Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues

SEVENTH EDITION

Allan C. Ornstein • Francis P. Hunkins

Seventh Edition

Global Edition

CURRICULUM

FOUNDATIONS, PRINCIPLES, AND ISSUES

Allan C. Ornstein

St. John's University

Francis P. Hunkins

University of Washington, Emeritus

Pearson

Credits and acknowledgments borrowed from other sources and reproduced, with permission, in this textbook appear on appropriate page within text.

Every effort has been made to provide accurate and current Internet information in this book. However, the Internet and information posted on it are constantly changing, so it is inevitable that some of the Internet addresses listed in this textbook will change.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Allan C. Ornstein is a professor of education at St. John's University. He is a former Fulbright-Hayes Scholar and has been a consultant for more than 60 different government and education agencies, including the American Federation of Teachers, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Educational Testing Service. Dr. Ornstein has published more than 400 articles and 55 books, recently including *Contemporary Issues in Curriculum*, Sixth Edition.

Francis P. Hunkins was a professor of education specializing in general curriculum, curriculum development, curriculum issues, and curriculum theory in the College of Education at the University of Washington for 35 years. Since retiring, Dr. Hunkins has remained active in writing educational textbooks. As a past president, he also remains active in the American Association for Teaching and Curriculum.

During his tenure at the University of Washington, Dr. Hunkins served as chairperson of the area of curriculum and instruction (1995–2000). He also consulted widely with school systems around the country. He twice was a visiting scholar at Monash University in Australia and was also a visiting scholar at the Hong Kong Institute of Education in 1999.

Over his career, he has written 21 educational textbooks and numerous articles for educational journals. He makes his home with his wife, Dr. Patricia A. Hammill, in the Seattle area.

PREFACE

Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues, Seventh Edition, is a book for researchers, theoreticians, and practitioners of curriculum. It is a basic text for those studying curriculum planning, development, implementation, and evaluation, as well as a reference for teachers, supervisors, and administrators who participate in curriculum making.

The book is a comprehensive and thoroughly documented overview of the foundations, principles, and issues of curriculum. *Foundations* are the areas of study outside curriculum that have an impact on the field; *principles* are the means and methods used in reflecting about the totality of curriculum and in designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum; *issues* are the current and evolving educational, political, and social dynamics that influence the curriculum field.

NEW TO THIS EDITION

The seventh edition has been thoroughly updated to address every aspect of curriculum foundations, principles, and issues. All chapters have been revised to reflect the latest scholarship and thinking regarding curriculum, writ large.

The following provide the specifics enacted in this new edition:

- All chapters begin with a listing of specific Learning Outcomes to guide students' reading.
- All chapters conclude with discussion questions designed to engage students in dialogue concerning the content.
- Several reference videos, corresponding to the presented subject matter (such as career and technical education (CTE) and digital literacy), supplement the contents of each chapter, and can be accessed by entering the YouTube URL provided.
- Updated information is provided on the Common Core (Chapter 2), accountability (Chapter 2), and universal pre-K (Chapter 5), which are some of the most significant reform initiatives.
- The importance of digital literacy and global skills in a 21st century curriculum, as well as the impact of technology (e.g., social media) on students' cognitive development.
- Updates to discussion on major learning theories and principles (Chapter 4).
- New content on executive function, social and emotional intelligences and learning, and non-cognitive skills (like grit and perseverance) as critical components of curricula (Chapter 4).
- New content on social foundations that provides bases for helping educators formulate excellent curricula (Chapter 5).
- Discussion on income inequality—a "defining" issue currently impacting schools and their curricula and challenging educators to formulate more equal opportunities for students (Chapter 5).
- Major discussions and reports on international achievement tests (including PISA, TIMSS, PIAAC, and PIRLS) as well as an emphasis on global issues and approaches to education in general and curriculum in particular (Chapters 5, 9, and 10).
- A new section on curriculum design theoretical frameworks: modern-influenced designs (constructivist perspective) and postmodernism-influenced designs (postconstructivist perspective) (Chapter 6).
- New discussion relating the technical-scientific approach to its modernist perspective (Chapter 7).
- New discussion relating the nontechnical-nonscientific approach to its postmodernist, postconstructivist perspective (Chapter 7).

- Updated material relating modernist approaches to curriculum implementation (Chapter 8).
- New information included on postmodernist approaches to curriculum implementation (Chapter 8).
- Expanded treatment of modernist and postmodernist approaches to curriculum evaluation (Chapter 9).
- Updated information on high-stakes testing (Chapters 9, 10).
- Expanded discussion on five nations in the international community (Chapters 5, 10).

OVERVIEW OF THE TEXT

The book consists of a one-chapter introduction to the field plus three major parts. Part I, "Foundations of Curriculum," has four chapters: one each on the curriculum's philosophical, historical, psychological, and social foundations. Part II, "Principles of Curriculum," is composed of chapters on curriculum design, development, implementation, and evaluation. Part III, "Curriculum Issues and the World Scene," consists of one chapter, "International Scenes in Education."

This book differs from other curriculum texts in several ways. Most texts focus on either theory or practice. Some texts advance a particular political or social position. Others approach the field of curriculum as an administrative challenge. This text provides a balanced and comprehensive view of the field of curriculum. We have avoided taking a particular philosophical, educational, political, or social stance. Instead, we have aimed at providing a complete view of the field of curriculum so that readers can consider choices and formulate their own views on curriculum foundations, principles, and issues. In short, we have supplied a mix of materials to help researchers and practitioners develop their own interpretations of the field—past, present, and future.

