THESIS

LIBRARIES
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
EAST LANSING, MICH. 48824

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

A FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING RECONCEPTUALISM
AND DERIVING ITS POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR
UNDERGRADUATE LIBERAL ARTS TEACHER EDUCATION

presented by

Robert Louis Mulder

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PH.D. degree in EDUCATION

Charles A Blackman
Major professor

Date 11/11/83

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

MSU

RETURNING MATERI
Place in
emo

Copyright by

ROBERT LOUIS MULDER

1983

133-1577

A FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING RECONCEPTUALISM AND DERIVING ITS POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE LIBERAL ARTS TEACHER EDUCATION

By

Robert Louis Mulder

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1983

ABSTRACT

A FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING RECONCEPTUALISM AND DERIVING ITS POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE LIBERAL ARTS TEACHER EDUCATION

By

Robert Louis Mulder

This study develops a framework for presenting and examining the work of two critical curriculum theorists known as reconceptualists. Selected works of William F. Pinar and Michael W. Apple are reviewed as examples of existential and structural emphases within reconceptualism. The main concepts and themes of Pinar and Apple are recast in the categories of the framework, as is their common perception of traditional modes of thinking about curriculum and schooling. The completed framework is then used to analyze structural and programmatic characteristics of typical undergraduate liberal arts teacher education programs, and suggestions are made regarding how liberal arts teacher educators might continue to use the framework, and reconceptualist insights, to examine their programs and direct them toward the promotion of social equity and justice in schools.

The framework is a matrix which displays Pinar's and Apple's theories, and their common perceptions of traditional theories of curriculum and schooling, in terms of the questions asked, the preferred location of answers, and the operative conceptions of curriculum, school in society, and value. Pinar is shown to be seeking

through a blending of neo-Marxist, phenomenological, and existential thought, to understand the nature of an individual's internal experiencing of schooling. Apple is shown to be seeking, through a primary reliance on neo-Marxist thought, to understand the nature of external social structures which act to shape an individual's experience of schooling. Both favor the use of intellectually rigorous analysis of curriculum and schooling, using historical, philosophical, and hermeneutic methodologies. Both are shown to view traditional curriculum theorizing and practice as embodying and valuing a reductionistic view of science, derived from positivism, which is directed to conserving extant social and cultural conditions and values, and which produces the latent consequences of dehumanizing students and reproducing an inequal and unjust society.

Selected structural and programmatic characteristics of preprofessional liberal arts teacher education programs, examined in terms of the categories and content of the framework, are shown to reproduce traditional thought and practice in teachers, and thereby in schools by extension. There appears to be little that is distinctively "liberal arts" in these programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my respect and appreciation to Dr. Samuel S. Corl III, and to Dr. Charles A. Blackman who succeeded him as my chairman and advisor. Both men intuitively understood and consciously promoted visions of curriculum and schooling which affirm human value as both ground and object of educational theory and practice. Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Benjamin Bohnhorst, Dr. George Ferree, and Dr. Willard Warrington for their counseling, advice, and support throughout the development and execution of this thesis.

To my colleagues and others unnamed, who may have understood me better than I do, and yet whose significant support and accommodation in separate and distinct ways is perhaps better known to me than to them, I offer my sincere gratitude.

Finally, I humbly say thank you to my wife, Karen J. Mulder, and to my children Mark, Curtis, and Kate Mulder, who in constant loving and supportive manners provided the motivation and opportunity to complete this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vi

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

    Introduction 1
    Purpose of the Study 1
        Assumptions on Which the Study is Based 2
    Methodology 2
        Delimitations of the Study 3
        Limitations of the Study 4
    Key Concepts 6
    Structure of the Study 8

2. AN OVERVIEW OF (A) TRADITIONAL CURRICULUM THEORIZING, (B) THE HISTORY OF RECONCEPTUALISM, AND (C) TWO CONCEPTIONS OF LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION 10

    Introduction 10
    Traditional Curriculum Theorizing 11
    The History of Reconceptualism 23
        The Movement 23
        Definitions and Descriptions 27
    Two Conceptions of Liberal Arts Education 30
    Notes 37

3. METHODOLOGY 40

    Introduction 40
    The Framework 42
    Strategy 49

CHAPTER Page

4. EXISTENTIAL AND STRUCTURAL RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CURRICULUM AND SCHOOLING 51

Introduction 51
Existential Reconceptualization: William Pinar . . 54
    Definition and Description 54
    The Effects of Schooling 63
    Search for a Method 67
    Liberation 74
Structural Reconceptualization: Michael Apple . . . 76
    Definition and Description 76
    Valuing, Science, and Schooling 79
    Liberation and Reform 90
Traditional Conceptions 101
Notes 104

5. THE APPLICATION OF A FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING TRADITIONAL CONCEPTIONS, AND EXISTENTIAL AND STRUCTURAL RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS, OF EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE 109

Introduction 109
Traditional Conceptions as Perceived by Reconceptualists 110
    Recasting of Concepts into the Categories of the Framework 110
    Summary Terms, the Framework, and Comment . . . 115
Reconceptualization: Existential (Pinar) 116
    Recasting of Concepts into the Categories of the Framework 116
    Summary Terms, the Framework, and Comment . . . 120
Reconceptualization: Structural (Apple) 121
    Recasting of Concepts into the Categories of the Framework 121
    Summary Terms, the Framework, and Comment . . . 126
Summary 126

CHAPTER Page

6. POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS OF RECONCEPTUALISM FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS 135

Introduction 135
Analysis of Situational Characteristics 136
Analysis of Programmatic Characteristics 151
Summary 156
Notes 159

7. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 160

Introduction 160
Summary and Recommendations 162

BIBLIOGRAPHY 170

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 3.1 Framework for Examining Traditional, Reconceptualized Existential, and Reconceptualized Structural Thinking About Curriculum and Schooling 44

Table 5.1 Traditional Concepts as Viewed by Reconceptualists 114

Table 5.2 Reconceptualizations: Existential (Pinar) 119

Table 5.3 Reconceptualizations: Structural (Apple) 125

Table 5.4 Completed Framework for Examining Traditional, Reconceptualized Existential, and Reconceptualized Structural Thinking About Curriculum and Schooling 128

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Over the past decade a new criticism has become increasingly evident in the professional literature dealing with schooling in general, and curriculum in particular. Although its names have varied, the term "reconceptualism" has evolved as the dominant label. Reconceptualist thinking is significant for two reasons. One reason is that its form, based upon the questions it asks, and therefore its content, consisting of the answers it provides, break dramatically from the mode of educational thinking which began to dominate the literature even before Ralph Tyler gave it expression in 1949. The other reason evolves from the first. Reconceptualism, if substantiated, has powerful implications for undergraduate teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions.

Reconceptualism cannot yet be called a movement. There exists no commonly endorsed platform or agenda among its proponents, and there is no subscription to a unitary mode of analysis. Theorists to whom the label is applied agree that one of the few things they agree about is their disagreement on significant issues. The use of the term, however, does have a discernable history, and running through the disagreements among reconceptualists are concerns and themes sufficiently similar in nature and import to suggest a loose framework of categories through which reconceptualism can be analyzed and understood, and through which implications for liberal arts teacher education can be extrapolated.

Purpose of the Study

The major purposes of this study are (1) to provide a framework through which the major themes of two identifiable groups of reconceptualists can be accommodated to each other and to their perceptions of the mode of thinking about curriculum and schooling which they believe to be contemporarily dominant, and (2) to employ the framework in an attempt to provide for liberal arts teacher educators a greater degree of conceptual clarity regarding reconceptualist criticisms and alternatives. It is hypothesized that the framework may later be employed to facilitate the drawing of inferences regarding the relevance of reconceptualism for teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions.

Assumptions on Which the Study is Based

The basic assumptions underlying this study are as follows: (1) liberal arts institutions will continue to play a significant role in the undergraduate education of teachers; (2) teacher educators in liberal arts institutions are desirous of providing the best possible programs; (3) teacher educators in liberal arts institutions value insights into the meaningfulness and consequences of their programs; (4) teacher educators in liberal arts institutions will perceive new critical insights to provide opportunities for improving their programs; and, (5) this study will inspire further inquiry into reconceptualism and its implications for undergraduate teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions.

Methodology

Given that the purpose of this study is to develop a framework for synthesizing already developed sets of concepts and themes, the overall approach to this study is conceptual rather then empirical, and is in a discussion format. This means:

(1) Much of the substantive content is a report and analysis of themes and sets of concepts already available in the literature. More specifically, an understanding of reconceptualism is promoted by reviewing the literature in order to derive a history of the use of the term, to identify its range of meanings and synonyms, and to delineate two central sets of concepts and themes. Inasmuch as reconceptualism is a "reconceiving" of what is believed by the reconceptualists to be the dominant mode of thinking about curriculum and schooling, their descriptions of features of the dominant mode are included in the review.

(2) The themes and sets of concepts of the two identified groups of reconceptualists are accommodated to each other, and to their sketches of the dominant mode of thinking, through the analytical tools of the philosopher and literary critic rather than through those of the empiricist. The categories selected for accommodating the views to each other constitute the framework this study set out to develop. The categories, presented in the form of questions, are as follows:

(a) What questions are selected as important to ask?

(b) What sources are identified as the location of answers?

(c) What conception of "curriculum" is operative?

(d) What conception of "school in society" is operative?

(e) What conception of "value" is explicitly or implicitly operative?

(3) Concluding implications are developed inferentially from conceptual rather than hard-data bases. The use of the framework for examining the relevance of reconceptualist thinking for liberal arts teacher education programs will be suggested through a discussion of ideas rather than through exclusive reliance upon empirical verification.

Delimitations of the Study

The framework developed in this study may also be relevant to the understanding and analysis of other areas of professional training, but the connections are not made because to do so would move this study beyond its intended focus on undergraduate teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions. The related areas are (1) inservice teacher education, (2) graduate level teacher education, (3) teacher education in other-than-liberal arts institutions, and (4) training programs for human service professions other than teaching.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are as follows:

(1) One intent of this study is to present an accurate representation of reconceptualist thinking as it is given expression by its

own spokesmen. Competing and contradicting theories, therefore, are not brought to challenge the accuracy or adequacy of reconceptualist insights or the methods of inquiry by which they were derived. Connections with prior traditions or compatible systems of contemporary intellectual thought are not made beyond those recognized and claimed by the reconceptualists themselves.

(2) Although reconceptualists claim that one of the few things they agree about is that they disagree with each other about important issues, this study accepts as valid, confirmed by this writer's own survey of the literature, that two identifiable orientations do exist among the reconceptualists. This does not necessarily prove that these two orientations exist, nor does it exclude the possibility that more than two orientations exist.

(3) Only one author has been selected to exemplify each of the two orientations. These authors have been chosen because, in the opinion of this writer, they have developed their views more thoroughly and extensively than have others, and therefore illustrate best the basic features of each orientation. It is possible that the selection of other writers either to substitute for or to augment the two featured may have served to modify in some minor respects the profiles of the two orientations as presented in this study.

(4) The two views of liberal arts education sketched in this study are not the only two which have been argued at one time or another, and it is unlikely that either is actually implemented in real institutions exactly as characterized in this study. They are, however, in

the judgement of this writer, the two dominant views claimed by liberal arts institutions and those who teach in them.

(5) The selection of reconceptualism as the focus for this study, and the pointing out of its relevance for undergraduate teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions, are indicative of this writer's positive biases toward both. A concerted attempt is made in this study to present the concepts and issues objectively, but the entire study must be understood as having been conceived and developed out of this writer's deep concern that the role of education in society be meaningfully understood by liberal arts teacher educators, and this writer's judgement that the insights and methods of analysis of the reconceptualists can enhance that understanding.

Key Concepts

The following five concepts are highlighted to alert the reader to their significance. Because each of them is defined more carefully in terms of the use to which it is put, and because their meanings differ within the views dealt with in this study, they are not defined here. What is provided at this point is a brief statement signaling the issue or problem involved in the use of the term, and its importance to this study.

Curriculum. The ambiguity of this term is generally recognized within the profession of education, yet it continues to be a central concept in educational theory. It is not necessary to this study to select and defend a particular definition, but its selection as an integral component in the analytic framework developed and used in this study is indicative of its importance.

Liberal Arts. Like curriculum, this term is also ambiguous, probably because the debate about what properly constitutes liberal arts education often can be understood as a conflict of conceptions regarding what curriculum is. In this study, the designation "liberal arts" serves to separate this concept from the larger generic categories "higher education" and "vocational training."

Reconceptualism. This is the name most commonly accepted for recent forms of criticism which take exception to, and attempt to reconceive, what is alleged to be the dominant contemporary mode of thinking about schooling and curriculum. The basic reconceptual stance is anti-positivistic, and attempts to provide insight into schooling and curriculum through the use of analytical models such as philosophy, history, phenomenology, politics and economics rather than singular reliance on an empirical model.

Schooling. In this study, the term has two referents. One accepts that schools are givens, and "schooling" is what is or what should be happening within schools. The other gets outside of the given in an attempt to understand "schooling" in terms of its role and function in the social order, and the personal and social consequences of individuals having "experienced" it.

Value. This study recognizes that this term functions sometimes as a noun to designate a characteristic or quality of something, and sometimes as a verb referring to appraising something. Furthermore, one can analyze a conceptual model both in terms of the statements it makes about things which are valuable, and in terms of the values which were operative in its construction. Its selection as an integral concept in the analytic framework of this study is indicative of its importance.

Each of the above terms receives more careful clarification and analysis within the context of its use in the positions reported later in this study. Other terms more technical and specific within the views this study reports will be defined as they occur.

Structure of the Study

The remaining chapters of this study are organized as follows. Chapter 2 is designed to provide a conceptual backdrop or "ground" against which this study can stand out as "figure." To that end, overviews of three areas relevant to this study are presented: (1) an overview of traditional curriculum theorizing, (2) an overview of the history of reconceptualism, and (3) an overview of two contemporarily dominant views of liberal arts education. The purpose of Chapter 3 is to present the framework to be used for clarifying two reconceptualist orientations and their perceptions of traditional educational thinking, and for generating possible implications of reconceptualist thinking for undergraduate liberal arts teacher education. The literature of selected reconceptualists to which the framework will be applied is presented in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5 the literature is recast in terms of the framework. Possible implications of reconceptualism for liberal arts teacher education are explored in Chapter 6. The appropriateness of the framework as a tool for reconceiving undergraduate liberal arts teacher education, and further suggestions for its use, are discussed in Chapter 7.

