

The curriculum and its ideological conceptions

Definitions of the word *curriculum* do not solve curricular problems; but they do suggest perspectives from which to view them.

Lawrence Stenhouse (1975: 1)

The problem of curriculum, and curriculum design in the main, is not the specification of objectives as targets to be attained by students; and then designing a course of study for achieving those objectives. A curriculum, to be truly educational, will lead the student to unanticipated, rather than predicted, outcomes. The problem of curriculum is rather a matter of experiencing a course of human action created through images and understanding related to the things that truly matter in life. Too many of the things that students experience in the school curriculum do not matter in the living of one's life. It is essentially the development of the powers of understanding in relation to the things that ultimately do count in life that is the real concern for educators and curriculum. A curriculum embodies the planning and implementation of educational experiences through carefully orchestrated procedures made from a judicious selection from the culture. To put it simply, education is not so much about arriving, as in hitting targets, as it is about traveling with passion, and being interested in worthwhile experiences at hand.

The problems of living are not technical concerns of taking a means to an end. They are largely moral, cultural and value-laden. One must choose wisely courses of action that are in harmony and consistent with a unified view of living that has purpose. Learning to choose, and value the "action turn," is central to learners, and teachers, who must develop situational understanding to be men and women of practical reason (McKernan, 2006). The curriculum must, if successful, ignite the human imagination. This idea of a curriculum as a unique and manifest mandate was ably put by Macdonald:

Curriculum theory is what speaks to us "through it" and what we do is informed by theory; but neither the specific words of theory nor the

specific pedagogical acts of educators are the reality of education. What defines each is the spirit and vision that shines through the surface manifestations.

(Macdonald, 1982: 56)

This is a book about designing curriculum in the absence of objectives. The underpinning idea is to develop a curriculum based on a theory of educational experience, rather than behavior change. The central ingredient is experience, rather than behavior. The primary aim of a curriculum is to enable students to think and to make critically informed choices. William Schubert claims the role of curriculum work is a moral imperative. He put it this way:

An educator is entrusted with the most serious work that confronts humankind: the development of curricula that enable new generations to contribute to the growth of human beings and society. This means that those who have chosen to devote themselves to curriculum must address the most basic questions that exist. What does it mean to live a good life and how can a just society be created?

(Schubert, 1986: 423)

The curriculum is concerned with what is planned, implemented, taught, learned, evaluated and researched in schools at all levels of education. The word *curriculum* is from the Latin *currere*, meaning “a course to be run, or the running of the course,” and usually is defined as the course of study at an educational institution. William Pinar (1975) argues that *currere*, as the Latin infinitive suggests, involves the investigation of the nature of the individual experience of the public: of artifacts, actors, operations, of the educational journey or pilgrimage.

The philosopher Richard S. Peters has argued that education involves the initiation of others into worthwhile activities in a morally acceptable manner (Peters, 1966). A curriculum is the educational policy proposal on offer by a school or college and is composed of the valued knowledge, values, skills and other dispositions that have been intentionally planned. The curriculum supports both training and education. This is a crucial distinction and the curriculum has a place for both. Basketball skills, classroom management techniques or computer processing do not involve development of intellect or mind in any depth and can be organized within an “objectives model” of curriculum as they speak to skills development and fall into a “training” sphere. However, areas that invoke knowledge and understanding, that is induction into forms of knowledge and the development of mind, are the sphere of education as distinct from training. The objectives model of planning is satisfactory for instruction and training but it breaks down in “education,” where a “process-inquiry” model is more appropriate. My point

is that we are not concerned solely with a cognitive mind development model in speaking of curriculum. In speaking of education we do better to support a process theory rather than a product theory, that is an objectives model of curriculum design. Curriculum can encompass mathematics, history and art as well as building construction and basketball; but not things such as pornography, methods of burglary or tiddlywinks.

In recent years a rather monopolistic view of curriculum design has emerged following the work of behaviorist planners and rational curriculum developers who have based their approach largely on the notion of behaviorist theory and, more specifically, planning by measurable outcomes. Franklin Bobbitt first introduced this concept of objectives into curriculum planning (Bobbitt, 1918, 1924), and Ralph Tyler (1949) popularized this idea for behavioral objectives with his simple syllabus for a course at the University of Chicago titled *Basic Principles for Curriculum and Instruction*. It is instructive to note in all fairness that Tyler does not merely describe how a curriculum actually occurs but how he thinks it ought to be developed.

This technical perspective is not only a curriculum problem but also a problem for teacher education. Giroux and McLaren boldly submit:

One of the great failures of North American education has been its inability seriously to threaten, or eventually replace, the prevailing paradigm of teacher as formal classroom manager with the more emancipatory model of the teacher as critical theorist.

(Giroux and McLaren, 1986: 286)

There are also political and cultural reasons for the way curriculum is mandated and implemented at present. The neoconservatives have sold policy-makers the notion that what is to count as “official curriculum” is a political strategy exercised to aid such causes as market ideology, personal choice of schooling, standards for literacy, school crime and violence: all decidedly away from the momentous concern for equality of educational opportunity which has been a hallmark of the political landscape, at least in the USA, in education, since the 1954 Supreme Court Case in *Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas*. In fact there is evidence that re-segregation is now occurring at a growing rate.

Since the 1980s the call has come from the New Political Right in both the USA and the United Kingdom for accountability and a “back to basics,” or essentialist theory; a notion of teaching and testing of pupils, alongside appraisal of teachers’ performances and competencies in subject matter. An allied theme has been that of cultural patriotism and heritage restoration. This has all been achieved by taking power away from teachers and professors and giving it to special interest groups and government.

In the USA curriculum policy and educational provision are duties of the local state. There is no mention of education in the US Constitution. All

matters not mentioned are given back to the individual states. Yet states are still subject to Federal Laws, to wit Title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act *No Child Left Behind* (2001). In the United Kingdom, although there are decentralized local education authorities there is a National Curriculum administered by the Department of Education and Science. More control over teachers, increased accountability and performance-based data has been a policy in both the USA and in the United Kingdom for the past quarter century.

The conception of curriculum design advanced in this book runs contrary to that of the technical rationalists' view. The process-inquiry model abandons the idea of education as the pursuit of specific instructional objectives and the concomitant ends-means production baggage in favor of *education as a process* and the assertion that the curriculum is really about being faithful to certain *key principles of procedure* in the conduct of education. The problem for curriculum today is that it is planned in an anti-educational and undemocratic way more often than not by government; and it leaves no discourse at the development and improvement level for those working at the grass roots level. We need, in brief, a political decision to allow for school-based curriculum reform and improvement to re-occur.

To my mind, the curriculum needs to be seen as a continuous educational experience: a process, rather than a product. That is, as an educative experience, rather than a behavior, or outcome of that experience. To this day the work of Lawrence Stenhouse, sketched in his *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*, remains the clearest account of a Process Model put forward as a valuable alternative to the objectives model for curriculum design.

One consequence of the growth in the study of curriculum has been an increasing rhetoric of teacher professional development. Many key decision-makers call for the acknowledgment that the teacher, as a professional, at whatever level of the education system, has a role to play in curriculum decisions, inquiry and improvement. This fact is often overlooked in the USA and the United Kingdom, where the teacher does not figure in the actual planning and development of new curriculum, but rather only in the implementation stage. In fact, curriculum itself has largely been separated from instruction and assessment. This separation counts as an unhealthy and unprofessional division of labor. Teacher professional development, or empowerment, has been a recent goal for teacher education: "No curriculum development without teacher professional development" was the old adage. However, Michael Apple (1995) argues that teachers have been largely disempowered and raises the interesting question: "Is there a curriculum voice to reclaim?" Indeed, Apple argues that scholars have almost no impact on the field of public curriculum today, nor have they had any influence in the past number of decades in the USA (Apple 1995: 38).

Stenhouse viewed curriculum work as a creative entity:

A curriculum is more like a musician's folio than an engineer's blueprint.

It requires an element of aesthetic quality, as well as imagination. Stenhouse continues:

A curriculum, like a recipe for a dish, is first imagined as a possibility, then the subject of an experiment.

(1975: 4)

It is, essentially, an educational proposal, that invites classroom testing. This is also the link that makes the relationship between teaching and research clear. In order to test his or her curriculum practice, the teacher must adopt a research stance.

Like the concept of education, the curriculum is creative, unpredictable in its itinerary and path of growth: moral, intellectual, spiritual and constructive. It is crafted through the exquisite aesthetic virtues of teachers acting upon their own artistic and intuitive situational understanding about what is right and good. It operates best when practical reason is highly honed. Dunne (1997), an Aristotelian educational scholar, argues for practical reasoning and wisdom, noting we need to get back to this "rough ground." Indeed, this practical self-reflective mode of professional conduct, although well identified by Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, has hardly been explored in the curriculum writing of the past century.