This seventh edition provides the following instructional and learning tools: Learning Outcomes for each chapter, Curriculum Tips, Overview Tables, and Discussion Questions to conclude each chapter. Learning Outcomes furnish the reader with what is minimally expected of him or her. The Curriculum Tips give practical meaning to the research and insights into the curriculum process. The Overview Tables enhance more meaningful learning and provide recaps of the major concepts and principles in the chapter. Discussion Questions challenge the reader to engage fellow students in reviews of the chapter content and to expand their grasp of the chapter's information.

Additionally and hopefully, the reader in engaging the content of this text will be stirred emotionally to relish the curricular challenges known and emergent in the 21st century. Ideally, the reader will recognize and accept the role of curricularist.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

GLOBAL EDITION ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BRIEF CONTENTS

CONTENTS

CURRICULUM TIPS

VIDEOS FOR REFERENCE

This page intentionally left blank

The Field of Curriculum

1

LEARNING OUTCOMES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to

1. Identify and differentiate the six curriculum approaches, and discuss which approach(es) educators tend to adopt
2. Define curriculum and articulate the challenges in defining it
3. Identify the commonly accepted foundations of curriculum
4. Explain why curriculum development, curriculum design, and planned/unplanned curriculum are crucial curriculum knowledge domains
5. Discuss the challenges involved in translating curriculum theory into practice
6. Explain the roles that students, teachers, and principals may play in shaping curriculum

Curriculum as a field of study has been characterized as elusive, fragmentary, and confusing. Certainly, the field can be all that at times, but curriculum as a field of study is crucial to the health of schools and society. Whether we consider curriculum narrowly, as subjects taught in schools, or broadly, as experiences that individuals require for full participation in society, there is no denying that curriculum affects educators, students, and other members of society.

Given the plethora of books, articles, and treatises on curriculum, many people in the field feel frustrated with the continuing confusion. However, the field of curriculum is intended not to provide precise answers, but to increase our understanding of its complexities. Curriculum results from social activity. It is designed for both present and emerging purposes. Curriculum is a dynamic field.[1]

Analyzing the concept of curriculum in a broad context illuminates what we mean by curriculum, what it involves, and who is involved in and served by the curriculum. We thus look at curriculum in terms of approach (an orientation or perspective) and definition. We also consider the relationships and differences among curriculum's foundations and domains, its theory and practice, and the roles of participants in the field of curriculum.

■ CURRICULUM APPROACHES

Our approach to curriculum reflects our perceptions, values, and knowledge. A curriculum approach reflects a *holistic* position, or a *metaorientation,* encompassing curriculum's foundations (a person's philosophy, view of history, view of psychology and learning theory, and view of social issues), curriculum domains (common, important knowledge within the field), and curricular theory and practice. An approach expresses a viewpoint about curriculum's development and design; the role of the learner, teacher, and curriculum specialist in planning curriculum; the curriculum's goals; and the important issues that must be examined.

A curriculum approach reflects our views of schools and society. By understanding our curriculum approach and that of our school or school district, it is possible to conclude whether our professional view conflicts with the formal organizational view.

Although schools, over time, tend to commit to a particular curriculum approach, many educators are not strongly committed to one approach. Rather, they emphasize one approach in some situations and advocate other approaches in other situations. Curriculum textbook writers sometimes adhere to more than one curriculum approach. Curriculum specialists, even curriculum students, must examine their approaches.

Curriculum approaches can be viewed from a technical/scientific or nontechnical/nonscientific perspective. Technical/scientific approaches coincide with traditional theories and models of education and reflect established, formal methods of schooling. Nontechnical/nonscientific approaches evolved as part of avant-garde and experimental philosophies and politics; they tend to challenge established, formalized education practices and be more fluid and emergent.

The remainder of this section outlines six curriculum approaches. The first three may be classified as technical or scientific and the last two as nontechnical and/or nonscientific.

Behavioral Approach

Rooted in the University of Chicago school (from Franklin Bobbitt and W. W. Charters to Ralph Tyler and Hilda Taba), the behavioral approach is the oldest and still the dominant approach to curriculum.[2] Logical and prescriptive, it relies on technical and scientific principles and includes paradigms, models, and step-by-step strategies for formulating curriculum. This approach is usually based on a plan, sometimes called a *blueprint* or *document*. Goals and objectives are specified, content and activities are sequenced to coincide with the objectives, and learning outcomes are evaluated in relation to the goals and objectives. This curriculum approach, which has been applied to all subjects since the early 1920s, constitutes a frame of reference against which other approaches to curriculum are compared. The approach has also been called logical, conceptual-empiricist, experientialist, rational-scientific, and technocratic.[3]

The behavioral approach started with the idea of efficiency, influenced by business and industry, and the scientific management theories of Frederick Taylor, who analyzed factory efficiency in terms of time-and-motion studies and concluded that each worker should be paid on the basis of his or her individual output, as measured by the number of units produced in a specified period of time. Efficient operation of schools became a major goal in the 1920s. (Some critics have termed Taylor's approach "machine theory.")

Ensuring efficiency in schools often meant eliminating small classes, increasing student-teacher ratios, hiring fewer administrators, reducing teacher salaries, maintaining or reducing operational costs, and so on, and then preparing charts and graphs to show the resultant cost reductions. Raymond Callahan later branded this approach the "cult of efficiency."[4] The goal was to reduce teaching and learning to precise behaviors with corresponding measurable activities.

