

4

Curriculum Reform

William H. Schubert

In 1943, at ASCD's birth, more than a decade of attempts to recover from the Great Depression had clearly left its mark; and World War II was the overriding concern in a world political context that few had felt as powerfully in earlier eras. An historical perspective on curriculum reform must consider the context of the past fifty years, including the cultural and social spheres (Cawelti 1985). Here, however, I maintain a more limited focus. Therefore, in examining fifty years of curriculum reform, I first consider the meaning of curriculum and reform; second, sketch the historical baggage of ideas and practices brought by earlier generations; third, examine factors that contribute to reform (society, learners, subject matter, and technology); and fourth, review key events and players that shaped curriculum reform. Finally, noting that questions are forged by our sense of history, I raise some questions that may help us consider, plan for, and create the next fifty years of curriculum reform.

Definitions of Curriculum and Reform

Reform is easier to define than curriculum. *Reform* merely means to reshape, to reconfigure, to make different. But mere change does not mean improvement. So, too, with reform; thus, the saga of *re-form* that we review here is not intended to imply an evolutionary development. Reformers themselves generally hope that their brand of reform will bring improvement; it is their inspiration to pursue their cause. Therefore, as we think about the past fifty years of curriculum reform, we need to ask whether the re-forming carried out was improvement or not.

The term *curriculum* is shrouded in definitional controversy, so much so that it would require a book-length treatment to begin to deal with it (Schubert 1986). For our discussion, curriculum means what-

ever is advocated for teaching and learning. This includes both school and nonschool environments; both overt and hidden curriculums; and broad as well as narrow notions of content—its development, acquisition, and consequences.

Historical Perspective

Under the surface of concern for World War II in 1943, there lingered a deeply felt concern for what human beings are and what they might become. One might argue that such a self-conscious interest is, indeed, what makes us human. In the curriculum literature from 1900 to 1980, three orientations to curriculum thought emerge with some persistence—the intellectual traditionalist, the social behaviorist, and the experientialist (Schubert and Lopez-Schubert 1980). In addition, Thomas (1991) added a category I call the “conciliator.” Let us briefly consider each of these and some recent variations, noting that few educators are wholly devoted to one position.

Intellectual Traditionalists

People with this orientation adhere to the ideals of Western intellectual history, stemming back to ancient Greece and greatly influencing U.S. educators, including Hollis Caswell and other founders of ASCD. Current examples of this approach to curriculum include the “great books” advocacy of Robert Maynard Hutchins and Mortimer Adler of the Britannica “Great Books of the Western World” and, most recently, Adler’s (1982) several iterations of the Paideia Proposal. The main emphasis of this approach is on great ideas derived from the classics of a Western intellectual tradition and from the attendant disciplines of knowledge. The great works are great because they cut to the essential ideas that persons of all backgrounds and from all eras need to consider: truth, beauty, goodness, liberty, equality, and justice (Adler 1981). Thus, the intellectual traditionalist curriculum not only augments knowledge and skill acquisition, but also brings the learner closer to the deepest concerns of humanity throughout the ages.

Today, E.D. Hirsch, Allan Bloom, Diane Ravitch, William Bennett, and Chester Finn are among those who advocate an intellectual traditionalist approach to curriculum reform. The argument is quite familiar: that all students deserve access to the best ideas that the human race has achieved, that pursuit of such ideas enables the best development of the human mind, and that society will be served most fully by people who are steeped in these traditions.

One finds the intellectual-traditionalist values in elite private schools, such as those discussed in *Preparing for Power* (Cookson and Presell 1985), as well as the upper tracks of public schools well known in different parts of the United States for having high numbers of National Merit Scholars and high SAT and ACT scores. Every city and its surrounding suburbs readily can give examples of such schools. In many different environments (affluent, inner city, rural, and suburban middle class), Mortimer Adler's "Paideia Schools" (Adler 1982) have made headway to broaden the constituencies who promote intellectual traditionalist perspectives.

Social Behaviorist

This orientation emerged out of a positivist notion of science. Social behaviorists were strongly influenced by the scientific psychology of E.L. Thorndike, the management science of Frederick Taylor, and the critiques by Joseph Mayer Rice of inefficient and ineffective schooling. Writers such as Franklin Bobbitt and W.W. Charters had a considerable effect on the curriculum reform ideas of 1943—and even to the present. Believing in empirical evidence, in a world where truth can be discerned by objective inquiry, Bobbitt (1918, 1924) and Charters (1923) set out to determine curriculum scientifically. They identified what successful people spend their time doing and used those activities and ideals they represent as a basis for inducting the young into society. Historically, social behaviorists (advocates of "social efficiency," according to Kliebard 1986; and *essentialists*, according to Brameld 1955) favored the use of tests as a basis for determining curriculum. Carefully controlled studies were their hallmark.

Many of today's advocates of social behaviorist perspectives call for attention to "time on task" and link behavioral aspects of teaching to standardized test scores. Similarly, they hold quantitative modes of evaluation to be the best indicators of valid and reliable results in education. The selection of curricular materials and methods for reform should be based on an analysis of convincing documentation by research studies. Such curricular reform should begin with a systematic needs analysis, followed by detailed planning of objectives and content and activities to further the objectives; organizational matters such as scope and sequence; the learning environment; and evaluation that leads to revision in subsequent course offerings. The central argument is that curriculum reform should be based on the best scientific evidence available. Schools in middle-class suburban environments, some in university communities where research is valued, and some large city

school systems adopt curriculum policies and teaching strategies that are social behaviorist in orientation.

Experientialists

Experientialist curriculum thought has its origins in the work of John Dewey, who referred to his own pragmatic philosophy as "instrumentalism" (Dewey 1930). Brameld's (1955) categories of *progressivism* and *reconstruction* both apply to the experientialist orientation to curriculum, as do a hybrid of what Kliebard (1986) labels *developmentalists* and *social* meliorists. With Dewey (1902, 1916), experientialists advocate the progressive organization of curriculum by moving from what Dewey called "the psychological" to what he referred to as "the logical."

To begin with the psychological is to start with the interests and concerns that emerge from learners' experience. As learners air their interests and concerns, they begin to see that at a deeper level they are similar to the concerns and interests of others. This vividly provides insight into a realization that gives basis to participatory democracy, namely, that there are common human interests. Seeing such interests as the perennial wonderings of human beings about great existential questions, Robert Ulich (1955) referred to them as the "great mysteries and events of life: birth, death, love, tradition, society and the crowd, success and failure, salvation, and anxiety" (p. 255). Interests and concerns of the moment coalesce around such existential questions, issues that have plagued humanity in every cultural and historical setting. Teachers and learners, together, build projects to understand more deeply the problems that grow from their lived experience.

Then the Deweyan logical, the disciplines of knowledge or funded knowledge of the human race, becomes relevant to learners. Thus, the disciplines are drawn upon in eclectic and interdisciplinary fashion, combined with experiential insights, and valued for the consequences they offer to the reconstruction of meaning and sense of direction in the lives of individuals and groups alike.

Dewey and prominent progressive theorists (such as George S. Counts, Harold O. Rugg, William H. Kilpatrick, Boyd Bode, and L. Thomas Hopkins) furthered this notion of curriculum reform emerging from the philosophizing-in-action of teachers and learners. This philosophizing-in-action is at once democratic, scientific, and integrative (of both diverse groups and dualistic ideas). It relies more on the understanding of those embedded in everyday dilemmas than that of detached experts, though both are deemed helpful. Some of these

dilemmas surely relate to today's increased consciousness of persons who are oppressed or silenced because of race, class, gender, health, age, place, and so forth. The central assumption is that curriculum reform is enhanced by grass roots participation of those who will be affected most directly by the reform.

The Central Park East schools, founded by Deborah Meier in New York City; the Fratney School, guided by Bob Peterson in Milwaukee; schools associated with the Institute for Democracy and Education under the leadership of George Wood at Ohio University and Eliot Wigginton's work at Foxfire Rabun Gap, Georgia, are notable varieties of experientialist experiences (see Wood 1992). So are private schools, some that remain from the free school movement of the 1960s and others that are associated with the revived emphasis on progressive education and the Progressive Education Association (see Jervis and Montag 1991). However many private schools associated with this movement cater to wealthy student populations; thus, it could be argued that the innovations are only possible because the advantaged can learn in a counterculture way without incurring negative repercussions. Examples provided by Wood (1992), Fratney School (Milwaukee), and Central Park East (New York) are counter examples, in that they reflect an experientialist orientation with children who are far from wealthy.

Conciliators

For decades, intellectual traditionalists, social behaviorists, and experientialists have struggled for power in curriculum reform. One early conciliating effort was the publication of the Twenty-sixth Yearbook (Vol. 2) of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE, Rugg 1927). The result of several years of deliberation by major figures in the field of curriculum, this report marked an early unification of the field of curriculum studies.

