Globalization is a multidimensional construct used to structure international initiatives in economics, politics, technology, population studies, and education, to name just a few. Economist, Theodore Levitt, was the first to describe globalization phenomena, events, and consequences of changes in global economics. Levitt's particular expertise was the complex world of production, consumption, and investment (Stromquist, 2002). Scholars and governments quickly embraced the term using it to describe political and cultural changes rapidly transforming nations and people worldwide (Spring, 2008).

By its very definition, globalization assumes an interdisciplinary perspective, in which societies, cultures, and even civilizations bend and transform under the weight of economic, political, and social pressures (Stromquist & Monkman, 2014). Policies, of course, exist within a context and in the case of globalization context, is not limited to international influences but also influences and is influenced by decisions made at the local, regional, and national levels. Therefore, the term, globalization, embraces both positive and negative forces from the local to the international as each level changes and is changed by informational awareness, economics, and the force of rapidly evolving public opinion (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).

As societies shift and adjust to world trends, societal institutions, such as education, also feel the weight of globalized policies. Neoliberal influences on government and economics have greatly molded educational perspectives in both developed and developing countries and reflect in no small way the desires of developed countries to influence education from systems to an individual level. Current discussions of globalization must acknowledge and explore this force and its impact globally through World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) policies (Chepator-Thompson, 2014) and locally based on resource allocations to community schools.

In this chapter, I begin with an overview of globalization discourses that are currently shaping economic, political, and social policies. I then apply these discourses to the construct of globalized curriculum in physical education (PE), emphasizing both current and future trends. I conclude by considering several sport pedagogy-related themes that hold global attention and value. In the final section, I discuss current and potential research initiatives that can be scaled and externally funded in the evolving contexts of fair play, cultural revitalizing pedagogy, and health and well-being to provide students with relevant and meaningful opportunities to develop active, healthy physical experiences.
Globalization discourses

Spring (2008) identifies four globalization discourses that influence educational models around the world. These include world culture, world systems, postcolonial, and culturalist discourses. Discourses surrounding world culture propose that, “all cultures are slowly integrating into a single global culture” (Spring, 2008, p. 334). From this perspective, often described as neo-institutionalist, nations draw on a single Western conception of mass schooling when planning their school systems. This single global model for schooling assumes that Western perspectives should be set as the standard for all nations and cultures regardless of history, ethnic origins, or localized schooling practices (Lee & Cho, 2014). In PE, one might consider the relatively rapid exportation of models-based practice especially as related to the games-based approaches and the impact of fitness and wellness approaches which in the United States have an overwhelming neoliberal appeal (see Casey, Chapter 4). Likewise, when curricula are embraced by ministries of education and written as national curricula (see Thorburn, Chapter 6), the world cultures globalization thread becomes pervasive and powerful, shaping programming and teacher and student accountability (Evans, 2014; Macdonald, 2014).

Advocates of the world systems discourses conceptualize the world into two major, but unequal zones. The core or Northern Zone (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) consists of the United States, the European Union, and Japan which allocate resources purposefully to inculcate Northern Zone values to dominate and influence national (and educational) policy in the Southern Zone (i.e., Africa, South American, Caribbean, South Pacific Island nations). Northern Zone nations further these aims through their influence on funding available through international organizations such as the World Bank, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and the World Trade Organization, or the General Agreement on Trade in Services. For example, the World Bank provides educational loans to developing countries for the express purpose of economic and educational development. In this way, it directly influences educational ideology, planning, and institutional structures in developing countries (Chepator-Thompson, 2014). Neoliberal policies such as privatization of school systems and support of private and religious schools with public and World Bank/IMF funding limit access to liberal education and funnel curriculum into vocational orientations. In PE, Chepator-Thompson (2014) points out the seductive pull of these forces as they shape curricula in a blatantly colonial scenario.

Postcolonial perspectives on globalization are a special case of the world systems theories. Postcolonials attempt to impose an economic and political system that benefits wealthy and rich nations (both individuals and large multinational corporations) to the detriment of the world’s poor countries and individuals (Stromquist & Monkman, 2014). In current manifestations of postcolonial globalism, wealthy nations attempt to impose market economies, human capital education, and neoliberal school reforms designed to further the agenda of rich nations and multinational corporations. From this perspective, education is an economic investment designed to produce skilled labor to serve corporations (Spring, 2008). Postcolonial analyses include those of slavery and migrations, race, culture, class, and gender manifest in resistance and struggle, identity complexity, and language rights.