CHAPTER 2

AN OVERVIEW OF (A) TRADITIONAL CURRICULUM THEORIZING, (B) THE HISTORY OF RECONCEPTUALISM, AND (C) TWO CONCEPTIONS OF LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a backdrop, or ground, against which this study may stand out as figure. Included are three separate sketches, each of which prefigures concepts which are dealt with in later chapters. The sketches developed are as follows:

(1) A brief overview of the central concepts of four major theorists, Ralph Tyler, Hilda Taba, Jerome Bruner, and Joseph Schwab, who have had a significant influence in familiarizing the currently widely-accepted four-step process of curriculum: state objectives, select learning experiences, organize learning experiences, and evaluate outcomes. Also included is a summary of Bruner's later revisiting of his earlier work, and a brief synopsis of selected writings of two recognized contemporary theorists, John Goodlad and Bruce Joyce, who although not labeled as "reconceptualists" show definite signs of "reconceiving" curriculum thinking.

(2) A synopsis of the studies of Margaret Ann Huber and Barbara J. Benham, who have each reviewed the history and literature of what has come to be called "reconceptualism." This section sets the context in

which are placed the works of William F. Pinar and Michael W. Apple as they are reviewed in Chapter 4.

(3) A brief overview of two different views of liberal arts education. These views set the context for Chapter 6.

Traditional Curriculum Theorizing

Although there have been many who have thought and written about curriculum in this century, Ralph Tyler's Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction[1], otherwise known as "The Tyler Rationale," appears to be the single most influential work. George Willis calls it "still the best known and most influential book on curriculum."[2] Herbert Kliebard believes the book to be "the most persistent theoretical formulation in the field of curriculum."[3] John Goodlad concludes that "most curriculum questions from Bobbitt on down can be placed in Tyler's framework or legitimately transferred into his terms . . . he clarified and systematized the central questions running through the practical affairs of curriculum makers."[4]

The Tyler rationale features four questions which set the agenda for curriculum workers: "What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?"[5]

Answering the first question is most important, since the other three proceed from it. Tyler proposes a two-step framework for answering the first question. The first step is to consult three sources for objectives: studies of learners, studies of contemporary life, and subject matter specialists. The second step is to filter the data derived from the three sources through psychological and philosophical screens. Those propositions which survive the screens are to serve as the educational objectives toward which and out of which specific curricula, instructional practices, and evaluative procedures are to be developed.

Tyler's four questions and the framework for addressing them figure large in the work of another influential curriculum theorist, Hilda Taba. Taba calls the answers to Tyler's questions "curriculum," and states,

> All curricula, no matter what their design, are composed of certain elements. A curriculum usually contains a statement of aims and of specific objectives; it indicates some selection and organization of content; it either implies or manifests certain patterns of teaching and learning whether because the objectives demand them or because the content organization requires them. Finally, it includes a program of evaluation of the outcomes.[6]

Taba credits Tyler with having developed "scientific curriculum development," which, she claims, "needs to draw upon analysis of society and culture, study of the learner and the learning process, and analysis of the nature of knowledge in order to determine the purposes of the school and the nature of its curriculum."[7] Taba expands Tyler's four questions into seven steps for "orderly thinking in curriculum development": (1) diagnose needs; (2) formulate objectives; (3) select content; (4) organize content; (5) select

learning experiences; (6) organize learning experiences; and (7) determine what to evaluate, and ways and means for doing so.[8]

It is interesting and significant to note that Taba takes the time to address what she perceives to be a gap having developed between theorists and practitioners. She believes the problem to exist at both ends of curriculum development. Theoretical designs, she notes, were being developed with meager experimentation and practice, and implementations were being carried out by practitioners with insufficient understanding of the theory behind them.

A third highly influential curriculum theorist is Jerome Bruner, whose book The Process of Education[9] can be understood as a modification of the Tyler framework, but still within the genre of the Tyler rationale. Bruner's statement "one must take into account the issues of predisposition, structure, sequence, and reinforcement in preparing curriculum materials,"[10] and his insistence that curriculum should be prepared jointly by the subject matter expert, the psychologist, and the teacher, with due regard for the inherent structure of the material, its sequencing, the psychology of reinforcement, and the building and maintaining of predispositions to problem solving both echo the Tyler retionale.

What sets Bruner somewhat apart are his perceptions regarding the source of curriculum objectives. Bruner believes that subject matter experts ought to be the primary source, with studies of the learner and of society also important but as sources out of which strategies might be developed rather than as sources for objectives. Bruner further believes that the role of subject matter study is not "to produce little living libraries . . . (but rather) to get a student to think mathematically, to consider matters as a historian does, to take part in the process of knowledge-getting."[11] This could be accomplished, he believes, by teaching the structure of the disciplines not only as a body of material already obtained and organized, but also as a procedure for knowledge-getting as well.

The work of Joseph Schwab, as given expression in "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum,"[12] can be understood as picking up Taba's concern about a practice-theory gap, and as taking some exception to Bruner's primacy of subject matter specialists, but still very much within the spirit of the Tyler rationale. Unlike Bruner, Schwab is convinced that there exists no foreseeable hope of a unified or meta-theory telling how to arrange subjects or to order them in a fixed hierarchy, not from subject matter specialists, nor from specialists who study learners and learning, nor from those who study society and culture. Schwab believes the theory-practice gap identified by Taba to be the consequence of increased specialization by theorists working in the three main sources identified by Tyler, and a concurrent reduction of dialogue bridging all three. The specialization had taken theory further and further from the pragmatic needs of practitioners, and the lack of dialogue exascerbated the problem by making any connections among the branches of specialization obscure, and therefore even less useful to the practitioner.

To bring theory and practice back in touch with each other, Schwab proposes an eclectic rather than theoretic approach, i.e. "the arts by which unsystematic, uneasy, but useable focus on a body of questions is effected among diverse theories, each relevant to the (curriculum) problem in a different way."[13] Schwab challenges specialists to renounce "the specious hegemonies by which we maintain the fiction"[14] that the problems of one curriculum area have no bearing on another area. He calls his method deliberation, and believes that the consequences of eclectic deliberation will be the enablement of practitioners to make decisions about action in concrete situations. The action of decision-making would occur in those four areas identified by Tyler.

There are two important features to note about Schwab's call to get beyond the differences separating the specialists. One is his perception that the discussion ought to take place within the real social and psychological contexts of people's lives. This represents a significant shift from what appears in Tyler to be an assumption that the experts can decide for others, practitioners and students alike, what their needs are. Schwab seems to agree with the questions and framework of Tyler, but he suggests that the needs of practitioners as they themselves perceive them set the context and point of departure for the eclectic work of theorists. The other significant feature, more implicit than explicit, is an apparent challenging of the assumption that curriculum development is the clean, neat, and completely scientific process that Taba believes it can be. There

is in Schwab a strong sense that all the answers are not yet in, and not all the right questions have yet been asked, and that the specialists should as aggressively address the ambiguities in theory and practice as they do the certainties.

It is precisely these two features, an insistence that the questions of curriculum and schooling to which theorists address themselves be located within the actual social and psychological contexts of people's lives, and dissatisfaction with the scientifically-certain views of curriculum and schooling, that distinguish the reconceptualists as reviewed in the second section of this chapter and amplified in Chapter 4. Before turning to reconceptualism, however, three examples of cogent, contemporary theorists who have not been labeled "reconceptualist" but nevertheless have clearly begun to reconceptualize curriculum and schooling are provided.

The first example, surprisingly, is Jerome Bruner, who revisited his work in 1971.[15] Bruner, in retrospect, concludes that in his emphasis on building school curricula upon the structures of the disciplines, he had overestimated the inherent interest of learners, particularly those in lower socio-economic classes, in a curriculum so conceived. In its place he suggests a curriculum designed to use knowledge in what he believes to be the massive task of bringing society back to a sense of values and priorities, to focus on the dispossession of the poor, and to guarantee a future to all, not just to those fortunate enough to have inherited a desire for and faith in learning as traditionally defined and practiced in schools. Bruner now believes the issues of curriculum and schooling to be deeply political, a perception to which he confesses to having been inadequately sensitive at the time Process of Education was conceived and written.

The work of John Goodlad also exemplifies a reconceiving of curriculum and schooling theory. Although there is abundant evidence in his work that he still wants to deal with the same four basic curriculum questions which Tyler identified, Goodlad suggests a significantly different framework for generating answers. Observing that "values and philosophical positions inevitably enter into all steps in curriculum planning; many alternatives will have been consciously or unconsciously ruled out by the time of Tyler's proposed screening."[16] Goodlad proposes "turning to values as the primary data-source in selecting purposes for the school and as a data-source in making all subsequent curricular decisions."[17] In other words, Goodlad is pointing out that a philosophy (particularly an axiology) is operative in Tyler at the outset, operating not only in the determination of which questions curriculum developers should ask, but in the determination of which sources to consult in order to derive the aims and objectives to consider, how to arrange them, and what to evaluate and how.

Kliebard, in an even more inclusive and critical reappraisal of the Tyler rationale, takes similar issue with Tyler's perception of the role of philosophy in his rationale, pointing out that, in Tyler,

> We are urged only to make our educational objectives consistent with our educational philosophy, and this makes the choice of objectives precisely as arbitrary as the choice of philosophy. . . . As long as we derive a set of objectives consistent with this philosophy . . . we have developed our objectives in line with the Tyler rationale. The point is that, given the notion of educational objectives and the necessity of stating them explicitly and consistently with a philosophy, it makes all the difference in the world what one's guiding philosophy is since that consistency can be as much a sin as a virtue.[18]

Goodlad's own values and biases in curriculum theorizing and development are evident in the following statements excerpted from Behind the Classroom Door: (1) the best hope for a self-renewing society is a self-renewing individual; (2) education is admirably suited and uniquely responsible for developing rational powers - not merely cognitive acuity, but involving the acquisition of knowledge, careful weighing and appraising, consideration of alternatives and the formulation of convictions and actions based on convictions; and (3) the educated man is fully aware of societal restraints, the reasons for them, and their appropriateness or inappropriateness for mankind; he needs opportunities for self-disciplining and assuming responsibilities for his own actions.[19] Important to note here is that Goodlad recognizes his philosophy as generative of all his professional work, and the primacy of the individual in the generation of his own philosophy and action. Philosophy is certainly more than merely an interposed screen for John Goodlad.

Goodlad believes that although there is evidence of comparable thinking in the literature, there is little evidence of it actually operating in schools. Instead, he observes,

> At present, schooling is equated with a process of formal schooling in time and place . . . a box run for certain hours of the day by people who have a surprisingly homogenous conception of what should go on in it.[20]

The dominant perception, he believes, is a common ends-common means concept of either-ors. In the classroom it is pass-fail; in the institution it is out or in, a decision made early for a child; in society as a whole it is when to begin and when to end, and a sorting process regarding eligibility for subsequent non-compulsory segments. Motivation for going on is maintained by requiring educational credentials for entry into the economic system.

Goodlad's observations sound very much like those of the reconceptualists, as do his conclusions, presented in the following statement:

> The maintenance of a schooling system with such limited alternatives, many of them punative, seems to require a good deal of accompanying baggage directed to rationalization, justification, legitimation, and the like. Testing systems . . . and external examinations . . . frequently are used as weapons against innovation. . . . The primitive carrot-and-stick psychology which proved virtually useless in adjusting children to the system is now being applied at great cost to their teachers. When we put together such a concept of accountability with performance-based teacher education, we have a rather elegant piece of bureaucratic folly . . . the interlocking system (implies) a predictive, scientific, or theoretical base. No such base exists; in fact, we are not even close to establishing one. . . . It is a sad commentary that in such a field of uncertainty we seek laws to enforce conformity and create an aura of certainty when, in fact, none exists. This is one form of censorship, a little more subtle than most.[21]

The work of Bruce Joyce represents yet another, and final for this overview, reconceiving of schooling and curriculum. That Joyce is thinking more like Goodlad, and less like Tyler, is evident in his introduction to Models of Teaching, where he writes:

> Educational procedures are generated from general views about human nature and about the kinds of goals and environments that enhance human beings. Because of their frames of reference - their views of man and what he should become - educators are likely to focus on specific kinds of learning outcomes and to favor certain ways of creating educational environments.[22]

Further explaining what he means by educational environments, Joyce states:

> Content, skills, instructional roles, social relationships, types of activities, physical features, and their use all add up to an environmental system whose parts interact with each other to constrain the behavior of all participants, teachers as well as students. Different combinations of these elements create different environments eliciting different educational outcomes.[23]

Joyce believes that an educational environment produces both "instructional effects, consisting chiefly of the content and skills which are developed through the activities which characterize the environment, and nurturant effects, consisting chiefly in changes in capacity (thinking, creativity, integrativeness) and values (including depth and flexibility as well as direction of values) which result from 'living in' the environment."[24] In other words, the assertion is being made that a student gradually comes to construct reality in a way that reflects his educational environment. Living a model year after year produces replicas of it in the form of student personality, skills, knowledge, and attitudes. Joyce postulates that an

environment featuring primarily a systems approach to schooling will produce over the years a student oriented to production and utilitarianism; whereas an environment featuring human awareness training will produce a student more oriented to humanistic and personal concerns.

In Flexibility in Teaching, Joyce[25] presents a more carefully focused yet more comprehensive view of the typical educational environment as he perceives it. In a brief historical overview of American schooling, Joyce states that the curricular content, the processes used to teach it, and the social structure of the school were designed to deal with two basic social needs. One was to help accommodate society to the new needs of an increasingly industrialized society; the other was to help establish a common heritage for new waves of immigrants. The school system became closely tied to the status systems of society, and education became an indispensable means of status maintenance for most persons.

