

On Doing Critical Policy Analysis

Educational Policy

2019, Vol. 33(1) 276–287

© The Author(s) 2018

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0895904818807307

journals.sagepub.com/home/epx**Michael W. Apple** 

Abstract

In my comments on this fine collection of critical policy analyses, I want to do a number of things. I shall point to the general conceptual and social orientation and commitments that provide the foundation for such research. I will then describe a number of contributions that these papers make. And finally, I shall suggest a number of areas where additional critical investigations could make a significant contribution to our understanding. I hope that I will be forgiven if, at times, I refer to my own work. But many of the arguments I will make in this essay require much more detailed treatments, ones in which I have engaged elsewhere. Thus, these references to my own lengthier analyses may serve as a shorthand pointer to the larger discussions.

Keywords

politics of education, social movements, social justice, religion, educational reform, educational policy

On the Politics of Critical Policy Analysis

Critical policy analysis is grounded in the belief that it is absolutely crucial to understand the complex connections between education and the relations of dominance and subordination in the larger society—and the movements that are trying to interrupt these relations. What is happening today makes these analyses, including the many very interesting contributions to this collection of papers, even more significant.

¹University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA

Corresponding Author:

Michael W. Apple, Departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA.

Email: apple@education.wisc.edu

Let me say more about this. Although as I have shown it is not neoliberalism and its attendant policy initiatives alone that are changing our commonsense about education, its imprint is everywhere. Such things as a politics of severe austerity, audit cultures, performance pay, never ending competition, privatization, attacks on teachers and teacher unions, raising standards while reducing support for public schools, a climate of White supremacy, a culturally restorative project to reinstall what is assumed to be high-status knowledge in schools, defining “important” knowledge as only that which serves the limited needs of economically powerful groups, and similar “reforms” are increasingly transforming what counts as a “good” school, a good teacher, a good curriculum, a good parent and a good student, a good community, legitimate culture, important evidence, and so forth (Apple, 2006). Education has once again become a site of crucial struggles over authority and identity, indeed over both the very meaning of being educated and who should control it.

All these reforms have particular histories; and all of them are driven not only by technical considerations but also profoundly by cultural, political, and economic projects and by specific and often unquestioned ideological visions of what schools should do and whom they should serve. In my view and that of the authors who are represented here, we have an ethical obligation to make public the effects of these policies, to challenge these positions, and to defend a robust education that is based on human flourishing.

Perhaps some of my own research can provide an example. Some of you may already know that I ask “simple questions.” Thus, rather than simply asking whether students have mastered a particular subject matter and have done well on our all too common tests, we should ask a different set of questions: Whose knowledge is this? How did it become “official”? What is the relationship between this knowledge and how it is organized and taught and who has cultural, social, and economic capital in this society? Who benefits from these definitions of legitimate knowledge and who does not? What are the overt and hidden effects of educational reforms on real people and real communities? What can we do as critical educators to challenge existing educational and social inequalities and to create policies, community relations, curricula, and teaching that are more socially just? (see, for example, Apple, 2014, 2019). Fundamental to both asking and answering these questions are the complex and, at times, contradictory relationships among what Nancy Fraser has rightly called the politics of redistribution, recognition, and representation (Fraser, 1997).

But for me and many others, one other question has been central. Indeed, it is the basic issue that guides any critical education. Can schools change society? This is the fundamental question that has guided almost all my books and much of my political and educational action.