Culturalist theories of globalization emphasize the role of “cultural variations and the borrowing and lending of educational ideas within a global context” (Spring, 2008, p. 334). On a positive note, this model of schooling argues for inclusion and educability of all, the right to a quality education, and the importance of perpetuating economic and democratic rights (Artiles, Kozleski, & Waitoller, 2011). To an extent, the culturalist perspective appears compelling until one examines the processes used to implement this aim. The argument is that when affluent nations design curriculum they incorporate best models and practices available. Disseminating
these curricular prototypes globally can provide uplifting educational experiences for poor nations unable to fund the development of curricula that meet world standards. Thus, the rationale for a world or globalized curricula from culturalists’ perspectives focuses again on a Western school model that should be globalized because it represents a universal, absolute conceptualization of best practice.

**Neoliberalism**

Set and entwined within these discourses are powerful strands that have evolved from and influenced economic and political policies impacting national and multinational educational systems. Among these discourses are Northern Zone products of neoliberalism, global uniformity, and knowledge economies (Spring, 2008). Neoliberalism has become a central plank in the political platforms of conservative governments and politicians. Neoliberalism can be traced to the work of Friedrich Hayek, an Austrian economist and Nobel Prize winner. His work is based on a strong criticism of large government and unwieldy government bureaucracies. He favored free markets and minimal government regulations on markets and business. Within this perspective, sanctioned and regulated institutions such as schools should be privatized and control shifted to the marketplace (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Thus, society, students, and their families could choose schools based on their interests and judgments of quality without the need to attend schools based on geographic region or family income (e.g., charter and magnet schools).

To facilitate free choice, neoliberal governments and taxpayers fund mechanisms such as vouchers permitting students to attend any public, private, or religious school. Schools would be free and influenced by marketplace competition to market their curriculum and recruit students based on their offerings. Conservative neoliberalists, however, are unwilling to relinquish control of key educational drivers such as curriculum standards, testing requirements, or teacher credentialing, tenure, and salary scales (e.g., Sloan, 2008). In other words, neoliberalists advocate individual choice and minimal government regulation while simultaneously protecting accountability structures which in fact limit choice and impose government regulations. The goal is to shape policies and, in the case of schools, require administrators and teachers to conform within a highly regulated environment. Thus, neoliberal school reforms are designed to privatize traditional school services and return them to the marketplace in the form of school choice and for-profit schooling (Apple, Kenway, & Singh, 2005; Macdonald, 2011). World system and postcolonial advocates argue for neoliberalist ideologies to ensure that privileged nations and people retain their wealth and power in a globalized economy (Stromquist & Monkman, 2014).

Historically, the relative low status of school-based PE actually has protected it from some of these neoliberalistic forces while making it the victim of others. While physical educators have successfully avoided many of the regulations associated with prescribed curriculum and accountability-based testing experienced by classroom teachers and their students in high-profile subjects, they have, in turn, been whipped by the consequential redistribution of already limited school resources to these ‘tested subject areas’ (Ennis, 2014; McCullick, 2014). Recently, though, this too has changed in the United States as the neoliberal government funding programs such as the ‘Race to the Top’ initiatives have provided millions of dollars in resources to develop accountability systems for all teachers, including physical educators (United States Department of Education, 2009). Physical educators in some states and school districts are compelled to comply with ASW (Assessments of Student Work) policies, focusing on PE students’ performance within specific standards and objectives.
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A second aspect of neoliberal agenda, *global uniformity*, is a double-edged sword of educational globalization policies. World culturalists perceive a world curriculum in which supposedly all individuals have equal opportunities to flourish in a competitive marketplace. This perspective resonates in Northern Zone countries that simultaneously welcome, resist, and struggle to assimilate migrants from diverse cultures. Yet, uniformity comes with a substantial price as ethnic minorities must subsume their identities within a Northern Zone world and work view. Homogenization of curriculum and peoples may be a consequence of efforts to find the ‘best’ curriculum from a globalized perspective (Anderson-Levitt, 2008). This perspective on the converging curriculum suggests that nations increasingly agree on core curricula with ‘subject areas’ as the unit of commonality (in PE: games/sport; physical activity). However, simply because most countries include a subject, topic, or concept in their core curricula does not mean that it is taught in a uniform manner.

While national economies benefit from the ‘brain gain’ that occurs as skilled workers arrive, this increase in multicultural populations can result in cultural and religious conflicts and resistance to uniform, assimilationist curriculum practices. Only recently have educators attempted to view globalization through a pluralistic lens. As multicultural advocates argue for sustaining curricula that permit ethnic and cultural minorities to maintain and embrace content and schooling practices from their cultures (see Barker & Lundvall, Chapter 24) there is hope that the resulting globally inclusive educational environment becomes more welcoming and stabilizing for both cultural minorities and majority populations. Culturalists point to these benefits as they advocate for curricular globalization.