In spite of the many reforms, task force reports and the general debate related to education in recent years the theoretical model governing the design and nature of curriculum and assessment has remained virtually unchallenged and unchanged, dominated as it is by an unrelenting mode of theoretical behaviorism and technical rationality that intrudes deep into the national psyche and culture. Yet the possibilities of alternative rational models have been raised. This book charts an existentialist critical context for curriculum thinking.

Culture and curriculum

Every society sets up schools in order to induct students into the culture, that is, the ways of the society. The English philosopher John Locke held that the child's mind is blank, or *tabula rasa*, at birth and must begin to acquire the knowledge, habits and values of the group. Thus experience, particularly involving the senses, provides the basis for Locke's empiricism. The vocal tradition, especially folklore, stories, songs and the like, is more evident than the written word in this process. The curriculum then becomes a reflection of what the people think is valuable, what they do, and what they believe. Curriculum is necessarily a selection from the culture, and it is

largely composed of knowledge. Now there is a great deal to select from the culture and this is the tricky task of curriculum developers and policy-makers. As one of my graduate students remarked, “The curriculum is like a library to which subjects are constantly being added but few are ever withdrawn.”

There are also difficulties in applying the culture concept to education and curriculum because we live in a multicultural society with pluralist values. That is, American society, just as British society or French society, contains many customs, traditions and values, often incompatible, that are transmitted, learned and shared. In actual practice, most schools emphasize formal bodies of knowledge, arts, skills, languages and moral values in education. This is customary and conventional, and for good reason, as these formal subjects or disciplines of knowledge have come down to us from the ages: in the main from the great medieval universities. This curriculum is known as the *Trivium* and the *Quadrivium*, or “The Seven Liberal Arts,” which were present in incipient forms in the schools of Greece, Rome and the Arab world. The *Trivium* comprised grammar, rhetoric and dialectic (logic); and the *Quadrivium* was composed of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music. Philosophy was relegated to advanced study – hence the tradition of the doctorate in philosophy degree.

What we need to appreciate about these seven “subjects” is that they did not approximate closely with what goes by these labels in the modern world. Grammar, for example, was more than the simple content found in grammar courses but also included a fair amount of literature, forms of expression and so forth. In modern times, the *Trivium* further added history and literature (Smith *et al.*, 1957).

The curriculum of our schools is also a product of politics and interest groups (Giroux, 1994). The theoretical basis of this book is grounded in a belief that educators are more than mere functionaries in a bureaucracy – they are the constructive agents of cultural renewal. Umberto Eco, the Italian art critic and social theorist, and other critical theorists, such as Jurgen Habermas, urge man to adopt a resistance theory towards the encroachment of technological communication (Habermas, 1976). Maxine Greene argues that the technical approach has frozen our imaginations (Greene, 1995: 379). It is an era of conservatism and theoretical frugality.

We observe the “back to basics” movement and the calls for economic accountability with a jaundiced eye. William James, in his celebrated work *The Will to Believe*, warned:

Philosophers long ago observed the remarkable fact that mere familiarity with things is able to produce a feeling of their rationality. The empiricist school has been so much struck by this circumstance as to have laid it down that the feeling of rationality and the feeling of famil-

ilarity are one and the same thing, and that no other kind of rationality than this exists.

(James, 1992: 514)

Thus, half a century after Tyler wrote his classic, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, the objectives model and the use of instructional objectives in both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced testing has assumed an air of infallibility, at least in the USA. It is a major contention of this book that this assumption is problematic and in need of critical re-examination. This author would align with Professor Kliebard:

One wonders whether the long standing insistence by curriculum theorists that the first step in making a curriculum be the specification of objectives has any merit whatsoever. It is even questionable whether stating objectives at all, is a fruitful way to conceive of the process of curriculum planning.

(1975: 80)

Kliebard goes on to assert the James notion of “the sentiment of rationality” in concluding his reappraisal:

One reason for the success of the Tyler rationale is its very rationality. It is an eminently reasonable framework for developing a curriculum. . . . Tyler’s version of the model avoids the patent absurdity of, let us say, Mager’s, by drawing that blueprint in broad outline rather than in minute detail.

In North America, Europe, Australasia and many other parts of the world, the education system is most definitely at risk from the lock-step linear ends-means model of curriculum and assessment. It is at risk from an enemy within its own ranks; that enemy is a dogmatic aspiration to enshrine program-building and evaluation around a limited objectives model and its concomitant assessment technology. The value and quality of an educational system can be judged by an examination of three critical features: first its system of teaching and teacher education; second its system of assessment and evaluation; and finally, with regard to its curriculum.

This work is offered in the free spirit of inquiry intended to open the long overdue discussion on the topic of how to replace the moribund paradigm of the objectives model in curriculum. We cannot offer the entire cultural heritage for the curriculum and therefore a judicious selection is required. When one thinks about it, the curriculum is in the first instance a selection from the culture of a people and is primarily implemented through discourse and conversation.

Interpretations of curriculum and educational imagination are always the idea of an individual thinker; the idea emerges in the mind and then is disseminated by believers who see the process of curriculum-making in a new light. These ideas are most always processed by practitioners – educators who are concerned about curriculum teaching and learning. They are practical theories.

This is a book about curriculum design and theory. It is offered as an alternative to the dominant objectives model of curriculum design. As such, the process-inquiry model outlined here contributes to curriculum theory. Curriculum theory has been evolving during this century. After several decades of unprecedented curriculum change and innovation we have moved into a more static situation characterized not by dramatic change but by bureaucratic functionalism in which the technical objectives model has been imposed upon schools, colleges and indeed universities. The curriculum is the foundation stone of any education system. One of the hallmarks of curriculum change in recent years has been the increasing incidence of planning and preparation in curriculum development activities involving both pre-service and in-service education of teachers and administrators. Yet most of this planning has subscribed to a single monolithic view of ends-means rationality and has limited rather than expanded the imagination and potential for curriculum experimentation. Curriculum work is artistic at its best. Bertrand Russell remarked:

The teacher, like the artist, the philosopher, and the man of letters, can only perform his work adequately if he feels himself to be an individual directed by an inner creative impulse, not dominated and fettered by an outside authority.

(Russell, 1950: 159)

The technical rationality-driven outcomes-based education (OBE) movement has subjugated self-autonomous thinking in preference for predetermined outcomes, standards and specifications. This is in total opposition to the concept of the educated mind principally because it is in opposition to the rights of students and teachers to exercise intellectual and moral judgment. I believe further that the virtue of the individual, and in fact humanity, is greatly diminished when judgment is over-ruled by the warrant of authority. In a democratic civilization, education allows the student and teacher to be entrusted with the responsibility of reflective judgment and a firm commitment to emancipation and freedom, not the promotion of a conception characterized by targets and predetermined outcomes mandating the limits of knowledge and human speculation.

A curriculum is something of taste and judgment, testing the power of creativity, research and evaluation, calling upon our best powers of *imagination*. In the past, at least before the twentieth century, curricula were seen as

of two kinds. First, was the curriculum that was offered to the common schools, and second, a different curriculum that was offered to fee-paying, elitist, academy/private schools. One prevailing conception was that the curriculum was whatever was taught and actually experienced in lessons. This reality-based “actual” type curriculum was set out as the “timetabled curriculum.” A second sense that emerged was that the curriculum involved all the learning that was planned and guided by the school. Thus we have on one hand a limited, and on the other a more expansive, notion of what is to count as a curriculum.

The curriculum is, above all else, the proposal for an educational process. I am loathe to set up strict definitions but to satisfy critics I shall offer a tentative one here and several standard definitions found in the literature:

Some definitions of curriculum

All the learning which is planned and guided by the school, whether it is carried on in groups, or individually, inside or outside the school.
(Kerr, 1968: 16)

The curriculum is a structured series of intended learning outcomes. Curriculum prescribes (or at least anticipates) the results of instruction.
(Johnson, 1967: 130)

We see the curriculum as a desired goal or set of values that can be activated through a development process culminating in experiences for students.
(Wiles and Bondi, 2007: 5)

The total experiences planned for a school or students.
(Wiles and Bondi, 2007: 347)

The term curriculum would seem to apply most appropriately to the program of activities, to the course run by pupils in being educated.
(Hirst, 1976: 183)

The curriculum of a school, or course, or a classroom can be conceived of as a series of planned events that are intended to have educational consequences for one or more students.
(Eisner, 2002: 31)

Curriculum is often taken to mean a course of study. When we set our imaginations free from the narrow notion that a course of study is a series of textbooks or specific outline of topics to be covered and objectives to be attained, broader more meaningful notions emerge. A

curriculum can become one's life course of action. It can mean the paths we have followed and the paths we intend to follow. In this broad sense, curriculum can be viewed as a person's life experience.