A little educational history of the United States may be helpful here, because most critical analyses consciously or unconsciously are part of very long tradition both inside and outside of education. In the 1930s, George Counts, one of the most famous radical educators in the United States, electrified an audience of progressive educators with a stirring call. He was responding to what he saw as the nearly total dominance of the governance and outcomes of education by economically powerful classes. Dominant classes had gained control of schooling and the economy, and this situation must be fought, so that schools could lead the way toward a more democratic society. The title of the published work that came out of his lecture was a simple question: *Dare the School Build a New Social Order* (Counts, 1932). This was at one and the same time a call to action and, so it seemed later, a naive claim. Could schools actually alter a social order? Did they have any independent power—what was later called the problem of “relative autonomy” in critical social theory? If so, what constituted such power? If not, what relations did schools participate in that made such independent political action impossible or at least unlikely? Of course, these kinds of issues had been consistently raised by organic intellectuals in oppressed communities and especially in communities of color for a very long time. Although I have tried to trace out the multiple traditions of asking and answering these questions in *Can Education Change Society* (Apple, 2013), in the process of struggling with these issues, one thing has become very clear to me. It is a truly difficult question both to ask and to answer.

Yet, although important, questions such as “Can schools create a new social order?” and “What is their role in social change?” in a number of ways are actually premature. Before we can begin to answer them, we need to more fully understand the ways in which the curricular, pedagogic, and evaluative principles and practices that go on within schools are “determined”? Thus, speaking metaphorically, prior to asking about education’s “inside-to-outside” relationship, we need to ask about the “outside-to-inside” connections. The essays here provide a number of paths to dealing more adequately both with these questions and with partial answers.

The political as well as academic implications of this are significant, because we need to be very cautious not to be reductive either in our questions or our answers—and we need to be just as careful about accepting easy and overly rhetorical answers. Anyone who knows me also knows that I am definitely *not* asking for quiescence or inaction. Also, I am not asking for such overly complex theories that the result is political and educational paralysis. Far from it. But I and the authors included here do insist that we be mindful of complexity and contradiction, of hidden relations and effects. This is crucial if we are collectively and individually to successfully challenge the

current neoliberal, neoconservative, authoritarian populist, and managerial agendas that are making it so very hard to build and defend an education worthy of its name (Apple, 2006).

It has become something of a truism in the literature in analytic philosophy that language does and can do many things, all of them valuable. It can be used to describe, explain, control, critique, legitimate, affiliate, and mobilize (Austin, 1962; Wittgenstein, 1963). Rhetorical language is associated with legitimation, affiliation, and mobilization; but it is often a poor tool for the other tasks that language must perform. All too many parts of the critical education traditions and critical research in education seem to be content with rhetorical slogans, rather than examining the complicated and multiple structures and power relations that exist in the real world and the full range of possible tactics that might be employed to change them (Gramsci, 1971; Hall, 2016; Morely & Chen, 1996). And, all too much of it sees its role as only deconstructive.

This is a pity because this lack has a number of negative effects. It weakens the explanatory potential of critical analyses. It paradoxically helps those who wish to marginalize critical analyses at exactly the same time as they are of even more importance. And finally, such rhetorical positions lack the strategic sensibility that is so crucial in what Antonio Gramsci (1971) called a “war of position,” a nuanced understanding of the actual possibilities of doing critical work in multiple sites.

This is not true of all the critical traditions of course. Some of the most interesting work in critical policy analysis and in critical education, in general, is much less rhetorical and is grounded in the concrete understanding of and action in and with communities, cultural activists, practicing educators at all levels of the educational system, and social movements (see, for example, Apple et al., 2003; Apple, Au, & Gandin, 2009; Apple, Ball, & Gandin, 2010; Apple, Gandin, Liu, Meshulam, & Schirmer, 2018; Ferman, 2017). Much of the more robust and nuanced theoretical and political analyses that have emerged on the state; on the complex relationships among culture, politics, and the economy; and on the ways in which educational sites and institutions can be worked on—and worked with—have been developed during the past decades of intense conceptual and political progress. Indeed, much of the work employing critical policy analysis, critical discourse analysis, critical race theory, critical disability studies, and the other very interesting traditions that are represented in the contributions included here is grounded in these concerns.