Contemporary schools, says Joyce, continue to be dominated by mainstream cultural values, and he offers what he believes to be evidence that schools today are most commonly based upon an economic conception of humanity and economic values: (1) making lower levels prerequisite for higher has yielded a system of rewards and punishments for production; (2) students who do not behave fall off an economic as well as academic ladder; (3) expulsion represents a fine throughout a lifetime in the form of earnings not received; (4) the structure of the school is designed to facilitate this conception of education and to permit the easy maintenance of order and regimentation; (5) students move from class to class in departmentalized systems, under the supervision of a particular teacher who is a taskmaster and disciplinarian; (6) a segmented day helps keep teachers, rather than students, in control; (7) the structure of secondary education, with students passing from station to station, mimics the assembly line; and, (8) individuals are seen as producers and consumers, the purpose of education being to make them better at both.

Furthermore, teacher education as presently conceived and practiced is said to perpetuate these economic values. The primary purpose of teacher education, says Joyce, is believed to be the provision of personnel to work in schools as they are, and he highlights characteristics of typical teacher education programs which reflect and reinforce current normative schooling practices: (1) student teaching is basically an apprenticeship, and the apprenticeship model of training is notoriously conserving; (2) methods courses do little more than deal with traditional curriculum areas and introduce trends-of-the-time; (3) theory courses are separated from methods, the consequence being that the perspectives a teacher would need for autonomous decision-making are clearly separated from and differentiated from the pragmatism of methods; (4) curriculum language is efficiency oriented; and (5) the bulk of research is presented in an economic mode. "Any great deviation," concludes Joyce, "immediately stimulates a negative reaction, frequently a severe one.

Thus most schools are minor variations on the basic cultural theme. . . . This (economic) conception forms the ground against which competing alternatives vie for attention."[26]

The History of Reconceptualism

The Movement

Margaret Ann Huber, desiring to "show how important it is, when studying change in education, to take into account three factors: the historical context, the social process, and the intellectual substance of scholarly debate,"[27] developed an historical overview of reconceptualism by identifying and interviewing five "leaderparticipants": Maxine Greene, James B. Macdonald, Dwayne Huebner, William Pinar, and Michael Apple. Barbara J. Benham, addressing the questions "Is there really a movement? If so, what is its history? What is its underlying philosophy? And, most importantly, what impact is it likely to have on the institution of schooling in our society?"[28] reviewed the literature extensively and interviewed eight educators who have been involved in reconceptualist conferences and who have published papers supporting the notion of reconceptualization. The eight educators interviewed were Janet Miller, Donald Bateman, Madeline R. Grumet, William Pinar, Maxine Greene, Michael Apple, James Macdonald, and Ira Wiengarten.

Although Benham's primary focus is reconceptualism in the 1970's, she places it as an extension of a longer tradition in curriculum theorizing. She reports from her interview with Macdonald that in

Macdonald's view, he and Dwayne Huebner have been in the business of reconceptualizing curriculum theory for at least twenty-five years, with much of their work unacknowledged, or even unpublished, because nobody would talk with them for at least the first fifteen years. Michael Apple is reported to have viewed his work as an outgrowth of the efforts of George Counts, Harold Rugg, and John Dewey; and William Pinar's debt to the existentialism of Jean Paul Sartre is established.

Huber also identifies past writers, conditions, and events which have led to the reconceptualizing of curriculum in its present form, through a decade-by-decade synopsis, beginning with the 1920's. She establishes the curriculum field to have been developed in the 1920's in direct response to the practical needs of practioners in the schools. Principles of what should be learned in schools were formulated, and ways of teaching and evaluating students were proposed. In the early 1940's, the term "curriculum theory" came into use, but seemed generically interchangeable with "curriculum studies" and "curriculum writing." The Chicago Conference on Curriculum Theory in 1947 is marked as the most significant event in the evolution of curriculum work to that point in time. Huber also highlights the 1940's as the beginning of two post-World War II significant developments in education. One was the rise of behavioral sciences and behaviorist theory; the other was the placement of "theory" as a subspecialty in the curriculum field and in other sub-fields of education.

Huber believes the origins and development of a critical curriculum movement as a protest to the rise of the behaviorist approach in education to be discernable in the three decades following World War II. The 1950's are identified as the beginning of a protest in the humanities to what was believed to be excessively exclusive employment of behaviorist models for analyzing and determining schooling. The protest became more aggressive in the 1960's. The writing of James Macdonald, Dwayne Huebner, Herbert Kliebard, Paul Klohr, Ross Mooney, and Eliot Eisner are identified as illustrative of the humanist protest. Impetus for the protest was provided by the emergence of a more vigorous humanistic psychology, and the joining of the humanists by others who were committed to educational reform and who protested vehemently the positivist values that had become acceptable and even popular in education. The protest became strong, concludes Huber, but "lacked the force of an organized group protest movement."[29]

Beginning in the late 1960's, and continuing through the 1970's, says Huber, a second generation of critics, students of those prominant critics of the 1950's and early 1960's, began focusing more intensively on the notion of reconceptualizing curriculum, and they "discovered new bases for theory in curriculum: history, philosophy, literary criticism, political science, radical psychology, aesthetics and anthropology."[30] Michael Apple, Donald Bateman, Alex Molnar, and William Pinar are identified as the most prolific and well-developed new voices. The key feature of the new criticism is shown to be the desire to identify and call into question the value assumptions out of which the then dominant behavioralistic/positivistic theories of curriculum and schooling arose and were employed. Benham suggests that there are two reasons that the critical stance of the reconceptualists finally found an audience in the 1970's rather than in the more turbulent 1960's or in the 1950's when Macdonald and Huebner were beginning their work. One reason, attributed to Bateman, is that in order for the element of radical criticism to become an integral part of the reconceptual stance, the 1960's had to be experienced first. "We now see," says Benham, "that the school is embedded in its society and that its problems are not educational problems alone but are unavoidably social, political, and economic problems as well. And we see also that one cannot expect significant changes in schools unless there are significant changes in society as a whole."[31] The second reason is that the work of Paulo Friere, when it became available in the United States in the 1970's, "had a catalyzing effect on curriculum theorists . . . it was as if he had given words to what everyone had been thinking."[32]

Huber characterizes the protest as having peaked in 1973, when critical curriculum theorists held their first organized conference at the University of Rochester to share their thinking on the theme "heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory." Conferences have been held annually since, and The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing was first published in 1978 to provide a more centralized and public forum for the expression and debate of critical curriculum theorizing. The term "reconceptualist" first appeared in 1975, and it is to a more careful treatment of this term that the study now turns.

Definitions and Descriptions

Benham reports that although the term "reconceptualism" did not make an appearance prior to or during the first conference in 1973, Pinar began using the term in 1974 in a paper presented at the Xavier University Curriculum Theory Conference in Cincinnati in 1974, and the term appeared in the title of a curriculum theory conference held at the University of Virginia in 1975. Comments Benham, "Whether or not it was the best choice of terms, it stuck; the burgeoning movement had a name."[33] In her reference notes on this point, Huber states "evidently James Macdonald coined this term . . . but Pinar has given it currency through its appearance in the books (edited by Pinar). At any rate, each credits the other with popularizing the term."[34]

Precise definitions of the term have been difficult because of the varied referents residing in the diversity of theoretical bases from which individual reconceptualists work. Consequently, definitions have tended to take the form of descriptions of the uses to which the term is put, or of the foci and activities of reconceptualists. Macdonald, credited with coining the term, is quoted as saying:

> I don't see it as a label. I see it as a way of saying there are a lot of thoughtful people who, for many different reasons and from many different persuasions, feel that the field of curriculum is arid, is not fulfilling its human promise. . . . We must search for a new ground for the curriculum field. It's the spirit, the searching, the sharing of new ground, that is the Reconceptualization.[35]

Benham, working with the term "reconceptualization," offers this definition: "the effort to focus curriculum thinking on personal, social, and political realities."[36]

Huber prefers "critical curriculum theorists" to "reconceptualists" as a more useful label to distinguish them from curriculum specialists and other curriculum theorists who do not employ critical history or literary analysis as they do, and provides an extensive summative list of descriptors:

> Critical curriculum theorists . . . see schools as proactive and reactive social institutions . . . use methods derived from historical, literary, and esthetic criticism . . . believe in the rights, freedom, and value of the person and conceive of themselves as scholars protesting the alienation and dehumanization of life in the school system . . . consistently resist categorization of their work into any general school of thought . . . are unified by their critique of unexamined bases of society, of knowledge, and of existing educational practice and research . . . protest dehumanization, technical rationality, the submersion of human consciousness, and fragmentation of human life . . . affirm the importance of emotions and intuition . . . defined reality in terms that go beyond economic materialism to include spirituality, and criticize schools for cooperating in maintaining values which preserve the social structure at the expense of the individual . . . are a movement against scientism in educational theory . . . are anti-institutional . . .

> believing in moral choice and freedom for the individual in a pluralistic world, (they) oppose determinism and behaviorism in the schools and in learning theory . . . while critical of the existing social structure, the theorists nevertheless believe that the conversion of the individual to a new consciousness is possible if educators make an effort to renew the language of education, to value the individual, and to demystify common conceptions of reality.[37]

Perhaps the most precise descriptions are William Pinar's picture of the reconceptualist at work, Huber's statement of the purpose of research, and Benham's statement of the aim of reconceptualism, as follows:

> The Reconceptualists tend to study not 'change in behavior' or 'decision-making in the classroom' but matters of temporality, transcendence, consciousness and politics. In brief, the reconceptualist attempts to understand the nature of educational experience.[38]
>
> For the critical theorist, the purpose of research is to examine critically the existing curricular systems to make explicit their implications for the students and teacher as well as the probable effects on society.[39]
>
> Reconceptualization, then, aims at altering one's conceptions, quite literally, one's ways of looking at things in life: at oneself, which involves consciousness and leads to the existentialist position; or at the forms of social organization, which involves political action and leads to the structuralist position. Conceptual change must, then, be the result of either developed consciousness or of structural changes in society, or a combination of both.[40]

The structuralist position and the existentialist position to which Huber makes reference are thoroughly delineated in Chapter 4 of this study.

Two Conceptions of Liberal Arts Education

Richard Stanley Peters observes "I suppose the conviction that an educator must have aims is generated by the concept of education itself; for it is a concept that has a standard or norm, as it were, built into it. To speak of 'education,' even in contexts quite remote from that of the classroom, is to commit oneself, by implication, to a judgement of value."[41] One can conclude, then, in the spirit of Peters' general observation, that the concept of liberal arts education has a standard or norm built into it, and that the question of aims is as much the question of liberal arts education in institutions of higher learning as it is that of elementary and secondary schooling.

Indeed, all of the theories regarding curriculum and schooling reviewed in this chapter to this point have direct relevance for liberal arts education. Tyler's first question "What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?" is the first question for liberal arts institutions as well. Bruner's views regarding study in the disciplines, as originally conceived and as reconstructed, speak directly to an ongoing debate among liberal arts educators, as does Schwab's call for specialists in the disciplines to engage in eclectic deliberation of the problems of education within the actual social and psychological context of people's lives. Goodlad's challenge to view values as the primary data-source from which all curriculum questions are addressed comes with equal relevance to liberal arts education, and Joyce's spotlighting of the linkage between cultural values and educational programs, and of the instructional and nurturant effect of different forms of schooling, shines with equal intensity upon liberal arts institutions. And, as is pointed out in Chapter 6, the reconceptualist's challenge to rethink the assumptions upon which education is based, and to face up to the latent but nevertheless real consequences of curriculum and schooling practices, has powerful implications for liberal arts education.

Liberal arts institutions are not unique in this regard. Peters' conception of "education" as having norms and aims built into it is broad enough to encompass education in other institutions of higher learning as well. This recognition undergirds Boyer and Levine's recent essay, A Quest for Common Learning[42]. Addressing themselves to what they call the general education component of undergraduate higher education, the authors lament what they judge to be a lack of a uniform conception of the aims and purposes of general education among colleges and universities, but their affirmation that programs of general education must have clearly understood aims is persistent and clear. Following extensive interviewing of colleagues and reformers regarding their perceptions of and plans for general education, Boyer and Levine liken programs of general education to the spare room of a house, which, like most spare rooms, "is chronically in a state ranging from casual neglect to serious disrepair."[43] Believing general education to be of critical importance to both colleges and society, they challenge all institutions of higher learning to accept what they offer as a normative agenda for general education, namely, "those experiences, relationships, and ethical concerns that are common to all of us simply by virtue of our membership in the human family at a particular moment in history." In other words, "General education is an institutional affirmation of society's claim on its members."[44]

Whether or not it seems sensible for Boyer and Levine to conclude that a diversity of stated institutional or individual aims for general education is equivalent to chaos, and that clarity can come only with uniformity, may be a fruitful question to pursue at some other time. Of similar interest is the question of the compatibility and equivalence of the aims and purposes of general education with those of liberal arts education. There are, however, elements available in Boyer and Levine's essay to which parallels can be drawn to begin to describe liberal arts education.

