Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research, Winter 2016, Vol. 6, No. 2: 30-52. doi:10.5929/2016.6.2.2

Advanced Placement U.S. History and the Application of Social Justice

Katherine A. Curry, Ed.D.
Oklahoma State University

Lou L. Sabina, Ph.D.
Stetson University

Jon Loffi, Ed.D.
Oklahoma State University

Abstract

Recent changes to Advanced Placement U.S. History have sparked a national debate concerning goals and purposes of college level history courses. Critics suggest that the revisions result in a national curriculum that promotes a revisionist history perspective. Defenders claim that revisions are an important step in preparing students for 21st century citizenship. This document analysis identifies key differences between the 2010 and 2014 AP U.S. History frameworks and considers changes made in 2015 by College Board in response to the national debate. The challenges of applying a social justice lens to curriculum are discussed, and suggestions are made concerning the application of procedural social justice to stimulate voluntary cooperative behavior on the part of members of groups, thereby enhancing true social justice for all members of society. A procedural justice lens is suggested to enhance commitment and cooperation among individuals, groups, and societies.

Key words: distributed justice, procedural justice, College Board, curriculum reform, social justice, U.S. history, advanced placement

On Thursday, July 30, 2015, the College Board released new 2015 Advanced Placement U.S. History guidelines following a year of intense debate concerning their release of a revised framework in 2014. According to College Board, the 2014 revision of the former 2010 framework was in response to frustrations expressed by many AP teachers that the "previous course did not provide sufficient time to immerse students in the major ideas, events, people, and documents of U.S. history" and that they were, instead, "required to race through topics" (Advances in AP, 2015). Although a seemingly benign concern to address, College Board's revisions resulted in what became a national controversy regarding changes in the 2014 revised framework.

The Debate Defined

A contentious debate raged after the middle of 2014 when the College Board introduced revisions that critics claimed were designed to encourage critical analysis of America's founding narrative. Critics suggested that such significant changes were made in emphasizing "less content, in depth" (2014 Framework, p. 7) and including more of an emphasis on "Historical Thinking Skills" that, ultimately, the interpretation of U.S. history would be left to high school students themselves. Prompting particularly strong reaction was the understanding that references to the "founding fathers" and foundational documents were given little emphasis in the revised framework. Instead, students were to be trained to "think historically" (2014 Framework, p. 18), thereby developing an interpretation of U.S. history according to their own understandings, experiences, and, as critics claimed, the new College Board narrative.

Additional concerns, outside of the "content/thinking skills" debate, quickly emerged. The new framework sparked strong reaction from both sides of the political aisle. Conservative groups in North Carolina, Texas, South Carolina, Georgia, Colorado, and Oklahoma challenged the new framework as an attempt to rewrite history. Critics such as Representative Dan Fisher (Oklahoma) suggested that the new framework emphasizes America "as a nation of oppressors and exploiters," and activist and attorney Jane Robbins inspired the Republican National Committee's resolution condemning the framework as "radically revisionist" (Lerner, 2015). Dr. Stanley Kurtz, an education scholar at the Ethics and Public Policy Center and a leading critic of the 2014 framework, said that the guidelines were "hostile" to the idea of American exceptionalism. He stated, "I don't object to critical analysis, which is a crucial part of the framework. But I tend to believe the (revised) critical analysis is applied one-sidedly and unevenly" (Lerner, 2015).

In contrast, those in support of the 2014 revision argued that the document did not contain progressive bias. In an OP-ED column for *The New York Times*, James R. Grossman (2014) stated, "Those who assume that America's founders are neglected seem not to have actually read the material . . . . The framework even makes a bow to American exceptionalism — noting "the emergence of distinctly American cultural expressions" in the new republic" (para. 10, 11). Similarly, on September 3, 2014, The National Coalition for History (NCH) sent a letter to eight states' Boards of Education (Georgia, Tennessee, Louisiana, South Carolina, North Carolina, Texas, Colorado, and Nevada) in support of the framework developed for the Advanced Placement in U.S. History exam. Their letter, signed by John R. Dichtl, NCH Policy Board President, and Lee White, NCH Executive Director, expressed their opinion:

> The AP History framework was developed over a 7-year period by professionals of good faith and good will in the field and peer reviewed by a diverse group of 400 high school AP history teachers and 58 college professors with expertise in U.S. history. It is a framework that offers expert guidance while providing individual teachers with flexibility to adapt their AP courses to state standards and local concerns . . . . The National Coalition for History supports the College Board's new framework. While no document is perfect, the current guidelines are an important step forward in helping teachers to prepare future citizens for a 21st-century global economy. (para. 3, 8)

As the debate gained momentum, critics demanded attention to their concern that the 2014 framework was "too negative and too political" (Kamenetz, 2015), while advocates staunchly supported the revisions made in the new framework.

Problem and Purpose

As time progressed, news media coverage and related publicity caused conversations to evolve to a defense of ideological positions rather than informed perspectives based upon knowledge of actual similarities and differences between the former 2010 framework and the revised 2014 and 2015 frameworks. As a result, we sought to conduct a careful and thorough document analysis of the past 2010 Advanced Placement U.S. History Framework and the revised 2014 Advanced Placement U.S. History Frameworks. The document analysis was meant to provide educational leaders and policymakers with data to make informed decisions and to more effectively contribute to this important debate. This document analysis addressed the following research questions:

- What are the similarities and differences between the 2010 (former) and 2014 (revised) AP U.S. History frameworks?
- What persistent themes are evident in each framework?

Methods

During the first stage of this study, we carefully and independently read through the 2010 and the 2014 frameworks, noting similarities and differences. Each member of the assessment team then independently produced summaries of similarities and differences, and each independently coded recurring themes in each framework. After documents were thematically coded, we compared findings to produce a compiled list of findings. Axial coding was then done to explore how concepts and categories were related and to ensure that important aspects had been identified. Tables were created to represent similarities, differences and consistent categories and concepts.

We present a brief explanation of the differences between the 2010 and 2014 Advanced Placement U.S. History frameworks as an important foundation for the purposes of this manuscript, furthering the discussion of "where we go from here" after changes made in 2015. We briefly summarize findings from the first stage of our research below and follow this summary with suggestions for moving forward following release of the 2015 revisions.

Findings: Stage One

Five findings emerged that outlined key differences in the 2010 and 2014 Frameworks. These findings included 1) very different organizational structures and level of detail; 2) differences in emphasis on Historical Thinking Skills; 3) differences in the importance of content knowledge; 4) inclusion of specific proficiency standards and suggestions of "how" teachers might teach a particular concept to meet identified learning objectives in the 2014 Framework; and 5) a "skills-based" approach to U.S. History in

the 2014 Framework verses utilizing content knowledge in the 2010 Framework as a needed "reservoir" for students to exercise analytic skills intelligently. These findings are important because they frame the discussion of particular responses to College Board revisions in 2014 and 2015.