(Connelly and Clandinin, 1988)

Curriculum is such permanent subjects as grammar, reading, logic, rhetoric, mathematics and the greatest books of the Western world that best embody essential knowledge. An example is that of the National Curriculum found in the UK with three core and seven foundational subjects, including specific content and objectives for student achievement in each subject.

(Marsh and Willis, 2007: 9)

A curriculum is an attempt to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of translation into practice.

(Stenhouse, 1975: 4)

Stenhouse's idea of curriculum as a hypothesis invites scrutiny and testing. This casts the teacher and students in the role of investigators or researchers with a view to improving social practice or curriculum. It is also very faithful to the notion of action inquiry, which seeks to solve problems in social interaction. My definition is similar in adopting a process rather than specifying the results of teaching and learning. A curriculum is a proposal setting out an educational plan, offering students socially valued knowledge, attitudes, values, skills and abilities, which are made available to students through a variety of educational experiences, at all levels of the education system. As a proposal, the curriculum is a hypothesis inviting a research response.

The above definition does not separate curriculum from assessment or evaluation, nor from instruction as is so often the case in contemporary thinking. There is no division of labor here. Just as the curriculum includes evaluation and inquiry by the teacher into her or his work there is no theory and practice divide. The theoretical aspect is incorporated in the proposal which has grown out of practice and is validated by concrete evidence of practice. It is also substantiated by thirty years of my own teaching practice. I am claiming that a procedural values position does better than a teaching-to-the-objectives style. It is really a question of liberating students. What I mean is getting students to not be dependent on my authority, to accept the need to justify their own reasoning and evidence for their judgments. It was Peter Abelard, the eleventh-century Parisian speculative philosopher, who said that we must reside in the belief of using speculative reason operating upon human doubt as the means to advance the truth.

With critical educationalists like Paulo Freire (1970, 1972) the process

theory permits an educational policy that is concerned with liberating human reason and granting freedom; to use Freire's language it is a "pedagogy of the oppressed"; and with Antonio Gramsci, correlative of the notion that:

The last phase of the common school must be conceived and structured as the decisive phase, whose aim is to create the fundamental values of "humanism," the intellectual self-discipline, and the moral independence.

(Gramsci, 1971: 32)

A curriculum is, above all else, imagined as an ideal. Should we fit curriculum out with a design that includes key concepts and electronic student portfolios? Alternatively, should it be based on an inquiry-discovery pedagogy? Thus, it is a grand experiment. Like a cooking recipe, it might have a good or bad taste. However, we can modify a curriculum like a recipe by adding virtues like the concepts of courage or cultural nationalism. Yet it is at once a compelling task of the human imagination. It is, at base, simply a hypothesis that invites being put to the test of action. It is never a finished entity but open to modification.

The curriculum must not be regarded as a final prescription or blueprint; it is nothing more than an idea, and ideal in the form of a proposal that it represents some worthwhile plan for leading us out of ignorance and thereby resulting in further growth through education. As an ideal, it springs from the imagination. It is conceived as an image, the purpose of which is to facilitate learning and education.

John Dewey (1916) argued that the purpose of education is simply the continuing growth of the person. This perspective is helped by teachers who understand that the aim of education is to have students become participants in that process – as opposed to being mere spectators – and to rely on the use of a process of inquiry for resolving difficulties, thereby allowing them to lead themselves out from ignorance through self-expression, critical thinking and the motivation of curiosity (Dewey, 1910, 1938). Aristotle held that the aim of education is to allow students to like and dislike what they want. Such a perspective grants autonomy to the student. It is not one in which the student is passive and the only authority is the teacher.

Curriculum as a social practice

Education is a social practice. Teachers and students meet in social interaction within the institution of the school. Curriculum is not exclusively a theoretical matter but mainly a practical matter involving the actions of humans that will make a difference. As such, it constitutes a challenge for praxis – a commitment to using principles in action. A practical action

theory seems to be a fitting rationale for curriculum. This “practical” element, and the “action turn” (Reason, 2006) has a strong connection with both Pragmatism and Critical Realism. It was Charles Sanders Peirce who first used the word “pragmatism,” which is from the Greek word *pragma* meaning “action,” in an article in *Popular Mechanics* appearing in 1897. Peirce’s idea is that unless some action makes a real difference then it is insignificant and one should be able to re-trace the consequences of actions, as they impact, to determine this difference on an empirical footing.

Who, when, why and how become key questions that need to be answered in negotiating and implementing a curriculum. The whole subject of education is practical, social and very much a highly moral matter more than the current weight given it as a “technical” matter. It is a great mistake to reject educational theory and indeed a curriculum on grounds that they cannot be proved. After Aristotle, one must not demand more rigor than the subject matter is fitted for. The curriculum is created, tried and judged. As such it is above all else an idea worth testing – a hypothesis the rational educator might proffer. Like the culture concept, a curriculum is created, shared and transmitted to others embodying values and knowledge and skills and a host of dispositions. It is found in the normative realm of beliefs and rituals and in the physical artifacts of texts and materials.

Curriculum, as a term, is a rather recent concept if we accept the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* as an authoritative source. The term was used originally to describe courses of study at universities and in schools. One might refer to the law or engineering curriculum in the university, or the history or reading course in a high school.

In terms of the American experience, Lawrence Cremin argued that a founder father of curriculum reform in the USA was William Torrey Harris, who as Superintendent of St. Louis public schools began a rigorous curriculum change movement around 1870 onwards. Whilst holding distinctively rationalist values he argued that the purpose of education was a process “by which the individual is elevated into the species,” or by which a self-active human being is enabled to become privy to the accumulated wisdom of the race (Cremin, 1974: 28). Harris (1898a, 1898b), subscribed to a view which accorded import to a process of widening concentric circles involving family education, formal schooling, vocational induction and civic and political education as well as the religious education of the student. He advocated the use of the textbook as the vehicle *par excellence* for public education. In this, Harris paid a tribute to the emergence of psychology and to science in education in the preparation of teachers and the school curriculum. The age of curriculum thinking and making had arrived by the turn of the twentieth century.

The curriculum is concerned with what is planned, implemented, taught, learned, evaluated and researched in schools at all levels of education. To experience a curriculum is not to arrive at a particular destination, but to

have traveled with a different view. It is in the journey and its experiences that a curriculum is realized, not in the act of alighting from the train.

Anyone who studies curriculum theory and history is bound to be very soon faced with the question of whether the logic of the literature coincides with the experiences of teachers and pupils in the schools. There is a vast difference between the two. There is the “official” curriculum and the “actual” curriculum in this debate: what is supposed to happen and what actually is happening, to be blunt. In addition, there is the “hidden curriculum” which describes the latent values which are unplanned but which exert a powerful effect on pupils and teachers.

Elliot Eisner has stated that “the quality of school curricula and the quality of teaching are the two most important features of any educational enterprise” (Eisner, 1983: 1). However, there is not a general consensus as to what constitutes quality in teaching and curriculum. Here I wish to suggest that two separate but complementary social practices were regenerated out of the curriculum reform movement in Europe, mainly under the aegis of first-generation innovatory programs: first, the design of curriculum without behavioral objectives and second, revitalization of the teacher action research movement. Both movements emerged due to a large-scale assault on the technical model of curriculum design, which had become distanced from democratic classrooms and teacher practices seeking excellence in evaluation.

The lost democratic ideal of school-based curriculum development

One of the most important questions is “Who should improve curriculum?” During the early years of the twentieth century, there was a widespread interest in educational circles for school-based curriculum development linked with the concept of democracy, particularly in the USA and Britain (Dewey, 1916; Whitehead, 1929; Skilbeck, 1984). In fact, John Dewey set up a “Laboratory School” at the University of Chicago for his experiments with democracy and education.

This is a rather profound democratic ideal, which granted autonomy to local schools and teachers for creating and recreating their curricula. In the United Kingdom, Labour Government policy had empowered teacher unions and local schools to exercise a right to reform their own school programs and to develop experimental modes of curriculum and evaluation under work commissioned by the Schools’ Council in the 1960s and 1970s. Sadly, neo-essentialism and conservatism has clawed back power from schools and teachers and placed it with government.

It is quite clear that schools in the USA do not have the freedom of deciding the curriculum at the local level of the school. I was able during the 1970s to enjoy working with schools committed to school-based curriculum development in Northern Ireland. The concept was widely taken

up by a number of secondary/comprehensive schools, at that time, throughout the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland outside of the selective grammar schools who were strongly tied into the GCE O- and A-Level examinations which permitted little experimentation.

