sarason, p. 1996, p.19)

Debates over accountability and the related questions of the purposes, structure, and supervision of schooling continued in the second half of the twentieth century. The exponential increase in the existences and uses of new technology, the increasing power of the corporate world, and the resulting globalization of capital have had and will continue to have important implications for the way in which we conceive of and create education. Although the realms of economy, politics, and culture have always been a

part of the dialogue surrounding education in the United States, these relationships

deserve renewed attention with the technological revolution and the changes this has

brought in understandings of economy, culture, and knowledge.

The overwhelming and seemingly monolithic character of international corporate

capitalism threatens to shut down spaces of discourse about education and the

possibilities it still holds in preventing the reduction of true learning in education, as a

human enterprise, to training and the acquisition of skills in terms of dollars and

cents/sense. The particularities of various policies and legislation concerning

accountability in the twentieth century are intimately related to the topic of globalization,

the focus of the next chapter. However, in the remainder of this chapter, these policies

are examined from the perspective of the ways in which private and public values

become somewhat indistinguishable and the mutual influence of the private and public as

others, particularly the unique position of independent schools as an "other" to speak out

against some of the more recent and restrictive accountability movements. The

independent school, as a private institution, is a necessarily paradoxical site for public

attention and dialogue.

The race against time

The charge of decline, of course, can embrace many different meanings and serve as a

surrogate for a wide variety of discontents, only one of which may be that young people

are actually learning less. As often as not, it suggests that young people are learning less

of what a particular commentator or group of commentators believe they ought to be

learning, and the "ought" derives ultimately from a conception of education and of the

educated person. (Cremin, 1990, p.7)

Schools and their curriculum stand as a manifestation of what values are of most import to a particular groups or society. They are invested with hopes and trusts to shape young people into various ideals: these ideals varying but ultimately reflective of some conception of the good, or better, life. As Cremin (1990) notes above, "the charge of decline" in the second half of the twentieth century through the present is reflective of various different expectations in whose knowledge is of most worth in our schools. Various groups derive their expectations and measure them against various standards of the purposes of schooling, adult life, and society, whatever form these may take to various groups.

The second half of the twentieth century has been full of such critiques of schools and education in the United States. However, these differ substantially from earlier critiques not just in their volume but in their source. Prior to the mid-twentieth century, calls and initiatives for reform came primarily from various interest groups, students, educators, and professional organizations. The mid-twentieth century and the events of the last few decades have been filled not just with criticisms from the public, but the federal government has played an increasing role in critiquing and directing education reform, thereby linking more directly federal interests, the economy, and the purposes and goals of schooling. The discussion of these events is not meant to serve as a detailed summary of each of these movements, as there have been many well-written and detailed texts on each of these. Rather, the purpose of this discussion of the accountability movements of the last few decades is to explore the ways in which values and goals have evolved and been made manifest in various federal policies, and explore the ways in

which increasing standardization and democracy intersect and conflict in a troubling of the private/public distinction.

Several national events have led to an increasing focus on education from the federal government. The launching of Sputnik and the space program of the U.S.S.R. served as one such key event. In this midst of the despair that the U.S.S.R. had succeeded in launching a space program before the United States, many were eager to point the finger of blame away from themselves. Ultimately, it pointed to schools and a supposed lack of focus in the sciences and mathematics.

> To anyone who was not an adult in 1957 it will be difficult to convey what a "narcissistic wound" the American pride experienced when Russia successfully launched its first Sputnik. The reactions were diverse and pervasive. One of these reactions was the opinion that our educational system was not training enough scientists and, perhaps more important, that its teaching techniques and curricula were effectively extinguishing students' interest in science and scientific careers. (Sarason, 1996, p.47)

The blame led to the development of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), pouring resources into revising the curriculum to place more emphasis and increased instruction in math and sciences, as well as foreign-languages.

> These developments provided the impetus for the passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, which provided categorical aid to states to improve math, science, and foreign-language instruction in U.S. schools. The NDEA was an important political precedent and psychological breakthrough for advocates of federal aid to education. (McGuinn, 2006, p.28)

The name of the NDEA reveals much about the values, purposes, and goals to which it held education and schooling. Schools were given the task of becoming a system of national defense against the increasingly competitive international arena. Sputnik, as well as the Cold War and nuclear arms race with the U.S.S.R. served as the catalyst for a change in the amount and interest of the federal government in education.

The decades that followed included rising amounts of federal involvement in education, holding schools accountable for increasing amounts of responsibilities previously spread across many different social institutions. The passage and evolution of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in the 1960s was the next legislative act that transformed the level of involvement of the federal government. If schools were to improve in the areas of supposed weaknesses, they would need greater resources to do so. There was also escalating attention paid to the difference in achievement amongst minority and poor children, and schools declared that if they were to be able to help these students in the wake of integration efforts, they would need a greater per-pupil expenditure.

The mounting pressure for schools to tackle these many goals led to the passage and subsequent amendments of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act under the term of President Lyndon Johnson. Johnson and his commissioner of education, Francis Keppel, developed the ESEA primarily to provide a system for increasing federal funds to poor and minority students. However, as various interest groups and professional organizations used their power and voices to shape the character of the policy, as well as Republican interests in limiting federal involvement, the actual ESEA that was implemented took on a very different character than how it was originally conceived,

providing aid to ninety-four percent of all schools districts for various purposes

(McGuinn, 2006). The funding for the ESEA was also given in the form of "categorical"

rather than general aid; general aid being advocated by most education interest groups.

This meant that there would be federal government supervision and oversight of the

program, rather than financial assistance that was left to local governments and districts

to implement and use at their discretion.

> One of the most significant features of the ESEA was what it did not do- it did not
>
> provide general federal aid to public schools. Instead, ESEA provided
>
> "categorical" aid that was targeted to a specific student population: disadvantaged
>
> students…. the creation of federal categorical programs required that federal
>
> educational institutions shift from what had been largely an information-gathering
>
> and –disseminating role to a more supervisory role in the administration of the
>
> new federal funds and programs. Given the political opposition to federal
>
> "control" in education, however, it had been impossible to include rigorous
>
> compliance provisions in ESEA, or even the kind of requirements that were
>
> normally attached to categorical grants. (McGuinn, 2006, p.32)

The ESEA was an important piece of legislature in the role of the federal

government in relation to supervision in schools. The lack of ability to include specific

supervisory measures in the original legislature increased the amount of criticism from

various directions regarding the success of the program. This ultimately led to

amendments to the act in order to provide greater accountability for the use of federal

funds, and furthered the involvement of the federal government in education.

Initially the U.S. Office of Education relied on the assurances of state education officials that they were in compliance with federal guidelines. But one of the fundamental premises behind the idea of compensatory education, and of ESEA more generally, was that state and local education authorities had failed to ensure equal educational opportunities for their students and that they could not be trusted to do so in the future without federal intervention. The distrust of local education authorities… ultimately led Congress and federal bureaucrats to increase the regulation and supervision of federal aid. (McGuinn, 2006, p.35)

The NDEA and ESEA were the first in a string of policies in the twentieth century that did much to place solely on schools the responsibility of resolving national issues in the eyes of the general population. Whereas education had until then been one institution among many in social formation and economic viability, including civic organizations, family, religion, and government officials themselves, schools were now to blame and be held accountable for solving a wide-array of national problems. Therefore, when it was conceived that students in the United States were falling behind academically in comparison with other countries, coupled with a renewed fear of loss in international power in the economy, surfaced in the 1970s, it was not a far cry to place both blame and responsibilities on schools.

The fears and events of the 1970s led to the investigation of schools and resulting report of the 1980s by the Reagan administration known as A Nation at Risk. This report did much to further the public perception that United States' schools were responsible for the state of and future of the national economy.

The picture painted in A Nation at Risk is that of a tired giant losing a global trade

war because of the failure of its public schools. The solution to the problems of

international trade, according to the report, is the reform of public schooling.

(Spring, 2001, p.125)

Increased involvement by the federal government in the form of funding

necessitated an increase in supervision and accountability measures. The move from

local educational control to national educational control brought with it increasing

movements and levels of standardization from one district and state to the next, uniform

standards allowing for easier federal control. The increase in the need for standardization

and accountability brought with it the need for measures of success, increasing both the

uses and purposes of standardized test in order to measure student achievement during

the 1980s and 90s. The premise behind such testing was that it would provide an

objective measure of student achievement and progress, allowing for the federal

government to measure the effectiveness of funds and their use in improving curricula.

The escalation in the use and emphasis placed on standardized testing for

accountability reached a peak in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) passed in 2001.

This policy, more than any other, emphasized the use of standardized and high-stakes

testing to determine the success of state educational plans and the amount of federal

funds to be received. The NCLB Act placed testing as the paramount measure of student

progress and success, thereby promoting standardized curricula in order to prepare

students for success on cumulative exams and college/career success. The act call for the

use of testing at federally mandated intervals to prove "adequately yearly progress"

culminating in a hundred percent efficiency by 2014 (McGuinn, 2006).

The use of standardized testing shifts the focus from the values and purposes (the ends) of education manifested in national policy to the measured success of students on tests (the means) in order to improve education. Although written many years before the NCLB Act, Macdonald (1975) articulated well the ways in which standardized testing legitimates the current state of affairs rather than improving and reinventing the social landscape.

> Education legitimates the [present] social order by presenting a stance of objectively rewarding youngsters on measured cognitive achievement in the context of accepting the fundamental and critical nature of cognitive skills for success in the system. (Macdonald, 1975, p.11)

Success on national and statewide standardized testing necessitates a standardized curriculum, shifting control from local governance to federal oversight. In such a system, it is implicitly stated that all students learn in the same ways at the same times, and that local variance and student background should not alter expectations or stated purposes for education. Whereas local control allowed curricula to be shaped to the needs and desires of local constituents, federal control denies much of this variance as well as the importance and value of education for anything other than solving national problems. It replaces the ends with the means, greatly distorting and deflecting criticism, as well as confusing the need for accountability and the shape of democracy in schooling.

> The goals of change, the outcomes sought, surely are not to see if it is possible to substitute one set of books for another, change the racial composition of a class or a school, or have children read or listen to black or Mexican history…

Realizing these types of possibilities simply begs the question of their intended

consequences, and in these as well as in other instances the intended

consequences- the basic goals and outcomes- always intended a change in the

relationships among those who are in or related to the school setting. But these

intended consequences are rarely stated clearly, if at all, and as a result, a means

to a goal becomes the goal itself, or it becomes the misleading criterion for

judging change. (Sarason, 1996, p.59)

I would suggest in closing this survey of different ways and movements in which

accountability and schooling have been linked throughout history that the present

moment in education is crucial. Schools are rapidly becoming the sole barers of

responsibility for national pursuits in a global economy. The evolution leading to this has

been fraught with both genuine and disingenuous intentions. However, increasing federal

control has led to a lack of ability on the part of local educational institutions to

determine and then meet the needs of its constituents, based upon their hopes and desires.