At the very root of these concerns are two simple principles. First, we must think and act *relationally*. That is, all our institutions and sets of social relations—and even our very identities—need to be seen as intimately

connected to the inequalities that structure our society and to the movements that seek to interrupt such inequalities. Second, to understand and act on education in its complicated connections to the larger society, we must engage in the process of *repositioning*. It will be hard, but we should constantly try to see the world through the eyes of the dispossessed and act against the ideological and institutional processes and forms that reproduce oppressive conditions. This repositioning concerns both political and cultural practices that embody the principles of critical education; but it also has generated a large body of critical scholarship and theory that has led to a fundamental restructuring of what the roles of research and of the researcher are (see, for example, Apple, 2013; Winn & Souto-Manning, 2017).

The issues surrounding the roles of research and of the researcher are central here. The discourses that increasingly circulate through the media and that are now becoming “common-sense” are powerfully influenced by the forces of what I have elsewhere called *conservative modernization*. As I have documented at much greater length in *Educating the “Right” Way*, the dominant tendencies in educational reform—and indeed in the entire public sphere—are moving us in directions that have damaging consequences in terms of robust understandings of democracy and the necessity of a critically democratic education as a crucial path to achieving it (Apple, 2006). This is one of the major reasons that, in the list of tasks of the critical scholar/activist I detail in *Can Education Change Society?* (Apple, 2013), *The Struggle for Democracy in Education* (Apple et al., 2018), and elsewhere (see, for example, Lim & Apple, 2016); I stress the importance of also relearning how to talk in ways that do not mystify, that embody a real commitment to making the case for a more robust critically democratic education clearly and in compelling ways publicly. Many of the essays included here have struck a fine stylistic balance in this regard. They direct our attention to important realities, inequalities, and conflicts, but at the same time, the authors work hard so that their contributions are not written in such a way that their implications for thinking more critically about real policies and practices are missed.

In striving to be clear, this does not mean that serious substance is sacrificed. The papers as a whole document that critical policy analysis has an important role to play in understanding each moment in what has been called the circuit of cultural production in the literature in cultural studies (see Johnson, 1986/1987). Richard Johnson points out that to understand the dynamics behind any “text” (a policy, a state institutional body, set of meaningful acts, a textbook, etc.), we need to examine three interrelated elements—*production*, *distribution*, and *reception*. Thus, the politics and compromises that go into the creation of a policy, and the preferred meanings that are contained within it, need to be critically examined. Next, how the policy is

distributed and given authority and power—through state law, through training programs, through the mechanisms of “audit cultures”—are equally significant. Finally, how a policy is received, reinterpreted, and even resisted—how it is “read” and made sense of and employed by local actors and communities as it is “recontextualized” at every level (Bernstein, 1990) is crucial. In the process of reception, the moment of “reading” has its own politics. A “text” can be read in dominant, negotiated, or oppositional ways—and often, in a combination of these ways (see Apple, 2014, pp. 60–61). Thus, policies have a life. As we might say, in many ways, they are as much verbs as they are nouns.

In examining each of these elements here, the range of theoretical and empirical approaches is impressive. As is fully evident, the foundation for nearly all the essays is of course critical policy analysis. But by combining this guiding perspective with other crucial additions such as critical discourse analysis, critical race theory, actor network analysis, critical disability studies, and institutional ethnography, even more insights can be and are generated.

The influence of theories of intersectionality is also visible in a number of the papers. For example, the connections between disability and race are made clear as are the relations between gender and race in, for example, Latinx mothers’ actions to influence policies on the ground. To be sure, theories and research on intersectionality are a significant advance (see Powers, Fischman, & Tefera, 2018), provided we do *not* lose the history and detailed current struggles over each individual relation of inequality. This last point needs to be taken very seriously. There is a danger that we can focus so much on intersectionality that we lose sight of the extraordinary power of racializing policies and practices in themselves for instance. And, the same can be said about the histories and struggles over gender and class. Intersectionality is not a full replacement for a disciplined deep dive into each dynamic of differential power.