Organizational Structure and Level of Detail

We began our comparison of the two documents by highlighting the very obvious differences in the length of the two frameworks (35 pages in the 2010 APUSH Framework; 135 pages in the 2014 APUSH Framework). Initial observation identified vastly different organizational structures as well. Significant differences in the 2014 Framework included detailed description of nine skill types listed in Historical Thinking Skills, six detailed Thematic Learning Objectives, and a very detailed Concept Outline. The difference in length is primarily explained by the inclusion of a Concept Outline in the 2014 Framework (2014 Framework, pp. 32-81). The Concept Outline includes instructions to teachers for "how to use the Concept Outline," nine very detailed "Key Concepts," and suggestions of content for teachers to utilize to teach these Key Concepts. This level of detail is compared to a brief Topic Outline provided in the 2010 Framework (pp. 7-11). The Topic Outline in the 2010 Framework, a four-page list of suggested topics, is "intended as a general guide for AP teachers in structuring their courses for students." The list provided "broad parameters for the course (that) may be expanded or modified for instruction" (2010 Framework, p. 7). An overview of the organization and areas of emphasis in each framework can be found in Appendix A.

Emphasis on Historical Thinking Skills

Another finding in the first stage of this study is difference in the two frameworks on the emphasis of student development of historical thinking skills. The 2014 Framework included a strong emphasis on, and thorough explanation of, the development of Historical Thinking Skills (pp. 11-20), including specific proficiency standards and suggestions of "how" teachers might teach a particular concept to meet identified learning objectives, a component clearly not included in the 2010 Framework. Historical Thinking Skills were given prominence in the 2014 Framework as evidenced in the statement, "the AP U.S. History course focuses on the development of Historical Thinking Skills and an understanding of content learning objectives organized around seven themes" (2014 Framework, p. 7). In contrast, the 2010 Framework was designed "to provide students with the analytic skills and factual knowledge necessary to deal critically with the problems and materials in U.S. history" (2010 Framework, p. 4).

Importance of Content Knowledge

A significant finding in the analysis of the 2010 and 2014 documents was identification of very different perspectives of the importance and utilization of content knowledge. These differences are outlined below.

***The 2010 Framework*.** The 2010 Framework specifically emphasized the importance of acquisition of content knowledge *and* development of critical thinking skills. Content knowledge was recognized as having inherent value as a foundation for development of analytic skills. Teachers were

expected to introduce students to a broad array of factual knowledge, and this factual knowledge served as a "reservoir" that students needed in order to exercise analytic skills intelligently (2010 Framework, p. 5). The importance of factual knowledge was emphasized in the statement, "striking a balance between teaching factual knowledge and critical analysis is a *demanding but crucial task* (emphasis ours) in the design of a successful AP course in history" (p. 5). Content knowledge was not the only emphasis in the 2010 Framework. Additional student outcomes included an awareness of multiple interpretations of historical issues in secondary sources, a sense of multiple causation and change over time, and the ability to compare developments or trends from one period to another. However, content knowledge served as the foundation for these student outcomes. Multiple choice questions were designed to test students' factual knowledge, breadth of preparation, and knowledge-based analytical skills, and the Data-Based Question (DBQ) emphasized the ability of students to analyze and synthesize historical data and assess verbal, quantitative, or pictorial materials as historical evidence.

***The 2014 Framework*.** In contrast, the 2014 Framework introduced a skills-based approach to U.S. history focused on teaching Historical Thinking Skills through a list of Thematic Learning Objectives and related Concept Outline. Historical Thinking Skills encompassed four Skill Types broken into nine specific skill categories. Thematic Learning Objectives, "what colleges expect AP students to know and be able to do by the end of the AP U.S. History course" (2014 Framework, pp. 9-10) provided a framework for teachers in teaching Historical Thinking Skills. Themes were also identified that served the purpose of helping "students to recognize broad trends and processes that have emerged over centuries in *what has become the United States*" (p. 20).

Content vs. Concepts

In contrast to a list of topics, the 2014 Framework included a Concept Outline "to provide teachers with clarity regarding the concepts that students may be asked to analyze on an AP Exam" (p. 29). This section of the framework also listed related sources that teachers could potentially utilize as teaching tools, thereby assisting teachers in understanding how to highlight the relationship between specific historical developments and larger, thematic understandings.

This difference is important because the use of concepts (instead of content) stood in stark contrast to the 2010 Framework, in which content knowledge was emphasized as having inherent value. In the 2014 Framework, content had only utilitarian value to reach the intended goal of teaching students to "think as historians." Teachers were free to choose any content that reached the goals of teaching Historical Thinking Skills and promoting understanding of thematic objectives.

While each framework listed examples of content that may be included on the AP History exam, an additional difference in the two frameworks was that the 2014 Framework encouraged teachers to select "fewer examples (of content) in depth" (p. 30), as opposed to providing a broad understanding of U.S. history, as was emphasized in the 2010 Framework. "Gray boxes" in the 2014 Framework provided examples of possible content that could be relevant for a particular concept. The list was meant to be illustrative, not mandatory, thereby indicating that content offered across AP U.S. History courses at different locations could and would differ dramatically. Instead, the common element across courses at

different locations would be the development of Historical Thinking Skills. The intent was to train students to "think as historians" and to understand history according to their own interpretations (p. 18). A comparison of the suggested Topic Outline in the 2010 Framework and the Concept Outline in the 2014 Framework can be found in Appendix B.

Proficiency Standards

A clear difference between the 2010 and 2014 Frameworks was that the 2014 Framework detailed specific expectations for student understandings, a component not present in the 2010 Framework. These proficiencies were outlined in the section "Learning Objectives by Theme" (pp. 21-27) and in the section "Historical Thinking Skills" (pp. 11-19). "Overarching questions" were provided, with specific details of how students were expected to demonstrate mastery of the stated learning objective. Each learning objective was also linked with a specific objective in the Content Outline.

Key Themes in Each Framework

Three key findings emerged concerning consistent themes in the 2014 Framework. First, the 2014 Framework represented a sociological approach to U.S. History as evidenced by a consistent focus on interactions between social groups, a position that authors intentionally resisted in the 2010 Framework. The second finding was a persistent theme of conflict between social groups across all aspects of the 2014 Framework. Third, because of the level of detail included in the 2014 Framework, interpretation of history was evident despite the statement that "thematic learning objectives are written in a way that does not promote any particular political position or interpretation of history" (2014 Framework, p. 10).

Sociological Approach to U.S. History

It was noted that authors of the 2010 Framework recognized a persistent trend, at that time, among U.S. history courses to emphasize social and cultural history. The 2010 Framework concluded,

> Much recent scholarship in U.S. history merges social and cultural history. Based on college curriculum survey data, the Development Committee decided to combine these two categories into one called "social change and cultural and intellectual developments" (p. 13).