Bobbitt set out to organize a course of studies for the elementary grades: "We need principles of curriculum making. We did not know that we should first determine objectives from a study of social needs. . . . We had not learned that [plans] are means, not ends."[5] He developed his approach in the early 1920s in *How to Make a Curriculum,* in which he outlined more than

800 objectives and related activities to coincide with predetermined student needs. These activities ranged from teeth and eye care, to keeping home appliances in good condition, to spelling and grammar.[6] Bobbitt's methods were sophisticated for his day; however, taken out of context, his machine analogy and his list of hundreds of objectives and activities were easy to criticize.

It was left to Tyler, who took a number of Bobbitt's courses at the University of Chicago, to recognize the need for behavioral objectives that were not so small or lockstep. He combined basic techniques of curriculum, instruction, and evaluation into a simple plan. Tyler advocated using a school's (or school district's) philosophy "in making decisions about objectives." Tyler's approach combined behaviorism (objectives were important) with progressivism (the learner's needs were emphasized). Tyler was influenced by Edward Thorndike, John Dewey, and the "scientific movement of curriculum [making] during the . . . thirty years" prior to his classic text.[7]

Today, few educational behaviorists continue the tradition of Ivan Pavlov's and John Watson's stimulus-response (S-R) theories, but many formulate precise objectives and evaluate programs according to those objectives, urging accountability plans, outcome-based education, and standards-based education. Many still rely on direct instruction, practice and drill, monitoring students, and prompt feedback. Behaviorism has evolved over the years to address the complexities of human learning; it now allows for research that investigates the mind's depths.[8] Most behaviorist educators now perceive learners as cognitive individuals functioning within a social context. Individual students experience and respond to the same curriculum in different ways, depending on their cultural interpretations and prior life activities. The behavioral approach to curriculum, with its dependency on technical means of selecting and organizing curricula, is likely to continue to serve us well in the future.

Managerial Approach

Reminiscent of organizational theory, the managerial approach considers the school as a social system in which students, teachers, curriculum specialists, and administrators interact. Educators who rely on this approach plan the curriculum in terms of programs, schedules, space, resources and equipment, and personnel. This approach advocates selecting, organizing, communicating with, and supervising people involved in curriculum decisions. Consideration is given to committee and group processes, human relations, leadership styles and methods, and decision making.[9]

An offshoot of the behavioral approach, the managerial approach also relies on a plan, rational principles, and logical steps. It tends to focus on curriculum's supervisory and administrative aspects, especially the organizational and implementation process (see Curriculum Tips 1.1).

Advocates of the managerial approach are interested in innovation and in how curriculum specialists, supervisors, and administrators can facilitate change. The curriculum specialist or supervisor (sometimes the same person) is considered a practitioner, not a theorist—a change agent, resource person, and facilitator. This person reports to an administrator and adheres to the school's mission and goals. The school may resist or support change.[10] If the school is innovative or reform minded, then the school culture tends to create and sustain a culture for change. If the school emphasizes the "three *R*'s" (reading, writing, and arithmetic), the curriculum specialist introduces plans accordingly. Managers communicate a desire for change or stability to subordinates (teachers).

The managerial approach is rooted in the organizational and administrative school models of the early 1900s, a period that combined a host of innovative plans involving curriculum and instruction that centered on individualization, departmentalization, nongrading, classroom grouping, and homeroom and work-study activities. It was an era when superintendents introduced school district plans to modify schools' horizontal and vertical organization. The plans' names usually reflected the school district's name or organizational concept, as in Batavia (New York) Plan, Denver Plan, Portland Plan, Platoon Plan, and Study Hall Plan. Superintendents and associate superintendents were involved in curriculum leadership, often developing a plan in one school district and also implementing it in another. Many administrators combined managerial and curriculum leadership skills.[11]

CURRICULUM TIPS 1.1   The Role of the Curriculum Supervisor

Regardless of the curriculum approach, a curriculum supervisor or specialist performs certain roles and many important tasks within the school or school district, such as the following:

1. Help develop the school's or community's *educational goals*
2. *Plan curriculum* with students, parents, teachers, and support personnel
3. Coordinate or evaluate a *survey of student needs*
4. *Design programs* of study by grade level and/or subject
5. *Plan* or *schedule classes;* plan the school calendar
6. Develop or help staff to write *behavioral objectives* for subject areas
7. Prepare *curriculum guides* or *teacher guides* by grade level or subject area
8. Formulate or revise *resource units* and *unit plans*
9. Help select and evaluate *textbooks*
10. Organize, select, or order instructional *materials* and *media*
11. Serve as a *resource agent* for teachers
12. *Observe teachers* and hold pre- and post-observation conferences
13. Help teachers *implement curriculum* in the classroom
14. Help redefine or *improve content*
15. Work with staff in *writing grants*
16. Encourage curriculum *innovation;* serve as a change agent
17. *Conduct curriculum research* and/or work with curriculum consultants within the school
18. Develop standards for curriculum and instructional *evaluation*
19. Coordinate or plan *staff development* programs
20. *Work with supervisors,* subject chairs, resource personnel, testing and technology specialists, and teachers within the school (and school district)

The managerial approach became the dominant curriculum approach in the 1950s and 1960s. During this period, principals were seen as curriculum leaders, instructional leaders, and managers. Midwest school administrators and professors with administrative backgrounds dominated the field of curriculum in setting policies and priorities, establishing the direction of change, planning and organizing curriculum, and carrying out its instruction.