Another important conciliating act was the birth of synoptic curriculum texts—books designed to bring together under a single cover a holistic portrait of curriculum knowledge. Following Caswell and Campbell's (1935) text, many synoptic works—and their revisions—have appeared in subsequent decades. For instance, influential writers in the 1940s included Gwynn (1943); Alberty (1947); Stratemeyer, Forkner, and McKim (1947); and Tyler (1949). The 1950s included Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1950) and Saylor and Alexander (1954); and the 1960s, Taba (1962) and Doll (1964). It is not unusual for curriculum

leaders or scholars to recall the synoptic text(s) that provided initiation to the curriculum field early in their own careers.

One text, which was perhaps too brief to genuinely be called synoptic, had an extraordinary impact on curricular theory and practice: Ralph Tyler's (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (also called the "Tyler Rationale"). Tyler's text, initially written as a course syllabus at the University of Chicago, is the seedbed of thinking about curriculum in terms of purposes, learning experiences, organization, and evaluation—and in perceiving sources of curricular purpose in the study of learners, society, and subject matter (see the "Chronology" section, "1943 to 1953").

It is fair to say that the Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the NSSE, the synoptic texts begun by Caswell and Campbell, and the Tyler Rationale were major conciliating forces that gave intellectual justification to the emergence of ASCD. Each of these events, including the creation of ASCD, was a major effort to bring together the best of each of the evolving schools of curriculum theory and practice. The hope was that curriculum reform could best develop as an eclectic endeavor in which each of the major orientations could be tapped for insight in the leadership of educational practice. The extent to which this was (is being) accomplished, the extent to which it is possible to combine the different sets of assumptions without inoperative contradiction, is of course problematic. Too many schools are conciliatory in the negative sense of trying to integrate a range of popular "hot topics" that conflict with one another. However, inclusive approaches that are productive include the work of Theodore Sizer (1984) in the Coalition of Essential Schools and James Comer (1980) in schools for inner-city populations.

Analysis of the Four Orientations

The strengths of intellectual traditionalists lie in the transmission of the Western cultural heritage. Critics argue that other traditions are equally valid, for example, those from the Far East, Latin America, Africa, and Oceania. Proponents of the Western tradition claim that because it has spawned great divergent insights as a basis for inquiry and that any cultural tradition embodies the great ideas, we should stick with the one with which we are most familiar. Critics, however, add that insights do differ among these and other traditions, often criticizing the Western tradition as being the ideas of affluent white men. Proponents counter by asserting that the Western tradition is, in fact, multicultural, having evolved from great cosmopolitan centers, such as Athens, Alexandria, Rome, Constantinople, Madrid, Paris, and London.

The strengths of social behaviorists are evident in their reliance on findings of scientific, educational, and psychological research. Criticisms focus on their overreliance on highly generalized information. Critics of the empirical, analytical assumptions of social behaviorists say that they should investigate problems found in actual states of affairs, not conjured-up problems in researchers' minds (e.g., the best method to teach science or the best curriculum for at-risk students). Critics claim that we should avoid overgeneralizations, and that we should find situational insights that enhance decision and action rather than search for laws that produce knowledge for its own sake (which they claim is a search for the will-o'-the-wisp). Advocates, however, maintain that empirical study is the only sure route to truth, and that the failures of many past curriculums have been caused by lack of documented evidence to support them.

Experientialists' strengths reside in their recognition that much important learning is from life itself. A fundamental asset lies in the recognition that it is valuable to start with learners' actual concerns. In principle, this brings a higher chance of engagement in learning. However, critics suggest that it is impossible, impractical, and too costly to think about building a curriculum for each learner. Advocates counter this by arguing that it is a misconception to hold that the experientialist position requires a separate curriculum for each learner. Advocates hold that starting with immediate concerns and interests of learners is only the beginning. It leads to democratic communication that probes to deeper inquiry through group investigation into common interests. Critics argue that pursuit of interests does not cover the requisite realms of knowledge. Experientialists say that the pursuit of any genuine human interest in depth requires interdisciplinary study that taps many realms of knowledge.

The strengths of conciliation lie in the view that none of the three "pure" positions can be completely right. Conciliation favors an eclectic position that draws on the other approaches as situations and interpretations require. Critics claim that most conciliators merely advocate "hot topics" or whatever is in vogue due to the winds of politics and economics. Advocates, however, retort that it requires the most creative and critical thinking to function in the best eclectic traditions.

Currently, the status of the conciliatory position is greatest in school practice, probably in theory as well. The publications of ASCD, especially *Educational Leadership*, exemplify conciliation in both practice and theory. It is interesting that the experientialist position is quite dominant among curriculum theorists today, and yet its pure form is

least represented in policy and practice. Though the social behaviorist position is strong and quite stable in the research community and in practice, the intellectual traditionalist position has grown in strength through the concerted efforts of political leaders such as William Bennett, Chester Finn, and Lamar Alexander, and scholars such as Diane Ravitch, Allan Bloom, and E.D. Hirsch.

Factors Contributing to Reform

Each "pure" curriculum position—intellectual traditionalist, social behaviorist, and experientialist—could have its own set of factors that contributes to reform. The conciliators, however, come to the rescue by providing something of a common language, with special emphasis on the contribution of the Tyler Rationale (Tyler 1949). Granted, when one thinks of the Tyler Rationale, the quartet of categories (purposes, learning experiences, organization, and evaluation) comes to mind immediately.

At least as great, however, is Tyler's contribution to sources for determining purposes, noted previously: studies of learners, studies of contemporary life outside school, and suggestions from subject matter specialists. These three topics can be traced back through work by Harold Rugg and other progressive theorists to Dewey (1902), who called for balanced attention to the *learner*, to *subject matter*, and to *society*. Two decades after Tyler's book was published, Joseph Schwab (1969) added the *teacher* to the curriculum universe. One can easily see the compatibility of these categories. It is impossible to consider curriculum reform in any meaningful sense without addressing the impact of these factors on curriculum development. Curriculum development, too, as a technology has been re-formed over the past fifty years. That reform must be seen in the context of (1) social forces, (2) learners, and (3) subject matter.

How have these three factors changed over the years? And how do we see society, students, and subject matter through the alternative lenses of the intellectual traditionalist, the social behaviorist, the experientialist, and the conciliator? Looking at these issues necessarily involves a fourth factor—curriculum development and the technologies that support it.

Societal Forces

The intellectual traditionalist sees societal forces, the political and economic activity of the day, as a possible impediment to realizing a

curriculum through the classics and disciplines of knowledge. Nevertheless, these forces must be met with the greatest of wisdom, which is derived from the classics and the disciplines of knowledge. Therefore, to understand societal forces, one should pursue a liberal education. An intellectual traditionalist might argue, for instance, that urban social life can be understood better by reading Dickens' *Oliver Twist* and Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* than from studying the great tomes of mediocre sociological research. The central point, however, for the intellectual traditionalist, is to clear away societal factors that might be impediments to learner access to the classics and the disciplines of knowledge.

The social behaviorist sees societal forces as factors to research—on the one hand, to have better information as a basis for behavior and, on the other, as factors to orchestrate for increased control of the environment.

The experientialist sees curriculum reform as situated in and largely created by societal forces. Looking to an interaction of culture, politics, and economics—sometimes referred to as ideology—the experientialist sees schools as frequently perpetuating inequities. Advocating greater justice, the experientialist sees democratic action as the means to enter into serious discourse about ways to contest oppressive ideological societal forces, through the opening of channels of dialogue from all realms of society, especially from those who have been silenced in the past.

Conciliators see social forces from the vantage point of each position, almost at once, or alternatively in whatever way seems expedient. The matter of holding contradictory positions at the same time, however, needs to be addressed. For instance, is it logically or pragmatically defensible to hold with the experientialist view that powerful structures of inequality in society are reproduced by schooling and, at the same time, agree with a social behaviorist that individuals should be expected to pull themselves up by the bootstraps regardless of social class background?

Learners

Another factor contributing to curriculum reform is the conception of *learner* that is held by curriculum reformers. Intellectual traditionalists essentially hold that learners are passive recipients of the wisdom of the ages; nevertheless, they expect learners to actively engage in Socratic discussions, demonstrate knowledge and skills through oral and written presentations, and exemplify the attributes of self-directed learners in search of a liberal education.

Social behaviorists usually share the idea that a learner is a subject to be altered into a more desirable state by methods and materials that are supported by research. Both social behaviorist and intellectual traditionalists think it is important to know about student interests and concerns—but not as the starting point of curriculum. Rather, both social behaviorists and traditionalists see student interests and concerns as aspects of student life to use as linkages to gain access for “delivery” of curriculum determined by adult experts for students.

In contrast, the experientialist holds that learners' interests must be the key to understanding what the curriculum should be, and educators and students should be cooperative partners in determining the purposes and experiences of learning. This, they hold, is the only defensible way to encourage genuine learning and participation in democratic living.

The conciliator might hold that learners vary greatly from one another and, moreover, that any one learner varies from situation to situation. Therefore, one needs to have a repertoire of perspectives to draw on to fit situational needs, sometimes seeing the learner as self-directive and sometimes as needing considerable direction.

Subject Matter

To the intellectual traditionalist, subject matter is contained in the disciplines of knowledge and in the great books, and it should be disseminated with the logic or chronology of organization that fits the structure given by experts in each of the several disciplines.