It seems more than ironic that a government that proposes democracy would disallow the

rights of local citizens to determine the ways in which they view the purposes and values

of education, as well as the best way to meet those purposes based on the backgrounds

and histories of their constituents through national policies that mandate standards. The

recent policy initiatives in education outlined above declare a difference between the

private and public realms, simultaneously interchanging one for the other, making

suggestions, critiques, and improvements in education a formidable task. In the next

section, I outline the ways in which independent schools can serve as an "other" in the

public space of education, serving as a space for exploration and contestation to the present moment.

The paradox of the public space within the private of education

Independent schools currently serve as an 'other' to the national, public educational institution. It is my contention that this identity as an 'other' is what makes independent schools powerful in the educational dialogue about what constitutes learning and knowledge. The other always serves to discredit the norm, to show that there is a different option. This is the power of independent schools in the dialogue on education. The approaches to education found in independent schools, more specifically, open space for new ideas that create opportunities for freedom from the dogmatic and oppressive content of curriculum that is advocated by proponents of the standardization of education. In this proposition, I explore the ways in which the successes and freedom in the private school sector, specifically the independent schools, are powerful as models of change and resistance for public education.

This space is necessarily paradoxical in that it is a traditionally seen as a private space, and even elitist as noted in chapter 3. However, if independent schools were to become public, they would no longer stand as an alternative and would become subject to the regulation of federal government (and corporate as will be explored in the next chapter) supervision. Independent schools, as opposed to private schools more generally, provide this space and the voice of an other that is valid and supportable in the public because of their unique structure and mission.

It is in their very structure and organization that independent schools have power in the discourse of education that allows them the freedom to be an "other." Because

independent schools are funded privately, they are free from government regulations concerning curriculum design and instruction. As noted above, funding from the federal government is what ultimately allowed for federal supervision in schools. There are some regulations that independent schools must meet in order to be licensed and accredited educational institutions, but many of these have to do with safety and health regulations. They also have an intrinsic interest in preparing their students for the next stage in their life, whether that is a postsecondary education or a certain vocational path. However, it is determined by individual schools what is needed in this preparation. Because these schools are on average much smaller that public school districts, this can be done within a much more individualized context. Furthermore, attendance at these institutions is voluntary, so that no student is required by law to submit to the curriculum in order to be considered educated.

Independent schools are run independently and are not owned by any particular body. They are relatively small, and are non-profit organizations. They must act in accordance with national policies that demonstrate that they are an institution whose primary purpose is not to acquire excess revenue for the purposes of making a profit. Therefore, their goals in proposing and abiding by particular educational philosophies are not primarily in an attempt to make money or profit.

Independent schools' ability to design their own curriculum allows them to design one that is meaningful to their particular student bodies. This is an important acknowledgement about the value of varied systems and types of knowledge. It implies a belief that not every student comes to school needing or wanting the same types and

outcomes of education. This has important implications for the way in which curriculum is designed in independent schools. Commenting on this, Kane (1992) states,

> Self-governance results in responsiveness to the particular needs of the individual
>
> school and freedom from the bureaucratic intrusion by local, state, and federal
>
> governments… (p. 7)

The stakeholders, or those who have a vested interest in the welfare of the schools, determine the purposes of the school and what sort of curriculum will best achieve those purposes. In independent schools, this includes the students, parents, teachers, administration, and the board of trustees. Because of the small nature of the schools, these stakeholders often claim more than one of these roles.

Relic (2000) has commented on the possibilities within independent schools that act as a space to address these issues in education and provide an "other" to the dominant discourse.

> Opportunities to seek understanding and collective action among private and
>
> public schools are increasing. Just as educators and trustees are concerned about
>
> the intrusion into independent school governance by the imposition of the state
>
> assessment movement, so are the public schools threatened by the tyranny of
>
> standardized tests. With the demands of politicians for students to achieve high
>
> test scores, public school principals and teachers have been forced to teach to the
>
> test… Independent school boards and heads can be involved in the political
>
> debate as private and public school people attempt to preserve the integrity of
>
> education against those who would reduce everything to a test score…. We, in
>
> independent schools, have a responsibility to work on the cutting edge of teaching

and learning and to collaborate with educators from other levels and sectors…"

(p.8)

Precisely because they are private institutions, independent schools can educate students according to community-determined values and beliefs and then act publicly to address the ruptures within the argument over the equation of education and national standardization that results in knowledge being deduced to that which can be measured on test scores. Independent schools have claimed this unique site of privilege historically and continue to do so in the current corporatization of education. Stettler and Algrant (2003) express the possibilities that this position presents currently.

> Independent schools are privileged. We do not have to respond to the whims of
> the state, nor to every or any educational trend. We can maximize our time
> attuned to students and how they learn, to the development of curriculum that
> enriches them and encourages the skills and attitudes of independent thinkers….
> (p.42)

Independent and private schooling historically has been seen as a site of cultural reproduction for the economic elite. This claim cannot be denied in the foundation and roots of many types of independent schooling. However, as Kane (1992) notes, independent schools are recognizing the benefits for students and schools alike to make the school population more reflective of the general population in society at large, and opening their doors and providing the means for students from different backgrounds to attend independent institutions. The missions and curricula of independent schools have been altered and adapted to address the needs and talents of a diverse student body.

Ravitch (1992) notes the public space and benefit of private, specifically independent, schools in education open dialogues that counter the hegemonic discourse on what "works" in education.

> The public schools benefit by the diversity that private education encourages. We look to private education for the off-beat schools, for schools that are out of step with conventional thinking. Some private schools will be experimental and take risks. Some will offer a kind of rigorous academic curriculum that has virtually disappeared from public education. Others will find their own way of diverging from the mainstream. (p.26)

The diversity in composition, curriculum, and mission of independent schools suggest that there are multiple ways to educate children. These schools demonstrate that there are certain and specific aspects of populations of students that need to be attended to in the education, and that a standardized, one size fits all approach to schooling will never result in positive benefits, economic or otherwise, for every student or school. I am not advocating that all public schools should model themselves by the general principles and structures of independent schools. Nor am I denying that independent schools do not face many of the challenges that are present in public education that serve as obstacles to transforming the way we educate. I am, however, advocating for a closer working relationship between educators who are committed to problematizing the notion of learning and pointing out the ruptures within the argument for the reduction and equation of education to a set of federally mandated standards that deny the mutual influence of the private and public. Paradoxically, the private of independent schools is an opportune site within which this work can publicly take place. Independent schools

serve as the voice of an other in the accountability movement supported by the corporate

world. They open and serve as a public space in which the dialogue about what

constitutes education and learning can remain open and show the possibilities outside of

the current regime of technology, corporate interest, and accountability.

This space, intersecting between the private and the public, is an important space

as education and schooling is increasingly viewed as and designed to meet economic

needs in national pursuits for globalization. The next chapter focuses more specifically

on how private and public spaces become increasingly indistinguishable in a globalized

context; the ways in which this shapes the character of schooling; and the positions of

both public and independent schools.

CHAPTER 6: THW WHOLE WORLD IN OUR HANDS? THE ERASURE OF BOUNDARIES AND THE TROUBLE IN GLOBALIZATION

We might then model to our children

how we can live in this society without succumbing to it,

without giving up our dreams and aspirations for education.

Teachers can become witnesses [in a theological sense…]

to the notion that intelligence and learning can lead to other worlds,

not just the successful exploitation of this one. (Pinar, 1994, p. 247)

The concept of globalization conjures different understandings, reactions, and ideas depending upon the context and culture in which and about which it is employed. Like accountability, globalization is a somewhat nebulous term. Is the concept of globalization new, or is the way in which and frequency with which we employ it?

For some, globalization refers to a new economic paradigm in which the pace, manner, and space of global economics radically alters our understanding of trade and industry. In other cases, globalization is understood as the erasure of borders and increasing interaction and contact with peoples outside our local communities due to technological innovations. Globalization is at times understood as the need to become internationally aware. There is varying emphasis placed on all of these topics within each proposed understanding of globalization. There are a variety of fields and names attached to the study of globalization: multiculturalism, comparative studies, global studies, etc. These introductory ideas only scan the surface of the work and understanding of globalization. The topic of globalization has become prominent in almost every academic field, from economics to sociology, from science to education.

The proliferation of concern with globalization suggests that it is having profound impacts on how we understand our worlds and cultures. While globalization is the manifestation of decades and even centuries of global expansion in political, economical, and technological paradigms, the recent attention and focus upon it suggests that we are becoming more aware of its existence, albeit from various perspectives, and the import of its existence on our everyday lives. Brown (2005) states the continuity of globalization eloquently.

> Since antiquity, the historical processes of migration, economic integration, technological development and transfer, and cultural exchange that together have intensified during the contemporary era of globalization have been turning the world into a single, unified place. Now, more than ever, these developments are producing people throughout the world who are increasingly conscious… of these convergences. (p.173)

The intention of this chapter is not to summarize the different perspectives on globalization, traces its origins, or determine its ethical value. Each of these approaches to globalization have been attempted by others and could include a variety of materials. However, the ways in which globalization has been and is a part of curriculum in public and independent schools expresses varying accounts of the ways in which education is both shaped by and can influence the course of globalization, in a variety of understandings of what globalization constitutes.

In their edited text on globalization and education, Apple, Kenway, and Singh (2005) discuss the variety of approaches in terms of "globalization from above" and "globalization from below". Both of these approaches consider globalization as a

multifaceted issue concerning the intersection of economics, politics, culture, technology, and education. The authors understand the perspective that each approach takes in terms of the treatment and selection of these topics in defining and exploring globalization. Approaches understood by the authors as "globalization from above" are "often from the standpoint" of the first world, and are "highly selective in scales, spaces, flows, networks, and subjects of globalization that it chooses to analyse" (p. 6). In contrast, "globalization from below" focuses on "intersecting geographic scales and to the uneven and particular aspects of globalization" stressing "complex connectivity" (p.7-8).

In continuing to trouble the private/public distinction, the focal point of this chapter is that no matter from what orientation one considers globalization (political, cultural, economic, technological, education), the concept of interdependence is integral. While this work stresses that in dialogical relationships we are and always have been interdependent upon the other, globalization makes us more acutely aware that our own actions regarding economics, politics, technology, cultural understandings, and education affect the other and that the actions of others affect our own existence.

This chapter will explore the ways in which globalization is understood differently by the public school sector and independent schools and how these understandings are manifested in the curriculum; as well as how the curriculum communicates differing perspectives on globalization that make difficult a private/public distinction. These explorations will then be linked to the ways in which there is a dialogical relationship between the histories of the two types of schooling, and how their histories trouble the private/public distinction more generally.

The pluralities of monoculturalism

It can seem somewhat ironic that in a time when there are calls that the world is becoming ever smaller and more united, that it is once again "flat" (Friedman, 2007), that technology is erasing cultural boundaries and making obsolete the concept of the nation-state (Barber, 1992), that there would be an increasing proliferation of ideas on what exactly the new global culture should/could entail. This plurality of ideas on what the new global culture will or could entail is often spoken about in terms of both possibilities and potential threats.

In continuing to utilize the perspective of Apple, Kenway, and Singh (2005), the ways in which possibilities and potential threats of a global culture are explored varies depending upon whether they are undertaken "from above" or "from below". Those who understand and explore globalization from above express the possibilities in terms of increases in the human capacity for control and efficiency provided by technological innovations. The potential threats in this approach to globalism are an increased access to circles of power by those who were previously shut out, thereby making the global community one of extreme competitiveness that requires those seeking to sustain power to reach into all facets of life, public and private, to keep the upper hand. This perspective is embraced by the popular author Friedman (2007) in his work *The world is flat*, albeit more responsibly than in some instances, in which he traces the ways in which accesses to power are expanding and the threat this poses to the previous superiority of American economic and political power.