As is the case with general education, the concept "liberal arts" presently and historically admits of a plethora of definitions. R.S. Peters states that a fundamental difficulty about the term is its endemic ambiguity.[45] Similarly, in 1970 one liberal arts college concluded a decade of faculty research and discussion intended to review the historical antecedents of the concept, and to clarify their institutional position with respect to it.[46] That few liberal arts institutions have ever considered this a possible task testifies to the difficulty of giving any precise and intersubjective definition. In their report to the faculty, the Curriculum Study Committee of this institution provided this synoptic overview: "In the minds of some people the term is associated with political or ideological liberalism; for others it is synonymous with 'classical humanistic studies'; for others it connotes an educational program dissociated from the reality of life; yet for others it calls up the image of an education designed for the aristocracy."[47]

Also, as is the case with Boyer and Levine's treatment of general education, there is an apparent readiness amongst "liberal" or "liberal arts" educators to affirm the importance of liberal arts education to society, and to suggest a normative agenda. Peters, recognizing that liberal functions lie "free" in that it suggests removal of constraints, and there are different forms of constraints, still concludes that common to all perceptions is the value placed upon knowledge and understanding, and the removal of constraints which impede the mind in its quest for knowledge and understanding.[48] The Curriculum Study Committee arrives at the same conclusion, as is evident in the following rather lengthy quote reported here for its illustrative power:

> Amid all the variations . . . one factor is constant. What everyone who uses the term agrees upon - and perhaps this is the only thing everyone agrees on - is that a liberal arts education is one which is not aimed at equipping the student to hold down some specific occupation. A liberal arts education . . . can be of great utility to men in their vocations and professions. Throughout history, various forms of liberal arts education have in fact been regarded as prerequisite to engaging in the learned professions; and nowadays it is widely held that a liberal arts education is equally indispensable to success in various business professions. But the concern of a liberal arts education is not with communicating the skills and knowledge necessary for engaging in some specific vocation or profession. Rather, though its focus is on none, its relevance is to all. It

> does not point toward the scholar's life, nor the diplomat's, nor the clergyman's, nor the banker's. It points toward human life.[49]

Given the diversity of conceptions regarding liberal arts education, there nevertheless appear to be two dominant rubrics which serve to catalogue them. One will be called the "Classicist" view, the other the "Pragmatist" view. It is unlikely that either is actually implemented in pure form in very many institutions, or that one will find total assent among the faculty of most liberal arts institutions to one view or the other. What are presented briefly here are the central features which one tends to find in each view.

The Classicist view has the longest history and the largest following. Central to this view is the belief that study should be organized around the disciplines, which, loosely, means bodies of accumulated knowledge. Faculty are organized into departments accordingly, and students are expected to select one or another in which to major after having sampled, mandatorily, a range of courses introducing the various disciplines. The purpose of liberal arts education so conceived is to liberate learners from the too narrow confines of having to direct their study to the performance of any specific occupation or vocation. This liberation is to be accomplished by imbuing learners with the best of the accumulated knowledge of the ages, putting them in touch with the broad patterns and main features of humanity, rendering them sufficiently knowledgeable and wise to encounter and master any contemporary situation whatsoever. One often finds in this view an affirmation that knowledge is its own reward. Although one frequently finds statements of rationale attesting that learning the methodology for getting and extending knowledge in a particular discipline is as much a feature of study in the disciplines as is learning the content already accumulated, many students graduate with little awareness of having encountered anything other than the content.

Within this general pattern of institutional thinking, the status and place of professional education programs, particularly teacher education, tends to be suspect, for two dominant reasons. One is that the content of teacher education programs is not believed to constitute a discipline, but rather derivative from the disciplines, which presumably might be better studied in their own right. The other is that the professional training is suspected of being too narrowly occupational and too pragmatic in its emphases to be legitimately within a liberal arts institution.

The Pragmatist view, by contrast, emphasizes the very utility of a liberal arts education which the Classicists try to avoid. Pragmatists believe the Classicist view to err too much in promoting the cataloguing and transfer of already acquired knowledge, and instead search for uses to which knowledge might be put. Knowledge, and the methods for getting it, are accorded high value, but not for their own sake. For the Pragmatist, the worth of what is known must be put to the test of its relevance to and utility for solving contemporary real-life problems as they occur in real-life work or citizen situations. To study in-depth means to begin to see the connectedness of the disciplines to each other and their relevance to real-life situations. The purpose of liberal arts education so conceived is to liberate learners from the too narrow and abstract confines of disinterested study, and the purpose can be accomplished by organizing study around problems or interdisciplinary themes, using the disciplines as a means to an end rather than treating them as ends in themselves. This view seldom finds institutionally organized expression, but it is not unusual to find it expressed by or operative in the work of individual faculty members.

Within this conceptualization of liberal arts education, teacher education programs, to the extent that they in fact draw upon the disciplines in significant ways to address the pragmatic issue of curriculum and schooling, are considered to be legitimately and necessarily at home.

Notes

[1] Ralph Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1949).

[2] George Willis, "Curriculum Theory and the Context of Curriculum," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, ed. William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975), p. 428.

[3] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Reappraisal: The Tyler Rationale," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, ed. William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975), p. 70.

[4] John I. Goodlad, The Development of a Conceptual System for Dealing with Problems of Curriculum and Instruction, The Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Contract No. SAE-8024, Project No. 454, 1966, p. 5.

[5] Tyler, p. 1.

[6] Hilda Taba, Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962), p. 10.

[7] Taba, p. 10.

[8] Taba, p. 12.

[9] Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (New York: Random House, 1970).

[10] Bruner, Process of Education, p. 70.

[11] Bruner, Process of Education, p. 72.

[12] Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum," School Review, 78 (November 1969).

[13] Schwab, p. 1.

[14] Schwab, p. 21.

[15] Jerome S. Bruner, "The Process of Education Revisited," Phi Delta Kappan, (September 1971).

[16] Goodlad, p. 28.

[17] Goodlad, p. 27.

[18] Kliebard, "Reappraisal: Tyler Rationale," pp. 77-78.

[19] John I. Goodlad and Frances Klein, Behind the Classroom Door (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1970).

[20] Goodlad and Klein, p. 114.

[21] John I. Goodlad, et al., The Convention and the Alternative in Education (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975), p. 16-17.

[22] Bruce R. Joyce and Marsha Weil, Models of Teaching (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1972), p. 5.

[23] Joyce and Weil, p. 25.

[24] Joyce and Weil, p. 25.

[25] Bruce R. Joyce, Clark C. Brown, and Lucy Peck, eds., Flexibility in Teaching (New York: Longman, 1981).

[26] Joyce, Brown, and Peck, p. 3.

[27] Margaret Ann Huber, "The Renewal of Curriculum Theorizing in the 1970's: An Historical Study," Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3 (Winter 1981), p. 14.

[28] Barbara J. Benham, "Curriculum Theory in the 1970's: The Reconceptualist Movement," Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3 (Winter 1981), p. 162.

[29] Huber, p. 19.

[30] Huber, p. 14.

[31] Benham, p. 163.

[32] Benham, p. 163.

[33] Benham, p. 164.

[34] Benham, note 3, p. 169.

[35] Benham, p. 163.

[36] Benham, p. 162.

[37] Huber, pp. 16-17.

[38] William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975), p. xiii.

[39] Huber, p. 16.

[40] Benham, p. 164

[41] Richard S. Peters, Authority, Responsibility, and Education (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1959), p. 84.

[42] Ernest L. Boyer and Arthur Levine, A Quest for Common Learning (Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.).

[43] Boyer and Levine, p. 3.

[44] Boyer and Levine, p. 19.

[45] Richard S. Peters, Education and the Education of Teachers (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977).

[46] Christian Liberal Arts Education (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Calvin College and W.B. Eerdmans, 1970).

[47] CLAE, introduction, n.p.

[48] Peters, Education of Teachers.

[49] CLAE, introduction, n.p.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purposes of this study are two-fold. One is to develop a framework through which the existential and structural emphases in reconceptualism can be accommodated to each other and to their common perceptions of the modes of educational thinking they believe to be dominant and to which they take exception. The other is to employ the framework in order to provide for teacher educators a greater degree of conceptual clarity regarding reconceptual criticisms and alternatives.

The motivation for this effort is to provide a partial response to Huber's question "What would it take, in the preparation of teachers, to help them learn how to translate (reconceptualist) theory into practice?"[1] Huber's observation that the reconceptual theorists seldom address this problem is corroborated by the relative silence of Pinar and Apple regarding this issue in their writing. The silence need not be construed as a weakness or unwarranted omission in the theories. The avowed purpose of both theorists is to understand the nature of the educational experience, from theoretical perspectives they believe to be important but which have not typically been employed. Their work should be analyzed and understood in those terms.

It appears, however, to be the case that the reconceptualizations have powerful implications for the training of teachers, in undergraduate liberal arts institutions and elsewhere. It is for professional educators who train teachers in liberal arts institutions that this study is specifically undertaken.

It is the belief of this writer that essential to a more complete answer to the problem of helping teachers to translate reconceptualized theory into practice is a high level of conceptual clarity regarding reconceptualism on the part of teach educators. However well-intentioned they might be, teacher educators cannot act upon what they do not know or understand; and the critical theories contain complicated and sophisticated concepts calling for a great deal of effort and thought in order to understand them. The difficulty accompanying understanding may in part be explained as a consequence of teachers and teacher educators having had very little opportunity to think about curriculum and schooling in any terms other than those growing out of the Tyler rationale and a positivist philosophy of science undergirding the behavioral and social sciences from which the majority of contemporary educational theory is said to borrow or imitate. If this is the case, then the solution begins with consciousness raising and the opportunity to come to grips intellectually with the reconceptualized concepts. The difficulty may also be explained as a consequence of teachers being typically not trained as theorists, but rather as practitioners, and the apparently frequent expectation that undergraduate teacher educators be "master practitioners" whose primary job is to pass on the technical tools of the trade in the "curriculum and methods" and "methods and materials" courses which proliferate and dominate teacher education programs. If this is the case, then the solution begins with calling to attention with reconceptualized concepts the actual consequences and limitations of teacher education programs so conceived. In either case, the process must begin with a clear and accurate understanding of the sets of concepts and themes which are central to the new theories and relevant to teacher education. To provide this understanding is the purpose and function of the framework developed and employed in this study.

The Framework

The framework for enhancing conceptual clarity and for suggesting possible implications for liberal arts undergraduate teacher education consists of a two-dimensional matrix in which the concepts selected as important to understanding reconceptualist theorists and their common perception of traditional thinking may be displayed, and compared and contrasted. Along the abscissa are three categories: (1) Traditional Conceptions as Perceived by Reconceptualists, (2) Existential Reconceptualizations (Pinar), and (3) Structural Reconceptualizations (Apple). Along the ordinate are listed five categories: (1) Questions Asked, (2) Location of Answers, (3) Conception of Curriculum, (4) Conception of School in Society, and (5) Conception of Value. The figure is displayed in Table 3.1, "Framework for Examining Traditional, Reconceptualized Existential, and Reconceptualized Structural Thinking About Curriculum and Schooling."

The rationale for the three categories along the abscissa is obvious. These categories represent the three viewpoints selected for focus in this study and reviewed in the literature.

Regarding the five categories along the ordinant, however, several comments need expression before a rationale is provided for each of the five. What should be understood at the outset is that the framework is offered as an analytic tool for the reader of reconceptualist literature. Inasmuch as it has been developed specifically for this study, it is reasonable to assume that it has not been used by reconceptualist writers as a scaffold or outline for focusing their thinking or organizing their writing. What this means is that the framework is not employed in this study as a standard by which the adequacy (in the sense of completeness) of the writings of a reconceptualist, or any other educational theorist, might be judged. Three additional comments are corrolary to this: (1) When writers addressed one of the five categories explicitly, their views were merely synopsized and reported in the appropriate cell of the matrix. (2) When a category was not specifically or explicitly addressed, reasonable inferences relevant to the category were drawn and recorded to the extent it was possible to do so without twisting or stretching unduly the original emphasis of the writer. (3) The statements recorded in the cells are synoptic, distillations and reductions of views more thoroughly developed in the literature. A concerted effort has been

TABLE 3.1 Framework for Clarifying Traditional, Reconceptualized Existential, and Reconceptualized Structural Thinking About Curriculum and Schooling.

	TRADITIONAL CONCEPTIONS AS PERCEIVED BY RECONCEPTUALISTS	RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS	
		EXISTENTIAL (PINAR)	STRUCTURAL (APPLE)
QUESTIONS ASKED			
LOCATION OF ANSWERS			
CONCEPTION OF CURRICULUM			
CONCEPTION OF SCHOOL IN SOCIETY			
CONCEPTION OF VALUE			

made to insure that the statements are accurate, but their limitations as denotations of the larger treatment of the concept are acknowledged. The statements certainly ought not be encountered and understood merely as slogans. The intent is that the statements provide not only an accurate, but more importantly, an adequate representation of the views reported; they represent the whole, and not just pieces of it. It is acknowledged, however, that the selection of categories for organizing the statements is as much a function of this writer's judgement about what features of a theory are important to look for as it is a judgement about the definitive dimensions of the theory as originally presented in the literature.

The rationale for each category along the ordinant is as follows:

1. Questions Asked. The questions a theorist asks can provide insight into the nature of the assumptions and values from which the theorist works. Implicit in this assertion is a recognition that theory cannot be value neutral. Theory begins with a set of questions, selected from a much larger universe of questions which could be asked. Selection involves choice, and choice is predicated on the application of some criteria or rules for determining which questions should be asked. The realm of "should" is the realm of judgement and valuation.

2. Location of Answers. The questions one asks suggest where one might look for answers. What is important to notice about the source out of which answers are developed are the limitations of the source

with respect to what kinds of answers it can provide. Sources are responses to a prior set of questions, which themselves reflect value choices and deliberately imposed rules. An understanding of the answers a source can and cannot provide can give insight into a theory which draws upon the source. For example, if the question "What is the nature of the student with whom I work?" has been selected as an important question to ask, the sources one chooses for answers can vary the nature and shape of the answer significantly. The answers one gets to this question varies dramatically if the source consulted is biology, anthropology, chemistry, Freudian psychology, or Calvinistic theology.

3. *Conception of Curriculum*. Although the *concept* "curriculum" is highly ambiguous in the sense that there exists among those who use it a broad range of definitions and understandings, a specific *conception* of curriculum is an integral feature and distinguishing component of all serious thinking about education, and is tightly bound to the questions a theory asks and the places in which it looks for answers. In a very real sense, an understanding of the conception of curriculum in a theory is the key to unlocking, often by inference, the value and assumptive bases out of which the theory arises.

4. *Conception of School in Society*. Important to notice about this category is that "schooling" delimits the concept from the larger category "education." Although schooling and education are in some respects coterminous, this study recognizes that the questions of the aims, purposes, and roles of *schools* in our society is an important

question for each of the views presented. The answers a theory gives to this question help shape a conception of curriculum; and both are functions of prior assumptions and values. Of further help to the analyst is to distinguish between a treatment of schooling which calls into question the role schooling plays in the larger social and cultural context, and treatment which assumes a particular role for schools and locates its research questions and theory development within that given role.