It is also interesting to see both qualitative and quantitative analyses employed. Many researchers within the critical education community(ies) have quite elegant theoretical and qualitative skills—ethnographic, narrative, life history, and many others. Each of these is crucial of course. However, there has been a good deal of overstatement in the critiques of “positivism” that often accompany these approaches. Granted that reductive and “medical model” epistemological commitments are too often employed as part of what might be called an “epistemological war” on thick understanding of the social and personal realities of education. And, these deserve powerful critiques. Yet, in the process, we have partly deskilled a large number of critically oriented researchers who lack the skills and the ability to engage with, use, and

critically read quantitative research. Thus, both qualitative and quantitative perspectives of multiple kinds contribute to the overall value of the essays.

These methodological gains need to be accompanied by a clear sense of who are important actors in each of the moments of the circuit of cultural production. It should be clear by now that lasting transformations in education are not only the results of the actions of educators. They are often also the results of social mobilizations and alliances in the larger society. Of course, educators participate in these larger movements in a variety of ways, so their actions are certainly not inconsequential. However, truly substantive progressive transformations that stand the test of time often require organized pressure from below, especially from groups who demand that our institutions act in more responsive ways around the issues of redistribution, recognition, and representation (Fraser, 1997). This recognition also can be seen in a number of the papers included here.

Given the mobilizations on which some of the authors rightly focus, race should and does play a significant role in their analysis. Indeed, it is almost impossible to fully understand the impulses and histories that stand behind most neoliberal “reform” efforts unless the complex politics of race and the nature of the “racial state” are taken truly seriously (Gillborn, 2008; MacLean, 2017; Taylor, Gillborn, & Ladson-Billings, 2015).

Thus, it should be no surprise that the politics of race has a significant presence in a number of essays included here. As Ferman and Palazzolo remind us elsewhere in their own discussion of the effects of and challenges to dominant educational policies, “The issue of race complicates nearly every facet of education politics. Market-based reforms are playing out most heavily in urban areas where the student body is disproportionately black and brown” (Ferman & Palazzolo, 2017, p. 117).

This recognition is seen in the treatment of school integration, for example, here. Although perhaps some readers may not have thought in a detailed way about the connection that is made, we should not be surprised at all by the discussion of school integration and Jim Crow. Any serious analysis of the history of government policies in the United States documents how “interest convergence” continues to be very real, as well as how the government itself has often participated in not only maintaining but also often widening the sphere of racial segregation over time (Rothstein, 2017). A full understanding of this must also include the just as long a history of complex and daily resistance to these policies and practices (see, for example, Berrey, 2015).

But resistance is not only found in progressive movements and actions. Indeed, resistance to policies is very visible increasingly on the Right as these groups mobilize against more progressive state policies. For many of the

people involved in these much more conservative acts of resistance, there is now a social cost to “being white.” Thus, for them, White people are “the new oppressed.” This position is not only historically and currently deeply inaccurate and often openly racist. But the proponents of this agenda have “masterfully appropriated the language of the civil rights movement in promoting their agenda” (Ferman & Palazzolo, 2017, p. 17). Their discourse is powerful and unfortunately increasingly effective in convincing large numbers of people to support rightist movements.

This statement contains a number of important insights. The recognition that in the United States and a number of other nations, “race” is constitutive to any substantive understanding of educational politics and to the dynamics that lay behind dominant reforms should not have to be said; but unfortunately, this is denied by too many people. In addition, recognition of the role played by discursive politics in the struggles over educational policies opens a door to understanding the way language is used to bring people under the leadership of dominant groups. This makes the use of critical discourse analysis by a number of the authors a wise choice.

Going Further

Even given the strengths of the contributions in this collection, there are areas that could be given further attention in the future. Given space restrictions in a response of this kind, let me simply briefly note them.