This category was addressed in the multiple-choice section of the 2010 exam, and it represented 40% of the focus in exam questions. In contrast, the 2014 Framework emphasized social and cultural history as a persistent theme across all areas of the 2014 Framework.

Conflict as a Persistent Theme

Conflict between social groups appeared to be the predominant theme across all aspects of the 2014 Framework. Because this theme was so pervasive, we do not attempt to provide a complete list of identified conflicts here. For illustrative purposes, we provide an example of the prevalence of conflict

throughout the 2014 Framework as evidenced in the fact that 13 of the 15 overarching questions and related learning objectives required students to analyze conflict, debates, or differences among social groups in either the overarching question itself or at least one of the learning objectives.

Interpretation of History in the 2014 Framework

The 2014 Framework included the statement, "thematic learning objectives are written in a way that does not promote any particular political position or interpretation of history" (p. 10). However, Key Concepts throughout the Concept Outline represent clear interpretations of U.S. history. Two examples are included here for illustrative purposes. Key Concept 2.1.II.C states, "Reinforced by *a strong belief in British racial and cultural superiority*, the British system enslaved black people in perpetuity, altered African gender and kinship relationships in the colonies, and was one factor that led British colonists into violent confrontations with native peoples" (p. 37). Additionally, Key Concept 1.3.I.B states, "Many Europeans developed a belief in white superiority to justify their subjugation of Africans and American Indians, using several different rationales" (p. 35). Whether or not someone agrees with the statements listed in the 2014 framework, it is important to note that interpretations of U.S. history were included throughout the document.

2015: The College Board's Response

The College Board's response to what had become a national controversy came as a surprise to many. In response to the intense criticism received over the 2014 revision, College Board opened a public review period to "gather feedback from concerned citizens, historians, educators and public officials" (College Board, 2015). They also hired Jeremy Stern, an independent scholar and education consultant with the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, as a consultant on the revision. The result of intense review was even more surprising as College Board publically recognized that the 2014 Framework contained an unbalanced approach to U.S. History. A statement issued by College Board on July 30th, 2015, indicated that the 2014 framework was revised in 2015 to provide "a clearer, *more balanced approach* to the teaching of American history that remains faithful to the requirements that college and universities set for academic credit" (Advances in AP, 2015).

Responses to the revisions made in 2015, though not as volatile as responses to the 2014 framework, remain mixed. Max Eden (2015), from the American Enterprise Institute and a former critic of the 2014 framework, wrote, "'When we saw the 2015 framework, we were pleasantly surprised. . . . The standards weren't just scrupulously fair—they were 'flat out good'" (para. 3). In contrast, John Fonte and Stanley Kurtz, in their article, "AP U.S. History Bias Still Runs Deep*,"* claim,

> The underlying bias remains. . . . The problem with the latest (2015) APUSH framework is that it variously downplays, omits, and distorts the significance of the assimilationist ethos in American history. Instead of conveying the nature and importance of assimilation, the College Board projects a contemporary multiculturalist perspective onto earlier eras. This does an injustice both to the facts and to a theme that rightly serves as a foundation for successful civic education: assimilation. (para. 2 & 3)

What remains obvious is that U.S. History courses have become a platform for transforming thinking about deeply held understandings experienced by marginalized groups. An emphasis on revisionist history has evolved as a means to address injustices of the past. Delgado and Stefancic (2001) explained that "revisionist history reexamines America's historical record, replacing comforting majoritarian interpretations of events with ones that square more accurately with minorities' experiences" (p. 20). Davis, Gooden, and Micheaux (2015) suggested that, according to critical race theory, "research (reflecting the voices of the marginalized) should be given credence over other traditional works, which invariably insulate the status quo" (p. 342). It is obvious that discussions will continue, and our goal is to provide insight, based upon our experiences in the debate, that could potentially lead to more informed discussions.

Discussion: After the 2015 Revision

Following our investigation and our experiences in this contentious debate, we have developed the following understandings about the outcomes, both positive and negative, of the debate about the teaching of U.S. history. Our goal is not to present a comparison of the 2014 and 2015 Frameworks (comparisons of the 2014 and 2015 Frameworks are available from the American Enterprise Institute, National Review, and College Board). Instead, we seek to present more overarching observations and important considerations that could contribute to the national debate.

Ideological Debates vs. Informed Debates

Our observations led U.S.to conclude that many of the heated dialogues that we encountered about changes made in the 2014 framework, even at the legislative level, were between individuals who had not actually studied the frameworks. We observed students, Advanced Placement teachers, administrators, and policy makers who expressed strong opinions for and against the changes made. When asked if they had actually read the frameworks, few, if any, indicated that they had read the revised framework. Many were defending their positions regarding the 2014 Framework based upon past experiences in Advanced Placement U.S. History, as they had either taught it or experienced it in the past, without knowledge of the changes that had been made. It seems logical to U.S. that, in discussions of this magnitude (affecting over 500,000 students annually), that, at a minimum, those who are debating the issue should be familiar with the actual content of each framework. Therefore, we conclude that there is a need for informed discussion, rather than discussion based on ideological positions about changes in curriculum, that can and will influence understandings of students for generations to come.

Curriculum to Promote Social Justice

Creating a completely neutral curriculum, free from ideology or bias, is a difficult, if not impossible, task. Curriculum writers will inadvertently impose their ideology by the choices that they make concerning what to include, what to emphasize, and even what to omit. The revisions made in 2014 by the College Board were likely in response to their perceptions of bias in traditional history textbooks, thereby serving a much larger purpose than simply addressing concerns of AP U.S. History teachers that "they

did not have sufficient time to immerse students in the major ideas, events, people, and documents of U.S. history" (College Board, 2015, para. 1). Furthermore, it is likely that the debate that emerged over the 2014 framework was fueled by inconsistent messages about the purpose of the revision.

What is important to note in this discussion is the responsibility of those who write and adapt curriculum to clearly communicate their intended purposes for revisions, especially when the revisions influence large numbers of people for extended periods of time. Healthy communication and dialogue about the intended purposes of curricular changes can promote common understandings and even bring about intended purposes of the writers of the curriculum. It is also worth noting that inclusion of additional detail in a curriculum, as evidenced in both the 2014 and 2015 revisions to the U.S. History Frameworks, offers an additional opportunity for specific ideology to be introduced into the curriculum. This observation leads U.S.to our next point of discussion.

Is AP Becoming a National Curriculum?

Critics of the revisions to the 2014 and subsequent 2015 Frameworks have expressed the concern that the changes no longer qualify the document as a "framework," but, instead, they claim it has become a curriculum, or more specifically, a national curriculum. Their argument is based upon the inclusion of increased detail, learning objectives, and proficiency standards in revised documents. However, the College Board seems to refute this conclusion. College Board's statement, "It is left to AP teachers, in consultation with their state and local standards, to design their curriculum and decide how they approach the founding documents" appears to be an attempt by College Board to emphasize control of the curriculum at the local level. Jeremy Stern (2014) addressed the challenge that College Board faced in developing the new curriculum. He posed the questions,

> How do you lay out the areas for which students will be responsible without laying out the key specifics that such questions may depend upon? And how can you lay out specifics without creating a set of overly prescriptive standards, intruding upon state documents and teacher autonomy? (para. 2)

Stern's conclusion is that "this document seems to have come down in a sort of no-man's land—not quite standards, not quite a testing guide, definitely not a full-fledged curriculum guide, and arguably too long and complex to be used easily alongside state-mandated and local materials" (2015, para. 4).