**Globalized curriculum**

A global perspective emphasizes national and regional settings that shape curriculum. Worldwide initiatives and struggles for power that consume peoples, resources, and lives influence what we teach and how we teach it. The dramatic increase in the number and diversity of migrants, the instantaneousness of communications, and the speed of travel suggest that many curricula are already globalized, impacting considerably larger numbers of individuals across large geographic spaces. Anderson-Levitt (2008) argues that another characteristic of curricular globalization is that most countries tend to agree to disagree about a similar set of issues. This is particularly true about those stemming from a neoliberal agenda. The role of market reforms, school choice, educational privatization, and depprofessionalization of teacher roles in teaching and curricular development resonate in developing countries eager to win World Bank/IMF grants.

Anderson-Levitt (2008) notes, however, that more than one type of curriculum and pedagogy can lead to high achievement. Yet, because of a uniform commonality or globalization of curriculum in mathematics and science, for example, it becomes increasingly difficult to differentiate curriculum by country. This can be true in PE with the globalizing influence of sport and health-related fitness. Academic success may also be attributed to a nation’s wealth distributed across schools, school districts, and regions making it difficult to determine if high achievement should be attributed to a country’s wealth or to a globalized curriculum of best practices. It is also possible to look at a country’s Ministry of Education as a culprit in the drive for globalization of successful practices. In PE, globalization of model-based and games-based approaches are central to national curricula attempts to inculcate best practices for teaching while enhancing nationalistic pride and Olympic and World Cup success. Ministries of Education often promote agenda at the expense of teacher reflection and community input. Yet, to the extent that games- and movement-based models replace more traditional, authoritarian, and teacher-centered approaches, they provide hope for better student experiences in PE.
Community schooling

Farrell (2008) reports that a strengthening global focus on models of community schooling also holds promise to strengthen the connections between communities and their local schools. Although the model varies by location based on unique histories and social structures, a growing body of research is tracking student success in terms of enrollment, retention, grade completion and promotion, and academic success. Farrell (2008) identifies 200 of these community programs that roughly fit within the community-schooling model, arguing that community schools represent the best current model for enhancing learning on a large scale in developing countries with very poor and disadvantaged students. He concludes that the traditional model of schooling can be changed on a large scale even in very poor places with very limited resources.

Globalization of community schools depends on characteristics of effective schooling institutionalized as ‘best practices’ pedagogy. Child-centered curriculum, active learning, and engagement of parents and the community in the educational process propel community schools and their students to strong learning results. Community schools reflect an in-depth reorganization and revisioning of traditional schools leading to new models of schooling that are far different and far more effective than current neoliberalist schools (Coalition of Community Schools, 2016).

Culturally sustaining pedagogy

Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) elegantly articulated the importance of community and cultural relevance in her study of successful teachers of African-American students. She proposed “a theoretical model that not only addresses student achievement but also helps students to accept and affirm their cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities that schools (and other institutions) perpetuate” (p. 469). She provided strong evidence to refute the value of traditional behaviorist school and class structures in favor of inclusive approaches to education.

Paris (2012) has reconceptualized this concept to focus on culturally sustaining pedagogy. This stance focuses on the need to “perpetuate, foster and sustain linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling” (p. 93). In a symposium published in Harvard Educational Review, Ladson-Billings (2014) reconceptualized cultural relevance to add the dimension of sustenance for ethnic and racial minorities. In this symposium, Paris and Alim (2014) argue that culturally sustaining pedagogy expands on Ladson-Billings’ original construct to include (a) a focus on “the plural and evolving nature of youth identity and cultural practices and (b) a commitment to embracing youth culture’s counterhegemonic potential while maintaining a clear-eyed critique of the ways in which youth culture can also reproduce systemic inequality” (p. 85). They argue that this perspective is desperately needed as traditional schools continue to emphasize deficit learning (Artiles et al., 2011; Paris & Alim, 2014). Within the symposium papers, McCarty and Lee (2014) expand the ‘sustaining’ construct further to advocate for culturally revitalizing pedagogy; curricula that mend and heal indigenous cultures through a dynamic reenactment of responsive schooling focused on heritage, language, and culture.