Wolfgang Klafki (1975) wrote a Council of Europe paper on the topic of localized school-based curriculum development as action research, which Klafki saw as an alternative to empirical research. An early example of action inquiry related to curriculum development in Europe.

Other recent influences have come from the critical philosophy of Jurgen Habermas challenging the primacy of technical and analytical positivism in favor of a more critical social theory of hermeneutics and interpretive models. In education, this critical theory was introduced by Wilfred Carr and Stephen Kemmis in 1986 with their book *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*. The role here would be to advance human emancipation and justice to rid institutions of inequality through action research.

Advances in educational program evaluation contributed significantly to curriculum thought as qualitative approaches were added to the standard quantitative styles. Evaluation as “illumination” (Parlett and Hamilton, 1972), or as “literary criticism” and “connoisseurship” (Eisner, 2002), or as “democratic evaluation” (MacDonald, 1971). Michael Scriven (1973) offered “goal free evaluation,” acknowledging that programs often attain unanticipated effects, and Robert Stake produced “responsive evaluation” (1967). All of these creative evaluators have allowed practitioners to better understand their actions and involvement through “thick description” rather than bean counting and number crunching of the behavioral style of evaluation.

While at a professional meeting in Scotland I was informed by an American professor of curriculum that most American educationalists did not know anything about how curriculum, or indeed education, was studied and practiced in Britain or Ireland; or indeed, elsewhere in Western Europe. This may have been an exaggeration but it certainly is true that, as regards higher education in particular, and the manner and means by which curriculum and the foundations of education are pursued, one might readily conclude that either side of the Atlantic two completely different fields or subjects are being studied.

Stenhouse crafted his Process Model as opposed to the objectives model of curriculum design and with his reconstructed version of teachers as researchers, manifest through the Humanities Curriculum Project (HCP). Stenhouse acted as External Examiner for my own D.Phil thesis, which dealt with controversial issues in curriculum. John Elliott, a member of Stenhouse’s HCP team, which first advanced the “teacher-researcher role” in the United Kingdom, has been a champion of educational action research on an international scale, and Jean Rudduck, an HCP member and, later, life partner of Lawrence Stenhouse, has written on teacher research and reflective practice in teacher education (Rudduck, 1989).

When I arrived in Northern Ireland in 1973, Professor Malcolm Skilbeck was Director of the Education Centre at the New University of Ulster and, as my doctoral supervisor, he counseled me to surround myself with what he called “about fifty great books.” Skilbeck was a scholar of Dewey and of the social reconstructionist theory of education. Reconstructionists believe that schools can rebuild a culture in crisis and are the genuine forerunners to critical theory. Skilbeck first mentioned Kurt Lewin’s work in solving conflict and his notion of action research, and we discussed the possible role of action research in our Schools Cultural Studies Project aimed at peace education in Northern Ireland secondary schools. This was during 1974 and the second cycle of the educational action research movement had not yet begun in earnest at this time. The first cycle began during the 1950s in the USA (Corey, 1953). Action research fizzled out as educational research became dominated by the scientific method and Research, Development and Dissemination (R, D & D) styles of work became the norm (Hodgkinson, 1957). We did have the already-documented experience of the Schools Council curriculum projects, and the Humanities Curriculum Project made forays into promoting the “teacher as researcher” notion.

As a postgraduate research student attached to the Schools Cultural Studies Curriculum Project in Northern Ireland in the mid-1970s I was concerned with curriculum development in social/cultural studies within secondary schools aimed at promoting peace, tolerance and mutual understanding. The now UK-wide goal for promoting “education for mutual understanding” (EMU) as a policy aim was first forged by our project at Ulster University. Thus, “conflict resolution” was a central interest. Skilbeck organized an Education Centre Seminar for faculty and postgraduate research students at Ulster University around the theme “Education and Conflict in Northern Ireland.” It is within this seminar that I began to forge some ideas about how the teacher and curriculum could be used as a significant aid for cross-community understanding. One of Skilbeck’s first suggestions was for me to read Kurt Lewin’s (1948) book *Resolving Social Conflicts*, in which he first argued for action research as an applied form of inquiry that would solve social problems.

At my D.Phil research sessions with Professor Skilbeck, and later with Professor Hugh Sockett, I would be handed several books at a time and told to go away and read, and come back months later and discuss these in preparation for lodging a doctoral proposal. There were no classes to attend for it was assumed my basic grounding in the knowledge and skills of education and research methodology had been adequately completed with a good undergraduate degree and a Master of Arts degree as preparation. I would conduct field work, write a chapter, and make an appointment to see my (by then) supervisor, Professor Sockett, who had studied under Richard Stanley Peters at London and was an analytical philosopher of education with an abiding interest in curriculum design. He would leave no stone unturned,

drafting long critical pages of typescript critique for me of my draft chapters to take away after having discussed my writing. This process continued for several years. Now this graduate education differs markedly from that in the United States. In the USA, students attend classes, and perhaps seminars at graduate level. There is rarely individual tutorial type work, which to my mind is a great pity and demerit in the American system. Ben Bloom (1995) has concluded in research on student learning that the tutorial is the most effective method of learning. If we accept this to be true then it will dramatically affect the way in which the curriculum will be organized and implemented. Tutorials are noticeably absent as a mode of teaching in the USA.

Giving teachers the role of curriculum development and research is an ultimate act of democratic education for it admits to authority and power to change at the local level and requests educators to operate within a reflective research and professional development brief. Teachers logically must be researchers in such a change scenario. The most amazing hypocrisy is that on the one hand Colleges of Education argue for the development of “professionals committed to reflective practice” and on the other the teachers and administrators are stripped of their professional autonomy.

The school-based model advanced by Skilbeck (1984) admits five stages to the process of curriculum development: situational analysis; specification of goals; organizing content and program building; creation of learning experiences; and feedback and evaluation. Skilbeck held that logically, teachers, when faced with curriculum change, do not set about the task by addressing goals and objectives first – but rather they take account of the situation that they find themselves in (“Situational Analysis”). I found that teachers do, in fact, ruminate over the constraints they face, say a public examination system, and discuss resources available and other immediate concerns before outlining any targets they hope to achieve. This stage is concordant with the artistic awareness of constraints and resources, or a situational understanding. This is not a theoretical matter, nor indeed a technical concern, but rather a practical and at once, professional choice.

The failure of large expert-led national curriculum projects to create teacher-proof resources and materials packages led ultimately to a strategy of bringing teachers into the mix of school-based curriculum developments. This conception of curriculum planning derives from the needs of learners in the first instance and the need for the freedom to learn by students and teachers is a necessary condition of this work. It further suggests that schools are responsible, as human communities, to being responsive to their own environment. In addressing this environment, it is vital that teachers be researchers and curriculum developers in adapting learning to its own idiosyncratic ecology.

Given this experience and the wide-scale acclaim attributed to school-based support groups it remains a marginal strategy in the face of large

production type packages of school curriculum innovations today. I would argue with others that there could be no effective curriculum development without teacher development.

The objectives model and technical rationality

Our present paradigm of curriculum-making is the direct result of the beliefs and assumptions of those engineers and psychologists such as Bobbitt, Thorndike and Charters, and technologists who have dominated curriculum thought over the past one hundred years. These beliefs are deeply rooted in a scientifically based educational technology and practice. The contributions of Thorndike and Dewey reflected this scientific orientation. In 1910 the first issue of *The Journal of Educational Psychology* contained an article by Thorndike titled "The Contribution of Psychology to Education." This used measurement of intellect and character and ultimately the prediction of behavior, an ends-means notion relying on a strict regimen of behavioral testing which has come to have a politically connected high profile in Western nations.

One can locate the origin of educational objectives notably in the work of Franklin Bobbitt, who was an engineer by training, and in his two principal works *The Curriculum* (1918), and *How to Make a Curriculum* (1924). The advent of management orthodoxy and scientific planning in the years after the First World War cemented this perspective. Bobbitt held the Chair of Education at the University of Chicago, as did Ralph Tyler and later Benjamin Bloom, who applied principles of behaviorism to instructional design.

In recent years a rather monopolistic view of curriculum has emerged following the work of behaviorist planners and rational curriculum designers who have based their approach largely on the notion of behaviorist thinking and more specifically according to planning by "objectives." Ralph Tyler (1949) popularized this idea with his simple syllabus for a course at the University of Chicago titled *Basic Principles for Curriculum and Instruction*. Regrettably, the objectives model has been championed dogmatically and aggressively, not only in North America, but also internationally.