The deciding factor in these important questions appears to be dependent upon teachers' responses to the changes in the framework. The question remains: "Will the increased level of detail, along with defined proficiency standards in the revised framework, dictate how and what a teacher teaches in the classroom?" Ultimately, time will test the ability of the classroom teacher to make decisions at the classroom level. It is also important to note that, in this consideration of local verses national influence, a spotlight has been placed on each States' responsibility to provide a pathway for teachers of advanced courses to design their curriculum and evaluate how that curriculum supports/does not support state standards (College Board, 2015).

The Lens of "Social Justice"

Finally, and most importantly, what seemed obvious is that the 2014 curriculum Framework was developed through a social justice lens. Eden (2015) described the 2014 revisions as having a "preoccupation with race, gender, class, and exploitation" (para 3). Critics of the 2015 Framework complain that this preoccupation still exists in the revised 2015 framework (Kurtz, 2015). According to Eden (2015), the revised 2015 framework, however, "strikes a balance between the darker elements of our history and the progress we have made toward fulfilling our nation's ideals" (para. 3). Despite disagreements about the role of "race, gender, class, and exploitation" in the curricular framework, what has evolved from this debate is important consideration about how to responsibly promote social equity through curriculum revision.

Challenges of a Social Justice Lens

Addressing the issue of past injustices through a social justice framework is not as simple as it may first appear. While the revised 2014 framework may reflect a sincere and noble effort on the part of curriculum developers to promote future equity among all social groups (National Coalition of History, 2014), what is not well recognized is that common understandings of the term "social justice" rarely exist (Harris, 2015). In fact, even as long ago as 1976, Hayek argued that scholarly battles over social justice have developed from people who "simply do not know themselves what they mean by it" (as cited in Harris, 2015, p. 97). Harris (2015), in his work regarding the utility of frameworks in social justice discourse, outlined disparities in the various philosophical and ethical underpinnings of social justice by recognizing religious explanations of social justice, social justice for utilitarian purposes, and social justice as "a universal concept representing a way to live rather than a concept to be defined" (Griffin, 1998, 1990, as cited in Harris, 2015, p. 97). Differences in understandings of social justice are further emphasized in the comparison of John Rawls' (2003) Justice as Fairness and David Miller's (2003) Principles of Social Justice. To Rawls, social justice is about assuring the protection of equal access to liberties, rights, and opportunities as well as taking care of the least advantaged members of society. Miller (2003), on the other hand, believed that social justice deals with the distribution of good (advantages) and bad (disadvantages) in society and, specifically, how those things should be distributed.

Because social justice is "inextricably linked to social contexts within which models of justice make sense to the people involved" (Harris, 2015, p. 97), deeper discussions about the term "social justice" are needed to gauge potential outcomes of its use in curriculum frameworks. Specifically, in regard to this debate concerning U.S. history curriculum, the following question emerges, "How can educational experiences be designed/curriculum be developed that promote social equity for all individuals without creating further dissension between social groups and while preserving and promoting the distinctiveness of American ideals?"

A close examination of two types of social justice, distributive and procedural justice, may provide a more in-depth understanding of potential outcomes of developing curriculum frameworks through a social justice lens. A basic understanding among most scholars engaged in social justice work is that

social justice emphasizes the idea that, when people interact with other groups or organizations, their "judgments, feelings, and behaviors are influenced by their evaluations of what is 'fair' or 'unfair 'just' or 'unjust'" (Tyler, 2003, p. 344). However, two types of social justice are particularly important in this analysis: assessments of fairness of allocations (distributive social justice) and evaluations of fairness of processes (procedural social justice).

Distributive Social Justice. Examination of the 2014 Framework suggested primarily a distributive social justice approach to understanding U.S. History. Distributive justice helps to explain people's reactions to the fairness, or lack of fairness, in allocation of resources such as possessions, power, or position (Tyler, 2003). Examples from the 2014 framework include Key Concept 5.1.I.A: "The idea of Manifest Destiny, which asserted U.S. power in the Western Hemisphere and supported U.S. expansion westward, was built on a belief in white racial superiority and a sense of American cultural superiority, and helped to shape the era's political debates" (p. 55); Key Concept 6.2.I.D: "In an urban atmosphere where the access to power was unequally distributed, political machines provided social services in exchange for political support" (p. 63), and Key Concept 6.1.I.D: "As cities grew substantially in both size and in number, some segments of American society enjoyed lives of extravagant 'conspicuous consumption,' while many others lived in relative poverty" (p. 61). The 2015 revised Framework diminished the emphasis of distributive social justice; however, elements are still present. For example, Key Concept 6.2.D in the 2015 Framework states, "In an urban atmosphere where the access to power was unequally distributed, political machines thrived, in part by providing immigrants and the poor with social services" (p. 63) and Key Concept 6.3.A, which states, "Social commentators advocated theories later described as Social Darwinism to justify the success of those at the top of the socioeconomic structure as both appropriate and inevitable" (p. 65). Even though the wording chosen by the writers is not necessarily explicit, the underpinnings of distributive justice appear to be present.

According to Tyler (2003), a distributive justice lens may not provide a useful approach for solving social conflict, and it may not be the most effective means of reaching the intended goal of preparing future citizens for a 21st century global economy (National Coalition of History, 2014). Critique of a distributive justice lens suggests that distributive justice judgments are often biased (Messick & Sentis, 1985; Ross & Sicoly, 1979; Thompson & Lowenstein, 1992), and people are not always able to objectively assess fairness in the allocation of resources (Tyler, 2003). This tendency to make inaccurate judgments is exacerbated in ambiguous situations (Allison, McQueen, & Schaerfl, 1992; Herlocker, Allison, Foubert, & Beggan, 1997) and may actually hinder, rather than promote, conversations that result in true social unity and equity. Tyler (2003) concluded,

> Early research on justice focused on the argument that people's feelings and behaviors in social interactions flow from their assessments of the fairness of their outcomes when dealing with others (distributive fairness); [however,] distributive justice has not proven as useful in resolving group conflicts as was initially hoped. (p. 350)

Procedural Social Justice. In contrast, procedural justice judgments have been found to have robust effects on adherence to agreements over time (Pruitt, Peirce, McGillicuddy, Welton, & Castrianno, 1993, as cited in Tyler, 2003). Procedural justice refers to judgments about the justice of

decision-making or allocation *procedures* rather than outcomes, thereby offering potential for people to manage the problems of cooperation with others by helping to define fair ways to resolve conflicts and helping them to gain acceptance for outcomes (Wenzel & Mikula, 2000). According to Tyler (1999), people in groups are more likely to seek justice for others when they feel that group decision-making procedures are fair. An example is the writing of the 2014 Framework itself. It stands to reason that extreme conflict over the revisions in the new framework may actually reflect a perception of procedural injustice as the process of redesign may actually be perceived as procedurally unfair to those who had no voice in revisions and, therefore, opposed it.