These administrators were politically active. They used supervisory and curriculum associations and their respective journals and yearbooks as platforms for their ideas. Many, such as William Alexander, Robert Anderson, Leslee Bishop, Gerald Firth, Arthur Lewis, John McNeil, and J. Lloyd Trump, became curriculum professors at major universities; others became active as board directors and executive committee members of professional organizations that had major impact on curriculum, supervision, and administration. Many published curriculum books that expressed their managerial views.[12]

These school administrators were less concerned about content than about organization and implementation. They were less concerned about subject matter, methods, and materials than about improving curriculum in light of policies, plans, and people on a systemwide basis. They envisioned curriculum changes as they administered resources and restructured schools.

Many of today's ideas about school reform and restructuring derive from the 1950s and 1960s: A current emphasis on standards and high-stakes testing reflects an earlier emphasis on state control of schools. Many current plans related to school-based management and empowerment are based on the previous era's career ladder, team teaching, and differential staffing models. Much of the new legislative and administrative support for improving curriculum and instruction is based on the changing roles of the superintendent and principal as curriculum and instructional leaders that blossomed during the 1950s and 1960s.

Systems Approach

A managerial view that emphasizes organizing people and policies led to an emphasis on organizing curriculum into a system. The organization's units and subunits are viewed in relation to the whole. The curriculum plan often entails organizational diagrams, flow charts, and committee structures. Sometimes referred to as *curriculum engineering,* the approach includes the processes by which *engineers,* such as superintendents, directors, coordinators, and principals, plan the curriculum, the curriculum's *stages* (development, design, implementation, and evaluation), and the curriculum's *structures* (subjects, courses, unit plans, and lesson plans).

Systems theory, systems analysis, and systems engineering influenced the systems approach to curriculum. School managers widely employ concepts developed by social scientists when they discuss administrative and organizational theory. The military, business, and industry use the systems approach to ensure that people master the tasks they must perform.[13]

In the systems approach to curriculum, the parts of the school or school district are examined in terms of their interrelatedness. Departments, personnel, equipment, and schedules are planned to change people's behavior. Information is usually communicated to administrators, who then consider choices.

A school district's organizational chart represents a systems approach, showing line-staff relationships of personnel and how decisions regarding special areas (i.e., curriculum, instruction, testing and evaluation, personnel, and budgeting) are made. In large school districts (50,000 or more students), teachers, supervisors, and principals at the school or local level often seem distant from top administration at the school district or central level. In small school districts, the central office is less bureaucratic (and less distant from the local level) because there are fewer layers. Two educators have written, "The organizational hierarchy of larger school districts [is] cumbersome, and those with 100,000 or more students (0.01 percent of all school districts) often have charts extending off the page. Most readers would have difficulty understanding [or following] these charts, not because they are unknowledgeable," but because of the complex systems and hierarchical arrangements of large (city or county) school districts.[14]

RAND Corporation developed one application of the systems approach that has rapidly spread from government to business agencies. Called the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS), it integrates planning, programming, and budgeting into the system's structure, functions, and capabilities. In our case, the system is curriculum.

Currently, many schools use a systems approach, known as *total quality management* (TQM), based on Ed Deming's 14 points for improving the system in which people work. This approach, also drawn from industry, represents a paradigm shift emphasizing client priority (in our case, students), extensive data collection and analysis, self-monitoring and inspection, collaboration, communication, cooperation, and team responsibility.[15]

When applying TQM to curriculum development and implementation, participants realize that their function depends on acquiring and applying what is called *profound knowledge.* Such knowledge is based on four components: systematic thinking, theory of variation, theory of knowledge, and knowledge of psychology. *Systematic thinking* enables people to realize that their actions interact with others' actions and that the total organization entails the dynamic interaction of many subprocesses. The *theory of variation* recognizes that curriculum activity entails common and special causes and effects. A school is a community in which people exhibit individual differences. They must learn to communicate, cooperate, respect others' opinions, and reach a consensus. According to the *theory of knowledge,* the knowledge possessed by the people within the system is essential to curricular success. The *knowledge of psychology* supports TQM by optimizing the participation and learning of students and teachers. To use this approach successfully, individuals must understand, respect, and care for one another.

George Beauchamp described the first systems theory of curriculum. He postulated five equally important components of education: (1) administration, (2) counseling, (3) curriculum, (4) instruction, and (5) evaluation.[16] Many professors of education (outside of curriculum) do

not accept this notion of equal components; they view their own field as most important. For example, school administrators often delegate supervisors to take care of curriculum matters, especially if the administrators view their leadership role as chiefly managerial. Curriculum specialists usually view curriculum as the major component and see related fields such as teaching, instruction, and supervision as subsystems that help implement the curriculum.[17] However, Beauchamp was trying to convey that the five components of education draw their ideas from psychology, sociology, history, philosophy, and so on. In any event, practitioners should use whichever procedures are most helpful and applicable to the real world.

Curriculum specialists who value the systems approach view curriculum broadly and are concerned with curriculum issues relevant to the entire school or school system, not just particular subjects or grades. They are concerned with theory in which the curriculum is related across different programs and content areas, the extent to which the curriculum reflects the school's (or school system's) organization, the participants' needs and training, and various methods for monitoring and evaluating results. Long-term planning is fused with short-term, or incidental, planning.