While considering the same facets of globalization, understandings and explorations of globalization from below often see the possibilities as exactly those

threats expressed in perspectives from above. The possibilities in globalization lay in the access to previous closed circles of power by those who were previously marginalized and denied such access through technology and education, thereby allowing them to increase their economic, social, and political well-being. The potential threat for those who understand globalization from below is in the ways in which it can promote assimilation and the loss of previously private ways of living and cultural understandings. This perspective can be seen in the work of another popular author, Barber (1992), in his work entitle *Jihad vs. McWorld*, in which he traces the polarizing influences of globalization between haves and have-nots; as well as the tensions between accesses to power and the desire to retain cultural authorship.

As stated above, both understandings, "from above" and "from below" recognize the ways in which globalization requires an attention to all facets of life, both public and private. This chapter explores the ways in which these facets call increasing attention to educational models, how and why education intersects with economy, politics, technology, and culture, and how public schools and independent schools express their understanding and perspective of globalization through their curricula.

In Chapter 5, accountability was explored from the perspective of a dialogical relationship in which the private is articulated and instituted publicly, thereby shaping the public articulation of value, which is then instituted and utilized to shape private understandings. As explored in the previous chapter, educational institutions are and always have been accountable in some sense. Both public schools and independent schools were instituted to serve some purpose, the curricula and evolution of it being the attempt to attain various purposes throughout their histories, and the level of attainment

of theses purposes being expressed through various standards. The current focus and dialogue on accountability, particularly in public schooling, results from a rapidly changing world paradigm understood in a variety of forms and manifestations as globalization. The changing world paradigm of globalization, in which our interdependence is highlighted and revealed, requires that we refocus on what values should and are articulated in the curricula of schools, and how schools are best held accountable to achieving these values.

Education is a key focus in understandings of globalization from both above and from below because in it is recognized the potential to transform understandings of the world. Yet, there is an irony in the plurality of monocultures that are advocated, each of these representing various private and public values that are at times compatible and at other times conflicting with each other. In the sections that follow, I explore the ways in which public schools and independent schools represent what values are seen to be of most worth and how these have and are being articulated in the curricula within these schools. The final section offers a commentary on how the private spaces of independent schools can be used publicly to explore and demonstrate the plurality of approaches to curricula in an increasingly "flat" world.

Privatization of the public

During the industrial revolution, the advances in technology in the industrial sector pulled people from rural occupations to the cities and factories that promised new and more comfortable lifestyles. As industry and science has made further advances in technology that allow for more automated production and less human labor, the number of jobs within the industrial sector has been drastically reduced. This has left many in

cities without the sources of income and resources of previous generations. Many jobs have been mechanized or sent overseas for less money, and therefore more profit for corporations. Because many of these industrial jobs were mostly manual and required little formal education, many who did not want or could not pursue secondary and post-secondary education found a steady form of income in these jobs.

As the younger generations survey their environment, education seems the one ticket to acquiring the cultural capital necessary to escape the poverty and lack of jobs left by deindustrialization. As Aronowitz (2000) describes,

> Deindustrialized cities and towns that have expired utter destitution have done so because they have transformed themselves… Absent these conversions, some U.S. urban areas have fallen into abject disrepair… Many who choose to enter postsecondary educational institutions know that successful completion of their course of study qualifies them to leave town. (p. 8).

The deindustrialization that resulted from the technological revolution has positioned education as primarily a necessary means to economic well-being. Although this has always been a secondary aim of education, it shifts the primary justification and understanding of education from a democratic purpose to a capitalist purpose. This purpose is reinforced as political power has become dependent on technological innovation and corporate thriving in the international economy. The threatening of this power in the Cold War and in the rising economy of previously impoverished nations, such as China and India, has affected education in the United States in important ways.

The *A Nation at Risk* policy has been the most overt example of the impact that the intersection of technology and neoliberal capitalism has had on education. With the

threat of losing international standing in the economy and technology advancement, education has come into the spotlight as both the source of failure and the only source of hope in maintaining American hegemony in the global marketplace. As Giroux and Giroux (2004) explain,

> With the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the Reagan administration gave the green light to pass spending cuts in education… Reconceived as a "big government monopoly," public schooling was derided as bureaucratic, inefficient, and ineffectual, producing a product (dimwitted students) who were singularly incapable in competing in the global marketplace… A clever strategy to be sure, which provided a ready scapegoat to legitimate the flight of U.S. manufacturing to markets overseas. Schools were blamed for increased joblessness and insecurity,- not the rapacious greed of corporations eager to circumvent U.S. minimum wage laws, federal taxes, and environmental regulations, while breaking the back of unions at home. (p.3)

The reforms of this policy were and continue to be multifaceted. The government simultaneously called for higher standards, the teaching of more "valuable" knowledge (mathematics and science), and measures of accountability while reducing the funds to support these programs if they did not produce quantified, positive indications of success. The principles of the free market are used to justify these budget cuts and the initiatives for school choice based on school success as demonstrated on high stakes, standardized tests.

These principles continue to be reflected in the *No Child Left Behind Act*. The No Child Left Behind act (NCLB) continues to be a loud voice in the discourse within

education. It is in studying the language and policies communicated in this act that one can see what is currently defined as health and value in public education by the government. In one excerpt from the Department of Education's website that addresses the supposed lack of achievement in our nation's high schools, the following is stated as the President Bush's response to "lagging achievement" and why he is responding.

> In response to lagging achievement and completion rates in the nation's high schools, the president's High School Initiative would hold high schools accountable for teaching all students and provide timely intervention for those students who are not achieving at grade level. The goal of this initiative is to ensure that every student graduates from high school with the skills to succeed in either higher education or our globally competitive workforce.
>
> (http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget06/nclb/index.html)

This quote reveals some very interesting statements about the goal of education. Stated very clearly is the belief that the primary purpose of public high schools is to ensure that students can go on to succeed in higher education or the globally competitive workforce. Therefore, one is led to believe that there is evidence of "lagging achievement" among students from the United States in comparison to those from other nations. The question that this goal implicitly asks is whose interest does a population of competitive workers in the global market benefit? If this is the goal for those who graduate from our elementary and secondary public schools, what curriculum most effectively prepares students for this task? What type of "education" is most valuable in producing these workers?

To address the first question, I turn to a speech recently delivered by Bill Gates that received a large amount of public attention. This speech was delivered at the National Education Summit on High Schools in February of 2005. In this speech, Gates states that he has a very direct interest in high school education for two reasons. The first is that his philanthropic organization, the Gates Millennium Scholars program, has provided close to one billion dollars to public high school improvement (www.gatesfoundation.org). What is his interest in funding public high schools? The following quotes from his speech are revealing.

> In the international competition to have the biggest and best supply of knowledge
> workers, America is falling behind… That is the heart of the economic argument
> for better high schools. It essentially says; 'we'd better do something about these
> kids not getting an education, because it's hurting us.'
> (www.gatesfoundation.org/MediaCenter/Speeches/BillsSpeeches/BGSpeechNGA
> -50)

Perhaps Gates' interest in public education lay in the fact that he owns a multi-billion dollar company that relies upon the production of skilled workers who he can employ to help sustain, and even increase, his profits. He does however, in the same speech, state his belief that there is also a moral or ethical argument as well. "… [T]here's a moral argument for better high schools, and it says: 'We'd better do something about these kids not getting an education, because it's hurting them.'" (www.gatesfoundation.org/MediaCenter/Speeches/BillsSpeeches/BGSpeechNGA-50)

He goes on to explain that the reason a lack of education hurts our students is economic. Most jobs, he states, "that allow you to support a family require a

postsecondary education." Yet, he claims that only approximately half of the students who begin high school actually enroll in postsecondary institutions.

Michael Apple (1999) discusses the phenomena of structuring the goals of education to meet the needs of the corporate culture of the United States.

> No longer is education seen as part of a social alliance, which combined many "minority" groups, women, teachers, community activists, progressive legislators and government officials , and others acted together to propose (limited) social democratic policies for schools… Rather it aims at providing the educational condition believed necessary both for increasing international competitiveness, profit, and discipline and for returning us to a romanticized past of the "ideal" home, family and school. (p. 313-314)

I do not mean to undermine the importance of education in support of economic well-being. Rather, I wish to point out that this is the primary and dominant driving force in the discourse that directs current educational policy in public education within the context of globalization. There is a potential threat in approaching education from a primarily economic perspective, from embracing education within the understanding of globalization "from above". Education does not only structure knowledge but self-formation. "Behind this is the assertion that the concept of production involves not only the 'making of things,' but also the self-production of human beings." (Haymes, 1995, p.33). More specifically, in education, this economic perspective to education in the school, "achieves control at the cost of intelligence, intelligence broadly understood as including problem solving, critical thinking, and creativity as well as memorization and calculation." (Pinar, 2004, p.28).

It is stated quite clearly in the discourse that rationalizes the NCLB act and is prominent in the media as demonstrated by Gates' speech. Whose interest does this educational goal serve? If this is the goal for those who graduate from our elementary and secondary public schools, what curriculum most effectively prepares students for this task? What type of "education" is most valuable in producing these workers?

The answers to these questions are also found in the discourse surrounding the NCLB act but are rather ambiguous. The NCLB act allows states to decide those elements that they believe to be important in each core subject area to determine the curriculum. The important aspect is that they be able to demonstrate improvement in these areas through quantifiable data. How do states attain this data? In all states, it is through the results obtained from standardized testing.

> Under the act's accountability provisions, states must describe how they will close the achievement gap and make sure all students, including those who are disadvantaged, achieve academic proficiency. They must produce annual state and school district report cards that inform parents and communities about state and school progress. Schools that do not make progress must provide supplemental services, such as free tutoring or after-school assistance; take corrective actions; and, if still not making adequate yearly progress after five years, make dramatic changes to the way the school is run.
> (http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/ayp203/edlite-slide003.html)

Why use standardized testing as a measure of progress? The government also addresses this question.

Testing provides information. Until teachers and parents recognize what their students know and can do, they can't help them improve. Testing will raise expectations for *all* students and ensure that no child slips through the cracks. (http://www.ed.gov/nclb/accountability/ayp/testing.html)

It is here that we can see one of the most important ramifications of using economics as the driving force behind our public educational models: that the success of our students in our public education institutions is measured and determined by standardized tests. The concept of using quantifiable data to determine the success and effectiveness is derived from the efficiency models of industrialized and capitalist business practices. This is advantageous for politicians in that, "[b]y linking the curriculum to student performance on standardized examinations, politicians have, in effect, taken control of what is to be taught: the curriculum" (Pinar, 2004, p. 2). As stated earlier, I believe this is an attempt by politicians to imply an objective authority over the public school curriculum so that the ramifications of that policy are not challenged. Students in public schools are asked to demonstrate that they are educated by responding to questions determined by a bureaucratically designed tests that assumes that all students will be able to learn the same information in exactly the same way and then demonstrate it uniformly on a standardized test. This approach to education allows for little difference in learning styles and approaches, as well as what it considered a valid way of demonstrating knowledge.