Of additional importance in this discussion is the movement of procedural justice research away from an emphasis on procedures as mechanisms for making decisions about the allocation of outcomes (Tyler & Blader, 2003). More recently, researchers have moved their attention to the interpersonal aspect of procedures because procedures are "settings within which people are involved in a social interaction with one another" (p. 350). Findings in the literature suggest that having an opportunity for "voice" had worth that was not linked to the outcome of a decision (Tyler, 1987). In other words, people were concerned about the way they were treated and whether or not their concerns and needs in a situation were treated respectfully by a decision maker "independently of whether or not the course of action they recommend to resolve those concerns was adopted" (Tyler & Blader, 2003, p. 351). Tyler and Huo (2002) confirmed that interpersonal treatment is an important factor in shaping procedural justice judgments. Therefore, instead of viewing justice as fairness in the distribution of resources, procedural justice as a means to engender respectful, trusting relations, treating people with politeness and dignity, could potentially lead to desired outcomes of unity and cooperation between social groups. Procedural justice that "shapes cooperation in groups, organizations, and societies" (Tyler & Blader, 2003, p. 352) may be the appropriate lens for curricular revisions because, rather than minimizing anger and destructive behavior, procedural justice has been found to stimulate actual commitment and cooperation (Tyler, 2000; Tyler & Blader, 2003) among individuals, groups, and societies.

Summary

The most important findings from this study suggest the need for reconsideration of the type of social justice lens needed to effectively prepare students for global citizenship in the 21st century. Application of a procedural justice lens, rather than a distributive justice lens, may better address social injustices of the past and offer promise for the creation of a mechanism that promotes internal values that support voluntary cooperative behavior on the part of members of groups thereby enhancing true social justice for all members of American society. Thibaut and Walker's (1975) words are as true today as they were in 1975:

> One prediction that can be advanced with sure confidence is that human life on this planet faces a steady increase in the potential for interpersonal and intergroup conflict. The rising expectations of a continuously more numerous population in competition for control over rapidly diminishing resources create the conditions for an increasingly dangerous existence. It seems clear that the quality of future human life is likely to be importantly determined by the

effectiveness with which disputes can be managed, moderated, or resolved. Procedures or methods that may be put to this task of resolution therefore claim our attention.

As Kamentz (2015) concludes, in the education policy world, the revisions included in the 2015 Advanced Placement U.S. History framework seem like a happy ending to a heated national controversy. However, it is recognized that culture wars are very much alive "and for many young people, those debates start in history class" (Kamentz, 2015, para. 20). A responsible approach to the application of social justice may facilitate common solutions to America's deepest problems and provide all students with the opportunity to "participate more deeply in civic life in the United States and globally" (College Board, 2015).

References

Allison, S. T., McQueen, L. R., & Schaerfl, L. M. (1992). Social decision-making processes and the equal partitionment of shared resources. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *28*, 23–42.

Davis, B. W., Gooden, M. A., & Micheaux, D. J. (2015). Color-blind leadership: A critical race theory analysis of the ISLLC and ELCC standards. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 51*(3), 335-371.

Dichtl, J. R., & White, L. (2014, September 3). NCH AP history letter. Retrieved from http://historycoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/NCH-AP-History-letter.pdf

Eden, M. (2015). *The mend of history: The College Board's 2015 framework*. American Enterprise Institute. Retrieved 23 October 2015 from http://www.aei.org /publication/the-mend-of-history-the-college-boards-2105-framework/

Fonte, J. & Kurtz, S. (2015). AP U.S. history bias still runs deep. *National Review* (22 September 2015). Retrieved 23 October 2015 from http://www.nationalreview.com /article/424414/ap-us-history-bias?target =author&tid=900290

Grossman, J. R. (2014, September 1). The new history wars. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://historycoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/NCH-AP-History-letter.pdf

Harris, E. (2015). A grid and group explanation of social justice: An example of why frameworks are helpful in social justice discourse (p. 97- In I. Bogotch & C. M. Shields (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Social (In)justice* (p. 97). DOI:10.1007/978-94-007-6555-9.

Herlocker, C. E., Allison, S. T., Foubert, J. D., & Beggan, J. K. (1997). Intended and unintended overconsumption of physical, spatial, and temporal resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 992–1004.

Kamenetz, A. (2015). *The new, new framework for AP U.S. History*. Retrieved 14 October 2015 from http://www.npr.org/sectios/ed/2015/08/05/429361628/the-new-new-framework-for-ap-u-s-history

Lerner, A. B. (2015). AP U.S. History controversy becomes a debate on America. *Politico.* Retrieved 2 May 2015 from http://www.politico.com/story/2015/02/ap-us-history-controversy-becomes-a-debate-on america115381

Messick, D., & Sentis, K. (1985). Estimating social and nonsocial utility functions from ordinal data. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 21*, 389-399.

Miller, D. (2003). *Principles of social justice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Bachman, R., & Sherman, L. W. (1997). Do fair procedures matter? *Law and Society Review*, *31*, 163–204.

Rawls, J. (2005) *A theory of justice.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Ross, M., & Sicoly, F. (1979). Egocentric biases in availability and attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 322-336.

Stern, J. A. (2015). *The new AP U.S. History test guide: Standards-lite, thematic guide, or not quite either?* Thomas B. Fordham Institute. Retrieved 22 October 2015 from http://edexcellence .net/articles/new-ap-us-history-test-guide-standards-lite-thematic-guide-or-not-quite-either

The College Board (2010). United States history: Course description. Retrieved from http://www .apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/repository/ap-us-history-course-description.pdf

The College Board. (2014). AP United States History: Course and exam description including the curriculum framework. Retrieved from https://securemedia.collegeboard.org/digitalServices /pdf/ap/ap-us-history-course-and-exam-description.pdf

The College Board (2015). Overview of the AP U.S. History Redesign Process. Retrieved 16 October 2015 from https://advancesinap.collegeboard.org/english-history-and-social-science/us-history/2015-ced

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Thompson, L., & Loewenstein, G. (1992). Egocentric interpretations of fairness and interpersonal conflict. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 51*, 176-197.

Tyler, T. R. (2003). Social justice. In R. Brown & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Press.

Tyler, T. R. (2000). Social justice: Outcome and procedure. *International Journal of Psychology, 35*(2), 117-125.