5. Conception of Value. Some notion of value, i.e. some distinguishing of "value" as a noun (referring to a quality residing in a particular object, act, or idea) and as a verb (referring to a set of rules and a process for applying them to appraise a particular object, act, or idea), is important in any theory of curriculum and schooling. In the first case, the noun designates a value. In the second case, the verb designates valuation. As pointed out in the rationale given for the prior four categories, a conception of value resides in choosing questions, selecting sources for answers, conceptualizing curriculum, and determining the nature and role of schooling in society. Of further importance is to note that both "value" and "valuation" must ultimately be grounded somewhere, in something. Neither are whimsically or arbitrarily determined in any serious theory of schooling. Whether value is finally grounded in rationality, or intuition, or revelation, or in something else, is an important and distinguishing feature of a theory, and therefore an important analytic category in the framework.

It should be evident at this point that the five categories selected for the framework are integrally interwoven and interdependent rather than discrete. Although it is beyond the purpose of this study to do so, a testing of the adequacy of a particular theory might be available via this framework, the criteria being the sufficiency of address of each category and the coherence of the fit of each to the other.

Three other categories were considered for the framework, but rejected. Because "instruction" is frequently viewed as an important category separable from curriculum, its inclusion was considered. It was dropped, however, for two reasons. One reason is that what many educators mean by instruction is for the reconceptualists a process intimately bound with and residing within the conception of curriculum. The second follows from the first: to the extent that instruction is separately identifiable, it exists as a subset of or derivative from the more important conception of curriculum. "Evaluation" was also considered, not only because it features dominantly in "traditional" thinking, but also because some reconceptualist writers have addressed it explicitly. It was dropped, however, because it can be derived from the more generic categories already present in the matrix. Traditional thinking would likely link it first with "curriculum." Reconceptualists would more likely link it first with "Questions Asked" or "Conception of Value." A third category, "Antecedent Theorists," that is, theorists whose work has influenced the views reported in this study, was considered as relevant to a more thorough historical understanding of the views presented, but dropped as incidental to the desire to report the views as they are given expression in recent writings of the reconceptualists. Those significant antecedent theorists who are recognized as important by the writers presented in this study are named in the review of the literature.

Strategy

In Chapter 2, overviews of traditional curriculum theorizing, the history of reconceptualism, and two dominant views of liberal arts education have introduced the conceptual context in which this study takes place. In Chapter 3, the framework which is to be used for examining reconceptualism and for deriving its possible implications for undergraduate teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions has been presented and explained.

The remainder of this study proceeds as follows. In Chapter 4, selected literature is reported and explicated to represent two major orientations within reconceptualism. Selected works of William F. Pinar are featured as the most adequate representation of Existential Reconceptualization, and selected works of Michael W. Apple are featured to represent Structural Reconceptualization. Also in Chapter 4, a sketch of traditional thinking about curriculum and schooling as perceived by Pinar and Apple is extracted from their writings.

In Chapter 5, the literature reviewed in Chapter 4 is analyzed and recast in terms of the categories of the framework presented in Chapter 3. The analyses are then further distilled to brief synoptic statements which are placed in the cells of the matrix. The contents of the ordinal columns of the matrix are then accommodated to each other by comparing and contrasting their salient features.

In Chapter 6, situational and programmatic characteristics which most undergraduate liberal arts teacher education programs are likely to have in common are identified. These characteristics are then analyzed, or "reconceived," by suggesting their relative congruence with reconceptualist thinking as recast via the framework in Chapter 5. The primary purpose of reconceiving the typical characteristics of liberal arts teacher education programs is to call into question and to prompt discussion about the operative assumptions, and the explicit and latent outcomes, of the professional component of undergraduate liberal arts teacher education.

Chapter 7 concludes the study. In this chapter, the purposes and limitations of this study are reviewed, and suggestions are provided regarding how individual liberal arts institutions might employ reconceptualist themes and the framework presented in this study in productive re-thinking of their professional teacher education programs.

CHAPTER 4

EXISTENTIAL AND STRUCTURAL RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CURRICULUM AND SCHOOLING

Introduction

The review of the history of reconceptualism in Chapter 2 concludes with the calling to attention of two distinguishably different orientations in reconceptualism, the "Existentialist" position and the "Structuralist" position. Benham[1] reports the two orientations to have surfaced at a conference of reconceptualists at the University of Virginia in 1975. At issue was the organization of Pinar's then recently published book Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists.[2] The debate centered on the way the book was organized. Critics apparently felt that the long history of the work done in curriculum theorizing, existential philosophy, and phenomenology, upon which, in their view, all the more recent work rests and to which current work owed its conceptual existence, was minimized.

Benham views the two orientations as fundamentally different, and credits James Macdonald with having identified and labeled them as existential and structural. The orientations are similar, however, in that they both take as their point of departure traditional theorizing about curriculum and schooling, which they perceive as wrongfully sacrificing the individual to the needs of a materialistic and technocratic society. Both want to liberate the individual from this oppression, and take it as their first task better to understand what really goes on in schooling and the theoretic formulations upon which schooling is based. Benham characterizes the Existentialists as recognizing that there are forces outside the individual which act to shape his life, but they center their interests on the individual's own experiencing, his awareness of it, his feelings about it, and his interpretations of its meanings for him. The Structuralists are characterized as recognizing the need for the individual thoroughly and honestly to know himself and the fact of his being-in-the-world, but they center their interests on the political acts necessary to transform those forces outside the individual which act to shape his life.

It may be the case that although the orientations are different, they are not necessarily opposed. Benham credits Donald Bateman with clarifying the distinction, and James Macdonald with bringing the two together. Bateman, in an interview with Benham, observed "You can look inward, and see the whole business of education from the point of view of self-knowledge. Or, you can look outward, to think of what education means in a world where there is not a whole lot of freedom. And that becomes more political."[3] Macdonald, also in an interview, suggests that "In a sense, they really aren't opposed. In the long run one is a cultural phenomenon, and the other is a social phenomenon, and they interact. One starts with consciousness; the other starts with structures. They're never really separated."[4]

Benham summarizes her synopsis of the Existential and Structural orientations by focusing on the positive aspects of the lack of agreement within the movement. She quotes Bateman to draw attention to her positive focusing: "the more important thing to ask is: are they raising questions that are critical, that have the possibility of opening up new ways of thinking?"[5] As her final thought on the issue, Benham states, "The existence of the two different orientations - existential and structural - can be viewed not only as healthy, but as essential to the movement. Far from splitting it, these two sets of viewpoints may be seen as interacting in a classic, dynamic dialectic relationship . . . (it is) the conceptual distance between the two camps that may keep the movement alive."[6]

The major purpose of this chapter is to develop and clarify a more complete characterization of the Existential and Structural orientations in reconceptualism. This is accomplished by reporting and explicating selected writing of William Pinar and Michael Apple, whose work, as established by this writer's own survey of reconceptualist literature, stands out as the most thoroughly and extensively developed representation of the two orientations respectively. Only primary sources will be reviewed, and the writings of other reconceptualists will be included only to the extent that they are used by Pinar and Apple and will contribute clarification. Following the review of the literature, a sketch of the traditional thinking about schooling and curriculum, as Pinar and Apple perceive that tradition, will be extrapolated from their writings.

This chapter, accordingly, is presented in three sections: 1) Existential Reconceptualization: William Pinar; 2) Structural Reconceptualization: Michael Apple; and 3) Traditional Conceptions. The content of these three sections is recast in Chapter 5 into the categories of the framework for analysis developed for this study.

Existential Reconceptualization: William Pinar

Definition and Description

Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, the book which served as catalyst in 1975 to the debate out of which emerged a clearer awareness of the two orientations in reconceptualism, was edited by Pinar, and four of the twenty-six chapters were written by him. In the preface, he calls the volume a collection of major contemporary theorists, an avant-garde not yet well known, a movement just under way, the theme and function of which is first to challenge, then to supplant, traditional curriculum writing. Pinar helps locate reconceptualism within the larger field of curriculum work by contrasting it with what he identifies as "traditional writing" and the writing of "conceptual-empiricists."[7] Traditional curriculum writing, says Pinar, "includes the work of Ralph Tyler, and all else falling under its considerable shadow," a genre constituting the heritage of the contemporary field, a field characterized by the pragmatic, by concrete ever-changing tasks of curriculum development, design, implementation, and evaluation. Traditional curriculum work is said to be largely atheoretical, its one essential purpose being to guide those who work in schools by providing practical suggestions for those who want to know "how to." Pinar estimates that 60-80 percent of the professors of curriculum belong to this group, and he identifies the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) as the traditionalists' professional organization.

Amplifying his picture of traditionalists in "The Reconceptualization of Curricular Studies," Pinar[8] observes that most of the curricularists and professors in this group tend to be "former schoolpeople whose intellectual and subcultural ties tend to be with school practitioners. They tend to be less interested in basic research, in theory development, and in related development in allied fields than in a set of perceived realities of classrooms and school settings generally."[9] Furthermore, they carry forth a tradition born in the 1920's and shaped by the intellectual character of that period, which, "above all was a time of emerging scientism when so-called scientific techniques from business and industry were finding their way into educational theory and practice."[10]

Pinar credits Herbert Kliebard with having termed this perspective the "bureaucratic model". Since Kliebard's exigesis of this model is exceptionally succinct, two of his writings are synopsized here. In "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective," Kliebard[11] summarizes the state of the curriculum field, and identifies three persistent issues. The field of curriculum is characterized as having: (1) An Ahistorical Perspective - even the most articulate spokesmen have little knowledge about the basic facts in curriculum history, the consequences being that certain myths are perpetuated to support selected ideological convictions, and that the field is characterized by "an uncritical propensity for novelty and change rather than funded knowledge or a dialogue across generations." (2) An Ameliorative Orientation - "the urge to do good is so immediate, so direct, and so overwhelming that there has virtually been no toleration of the kind of long-range research that has little immediate value to practitioners in the field, but which may in the long run contribute significantly to our basic knowledge and understanding." This ameliorative approach may be rooted in the origins of the curriculum field as a reform movement, and may be contemporarily sustained by "the huge constituency of teachers, school administrators, and supervisors who exert continual pressure on those who conduct research for answers to practical questions." (3) A Lack of Definition - "a paucity of ordered conceptions of what the curriculum field is and its relationship to cognate fields." Not only has curriculum terminology been in a chaotic state historically, but currently "a typically rigid and pervasive 'party line' has developed with respect to the specification of curricular objectives which brooks very little opposition."[12]

Out of this ahistorical posture, ameliorative orientation, and lack of definition arise two persistent issues. One is the role of curricular objectives, and the other is curriculum differentiation. The role of curricular objectives as traditionally viewed is "enshrined" in the Tyler rationale, the essence of which "is not . . . the curriculum planning steps that are frequently associated with it, but the embodiment of a production model of how the process of teaching and learning proceeds. In applying the model, we are asked in effect to state certain design specifications for how we want the learner to behave, and then we attempt to arrive at the most efficient methods for producing that product quickly and . . . cheaply."[13] In juxtaposition, Kliebard quotes R.S. Peters: "Education . . . can have no ends beyond itself. Its values derive from principles and standards implicit in it. To be educated is not to have arrived at a destination; it is to travel with a different view. What is required is not feverish preparation for something that lies ahead, but to work with precision, passion, and taste at worthwhile things that lie to hand."[14] The issue of curriculum differentiation centers on the appropriateness of applying a utilitarian criterion for legitimating school subjects. Once the utilitarian framework is accepted, "it becomes possible to refer to both a school student and a school subject such as physics as being 'college-entrance,' and schooling becomes a vast bureaucratic machinery for labeling, stamping, and tracking students into different curriculum patterns."[15]

The constitutive features of the bureaucratic model, the so-called scientific techniques, which have found their way into curriculum and schooling theory are identified by Kliebard in "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory,"[16] and their consequences are identified. Three specific features are cited: (1) Scientific Management - a view that within organizations, productivity is central, and the individual is simply an element in the productive system. The individual is not ignored; he is made the subject of intense investigation, but only within the context of increasing product output. School administrators shift from educators to business managers, and curriculum theory makes the child the "raw material" from which the school-factory must fashion a product drawn to the specifications of social convention. "Educate the individual according to his capabilities . . . meant in practice that dubious judgements about the innate capacities of children became the basis for differentiating the curriculum along the lines of probable destinations for the child. Dominated by the criterion of social utility, these judgements became self-fulfilling prophecies in the sense that they predetermined which slots in the social order would be filled by which 'class of individuals'."[17] (2) Standardization and the Worker - uncertainty being the great bane of bureaucracy, the bureaucratization of curriculum moved it in the direction of predictability. "In the curriculum field, vague conceptions of the purposes of schooling became intolerable, and 'particularization' of educational objectives became a byword."[18] Furthermore, the scope of curriculum was broadened beyond subject matter to embrace all of human experience, the total range of knowledges, skills, and attitudes for the total range of life roles and activities. (3) Standardization of Product Diversification - all persons would receive training to perform some activities in common, but each would be individually programmed for differentiated social roles as well, in programs "advertised under the slogans of curriculum flexibility and individualized instruction."[19] This calls for even greater standardization of units of work, and arranging those standard units into the most efficient sequence for manufacturing the particular products.