Academic Approach

Sometimes referred to as the *traditional, encyclopedic, synoptic, intellectual,* or *knowledge-oriented approach,* the academic approach attempts to analyze and synthesize major positions, trends, and concepts of curriculum. This approach tends to be historical or philosophical and, to a lesser extent, social or practical. The discussion of curriculum development is usually scholarly, theoretical, and concerned with many broad aspects of schooling, including the study of education.

This approach is rooted in the works of John Dewey, Henry Morrison, and Boyd Bode,[18] and it became popular during the 1930s and carried through the 1950s. The influx of new topics related to curriculum during this period expanded the field to include many trends and issues and led to the integration of various instructional, teaching, learning, guidance, evaluation, supervision, and administrative procedures.

After the 1950s, interest in curriculum centered on the structure of disciplines and qualitative methods. The academic approach lost some of its glamour. The texts that continued to reflect this approach in the second half of the 20th century (such as those by William Schubert, Daniel and Laurel Tanner, and Robert Zais)[19] tended to overwhelm the beginning curriculum student, who usually lacked sufficient background knowledge. This "fear of knowledge" or cultural resistance among students in general has led to an overemphasis on the learner as an individual who needs to be validated rather than as a social being.[20] Students lose the privileges that knowledge affords. Curriculum, according to a recent curriculum theorist, should therefore start not from the student as learner, but from his or her entitlement, or access, to knowledge.[21]

The academic approach has partly returned in the current focus on the nature and structure of knowledge as current curricularists address curriculum from a postmodern academic perspective. Attention is now on understanding how knowledge can be constructed, deconstructed, and then reconstructed. As William Pinar noted, academics and schools must strive to comprehend the field of curriculum.[22] However, it is doubtful that the academic approach will become popular among practitioners.

The academic approach to curriculum addresses much more than subject matter and pedagogy. Academics cover numerous foundational topics (usually historical, philosophical, social, and political), thus presenting an overview of curriculum. They consider areas of study not usually included in curriculum deliberation and action, such as religion, psychotherapy, literary criticism, and linguistics. To many educators, such fields seem very foreign at first. However, educators are beginning to realize the need to perceive curriculum as diverse discourse. Everyone involved in the academic approach to curriculum is in the "business" of words and ideas.[23]

Humanistic Approach

Some curriculum leaders contend that the preceding approaches are too technocratic and rigid. They contend that curricularists who try to be scientific and rational miss the personal and social aspects of curriculum and instruction; ignore subject matter's artistic, physical, and cultural aspects; rarely consider the need for self-reflectiveness and self-actualization among learners; and overlook the sociopsychological dynamics of classrooms and schools. This view is rooted in progressive philosophy and the child-centered movement of the early 1900s (first spearheaded at the University of Chicago, when Dewey, Charles Judd, and Francis Parker developed progressive teaching methods based on the student's natural development and curiosity).[24]

In the 1920s and 1930s, the progressive movement moved east and was dominated by Teachers College, Columbia University, and by such professors as Boyd Bode, Frederick Bosner, Hollis Caswell, L. Thomas Hopkins, William Kilpatrick, Harold Rugg, and John Dewey (who was by then at Columbia).[25] This approach gained further impetus in the 1940s and 1950s with the growth of child psychology and humanistic psychology (which deals with valuing, ego identity, psychological health, freedom to learn, and personal fulfillment).

Mainly at the elementary school level, curriculum activities emerged from this approach, including lessons based on life experiences, group games, group projects, artistic endeavors, dramatizations, field trips, social enterprises, learning and interest centers, and homework and tutoring stations (or corners). These activities include creative problem solving and active student participation. They emphasize socialization and life adjustment for students, as well as stronger family ties and school–community ties. They are representative of Parker, Dewey, Kilpatrick, and Carleton Washburne's ideal school and the kinds of curriculum activities they put into practice. Such activities are still practiced in the Parker School in Chicago; Dewey's lab school at the University of Chicago; Washburne's school district in Winnetka, Illinois; Kilpatrick's Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University; many other private and university lab schools; and some recent charter schools.

Various developmental theories (e.g., those of Frederick Erikson, Robert Havighurst, and Abraham Maslow) and child-centered methods (e.g., those of Friedrich Froebel, Johann Pestalozzi, and A. S. Neill) for curriculum derive from the humanistic approach, which considers informal as well as formal curricula. This approach considers the whole child, not only the cognitive dimension. The arts, the humanities, and health education are just as important as science and math.

Curriculum specialists who believe in this approach tend to put faith in cooperative learning, independent learning, small-group learning, and social activities, as opposed to competitive, teacher-dominated, large-group learning. Each child has considerable input into the curriculum and shares responsibility with parents, teachers, and curriculum specialists in planning classroom instruction. In schools that adopt this approach, curriculum leaders and supervisors tend to permit teachers more input into curriculum decisions, and the ideas of professional collegiality and mentor systems are more pronounced. Curriculum committees are *bottom-up* instead of *top-down,* and students often are invited into curriculum meetings to express their views.[26]

The humanistic approach became popular again in the 1970s as relevancy, radical school reform, open education, and alternative education became part of education's reform movement. Today, however, demands for educational excellence and academic productivity have resulted in an emphasis on cognition, not humanism, and on subjects such as science and math, rather than art and music. Nonetheless, the humanistic approach may be gaining adherents as more people come to realize the interdependence of cognition and affect,[27] specifically noncognitive and social-emotional skills like focus, grit, and understanding others.[28] Nel Noddings believes any 21st century curriculum approach must integrate the three great domains of human life: home and personal life; occupational life; and civic life.[29] They extend her theory of caring in education from the 1980s. To be sure, the student's self-concept, self-esteem, and personal identity are essential factors in learning, which involves social and moral, not just cognitive, aspects.