Interestingly, Tyler appears far more direct and liberal than the host of psychologists who have put their stamp on curriculum since mid-century, including Popham, Gagne, Bereiter, Carroll, Bloom, Anderson, Block, Guskey and others who come offering educational blueprints of a technical nature. Such a view of curriculum restrains the human imagination simply because it sets limits or boundaries to what is learned, and tested. The curriculum equates with tested knowledge. Content, or the material covered in a course, becomes the means to the stated objectives. Thus, most courses reduce content to an instrumental role. This is a serious problem. Let us accept that education can, in certain senses, be seen as an introduction to

disciplined forms of knowledge like mathematics or philosophy. If we accept this then we can see how education can be viewed as being justified by being faithful to the forms, or principles of procedure, equated with these disciplines. To work as a mathematician, or philosopher, is to work in accordance with and fidelity to these *principles of procedure* rather than in accord with some pre-specified objective, which is external and extrinsic to the activity itself. Thus, the model outlined here is that if one defines the content, that is, the knowledge base, the key concepts, the methods of doing philosophy, its tests of proof, and then set out an acceptable teaching procedure and standards to judge students' work, then one would be planning without utilizing objectives. I believe this to be the prized model for work in the disciplines of knowledge because the principles of procedure then become our objectives, if you like, and this is the best way to communicate the essence of these endeavors. Disciplines allow us to determine the input into the educational process rather than the outputs. Eisner (1981) argues that there have been at least six consequences of behaviorist curriculum powered by positivism and scientific control:

- 1 The utter dominance of a scientific epistemology in education that has excluded all other notions of inquiry. (Indeed the recent Federal Law passed with the self-recommending Title X, *No Child Left Behind* (2001) has eliminated all but the most scientific and quantitative methods of educational research.)
- 2 Educational research has been preoccupied with control.
- 3 There has been a preoccupation with standardized outcomes – such practices undermine students' creative idiosyncrasies.
- 4 Little role is accorded students for participation in the creation of their own learning programs.
- 5 The consequences of being interested in issues of control and measurement has led curriculum makers to break up curriculum into small micro-units of behavior and in so doing to render much of the curriculum meaningless and irrelevant to pupils.
- 6 So much of curriculum is characterized by humorless and devastatingly sober quality writing in both research and educational practice. Eisner concludes:

The tendency towards what is believed to be scientific language has resulted in an emotionally eviscerated form of expression; any sense of the poetic or passionate must be excised.

(Eisner, 1981)

This conception of writing is in opposition to the view of R.S. Peters (1966), who urges students to work with passion with educational tasks at hand. Passion is a precious possession for the student and for the teacher.

Deliberation and curriculum

Deliberation is a significant concept associated with the whole field of the “practical” in curriculum studies. The curriculum is a deliberately planned practical activity. Several writers (Reid, 1978; Sanders and McCutcheon, 1986; McCutcheon, 1995b) have exhumed this concept in some depth. The authors question how practical wisdom can be facilitated and developed. The position is that professionals do develop practical theories out of their own hard-won experience. McCutcheon (1995a: 5) states that there are at least nine characteristics of deliberation. A deliberative activity is one that embodies decision-making at its core. Deliberation:

- 1 considers alternative possible solutions;
- 2 envisions the consequences and outcomes of each alternative;
- 3 considers facts and values, and means and ends simultaneously;
- 4 takes action within time constraints;
- 5 is a moral activity;
- 6 is a social enterprise consisting of responsibility, social interactions, anticipation of events and trends;
- 7 is simultaneity – that is, as we think and speak many things vie for attention. Deliberation is mistakenly thought of as a linear clear rational activity when it is often a muddle;
- 8 involves presence of interests;
- 9 involves presence of conflicts.

Further, McCutcheon discusses teachers’ use of “practical theories,” that is, their explanations of their thinking, and she has summarized an important literature dealing with “professional knowledge of teachers” (Elbaz, 1983), or “personal knowledge” of their work (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988). This vein of research is crucially important if we are to understand the “situational understanding” held by the practitioner. A complete new literature on teacher knowledge about teaching has come forth from this area of “practical theory.”

Some of this theoretical knowledge is arrived at through autonomous independent thought, which McCutcheon (1995a: 147) labels “solo deliberation.” Other theories are arrived at through a socially constructed knowledge in interaction with others in our culture. Thus, curriculum development is a deliberately planned activity through which courses of study or other educational patterns of activity and experience are designed and proffered as proposals worthy of implementation and evaluation in practice. These ways of developing and deliberating vary from one national system to another. In Ireland, we used to have a fair amount of school-based curriculum development. In the USA, the state is increasingly deleting the amount of control teachers and schools have to make changes.

Imagination and curriculum

Mary Warnock, the English philosopher of education, has remarked that:

Quality in education is measured by the degree to which the imagination is exercised. To exercise the imagination is to keep it in practice, by giving it, to attend to, in detail, objects which are worthy of attention; and all objects are more worthy of attention in detail than superficially.
(1973: 121)

The imagination, on Warnock's view, is akin to "free-thought," and therefore, if we neglect imagination, then we are in a strong sense neglecting a student's freedom. Thus, a curriculum must provide opportunities for students to think critically and freely for themselves. Given that curricula emerge from images of desired and ideal practices we need to introduce another powerful concept, often neglected in education, and that is the concept of *imagination*. Imagination is central to the educated mind. It permits the possibility of the creative.

The work of Elliot Eisner (2002) and Kieran Egan (1990, 1992, 2005) stands out as singular in dealing with the concept of imagination, particularly with reference to good curriculum and evaluation in education. Eisner advocates a new form of curriculum evaluation positioning educators as connoisseurs of practice who reveal their qualities through literary criticism. Egan has launched an Imagination Educational Research Group out of his base at Simon Fraser University to promote the development of students' imagination through curriculum reform. Eisner works at encouraging new forms of expression in evaluation as literary criticism and private savoring of quality through educational connoisseurship.

The cultivation of imagination is one of the most important aims of education yet it is rarely discussed in a meaningful way. By imagination, I mean two things: first that the student becomes intrigued and seduced by a subject, so much so that the student makes it his or her territory. The student, moreover, feels compelled with the need "to go on" with his or her individual inquiries. Second, they acquire tools that allow them the ability to develop their knowledge, skills and abilities after they leave the guidance of the teacher. This is particularly true of college-level education. Students at university, or college, need to learn research skills so that they can follow a line of inquiry that has been pursued by others but with their own questions. Above and beyond this, they need to know that this is really what they are doing. If they can make a genuine and concrete contribution to knowledge they need to understand this to be the case. This is one reason that instead of a formal examination I require my graduate students to complete a piece of educational action research as applied to their day-to-day professional life and work. My students come to understand, albeit gradu-

ally, that they are doing research that will improve their practice and therefore make a difference. I think that some research in education does do this but I feel this is the exception to the rule generally. The purpose of education and of imagination is to seek the freedom to “go on” in the study of the subject. A good education, or what some might refer to as “quality” then might be evaluated by the extent to which the student’s imagination is worked. It is akin to freethinking, which is critical. Therefore, if we neglect the imagination then we shall be putting constraints on our freedom. By allowing students the opportunity to think freely for themselves we shed our being in authority and give this as a right to the student. This is what is emancipatory about education; it frees the student from the *patria potestas*, or the parental jurisdiction. This is at the core of the concept of education, which my *OED* informs me comes from the Latin *educere*, “to lead out from ignorance,” thus setting one free from the warrant of authority. Education is implemented through the curriculum in schools and it is the great emancipator in liberating us from more than the parental jurisdiction.

In this chapter, I have been touching on aims of education, which raises questions of philosophy. The philosophers that I have been influenced by are the sort who ask questions like “What do you mean?” and “How do you know?”

The poet Shelley thought it was imagination, in the end, which made love and sympathy possible. Poetry for Shelley was influential because he thought it directly appealed to imagination.

(Warnock, 1973: 112)

Part of the problem of curriculum is that our concept or image of education has been one of consumers and products, no doubt located in the obsession with capitalist motives and market production; or an image of the school as a corporation or factory utilizing quality control mechanisms and treating education as a consumer beltline. This reasoning has led us directly to the present “market ideology” which drives curriculum and assessment in American schools. Making products is technical, but I would submit that education has more to do with pastoral care and a caring pedagogy. Indeed surveys of teachers show clearly that the main motivation for entering teaching is to care and help children grow and learn (Ornstein and Levine, 2006).

Pedagogy, or the art of teaching, is a word that is not in vogue much in the USA. Yet the concept of pedagogy still has widespread currency in Europe. The etymology of the Greek word pedagogy comes from the root “ped” or foot, and means literally “leading children.” The pedagogue was originally an escort to the pupil between home and the Ludus, or Roman school. Some of these pedagogues were actually slaves of some education who acted as tutors, thus diminishing the place of the father and supplementing the teacher over education (Gutek, 1995: 63).

Teachers “educate” if the leading is grounded in care and love. This is the basis for an educational relationship between teacher and student. Aristotle commented that the relationship between a teacher and pupil was characterized by this special care and was a loving relationship.