Kliebard believes the bureaucratic, production model to still be strongly and dangerously operative in contemporary modes of thinking, as is indicated in his concluding remarks:

> Modern curriculum theory, currently being influenced by systems analysis, tends to regard the child simply as input inserted into one end of a great machine from which he eventually emerges at the other end as output replete with all the behaviors, the 'competencies,' and the skills for which he has been programmed. Even when the output is differentiated, such a mechanistic conception of education contributes only to man's regimentation and dehumanization, rather than to his autonomy. The mechanistic conception of man, the technology-systems analysis approach to human affairs, the production metaphor for curriculum design all share a common perspective. They represent a deterministic outlook on human behavior. The behavior of human beings is controlled in an effort to make people do the particular things someone wants them to do.[20]

The second, and smaller, group of curriculum theorists Pinar calls the "conceptual empiricists." Although Pinar does not specifically identify them as such, they might be viewed as the specialists who are most influential in providing conceptual and programmatic rigor for what Kliebard has called the bureaucratic model of schooling. This group is said to be steeped in the theory and practice of present-day social sciences, using the methods of the social sciences to investigate curriculum phenomena with an eye to the goal of the prediction and control of behavior.[21] They tend to be researchers who view education not as a discipline in itself, but as an area to be studied by the disciplines; researchers whose primary identity is with the cognate fields of sociology and psychology, and who have research interests in schools and education-related matters.[22] These researchers claim to be value neutral, but Pinar believes that mainstream social science research, while on the surface seemingly apolitical in nature and consequence, if examined more carefully "can be seen as contributing to the maintenance of the contemporary sociopolitical order."[23] Pinar estimates that 15-20 percent of contemporary curricularists belong to this group, and he identifies the American Educational Research Association (AERA) as the conceptual-empiricists' professional organization.

By contrast, the third group, the reconceptualists, are said by Pinar not to take as their purpose the practical guiding of practitioners, nor the investigation of educational phenomena with the methods of behavioral and social science, but to understand, working much in the way of those who work in the humanities, using modes of inquiry that are historical, philosophical, and literary. As reported in Chapter 2, reconceptualists tend to study "not 'change in behavior' or 'decision-making in the classroom,' but matters of temporality, transcendence, consciousness, and politics. In brief, the reconceptualist attempts to understand the nature of educational experience."[24]

Pinar reiterates these points with even greater force in "A Reply to My Critics,"[25] specifically, in this instance, Daniel and Laurel Tanner. Responding to the allegation that reconceptualism is not research, and errs in calling for emancipation from research, Pinar expresses his view that research takes several forms, one of the most historically recent and epistemologically questionable being that of the mainstream social scientists. To charge that reconceptualism is not research underscores the "intellectual parochialism" of those who have evidently forgotten that the term is not their invention. There are research traditions centuries older, such as the hermeneutics of the humanities and arts, literary criticism, art history and criticism, philosophical inquiry, and historical analysis, all of which contribute to reconceptualist research methodologies. Responding to the allegation that there cannot be something called reconceptualist theory if it has no identifiable leaders, and no identified adherents, Pinar states that the reconceptual scholars are individualists, and that it is demeaning to suggest that there could be "adherents." Reconceptualization "is not a movement comprised of 'leaders' and 'adherents' but a term used to describe a fundamental shift - a paradigm shift - in the orders of research conducted by diverse curricularists, the common bond of which is opposition to the traditional field."[26]

In further contrast to the two larger groups, Pinar states that "in contrast to the canon of traditional social science, which prescribes data collection, and hypothesis substantiation or disconfirmation in the disinterested service of building a body of knowledge, a reconceptualist tends to see research as an inescapably political as well as intellectual act."[27] And, finally,

> Because the difficulties these reconceptualists identify are related to difficulties in the culture at large, they are not 'problems' that can be 'solved.' That concept, created by technical rationality, is itself problematic. Thus, what is necessary in part is fundamental structural change in the culture. Such an aspiration cannot be realized by 'plugging into' the extant order. . . . What is necessary is a fundamental reconceptualization of what curriculum is, how it functions, and how it might function in emancipatory ways. It is this commitment to a comprehensive critique and theory development that distinguishes the reconceptualist phenomenom.[28]

Pinar estimates that only 3-5 percent of contemporary curricularists are active as reconceptualists. Many are members of ASCD or AERA, but only recently have reconceptualist spokesmen been granted audience in the publications or at the conventions of these groups.

Pinar believes that the reconceptualists, at their most ambitious extreme, may approach a synthesis of contemporary social science and the humanities, attempting a marriage of the scientific, and artistic and humanistic, cultures. He believes such a synthesis to be the next step in the intellectual evolution of the West, and dares dream that the field of curriculum may be one of the first places where it occurs.[29] This cannot occur, however, if the traditional wisdom of the field, conceptual-empiricism, or reconceptualizations are approached as calling for either-or choices. "Each is vital to the other. For the field to become vital and significant to American education, it must nurture each 'movement' . . . and it must strive for synthesis, for a series of perspectives on curriculum that are at once empirical, interpretative, critical and emancipatory."[30]

Of further interest in the "Introduction" to Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists is Pinar's identification of what he believes to be three stages in the emerging transfiguration of one who moves from thinking in the traditional mode to a reconceptual mode.

In the beginning, says Pinar, tradition accumulates, and many who are initiated into it accept its values uncritically. Their work is the application of its theoretical formulations, and perhaps an occasional theoretic extension thereof. Essentially, though, the work is technical/practical, and over time one may sense personal atrophy, which is usually a necessary precondition for the second stage. In the second stage, one painfully realizes difficulties in the tradition. He begins a process of self-education, and becomes increasingly critical, but in hopes of rectifying the tradition. He aims his new work at his colleagues, but the real target lies within, placed there by his early accultration. One begins to move into the third stage when he beings to look at the present and future, and not just at his past, and introduces existentialism and phenomenology to the field in order to provide conceptual tools, unavailable or unrecognized in the tradition, for understanding the human experience of education.

Whether one can generalize that this process explains all who are or are becoming reconceptualists cannot be said, but within Pinar's description one can certainly see evidence of his personal existential beliefs.

The Effects of Schooling

The writing of Pinar presented in the prior section has been primarily about theory. "Sanity, Madness, and the School"[31] presents a striking example of Pinar at work as an existential, reconceptualizing critic. Explicitly acknowledging his criticism to be grounded in the theoretical work of Brazilian Marxist educator Paulo Friere, radical psychologists Laing and Cooper, and existential philosopher Jean Paul Sartre, Pinar opens his critique of what he believes to be some of the actual consequences of schooling with the claim that "The schooling process is a dehumanizing one. Whatever native intelligence, resourcefulness, indeed whatever goodness is inherent in man deteriorates under the impact of the school. The result is the one-dimensional man, the anomic man, dehumanized, and, for some critics, maddened."[32] Schools do this, he says, because the image of children implicit in American schooling is that they are basically wild and unpredictable beasts who must be tamed, who cannot be trusted until they have internalized the values of socially controlled and emotionless adults. "To speak about American schooling," he asserts, "is to speak about the 'banking' or 'digestive' concept of education, the latter being the one Sartre employed to discuss the process in which information is 'fed' to students by teachers in order to 'fill them out'."[33]

Twelve effects of schooling reconceived, "which flow into each other and manifest themselves in the ideosyncratic manner of each individual,"[34] are identified and explicated. The twelve are listed here, with a brief precis of Pinar's development of each: (1) Hypertrophy or Atrophy of Fantasy Life - the rigidity of schools, and their indifference to the person of the learner, tends to force students either to escape its reality through private fantasizing while in school, or to deny fantasy in order to concentrate on conforming to the school. (2) Diversion or Loss of Self to Other via Modeling - more important than whom children model is that they model. To desire to be like someone else, children must first learn to be dissatisfied with themselves. This dissatisfaction is almost always introjected by a teacher. Its internalization represents a violation of self, and leaves one constantly questioning his identity. (3) Dependency and Arrested Development of Autonomy - students are taught that one is not enough to exist in the world on one's own. Schools make the student desire, and then need, to be instructed. Eventually students come to consider the necessity of instruction 'natural,' and look askance at anyone who suggests otherwise. (4) Criticism by Others and Loss of Self-Love - an outgrowth of the banking concept and modeling. If one does not come up with the teacher's answers (i.e. to "master" the "fundamentals") one is made to feel, and defined as, deficient. One's sense of worth and self-love become contingent upon one's performance and the resulting attitudes of significant others. (5) Thwarting of Affiliative Needs - affiliative needs are not merely unmet, but are actively thwarted by dependency relationships with teachers, a competitive methodology of teaching, and teacher strategies emphasizing intervention, instruction, and criticism rather than loving. Students may need to strike back, but because the teacher is politically inaccessible, anger is displaced horizontally in aggression against peers. The general ill-will one finds in schools is a direct function of teacher-initiated violence. (6) Estrangement from Self and Its

Effect Upon the Process of Individualization - day-in, day-out physical and psychic discomfort numbs one's tactile sensations and produces continual, usually subliminal, anxiety. Stress on cognition makes students more cerebral at the expense of feeling, numbing them to internal messages. Students who cannot get in touch with themselves cannot get in touch with others. (7) Self-Direction Becomes Other-Direction - intrinsic motivation is replaced with extrinsic. Rather than ask "Who am I?" kids learn to ask "Whose am I?" The political and psychic implications of this are frightening. An accompanying phenomenon is the muddling of motives - e.g. doing schoolwork to please a teacher, and writing essays for high marks rather than communication, leads to such things as marriage for financial or social reasons, and getting PhD.'s for status rather than for inquiry or learning. (8) Loss of Self and Internalization of Externalized Self - self becomes a thing, a role rather than a subjective being, an image such as "good student," "intellectual," "hard worker." An objectified self is stable, but dead. As things, people have no purposes except those prescribed for them by others. (9) Internalization of the Oppressor: Development of a False-Self System - a student either learns to identify with others as objects, or is forced to develop a facade to prevent friction and protect himself. In the latter case, schooling becomes a game, with a myriad of rules to follow in order to win, with the student as player. Playing the game year after year leads to viewing all of life as a game, with self split into observer-player, and, as such, incapable of full authentic participation in anything, isolated from genuine and intense contact with others. (10) Alienation from Personal Reality Due to Impersonality of Schooling Groups - the cumulative effect of living in groups whose reality is established by teachers is a forgetting of one's personal realities. The sheer impossibility of seclusion, solitude, and quiet in schools forces students to ignore themselves. Unable to reflect on oneself, one becomes incapable of developing loving and caring relationships with others. (11) Desiccation via Disconfirmation - confirmation of self by others is essential to self-knowledge and self-love. In schools, however, all one seems to get are questions, instructions, and ignorance. Some may respond with strategies for getting attention, but recognition for behaviors is not a genuine response to self, and finally is disconfirming. (12) Atrophy of Capacity to Perceive Esthetically and Sensually - dreary, efficiency-oriented school architecture, and relentless inspection and explication of subject matter preclude the development of esthetic and sensuous sensibilities. Ours is an age petrified by objectification which renders the object lifeless, and the intellectual's gaze turns all to stone.

Search for a Method

The writing addressed in this section can be understood as Pinar's attempt to come to some sort of better understanding of how and why schools promote "madness," and his search for a way out of it. "The Analysis of Educational Experience,"[35] "Currere: Toward Reconceptualism,"[36] and "Search for a Method"[37] collectively indicate that

Pinar believes that the way out begins by turning inward, first to understand and liberate oneself, then to help others do the same.

"The Analysis of Educational Experience" appears to be addressed to curriculum theorists. The operative word in the title is "analysis," and the goal of the work is not to provide an analysis of educational experience, but rather to make problematic the activity of analysis. Pinar begins by making explicit a basic assumption with which he works, namely, that "the development of a sophisticated understanding of one's psychic state will probably result in more accurate and eventually more comprehensive social or educational observations."[38] The problem first is to find the answer to Who am I? and How do I bring out what is already there? A corrolary question is How do I begin to focus my attention on myself, in a non-critical, non-evaluative way, so that I can illuminate my inner world? This, for Pinar, is an exceedingly difficult problem given what he believes to be our general psychic condition in the West, which is said to be "disintegrated," (i.e. self has been lost to others, fragmented into multiple selves, and trapped), and "unaware" (i.e. unaware of the disintegration, and unaware of what self is really there).

This disintegration and unawareness is said to be a consequence of the "domain assumptions" behind the theoretical formulations of mainline social theorists. These domain assumptions are typically unexamined, and global, such as "man is rational" and "progress is inevitable," and they influence research hypotheses in subtle but decisive ways. Domain assumptions are part of a large inner world, a lebenswelt, which is "the world of lived experience, the preconceptual realm that, given our current condition, is usually beyond our perceptual field."[39] In our culture, says Pinar, the lebenswelt becomes severed from and inaccessible to the conscious self rather early in our lives. The first problem for curriculum theorists, then, is to reestablish contact with their own lebenswelt, to reexamine one's domain assumptions as part of the larger task of finding the real self. Only then will one approach the proper position from which to begin to try to understand the nature of the educational experience.

Pinar suggests three tasks to perform as the medium for movement inward to one's self. The first is to render one's own educational experience into words. The second is to use one's critical faculties to understand what principles and practices have been operative in one's own life. The third is to analyze the experiences of others to reveal whatever basic educational structures or processes cross autobiographical lines. This three-task process is primarily cognitive and intellectual; emotional and other dimensions should be rendered verbally, edited through the intellect. To perform the tasks would yield information regarding the nature of educational experiences and their fundamental existential structures, and would yield biographic information that would enhance insight, and cultivate the inner-centeredness and focus that are essential to psychic integration. Stated summarily, "The analyst of educational experience or the educational experiencialist attempts to discover what factors are operative in educational experience, what relations among what factors under what circumstances, and finally what fundamental structures describe or explain the educative process. In a sense, these structures would represent the 'last stop' in the realm of the conceptual, the most fundamental level of analysis possible before entering the preconceptual, the lebenswelt, the ineffable."[40]

Using the three-task framework as a medium for getting in touch with one's lebenswelt would benefit the curriculum field in three ways, says Pinar. Observing that much theoretical work in education is divorced from the actual experience of teachers and students, Pinar suggests that to conceptualize "theory as the articulation of existential experience"[41] would help effect the synthesis. Furthermore, observing that the field of curriculum currently lacks its own research method, relying instead on the techniques of social theorists and psychologists, Pinar suggests that this method, once better developed, outlines a research methodology which clearly and originally is employable for the elucidation and analysis of educational experience. Finally, a process fostering an emergent sense of who one is, a bringing out of what is there but unobserved if not buried by conditioning, recalls another term, "education," and is tantamount to what is called "humanization."