In light of what I said above, although this does not lessen the insights that the contributors give us in their own analyses, in some of the contributions the power of critical discourse analysis and similar approaches could have been demonstrated with better connections made to the robust critical literature on the political dynamics of language and race (see Morely & Chen, 1996; Hall, 2017; Omi & Winant, 2014).

Also, it would have added to the strength of the collection as well if the politics and influence of religious groups had been given more attention. Although this is mentioned in the discussion of state boards of education, especially in Texas, what I have called “authoritarian populist” religious conservatives have played a significant role in educational policy around privatization, educational finance, home schooling, curriculum politics, teacher certification, and a number of other areas (Apple, 2006). Yet, at the same time, more progressive religious groups also have served as a counter to some of the more conservative (and, at times, racist) religious mobilizations that have grown in influence over the past decades in the United States and elsewhere. This fact serves as a corrective to the ways in which religious groups are often portrayed in the media and in the narratives of a large number of

progressive critics and critical educators. Conservative evangelicals are primarily focused on in these narratives, whereas much more socially and culturally critically oriented religious groups are less often included, except perhaps in passing. Yet, although conservative religious groups must be given a good deal of attention (witness Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos's own religious history and affiliations and policy emphases), it would be a mistake to only attend to them.

Of course, there is no doubt that many conservative religious groups play a key role in the "hegemonic bloc" that supports much of the neoliberal and neoconservative agenda in education and so much else. Indeed, this is one of the reasons I have devoted a good deal of attention to them elsewhere (see Apple, 2006, 2014). However, in the United States and in many other nations, religious support for critical democracy, for antiracist and more robust thick participatory forms of public institutions including schools and similar things have played key roles in building and defending more progressive policies (Apple et al., 2018).

The points I made about possible progressive support by religious groups directs our attention to one of the strengths of this collection—its recognition that there are actions on the ground that act against dominant policies and practices. However, although a number of the essays speak to progressive gains and the agentic work of teachers and community activists, there is a problem if we focus only on short-term victories. One thing should be clear. In essence, the Right never sleeps. It learns from its defeats and treats them as temporary setbacks in its larger agenda—and then continues with its overall project of transforming educational, economic, political, and social policies. It has a vision and a set of strategies that are long term. Critical approaches that highlight "counterhegemonic" actions need to remember this as well. Such victories can be—and unfortunately sometimes are—temporary. We need to pay much more attention to putting in place the conditions that cement such gains in place.

This is a crucial issue for critically oriented research. Can individuals and groups sustain progressive policies and practices over the long haul? Considerably more research needs to be done on the longitudinal analysis of gains. Do they last? What happens after 5 or 10 years? How have they changed? What actions, social conditions, and alliances made it possible for them to remain in place? (see, for example, Apple et al., 2018).

I have two other suggestions for further work. First, although there were interesting discussions of the issues surrounding what is and is not made available in the curriculum as well as how teachers engage in practices that interrupt policies that diminish their autonomy, much more needs to be said about the role of the state in regulating "official knowledge" and

its role in creating and/or interrupting “historical amnesia.” Perhaps, one of the best recent analyses of this can be found in Charles Eagles’ recent very detailed and insightful analysis of state textbook regulation and the politics of race (see Eagles, 2017). Its critical analysis of the legal and personal battles over what and whose knowledge is and is not made available in public schools provides us with many insights into the lived histories of the struggles over meaning in schools. It also documents the complex roles played by state agencies and social mobilizations in these struggles. Further work on the curriculum needs to play an even more central role in critical policy analysis in the future.

Finally, there is another path to which critical policy analysis could contribute—powerful histories of the larger social, economic, and ideological contexts out of which educational policies have arisen. This is best seen, for example, in Nancy MacLean’s (2017) insightful history of the roots of public choice theory in the conflicts over school desegregation and in Jane Mayer’s (2016) powerful critical account of how the forces of “dark money” behind influential conservative organizations such as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) have transformed the debates and legislation process surrounding social and educational policy in not only the United States but also other nations. When connected to my earlier suggestion to engage in more long-term analyses of gains and whether they are truly lasting, this can give us a much more nuanced understanding of the dialectics of policies and of both their hidden effects and long-term consequences—both good and bad.