The idea of curriculum posited in this book runs contrary to that of the instrumentalist notion in that it abandons the idea of education as the pursuit of specific instructional objectives and this ends-means production baggage in favor of education as an educational experience crafted by adherence to certain processes and that the curriculum is really about being faithful to certain key principles of *procedure* in the conduct of education. The curriculum is the mechanism enabling the education of students. Education is a process embodying key principles and values – it is in the realization of these embedded values that one is educated: not through the attainment of trivial outcomes seen as products.

Because curricula are at base mere proposals, or hypotheses, and not finished products, there will always be unresolved questions and no one can write the last word on the subject. We are all, as educators, faced with curriculum questions, some more tormenting than others. In facing these questions, we have to engage serious thinking, which can be done well or badly. It is the task of curriculum theory to help us think better on these questions and issues. A central issue is that of *rationality*. We have practical and technical versions of rationality. We can ask, “Which rationality shall prevail?” In all cases, a first step towards answering questions of curriculum rationally is to understand the question. Understanding is often the goal or purpose of teaching and learning and is always seen to be a crucial aim of curriculum. Yet understanding itself is fraught with difficulty, even for philosophers. I can hold any of the following positions tenably:

“I understand fully what you say.”

“I do not understand what you say.”

“I do not fully understand what you have said.”

“I think I understand what you have said.”

“I understand what you say but your understanding is wrong.”

“I misunderstood what you have said.”

Stenhouse (1975) contended that we could decide on designing the curriculum by three means:

- 1 *Planning* considering *epistemological issues* of knowledge. The “Content Model”;
- 2 *Planning* by consideration of the *pupil's characteristics*. The “Process or Learner Development Model”; and
- 3 *Planning by objectives*. The “Objectives Model.”

That is, we can plan with reference to the knowledge, student or outcome desired.

Designing a curriculum is like designing a building. First, what will be the purpose of the building? Thus, its function is considered. Second, how much finance is available? Thus, the practical concerns are paramount in design.

Policy-makers are notoriously obsessed with the concepts of cost, effectiveness and efficiency, and not only in education. Curriculum and schooling must be managed scientifically, echoing conduct in corporations, factories and finance institutions. Such engineering is said to be “rational,” namely taking a means to a specified end. But Dewey (1910) and Oakeshott (1966, 1981) have both argued that such thinking, first posited by John Stuart Mill in *On the Logic of the Moral Sciences* (1843), is fuzzy indeed. Mill’s account of rational action is the basis for the scientific rationale for planning, and it is true that many educators see themselves as behavioral scientists. Mill argued that rational action is *planned action*. One should first consider the *end* to be achieved and select this carefully. You should then determine, with the aid of science, what will enable you to achieve your end. You then have to act on that knowledge. Mill argued further that actions that deviate from this procedure are that much less rational.

Michael Oakeshott (1966, 1981) is perhaps the harshest critic of Mill’s account of action. For Oakeshott it is inconceivable that we could detach ourselves from our ends quite independently of the context in which they were aimed at. Our actions are part of our ways of proceeding, of going on in a situation, just as there are ways of continuing in a debate or game. Oakeshott’s central thesis is that actions cannot be taken away from or detached from their social context. What makes an action rational for Oakeshott is how far it conforms to the “idiom of the activity,” that is, the context in which we act. Supporters of Tylerian notions of rational curriculum planning must defend against these criticisms. Arguably, there have not been that many critics of technical rationality and educators are often hounded by the ends-means rationality embodied in our system of schooling and education. Teachers are often seen and view themselves as functionaries in a bureaucracy. This becomes more visible when they are shrouded in state accountability standards, and of course test results and the like.

Much Western education could be evaluated theoretically as being behaviorist and neo-essentialist in nature. There is a newfound belief in basic subjects, core curriculum, testing, control and accountability through the achievement of outcomes specified in behavioral terms. Beginning around 1980 with conservative education policies, arguably imported from Britain, where Margaret Thatcher, herself a neo-conservative, and former school-teacher, implemented the social market perspective, at all levels of British

education. It was a shift in policy away from local control and choice towards government education policy control – often under-resourced and incoherent.

In the United States this might be called “The New Federalism” characterized by five trends: (1) more choice for parents; (2) deregulation of rules; (3) cutbacks and downsizing at all levels and programs; (4) consolidation of agencies and elimination of programs; and (5) establishing national standards. This latter is somewhat at odds with the more decentralized concerns of the other trends striving for national standards and testing where teachers and students are accountable for performances. Thus one can analyze a shift in American Federal education policy that might have been categorized as reconstructionist or, at least, progressive rather than traditional-essentialist.

The current debate about curriculum needs to acknowledge that the use of instructional objectives as the ultimate basis for planning is seriously flawed, not only as a planning model, but as an assessment model of student learning. This picture of student learning is also criticized by Dewey (1916) in arguing that our results – what students actually achieve – are different from our intended ends-in-view – what we were aiming at. In the course of trying to achieve our ends-in-view all sorts of interactions occur, changing our course, and we must not, as he said, be under a “tyranny of ends.” For Dewey the aim of education was not in reaching some standard, or end, but in “achieving growth and more growth.” Sockett (1976) has outlined these objections in his attack on the Mill account as it relates to curriculum design.

In most nations, citizens are demanding more and more of their education system. Schools are requested to establish drug education programs, to teach critical thinking, character education, technology education, to combat inequalities, racism, crime, and even prepare students to accept death, besides fulfilling the traditional role of imparting the culture and cultural heritage.

Conceptions of curriculum

By the notion of a “conception” of curriculum, I refer explicitly to a defined orientation, or values, embedded in a curriculum perspective, which characterizes the most prized virtues connected with a curriculum style or practice. Several curriculum researchers have worked this idea (Eisner and Vallance, 1974; Schubert, 1986; Eisner, 2002; Marsh and Willis, 2007). I believe it is very difficult to pigeonhole persons and policies into a labeling system; however, in thinking about this one must necessarily see that all curricula are based on a conception or vision of desirable qualities, or values. Eisner (2002) provides an in-depth discussion of the notion of curriculum *ideologies*. He suggests competing conceptions, or ideologies: Religious Orthodoxy, Rational Humanism, Progressivism, Critical Theory, Reconceptualism and Cognitive Pluralism.

Ideologies are thus more than models – they have a political essence at their core. The base of values from which decisions are made about what and how to teach. These ideologies are often construed as philosophical orientations such as perennialist theories.

Six curriculum ideologies

I have identified six major curriculum conceptions, or ideologies, which correlate remarkably and mesh closely with the six value orientations of teachers I independently derived from survey work with teachers' value systems around the world (see Chapter 11). I believe there is great significance between the theoretical constructions posed in the literature and the actual data found from teachers in four nations which requires greater exploration and explanation. The six curriculum ideologies are:

- 1 intellectual-rationalist (Greek/Roman/medieval);
- 2 theo-religious (Christian-Scholastic, Islamic, Jewish);
- 3 social-romantic (child-centered);
- 4 technical-behavioral (science-efficiency);
- 5 personal-caring (Existentialist-self-growth and self-realizing);
- 6 critical-political (equality-meliorist).

The history of education shows pretty well clear patterns of preference in moving from an intellectual rationalist tradition that merges with the rise of Christian education to the humanistic child-centered tradition of the Enlightenment. In the modern period the concern for a science of education led to technical and behavioral conceptions. Running parallel was a concern by some curricularists to focus on the personal values and growth of the student as a person. I call this tradition the “personal-humanistic” and it can be seen in the work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Friedrich Froebel, A.S. Neill, William Pinar, Carl Rogers, Sidney Simon and others. Since 1945, there has been a conscious attempt to employ curriculum to achieve equality of opportunity and with the rise of curriculum research into inequality has emerged a new vibrant “critical-political” ideology for curriculum.

From where does the content, usually called the “subjects,” offered in school come from? What should be in the curriculum? What knowledge is of most worth? Whose knowledge is most worthwhile? These questions invite our imagination to work. An overview of various conceptions or curriculum ideologies follows:

1. Intellectual-rationalist ideology

This conception of curriculum was the earliest and is seen in the development of education in the Greek and Roman states and with the curriculum

of the early universities in Europe based on the seven liberal arts, or the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*. Intellectual rationalism holds to the view that the function of education is to cultivate the intellect and to further intellectual growth by subjecting students to the most rational forms of subject organization that have been consistently passed on. This is a knowledge-driven enterprise with development of mind as a virtue. One strand of this is perennialism, or the idea that character is permeated with a search for the truth and it contains the best of the cultural heritage and is therefore “perennial” in nature. This is the idea that truth will always be the same and these studies (mathematics, music, etc.) have stood the test of time and should be permanent studies in the curriculum. This is undoubtedly the oldest form of curriculum organization dating at least to Platonic Idealism. The idea is that the curriculum requires an elite selection of true knowledge; schools do not exist to meet all forms of social need or special extracurricular activities for these would ultimately take away time required for intellectual and worthy academic pursuits.