The social behaviorist tends in the same direction, but is much more open to delivering or engineering what the public wants. The social behaviorist's view of democratic leadership in curriculum reform is to find out what the public wants, ask questions to see if enough options are provided for people to choose from, help them anticipate the probable outcomes of what they want, and then engineer the desired results. Thus, the social behaviorist is not wedded to a highly academic curriculum; instead, a variety of social and individual needs might be met that have little directly to do with the great books or the disciplines of knowledge, such as curriculums for prevention of teen pregnancy, parenting, anti-drug use, thinking skills, computer literacy, and consumer education.

The experientialist views subject matter more as process than product, emphasizing the experience of learning more than specific, discrete bodies of knowledge and skills to be acquired. Subject matter, in this orientation, is created by learners and teachers who pursue

concerns together and develop an understanding of those concerns. This is a kind of personal knowledge, to be sure, but it does not neglect public knowledge; for learning must tap what has been learned before, what is stored in the disciplines.

The conciliator, in a desire to meet situational needs, must try to bring together different types of subject matter. On the one hand is the content of the various disciplines, and on the other is the experience of many people as they share their subjective realities. The question of whether to emphasize the disciplines or experiences is not necessarily an either-or matter; yet it must be thought about carefully so that incompatible notions of subject matter are not uncritically merged.

Curriculum Development Technologies

The term *technology* refers here to systematic treatment, not the kind of hardware used in curriculum development for reform. Thus, a popular approach, such as strategic planning, is a form of technology. The intellectual traditionalist would be less supportive than the others of placing great emphasis on curriculum development, claiming that the curriculum (the classics and knowledge disciplines) are already developed. It is merely a matter of providing students with what is known.

In great contrast, the social behaviorist calls for a detailed needs analysis as a basis for forming purposes, followed by in-depth analysis as purposes are translated into manageable behavioral objectives. Behaviorists systematically delineate learning activities that serve as vehicles for the objectives; design the route (scope, sequence, environment, and instructional models) through which the objectives and activities take shape; and evaluate how well the objectives are realized. The evaluation of the process then guides revision and shapes the next curriculum reform.

For the experientialist, the steps of curriculum development appear to be much less systematic; yet, structure is there but more deeply embedded in the fabric of human interaction. Rather than a top-down orientation to curriculum development (i.e., planning by experts, to be distributed to teachers and learners), curriculum development is seen as a natural function of school and classroom life. The structure or systematic treatment (technology) of curriculum development is evolutionary—formed through communication in small groups who work on projects that evolve into other projects in a continuing sequence.

The conciliator admits that such “natural” curriculum development can sometimes occur when certain kinds of ideal teachers and students

meet. On the other hand, the conciliarist tends to lean heavily on more overtly structured forms of curriculum development. The conciliator encourages input from teachers, learners, parents, and relevant others, but usually stops short of giving these groups full reign in actually creating the curriculum.

Clearly, there is a tendency among three of the four orientations discussed here to favor a top-down rather than a grass roots approach to curriculum development. The experientialist stands largely alone in the naturalistic approach to curriculum development. Nevertheless, each of the other orientations acknowledges the need for some grass roots participation, if only to make all those affected by curriculum *feel* that they had some input.

The top-down versus grass roots debate is well illustrated by a decade or more of reform in the area of assessment. Outcome-based education, for instance, can be seen as national, state, or even school district-level impingement, leading to a top-down situation in which political authorities determine curriculum by specifying outcome criteria. In contrast, strategic planning at the school level (or even within democratic classrooms or teams of teachers and learners) can become an interpretation of outcome-based learning that is grass roots in character. Cronbach (1980) and a team of evaluators and scholars formulated a productive statement about needed reforms in program evaluation that goes considerably beyond traditional models. Eisner (e.g., 1985) has called for “connoisseur-based evaluation,” educational criticism that is an imaginative blend of outside expertise and grass roots participation. Lee Shulman is exploring new forms of evaluation of teachers through a broadly based configuration of portfolios, tests, demonstrations, and oral components, with considerable input from practitioners in both curriculum and the assessment.

Illustrations of Contributing Factors in Major Reforms

The major reforms of the past decades clearly reflect all four contributing factors (society, learner, subject matter, and curriculum development technology). For example, since the founding of ASCD in 1943, reforms have resulted in changes in science education, elective subjects, Chapter 1 (formerly Title I) programs, special education, and bilingual education. A careful policy analysis of these reforms is far beyond the scope of this chapter, but let’s look at these reforms in terms of influences from society, learners, subject matter, and curriculum development.

The heyday of change in science education was triggered by Sputnik. It was societal and political reform at its roots. Quite simply, the society (especially its economic and political moguls) wanted the United States to be competitive with the Russians, a strikingly similar phenomenon as that with the Japanese today. To make the advances necessary to reach the aspired goal, a range of government and private agencies provided funds; however, The National Science Foundation was chief among them. Through funding, research projects that heretofore operated on shoestring budgets were able to engage in development and dissemination, as well as in more research. The curriculum projects often advocated a new conception of the learner as an active inquirer, rather than passive recipient. Although changes in science education from post-Sputnik reform crept into the experiences of students in schools, it is ironic that too many of the “reforms” in science education did not give teachers the same accord as the curriculums offered students. Instead of treating teachers as active inquirers capable of reforming curriculum in their own school settings, they were subjected to what was pejoratively called “teacher-proof curriculum.” Many curriculum developers saw teachers, at best, as followers of orders.

Elective subjects have a much longer history, harkening back to Charles Eliot’s call in the 1890s for electives in secondary education to parallel the history of elective subjects at Harvard, where he was president. Thus, status and academic tradition in subject matter organization was an initial boon to elective subjects. As social interest broadened to accommodate learners from a wider variety of cultural backgrounds, it was thought appropriate to have course offerings that paralleled the interests of learners.

A dominant interest that emerged was the call for curriculums to facilitate the emergence of large groups of underserved student populations. One such group was special education students. The need to understand and serve a broad range of students with special needs emerged as a grass roots movement. The result was large-scale legislation to identify, carefully analyze, and provide for students with many different kinds of disabilities and potentials. Bilingual education also grew as a grass roots social development and, simultaneously, from teacher perception of a set of needs presented by a new and growing body of Latino students.

Similarly, Chapter 1 evolved from the War on Poverty and The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of the mid-1960s. Thus, it was societal in origins and grew from a desire to overcome the cycle of poverty and its adverse educational implications. The impact on

schools, teachers, subject matter, and students of programs and funding in this area is far too enormous to be dealt with fully here. Nevertheless, Chapter 1 programs are part of attempts at curriculum reform in the past fifty years.

As with the other examples of curriculum reform, the societal dimension had a great effect on students and subject matter. Moreover, any reform effort always carries an orientation to curriculum development, that is, a technology of intervention and change, with top-down or grass roots emphasis.

Reflection on Perspectives and Reforms

The four historical perspectives (intellectual traditionalist, social behaviorist, experientialist, and conciliator) and the four factors contributing to curriculum reform (societal forces, learners, subject matter, and curriculum development technology) are *analytic* categories. As such, they are devised to enhance thinking about tendencies in curriculum. They are not intended to be pure categories, compatible in a one-to-one way with real-world instances. Rather, we should keep them in mind when reviewing curriculum events of the past fifty years, or even those of today. It would be unproductive to try to classify noted figures in the curriculum field as “members” of one or another orientation, but it is helpful to perceive researchers and educators as having different degrees of emphasis toward or away from these orientations in their theory and practice. Likewise, we may find it helpful to reflect on the stance of a given curriculum scholar or on the perspectives apparent in a reform movement. Do some scholars, for example, take some factors for granted, such as societal forces, or one conception of the learner, or one interpretation of subject matter? Do others take the time to consider a wide range of different perspectives?

To note some familiar examples from early in the 20th century, Bobbitt’s scientific curriculum-making took for granted the rightness of successful members of society when using them as exemplars from whom to fashion objectives, and did not seem to consider the possibility that certain dominant strands of value and belief in a society may be headed on a detrimental course. Deweyan experiential theorists may hold such a dynamic faith in the goodness of human nature that they fail to accept the need for certain benevolent kinds of external control and authority. Advocates of the classics may not want to see the possibility that powerful societal forces have designated certain works classics (perhaps due to the race, class, or gender of the authors) and

omitted others from high rank, because of a wish to have a clear and decided picture of the best and wisest for subsequent generations.

No doubt, social behaviorist, experientialist, and intellectual traditionalist influences are present in today's curriculum reform proposals and practices; but conciliation is probably more widespread in practice than any of the other three. This state of affairs holds the promise of developing into a *principled eclecticism*, whereby educational decision makers carefully clarify assumptions, survey theory and research, and select a course of policy and action that fits the needs and interests of particular situations. In other words, they engage in a process that Cronbach and Suppes (1969) called "disciplined inquiry." This process involves carefully studied and defensible inquiry, reflection, decision making, and action—sometimes at the same time.

More problematic, however, and more prevalent is the conciliar tendency to uncritically choose whatever theory, research, and practical approaches seem most expedient, most intriguing, most valuable for public relations, or most in vogue at a given moment. Such decision making runs the risk of being inconsistent—subject to being dictated by the flow of economic, political, and social events of the day. It is passive, not active and creative. It operates on unclear or nonexistent assumptions and is responsible for the phenomenon known as "the educational bandwagon."