Conclusion

My comments in the previous section should not be taken in any way as a negative assessment of this fine collection of papers. Indeed, the collection is certainly something I would seriously consider using with my own students as a text on how these approaches can be employed to more fully demonstrate many of the ways in which we might engage in more critical analyses of educational policies and practices.

There is much more that might be said. A key, however, is to recognize that critical policy analysis and the other critical approaches that are represented in this collection are justifiably engaged in a dual task. They must assist us both in understanding the complexities and power relations of educational policies and practices, and, at the same time, employ critical approaches to document the interruptions, actions, and movements that continually challenge the dominant forms of policy and practice that generate and/or reproduce inequalities. The concept of *critical* then does not

necessarily mean “negative” and deconstructive. It also plays an important positive role in the construction of a set of policies and practices that embody the thick democratic norms and values that stand for what neoliberalism denies.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Michael W. Apple  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8459-8238>

References

- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the “right” way: Markets, standards, god, and inequality*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2013). *Can education change society?* New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2014). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2019). *Ideology and curriculum* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., Aasen, P., Cho, M. K., Gandin, L. A., Oliver, A., Sung, Y. K., . . . Wong, T.-K. (2003). *The state and the politics of knowledge*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., Au, W., & Gandin, L. A. (Eds.). (2009). *The Routledge international handbook of critical education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., Ball, S., & Gandin, L. A. (Eds.). (2010). *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., Gandin, L. A., Liu, S., Meshulam, A., & Schirmer, E. (2018). *The struggle for democracy in education: Lessons from social realities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berrey, S. A. (2015). *The Jim Crow routine: Everyday performances of race, civil rights, and segregation in Mississippi*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Eagles, C. (2017). *Civil rights culture wars: The fight over a Mississippi textbook*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

- Ferman, B. (Ed.). (2017). *The fight for America's schools: Grassroots organizing in education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Ferman, B., & Palazzolo, N. (2017). Challenges to coalition building: Confronting power with creativity. In B. Ferman (Ed.), *The fight for America's schools: Grassroots organizing in education* (pp. 17-32). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus*. New York: Routledge.
- Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy*. New York: Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Hall, S. (2016). *Cultural studies 1983*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hall, S. (2017). *Familiar stranger: A life between two islands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Johnson, R. (1986/1987). What is cultural studies anyway? *Social Text*, 16, 38-80.
- Lim, L., & Apple, M. W. (Eds.). (2016). *The strong state and curriculum reform: Assessing the politics and possibilities of educational change in Asia*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- MacLean, N. (2017). *Democracy in chains: The deep history of the radical right's stealth plan for America*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Mayer, J. (2016). *Dark money: The hidden history of the billionaires behind the rise of the radical right*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Morely, D., & Chen, K.-H. (Eds.). (1996). *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Powers, J. M., Fischman, G. E., & Tefera, A. A. (Eds.). (2018). *Review of Research in Education: Vol. 42. The challenges and possibilities of intersectionality in education research*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Rothstein, R. (2017). *The color of law: A forgotten history of how our government segregated America*. New York, NY: Liveright.
- Taylor, E., Gillborn, D., & Ladson-Billings, G. (Eds.). (2015). *Foundations of critical race theory in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Winn, M., & Souto-Manning, M. (Eds.). (2017). *Review of Research in Education: Vol. 41. Disrupting inequality through education research*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1963). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Author Biography

Michael W. Apple is John Bascom Professor Emeritus of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He is also Distinguished Visiting Professor of Education at Rowan University. Among his recent books are *Can Education Change Society?* (2013), *The Struggle for Democracy in Education: Lessons From Social Realities* (2018), and the *40th Anniversary 4th Edition of Ideology and Curriculum* (2019).