"Currere: Toward Reconceptualization" extends the work begun in "The Analysis of Educational Experience." Pinar claims that "the curriculum field has forgotten what existence is,"[42] as evidenced by the use of the term "curriculum" to focus on what is external and public, on observable learning outcomes and the material and artifacts used in courses of study. Pinar traces this concept to the Latin root *currare*, which in its noun form functions to identify "a course to be run." As a better alternative, Pinar suggests the Latin *currere*, which functions in its noun form to connote "the running of a course," focusing on the experiencing of running a course rather than a description of the physical characteristics of the course. *Currere* "involves the nature of the individual experience of the public: of artifacts, actors, and operations of the educational journey or pilgrimage."[43] Curriculum understood in the sense of *currere* is not about design, development, instruction and evaluation, but rather a knowledge producing discipline, with its own method of inquiry and investigation, explicating the nature of the educational experience.

One important context of *currere* is identified as political, in that often the trip, experiences, and reasons are not self-chosen but imposed. Furthermore, one's cultivation and awareness of one's existential freedom occurs within a broader sociological context, and is necessarily and importantly colored by one's practical and political freedom. Nevertheless, says Pinar, even though the facts of political and economic injustice call for necessary political work, the work of self-knowledge, the investigation of the realm of *currere*, remains of the first order. Reformulating the three tasks given in "The Analysis of Educational Experience," Pinar suggests that we must do three things: 1) Bracket the educational aspects of our taken-for-granted world, attending to the contents of consciousness as they appear. 2) Allow the mind to freely associate, making note of the intellections and emotions, in a manner more pointed and focused than is the case in psychoanalysis. And, 3) Analyze what one finds. Pinar calls these three steps the method of *currere*, and summarizes that "While self-analysis and introspection can be unfruitful and even self-destructive, with proper guidance and strict adherence to the rules of analysis, one can reverse one's outer directedness, one's enslavement to the stimulus-response reality of the present public world. . . . In other terms, one is able to think vertically as well as horizontally."[44] Vertical thinking will take one to the base of consciousness, then into the *lebenswelt*.

Pinar concludes with some observations regarding the "utility" of the method of *currere*. "We Americans," he says, "have been and are impulsive instrumentalists. We use ourselves, our families, our work; in a word we *use*, rather than appreciate, contemplate, speculate, and so on . . . so understandably one would ask, what good is a method, or less badly, what is its utility? More narrowly, we can observe that those of us in the curriculum field have been instrumental in a specific way that I think Kliebard rightly characterized as ameliorative."[45] Pinar's answer is that the method of *currere* makes one more accurately able to read signs and to interpret events more fruitfully, to study and to achieve a measure of wisdom. Having accomplished this with oneself, one can then better assist and accompany novice travelers. "We teachers . . . must become students, students of *currere*, which is to say students of ourselves, before we can truthfully say we understand teaching in this sense."[46] The method of currere involves a shift in perspective, not merely cognitive insight but affective insight as well. This turning inward, the process of individualization, is change of consciousness.

"Search for a Method" once again reiterates Pinar's criticism of current curriculum theorizing, and further refines the method of currere. He notes that "positivistic, so-called empirical research methodologies now unmistakeably occupy center stage"[47] and that even though they represent an advancement over earlier research methods, many writers are still dissatisfied. The dilemma is that "for the sake of precision, clarity, and utility, we have taken to studying that which is observable and, at times it seems, quantifiable. Not surprisingly this approach necessarily omits something. . . . What is noteworthy is that most of us agree that quantitative research answers many questions well, other questions not as well, and some questions not at all."[48] What is missing involves the concept of experience, not in the sense of thought, feeling and sensation, but in the sense of lebenswelt. Pinar believes our dilemma to be metaphysical, not just technical and logical. "Rather than constantly asking 'how many,' 'what' and 'how' questions, we must force ourselves to ask 'why' and not be satisfied until we get to the source."[49] The source and lebenswelt are related, perhaps equivalent; "it lives inside of us, and to search for it . . . involves heightened awareness of our immediate experience."[50]

Following an example of using his method of currere to understand the educational experiencing of literature, Pinar reformulates his statements of the method once again, stating that the educational meaning of present educational situations can be decifered by; 1) recalling and describing phenomenologically the past, then analyzing its psychic relation to the present; 2) describing one's imagined future and analyzing its relation to the present; and, 3) placing this phenomenological-psychoanalytic understanding of one's educational present in its cultural and political present. The characteristics of this methodology are pointed out as these four: it is 1) regressive - involves a description of one's educational past; 2) progressive - involves a description of one's imagined future; 3) analytic - calls for a psychoanalysis of one's phenomenologically described present, past, and future; and, 4) synthetic - it totalizes the response and context of the person, and places this integrated understanding of individual experience into the larger political and economic web, explaining the dialectical relationship between the two.

Liberation

"The Abstract of the Concrete in Curriculum Theorizing"[51] is perhaps the most tightly reasoned of Pinar's works reviewed in this chapter, and the most illustrative of the values and assumptions with which Pinar works.

Pinar states that the underlying purpose of all of his work is to seek "liberation," which is "a process of freeing oneself and others - from political, economic, and psychological inquities."[52] He believes the process to be multidimensional, and inherently temporal, not suggesting something finished or static in a final or absolute sense. Liberative work "can and must occur along several dimensions, and the success of work in any given dimension - say the economic - is dialectically related in important ways to work in other - political, psychological, sexual - dimensions. This is an ecological view of the human and natural world, a view in which action in one domain affects the character of others. Work in isolation cannot occur except in a superficial sense. Work focused on the individual has inescapable social consequences."[53]

More specifically, Pinar seeks liberation from abstraction. He wants to recover the immediate, individual experiences of a lived, in contrast to exclusively conceptual, sense of self and world. He sees in the curriculum field, in traditional, conceptual-empirical, and structural-reconceptual curriculum work, a tendency to reduce the concrete individual to an idea of individual. This abstraction is believed to distort human life; "the idea becomes more real than the concrete; it becomes a source for explanation, and worse, action. As ideas become more real than concrete human beings, the capacity to sacrifice the latter for the sake of the former is more possible and more likely."[54] Traditionalists, says Pinar, tend to focus on "principles" of "curriculum and instruction," phenomena which presumably can be studied and formulated independent of the specific individuals whose use of them gives them life. Even those who have attempted to function "humanistically" exhibit this same tendency. Politically oriented reconceptualists also are seen to reduce the concrete to the abstract, using forms of analysis that omit individual experiences as they focus upon the structural relations existing in society. Contemporary work in curriculum theory, summarizes Pinar, "begins with the concrete and moves to the abstract, and as Piaget's theory of cognitive development correspondingly suggests, the greater the degree of abstraction, the greater the degree of profundity and accuracy. Such assumptions - we may term them pre-theoretical - often lead to a distortion of human experience. What is central to human experience is its particularity, in a sense even its eccentricity. Scientific laws and abstractions cannot capture the singularity of individual experience."[55]

Liberative activity very quickly becomes something to do to and with others, especially when expressed by educators caught in a scientific understanding of the relation of theory to practice. When it is only that, reduced to a mode of social interaction, an important order of liberative work is lost. The liberation from abstraction can occur by refocusing on the individual. By doing so, "it is possible to reclaim the abstractions and to extricate oneself from capture by ideology. One's voice becomes discernable . . . one begins to reclaim himself from intellectual and cultural conditioning."[56]

Structural Reconceptualization: Michael Apple

Definition and Description

As does Pinar, Apple provides an autobiographical account of his movement from traditional to non-traditional modes of thinking about curriculum and schooling. He recounts in Education and Power[57] that as someone who had taught for years at both elementary and secondary levels, and had worked continuously with teachers and administrators as a professor, he was searching for ways of understanding his and their actions. Both he and teachers, for example, blamed themselves as individuals, or their pupils, for the failures of students. More and more it seemed, however, that it was not a question of the amount of effort teachers and curriculum workers put into it. What became clearer was that the dominant rules and practices of educators' lives were generated by the institution itself and the connections it had to other powerful social agencies. Blaming teachers and castigating individuals was not helpful. What seemed more ethical was to figure out how and especially why the institution did what it did in ways that went beyond and constrained these actions in ideological and material ways. An understanding of this control would be perhaps a small, but essential step in challenging that control and seeing it for what it was and realizing the differential economic and cultural benefits that resulted from it.

A significant difference between existential and structural reconceptualism can be noted at this point. Pinar situated this awareness of self with respect to things outside of self as a keystone in his framework for unpacking the meaning and nature of the educational experience. Apple, however, does not make his own awareness problematic. Instead, he takes note of the content of his awareness, and focuses his attention on why and how things outside of self have produced that particular content.

His basic methodology for generating understanding is made explicit in "Rationality as Ideology," where he writes "to gain insight, to understand the activity of men and women of a specific historical period, one must start out by questioning what to them is unquestionable. . . . The investigator must situate those activities in a larger arena of economic, ideological, and social conflict." Apple believes that one of the most neglected areas of educational scholarship is such situating, which he defines as "the critical study of the relationship between ideologies and educational thought and practice, the study and the range of seemingly commonsense assumptions that guide our overly technically-minded field."[58]

Apple himself believes that study such as he calls for would not really constitute a reconceptualizing of the curriculum field, but a return to an issue which the field had forgotten, testifying to its basically ahistorical posture. Specifically, Apple recalls intense argumentation in the Progressive Education Association which featured as its main point of contention the problem of whether or not schools guided by a sense of a more just society should teach a particular set of social meanings to their students. Clear in the debate is a recognition that the culture preserved and distributed by schools is not neutral, and that the actions of educators stem from that recognition.[59]

Whether or not Apple is willing to claim the label of reconceptualist for this mode of thinking, it indeed illustrates what Benham and others had in mind as the "Structural" orientation within reconceptualism.

In this section of this chapter, selected works of Apple which illustrate in a substantial way the nature of structural critical curriculum theory are reviewed in the chronological order of their publication. Sometimes only portions of a particular work are included. The reason for this selectivity is that much of what Apple has written has had as one of its purposes the continuation of dialogue among neo-Marxist scholars at a highly sophisticated level of abstraction and theory, replete with the technical language and concepts of that particular tradition of inquiry. Those occasions in which Apple turns his constructs to the direct analysis of curriculum and schooling theory and practice are of interest in this study, and are reported here. Furthermore, although Apple has written two books, each tends to include reproductions or summaries of work already published in journals or anthologies. This review, therefore, features Apple's "shorter" works. As was the case with the review of Pinar, only primary sources are used.

Valuing, Science, and Schooling

In "The Process and Ideology of Valuing in Educational Settings," Apple[60] begins by asserting that in order to be more than a pretender to rationality, any field seeking to make conceptual headway must stand open to criticism. His comment is addressed directly to contemporary curriculum theorists who, in his view, seem more concerned with conceptual and social stability and a search for prior consensus than with a critical give-and-take which support genuine advances.

Apple grounds this article in the work of revisionist educational historian Michael Katz, who argued that schooling had reflected not the great democratic engines for identifying talent and matching it with opportunity, but rather a treatment of students as units to be processed into particular shapes and dropped into slots roughly congruent with the status of their parents. In other words, "schools had been instrumental in confirming the existing distribution of knowledge and power in the United States."[61] Apple proceeds from this to present a case for reconceiving the testing and evaluation movement as an example of this interpretation of schooling, saying that the "quest for efficiency and quantitative 'output measures' that the movement embodies has mirrored social interests in stability, human predictability, and ultimately social control."[62] Recognizing that this may be disconcerting to evaluation and other school people, Apple cautions them not to dismiss it casually, the reason being that "Education is through and through a valuative enterprise. The proposals educators make for organizing and evaluating school activities are usually derived from slogan systems (such as 'structure of the disciplines,' 'life adjustment,' and 'social efficiency') with identifiable ideological and philosophical presuppositions. Given this fact, educators cannot afford to be less than fully aware of the latent tendencies in their work."[63] Indeed, "there are very few things as conceptually, ethically, and politically complex as education, and educational scholarship has hardly scratched the surface of its intricacies."[64]

Apple begins his actual reconceptualization of the evaluation movement by identifying six of its characteristics in which ideological perspectives can be seen: (1) Process-Product Reasoning - evaluation is a process of social valuing in which a person or group assigns value to the activities, goals, and procedures done by others. This placing of value implies a choice from a range of value systems, and "it is not naturally predetermined that education should be valued only for its ability to reach our goals adequately and efficiently."[65] Process-product rationality is actually a factory metaphor, usually fit into a systems management approach, which usually defuses any debate over which goals to strive for. The tools of this approach embody an ideology of control, overvalue certainty, trivialize inquiry, and are psychologically and philosophically naive. (2) Evaluation as a Social Construct - "the guiding principles of evaluation are not inherent in individuals. . . . Rather, they are instances of the application of identifiable social rules about what is to be considered good or bad performance."[66] As well as evaluating recipients, evaluation should also focus on evaluating the school as an institution that embodies those social rules and assumptions. "Educators must examine the ideological and political uses of evaluation and the place of the school in the larger social setting if they are to uncover what evaluation is actually about. And they must engage in the prior examination of what is considered valuable knowledge both overtly and covertly in school settings."[67] (3) The Process of Political Quiescence - evaluation is often used for political purposes, sometimes to get a group the tangible "results" it wants, at the expense of others. Furthermore, evaluation, and its results, are often intentionally used to arouse or placate the public at large. (4) The Role of the Expert - an evaluator's perspectives are strongly influenced by the collectivity to which he belongs. The linguistic, programmatic, methodological, and conceptual tools, and expectations of how they are to be used, are built into his job. In general, a logic of reconstructed rather than science-in-use scientific investigation is used, featuring an outdated positivistic model which defines out of existence forms of meaning illuminated only through ethical and aesthetic perspectives. Usually the evaluator's job is perceived to be to furnish administrators specific information they think they need in order to decide a particular matter; the type of knowledge the expert is to provide is determined for him in advance. (5) Clinical Assumptions and Bureaucratic Support - "evaluation" generally accepts a basic institutional definition of underachiever, places "blame" on the person rather than the institution, and takes action to change the individual rather than the structure of the institutional setting. Such activity does not help solve the problem of how to design environments that strike a balance between a student's desire for a setting that is personally responsive and the educator's need to school and control large masses of students. "This is as much a moral problem as it is an engineering one."[68] (6) The Logic of Research and the Ideology of Control - consciousness in modern advanced societies centers on forms of logic that tend to make people treat major problems as technical problems that can be solved with the application of engineering rationality. Ethical questions are defined out of existence, and redefined in terms of instrumental logic into technical concerns solvable by standardized means to get previously chosen ends. Such interest in control and certainty may be warranted in the physical sciences, but in human sciences this orientation eliminates the ambiguity and uncertainty that makes human action a personal statement, leads to alienation, and prevents ethical and political dialogue from evolving. In such a context, "educational thought becomes an ideology of manipulation rather than a means for providing varied structures that can be made responsive to the needs of intellectual traditions, social benefits, and student sentiments."[69]