In the following chronology, consider the character of conciliation that formed the events in education during the past fifty years. Why did certain movements and decisions move in the direction of social behaviorist, experientialist, or intellectual traditionalist assumptions? Were such reform tendencies based on disciplined inquiry or were they left to the fate of events? Moreover, how did educators and other decision makers (politicians, legislators, community members, and others) respond to factors such as social forces, changes in learners, subject matter interpretations, and the technology of curriculum development and enactment?

Chronology of Key Events and Players in Curriculum Reform: 1943-1993

No era begins on an empty stage. The stage for curriculum reform of the past fifty years includes the following influential works:

- *The Eight Year Study*, a five-volume work led by Wilford Aikin (1942), presented convincing evidence that progressive approaches in

high schools yielded results that at least matched and usually exceeded those of traditional schools, even when it came to success of students in traditional colleges. But the publication of results received scant attention in a world at war. Thus, societal forces effectually prevented what in another day might have been a fertile seedbed of experientialist curriculum reform.

- Publications of the Educational Policies Commission (EPC) of the National Education Association—2.5 million copies of almost 100 books and booklets—were widely distributed during the late 1930s and the early 1940s. Works included *A War Policy for American Schools* (EPC 1942), *Education and the People's Peace* (EPC 1943), and *Education for ALL American Youth* (EPC 1944).

- A strongly influential synoptic curriculum text was published by Gwynn (1943) and subsequently went into several editions. This book particularly emphasized the influence of social trends on curriculum. Meanwhile, Franklin Bobbitt, architect of detailed procedures that swept the curriculum world for two decades (e.g., Bobbitt 1924, *How to Make a Curriculum*) shocked curriculum developers when he asserted in his last major work, "Curriculum making belongs with the dodo and the great auk." He went on to argue, "Current curriculum discovery, one for each child and youth, takes its place" (Bobbitt 1941, p. 298). This is clearly a move from the social behaviorist toward the experientialist position, and if nothing else shows that curriculum reformers, not just the curriculum, can reform!

- In *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*, Boyd Bode (1938) addressed the experientialists' often divisive concerns with the either-or dualism of child versus society. And Dewey's last major book on education, *Experience and Education* (Dewey 1938), was a conciliatory attempt to undo the misinterpretations done in his name under the label of "progressivism" since the turn of the century.

- Harold Benjamin (1939) poignantly satirized the still-dominant traditionalist curriculum as equivalent to that in prehistoric times. Prehistoric curricularists, for instance, he asserted, once had necessary courses such as "Fish-grabbing with the Bare Hands" and "Saber-tooth Tiger Chasing with Fire"; these courses, however, were retained long after the glaciers had frozen the streams and pushed tigers to warmer climes, the intellectual traditionalist justification being that they trained the mind. Studies by eminent social behaviorists, such as Edward L. Thorndike, did much to dispel myths of faculty psychology and the notion that certain traditional subjects (classical languages, geometry, etc.) exercised "muscles" of the mind (the "faculties" of

reason, imagination, and the like) in a way that physical exercise develops the bodily muscles. But the sentiments of faculty psychology persisted for a long time.

- Alfred North Whitehead, a conciliator of the first order, elegantly called for the removal of inert ideas (social behaviorist efficiency) from the curriculum; the study of only a few essential subjects but in great depth (intellectual traditionalist); and the acquisition of the art of using knowledge (experientialist)—all in one profound essay on curricular purposes, *The Aims of Education* (Whitehead 1929).

These works form a sizable part of the backdrop that set the stage for another conciliar move led by Hollis Caswell and others: the formation of ASCD in 1943, by curriculum specialists, supervisors, and other educational leaders from diverse intellectual persuasions and a wide range of contextual backgrounds.

Let us now turn to a decade-by-decade look at curriculum reform that evolved from the foregoing perspectives, contextual factors, and events.

1943 to 1953

The mid-'40s saw World War II grind to a halt; and as the decade moved along, people asked why the world got to the point of war and how it might be prevented in the future. To get back to basics in work as well as in education became a major concern, and basic values (moral and political) were reinstated. McCarthyism was one of the more inimical forms of control set forth to ensure adherence to basic American values. In a more constructive vein, the world was trying to pull together through such ventures as the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, the Warsaw Pact, and NATO; nevertheless, the decade ended with the Korean War. The advent of the atomic age issued at once feelings of fear and hope—fear of annihilation, as well as hope for technological achievement.

At the beginning of the 1940s, 49 percent of the seventeen-year-olds graduated from high school, a substantial increase over 29 percent in 1930; by 1950 it was 57 percent in the United States (Cawelti 1985). The G.I. Bill also contributed to a great influx of members of the military who entered college after World War II. These gains in student populations affected all levels of education by bringing a broader population to the curriculum encounter. Debate was, therefore, heightened about what knowledge and experiences were most worthwhile for this new group. It was not at all certain that classic subjects, even the modified

or (more pejoratively) watered down classics and disciplines of knowledge were appropriate for all of the newcomers. Already in place were varieties of vocational education, since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, but it was not clear that the only option to scholarly preparation should be training in trades, service industries, home economics, and agriculture.

Charles Prosser and others argued persuasively that only about 40 percent of the students' needs were met by the extremes of classic education on one end of the continuum and vocational and distributive education on the other. Thus, these advocates called for "life adjustment education" to meet the needs of the vast 60 percent of students who they claimed had been essentially ignored. Some see life adjustment as a social behaviorist variation on tracking; others perceive it as an experientialist interest in more adequately meeting life needs. Most likely, life adjustment curriculum reform was a blend of both social behaviorist and experientialist origins; nonetheless, it was a far cry from the radical experientialist call of George S. Counts (1932) for schools to change the social order. Indeed, life adjustment was more efficiency oriented, harkening back to Joseph Mayer Rice (1913), whose school visitations in search of experientialist schools had led him to conclude that such schools were so rare and most schools were so inefficient that the only recourse was to manage them with a tight hand. So, life adjustment was a blend, a conciliar creation.

The intellectual traditionalist orientation received considerable impetus in the mid-1940s from a landmark book, *General Education in a Free Society*, by the Harvard Committee on the Objectives of Education in a Free Society (1945). Known as the *Harvard Red Book*, this volume rekindled the kind of rationale that Robert Maynard Hutchins and Mortimer J. Adler cultivated through their call for a liberal education that could keep alive the spirit of learning and a quest for the most worthwhile as the basic necessity of a free and democratic society. The impact of the experientialists had dwindled because of internal argument; yet several efforts pointed to the continuation of progressive strands after the war: L. Thomas Hopkins' (1937, 1941) emphasis on integration among subjects and between subjects and the self, and interaction as a democratic process of the organic human group; Arthur Jersild's (1946) attempt to integrate child development and curriculum development; Alice Miel's (1946) call for curriculum as a social process; Harold Albery's (1947) delineation of several interpretations of core curriculum—ranging from combining subjects to a problem-centered study to study of self; and the work of Florence Stratemeyer and her

colleagues (1947), who emphasized the need to build curriculum around “persistent life situations.”

Interestingly, whether experientialist or intellectual traditionalist, the fear of loss of freedom from the war experience did much to ensure that almost any brand of curriculum reform had to be justified in terms of the contribution it could make to preserving freedom.

Ironically, however, another strand of reform, one that accompanies the educational aftershock of most wars, is a back-to-basics response, a return to the “nuts and bolts” to prevent any future loss. This is ironic, because in the intent to preserve freedoms, we often establish a control-laden education system, arguing that too much freedom of choice in early learning may lose our freedom in the long run. Experientialists, in contrast, had long argued that the only way to have genuine freedom and democracy in the adult world is to live democracy and experience freedom of choice in childhood and youth.

Perhaps the single most influential event of the 1943-1953 period was the creation of a small text on curriculum, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, by Ralph W. Tyler (1949), former evaluation director of the *Eight Year Study*. Tyler, having been trained originally by Charles Judd at the University of Chicago in social behaviorist methods of educational science and measurement, was at once respectful of the intellectual traditionalist value of liberal education (as he was brought back to chair the Department of Education at the University of Chicago in 1936, after having been influenced by Dewey, Bode, and others in the experientialist work of the *Eight Year Study*).

Tyler had the ideal background to draw disparate perspectives together in a new conciliar position known afterward as the Tyler Rationale. His book, now translated into more than a dozen languages, influenced curriculum development and design throughout the world by creating what now may seem to be conventional wisdom—that curriculum and instruction should have carefully determined purposes, defensibly selected learning experiences, organizational character that facilitates the purposes and the learning experiences, and evaluation that furthers understanding of consequences and provides a basis for revision. Purposes, he said, should be conceived from a balanced study of contemporary society, subject matter, and the nature of learners. Decision and action should be carefully filtered through both philosophical and psychological screens. For some years, the Tyler Rationale was used by advocates of curriculum reform from many different orientations. Its basic categories today are still evident in state and school district planning documents, guides to the use of textbooks and

other instructional materials, and teacher education classes on lesson and unit planning.