2. Theo-religious ideology

The oldest known schools were in the Tigris Valley in what is modern Iraq around 6000 BC. These were known as *Edubba*, or “Tablet Schools,” whose purpose was religious training of young boys using a cuneiform stone tablet for the text (Webb *et al.*, 2003). Similar religious schools were also characteristic of education in Egypt from 3000 BC, for educating religious or temple scribes. In the Western tradition, the Monastic Schools arguably kept the lights of civilization from going out altogether during the Dark Ages of AD 500–1000. The “Cathedral Schools” also demonstrated the primacy of religion in education after Charlemagne. Following the rise of the universities around AD 1100, Thomas Aquinas, a Dominican priest and professor of theology at Paris, advanced deductive logic as a primary reasoning model by meshing Aristotelian thought with Roman Catholic Church doctrines. However, the supremacy of Scholasticism was devastated by the ideals underpinning the Renaissance, and the shift from religious values to the educated courtly gentleman.

In North America, religion was the central galvanizing factor in the rise of both private and public education. The historian E.P. Cubberley (1934) argued that three types of religious influence were transplanted from Europe to America. First, the Church–State type founded in New England by Puritan Congregationalists, for example the establishment of Harvard as a Divinity College in 1636 and the passing of the “Old Deluder Satan Act” of 1647 which made towns responsible for building Town and Latin Grammar Schools. Second, the Parochial tradition of both Protestants and Catholics in Pennsylvania and Maryland, and third, the tradition of Charity and Sunday Schools found in Virginia and the Carolinas. One need only look at the fact

that all of the Ivy League colleges were religiously endowed. In fact, there was not a public university until after the Republic was established. The University of North Carolina, of which East Carolina University, where I labor, is a constituent institution, was founded in 1789. Even today some 12 percent of children attend mostly religiously endowed private schools in the USA and, Eisner (2002: 57) states, "In America about 90 percent of all private or independent elementary and secondary schools are Roman Catholic."

3. Social-Romantic ideology

This ideology focuses upon the needs and interests of the child rather than the subject or content to be taught. Part of the message is that students need to be made ready for being with others in society – to be democratic and sociable. Exponents range from Comenius with his passion for peace and justice to the Romantic naturalism of Rousseau and the work of Johann Pestalozzi and Froebel's Kindergarten. Progressives of the twentieth century would include, but are not limited to, A.S. Neill in Britain, John Dewey and William Kilpatrick in the USA, and Maria Montessori in Italy.

Notably, Dewey longed to teach students a "logic of inquiry" with which to solve problems. This is the essence of Pragmatism, the philosophy that drives much of the experimentalism of Dewey and his followers. Deweyan Progressivism adopts a scientific method of thought and action (Dewey, 1910). For Dewey, curriculum does not begin with knowledge as the source, but with the child and his or her nature. Professor A.V. Kelly (1989: 87) boldly asserts: "the fundamental values of education are to be found in the nature of human development and its potentialities." These theorists have also pointed to the profound changes in the role of the teacher using a child-centered human development approach. From subject expert to facilitator; from judge to advisor; from text master to inquiry-centered teaching role.

4. Technical-behavioral ideology

This is a set of values that encourage students as consumers in the capitalist system: producing, consuming, measuring and vocationalism. Students are seen as contributors to the market economy and being readied for participation in globalization. The high emphasis on curriculum for career work and the premium bunting applied to those aspects of curriculum governed by technology courses are evidence of these values. Indeed the way in which the curriculum is measured for both students and teachers bespeaks of this emerging accountability concern. Students and teachers get the message that they will be held accountable for the results of their performance and there is a widespread view that education is at base preparation for the world of work – that is, it is instrumental in leading students to this transition.

5. Personal-caring ideology

Perhaps the most widely ascribed ideology by teachers is the caring orientation (see Chapter 11). It is found in curricula and personnel who advocate for the care and welfare of the child.

The Metropolitan Life National Survey of teachers' motivations for entering teaching showed that the number one reason folks enter teaching is to help children grow and learn (Ornstein and Levine, 2006). This ideology has found intellectual advocacy from writers such as Jane Roland Martin with her three Cs – care, concern and connection – and in the writings of Nell Noddings and William Pinar within the USA. In Britain, the traditional emphasis on programs of pastoral care (Hamblin, 1984) in schools has become part of the structure for curriculum. Pastoral care emphasizes the role of the teacher as shepherd, caring for the total needs of the students from guidance advice to education for life (McKernan *et al.*, 1985).

The personal ideology is concerned with the growth of the student as a person. It signals an emphasis on self-actualization, inner harmony, self-respect and the dignity and worth of persons. In this latter sense, it can be seen to exercise its humanistic curriculum features. It answers the questions “Who am I?” “What are my values?” “How can I learn to clarify my values and beliefs?” Existentialist and Reconceptualist educators would see this as a priority for curriculum – a spiritual form of values education and personal identity construction. Eisner (2002: 31) has stated that in the self-actualizing ideology content is important only to the extent that it helps the individual student personally – not as it is defined by outside experts.

One salient feature of the personal-caring curriculum ideology is the belief that students need to learn how to make moral decisions and choices – choices that ultimately affect their personal well-being, for example “Who am I?” “Should I do, or not do, drugs?” In the Schools Cultural Studies Project high school students in Northern Ireland were given opportunities to exercise making decisions about their values and to choose from competing alternatives. Dewey's method of valuing – a process of choosing, prizing and acting on choices – was used as a values clarification process by others (Raths *et al.*, 1966). Values and moral education are central in the humanistic ideology.

This caring and humanistic ideology also has a concern for the development of the student as a spiritual being. Philip Phenix (1974) calls this the dimension of transcendence – the idea of the student going beyond any limitless state or realization. It is akin to infinitude – limitless exploration. The student, on this ideology, is committed to inquiry and getting beyond the boundaries so as to grow even more, in accord with Dewey's goal of growth (Dewey, 1916).

6. Critical-political ideology

The critical-political ideology attempts to lay bare and expose the underpinning values of the curriculum – it has taken on the brief formerly attempted by social reconstructionist thinkers that views schools as agencies of political and cultural renewal.

Critical ideology would carefully consider issues that underpin equality in the school, for example gender relations, or analyses of social class backgrounds that affect school performance.

Eisner suggests:

Critical theory provides one of the most visible and articulate analyses of education found in the pages of educational journals and in books devoted to the state of schools. It is for this reason – its salience in the intellectual community and its potential for reforming the current priorities of schools – that it is included here as an ideology affecting education in general and curriculum in particular.

(2002: 73)

This perspective gained currency with attacking some of the social inequalities that serve as a sort of “upside down core social curriculum” after the Second World War in both Britain and the USA. Problems of intergroup conflict, racism, anti-Semitism, environment, poverty, gender issues, led some to call for active roles for schools to help transform culture by teaching about equality and conflict resolution. At school level, the Schools Cultural Studies Project mentioned above promoted student understanding of controversial issues and attempted to advance processes of conflict resolution and values clarification. One direct result was the extension of “education for mutual understanding” to all other teachers in the United Kingdom. Critical ideology would seek to empower all who work in the school – teachers, administrators and students. Yet as Eisner notes they tend to emphasize the negative and not the positive – and their strident critiques probably do not have much impact on policy.

In conclusion it may well be that the best way to unearth and exhume the values of a school curriculum is through the direct exploration of the priority the curriculum gives to any or all of the above six curriculum ideologies.

Curriculum development

Political, economic, social, legal and technological change in cultures during this century have caused the curriculum to be modified, adapted and radically altered in educational institutions. These changes have affected the meaning of education. Curriculum development has been the means by which responsible groups have tried to deal with changing the educational

experiences students at school enjoy. Curriculum development is a systematic and critical process of realizing educational values as ideals and worthy images and transforming these into proposals for action in the form of programs of teaching and learning that will hypothetically be realized in reality. Such a view sets up the curriculum development work as a research enterprise inviting our inquiry. Our imagination is fueled by our environment, experiences and language. If we prefer to talk of “outcomes” rather than aims, of feedback rather than evidence, of products rather than learning, we shall become slaves to technical rationality. Johnson has adopted a technical view of curriculum development as the processes by which a set of objectives, or intended learning outcomes, are to be realized in the classroom. I would assert that the term curriculum development is a concept denoting deliberately planned activities involving the design of courses: their aims, content, methods and modes of evaluation and styles of organizing students in courses of study and patterns of educational experience as worthwhile proposals intending to educate students. To venture a definition I would proffer that curriculum development is the process of planning, implementing and evaluating courses of study, or patterns of educational activity, which have been offered as proposals for improvement.