The transformation and globalization of the corporate world have brought together seemingly contradictory positions. Apple (2001) notes these contradictory alliances in which neoliberals and neoconservatives come together to have "creative"

influences on public education. Neoconservatives advocate for strong state control over the content and results of education while neoliberals' call for the marketization of school in voucher and school choice programs. All of these factors combine to reduce the value and success of education to the degree to which it provides skilled and knowledgeable workers as measured on standardized tests.

> In essence, the new alliance has integrated education into a wider set of ideological commitments. The objectives in education are the same as those that guide its economic and social welfare goals. They in the dramatic expansion of that eloquent fiction, the free market: the drastic reduction of government responsibility for social needs; the enforcement of intensely competitive structures of mobility both inside and outside the school; the lowering of people's expectations for economic security… (p.65)

In this understanding and approach to globalization, technology, economics, and politics have become intertwined in complex relationships. The complexity of these relationships makes it difficult to dissect and understand how in less than a half-century the primary aim as espoused in educational policy has shifted from ensuring and creating democracy to ensuring our national position of power in the global marketplace. The results of this shift are seen in the marketization of education, in which success is measured by the extent to which students are ready to compete in the corporate world. This shift has problematized our understanding of the processes and results of learning, as well as how knowledge is valued.

Readings (1996) understands this problemization as a move from purposefully guarding and creating national culture to a corporate call for "excellence." The

traditional purpose of the University as a guardian and producer of the knowledge and national culture provided an understandable framework for what counted as learning and knowledge. However, the corporate call for "excellence" problematizes our notion of what learning is and how it is valued.

> In this context, excellence responds very well to the needs of technological capitalism in the production and processing of information, in that it allows for the increasing integration of all activities into a generalized market, while permitting a large degree of flexibility and innovation at the local level…. The point is not that no one knows what excellence is but that everyone has his or her idea of what it is. And once excellence has been accepted as an organizing principle, there is no need to argue about differing definitions. (p.32-33)

Excellence as the standard for education is problematic precisely because it is open to interpretation and can be used to justify any position, so long as it is "excellent." Readings (1996) names this ability to refer simultaneously to everything and therefore nothing in particular "derreferentialization." This call to excellence makes it extremely difficult to find spaces to deconstruct and rally against this shift. As Graff (2003) notes, "Academia itself has become part of the mass culture industry," making it difficult to separate out to rally against. Because culture is all encompassing, it is derreferentializing and cannot be used to make a case for a particular educational philosophy or position. This problematizes the notion of education in general.

> The current academic system has fudged the distinctions between training, education, and learning. Administrations of most colleges and universities have responded to the economic and cultural uncertainties provoked by budget

constraints and a volatile job market by constructing their institutions on the model of the modern corporation… Lacking a unified national culture into which to socialize students and in any case lacking an educational philosophy capable of steering an independent course, the academic system as a whole is caught in a market logic that demands students be job-ready upon graduation. (Aronowitz, 2000, p.157)

This derreferentialization is most obvious in higher education and at the university level, but has trickled down and become present in the primary and secondary education system in general. As a post-secondary degree becomes necessary to obtain secure employment and comfortable lifestyle, the requirements for college entrance have confounded the call for specific standards in primary and secondary education of a government tied to corporate interest.

Re-orientation from within

As Reading notes (1996), the derreferentialization of culture disallows the claim to culture as a site for reclaiming a definition of learning from the corporate world, which seeks to reduce learning to training and the acquisition of skills that are of value in economic terms. Therefore, any claim to learning as an essentially human process must find a space and orientation from within culture that is not based upon culture.

The complexity of the relationships between the economic, political, cultural, and intellectual realms that constitute the global marketplace make it difficult to find such spaces and orientations. However, there are places in which the argument for the equation of education with marketization rupture and prove ineffective even to justify itself. It is in these ruptures that one can provide a rationale for education as a human

endeavor and reclaim a definition of learning that is not reducible to a quantifiable product.

The most obvious ruptures lay within the mandate for the reduction of learning to an acquisition of a particular set of skills. The use of education as a scapegoat for the ill-preparedness of students to compete in the global marketplace provides a rationale for corporate involvement in the development of the content of curriculum, while at the same time pushing for more public funding of that content. The rupture in this argument is that the rapidity with which technology changes and influences the way we understand the world is occurring at a rate faster than that with which we can keep pace. Therefore, an attempt to define a particular set of skills that students must know in order to be successful is futile. An argument for a more general emphasis on the processes of learning can be framed within market principles.

As Readings (1996) points out, this sort of claim is valuable for many reasons. It allows for educators to claim the importance of teaching students how to learn, and allows for them to make an argument that is irrelevant the exact nature of what they learn, so long as it allows them to acquire the skill of learning.

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) point to another rupture in the argument for the marketization of education.

> Several fault lines are evident in the academic capitalist knowledge/ learning regime. (p.329)
>
> …[T]hose who support patenting argue that it will contribute to economic growth beneficial to the citizenry as a whole. However, the overall pattern of the new economy, at least as configured in the United States, has resulted in greater

income and wealth stratification within and outside the academy than was the case

under the public good knowledge regime. (p.331)

While pointing out these ruptures will not allow for a return to the understanding

of education as learning and producing of culture, they do allow us a space to

problematize the notions of knowledge and learning so that they are not reduced and

equated with the acquisition of skills and training. This problematizing will allow

schools to become "places where people can share and understand differences and where

they can demonstrate a collective concern for all members of the global/local society…"

(Reid, 2005, p.287). Given the nature of globalization, I argue that one place to reclaim

these public understandings of education is in the public of the private spaces of

independent schools.

Private going public? Independent schools' responses to globalization

As explored and highlighted in Chapter 5, the structure and governance of

independent schools delivers and necessitates an involvement by all stakeholders in the

creation of curricula. In the spirit of independent schools, there is no one answer that is

advocated by NAIS to which values are best developed within the student to prepare

them to be members of an increasingly global society or how best to achieve those

values. The paradoxical combination of independent and community development and

focus within individual independent schools, coupled with an emphasis on sharing and

collaboration on individual initiatives, provides room for experimentation and generation.

This experimentation and generation does not produce one singular response or "best

practice" to approaching curriculum within globalization, but rather embraces a

collaborative and creative approach in which multiple responses are shared and explored, and then further adapted and refined at the local level.

In *Looking ahead: Independent school issues and answers* (Bassett & Crosier, 1994), various challenges that face independent schools in the current and future world are explored by various educators and scholars within independent schools. The concern with the future character of schooling in a society that views globalization in terms of economic gains and losses is expressed by Heischman (1994) in his contribution to this work.

> The school becomes a stepping stone, a vehicle for success, viewed less in terms of its inherent value as a place of learning and more in terms of where it can, ultimately, deliver its students.
>
> Such a view of school, of course, collides with the perspective of school being a meeting place, a locus of value and dialogue on what is important to a community, an environment where learning is valued for its own sake and the exchange of ideas and experiences creates a model for what all of life should be like. (p.9)

The concern expressed by Heischman is reflective of an awareness of the trepidation that independent schools face as they seek new ways to educate students for a global society. However, his concern also reflects a belief in the nature of independent schools as valuable in their ability to design and shape their schools as communities of learners and stakeholders that collaboratively develop and refine their educational goals and curricula.

Heischman also articulates the ways in which independent schools are increasingly becoming aware that while their independence and community development are valuable, they must be cognizant of and responsible to the larger societies of which they are a part.

> A subtle shift has taken place in many of our schools, as they view themselves and see better to understand themselves: the independent school has moved significantly from being a place apart to being a place more reflective of the character and makeup of society in general. We seek more to be mirrors of the culture, as opposed to heavens from it. (p.10)

Therefore, independent schools face both challenge and opportunity in developing meaningful curricula in response to globalization. They have the independence and space to creatively develop curricula that meet the needs of stakeholders on a community and local level. However, they must be simultaneously cognizant of the ways in which globalization shapes the local communities and cultures that they serve and of which they become a part.

As stated earlier, it would be contradictory to create a singular, standardized response amongst all independent schools with regards to the ways in which to develop meaningful curricula within globalization. Rather, there are numerous responses based on localized knowledge of resources, needs, and understandings of the implications of globalization on local levels.

There are various collaborations amongst various schools to work together to share various approaches to responding to globalization within schools. One such organization is the Global Connections Foundation developed by Peter Pelham (Widmer,

2004, p. 52). The purpose of the organization is for independent school educators and leaders to explore collaboratively the questions of how education might best respond to the changing and increasingly international dimensions that effect and are important for stakeholders to be aware of and ready to respond to on a local level (http://www.globalconnection.org/gpie.html). The group is not an organization for professional development or budgetary issues, but is focused on opening conversations amongst independent educators about how different school communities can and are successfully educating students for a global community on a local level.

Another such collaborative initiative that celebrates the sharing of local community responses to globalization is Round Square, an organization of schools that seeks to promote "international understanding" (Raley, 2004, p. 68). The organization focuses on bringing school stakeholders, mainly students, together in order to encourage "an ongoing process of self-confrontation and formation". The website for the organization states that achieving this goal involves multiple aspects of the student.

> …[A] fundamental objective of the full and individual development of every student into a whole person…academically, physically, culturally and spiritually, within the supportive environment of a school community.
> This underlying belief also embraces the importance of service to others, adventure and leadership training, responsibility and international understanding. All these are essential in preparing young people to meet the challenges of the future with confidence and compassion.
> (http://www.roundsquare.org/whoweare.htm)

The organization allows for students and other school stakeholders to come together in service and sharing, as well as collaborative outreach of how each school can better achieve the goals of the organization, a commitment to international understanding, democracy, environment, adventure, leadership, and service (http://www.roundsquare.org/members.htm).

In addition to organically organized movements amongst and within independent schools, NAIS is actively providing and seeking opportunities for more collaboration and exploration of the various ways in which independent schools can and are developing curricula that is attentive to the various impacts of globalization within independent schools and amongst their stakeholders.

One such initiative is Challenge 20/20, in which independent schools within the United States partner with schools abroad. The high school students in both schools work over the course of several months to generate solutions to global problems (http://www.nais.org/conferences/index.cfm?ItemNumber=147262&sn.ItemNumber=148035). Students gain the opportunity to understand how different global problems are manifested differently within each locality, thereby gaining an insight into the ways in which local cultures intersect on a global level. They must then test the practicality of their solutions by setting them in motion in their local communities and sharing the results of these as part of the program.

Another such initiative is the sponsoring of teacher exchanges. An example of one teacher exchange program promoted by NAIS is the China Connection Program, a partnership between NAIS and HANBAN, an organization that is funded through the Chinese government. As stated on its website, the goals of the program are,

…to advance the teaching of the Mandarin Chinese language in schools in the

United States and to provide schools with resources that will assist them in

becoming more globally sustainable

(http://www.nais.org/resources/index.cfm?ItemNumber=149408).

Through the program, heads of independent schools can travel to China to

interview and recruit teachers, and the program trains and sponsors these teachers to

teach in independent schools in the United States.