1953 to 1963

The Cold War—and its later manifestation in the “space race” and post-Sputnik cries for catching the Russians—was an almost all-encompassing influence on curriculum reform of this period. This was so much the case that it even overshadowed the landmark court case *Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka* in 1954 and the use of federal troops to integrate Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1957. Although these events may symbolize salient struggles in a more important journey than the Cold War, the latter was the focal point for a decade of education.

Even before post-Sputnik curriculum reform, the nation had begun to question the schools, to force them back to the basics, to the essentials. Rudolf Flesch (1955) severely criticized reading instruction in *Why Johnny Can't Read*; English professor Arthur Bestor (1953) called the schools “educational wastelands” and later (1955) called for “the restoration of learning”; Albert Lynd (1953) coined the phrase “quackery in the public schools”; and Hyman Rickover (1959, in *Education and Freedom*, spelled *freedom* with *control*).

Meanwhile, progressivism was on its last legs (until its next reincarnation in the mid-to-late 1960s); and even Hollis Caswell (experientialist of the conciliar vein) called for less emphasis on process and more on substance (Cawelti 1985). While his call was similar to Dewey’s (1938) — to show that the best experiential education has considerable content and to avoid the misinterpretive emphasis on process alone—those who wanted to end progressive education interpreted it as recanting from within.

When the Soviet Union put Sputnik in orbit, the criticism took a new turn, achieving enormous power. Research on teaching and learning that had gone virtually unnoticed since the late 1940s (e.g., Max Beeberman’s work on mathematics education at the University of Illinois) was brought immediately to the center of attention in 1957 as a basis to regain the competitive edge in the space race. So great was the perceived need to win this race, that the National Defense Education Act of 1956 was used in the late 1950s to justify federal funds for education on the basis of defense needs. Because education was constitutionally to be handled by the states and localities, not the federal government, the funding had to be justified as fulfilling defense needs, rather than educational needs alone (Tyler 1991). To use the money well,

it was deemed necessary to act quickly and to bring in psychologists and other social scientists, if not to completely replace educators, then to at least tap sources thought more credible than those who had contributed to the current state of affairs. There was, of course, no small amount of scapegoating; something seems amiss in blaming educators as major reasons for decline of power in military and space exploration. At least, many educators felt that way when large numbers of prominent psychologists, social scientists, and natural scientists were brought to the fore to reform curriculum in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Those who lived through the era as educators or as students remember the so-called “new math,” which mathematicians acknowledge as mathematics as it has always been (except in schools). They remember language teaching that involved actually speaking the language being studied and learning it from experience in cultural context, and they remember the raft of acronyms of science education projects such as BSCS, CBA, CHEM Study, and PSSC at the secondary level, and at the elementary level ESS, SAPA, MINNEMAST, and SCIS—to name but a few (many are reviewed by Goodlad, Von Stoephasius, and Klein 1966, in *The Changing School Curriculum*). Most of the projects drew in eclectic fashion from several different roots.

Probably the most influential scholar in this movement was Jerome Bruner (1960), whose book *The Process of Education* had overtones that were at once experientialist, intellectual traditionalist, and social behaviorist. He inspired other curriculum developers from each of these perspectives. Bruner’s emphasis on having students learn science as scientists engage in inquiry was clearly experientialist, and he acknowledged his debt to Dewey; his emphasis on teaching students in ways commensurate with the structure of the disciplines invokes an intellectual traditionalist respect for the logical organization of knowledge.

The projects of reform, the ready-made packages delivered to schools with specified instructions for conveyance to students, however, smacked of a social behaviorist efficiency often known as “teacher proofing.” While students were to learn how to learn by engaging in problem solving, those who taught them were to follow predetermined recipes. Some teachers did not understand what they were asked to do, while others understood quite fully but refused to do it because they saw the contradiction or thought they had a better way to reach students. Whatever the case, evaluations of the success of the costly curriculum reform projects were disappointing to those who devoted huge amounts of time and effort in making them. The goals of inquiry—insight into the structure of the disciplines, and enhanced problem-

solving in science and other subjects—were rarely realized. What was the explanation? The projects were carefully developed and designed. What about implementation?

Much of the answer was found by Goodlad, Klein, and Associates (1970) and reported in *Behind the Classroom Door*. Behind the rhetoric of reform, they found little reformed practice; traditional practice still dominated the scene. Therefore, we cannot conclude that the post-Sputnik curriculum reform packages failed as indicated by evaluation. Rather, evaluation did not indicate much difference in outcomes because the reform packages frequently were not implemented. Indeed, *no implementation* should mean *no project* rather than the failure of an experiment. On the other hand, implementation itself must be seen as a salient feature of any experimental reform; thus, failure to implement is itself a failure in the reform design.

Much of the evaluation of post-Sputnik curriculum reform was social behaviorist in nature, despite the intellectual traditionalist and experientialist themes of reform advocacy. The demands for definitive evidence of increased achievement, not unlike those of today, pushed the balance toward a greater social behaviorist mind-set. It is not surprising that such an emphasis brought the end of progressive education. In fact, Lawrence Cremin’s (1961) classic history of progressive education, *The Transformation of the School*, dates the progressive era in American education as extending from 1876 to 1957.

The dismissal of progressive or experientialist curriculum by some, however, brought voices of others who called for balance in the curriculum in quite different ways from one another. Margaret Willis (1961) tried this by doing an elaborate follow-up study of participants in the *Eight Year Study*, finding them highly adept in many aspects of life after school as well as during school. Bloom’s (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* called for balance in another way, by setting forth a cognitive domain of objectives; in the long run, this work led his colleague and former student, David Krathwohl (1964) to issue a similar handbook on the affective domain of objectives. Later, others wrote psychomotor and social handbooks. The images of cognitive, affective, psychomotor, and social domains influenced a great many curriculum reform designs for at least two decades.

Balance was highlighted in several other sources as well. In the realm of practices of school organization, it is difficult to find a greater influence on yet another version of balance than James B. Conant. In *The American High School Today*, Conant (1959) argued for the comprehensive high school, one large enough to provide for many different

kinds of learning on one campus. Through substantial grants from Carnegie, Conant was able to distribute his book to most school boards, again illustrating the power of funding, which added substantially to the sweeping consolidations of small schools into large ones in the 1960s. ASCD also tried to make sense of the issue of balance in the 1961 Yearbook, *Balance in the Curriculum* (Halverson 1961).

Finally, a steadily growing intellectual thrust in curriculum, one emphasizing theory, resulted from the publication of papers from a 1947 curriculum theory conference organized by Virgil Herrick and Ralph Tyler (1950). Theory, it was argued, could become a sound rationale for the careful justification of balance in the curriculum. This early work on curriculum theory held closely to positivistic notions, and it admittedly inspired the contributions of George Beauchamp to curriculum theory from 1961 into the 1980s. But commentaries on curriculum reform assembled by Eisner (1971) illustrated a wider range of theoretic contribution on the horizon.

1963 to 1973

The middle '60s and early '70s were times of questioning authority; of grass roots political action; of steadfast consumer activism; of debate over what was worth fighting for; and of how to achieve greater equity, justice, and human well-being. These concerns were national, they were worldwide, and they were curricular. Books about curriculum, which did not look like curriculum books of previous decades, actually appeared on the popular book market. These were usually first-person accounts of teaching and thoughtful reflections about how counterculture activist teachers made a difference in the lives of children and youth by thinking deeply about what is worthwhile to know and learn, how that contributes to better human beings and to a more just society. Exemplary authors included Myles Horton, A.S. Neill, John Holt, Sylvia Ashton-Warner, Jonathan Kozol, James Herndon, and Paulo Freire (e.g., Neill 1960; Holt 1964; Freire 1970; Kohl 1968; Kozol 1967).

The wide circulation of such books did much to fuel curriculum reforms that some contend were revivals of the experientialist position, such as individualized education, open education, open-space schooling, and personalized education, schools without walls, schools within schools—to note just a few of the labels. The alternative school movement, with its free schools, freedom schools, and folk schools, by the early 1970s made alternatives a much greater presence in the public and traditional private schools. Attention to the hidden curriculum, advocacy of humanistic curriculum, confluent learning, ecstasy in

education, affective instruction, classroom meetings, nongraded school organization, and values clarification are but a few of the ideas now etched in the minds of those who taught in this era.

But this era was not all experientialist, to be sure. Funding wars for education had reached a fever pitch. In fact, “Great Society” funding (the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary Secondary Education Act, the “titles” and later “chapters,” the opportunities of Head Start, Follow Through, Upward Bound, and the like) put the old Educational Policies Commission out of business by 1968. Some claim the EPC was replaced by the funding initiatives of the federal government and private foundations as the real policy determiners in education generally and especially in curriculum. It was possible to see funding origins as the dictators of curriculum reform.

Funding, however, had its price. Those who received funding faced heavy demands to be accountable. It was not enough to claim successful use of funds; strong measures of accountability needed to be provided. Educators turned for help to business, where funding had always been “the bottom line,” and the result was behavioral objectives—presented to educators by a successful instructor from the business world, Robert Mager (1962), and shortly after by James Popham and Eva Baker (Popham and Baker 1970, Baker and Popham 1973).