Traditional schooling practices continue to oversimplify cultural practices, ignoring ways that youth express and communicate their understandings through movements and dance-rap, such as hip-hop and Reggaeton. These diverse, non-traditional forms hold promise as a deeper form of expression that resonates with youth within their popular community (Hill & Petchauer,
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2013; Toscano, Ladda, & Bednarz, 2014). Further, Paris and Alim (2014) argue that multicultural and culturally relevant pedagogies are often:

enacted by teachers and researchers in static ways that focus solely on the important ways racial and ethnic difference was enacted in the past without attending to the dynamic enactments of our equally important present or future. As youth continue to inhabit a world where cultural and linguistic recombinations flow with purpose, we need pedagogies that speak to this new reality – as Pennycook (2007) puts it, pedagogies that “go with the flow.” (pp. 91–92)

Knowledge foundations for lifelong learning

Lifelong learning is inherent in discourse surrounding the global knowledge economy. Schools begin the preparation of students to use, attain, and apply skills to embrace rapidly changing technology (Spring, 2008) and to possess the capabilities to convert educational opportunities to their benefit (Scherrer, 2014). Knowledge is certainly one of the primary prerequisites and products of educational opportunity. Students first must be prepared to learn and must possess good health, skillfulness, and motivation to apply knowledge to their benefit (Scherrer, 2014). Although this message resonates within a neoliberal economic agenda of human capital enhancement (Bailey, Hillman, Arent, & Petitpas, 2012), there are other more substantive goals that are achieved through knowledge development.

The European Commission’s statement in the Horizon 2020 guidelines (European Union, 2011) defines lifelong learning as “all purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence” (European Union, 2000, p. 3). Lifelong learning is considered to be essential for individuals to compete successfully within the dynamic global job market and technology. While the explicit focus on purposes of economic development in some ways represents a neoliberal agenda, it is critically important that students have opportunities to use knowledge as part of a healthy and productive life. When discussing the knowledge economy, advocates argue first for learning basic skills, including mathematics, interpersonal, problem-solving, and the openness and ability to learn new things (Spring, 2008).

The centrality of community schools (Farrell, 2008), sustaining and revitalizing pedagogies (McCarty & Lee, 2014; Paris, 2012) and lifelong learning are essential to the development of positive and productive aspects of a globalized society. Globalized curricula, while resisting the urges to create uniform pedagogical systems, provide opportunities to connect communities of culture and learning while sustaining and revitalizing ethnic and cultural foundations. It is naïve to think, however, that sustaining pedagogies can provide necessary resources without also enhancing the children’s capabilities and knowledge to use those resources to create a better life (Scherrer, 2014). Knowledge of disciplinary principles, social concepts, and a deep understanding of relational knowing are critical in curricula of lifelong learning.

Sport pedagogy themes within globalized curriculum

While there are a number of viable sport pedagogy themes that can play a central role in positive, revitalizing globalized curriculum (e.g., Binder, 2001), I will discuss three holding promise for multinational, multisite collaborations such as those crafted within the European Union’s Horizon 2020 funding initiative. Although external funders often have a neoliberalistic agenda, there are opportunities for reflective scholars and practitioners to transform these guidelines into
cross-cultural, student-centered approaches that can provide relevant, appropriate programs for children and youth. For the remainder of this chapter, I will develop research scenarios for three themes, fair play, ethnically sustaining and revitalizing sport pedagogies, and knowledge-based curricula for healthful living. Each is founded in an extensive literature complete with theoretical frameworks, extensive bodies of research, and compelling human and political issues and concerns. With careful attention to individual goals and input from community-based groups, these initiatives can be shaped and molded to provide a positive and uplifting starting point for curriculum development. While it is important to avoid the seduction of neoliberal tactics, opportunities abound for scholars to design and scale flexible, reflexive programs to focus the curriculum toward positive, democratic aims. Although we have learned a great deal from single-class, site-specific research, we cannot disregard opportunities to identify central variables influential across many PE settings. These variables can be identified and shaped within local social settings to provide individual and unique opportunities specific to students’ needs and interests. It is very likely that these common structuring programmatic concepts exist and can lead to positive PE opportunities for students and teachers.

Funding to examine variables in multisite environments is available to PE scholars and researchers with the resulting programs enacted to benefit teachers and students. I describe these dynamic programs as ‘curricula of possibility.’ By this I mean flexibly constructed curricula with the individual student and teacher at the center of the planning process. Options, suggestions, and alternatives embedded in curricular materials provide opportunities for teachers and students working at the local level to own the curriculum by shaping it to provide relevance and meaning. In this section, I will briefly sketch out specific aims, rationale, and a research design, all in broad strokes, for each of these globalized PE curricular themes.