The organizations and programs represent a small proportion of the initiatives

that are being created and explored amongst independent educators and schools in order

to approach and respond to globalization within their local school communities,

recognizing their interconnectedness as local schools with the global community. More

initiatives can be found and explored from the NAIS website on global education at

(http://www.nais.org/resources/index.cfm?ItemNumber=146778&sn.ItemNumber=14678

3). As stated on the website, all of the programs are focused on helping "independent

schools in their efforts to nurture the skills and perspectives that help students become

global citizens and global leaders, and to assist schools and their students in making

contributions across borders".

The organization of these initiatives and programs embrace the belief in the value

of independent schools' organizations and structures to create curricula and learning

communities best through local development and collaborative efforts that recognize

diversity within localities and their respective resources, needs, and stakeholders.

Therefore, there is no singular or narrowly focused understanding of globalization. The

various curricular and programmatic responses to globalization reflect a respect for the

variety of ways in which globalization is manifested and understood within diverse communities.

Critics of independent schools as a sector of private education more generally charge that the very structural organization of these schools that allows them to operate free from federal government regulations regarding curriculum and programming is what is damaging and a threat to public well-being and education. Such critics argue that because these schools turn to their own stakeholders and communities in order to develop curricula that is meaningful to their local school community that they are turning to a select group of the elite that is out of touch with the needs of the community and society at large. Jacoby (1994) criticizes these schools as "educational oases" to which only the privileged have access.

A worsening situation spurs an elite- chosen and self-chosen- to redouble efforts to gain access to the few educational oases. This accelerates the free fall of the rest of the system. As the most ambitious, moneyed, and talented depart, they abandon public education and the bulk of higher education to their own, diminishing resources. (p.196)

As discussed in Chapter 3, independent schools do run the risk, and in fact are in some cases, elitist institutions because their free governance requires the acquisition of private funding. However, it is again noted that independent schools have done much to avoid being separated or isolated from the larger communities of which they are a part, local and global through various initiatives and programs. Chapter 3 also highlighted the diversity of missions and types of independent schools, ranging from traditionally wealthy and tuition-driven models to alternative free schools that raise outside funds in

order to be affordable, sometimes free, to the constituents they aim to serve. The non-profit status of independent schools institutes a certain responsibility to stakeholders to utilize their funds in socially responsible ways.

Lasch (1995) launches a similar criticism of elite society more generally, but one that is inclusive of and utilized against private education.

> The thinking classes are fatally removed from the physical side of life- hence their feeble attempt to compensate by embracing a strenuous regimen of gratuitous exercise. Their only relation to productive labor is that of consumers… They live in a world of abstractions and images… (p.20).

Lasch's criticism is more generalized than that of Jacoby, assuming that social class correlates closely with levels of intellectual activity. Despite this faulty generalization, the examples of collaboration, outreach, and awareness of human interdependence that are demonstrated in the programs and initiatives of independent schools above seem to counter this criticism and express an awareness of the potential and danger of allowing independent schools to become these types of communities. The response of independent schools through the various initiatives outlined above as well as others does not deny an economic aspect or imperative within globalization, but rather lets independent school communities define the ways in which they understand and will respond to globalization. The mission statement of NAIS' Global Initiatives sector reflects an awareness and responsibility to our interdependence in a global society, rather than a preoccupation with the preservation or maintenance of political or economic power and wealth, as does the current curricular reforms of public education as manifested in the No Child Left Behind Act.

Independent schools thereby represent a creative space in which they can, by virtue of their private organization and ownership, explore various approaches and responses to globalization, understood as a multifaceted construct without a fixed meaning for all communities, in different curricular initiatives and reforms. These programs express a social responsibility and cognizance of the danger of becoming isolated communities in an increasingly small world.

Blurring boundaries

There is an irony in the current approaches to globalization as manifested in the curricula of public schools and independent schools. In the face of the threat of international economic competition, the federal government blames the educational sector for misguided instruction that puts our students at a global disadvantage. The response has been increasing federal involvement and governance of public school curricula and structure over the past few decades, with calls for greater accountability to a set of national standards that are designed to rectify the current so-called failings of these schools. As discussed above, these standards are designed to primarily ensure the economic viability and superpower of our country in the midst of threats generated through technological advances that open up accesses to power that were previously closed. This approach to globalization expresses a perspective "from above" in which globalization is articulated and understood in terms of the threats it poses to previously assumed positions of power. Spring (2001) traces the evolution of the articulation of the uses of public education for gain in the private sector of business.

> In the early 1960s one would have been quickly branded a radical for arguing that
> the U.S. educational system was geared to meet the needs on international

corporate competition. Times have certainly changed. The recent reports from federal, state, and private groups demand an increase in academic standards in public schools, particularly in science and mathematics, are unanimous in the contention that higher standards in the schools will keep America competitive in foreign markets. (p. 123)

By contrast, the program of independent schools seem to articulate a perspective "from below". The programs and initiatives of independent schools explored above, as well as the many more initiatives instituted locally by schools, reiterate a belief in the need to start with local understandings and implications of globalization. This approach denies a monocultural understanding of what globalization is and encourages communities to understand it from a local perspective, developing approaches in curricula in response to those local understandings and an awareness of resources, needs, and stakeholders. The approach "from below" celebrates the opportunities that globalization holds for collaboration and new ways of understanding the world. The organic and collaborative organizations and initiatives encourage sharing and joint exploration of how globalization is a diverse construct with no fixed meaning, and an awareness of the interdependence it highlights.

The irony in exploring the various responses and approaches to globalization as articulated in the curricula of public schools and independent schools is the call for an increasingly regulated and singular understanding of globalization in public education. Rather than recognizing the plurality of understandings of how globalization is understood and manifested in local communities, the response of public education is to define globalization in terms of economic threats to private businesses and corporations

that serve the interests of a few. The current approach in educational policy in public schools denies democratic involvement in shaping the curriculum and shuts down spaces for imagining new types of schooling. Ironically, the approaches of independent schools, as one sector of private education, recognize the interdependence that globalization highlights and the plurality of understandings that it can constitute.

As Singh (2005) notes, globalization can open up new ways of understanding educational work more generally.

> Global/national restructuring and destructuring has opened up possibilities for innovative ways of reframing the role of education. Such responses to the risk of neoliberal globalism are less an extension to curriculum work than they are suggestions for the fundamental reworking of education. This means restoring the capacity of education for enabling students to respond to and engage with the ethical dilemmas and investment risks the world now takes. (p.133)

The reframing that Singh advocates is rarely possible in the current structure of public education as federally controlled and standardized. There must be room for creative development and exploration to "engage students" with different understandings and implications of globalization. In a narrowly defined curriculum that stresses discrete skills that can be measured on standardized tests, there hardly seems to be such free and public space for creativity.

Although he approaches globalization "from above", Friedman's (2007) work *The world is flat* suggests several implications of globalization for educational work. As stated earlier, while taking a "from above" perspective, Friedman's work is somewhat more responsible than other such perspectives. His work explores and documents his

travels and conversations with leaders from various international localities, attempting to articulate to an American audience the ways in which globalization is understood differently in various places and economic centers throughout the world. The intention of the book is to provide a warning that if we do not begin to pay closer attention to these different understandings of globalization, we will be at a distinct loss as a country and forfeit many of the privileges we have gained as a world superpower. While the global compassion of his intention in writing this book could be debated, however his observations and documentations of the perspectives of international others is valuable in understanding the multifaceted nature of globalization. His suggestions for education reflect this diversity and understanding of globalization.

Friedman suggests that schools focus on several key points in order to prepare students for the uncertainty of a global society, albeit for economic stability and sustainability. He suggests that education focus on the teaching of metacognitive skills in which students learn how to learn, allowing them to adapt as knowledge is quickly created and utilized in different ways, as well as giving students the ability to recognize and discriminate different types of knowledges through what he terms "navigation" skills. Another element for which Friedman advocates is passion and curiosity over and above pure intellectual ability, stressing the importance of "right brain" activity in being valuable as producers and creators of new types of knowledges. Finally, he stresses interdisciplinary learning through liberal arts in order to give students broad foundations from which to gather and "connect dots" in new and creative ways.

Theses skills are valuable in globalization according to Friedman because the work of storing and retrieving discrete and specialized bits of information and skills is

becoming increasingly inexpensive and automated, as it is outsourced to lower-wage workers and robotized industries abroad. The economic rewards of globalization will be achieved amongst those who can create and generate new types of understandings and knowledges, technology allowing this to be possible regardless of global location. It seems ironic that as public education advocates an economic understanding of and concern for globalization, it promotes almost contradictory types of learning to what is needed to achieve this success. Rather than allowing for the free space in order to allow students to develop metacognitive skills, curiosity and passion, exploration of interdisciplinary learning, and "navigation" skills, public education is teaching discrete amounts of information that can be disseminated and regurgitated on standardized tests. As explored above, policies such as the No Child Left Behind Act promote this generalization and consumption of information in the name of preparation for economic viability in a global society, yet fail to recognize the ways in which this type of education is counterproductive and disadvantageous within any understanding of globalization.

Nixon (2005) points out the ways in which the message of globalization as neoliberal capitalism and the resulting implications for schools has been communicated to the general public through vehicles other than educational institutions.

> …[C]ultural pedagogies of the media, advertising, and promotion, which operate on behalf of both institutional politics and the business sector have been key to the task of educating teachers and parents about how young people might best be prepared for participation in future national economic success within a global cultural economy. (p.52)

There is a need to re-evaluate how we understand education within a globalized society, no matter what understanding of globalization we embrace. There is a larger connection between school and the outside world; schools are not the only source of "education", and are increasingly less influential the more self-enclosed and standardized that they become. This realization begs the question of how schools can become more influential among other societal and cultural forces by both becoming more informed and informing others about the "how young people might best be prepared for participation" in a global community.

Globalization further troubles the traditional boundaries between what constitutes the private and the public. The increases in connectivity between human beings globally highlights the ways in which there is always the representation of the other in our human activities and curricular articulations. To revisit this notion, I restate this understanding of the always internal dialogical nature of language explored in Chapter 2.

> Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear. The processes for centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance; the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as an individualized embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participation in such speech diversity… Such is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a school and so forth. (Bakhtin, 1981, p.272)

The current articulation of curriculum within public education hides, and even denies, this representation of the other, employing public institutions to further the private

sector of business. In contrast, the organic and collaborative approaches to globalization within independent schools celebrate these possibilities within their curricular responses, recognizing the interdependence and play of the private understandings of globalization and their public manifestations and implications.

I hardly suggest that we privatize public education in an attempt to reorganize how we understand education in a global society. I do suggest that we use the private space of independent education more publicly to expose and trouble the traditional private/public distinction. The supposed articulation of this distinction in current public school curricula not only achieves the opposite of what it advocates, it stifles our understandings of the possibilities inherent in education. The explorations of this chapter serve to trouble the utility of this conception of curriculum, further troubling the ways in which the private and public interact in all forms of curriculum, recognized or not as such.