With this “golden age” of funding, then, came a similar emphasis on evaluation models. The growth of curriculum evaluation through the work of Ralph Tyler, Michael Scriven, Lee J. Cronbach, Malcolm Provus, Robert Stake, Daniel Stufflebeam, Elliot Eisner, George Willis, and others brought great debate about the best ways to get a handle on assessment of education. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) began its periodic testing of four age groups (9, 13, 17, and 26) in 1969, adding to questions about how to deal with large data sets in ways that could contribute to curriculum reform.

Similarly, this period saw the inflow of initial results of the International Education Assessment (IEA) Studies, international comparisons that began in 1959 to examine achievement in science, mathematics, reading comprehension, foreign languages, literature, and civic education in some 250,000 students, 50,000 teachers, and twenty-two nations. Again, the question was how to use the results to sensibly form policy for reform. Was it enough to see where one nation lagged behind another and to compel it to catch the other? Surely not, but that characterizes some of the criticisms, that is, a lack of serious study of the complexity of achievement and its multiple causes, meanings, and consequences.

ASCD yearbooks often captured the spirit of the times, the interplay of and tension between the humanistic and the accountability emphases. The following yearbooks captured central moments of this volatile period: *Perceiving, Behaving, and Becoming* (Combs 1962), one of ASCD's best sellers; *New Insights and the Curriculum* (Frazier 1963); *Individualizing Instruction* (Doll 1964b); and *Life Skills in School and Society* (Rubin 1969).

It was quite clear that a bona fide area of curriculum studies was emerging. This was represented in several ways. The field was becoming more conscious of itself; it was beginning to forge a history (Seguel 1966, on the field itself; and Elson 1964, on the impact of early textbooks). Scholarly journals, too, were emerging; *Curriculum Inquiry* (originally as *Curriculum Theory Network*) in 1968, and the *Journal of Curriculum Studies* (1968), and they remain influential in scholarly circles today. Collections of journal articles in book form became popular during the 1963–1973 decade; witness books of readings led by Glen Hass (1986), Short and Marconit (1968), and Van Til (1974). A conceptual unity amid this diversity of writing provided by synoptic texts continued through persistent use of books by Smith and colleagues (1950, 1957), Saylor and Alexander (1954, 1966, 1974, 1981), and Tyler (1949, 1969 reprint), Taba (1962, 1971 reprint), and Doll (1964)—a newcomer in the 1960s whose book, *Curriculum Improvement*, went through eight editions.

This unity, however, was more of a bringing together, while diversity of curricular orientations continued to expand. The notion of "hidden curriculum" or the lessons embedded in institutional life in schools expanded the notion of curriculum itself (e.g., Jackson 1968; Snyder 1970). In the same year that the structure of the disciplines was heavily debated through books by Elam (1964) and Ford and Pugno (1964), Philip Phenix (1964) brilliantly interpreted a range of ways of knowing and deriving meaning. Similarly, writing to curriculum developers and teachers as well as fellow scholars, Louise Berman (1968) went beyond the usual subject areas to explore new priorities, such as perceiving, communicating, loving, knowing, decision making, patterning, creating, and valuing; and Rath, Harmin, and Simon (1966) translated valuing thoroughly into the level of concrete classroom approaches through the promotion of values clarification strategies. Meanwhile, Norman Overly (1970) argued that curriculum as it occurs in the lives of students is virtually unstudied, calling for broader attention to the hidden curriculum; and Philo Pritzkau (1970) called for existential awareness in curriculum. Of perhaps greatest impact on scholars, and

indirectly on practitioners, was Joseph Schwab's (1970) call for broadening curriculum inquiry from an almost exclusive reliance on the "theoretic," which looks for problems in generalized categories; uses methods geared to seek law-like statements about education, and finds its ends in knowledge production or publication. His recommendation was that curriculum inquiry move to the "practical, quasi-practical, and eclectic"; that is, curriculum inquiry should seek insights about how to better decide and act in concrete educational situations.

1973 to 1983

The emergent pluralism of the previous decade was accentuated in curriculum theory of the 1973–1983 period, as evidenced by the continuation of the journals *Curriculum Inquiry* and *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, noted above, and the establishment of *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* in 1979 (now *JCT: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Curriculum Studies*) and *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* by ASCD in 1985. Though there was an air of the back-to-basics sentiment that follow wars and other times of crisis, it was longer in coming during this time period after the Vietnam War. Reform reports of the 1970s were more experientialist with some overtones in the intellectual traditionalist vein. Those that emphasized high school revitalization of different types were reviewed and critiqued by Cawelti (1974).

By the end of the 1970s, a back-to-basics movement had quite fully come into its own; however, during the first half of the 1970s, reform emphases were on the left side of the political spectrum. This was true of the turn in curriculum scholarship throughout the decade and well into the next. Considerable attention was generated in the early 1970s, for instance, by the critical work of Latin American scholar-practitioners, Ivan Illich (1972) on de-schooling society and Paulo Freire (1970) on how to respond to the needs of oppressed peoples. In England, critical sociologists (such as Michael F.D. Young 1971) raised questions about how knowledge is reproduced by schools to serve interests of dominant social classes, and Lawrence Stenhouse (1975) and colleagues from the University of East Anglia explored ways in which teachers and scholars could augment the efforts of one another by joining their expertise to create curriculum reform.

In the United States, new intellectual traditions were tapped in curriculum inquiry. These include critical theory, radical psychoanalysis, literary and art criticism, existentialism, phenomenology, feminist theory, and more. William Pinar (1975) convened a group of eminent curriculum scholars in the form of a book; Pinar argued that this new

brand of scholar was “reconceptualizing” curriculum as an area of study, partly because of an emphasis on “theorizing” (verb form) rather than the more static image of “theory” (as a noun, or finished product). Surrounding and flowing from this work (which reconceptualized curriculum in many different ways), we find such prominent examples as Maxine Greene’s *Teacher as Stranger* (1973) and *Landscapes of Learning* (1978); *Reschooling Society*, an ASCD publication, by James B. Macdonald, Bernice Wolfson, and Esther Zaret (1973); Michael Apple’s *Ideology and Curriculum* (1979) and *Education and Power* (1982); Elliot Eisner’s (1979) *The Educational Imagination*; Henry Giroux’s (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education*; and *Toward a Poor Curriculum* by William Pinar and Madeleine Grumet (1976).

It should be made clear that these and related scholars are not part of a “card carrying club” in fact, they disagree fundamentally on certain matters. Moreover, while Pinar signaled a change in the field of curriculum studies, he should not be considered the leader of a movement or of the aforementioned scholars, many of whom developed their ideas before he began to make his own contributions. The variety of emergent curriculum thought in the 1973-1983 period can be gleaned from some of the collections of essays that were developed, for example, *Curriculum Theory* (an ASCD book by Molnar and Zahorik 1977), *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum* (Eisner and Vallance 1974), and *Qualitative Evaluation: Concepts and Cases in Curriculum Criticism* (G. Willis 1978).

Major synoptic texts during the period tried to keep pace with the field, but often found it hard going to bring past and present developments, and the variety of intellectual sources, under a single cover. Firth and Kimpston (1973), Tanner and Tanner (1975, rev. ed. 1980), and Zais (1976) attempted this formidable task by relying heavily on philosophy, history, and other educational foundations as a stable basis for dealing with the multiplicity of ideas and approaches beginning to appear in the literature. The extent to which these books and the widely read aesthetic perspective of Eisner (1979) actually affected curriculum reform is debatable, but the influence must have been at least provided by the fact that curriculum reformers were influenced by the synoptic texts. In fact, one might argue that because of the great expansion of curriculum literature, curriculum reformers were educated by summaries, that is, the synoptic texts. Conversely, one might also say that curriculum reform can no longer be informed adequately by a one-book summary and analysis of extant literature. Instead, one might be advised to turn to historical treatments (bibliographies, interpretations,

categorizations), such as Bantock’s (1980) *Dilemmas of the Curriculum*, Connell’s (1980) *A History of Education in the Twentieth Century World*, and Schubert and Lopez-Schubert’s (1980) *Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years* as a starting point for reform efforts.

1983 to 1993

Because analysis requires time and distance, it is especially difficult to discuss the curricular developments in the past decade, particularly since this chapter was written a year before the 1993 publication date. Let us begin by identifying several prominent topics in curriculum theory and practice and briefly looking at the precedent for understanding them that the past fifty years can provide (see Schubert 1986).

Historical Awareness. It seems fitting to begin with historical awareness itself, since the whole thrust of this chapter is along this line. Ironically, there is little precedent for curriculum history in the curriculum field. There are many self-criticisms that note the condition of “ahistoricism.” In the 1980s, however, the field had access to Kliebard (1986), Goodson (1984), Franklin (1986), Van Til (1986), Cuban (1984), Schubert and Lopez-Schubert (1980), Kridel (1989), and in the next decade Tanner and Tanner (1990). Increased awareness of lack of awareness of curriculum history inspired work to create curriculum history. Through associations such as ASCD, the American Educational Research Association, and the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, this subfield is likely to grow and to influence curriculum reform.