Tyler, T. R. (1999). Why do people cooperate in organizations? In B. Staw & R. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*(4), 349-361.

Wenzel, M. & Mikula, G. (2000). Justice and social conflict: The impact of ideas of justice, perceptions of injustice, and justice arguments on the emergence, course, and resolution of social conflicts. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 126-135.

Appendix A
Organization and Areas of Emphasis in Each Framework

2010 Framework	2014 Framework
Goal: To provide the students with the analytic skills and factual knowledge necessary to deal critically with the problems and materials in U.S. history. **Skills Emphasized** Analytic/critical thinking skills, interpretation, and factual knowledge. Students are expected to: • access historical materials • weigh evidence and interpretations presented in historical scholarship • arrive at conclusions on the basis of an informed judgment and to present reasons and evidence clearly and persuasively in essay format • analyze and interpret primary sources, including documentary material, maps, statistical tables, and pictorial and graphic evidence of historical events.	Focus: The development of Historical Thinking Skills and an understanding of content learning objectives organized around seven themes. **Skills Emphasized: Historical Thinking Skills** **Skill Type I: Chronological Reasoning** a. Historical Causation b. Patterns of Continuity and Change over Time c. Periodization **Skill Type II: Comparison and Contextualization** a. Comparison b. Contextualization **Skill Type III: Crafting Historical Arguments from Historical Evidence** a. Historical Argumentation b. Appropriate Use of Relevant Historical Evidence **Skill Type IV: Historical Interpretation and Synthesis** a. Interpretation b. Synthesis
12 Themes - Overarching ideas designed to encourage students to think conceptually about the American past and to focus on historical change over time Themes: 1) American Diversity; 2) American Identity; 3) Culture; 4) Demographic Changes; 5) Economic Transformations; 6) Environment; 7) Globalization; 8) Politics and Citizenship 9) Reform; 10) Religion; 11) Slavery and Its Legacies in North America; 12) War and Diplomacy	7 Thematic Learning Objectives* – What colleges expect AP students to know and be able to do by the end of the AP U.S. History course in order to be exceptionally well qualified for credit and placement. Themes: 1) Identity; 2) Work, Exchange, and Technology; 3) Peopling; 4) Politics and Power; 5) America in the World; 6) Environment and Geography – physical and human; 7) Ideas, Beliefs and Culture *Each objective contains 2-3 overarching questions with related, specific expectations for student understandings (Table 2).
Topic Outline – a list of 28 suggested topics to use a general guide for AP teachers in structuring their courses and for students preparing for the AP U.S. History exam. The topics are not intended to be prescriptive of what teachers must teach. They provide broad parameters for the course and may be expanded or modified for instruction.	A very detailed Concept Outline is provided. This outline gives "teachers the freedom to select course content (individuals, events, documents, etc.) of their own choosing to help their students analyze statements included therein (the Concept Outline)" (p. 30).
Curriculum choices (resource materials) left to teacher and district.	Curriculum choices (resource materials) left to teacher and district.

Appendix B

Comparison of Suggested Topics of 2010 Framework and Concept Outline of 2014 Framework

Topic Outline 2010 Framework	Concept Outline 2014 Framework
Pre-Columbian Societies	**Period 1: 1491-1607 On a North American Continent controlled by American Indians, contact among the peoples of Europe, the Americans, and West Africa created a new world**
Early inhabitants and the Americas	
American Indian empires in Mesoamerica, the Southwest, and the Mississippi Valley	
American Indian cultures of North America at the time of European contact	**Key Concept 1.1: Before the arrival of Europeans, native populations in North America developed a wide variety of social, political, and economic structures based in part on interactions with the environment and each other**
Transatlantic Encounters and Colonial Beginnings (1492-1690)	
First European contacts with American Indians	Pueblo, Chinook, Iroquois, Algonquian
Spain's empire in North America	
French colonization of Canada	**Key Concept 2.1: European overseas expansion resulted in the Columbian Exchange, a series of interactions and adaptations among societies across the Atlantic**
English settlement of New England, the Mid-Atlantic region, and the South	
From servitude to slavery in the Chesapeake region	Smallpox, Mestizo, Zambo, horses, cows, sugar, silver
Religious diversity in the American colonies	
Resistance to colonial authority: Bacon's rebellion, the Glorious Revolution, and the Pueblo Revolt	**Key Concept 1.3: Contacts among American Indians, Africans, and Europeans challenged the worldviews of each groups**
Colonial North America (1690-1754)	
Population growth and immigration	Juan de Sepulveda, Bartolome de Las Casas, Spanish mission system, Pueblo, Juan de Onate
Transatlantic trade and the growth of seaports	
The eighteenth-century back country	**Period 2: 1607-1754 Europeans and American Indians maneuvered and fought for dominance, control, and security of North America, and distinctive colonial and native societies emerged.**
Growth of plantation economies and slave societies	
The Enlightenment and the Great Awakening	
Colonial governments and the imperial policy in British North America	**Key Concept 2.1: Differences in imperial goals, cultures, and the North American environments that different empires confronted led Europeans to develop diverse patterns of colonization**
The American Revolutionary Era, 1754-1789	
The French and Indian War	
The Imperial Crisis and resistance to Britain	
The War for Independence	Rebellion, sabotage, escape, the Carolinas (rice); Barbados (sugar)
State constitutions and the Articles of Confederation	
The federal Constitution	**Key Concept 2.2: European colonization efforts in North America stimulated intercultural contact and intensified conflict between the various groups of colonizers and native peoples**
The Early Republic (1789-1815)	
Washington, Hamilton, and shaping of the national government	Beaver Wars, Chickasaw Wars, fur, tobacco, Wool Act, Molasses Act, widespread smuggling in Spanish and English colonies; Catawba nation, population collapse and dispersal of Huron Confederacy, religious conversion among Wampanoag in New England leading to the outbreak of King Phillips's War, praying towns, clothing
Emergence of political parties: Federalists and Republicans	
Republican Motherhood and education for women	
Beginnings of the Second Great Awakening	
Significance of Jefferson's presidency	
Expansion into the trans-Appalachian West; American Indian Resistance	
Growth of slavery and free Black communities	**Key concept 2.3: The increasing political, economic, and cultural exchanges within the "Atlantic World"**
The War of 1812 and its consequences	