**Fair Play**

Beginning in the mid 1990s Gibbons, Ebbeck, and Weiss (1995; Binder & the Commission for Fair Play, 1990) proposed fair play curricula for sport pedagogy founded on the principles of equity and sportsmanship. The Fair Play curriculum was developed from a conceptual framework of moral development education, emphasizing concepts of moral judgment, reason, intention, and prosocial behavior for children and adolescents. Units and lessons are based on a progression of moral dilemmas, dialogue among peers and leaders, and tasks and experiences that create opportunities for moral balance. These task sequences and events lead students and teachers to develop a greater understanding and deeper appreciation for fair play, respect for others, and the value of equal opportunities. While numerous efforts at sportsmanship curricula exist, the program developed by Gibbons, Weiss, and their colleagues (Gibbons & Ebbeck, 1997; Gibbons et al., 1995; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986; Vidoni & Ward, 2009) provides a thoughtful, scalable opportunity that can benefit both students and their teachers. When developed as the centerpiece in a proposal for external funding the specific aim might read:

To design, implement and evaluate an elementary fair play curriculum in sport pedagogy to increase children’s knowledge, reflective abilities, and intentions to play fairly in sporting competitions.

Certainly, parents, physical educators and youth sport coaches are supportive of fair play curricula. Enticing neoliberal agencies and review panels’ support for PE programs with this focus requires linking Fair Play aims to world issues and events that resonate beyond the PE classroom. For example, football and sport hooliganism is a major cause for concern throughout
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the European Union, the United States, and many other world sporting venues. Incidents frequently occur surrounding sporting events worldwide, with one recent review identifying incidents in over 50 nations. The seriousness of these practices can be cataloged through incidents ranging from brawling, bullying, vandalism, intimidation, and death. These behaviors, however, are not limited to peripheral off-the-field spectators and events; players themselves are increasing engaging in purposefully violent behaviors in which the intent is to injure the opponent in retaliation or to gain a tactical advantage. Opportunities to address these behaviors as part of a Fair Play curriculum through instruction in moral judgment, reasoning, and respect, positive dialogue with peers, socially and morally acceptable behaviors during sporting contests, sportsmanship training, and identification and application of alternative behaviors hold promise for assisting youngsters to reflect on their personal and team behaviors in sporting environments. Fair Play curricula, while explicitly addressing these concerns, retain flexibility to permit teachers to adapt and adjust the concept of fair play to local and community issues.

Qualitative research designs have provided critically important information at the micro classroom or school level. I have conducted a fair amount of research using these designs and understand their benefits (e.g., Ennis, 2008). Yet, used alone, they are less likely in the United States or the European Union to receive levels of external funding necessary to scale PE programs to a range of school environments necessary to understand a curriculum’s potential to be a Curriculum of Possibility. Scaling requires curricula to be examined in multiple settings, taking into account both unique, context-specific factors and those common to multiple settings. This is necessary to identify factors that are unique to a particular school but still likely to exist at some level at many other schools. By broadening the school, classroom, teacher, and student populations, we gain a more complex understanding of how specific pedagogical elements impact students’ understandings of fair play concepts within the learning process.

In designing scalable research, in this case, to examine the opportunities and impact afforded by Fair Play curriculum, it is important to provide funders with information to compare the new program with existing curricula. A mixed method design permitting both individual school and student-level analyses as well as a broader understanding of student experiences can provide the right combination to enhance our cross-school understanding while addressing funders’ need for accountability. Development and testing (pre/post controlled trial) can focus on the same curricular and instructional variables (e.g., moral judgment, reasoning, and respect, positive dialogue with peers, socially and morally acceptable behaviors during sporting contests, sportsmanship training, and identification and application of alternative behaviors) across sites to identify those with cultural relevance and sustainability. Data collection might include pre/post assessments of moral development in authentic situations; qualitative observations of lessons and practices; interviews and focus groups with children, physical educators, and coaches; scenario analysis and the use of virtual reality experiential cases to assist students and players to become emotionally involved in fair play settings. While small unfunded research teams might examine a few of these variables within local contexts, external funding provides opportunities for in-depth exploration of curricular options and analyses of both the unique-to-the-setting and more comprehensive factors integral to meaningful programming.

Culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogies

Migrations of peoples have occurred throughout history in the countries around the world and continue today as families move to create a safe and economically secure life. Yet, with few exceptions, the dominant politics of education and educators continue to sustain a white, male privileged perspective on content and process reflected in national curricula. This is true in sport
pedagogy as represented in traditional, multi-activity programming. While skilled boys’ interest in football appears to cross many political, cultural, and ethnic boundaries, this sports-oriented perspective may not have the same meaning and value to girls and unskilled boys (see Fitzgerald & Enright, Chapter 21). Likewise, other traditional Eurocentric sports may not resonate with boys or girls from countries outside the United States, the Commonwealth of Nations, or the European Union.

Sport pedagogy curricula with potential to sustain and revitalize ethnic and cultural minority students can strengthen and enhance student identities, self-confidence, and feelings of security. Importantly, they can assist students representing majority populations to enhance and deepen their value for diverse cultural groups and practices. Rovegno and Gregg (2007) constructed and tested an interdisciplinary unit for elementary PE to provide a more authentic picture of Native American cultures (Hawaiian and Native American Indian Tribal). Instead of a traditional dance unit that privileges White dance forms, Rovegno and Gregg’s unit emphasized folk dance to emphasize diverse dances of native and ethnic Americans. Toscano and her colleagues (2014) also used a variety of dance forms from popular culture as the basis for dance curriculum. These dance forms assist students to follow the music while developing the rhythm of the dances. Their unit combined aerobic dance and fitness principles with contemporary dance patterns assisting students to develop competence in three dance activities: Zumba, Squaring the Rap, and Hip-Hop Hoedown. Zumba emphasizes aerobic dance steps with Latin American dance movements and music, Squaring the Rap combines basic square dance steps with rap music, while Hip-Hop Hoedown combines square dance with Hip-hop music. A proposal for external funding for this project may have as its specific aim:

To design and test a culturally sustaining and revitalizing middle grades dance curriculum that features migrant students’ heritage and contemporary dance to assist cultural and ethnic minority and majority students to engage in enjoyable physical activity while increasing their understanding and value for diverse cultures.

Migrant students are asked to assimilate into contemporary school sport pedagogy programs with typically little opportunity to share their culture and traditions with majority students. Likewise, majority students rarely have opportunities to learn dances and participate in ethnic and cultural traditions embraced by immigrant students in their classes. Culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogy acknowledges the pluralistic and evolving nature of youth identity and cultural practices and embraces youths’ cultural and ethnic heritage. By foregrounding ethnicity within an enjoyable dance context, migrants and majority students interact around dance within a physical activity context that foregrounds these cultures.

Investigators from different countries working as research teams can design, scale, and test community-focused dance curricula that feature dances from both majority and minority/migrant cultures within the community. While the specifics of dance selection, and cultural influences will be unique to each community, students learn to reflect on differences in dance forms as they are encouraged to embrace difference. Students learn the dance steps, music, and rhythmic patterns valued by ethnic groups within their geographic region and discuss the meaning and place of dance in these cultures. Factors and variables examined within this curricular research might include cultural awareness, openness to difference, sensitivity and respect, as well as ability to work cooperatively. In addition to class observations and teacher and student interviews across schools and countries, social protocols such as sociograms can be used to identify changes in student friendship groups and willingness to partner with others from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds.
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Again, the importance of ‘scale’ within the research both requires and attracts external funding to the project and provides opportunities to explore options across different cultures and communities. Intentionally building research designs with flexibility and site specificity permitting researchers to examine factors unique to their own communities within a comprehensive research structure retains individual site uniqueness while placing these differences within a larger national or international context.

Knowledge as a foundation for lifelong learning

The economic and social impact of health concerns associated with physical activity are a dominant force in many societies. This obsession is particularly evident in the United States where data from numerous epidemiological and medical studies have focused a national spotlight on health. While fully acknowledging the underlying (neoliberal) factors giving impetus to these initiatives, researchers have found opportunities to examine positive factors associated with health and well-being as a theme of PE curricula. Thorburn (Chapter 6) describes an asset- or strength-based approach to fitness and physical activity curricula that provides a nurturing environment for students to learn about physical activity and nutritional factors that can benefit their health. This can be done effectively without glorified, false claims for exercise or accusations associated with weight or obesity (McCullick, 2014), and with a sincere interest in assisting children and youth to reflect on the value of different healthy practices based on a range of informational sources. Students can construct their understanding while they examine truth claims associated with the effects of exercise on their bodies (Ferkel, Judge, Stodden, & Griffin, 2014).