As we become increasingly connected to the "other", within both other individuals in different geographical locations as well as the other in our own community or ourselves, the ways in which we conceive of our world and the concept of globalization will continue to evolve and change. There is not prescribed or set formula that provides the one best solution, as there remain multiple questions and problems and the constant regeneration of these as solutions are provided and tested. The quote at the beginning of this chapter from Pinar (2004) alludes to the creativity and possibilities necessitated by the changing global climate. Rather than "succumbing" to a current understanding of society, we must explore ways in which "intelligence and learning can lead to other worlds, not just the successful exploitation of this one" (p.247).

This chapter has explored the ways in public spaces can and are being co-opted and utilized for private gain and the ways in which private spaces can be used to explore and generate creativity for public benefits in attempts to rearticulate the possibilities of curriculum work to open new and multiple understandings of education within both private and public spheres. This articulation of this process can be understood in exploring the responses of public schools and independent schools to globalization through their curricula, and represent the interdependence of the private and public spaces between individuals and ourselves in any understanding of globalization. We must use both forms of education to navigate the space within and between the private and public spheres in order to allow for education to "lead to other worlds", moving beyond a narrow definition of curriculum as the means to a predefined end. Globalization, regardless of how it is understood, denies such predefinition and continues to blur boundaries of private and public spaces.

CHAPTER 7: LOOKING FORWARD TO LOOKING BEHIND: REVISITNG AND FINDING PUBLIC/PRIVATE SPACES

We can't simply bifurcate lost and found and say that one is good and one is bad.

Sometimes there is a foundness in being lost and a lostness in being found.

(Reynolds, 2003, p.54)

In looking at the histories of independent schools and public schools around the topics of identity politics, accountability, and globalization, this work leaves questions about the spaces between and within independent and public schooling. These questions ask where the public spaces within independent schooling, as a type of private schooling, reside and how these can be used publicly and privately to continue curricular innovation and movement. In troubling the distinction between the private and public divide, can we find ourselves amongst a middle, lost position?

The private/public divide was addressed in the second chapter by reflecting upon how Schubert's (1995) assessment of curriculum as an ongoing competition for primacy between the society, the individual, and the subject matter could be understood in postmodernism. To reflect upon these in light of the histories of public schooling and independent schooling suggests that these aspects of the curriculum are not necessarily independent of one another, and remain not only interrelated, but intra-related. The society contains within it the private lives of individuals, and the individual remains always within the context of the other in society. The subject matter acts as a sort of web, weaving in, out, and among these aspects of our lives.

Curriculum Studies embraces this web, the intervention of our lives with those of the other, understanding the curriculum as our "running (or lived experience) of the course" (Pinar, 2004, p. xiii). We encounter the other within ourselves and the lives of

individuals with whom we interact in our social institutions, including our schools. An

awareness of this web seems particularly important in the present moment (also inclusive

of the past and future moments).

Education is potentially becoming a stifling affair, approaching the project of

intellectual activity from a very ahistorical perspective, neglecting the past that is within

the present and the future to which it points. We look to schools for quick fixes to social

ailments and economic competitiveness, neglecting where these aspirations come from

and to where they will lead. In this understanding and employment of schools, we act a

bit like the Dutch boy with his finger plugging a leak in the dam. We stick our thumbs in

one crack, only for another to spurt open because we deny that the dam may be old or in

need of repair, or that it is no longer a dam that we need. In his exploration of teacher

pedagogy in classroom throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Cuban

(1993) found that although there was change in terminologies, theories, and materials,

there was relatively little change in the actual pedagogy of the classroom. He compares

this to a hurricane over an ocean.

> In examining how various forces had shaped the curriculum and classroom
>
> instruction over the previous century, I used the metaphor of a hurricane to
>
> distinguish among curriculum theory, courses of study, materials, and classroom
>
> teaching. Hurricane winds sweep across the sea, tossing up 20-foot waves; a
>
> fathom below the surface turbulent waters swirl, while on an ocean floor there is
>
> unruffled calm. (p. 2)

In *Curriculum: a river runs through it* (2003), Reynolds discusses the ways in which the curriculum is a river of our experiences. Perhaps we need a new way of understanding the rivers that schools hold. Schools hold the bodies of our experiences. The modernist approach to education seems to be counterproductive in our increasingly postmodern world. The use of public education as a means to assimilate, acculturate, or use as a political scapegoat and tool for economic betterment seems to stifle a creative passion for education and learning. Education is reduced to a series of products, as manifested in accountability legislation such as the No Child Left Behind Act. Further, it seems to deny democracy in education, replacing plurality with the bifurcation of knowledge into permanent categories so that intellectual activity is impossible.

A postmodern exploration of the histories of independent and public schools questions the location of the simplification of the understandings of our schools and education. It questions the ways in which education is becoming a product-oriented industry. It asks if there are new ways to conceive of the ways in which schools contain the ebb and flow of our experiences, if there is something other than a dam that we need to hold the bodies of our experiences.

Says who?

Postmodernism questions the voices and identities that speak, and any claims to definite meanings and permanence. It is a complicated discourse which questions the ways in which identity do and do not signify, the ways in which identities are multifarious and unitary simultaneously. The educational policies currently employed in public education are portrayed as anonymous and unanimous, and as such democratic. However, postmodernism questions the democracy of such an approach, in which

denying differences and plurality in approaches to curriculum is an evasive tactic. In denying distinctions, this approach attempts to force unity under the broad banner of "standards" and "accountability" while evading whose interest these standards serve and to whom we are accountable. It employs a politics of identity in denying the self-proposed identity of the individual, dictating what their identity is through standards that take little account of differences and plurality. This approach subsumes the role of the individual as subordinate to that of the subject matter and the society, denying their interdependence in an immoral display of power. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) write,

> The notion of unity (unite) appears only when there is a power takeover in the multiplicity by the signifier or a corresponding subjectification proceeding… Unity always operates in an empty dimension supplementary to that of the system considered (overcoding). (p.8)

This takeover of power attempts to deny the ways in which the private infiltrate and constitute a mutually-reflective relationship with the public. It denies the ways in which signifiers slip away from the signified, where multiplicity is formed and voiced, where creativity resides. In an exploration of one construct of identity, race, and the ways in which it has been understood and incorporated in educational policies of public and independent school *histories*, there is always the *presence* of this slippage. Race has been understood as biological, sociological, and economical, among other ways; and has been understood as an isolated construct of identity as well as a component of a "nonsynchronous" (McCarthy, 1990) identity.

Despite the slippery nature of the identity concept of race, it has been "overcoded" and denied its multiplicity in educational policies and reforms within both

the public and private sectors in various approaches to education, including essentialist racism, color-/power- evasiveness, and race-cognizance. This denial of the multiplicity of race is seen in structural accounts of both independent and public schooling that aspire to a sameness, as well as curricular policies and movements that require everyone to meet one standard or set of standards. Public schools have "overcoded" the concept of race in approaches to race such as separate but equal, structuring of school districts based upon property tax, and even now in accountability measures that do not distinguish between the multiplicity of identities of students and the private lives they bring. Independent school have also "overcoded" the concept of race in their growth during the Civil Rights Movement as institutions of white flight, denying entrance to diverse races by selective entrance policies and costly tuitions.

However, independent schools are becoming more attentive of the importance in multiplicity of its constituents in the project of education, recognizing difference gives birth to creativity and movement, while sameness stagnates. By revising admission criteria and fees structures, independent schools are making themselves more accessible to a diverse population. In studying and being attentive to the experiences of these students, their approach of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) gives voice to these students and their experiences, whether positive or negative. Independent schools are becoming increasingly aware that their private structure and organization is always situated within a public community and context, and that this situatedness invokes a responsibility to be attentive to the private/public intersection of the lives of their students. Despite this attentiveness, the organizational and financial structure of most independent schools still

place barriers to a truly diverse student body by virtue of a dependence of tuition for financial survival.

The histories of independent and public schools reflect the present slippery nature of the identity concept of race. It is slippery in the ways in which it is woven through the private and public lives of students in their lived experiences manifested as the curricula in schools. The organizational structure of public schools based on property tax make some public schools better than others, and admission is denied to many based upon the intersection of income and race. Despite policies aspiring to sameness for all students, students' experiences differ greatly from one public school to the next because of budgetary differences. And, curricular policies that aspire to sameness in the name of democracy seem to deny the private lives and identities of individuals in requiring a one-size-fits-all education. Although independent schools are becoming increasingly aware and attentive to their public situatedness and context, developing an awareness and appreciation of the ways in which they must be socially responsible to be truly educative, there is still work to be done to truly harness the private space of these schools for public good. Their structure and organization continue to draw a line between the private and public spheres that prevents the movement and creativity that potentially awaits.

Still accounting

The ways in which we express our identities and expectations for our identities in schooling is lived in the curriculum. As discussed in Chapter 5, these expectations are what we use to hold schools accountable, and the way in which we choose to whom they will be accountable. The bifurcation of a private/public divide does disservice to the

potentialities of how we hold schools accountable and for what we hold them

accountable.

In *Scientific method in curriculum-making*, Bobbitt (1993) wrote,

The central theory is simple. Human life, however varied, consists in the

performance of specific activities. Education that prepares for life is one that

prepares definitely and adequately for these specific activities. However

numerous and diverse they may be for any social class, they can be discovered.

(p.165)

This has been the guiding philosophy and approach to curriculum and

accountability for most of the second half of the twentieth century and into the twenty-

first century. There has existed the modernist assumption that intricacies of our activities

and lives can be described objectively, and thereby known and translated into the

curriculum scientifically. The goal of curriculum in this understanding is preparation and

training, for some prescribed outcome. Schools can be held accountable for either

achieving or failing in the pursuit of these outcomes. Public schools have been held

accountable to prepare citizens for participation in a democratic society, but exactly what

character that preparation may take on has been and continues to be a subjective

argument. Independent schools embrace the subjectivity of this argument, communally

deciding how to best design and implement this preparation to meet local contributions

and needs.

This understanding of curriculum, as a "scientific" approach, is stagnant and

denies creative spaces. Comparatively, postmodern approaches to curriculum do not

aspire to curricula as *descriptions* of specific activities and goals of our lives but stand

only as *representations* to our interactions across the public/ private divide. Curriculum is a dialogue in the third space between the private and public.

Bakhtin (1981) states of the word,

It is entangled, shot through with shared thoughts, points of view, alien value judgments and accents. The word, directed towards its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersect with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile. (p.276)

How does this apply to the ways in which we express and understand our identities as lived in the curriculum and the ways in which we hold students accountable for various prescribed standards? The work in postmodernism is not isolated or alone, but stands always in conjunction with the other. Standards that aspire to public objectivity and ignore the private lives of students, teachers, and those doing educational work will always be unsuccessful. They neglect that the discourse of standards is populated already with these private lives, and that they continue to infiltrate and intersect among themselves and the curriculum. Where the public begins and the private ends is an imaginary line, drawn in political sands for the purposes and pursuits of private ambitions.

Spreading globally, cohering locally

The intersection of the private and the public is becoming increasingly crowded as the concept of nation-states and geographical boundaries are overpopulated with

technologic and economic understandings that gloss over previous structures and categorizations of how we understand our own identities and our relationships to others. Amidst our enlarged awareness and access to the diversity around us, there is a sense of both opportunity and threat. The opportunity exists for us to expand our realms of contacts and understandings through communication innovations that give us immediate access to others and information. We can invent our private lives and place them into the public arena in virtual realities that are immune to any notions of objectivity.