Transformation of the Economy and Society in Antebellum America
The transportation revolution and creation of a national market economy
Beginnings of industrialization and changes in social and class structures
Immigration and nativist reaction
Planters, yeoman farmers, and slaves in the cotton South
The Transformation of Politics in Antebellum America
Emergence of the second party system
Federal authority and its opponents: judicial federalism, the Bank War, tariff controversy, and states' rights debates
Jacksonian democracy and its successes and limitations
Religion, Reform, and Renaissance in Antebellum America
Evangelical Protestant revivalism
Social reforms
Ideals of domesticity
Transcendentalism and utopian communities
American Renaissance; literary and artistic expressions
Territorial Expansion and Manifest Destiny
Forced removal of American Indians to the trans-Mississippi West
Western migration and cultural interactions
Territorial acquisitions
Early U.S. imperialism: The Mexican War
The Crisis of the Union
Pro and antislavery arguments and conflicts
Compromise of 1850 and popular sovereignty
The Kansas-Nebraska Act and the emergence of the Republican party
Abraham Lincoln, the election of 1860, and succession
Civil War
Two societies at war: mobilization, resources, and internal dissent
Military strategies and foreign diplomacy
Emancipation and the role of African Americans in the war
Social, political, and economic effects of war in the North, South and West
Reconstruction
Presidential and Radical Reconstruction
Southern state governments: aspirations, achievements, failures

had a profound impact on the development of colonial societies in North America.
Maryland Toleration Act of 1649, founding of Pennsylvania, John Locke, Casta system, mulatto, Metis, dominion of New England, Navigation Acts, Great Awakening, republicans
Period 3: 1754-1800 British imperial attempts to reassert control over its colonies and the colonial reaction to these attempts produced a new American republic, along with struggles over the new nation's social, political, and economic identity.
Key Concept 3.1: Britain's victory over France in the imperial struggle for North America led to new conflicts among the British government, the North American colonists, and American Indians, culminating in the creation of a new nation, the United States.
Pontiac's Rebellion, Proclamation of 1763, Iroquois Confederation, Chief Little Turtle and the Western Confederacy, Stamp Act, Committees of Correspondence, Intolerable Acts, Sons of Liberty, Mercy Otis Warren, Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania,
Key Concept 3.2: In the late 18th century, new experiments with democratic ideas and republican forms of government, as well as other new religious economic, and cultural ideas, challenged traditional imperial systems across the Atlantic World.
John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Adam Smith, tariff and currency disputes, Spanish restrictions on navigation of the Mississippi river, Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, Hamilton's Financial Plan, Proclamation of Neutrality, Abigail Adams, Pennsylvania Gradual Emancipation Law
Key Concept 3.3: Migration within North American cooperative interaction, and competition for resources raised questions about boundaries and policies, intensified conflicts among peoples and nations, and led to contests over the creation of a multiethnic multiracial national identity.
March of the Paxton Boys, Battle of Fallen Timbers Scots-Irish, Shay's Rebellion, frontier vs. tidewater Virginia, *corridos*, architecture of Spanish missions, *vaqueros*, Jay's Treaty, Pinckney's Treaty
Period 4: 1800-1848 The new republic struggled to define and extend democratic ideals in the fact of rapid economic, territorial, and demographic changes.

Role of African Americans in politics, education and the economy Compromise of 1877 Impact of Reconstruction The Origins of the New South Reconfiguration of southern agriculture: sharecropping and crop-lien system Expansion of manufacturing and industrialization The politics of segregation: Jim Crow and disenfranchisement **Development of the West in the Late 19th Century** Expansion and development of western railroads Competitors for the West: miners, ranchers, homesteaders, and American Indians Government policy toward American Indians Gender, race, and ethnicity in the far West Environmental impacts of western settlement **Industrial American in the Late 19th Century** Corporate consolidation of industry Effects of technological development on the worker and workplace Labor and labor unions National politics and influence of corporate power Migration and immigration: the changing face of the nation Proponents and opponents of the new order, e.g., Social Darwinism and Social Gospel **Urban Society in the late 19th Century** Urbanization and the lure of the city City problems and machine politics Intellectual and cultural movements and popular entertainment **Populism and Progressivism** Agrarian discontent and political issues of the late 19th Century Origins of Progressive reform: municipal, state, and national Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson as Progressive Presidents Women's roles: family, workplace, education, politics, and reform Black America: urban migration and civil rights initiatives **The Emergence of America as a World Power** American imperialism: political and economic expansion War in Europe and American neutrality The First World War at home and abroad	**Key Concept 4.1: The United States developed the world's first modern mass democracy and celebrated a new national culture, while Americans sought to define the nations' democratic ideals and to reform its institutions to match them.** McCulloch v. Maryland, Worcester v. Georgia; New England opposition to the Embargo Act, debates over the tariff and internal improvements; Charles G. Finney, Seneca Falls Convention, Utopian communities, American Colonization Society, Frederick Douglass, The Hudson River School, John James Audobon, Richard Allen, David Walker, slave music **Key Concept 4.2: Developments in technology, agriculture, and commerce precipitated profound changes in U.S. settlement patterns, regional identities, gender and family relations, political power, and distribution of consumer goods** Steel plow, mechanical reaper, Samuel Slater, Lowell system, Baldwin Locomotive Works, anthracite coal mining, cult of domesticity, Lydia Maria Child, early labor unions **Key Concept 4.3: U.S. interest in increasing foreign trade, expanding its national borders, and isolating itself from European conflicts shaped the nations' foreign policy and spurred government and private initiatives.** Negotiating the Oregon border, annexing Texas, trading with China, Monroe Doctrine, Webster-Ashburton Treaty, designating slave/nonslave areas, defining territories for American Indians, Hartford Convention, nullification crisis, War Hawks, Indian Removal Act, Seminole Wars **Period 5: 1844-1877 As the nation expanded and its population grew, regional tensions, especially over slavery, led to a civil war – the course and aftermath of which transformed American society** **Key Concept 5.1: The United States became more connected with the world as it pursued an expansionist foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere and emerged as the destination for many migrants from other countries.** Clipper ships, Commodore Matthew Perry's expedition to Japan, missionaries, parochial schools, Know-Nothings, Mormons, the gold rush, the Homestead Act, Mariano Vallejo, Sand Creek Massacre, Little Big Horn, John C. Calhoun, minstrel shows

Treaty of Versailles
Society and economy in the postwar years
The New Era: 1920s
The business of American and the consumer economy
Republican politics: Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover
The culture of Modernism: science, the arts and entertainment
Responses to Modernism: religious fundamentalism, nativism, and Prohibition
The ongoing struggle for equality: African Americans and women
The Great Depression and the New Deal
Causes of the Great Depression
The Hoover administration's reasons
Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Deal
Labor and union recognition
The New Deal coalition and its critics from the Right ant Left
Surviving hard times: American society during the Great Depression
The Second World War
The rise of fascism and militarism in Japan, Italy, and Germany
Prelude to war: policy of neutrality
The attack on Pearl Harbor and United States declaration of war
Fighting a multi-front war
Diplomacy, war aims, and wartime conferences
The United States as a global power in the Atomic Age
The Home Front During the War
War time mobilization of the economy
Urban migration and demographic changes
Women, work and family during war
Civil liberties and civil rights during war time
War and regional development
Expansion of government power
The United States and the Early Cold War
Origins of the Cold War
Truman and containment
The Cold War in Asia: China, Korea, Vietnam, and Japan
Diplomatic strategies and policies of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations
The Red Scare and McCarthyism
Impact of the Cold War on American society
The 1950s
Emergence of the modern civil rights movement

Key Concept 5.3: The Union victory in the Civil War and the contested Reconstruction of the South settled the issues of slavery and secession, but left unresolved many questions about the power of the federal government and citizenship rights.
Gettysburg, March to the Sea, Hiram Revels, Blanche K Bruce, Robert Smalls

Period 6: 1865-1898 The transformation of the United States from an agricultural to an increasingly industrialized and urbanized society brought about significant economic, political, diplomatic, social, environmental, and cultural challenges.