Sometimes described as health-related science PE initiatives, scholars are proposing physically active curricula focused on concepts and principles with a sound scientific basis (e.g., Finn & McInnis, 2014). These proposals are winning external funding to examine the impact of health-related science-based curricula on students’ physical activity interest and enjoyment. In the United States, where traditional PE is at great risk, these health and physical activity-oriented programs are seen as opportunities to increase resources and literally ‘save’ PE and PETE programs pushed aside in the rush toward high-stakes testing (McCullick, 2014). They are redirecting parents’ and administrators’ interest back to PE as an opportunity to enhance student health and reinforce science concepts, permitting PE to become a partner in the holistic mission of schools.

When PE is seen as ‘essential’ to schools, physical educators gain status and students place greater value on the content. Additionally, instructional time and other resources, such as staffing, may increase while learning-specific facilities and equipment become more available, making it possible to provide a positive environment for student learning. PE curricula are increasingly focusing on best practices in the promotion of physical activity and healthy nutrition (see Cale, Chapter 27). Health is central to improving and continuing prosperity in all countries and drives resource allocations for medical, educational, and public health professions.

Although sport pedagogy curricula currently are turning to examine physical activity/health and well-being-oriented approaches (Thorburn & Horrell, 2014), a few curricula afford a science-enriched knowledge-based perspective on physical activity and nutrition. The Science, PE, and Me! and the Science of Healthful Living curricula provide a coordinated curriculum for children ages 8–14 (Sun, Chen, Zhu, & Ennis, 2012). The US National Institutes of Health has embraced this concept and provided $3 million to design, evaluate, and disseminate science-enriched approaches to PE. The lessons are designed using a constructivist learning cycle strategy entitled the 5Es (Engagement, Experiment, Explanation, Elaboration, and...
Evaluation) to assist students to use a reflective, scientific inquiry process to examine the effects of exercise and nutrition on their bodies. Students (8–11 years old) examine fitness components in three constructivist-oriented physically active units, *Dr. Love’s Healthy Heart*, *Mickey’s Mighty Muscles*, and *Flex Coolbody’s Fitness Club*, while 11–14 year old students examine exercise and motivation principles (e.g., overload, progression, specificity, frequency, intensity, duration, caloric balance, stress management, goal setting) in two physically active units, the *Cardio Fitness Club* and *Healthy Lifestyles*.

This external funding has been used in a range of productive ways. For example, master teachers were hired to develop curricula and to provide professional development to teachers implementing the curriculum. Funding facilitated a large-scale evaluation of the curriculum using a pre-post test randomized controlled design in over 60 elementary and middle schools. Students in the experimental schools in all grades (3–8; ages 8–14) demonstrated statistically significant knowledge gains when compared to students participating in a traditional PE program in the control group schools (Sun et al., 2012). Student knowledge gains were traced to the 5Es learning cycle strategy lesson format and the practice of student reflection on health-related science (fitness) knowledge using student science journaling. Students use the journals in each lesson to record their personal data in the form of heart rate, ratings of perceived exertion, exercise repetitions and sets, and steps. They reflect on the meaning of their findings for their own health and well-being, and transfer knowledge necessary for solving physical activity-related challenges in their lives. A specific aim of research to examine this curriculum might be:

To design and field test science-enriched PE curricula to increase students’ knowledge and interest in health-related science, physical activity, and the role of a healthy diet in their health and well-being.

Research has provided compelling evidence to support the value of healthy behaviors, such as regular physical activity and healthy eating choices. This life- and health-science research provides critical evidence necessary to understand students’ healthy choices. Young adolescents are at a critical age when they question and test a range of personal and social behaviors, some of which place them at great risk for illness or injury. Adolescence also is a period when teachers have an opportunity to discuss health-related science concepts and teach the scientific inquiry process, guiding young teens toward the selection of personally relevant, research-supported healthy behaviors.

A proposal for external funding to scale this curriculum investigating its influence on students, teachers, and the community might be based on a pre/post-test controlled, randomized modeling design in which the experimental group participates in the curriculum while the comparison schools participate in traditional PE. Variables include science knowledge, interest in science and science careers, physical activity, reflection and application of concepts to life decisions, and motivation to participate in physical activity outside of school. By providing flexibility in curriculum implementation, content options and alternate health-focused scenarios, parents, teachers, and students can work collaboratively to shape a curriculum addressing issues and events within their community. This ‘curriculum of possibility’ provides multiple outlets for implementation at the local level while conveying science-based information to counter media, consumer, and crisis discourses.