Philosophical considerations and the role of values in the educational ideology proposed is of crucial importance to our understanding of curriculum and education. The conception of education entertained by planners, teachers and others is instrumental in how these courses are developed. Whatever the philosophy or ideological base, a curriculum involves a good deal of rigorous and systematic planning. Curriculum development rests on several assumptions. First, that the improvement of education and experience is possible and indeed justifiable. Accepting this means that current practices are not complete or perfect.

A second assumption is that individuals with an educational responsibility will have access to resources and other forms of support that will allow them to contribute to worthwhile endeavors in a positive direction. Third, that ongoing change in technology, culture and indeed even knowledge make curriculum development an imperative.

Teachers, parents, students and administrators are the partners in curriculum development for improved education. These partners need to establish quite clearly what purposes they have. This statement should not be confused with the technical specificity fostered by the objectives model approach, but rather involves a statement of aims: directions worthy of proceeding in.

These curriculum actors require significant support. Styles of supporting curriculum change vary widely from one culture to another. In Britain the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations was established in 1964 after an attempt by the then Ministry of Education (now the Department of Education and Science), a remarkable agency for making resources available for experimental programs. The purpose of the Schools Council was:

To undertake in England and Wales research and development work in curricula, teaching methods and examinations in schools, and in other ways to help teachers decide what to teach and how to teach it. In all its work it has regard to the general principle, expressed in its constitution, that each school should have the fullest possible measure of responsibility for its own curriculum and teaching methods based on the needs of its own pupils and evolved by its own staff.

(Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations, 1975: 7)

Such a statement is curiously similar to one made by Alfred North Whitehead in the introduction to his book *The Aims of Education*, published in 1929. Of course, today the Council is gone, and this sort of democratic thinking has been replaced by a National Curriculum. The role of central government has been stepped up and is certainly more powerful today in modern Britain than in the 1960s and 70s.

In American schools the degree of autonomy held by teachers in designing curriculum varies considerably from state to state, yet does not permit a totally free hand in the way that British teachers historically had before the advent of the Great Educational Reform Bill (GERBIL) and new National Curriculum of 1988 which eliminated much of that independent judgment and decision-making in curriculum concerns at the school level. Alas, the Schools Council has gone to the wall and the curriculum is now “telegraphed to the provinces.”

Curriculum development is a process; usually involving several steps or stages. Ideologically speaking I believe it is best undertaken by each school through working teams of participants in the spirit of practical deliberation. Schwab (1969) not only provided a model or practical approach to curriculum development but he gave a new language. One of the principal problems with curriculum is the antiseptic technical nature of curriculum theory at present. Perhaps the best statement of this idea is rendered by Whitehead in *The Aims of Education*, where he argued that each school needed to define and plan its own curriculum. Would this not be a reality in a true democracy? There are numerous starting points for curriculum development. For example:

- 1 The knowledge domain. Here we examine the epistemological issues connected with the discipline or subject we are developing. The working party draws upon all informed judgment and sources of knowledge and through a careful examination arrives at course aims or goals.
- 2 Identification of methods or strategies for teaching. Here we are concerned with the art of teaching the proposed curriculum. This is its pedagogy.
- 3 Creation of materials in the form of units. This is the action of structuring the knowledge and affective and skills components so that they have an internal logic.

- 4 Judging or evaluating the curriculum in practice. For example, student assessment through structured essay writing, subjective examinations and so on.
- 5 Informing the project team through feedback and further deliberation and reflection on the curriculum in action.

The above criteria imply no one particular starting point, as is the case with identifying specific objectives. It has been my experience that teachers do not think of objectives first and when asked to they have great difficulty in doing this. Rather they think of content in the form of unit themes, topics and material they would include. The curriculum, like education in general, is a rational and purposeful activity. However, the purposes, or virtues, of curriculum vary with philosophers and ideologies. For Aristotle, the aim of education is to allow the student to both like and dislike what he or she ought.

Imagination

The concept of *imagination* is crucial to the purposes of education. It “is the faculty by means of which one is able to envisage things as they are not” (Warnock, 1973: 113). What this suggests is that experience encapsulates more than we can see or predict. Lawrence Stenhouse once remarked that “education as induction into knowledge is successful to the extent that it makes the behavioral outcomes of the student unpredictable” (1975: 82). Stenhouse has grasped an important nettle of curriculum theory here. What he argued for is that the educated mind does not simply arrive at pre-determined outcomes but rather at unpredicted outcomes because it uses knowledge to construct unique meaning. This is the challenge of education and the human imagination. It is a constructivist operation.

The acquisition of new vistas requires a reflective imagination and mind. Maxine Greene has taken the position that the arts are the most likely content areas for releasing the imagination and capacity and give it play. There must be authentic and wonderful engagement of aesthetic experience for the imagination to have play. Maria Montessori recognized this with her theory of education based on storytelling, which ignites the curiosity and imagination of the pupil. Art strikes us as being more than simply objects, as Jean Paul Sartre suggested:

The work is never limited to the painted, sculpted or narrated object. Just as one perceives things only against the background of the world, so the objects represented by art appear against The background of the universe (T)he creative act aims at a total renewal of the world. Each painting, each book, is a recovery of the totality of being. Each of them presents this totality to the freedom of the spectator. For this is quite

the final goal of art: to recover this world by giving it to be seen as it is, but as if it had its source in human freedom.

(1949: 57)

Sartre thus sees many ways in which students having encounters through curriculum in the arts can use imagination to renew and extend their experience and knowledge. All too often, however, the arts and the curriculum are conceived as a repository or urn of the banking notion of curriculum in a postindustrial society serving the needs of technology. The alternative view is to allow young students to find their own values and voices. A few theorists have developed this existential idea of curriculum. William Pinar (1975; Pinar *et al.*, 1995) writes of the personal nature of curriculum. While the curriculum may be experienced as a private personal encounter, Pinar does not believe that curriculum can be planned for others. This is not a helpful principle when curricula are indeed planned for all pupils.

What is stated here is that curriculum study and planning is as much for the teacher as it is for those with a responsibility for planning at a local educational authority, district, state or national level. The creation of teaching and learning units broken down into daily lessons is at the base of sound curriculum planning. A curriculum is not the equivalent of a syllabus which is a mere list of topics, which has perhaps led to the view of curriculum as “content” to be covered. There are at least three aspects to curriculum:

- 1 The *intentions* – these are the aims, purposes, values and direction in which it is believed education should be progressed.
- 2 The *transactions* or encounters that happen while curriculum is being implemented. The “lived” or actual curriculum.
- 3 The *effects* of curriculum – the results of what transpires because of the teaching and learning.

Types of curriculum

- 1 *Formal curriculum*. The planned academic courses of study offered by the institution. The content, goals and arrangements formalized for learning.
- 2 *Informal curriculum*. The “extracurricular activities” which are organized around the formal curriculum such as societies, sports clubs, games.
- 3 *Null curriculum*. This is the curriculum that schools do not teach but that is perhaps equally as important as the formal curriculum. Eisner (2002: 97) argues that one important dimension is the intellectual processes that schools emphasize and then neglect their implementation and another is the subject matter that is absent in formal curriculum.
- 4 *Actual curriculum*. This is the curriculum that is actually implemented

and transacted and which may not have fidelity with the formal plan for curriculum.

- 5 *Hidden curriculum.* The curriculum that is latent or covert but present in school culture. Kids learn lots of things the school doesn't plan for, for example how to cheat; it also embodies key values, for example in a religious private school where the unwritten rule is that "silence is golden." The hidden curriculum is mediated through implication rather than direct teaching and is embedded in the culture of the school. It strikes me as interesting that some of the things I recall best from my early school days had nought to do with formal or informal curriculum but with the hidden curriculum. For example "Where do pupils congregate and why?" "Who holds the keys?" "What access exists to Principal and Teachers?" "Who has control of finances?"

Conclusion

There exist competing and conflicting ideas of planning the curriculum alongside competing ideologies. It is not the purpose of this work to say what the substantive content curriculum should be for all pupils – that is a task for each school and community to decide. The point of this work is to propose a model for curriculum that focuses on the educational process and in-built principles of procedure that can bring education about, helped by a teacher being careful of implementing a teaching strategy that has fidelity with these principles of procedure monitored through an action research brief. The process-inquiry model for curriculum design can be used both with disciplines such as mathematics, music and philosophy (forms of knowledge) and with subjects and interdisciplinary modules (fields of knowledge, e.g. geography, engineering, social studies).