Key Concept 6.1: The rise of big business in the United States encouraged massive migrations and urbanization, sparked government and popular efforts to reshape the U.S. Economy and environment, and renewed debates over U.S. national identity.
John D. Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan, Knights of Labor, American Federation of Labor, Mother Jones, The Grange, Los Gorras Blancas, Colored Farmers' Alliance

Key Concept 6.2: The emergence of an industrial culture in the United States led to both greater opportunities for, and restrictions on, immigrants, minorities and women.
National American Woman Suffrage Association, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, subsidies, land-grant colleges, Dawes Act, Chief Joseph, Ghost Dance movement

Key Concept 6.3: The "Gilded Age" witnessed new cultural and intellectual movements in tandem with political debates over economic and social policies
Referendum, socialism, Interstate Commerce Act, American Protective Association, Chinese Exclusion Act, Henry George, Edward Bellamy, Gospel of Wealth, Booker T. Washington, Ida Wells-Barnett, Elizabeth Cady Stanton

Period 7: 1890-1945 An increasingly pluralistic United States faced profound domestic global challenges, debated the proper degree of government activism, and sought to define its international role

Key Concept 7.1: Governmental, political, and social organizations struggled to address the effects of large-scale industrialization, economic uncertainty, and related social changes such as urbanization and mass migration.
Clayton Antitrust Act, Florence Kelley, Federal Reserve

The affluent society and "the other America"
Consensus and conformity: suburbia and middle-class America
Social critics, nonconformists, and cultural rebels
Impact of changes in science, technology, and medicine

The Turbulent 1960s

From the New Frontier to the Great Society
Expanding movements for civil rights
Cold War confrontations: Asia, Latin America and Europe
Beginning of Détente
The antiwar movement and the counterculture

Politics and Economics at the End of the Twentieth Century

The election of 1968 and the "Silent Majority"
Nixon's challenges: Vietnam, China, and Watergate
Changes in the American economy: the energy crisis, deindustrialization, and the service economy
The New Right and the Reagan revolution
End of the Cold War

Society and Culture at the End of the Twentieth Century

Demographic changes: surge of immigration after 1965, Sunbelt migration, and the graying of America
Revolutions in biotechnology, mass communication, and computers
Politics in a multicultural society
The United States in the Post-Cold War World
Globalization and the American economy
Unilateralism vs. multilateralism in foreign policy
Domestic and foreign terrorism
Environmental issues in a global context

Bank, National Recovery Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Writers' Project, Huey Long, Supreme Court fight, Social Security Act, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)

Key Concept 7.2: A revolution in communications and transportation technology helped to create a new mass culture and spread "modern" values and ideas, even as cultural conflicts between groups increased under the pressure of migration, world wars, and economic distress.

Radio, motion pictures, automobiles, Yiddish theater, jazz, Edward Hopper, Great Depression-era deportations, Bracero program, Luisa Moreno

Key Concept 7.3: Global conflicts over resources territories and ideologies renewed debates over the nation's values and its role in the world while simultaneously propelling the United States into a dominant international military, political, cultural, and economic position

Dollar diplomacy, Mexican intervention, Washington Naval Conference, Stimson Doctrine, Neutrality Acts, Atlantic Charter, development of sonar, Manhattan Project

Period 8: 1945-1980 After World War II, the United States grappled with prosperity and unfamiliar international responsibilities while struggling to live up to its ideals

Key Concept 8.1: The United States responded to an uncertain and unstable postwar world by asserting and attempting to defend a position of global leadership, with far-reaching domestic and international consequences.

Development of hydrogen bomb, massive retaliation, space race, Suez Crisis, Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC)

Key Concept 8.2: Liberalism, based on anticommunism abroad and a firm belief in the efficacy of governmental and especially federal power to achieve social goals at home, reached its apex in the mid-1960s and generated a variety of political and cultural responses

Fannie Lou Hamer, John Lewis, Thurgood Marshall, The Feminine Mystique, Gloria Steinem, Griswold v. Connecticut, Miranda v. Arizona, Students for a Democratic Society, Black Panthers

	Key Concept 8.3: Postwar economic, demographic, and technological changes had a far-reaching impact on American society, politics, and the environment. Beat movement, *The Affluent Society*, rock and roll music, Rachel Carson, Clean Air Act, Watergate, *Bakke v. University of California*, Phyllis Schlafly **Period 9: 1980-Present As the United States transitioned to a new century filled with challenges and possibilities, it experienced renewed ideological and cultural debates, sought to redefine its foreign policy, and adapted to economic globalization and revolutionary changes in science and technology**. **Key Concept 9.1: A new conservatism grew to prominence in U.S. culture and politics, defending traditional social values and rejecting liberal views about the role of government.** OPEC oil embargo, 1970s inflation, Iranian hostage crisis, Moral Majority, Focus on the Family, tax cuts under Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush, Contract with America, Planned Parenthood v. Casey, expansion of Medicare and Medicaid, growth of the budget deficit **Key Concept 9.2: The end of the Cold War and new challenges to U.S. leadership in the world forced the nation to redefine its foreign policy and global role** "Star Wars" missile defense system, Start I Key Concept 9.3: Moving to the 21st century, the nation continued to experience challenges stemming from social, economic, and demographic changes North American Free Trade Agreement, debates over health care reform, debates over Social Security reform, Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Don't Ask Don't Tell debate

About the Authors

Katherine Curry, Ed.D. (Katherine.curry@okstate.edu) is Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator of the School Administration program in the School of Educational Studies at Oklahoma State University. She teaches master's-level and doctoral courses in Educational Leadership and provides service to the State, including professional development training. Her research interests include educational leadership, school culture/climate, parent and community involvement, and K-12 curriculum reform.

Lou L. Sabina, Ph.D. is currently a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Education at Stetson University in DeLand, Florida, where he teaches courses in educational leadership. His research interests include PK-12 organizational issues in education: staffing, human resources development, succession

planning for school administrators, comparative and international education, and school finance issues. Lou has been in education for the past 16 years and has served as a business, mathematics, computer science, economics, and social studies teacher and elementary school administrator.

Jon Loffi (Ed.D.) is Assistant Professor of Aviation and Space Science in the School of Educational Studies at Oklahoma State University. He teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in Aviation and Aerospace Security, Aviation Terrorism, and Aerospace Research. His research interests include aviation security, aviation security management, and global security.