Paradigm Discourse. A great deal of study and debate has centered on the kinds of inquiry that best provide understanding about what is most worthwhile to know and experience. Scholars in this area include Short (1991), van Manen (1990), Carr and Kemmis (1986), Sears and Marshall (1990), Pinar (1988), Connelly and Clandinin (1990), Eisner (1991), and G.H. Willis and Schubert (1991). The study of assumptions behind inquiry helps us understand the lenses through which we perceive the world and evaluate different aspects of it. Major curriculum writers of earlier decades have much to contribute to this kind of understanding: Dewey, Bode, Rugg, Counts, and Whitehead in earlier years of the curriculum field, and more recently Maxine Greene, Dwayne Huebner, James B. Macdonald, Arthur W. Foshay, Philip Phenix, and Harry S. Broudy, among others. As long as curriculum is taken seriously, the question of paradigms will be significant.

Collaboration. This is a term used widely today to refer to partnership ventures by scholars and practitioners who share expertise to

resolve problems encountered in educational settings. Today, Ann Lieberman (e.g., 1988), well known for collaborative school improvement efforts, has brought together an array of contemporary exemplars. Precedent for this kind of work can be found in Deweyan theory, to be sure. Hollis Caswell, L. Thomas Hopkins, and others from the progressive era consulted in a collaborative spirit. More than most, Alice Miel (1946) saw curriculum reform as a dynamic social process, and her colleague at Teachers College, S.M. Corey (1953), wrote what was regarded by many as the central guide on action research. In England, as noted earlier, Stenhouse did a great deal to further teacher and university faculty cooperation.

Too many who do collaborative action research are virtually unaware of the heritage of similar work at their disposal. If collaborative researchers of today immersed themselves in similar work of the progressive education era, they might well determine more ways to involve not only teachers, administrators, and scholar-researchers, but students and parents as well. The work of several reformers of today clearly moves in this direction—for example, George Wood at the Institute for Democracy in Education (Ohio University), Theodore Sizer and the Coalition of Essential Schools out of Brown University, James Comer of Harvard and his work with schools in oppressed urban areas, and William Ayers and Chicago School Reform through Local School Councils. The progressive literature would help collaborators see their work as an effort to ask how all affected by reform can play a key role in its development and enactment.

Popular Curricular Approaches. Too many to cover here, popular curriculum ideas as we move into the 1990s include whole language, literacy, cooperative learning, individual education plans (IEPs), and basics. This is a motley assortment of efforts that are well known to the inservice education crowd. Each of these “hot topics,” as they are sometimes called, could become more fully developed by careful attention to precedent.

Beginning with basics, it is of benefit to realize that a return to basics has occurred in 20th century American education with great regularity after wars and other crises. Therefore the current basics thrust that stems from *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983) and its fear of an economic crisis that gives lower status to the United States in the world market is not dissimilar to post-Sputnik reform and a fear of loss in the space race and Cold War. It is similar to the worry of unpreparedness that accompanied the ends of World War I and World War II.

The IEP that has been part of special education literature for almost a decade, especially connected with the emphasis on mainstreaming, also has roots that run deep historically. Many remember the behavioral objectives movement that added the semblance of precision to statements of purpose in the late 1960s and provided the appearance of efficiency in response to accountability pressures of the 1970s. Behavioral objectives, however, had origins in the advocacy of scientific curriculum building by Franklin Bobbitt and W.W. Charters in the 1920s, and was strongly related to E.L. Thorndike's earlier work in behavioristic psychology and to Joseph Mayer Rice's calls for efficiency of management near the turn of the century.

Cooperative learning, as promoted by Roger Johnson and David Johnson and studied extensively by Robert Slavin (see, e.g., the ASCD 1990 videotapes, *Cooperative Learning Series*) has had great appeal. Yet, precedent for it in the experimental schools of the *Eight Year Study* and in progressive schools generally has not been explored systematically. Were it explored, new dimensions would likely be unearthed, ways to more fully develop the content of cooperation out of the life experience of the students. Of equal import, it would lead to tough questions about the connections and discontinuities between a cooperative ambience in classroom life and an ethos of competitiveness in the world outside. John Nicholls (1989) has addressed competitiveness relative to democratic education, and Donald Hellison and Thomas Templin (1991) have emphasized cooperation in physical education under the rubric of “social responsibility.”

The current emphasis on literacy and whole language is largely a return to experientialist roots in several ways (see Goodman 1992). The stress on wholeness bespeaks an integrated frame of reference that counterculture and open educators of the 1960s and early 1970s pushed, and earlier it was spoken to by progressive educators who perceived the dynamic relational character of language in human development. Another dimension of the literacy emphasis today is surely its relevance to the poor and oppressed, minority, and limited-English or non-English proficiency populations. In this regard, it has important connections to the international work in developing countries by Paulo Freire over the past thirty years. Some of this is tapped, but to tap it fully we must address the political and ideological context in which it is embedded and that gives it meaning. Thus, we must address head-on the potentially powerful social dimensions of whole language and other attempts to enhance literacy. When we accomplish real wholeness and relevance, George Counts' (1932) great question of

whether the schools dare change the social order will emerge as central to literacy education.

Curriculum Questions

To centralize or decentralize? This is perhaps the major question of curriculum reform today and tomorrow. It deals with the fundamental nature of democracy in education; and the precedent for this issue is found in the works of John Dewey and debates on his perspectives. Today's calls for national standards in America 2000 (see U.S. Department of Education 1991), a national curriculum, national testing, and the already established centralization of accountability standards in state departments of education provide ample evidence of the move toward centralization.

Ironically, many nations of the world, some that proponents of centralization wish to emulate in America, have long had a centralized curriculum and are moving away from it precisely because of the reasons to oppose tracking that Oakes (1985) presents. Nevertheless, some kinds of increased centralization are likely to emerge more fully in the years ahead. A careful comparative look at curriculums in different cultures and the implications for global awareness in curriculum policymaking (such as provided by Tye in the 1991 ASCD Yearbook) is essential. Just as essential, however, is the question of who decides. The following related questions require great reflection:

1 Who decides what is worthwhile to know and experience, in order that human beings might reach greater potential and develop a more just social order?

Do national standards, formulated necessarily by authorities who live outside of the specific context for which they are making curricular policy, fit the needs and interests of people who live in those contexts?

Fundamentally, how can genuine grass roots curriculum development (in an era when many educators value site-based management) become a reality under the auspices of centralized standards?

How can the interplay of centralized and grass roots reform yield excellence, equity, and genuine human growth (see Klein 1991; Beyer and Apple 1988)?

Finally, what should children know and experience to become democratic participants?

These are haunting questions; at the same time, they are the most hopeful questions we can ask. If these questions lie at the heart of

curriculum reform during the next fifty years, we must be prepared to experience forms of education that go far beyond schooling as we now know it. We must be prepared to facilitate the curriculum implicit in new coalitions of teachers, curriculum developers, administrators, teacher educators, researchers and scholars, publishers, parents, and especially, learners themselves.