Postmodern Approach

To some curriculum scholars, the postmodern, or reconceptualist, approach to curriculum largely extends the humanistic approach. Others argue that postmodernism is concerned chiefly with change and reform. Still others argue that reconceptualists lack an approach because they lack a model for developing and designing curriculum.

Postmodern curriculum theorists focus on education's larger ideological issues. They investigate and influence society's social, economic, and political institutions. Postmodernists are more interested in theory than practical applications. Pinar has gone so far as to state that the era of curriculum development has passed.[30] Pinar's viewpoint would be considered impractical by a practitioner who has to deal with the selection and organization of content. However, Pinar is addressing not practitioners, but other theorists—an example of the divide that exists between theorists and practitioners.

Some curricularists who associate with the postmodernists' camp contend that there is no one precise, certain way to create curricula; curriculum development is more like a communal conversation.[31] Curriculum development is not a closed system, but remains open.

Postmodernists are interested in curricula's interactions with political, economic, social, moral, and artistic forces.[32] They see the school as an extension of society and students as capable of changing society. Many postmodernists see current curricula as overly controlling and designed to preserve the existing social order and its inequalities.

Postmodernists have brought greater diversity to curricular dialogue. Postmodernism is rooted in the philosophy and social activism of such early reconstructionists as George Counts, Harold Rugg, and Harold Benjamin.[33] Today's postmodern thinkers, however, are more likely to speak in terms of inequality, discrimination, and oppression. Henry Giroux, for example, believes America's youth has been systematically undermined by authoritarian and morally malicious policies and actions of a government beholden to corporate, religious, and military interests.[34] Only through a new pedagogy and a from-the-ground-up approach can a genuine democracy be restored. Peter McLaren makes a similar point in *Life in Schools,* arguing that low-income and minority students are "silenced" in school and socially, politically, and economically dominated and victimized as adults.[35] For the greater part, teachers assume an oppressor's role, as they represent the dominant group. Hence, they often prevent their students from becoming fully human by teaching them to conform and be docile in school. Class and caste continue to influence the norms of school and society.

■ DEFINITION OF CURRICULUM

What is curriculum? What is its purpose? How does it affect students and teachers? By and large, the way we define curriculum reflects our approach to it. We can specify five basic definitions of curriculum.

First, curriculum can be defined as a *plan* for achieving goals. This position, popularized by Tyler and Taba, exemplifies a linear view of curriculum. The plan involves a sequence of steps. Today, most behavioral and some managerial and systems people agree with this definition. For example, J. Galen Saylor, William Alexander, and Arthur Lewis define curriculum as "a plan for providing sets of learning opportunities for persons to be educated."[36] David Pratt writes, "Curriculum is an organized set of formal education and/or training intentions."[37] Jon Wiles and Joseph Bondi view curriculum as a development process that (1) identifies a philosophy; (2) assesses student ability; (3) considers possible methods of instruction; (4) implements strategies; (5) selects assessment devices; and (6) is continually adjusted.[38]

Second, curriculum can be defined broadly as dealing with the learner's *experiences.* By this definition, almost anything planned in or outside of school is part of the curriculum. This definition is rooted in Dewey's definition of experience and education and in Hollis Caswell and Doak Campbell's view from the 1930s that curriculum is "all the experiences children have

under the guidance of teachers."[39] Humanistic curricularists and elementary school curricularists subscribe to this definition, which textbook writers have interpreted more broadly over the years. Elliot Eisner describes the curriculum as a "program" that a school "offers to its students," a "preplanned series of educational hurdles and an entire range of experiences a child has within the school."[40] Marsh and Willis view curriculum as all the "experiences in the classroom [that are] planned and enacted." However, they note a difference between what the school plans and what the teacher enacts.[41]

Third, curriculum can be defined as a *field of study* with its own foundations, knowledge domains, research, theory, principles, and specialists. Those who adopt this definition tend to discuss curriculum in theoretical rather than practical terms. They are concerned with broad historical, philosophical, or social issues. Academics often subscribe to this view of curriculum—for example, William Reid, Schubert, and the Tanners.[42]

Finally, curriculum can be defined in terms of *subject matter* (math, science, English, history, and so on) or content (the way we organize and assimilate information). We can also talk about subject matter or content in terms of *grade levels.* People who adopt this definition emphasize the facts and concepts of particular subject areas. Most U.S. school districts subscribe to this definition in light of the national focus on language arts and mathematics proficiency. Yet, university courses in elementary and secondary school curriculum rarely are subject specific (e.g., on math or biology curricula); they emphasize generic principles of curriculum that cut across and encompass most, if not all, subjects.