Simultaneously, amidst this celebration of plurality, there is a sense of peril amongst those who once held power under modernist structures that restricted movement and accesses to power. There is increasing competition for whose knowledge should be regarded as the ideal, to which schools should be held accountable, as those who previously held exclusive access to these portals of knowledge and communication scramble to find a way to hold on to power in the public and still obtain and maintain private wealth.

The modernist, scientific approach to curriculum has proven incapable of flourishing in this globalized context. It has become impossible to observe and know for certain what future activities students might need to be prepared, as technology changes the ways in which we understand ourselves and the ways in which we constitute our lives. One given set of knowledge will leave students ill-prepared to thrive, as well as act responsibly, in a global context. The modernist approach disregards the centripetal and centrifugal forces of globalization that blur the lines between the private/public divide.

A postmodern approach to curriculum intersects in the space between the private and public, a virtual space in a globalized context. It provides a paradoxical coherence

amongst the differences within globalization. An appreciative approach respectful of diversity paradoxically can bring a sort of coherence, and togetherness. Schubert (1995) writes,

> It may seem strange that diversity could bring a kind of coherence. However, the awareness of the diverse cultures, norms, ways of knowing, and ways of being in the world augments repertoires of possibility and enriches our capacity for creative lives worth living and worth sharing. (p.153)

The celebration of and play within difference, the rejection of a singular way of knowing, brings a sort of coherence in pulling together what is always apart. This pulling together is temporary and fleeting, relationships always slipping together and then apart.

An understanding of schooling that attempts to draw lines between the public and private spaces and relationships denies this celebration, and leads to stagnation. Rather, a connection to and exploration of localized diversity within education might lead to new and celebratory places for our students to understand their worlds and its intersection with others. Exploring this divide could not take on one specified formula for all students, but entails diverse approaches to learning and ways of knowing. The paradox in a postmodern understanding of curriculum is its coherence in its diversity. We are the same in our differences, different in our sameness.

(In)concluding: post-notes of postmodernism

In exploring the ways in which the private and public intersect in the histories of public schooling and independent schooling, there is no one conclusion to be drawn. One type of schooling is not inherently better than the other, and one type is not more or less private or public than the other, despite the misleading of their categorizations in

common educational dialogue. Their histories contain "utterances" of the other, utterances of the public within private and the private within public, and hint that there is always a middle, or third space. This third space is not locatable, but eludes concrete descriptions and categorizations. Public schools can and have been co-opted for private aspirations, an often dangerous prospect for schools built with the intention of insuring democracy. They contain the private lives of their students and teachers, and are influenced by these despite policies that attempt to deny this affect. Independent schools constitute public spaces that can be utilized as creative spaces to explore possibilities and freedoms in education because they are free from the control of government. They can be employed in our understandings of education as alcoves and pockets, where each community represents different and alternative views to what education should aspire and how to achieve that. The exploration and troubling of the private/public divide gives us new spaces and room for questioning, for the thinking of new questions to ask. Caputo (1987) describes the celebratory space in the flux of the in-between,

> Undecidability is the way to keep questions in question. Questioning is thought's movement, *kinesis*, the work (*ergon*) of a thinking which cannot rest.... Questioning is a way of staying under way. Undecidability keeps us in motion, keeps us faithful to the flux… Undecidability consigns us to the *doxa*, wandering two-headed in a maze of differential interweavings, with no footing, on constantly shifting, slipping grounds. It keeps us off balance, in *ébranler*, the trembling. (p.188)

This position has been critiqued for its lack of a position, postmodernism has been called flimsy and weak, a backdoor to real scholarly and philosophic work. Yet, this

critique is usually from those who benefit from the permanence of power structures in modernism, who have something to lose when all is called into the play and flux of the paradoxes of postmodernism; the paradox that not taking a position is simultaneously taking a position. The discourses in postmodernism remain removed from mainstream educational theories and discourses, perhaps hinting at what is at stake in schooling and what the project of schooling may be about protecting. Its absence hints that various approaches and reforms in schooling may be more about excluding certain people and restricting access to education and power to only certain other people. The chaos of postmodernism applied to education is menacing in its opening of spaces that have previously been protected and closed. When the public spaces within independent schools, as a form of private schooling, and private spaces within public schools are opened and explored, there is much to be lost and much to gain. Ironically, the traditional losers become winners and the traditional winners become lost.

In troubling the divide of this space in-between the public and private, new places for inspiration and creativity for what education is and might achieve can be found. This troubling questions our conventional understandings of curriculum as *what is taught* to ask *why and how it is taught*, and how this further weaves the web between the private and public lives of students. This third space is both the end and the beginning of curriculum, where our lived experiences are born, die, and become reborn. This circular space is what gives forth new intellectual activity, and allows for the continuation of true education, as manifested in curriculum. Serres (1991) celebrates this third space as the goal of instruction.

The goal of instruction is the end of instruction, that is to say invention. Invention is the only true intellectual act, the only act of intelligence… The inventive breath alone gives life, because life invents. The absence of invention proves, by counterexample, the absence of work and of thought. The one who does not invent works somewhere other than in intelligence. Brutish. Somewhere other than life. Dead. (p. 93).

To remain divided, to remain in a distinction between the private and public is to stop movement, become concrete and permanent, to cease invention. This work seeks to trouble this divide and open the third space between private and public schools, as a space to question and engage in the intellectual activity of education, to question education and curriculum, with the end of the instruction merely the beginning.

The troubling of the private/public distinction causes us to reconsider what constitutes the political. Often relegated solely to the realm of the public, the interconnectivity between the private and public gives cause to redefining how the political and democratic are understood, and how this re-informs our understandings of schooling and the curriculum. The dialogue between the histories of independent schools and public schools provides an exploratory space, a creative space, a space for this re-defining, for questioning and play. The utterances of the in-betweens of their histories suggest that they are not so separate and distinct as they have been traditionally portrayed, or that they neatly fit within the categories of private and public. The utterances of the in-betweens of their histories suggest that there are third spaces (Serres, 1991) between each, space that simultaneously contain both private and public, as well as neither private nor public. Neither form is better or worse, the in-between spaces suggest

that there are new questions to be asked about schooling; that there are new ways to envision the rivers of lived experiences (Reynolds, 2003) in the curriculum that do not require that we patch the dams, but that we question the dams themselves and envision new ways of embracing the rivers.

This dialogue of "otherness" in the histories of public and independent schooling opens ways for this questioning and play. It brings to the discourse of Curriculum Studies and education more generally an oft-overlooked sector of schooling, the private, as manifested in independent schools in particular. The space of independent schools troubles our traditional understandings of private education, and the intersection of its history with that of public school troubles traditional distinctions between the two.

This in-between space of the private/public divide is troubled, and is troubling, in its suggestions of other spaces and ways of envisioning curriculum, education, and schooling. I offer no definitive suggestions, rather a humble invitation to question this space, to question our current understandings of schooling and the possibilities and futurities of them. Invent, question, play, begin, end, and begin again. This space is a place for private broadcasts, public reserve, private inclusion, public exclusion, private undisclosure, public concealment … To engage in this play and creative space is to invent, to continue the project of curriculum, to continue to live.

REFERENCES

Aiken, W. (1993). The story of the Eight-Year Study, 1942. In G. Willis, W. Schubert, R. Bullough, C. Kridel, & J. Holton (Eds.)**,** *The American curriculum: A documentary history (pp.285-296).* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Ankersmit, F. R. (2001). *Historical representation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ankersmit, F. R. (1998). Historiography and postmodernism. In B. Fay, P. Pomper, & R. Vann. (Eds.), *History and theory: Contemporary Readings* (pp. 175-192). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Apple, M. (1995). Facing reality. In Beane, J. (Ed.), *Toward a coherent curriculum (pp.130-138)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Apple, M.W. (1999) Remembering capital: On the connection between french fries and education. In Pinar, W. (Ed.), *Contemporary curriculum discourses* (pp. 312 324). New York: Peter Lang.

Apple, M. (2001). *Educating the "Right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Apple, M., Kenway, J., and Singh, M. (Eds.) (2005). *Globalizing education: policies, pedagogies, & politics*. New York: Peter Lang.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The Knowledge Factory*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Arrastia, L. (2003). Should I stay or should I go now? In Kane, P. & Orsini, A. (Eds.), *The colors of excellence*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Arrington, E., Hall, D., & Stevenson, H. (2003). The success of African-American students in independent schools. **Independent School, 62, 11- 21**.

Ayers, W. (2001). *To teach: The journey of a teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Baker, B. (2002). The hunt for disability: The new eugenics and the normalization of school children. In **Teachers College Record, 104, 663-703**.

Baker, B. (2004). *Dangerous coagulations*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Baker, B. (2004). The functional liminality of not-yet-dead students, or, how public schooling became compulsory: A glancing history. In **Rethinking History, 8, 5 49**.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *Dialogical imagination: four essays*. [Trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist.] Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. [Trans. V. McGee.] Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barber, B. (1992). Jihad vs. McWorld. **The Atlantic, March 1992, 53-63.**

Barbieri, R. (2006). The way we were. **Independent School, 65, 72-79**.

Bassett, P. & Crosier, L. (Eds.) (1994). *Looking ahead: Independent School issues and answers*. Washington, DC: Avocus Publishing, Inc.

Bassett, P. (2003). Listening to students of color. **Independent School, 62, 7-8**.

Bobbitt, F. (1993). Scientific Method in Curriculum-Making, 1918. In G. Willis, W. Schubert, R. Bullough, C. Kridel, & J. Holton (Eds.)**,** *The American curriculum: A documentary history (pp.163-170).* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Brown, L. (2005). Virtual Spaces for Innovative pedagogical actions: education, technology, and globalization. In Apple, M., Kenway, J., and Singh, M. (Eds.), *Globalizing education (pp. 171-190).* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Caputo, J. (1987). *Radical hermeneutics: repetition, deconstruction, and the hermeneutic project.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Castenell, L., Jr & Pinar, W. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding curriculum as racial text.* Albany: State University of New York.

Collins, R. (1993). Responding to cultural diversity in our schools. In Castenell, L., Jr & Pinar, W. (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as racial text.* Albany: State University of New York.

Counts, G. (1969). *Dare the School build a new social order?* New York: Arno Press & the New York Times.

Cremin, L.A. (1961). *The transformation of the school.* New York: Vintage Books.

Cremin, L.A. (1988). *American education: The metropolitan experience 1876-1980.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Cremin, L.A. (1990) *Popular education and its discontents.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Croco, M., Murno, P., & Weiler, K. (1999). *Pedagogies of resistance: women educator as social activists 1880-1960.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: constancy and change in American classrooms.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Deleuze, G. & Guatarri, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia.* [Trans. B. Mussumi.] Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G. (1990). *Negotiations.* [Trans. M. Joughin.] New York: Columbia University Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children*. New York: The New Press.

Department of the interior, Bureau of Education. (1993). Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. In G. Willis, W. Schubert, R. Bullough, C. Kridel, & J. Holton (Eds.)**,** *The American curriculum: A documentary history (pp.153-162).* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Derrida, J. (1977). *Of grammatology*. [Trans. G. C. Spivak.] Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press Ltd.

Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions*. [Trans. A. Bass.] Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1995). *Archive fever: A Freudian impression*. [Trans. E. Prenowitz.] Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1954). *The public and its problems*. Athens, OH: Swallow Press.

Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and Education*. New York: Touchstone.

Faculty of Yale College. (1993). The Yale report. In G. Willis, W. Schubert, R. Bullough, C. Kridel, & J. Holton (Eds.)**,** *The American curriculum: A documentary history (pp. 25-37).* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Fay, B., Pomper, P., & Vann, R. (Eds.) (1998). *History and theory: Contemporary readings*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Fine, M. & Weis, L. (1998). *The unknown city*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Franklin, B. (1993). Proposals relating to the education of youth in Pennsylvania**.** In G. Willis, W. Schubert,   R. Bullough, C. Kridel, & J. Holton (Eds.)**,** *The American curriculum: A documentary history (pp. 377-384).* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Franklin, B. (Ed.) (2000). *Curriculum and consequences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat.* New York: Picador.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archeology of the human sciences*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge & the discourses on language*. [Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith.] New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1994). *Aesthetics, method, and epistemology*. [Trans. R. Hurley.] New York: The New Press.

The Gates Foundation. *Speech delivered at the National Education Summit on High Schools*. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from www.gatesfoundation.org.

Giroux, H. & Giroux, S.S. (2004). *Take back higher education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.

Global Connections. Retrieved November 23, 2007 from (http://www.globalconnection.org/gpie.html).

Graff, G. (2003). *Clueless in academe*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Graubard, A. (1972). *Free the children: radical reform and the free school movement*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Haymes, S. N. (1995). *Race, culture, and the city: A pedagogy for black urban struggle*. Albany: State University of New York.

Hebdige, D. (1996). Postmodernism and the 'other side.' In D. Morley & C. Kuan Hsing. (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp.174-200). New York: Routledge.

Heidegger, M. (1993). *Basic Concepts*. [Trans. G. Aylesworth.] Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Heidegger, M. (1993). The way to language. In D. Krell (Ed.), *Martin Heidegger: Basic writings (pp.393-426)*. San Francisco: HarperCollins Publishers.

Heischman, D. R. (1994). The storm in the midst of calm: seven moral polarities of independent day schools. In Bassett, P. & Crosier, L. (Eds.), *Looking ahead: Independent School issues and answers (pp. 3-13)*. Washington, DC: Avocus Publishing, Inc.

Hobsbawm, E. (1997). *On history*. New York: The New Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Huebner, D. (1975). The contradiction between the recreative and the established. In Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E. (Eds.), *Schools in search of meaning*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Huebner, D. (1991). Curriculum as concern for man's temporality. **Theory into Practice, 26, 324-331**.

Jacoby, R. (1994). *Dogmatic wisdom: how the culture wars divert education and distract America.* New York: Doubleday.

Kaestle, C. E. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Kane, P. R. (Ed) (1992). *Independent schools, independent thinkers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kane, P. R. & Orsini, A. F. (Eds) (2003). *The colors of excellence*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kellner, H. (1987). Narrativity in history: Post-structuralism and since. **History and Theory, 26, 1-29.**

Kliebard, H. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum*. New York: Routledge.

Kozol, J. (1972). *Free schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kraushaar, O. F. (1972). *American Nonpublic Schools Patterns of Diversity*. Baltimore, MA: John Hopkins University Press.

Kridel, C. (1989). *Curriculum history: Conference presentations from the society for the study of curriculum history*. Lanham, MD: University of America Press.

Kridel, C. & Bullough, R. V., Jr. (2007). *Stories of the Eight Year Study: reexamining secondary education in America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kuan-Hsing, C. (1996). Post-marxism: between/beyond critical postmodernism. In D. Morley & C. Kuan-Hsing. (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (p.309-325). New York: Routledge.

Lasch, C. (1995). *The revolt of the elites and the betrayal of democracy*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Lei, J. & Grant, C. (2001). Multicultural education in the United States: A case of paradoxical equality. In Grant, C. & Lei, J. (Eds.), *Global construction of*

multicultural education: Theories and realities. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Associates, Publishers.

Levine, A. & Levine, M. (1970). *A social history of helping services: Clinic, court,*

school, and community. New York: Meredith Corporation.

Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E. (Eds.) (1975). Schools in search of meaning. Washington,

D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCarthy, C. (1990). *Race and curriculum*. New York: The Falmer Press.

McGuinn, P. J. (2006) No child left behind and the transformation of federal education

policy, 1965-2005. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Megill, A. (1995). 'Grand Narrative" and the discipline of history. In Ankersmit, F. &

Kellner, H. (Eds.), *A new philosophy of history* (p.151- 173). Chicago: The

University of Chicago Press.

Morris, M. (2005). *Back up group: Herecomesthe(Post)Reconceptualization*. **Journal of**

Curriculum Theorizing, 21, 3-11.

Munro, P. (1998). *Subject to Fiction: Women teachers' life history narratives and the*

cultural politics of resistance. London: Open University Press.

Munro, P. (1998). Engendering Curriculum History. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum:*

toward new identities in/for the field. New York: Garland Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. *Public and private elementary and secondary*

enrollment, teachers, and pupil/teacher ratios: fall 1995 to fall 2001. Retrieved

Novemebr 4, 2003 from htt://www.nces.ed.gov/quicktables/Deatil.asp?Key=692.

National Association of Independent Schools. *What are independent schools*? Retrieved

November 4, 2003, from http://www.nais.org/about/what.cfm .

National Association of Independent Schools. *Mission statement.* Retrieved July 30, 2007 from http://www.nais.org/about.

National Association of Independent Schools. *Challenge 20/20.* Retrieved November 23, 2007 from

http://www.nais.org/conferences/index.cfm?ItemNumber=147262&sn.ItemNumer=148035.

National Association of Independent Schools. *China Connection Program.* Retrieved November 23, 2007 from

http://www.nais.org/resources/index.cfm?ItemNumber=149408.

National Association of Independent Schools. *Global education initiatives.* Retrieved November 23, 2007 from

http://www.nais.org/resources/index.cfm?ItemNumber=146778&sn.ItemNumber=146783.

National Education Association. (1993). Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies, 1893. In G. Willis, W. Schubert, R. Bullough, C. Kridel, & J. Holton (Eds.)**,** *The American curriculum: A documentary history (pp.85 -94).* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Nixon, H. (2005). Cultural pedagogies of technology in globalized economy. In Apple, M., Kenway, J., and Singh, M. (Eds.), *Globalizing education (pp. 45-60).* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Orsini, A. (2003). A context for understanding faculty diversity. In Kane, P. & Orsini, A. (Eds.), *The colors of excellence.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Pinar, W. (1994). *Autobiography, politics and sexuality.* New York: Peter Lang

   Publishing, Inc.

Pinar, W. (Ed.), (1999). *Contemporary curriculum discourses: Twenty years of JCT*.

   New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum

   Associates, Inc.

Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (2004). *Undersanding curriculum*.

   New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Rainbow, P., (Ed.) (1984). *The Foucault reader.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Raley, N. (2004). Round Square: forging international partnerships in education.

   Independent School, 63, 68-76.

Randall, E. V. (1994). *Private schools & public power: A case for pluralism.* New

   York: Teachers College Press.

Ravitch, D. (1974). *The great school wars: New York City, 1805-1973*. New York:

   Basic Books, Inc.

Ravitch, D. (1992). The role of private schools in American education. In Kane, P. R.

   (Ed.), *Independent schools, independent thinkers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,

   Inc.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reid, A. (2005). Rethinking the democratic purposes of public schooling. In Apple, M.,

   Kenway, J. & Singh, M. (Eds.), *Globalizing education (pp.281-296)*. New York:

   Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Relic, P. (2000). Reaching out- in the school's best interest. **Independent School, 60, 7-8.**

Reynolds, W. (2003). *Curriculum: a river runs through it*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Round Square. Retrieved November 23, 2007 from http://www.roundsquare.org/.

Sarason, S. B. (1996). *Revisiting "The culture of the schools and the problem of change."* New York: Teachers College Press.

Saussure, F. (1997. *Course in general linguistics*. [Trans. R. Harris.] Peru, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company.

Schubert, W. (1995). Toward lives worth living and sharing: Historical perspective on curriculum coherence. In Beane, J. (Ed.), *Toward a coherent curriculum (pp.146-157)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Serres, M. (1991). *The troubadour of knowledge*. [Trans. S. F. Glaser & W. Paulson.] Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Seybolt, R. F. (1971). *Source studies in American colonial education*. New York: Arno Press & the New York Times.

Short, E. (Ed.) (1991). *Forms of curriculum inquiry*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Singh, M. (2005). Responsive education: enabling transformative engagements with transitions in global/national imperatives. In Apple, M., Kenway, J., and Singh, M. (Eds.), *Globalizing education (pp. 113-134).* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Spring, J. (1992). *Images of American life: a history of ideological management in schools, movies, radio, and television*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Spring, J. (1993). *Conflict of interest: the politics of American schools*. New York: Longman.

Spring, J. (1994). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: a history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spring, J. (2000). *The universal right to education: justification, definition, and guidelines*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spring, J. (2001). *The American School 1642-2000*. New York, NY: The McGraw Hill Higher Education.

Spring, J. (2001). Education and the Sony wars. In Noll, J. W. (Ed.), *Taking sides: clashing views on controversial educational issues, (pp. 123-129).* Gullford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Spring, J. (2001). *Globalization and educational rights: an intercivilizational analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stettler, R. and Algrant, J. (2003). Changing course for the better. **Independent School, 62, 40- 47.**

Tyack, D. (1967). *Turning points in American educational history*. Waltham, MA:

   Blaisdell Publishing Company.

Tyack, D. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*.

   Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: a century of public school*

   reform. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. (2003). *Seeking common ground: public schools in a diverse society*.

   Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

United States Department of Education. *Document untitled.* Retrieved March 5, 2005

   from (http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget06/nclb/index.html)

   (http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/ayp203/edlite-slide003.html)

   (http://www.ed.gov/nclb/accountability/ayp/testing.html)

United States Supreme Court. *Abington School District v. Schempp, Murray v. Cutlett,*

   374, U.S. 203, 2963.

United States Supreme Court. *Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 1954.*

United States Supreme Court. *Engle v. vitale, 370 U.S. 421, 1962.*

United States Supreme Court. *Pierce v. Society of Sister, 268 U.S. 510, 1925.*

Walton, R. D. (1981). *A study to determine differences between public and new*

   independent schools in Georgia. Unpublished dissertation for the University of

   Mississipi.

Widmer, E. (2004). Making global connections. **Independent School, 63, 50-57**.

Willis, G., Schubert, W., Bullough, R., Kridel, C., and Holton, J. (Eds.) (1993). *The American curriculum: A documentary history*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Yeatman, A. (1994). *Postmodern revisionings of the political*. New York: Routledge.

Zagorin, P. (1998). Historiography and postmodernism: reconsiderations. In B. Fay, P. Pomper, & R. Vann. (Eds.), *History and theory: Contemporary Readings* (pp.193-204). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.