References

- Adler, M.J. (1981). *Six Great Ideas*. New York: Macmillan.
- Adler, M.J. (1982). *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.
- Aikin, W. (1942). *The Story of the Eight Year Study*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Alberty, H.B. (1947). *Reorganizing the High School Curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
- Apple, M.W. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M.W. (1982). *Education and Power*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1990). *Cooperative Learning Series* (videotapes). Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.
- Baker, E., and W.J. Popham. (1973). *Expanding Dimensions of Instructional Objectives*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bantock, G.A. (1980). *Dilemmas of the Curriculum*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Beauchamp, G.A. (1981). *Curriculum Theory*. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock. (Previous editions: 1975, 1968, 1961 by Kagg Press, Wilmette, Ill.)
- Benjamin, H. (1939). *The Saber-Tooth Curriculum*. New York: McGraw Hill. (Author pseudonym, J.A. Peddiwell.)
- Berman, L. (1968). *New Priorities in the Curriculum*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.
- Bestor, A. (1953). *Educational Wastelands*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Beyer, L.E., and M.W. Apple, eds. (1988). *The Curriculum: Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bloom, B.S., ed. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bobbitt, F. (1924). *How to Make a Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bobbitt, F. (1941). *The Curriculum of Modern Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bode, B.H. (1938). *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*. New York: Newson.
- Brameld, T. (1955). *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective*. New York: Dryden.
- Bruner, J.S. (1960). *The Process of Education*. New York: Vintage.
- Carr, W., and S. Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical*. London: Falmer.
- Caswell, H.L., and D.S. Campbell. (1935). *Curriculum Development*. New York: American Book Company. (Reprinted by R. West 1978).
- Cawelti, G. (1974). *Vitalizing the High School: A Critique of Major Reform Proposals*. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- Cawelti, G. (1985). *Great Events of the Twentieth Century* (a wall chart). Alexandria, Va.: Author.
- Charters, W.W. (1923). *Curriculum Construction*. New York: Macmillan.
- Combs, A.W., ed. (1962). *Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education*. 1962 ASCD Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- Comer, J.P. (1980). *School Power*. New York: Free Press of Macmillan.
- Conant, J.B. (1959). *The American High School Today*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Connell, W.F. (1980). *A History of Education in the Twentieth Century World*. New York: Teachers College and the Curriculum Development Centre of Australia.
- Connelly, F.M., and D.J. Clandinin. (1990). "Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry." *Educational Researcher* 19, 5: 2-14.
- Cookson, P.W., and C.H. Persell. (1985). *Preparing for Power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Corey, S.M. (1953). *Action Research to Improve School Practices*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Counts, G.S. (1932). *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* New York: John Day.
- Cremin, L.A. (1961). *The Transformation of the School*. New York: Knopf.
- Cronbach, L.J., and Associates. (1980). *Toward the Reform of Program Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cronbach, L.J., and P. Suppes, eds. (1969). *Research for Tomorrow's Schools*. London: Macmillan.
- Cuban, L. (1984). *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980*. New York: Longman.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1930). "From Absolutism to Experimentalism." In *Contemporary American Philosophy* (pp. 13-27), edited by G.P. Adams and W.P. Montague. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Doll, R.C. (1964a). *Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. (Other editions: 1970, 1974, 1978, 1982, 1986, 1989, and 1992).
- Doll, R.C. (1964b). *Individualizing Instruction*. 1964 ASCD Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- Educational Policies Commission. (1942). *A War Policy for American Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Educational Policies Commission. (1943). *Education and the People's Peace*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Educational Policies Commission. (1944). *Education for ALL American Youth*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Eisner, E.W., ed. (1971). *Confronting Curriculum Reform*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Eisner, E.W. (1979). *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W. (1985). *The Educational Imagination*. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W. (1991). *The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W., and E. Vallance, eds. (1974). *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.
- Elam, S., ed. (1964). *Education and the Structure of Knowledge*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Elson, R.M. (1964). *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Firth, G.R., and R.D. Kimpston. (1973). *The Curricular Continuum in Perspective*. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock.
- Flesch, R. (1955). *Why Johnny Can't Read: And What You Can Do About It*. New York: Harper.
- Ford, G.W., and L. Pugno, eds. (1964). *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Franklin, B.M. (1986). *Building the American Community and the Search for Social Control*. London: Falmer.
- Frazier, A., ed. (1963). *New Insights and the Curriculum*. 1963 ASCD Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. by M.B. Ramos. New York: Seabury.
- Giroux, H.A. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.
- Goodlad, J.I., M.R. Klein, and Associates (1970). *Behind the Classroom Door*. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones.
- Goodlad, J.I., R. Von Stoephasius, and M.F. Klein. (1966). *The Changing School Curriculum*. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.
- Goodman, Y.M. (April 23, 1992). "Roots of Whole Language in John Dewey and Women Progressive Educators of the Early Twentieth Century." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Goodson, I., ed. (1984). *Social Histories of the Secondary Curriculum: Subjects for Study*. London: Falmer.
- Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as Stranger*. New York: Wadsworth.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gwynn, J.M. (1943). *Curriculum Principles and Social Trends*. New York: Macmillan.
- Halverson, P.M., ed. (1961). *Balance in the Curriculum*. 1961 ASCD Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- Harvard Committee on Objectives of Education in a Free Society. (1945). *General Education in a Free Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hass, G., ed. (1986). *Curriculum Planning: A New Approach*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hellison, D.R., and T.J. Templin. (1991). *A Reflective Approach to Teaching Physical Education*. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics.
- Herrick, V.E., and R.W. Tyler, eds. (1950). *Toward Improved Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holt, J. (1964). *How Children Fail*. New York: Delta.
- Hopkins, L.T. (1937). *Integration, Its Meaning and Application*. New York: D. Appleton Century.
- Hopkins, L.T. (1941). *Interaction: The Democratic Process*. New York: D.C. Heath.
- Illich, I. (1972). *De-schooling Society*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Jackson, P.W. (1968). *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jersild, A.T. (1946). *Child Development and the Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Jervis, K., and C. Montag. (1991). *Progressive Education for the 1990s*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Klein, M.F., ed. (1991). *The Politics of Curriculum Decision-Making*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kliebard, H.M. (1986). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kohl, H.R. (1968). *36 Children*. New York: Signet.
- Kozol, J. (1967). *Death at an Early Age*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Krathwohl, D. R., ed. (1964). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Kridel, C., ed. (1989). *Curriculum History*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America and The Society for the Study of Curriculum History.
- Lieberman, A., ed. (1988). *Building a Professional Culture in Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lynd, A. (1953). *Quackery in the Public Schools*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Macdonald, J.B., B. Wolfson, and E. Zaret. (1973). *Reschooling Society: A Conceptual Model*. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.

- Mager, R.F. (1962). *Preparing Instructional Objectives*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon.
- Miel, A. (1946). *Changing the Curriculum: A Social Process*. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Molnar, A., and J.A. Zahorik, eds. (1977). *Curriculum Theory*. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Neill, A.S. (1960). *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*. New York: Hart.
- Nicholls, J.G. (1989). *The Competitive Ethos and Democratic Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Overly, N.V., ed. (1970). *The Unstudied Curriculum: Its Impact on Children*. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- Phenix, P.H. (1964). *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pinar, W.F., ed. (1975). *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W.F., ed. (1988). *Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. Scottsdale, Ariz.: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Pinar, W.F., and M.R. Grumet. (1976). *Toward a Poor Curriculum*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- Popham, W.J., and E. Baker. (1970). *Establishing Instructional Goals*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Pritzkau, P.T. (1970). *On Education for the Authentic*. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company.
- Raths, L., M. Harmin, and S. Simon. (1966). *Values and Teaching*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill. (Revised edition: 1978).
- Rice, J.M. (1913). *Scientific Management in Education*. New York: Nobel and Eldridge.
- Rickover, H. (1959). *Education and Freedom*. New York: Dutton.
- Rubin, L.J., ed. (1969). *Life Skills in School and Society*. 1969 ASCD Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.
- Rugg, H.O., ed. (1927). *The Foundations of Curriculum Making*. Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II). Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co.
- Saylor, J.G., and W.M. Alexander. (1954). *Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (Revised 1966, 1974, 1981, with Lewis).
- Schubert, W.H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schubert, W.H. (1991). "Historical Perspective on Centralizing Curriculum." In *The Politics of Curriculum Decision-making* (pp. 98-118), edited by F.M. Klein. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Schubert, W.H., and A.L. Lopez-Schubert. (1980). *Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Schwab, J.J. (1969). "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum." *School Review* 78: 1-23.
- Schwab, J.J. (1970). *The Practical: A Language for Curriculum*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. (Revised and expanded version of Schwab 1969).
- Sears, J., and D. Marshall, eds. (1990). *Teaching and Thinking About Curriculum: Critical Inquiries*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Seguel, M.L. (1966). *The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Short, E.C., ed. (1991). *Forms of Curriculum Inquiry*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Short, E.C., and G.D. Marconnit, eds. (1968). *Contemporary Thought in Public School Curriculum*. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown.
- Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's Compromise*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smith, B.O., W.O. Stanley, and J.H. Shores. (1950). *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development*. New York: World Book, Yonkers-on-the-Hudson. (Revised edition, New York: Harcourt Brace and World 1957).
- Synder, B.R. (1970). *The Hidden Curriculum*. New York: Knopf.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.
- Stratemeier, F.B., H.L. Forkner, and M.G. McKim. (1947). *Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. (Revised edition: 1957, with A.H. Passow).
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.
- Tanner, D., and L.N. Tanner. (1975). *Curriculum Development: Theory Into Practice*. New York: Macmillan. (Revised edition: 1980).
- Tanner, D., and L.N. Tanner. (1990). *History of the School Curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
- Thomas, T.P. (1991). "Proposals for Moral Education Through the American Public School Curriculum: 1897-1966." Doctoral diss., University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Tye, K.A., ed. (1991). *Global Education: From Thought to Action*. 1991 ASCD Yearbook. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.
- Tyler, R.W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R.W. (April 6, 1991). "Shared Leadership, Empowered Teachers, and the Politicization of Curriculum." Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Ulich, R. (1955). "Comments on Ralph Harper's Essay." In *Modern Philosophies of Education*, edited by N.B. Henry. Fifty-fourth Yearbook (Part I) of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 254-257). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- U.S. Department of Education (1991). *America 2000: An Education Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching Lived Experience*. London, Ontario: Althouse Press, and Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Van Til, W., ed. (1974). *Curriculum: Quest for Relevance*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. (Previous edition 1972).
- Van Til, W., ed. (1986). *ASCD in Retrospect*. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.
- Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*. New York: Macmillan.
- Willis, G., ed. (1978). *Qualitative Evaluation: Concepts and Cases in Curriculum Criticism*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.
- Willis, G.H., and W.H. Schubert, eds. (1991). *Reflections From the Heart of Educational Inquiry*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Willis, M. (1961). *The Guinea Pigs After Twenty Years*. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Wood, G. (1992). *Schools That Work: America's Most Innovative Public Education Programs*. New York: Dutton.
- Young, M.F.D., ed. (1971). *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Zais, R.S. (1976). *Curriculum: Principles and Foundations*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.