The Challenges of Definition

Definitional debates take time and energy, but they address important curriculum issues. The language of curricularists is neither philosophically nor politically neutral.[43] Variations in the way curriculum is defined provide needed scope and diversity. The more precise one's definition of curriculum and the more a person relies on a preconceived plan or document, the greater the tendency to omit or miss relevant (but hard to observe) sociopsychological factors related to teaching and learning. Ronald Doll points out, "Every school has a planned, formal acknowledged curriculum," but it also has "an unplanned, informal and hidden one" that must be considered.[44] The *planned,* formal curriculum focuses on goals, objectives, subject matter, and organization of instruction; the *unplanned,* informal curriculum deals with sociopsychological interaction among students and teachers, especially their feelings, attitudes, and behaviors. We must also realize the power of the *hidden* curriculum—the part of the curriculum that, while not written, will certainly be learned by students. If we define curriculum too narrowly, we overlook what Eisner has called the *null curriculum,* subject matter and experiences that are not taught.[45] Not everything that goes on in school can or should be discussed in terms of curriculum.

Other critics, such as Larry Cuban and Alfie Kohn, have argued that with the current emphasis on testing, the curriculum has become *narrow* and *bland.* Certain subjects, such as reading and math, are emphasized at the expense of subject matter that has moral, creative, and emotional value.[46] Teaching to the text seems to placate the public, especially if such actions lead to improvement of student test scores. The focus on facts for the purpose of testing is often at the expense of discussion topics and questions that ask, "Why?" and "What if?"

This narrowing of the curriculum, however, coincides with Taylor's machine theory and Bobbitt and Charters's school of scientific curriculum making. This guide to curriculum making was and is still advocated by educators who want to concentrate on precise objectives and subject matter and purposeful activities that correspond to the desired objectives and subject matter.

Background Issues for Defining the Field

Content or subject matter issues are relevant, too. Is it appropriate to talk about a social studies or math curriculum or about curriculum in general? Are there principles of curriculum that apply to all subjects, or principles that apply only to specific subjects? Should subject matter

be organized around separate disciplines or based on interdisciplinary and core approaches? To what extent is subject content a matter of student, professional, or parental choice? Should it be determined by the community, state, or nation? How should subjects be organized—around behavioral objectives, student activities, social or community values, future jobs? Which content should be graded? What portion of subject matter should be classified as general, specialized, or elective? What is the appropriate mix of required versus optional subjects? What is the appropriate stress on facts, concepts, and principles of subject matter? As Beauchamp writes, "The posture . . . one assumes with respect to the content of a curriculum inevitably will be of great influence upon . . . theory and planning."[47] Actually, that posture influences everything that follows, including developing, implementing, and evaluating the curriculum.

Other issues are related to people. Who are the major participants? To what extent should students, teachers, parents, and community members be involved in curriculum planning? Why are school administrators assuming greater roles in curriculum matters and curriculum specialists assuming fewer roles? What are the roles and responsibilities of researchers and practitioners in curriculum making? How do we improve their communication?

Fundamental Questions

Asking the right questions is crucial for addressing basic concerns in curriculum and for determining the basic concepts, principles, and research methods of the field. If we ask the wrong questions, the discussions that follow—and even the answers—are of little value. The danger in listing a host of fundamental questions, however, is that they tend to become translated as a set of principles or steps to be blindly followed. However, appropriate questions can be used as a base for raising issues and problems that curriculum specialists must address, whether they deal in theory, practice, or both.

The first list of fundamental questions was formulated by a famous 12-person committee on curriculum making, headed by Harold Rugg and organized in 1930 for the Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE). This group of curriculum specialists, perhaps the most prestigious ever convened to present a general system on the principles of curriculum making, started the second volume of the yearbook with 18 "fundamental questions" to serve as a basis for "viewing . . . the issues and problems of curriculum" for that era.[48] These questions centered on subject matter, learning, and the guiding objectives, activities, materials, and outcomes of the curriculum, as well as the role of school in American society.

A more recent set of questions was presented more than 50 years later and is shown in Table 1.1. These questions focus on the place and function of subject matter, the methods and materials for facilitating learning, the role of the curriculum specialist, and the relationship between curriculum, instruction, supervision, and government levels of curriculum making.

These fundamental questions help establish what Tyler called curriculum's "rationale," Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis later called its "purpose," and Schubert more recently called the "paradigm" that governs inquiry in the field of curriculum.[49] Curriculum specialists can delineate important theories, concepts, and methods in the field by asking, "What?" "Who?" and "How?"

■ FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM

Debate continues regarding curriculum's meaning, foundations, and knowledge domains. Current knowledge concerning curriculum is "ill-fitted and inappropriate to problems of actual teaching and learning," "widely scattered," and either "unknown or unread" by most who teach or practice curriculum.[50] Some people believe that the field lacks purpose and direction because it has extensively "adapted and borrowed subject matter from a number of [other] disciplines," including its major "principles, knowledge and skills."[51] This is basically the same criticism that Joseph Schwab made in 1969, when he complained that the field was "moribund [because] it has

Table 1.1	Fundamental Questions about Curriculum

1. How is curriculum defined?
2. What philosophies and theories are we communicating, intentionally or not, in our curriculum?
3. What social and political forces influence curriculum? Which ones are most pertinent? Which impose limitations?
4. How does learning take place? What learning activities will best meet our learners' needs? How can these activities best be organized?
5. What are the domains of curriculum knowledge? What types of curriculum knowledge are essential?
6. What are a curriculum's essential parts?
7. Why do changes in curriculum occur? How does change affect the curriculum?
8. What are the curriculum specialist's roles and responsibilities?
9. How is the curriculum best organized?
10. What are the roles and responsibilities of the teacher and student in organizing curriculum?
11. What are our aims and goals? How do we translate them into instructional objectives?
12. How do we define our educational needs? Whose needs? How do we prioritize these needs?
13. What subject matter is most worthwhile? What are the best forms of content? How do we organize them?
14. How do we measure or verify what we are trying to achieve? Who is accountable? For what and to whom?
15. What is the appropriate relationship between curriculum and instruction? Curriculum and supervision? Curriculum and evaluation?