Each of these three proposals presents opportunities for funding within curricular globalization initiatives. Research teams representing different universities and countries can compete successfully for external funding by proposing broadly based research initiatives that resonate with the contemporary themes and address key social and cultural issues.
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Future directions

Anderson-Levitt (2008) argues that when viewed along many dimensions, curricula are global and becoming more uniform as the trends that began in the 1950s of Western-style schooling have spread to Southern Zone developing countries. While many schools will advocate for reforms in the twenty-first century, the nature, complexity, and systemic nature of reform initiatives will be quite diverse across nations and world regions. It will remain true from a global sense that “whatever educators borrow they adapt, wittingly or not, to national culture and local ways of doing school” (Anderson-Levitt, 2008, p. 364). Most loosely coupled educational systems whether ‘controlled’ by a Ministry of Education or a small township, cannot prevent teacher-initiated curricular modification and differentiation. Thus, in the future, the actual risks of a uniform, globalizing curricular effect are really quite remote. Microanalyses of curricula at the classroom level continue to demonstrate significant diversity even among nations whose students receive the highest scores on the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA).

When globalization is viewed outside the neoliberal perspective, it can encourage more idealistic and somewhat more positive experiences. Stromquist and Monkman (2014) point out that although the economical and technological phenomena will continue to dominate at the national level, communities are still able to focus on specific educational and cultural goals. They can address national and global initiatives while still maintaining and sustaining unique cultural and ethnic perspectives. Education for All (UNESCO, 2000) and the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (United Nations, 2015) emphasize the dynamic nature of globalization and its wide range of opportunities and consequences. In developing countries, globalization can be transformative, providing opportunities to construct and reconstruct local cultures as knowledge is created and recreated at multiple sites. This coupling, decoupling, and loose coupling of systems with local cultures and communities will permit communities to foreground a form of globalization that values heritage and local knowledge while bringing broad-ranging knowledge and insights into the local conversation.

Summary of key findings

• Globalization is a multidimensional construct that has been used to structure international initiatives in economics, politics, technology, population studies, and education.
• Globalization embraces both positive and negative forces from the local to the international, changing and changed by increasing awareness, economics, and the force of rapidly evolving public opinion (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).
• Spring (2008) reports four educational globalization discourses that influence educational models around the world. These include discourses of a world culture, world systems, post-colonial, and culturalist approaches.
• Neoliberalism is a conservative ideology that seeks to spread policies that appear beneficial, yet when examined often constrain individual freedom and individuality.
• Neoliberalists advocate individual choice and minimal government regulation while simultaneously protecting accountability structures. In schools these tendencies are reflected in school choice, accountability testing, and efforts to superficially homogenize school curricula around ‘effective’ programming.
• Neoliberalism reflects the ‘dark side’ of schooling, limiting student and teacher opportunities to implement curricula that are meaningful and relevant to students at the local level.
• Globalization, though of concern for its homogenizing tendencies, can be useful as an initiative to provide opportunities for teachers and students to consider ‘curricula of possibility.’
• Curricula of possibility are programs that provide flexibility of content and implementation to permit teachers and students to select topics and methods that match individual and community diversity within a relatively uniform curricular structure.
• Scaling curriculum provides opportunities to better understand the impact of a specific curriculum across diverse school sites, permitting a focus on diverse needs and interests as integral to curricular reach and impact.
• External funding is often essential in scaling research designs to embrace diverse communities and interests. Broad topics and flexible implementation protocols permit scholars to examine opportunities provided by curricula of possibility.
• In this chapter three scenarios for externally funded projects were considered: fair play, culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogies, and knowledge as a foundation for lifelong learning. Each provides opportunities to engage teachers and students in a reflective, thoughtful approach to PE.

Reflective questions for discussion

1. In what ways do you see the effects of globalization in your community? To what extent are curricula in PE and teacher education impacted by globalizing concepts?
2. Neoliberal perspectives are influential in many school policy, curricular, and accountability decisions. Describe those most influential in your school or community. Which of these do you see as positively and negatively affecting educational decisions?
3. Globalization suggests that concepts that are effective in one setting might hold benefits for other settings. What factors might negate this premise? How can programs be designed to ‘scale’ so they reflect both broadly based and uniquely local interests and knowledge?
4. Fair play, culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogies, and foundations for lifelong learning were proposed as scalable concepts providing benefits at national and community levels. To what extent do you agree and what concerns do you have for teachers, students, and the educational environments where these curricula are implemented? Are they curricula of possibility or simply another crafty neoliberal plan to impose conservative privatization goals on education?
5. What other themes might be conceptualized and scaled or globalized to become curricula of possibility in PE? Select a theme and identify a specific aim, rationale, and research design to attract external funding to explore your idea in multiple schools.
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