Source: Allan C. Ornstein, "The Theory and Practice of Curriculum," *Kappa Delta Pi Record* (Fall 1987), p. 16. Used with permission.

adopted theories from outside the field of education."[52] However, the field's lack of unity also suggests flexibility and richness.

The foundations of curriculum set the external boundaries of the knowledge of curriculum and define what constitutes valid sources from which to derive the field's theories, principles, and ideas. Curriculum's commonly accepted foundations are philosophical, historical, psychological, and social—areas that will each be expanded upon in subsequent chapters. Two other areas, however, deserve equal attention in 21st century society, but have been largely ignored—*globalization* and *technology*.

Like the other four foundational disciplines, globalization and technology have a significant, yet distinct, influence over curriculum. Globalization has allowed people around the world to exchange goods, services, and ideas more easily, which significantly changes the way they live and work. It was a process Nobel Prize–winning journalist Thomas Friedman popularly foretold in his 2005 book, *The World Is Flat*. More recently, billionaire entrepreneur and PayPal cofounder Peter Thiel argued that many unchartered frontiers remain unexplored and that only by learning to think for oneself can one develop new ideas.[53] This kind of global perspective has already spurred growing demand for technology in classrooms—including massive open online courses (MOOC), the flipped classroom, digital literacy skills, online testing, and high-speed Internet access in classrooms. Curricularists, at some point, will need to acknowledge that globalization and technology are distinctly foundational to education.

1.1 The 21st Century Learner
Think about how you grew up learning. Did you mostly learn inside the classroom? Listen to lectures? Perhaps used websites to help write book reports? Watch this video on 21st century learning and discuss how it differs from the way you grew up.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0xa98cy-Rw

■ CURRICULUM DOMAINS

Whereas curriculum's foundations represent the field's *external* boundaries, curriculum's domains define the field's internal boundaries—the accepted knowledge *within* the field presented in published articles and books. Although curriculum specialists generally agree on the foundation areas, they often disagree on curriculum's knowledge domains. Many efforts have been made to determine these domains. However, much literature on the subject is largely unread,[54] and in other cases, it is considered diffuse and fragmentary.

The lack of consensus of the curriculum domains is illustrated by the experts themselves. Beauchamp divided curriculum knowledge into planning, implementation, and evaluation.[55] Fenwick English viewed curriculum in terms of ideological (philosophical-scientific), technical (design), and operational (managerial) issues.[56] Edmund Short listed curriculum's domains as policy making, development, evaluation, change, decision making, activities or fields of study, and forms and language of inquiry.[57]

Linda Behar established an empirical format for identifying *curriculum domains* (broad areas of knowledge based on the most influential curriculum textbooks over a 20-year period) and *curriculum practices* (precise activities teachers and curriculum specialists engage in while inquiring about planning or implementing the curriculum). As many as 49 curriculum practices were validated and then rated in importance by U.S. curriculum professors. These practices were grouped into nine curriculum domains: (1) curriculum philosophy, (2) curriculum theory, (3) curriculum research, (4) curriculum history, (5) curriculum development, (6) curriculum design, (7) curriculum evaluation, (8) curriculum policy, and (9) curriculum as a field of study.[58] The nine domains help establish recommended content for a curriculum text, because the domains outlined were based on assessing the most influential texts in the field over a 20-year period.

Allan Glatthorn and Jerry Jailall describe seven types of curriculum: (1) *recommended curriculum* delineated by scholars and professional organizations; (2) *written curriculum* that appears in state and school district documents; (3) *taught curriculum* that teachers attempt to implement; (4) *supported curriculum* that helps implement or deliver the curriculum resources such as textbooks and computers; (5) *assessed curriculum* that is tested and evaluated; (6) *learned curriculum,* what the students actually learn; and (7) *hidden curriculum,* unintended curriculum.[59] Traditionally, teachers have been most influenced by learned and assessed curriculum—making their curriculum decisions on the basis of students' needs and responses to the taught curriculum. Since 2000, the standards-education movement has resulted in school administrators becoming increasingly concerned with aligning the *written curriculum* (content) with the *assessed curriculum* (especially as assessed through high-stakes tests).

Despite this lack of consensus, however, it is important to establish a framework for conceptualizing the domains of curriculum—that is, the significant and indispensible curriculum knowledge necessary to conduct research and make theoretical and practical decisions about curriculum. The problem is that few curriculum writers can agree on the domains of curriculum knowledge; in some cases, no framework exists that connotes curriculum as a distinct enterprise with its own boundaries, internal structures, relations, and activities. We maintain that, of all the domains of curriculum knowledge, the *development* and *design* of the curriculum—what some observers refer to as the *theoretical aspects* and what others call the *technical aspects* of curriculum—are crucial for any text.

Curriculum Development

We maintain that, of all domains of curriculum knowledge, curriculum *development* and *design* (its theoretical or technical aspects) are most crucial in any curriculum text. Analyzing curriculum in terms of development is the traditional and most common approach to the field. The idea is to show how curriculum is planned, implemented, and evaluated as well as what people, processes, and procedures are involved in constructing the curriculum. Such development is usually examined in a logical step-by-step fashion, based on behavioral and managerial approaches to