Apple concludes with a call for a new question for evaluation, and new questions for evaluators. Noting that the "goodness" of an educational environment is an ethical question, embodying disparate views of how a group of individuals may treat a younger group, Apple suggests that the questions for educational evaluation should be whether the basic style of interaction in an institution reflects a commitment to treat individuals justly. The answering of this question would not call for more rigorous empirical methodology, but rather a legal and philosophical sophistication sorely lacking in the educational community. In the same vein, evaluators should ask new questions, such as "Why is it important for students to learn particular what's, how's and to's? Is the reason we continually find little significant difference in our comparative evaluations due to epistemological and analytic as well as methodological problems? What social group does this research support? And, finally, Is my work truly contributing to the reconstruction of educational institutions so that they are more just and responsive?"[70]

In "Scientific Interests and the Nature of Educational Institutions," Apple[71] continues to develop his themes that people in education should be aware of the value and ethical assumptions which ground their theoretic and practical activity. The thesis of this article is that the basis of many of the oppressive qualities of schooling lies in the set of assumptions that educators bring to their work. These assumptions reside in the models and language systems that are applied in designing educational environments, and are operative in a large portion of educational research. Behind them is a fundamental ethic that all important modes of human action can be known in advance by educators and social scientists, that certainty in interaction among people is of primary import, and that the primary aspects of the thought and sentiments of students must be brought under institutional control. The habits of thought generated by such assumptions and ethics mirror the lack of self-reflectiveness among members of the curriculum field, whose "reality," so "commonsensical" it is never questioned, sets boundaries for curricular imagination and provides the framework for a large portion of the problematic activities of schooling.

Apple believes that educators have taken on an outmoded positivistic stance, a stance which avows empirical certainty and disavows critical self-reflection, and have given it the name and prestige of _the_ scientific method. Consequent to the lack of reflectivity, this dominating style of scientific rationality is perceived as being interest free, a perception that contributes to a strong manipulative ethos of schooling. Most educators seem to be primarily interested in efficiency and smoothness of operation rather than intellectual and valuative conflict, and seek out paradigms to serve this interest. One paradigm frequently chosen is systems management, in which one identifies in advance what the learner must be able to do, know, and feel as outcomes of his learning experience; in effect, thought, action, and feeling are separated, and the environment is controlled so that an individual's behavior and thought will not deviate from the prescribed goals. Educators have become so enamoured with this form of what they believe to be science that science is no longer viewed as merely a way of gaining some forms of knowledge, but has become so engrained in consciousness as to have become a value.

This appropriating of positivistic science has two rather frightening implications. One is that educators have become so enamoured of "scientific procedures" that they expect arguments against what happens in schools to be couched in scientific language. Criticisms which are not so couched are ignored as "merely speculative." Those criticisms which nevertheless do slip through generally encounter extreme reactions, usually because they not only challenge the concrete activities of schooling, but also the valuative underpinnings upon which the whole edifice rests. The other implication is that while a technology of science is borrowed, the constitutive aspects of scientific rationality which keep it human are not. Symbolic experimentation, embiguity and subtlety, play and esthetic awareness, all of which characterize the work of the true scientist and parallel the arts and humanities, are ruled out of the continuing quest for absolute surety and gross operationalism. What survives parallels a factory model of production, with the child treated both metaphorically and literally as a product.

To help open up some conceptual "breathing space" with respect to science, and to introduce his own view, Apple presents a taxonomy of science developed by Jürgens Halbermas.[72] The taxonomy identifies three forms of science: (1) Strict Science - yields information that is based on and presupposes the interests of certainty and technical control. (2) Hermeneutic Science - is historical-interpretive. It yields understanding of the cultural life-world, and presupposes an underlying interest in intersubjective understanding. (3) Critical Science - an emerging form, the fundamental interest of which is the emancipation of individuals from lawlike rules and patterns of action in "nature" and history so that they can reflect and act in a dialectical process of creating and recreating themselves and their institutions. Apple sees himself as working in this third form of science. He likens the rules of science to the rules of a game, which are of two sorts. There are constitutive rules, which provide basic ways of defining situations, and preference rules, which denote choices which can be made within the constitutive framework. Most controversies occur with respect to the preference rules; the constitutive rules are usually assumed and unquestioned. The most salient feature of "Critical Science" is that it refuses to limit its discourse within the realm of the preference rules, preferring instead to call the constitutive rules into question.

In conclusion, Apple observes that "Beneath our usual pattern of decision making about educational institutions there are perspectives that may commit us to certain ways of confronting other human beings . . . that tend to ignore basic ethical issues about the proper modes by which one individual may seek to influence another or do not enable us to grapple significantly with the political and economic reasons that our educational institutions are often repressive."[73]

A concept of science plays a different, and secondary but still important, role in "The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict."[74] A concept of conflict is primary in this work, which has two theses. The first thesis is that the way conflict is treated in school curricula can lead to political quiescence and the acceptance by students of a perspective on social and intellectual conflict that acts to maintain the existing distribution of power and rationality in a society. The second thesis is that a greater emphasis on organized skepticism and the uses of conflict, as they exist in the ideal norms of science, could counterbalance the tacit assumptions being taught.

Apple observes that schools are generally insulated from overt forms of political and ideological argumentation and exploitation, but political socialization nevertheless tacitly and powerfully occurs via a hidden curriculum in schools which teaches constitutive rules of conflict, that is, the boundaries of activities to engage or not engage in, the types of questions which may and may not be asked, and the types of activities of people which should be accepted or rejected. The basic assumption of this hidden curriculum is that conflict among groups of people is inherently and fundamentally bad, and that we should strive to eliminate it within the established framework of existing institutions. Controversy occurs within these parameters, but not about them.

Apple uses the Science and Social Science programs typical of most schools to illustrate his point. The science which is taught, he says, is organized around regularities in the discipline, and scientific work is tacitly linked with accepted standards of validity and taught as subject to empirical verification. What is not taught is that "science" is also a group of people, a community of individual scholars, governed by norms, principles and values which are regularly contested in significant intellectual and interpersonal struggles. This political dimension of the process of science is hidden; students never learn a view of conflict as functional and necessary to progress, and never see scientific work to be linked with political commitment. In other words, "scientific knowledge as it is taught in schools has, in effect, been divorced from the structure of the community from which it evolved and which acts to criticize it. Students are 'forced,' because of the absence of a realistic picture of how communities in science apportion power and economic resources, to internalize a view that has little potency for questioning the legitimacy of the tacit assumptions about interpersonal conflict that govern their lives and their own educational, economic, and political situations. Not only are they presented with a view of science that is patently unrealistic, but, what is more important for our own position, they are not shown how critical interpersonal and intergroup argumentation and conflict have been for the progress of science."[75]

The social science which is taught to students is, in Apple's view, similarly distorted, in that it presents a social reality that tacitly accepts "happy cooperation" as the normal if not best way of life. Noting this to be a value orientation, incapable of empirical proof, Apple points to its power in determining the questions educators ask and the educational experiences they design for students. Typical social science curricula teach that "elements of society . . . (are) linked to each other in a functional relationship, each contributing to the ongoing maintenance of society. Internal dissention and conflict in a society are viewed as inherently antithetical to the smooth functioning of the social order. Consensus is a pronounced feature."[76] Implicit in this is an emphasis on man as value-receiving and value-transmitting rather than value-creating. Furthermore, these meanings are made obligatory in that they come repeatedly to children from significant others, and are consistently reinforced in textbooks and other curriculum artifacts.

Apple concludes that "the curriculum field has limited its own forms of consciousness so that political and ideological assumptions that undergird a good deal of its normal patterns of activity are as hidden as those that students encounter in schools."[77]

Liberation and Reform

Out of his reflection upon what he sees as the inadequacies and even injustices of traditional modes of thinking about curriculum and schooling, Apple concludes in "Ideology, Reproduction, and Educational Reform"[78] that reform is absolutely necessary, and that a serious appraisal of educational reform needs to be grounded in an analysis of the complex relationships among knowledge, ideology, economics, and power. The questions to be asked are about the dialectical relationship of cultural control and social and economic structure, questions such as How do they affect each other? What role does an educational system play in defining particular forms of knowledge? and Who is most likely to benefit from typically proposed educational reforms?

Questions like these are not typically asked in curriculum, in part because of the ahistorical nature of curriculum theory, and in larger part because large portions of educational and curriculum theories derive their programmatic impetus and logical warrant from psychologies of learning almost exclusively. Apple points out that

> The language of learning tends to be apolitical and ahistorical, thus hiding the complex nexus of political and economic power and resources that lies behind a considerable amount of curriculum organization and selection. In brief, it is not an adequate linguistic tool for dealing with what must be a prior set of curriculum questions about some of the ideological roots of school knowledge. In their simplest aspects, these questions can be reduced to the following issues: What is actually taught in the schools? What are the manifest and latest functions of the knowledge that is taught in schools? How do the principles of selection and organization that we use to plan, order, and evaluate that knowledge function in the cultural and economic reproduction of class relations in an advanced industrial society like our own? . . . These questions are not usually part of the language game of psychology.[79]

Apple characterizes school knowledge to have been typically investigated in two ways, one called the "Academic Achievement Model,"[80] the other the "Socialization Approach."[81] In the Academic Achievement Model, curricular knowledge itself is not made problematic; rather, the knowledge that finds its way into schools is usually accepted as a given so that comparisons can be made among the knowledge achievements among groups of students. It focuses upon determining the variables having major impact on success or failure in school, its social goal is the maximizing of academic achievement and activity, and it is influenced more and more by the managerial concerns of technical control and efficiency. A stunning account of how technical control is increasingly entering schooling is presented in the article reviewed immediately following this one.

In the Socialization Approach, a restriction to study only what might be called "moral knowledge" has been self-imposed. The approach typically establishes as given the set of social rules, and investigates how the school as an agent of society socializes students into its shared set of normative rules and dispositions. It focuses on social consensus and the parallels between society and educational institutions, and ignores the political and economic context in which social values function and by which certain sets of social values become, by whose definition, the dominant values.

A third, more critical tradition of analysis is said to be emerging, one which makes as problematic "how a system of unequal power in society is maintained, and partly recreated, by a transmission of culture."[82] The school is seen as one important agent in this. Schools are seen as processing both knowledge and people, and, although perhaps unintentionally, using formal and informal knowledge as a complex filter to process people, often by class, and at the same time teaching different values and dispositions to different school populations, again often by class (and sex and race). In other words, schools are seen as latently recreating cultural and economic disparities in our society.

One of the ways that unequal power is maintained in our society, explains Apple in "Curriculum Form and the Logic of Technical Control,"[83] is through the increasingly pervasive use in schools of processes of production found useful in industry for reducing costs and increasing profit. In neo-Marxist thought, the institutions of a society are seen to be connected in a complex web of influence and counter-influence. The needs of one, and the actions of one, have direct implications for each of the others, which, in turn, react back. In this sense the needs of one "determine" what happens in another, but not in a simple cause-effect way, and usually not in such a way that "intentionality" can be ascribed to it, as though there is some sort of conspiracy going on. In a heavily industrialized and technical society such as ours, the "needs" of industry are the greatest and therefore are exerting the greater force in the web of interrelationships; they are "determining" what is happening in schools.

Apple notes that overt attempts by industry, with reinforcement from the "state," which is another institution within the web, to bring schools more closely into line with their "needs" are obvious and increasing. For example, Chairs of Free Enterprise devoted to economic education are showing up with accelerating regularity in universities, prepackaged programs of economic education are being produced by industry and made available to teachers, and teachers are invited to industry-sponsored workshops to learn industry's views regarding their economic practices and needs. However, Apple cautions, keeping our focus on overt attempts to bring school policy and curriculum into closer correspondence with industrial needs may make us overlook what is happening at the day-to-day level of school practice, which may be just as powerful. Apple surmises that at the level of social practice within the routine activities in schools, covert and powerful forces are at work to bring schools more in line with industrial needs. These forces are at work not only in curriculum content, but more powerfully in curriculum form, in the manner in which curriculum is organized.

Borrowing from the research of neo-Marxist scholars investigating the social reality of industry, Apple postulates that technical control, the hallmark of efficient industrial production, is being exerted via curricular form in two ways. One is through a process of deskilling and reskilling; the other is the separation of conception from execution.

As background to his hypothesis, Apple summarizes that in corporate production, firms purchase labor power - they buy the capacity one has to do work, and often seek to expand the use of that labor to make it more productive. With the purchase of labor power comes the "right" to stipulate, within certain limits, how it is to be used, without too much interference or participation by workers in the conception and planning of the work.

Three kinds of control can be employed to extract more work: Simple Control, which involves telling someone you have decided what should go on, and they should follow or else; Technical Control, which is embedded in the structure of the job - for example, a machine may be programmed, or "controlled," to do the actual work, with the "worker" being merely an attendant to the machine itself; and Bureaucratic Control, which is less visible, is embedded in the hierarchical social relations of the workplace, and consists of the bureaucratic rules concerning the direction of one's work and a system of rewards and sanctions dictated by officially approved policy. Industry has learned that control can be made more powerful by making it less visible, built into the very structure of the work itself. As such, it is unlikely to be resisted or subverted.

The "theory" of built-in control has three propositions: control should come from what appears to be a legitimate overall structure; control must be concerned with the actual work, not features extraneous to it; and, the job, the process, and the product must be defined as precisely as possible on the basis of management's, not the worker's, control over the specialized knowledge needed to carry it out, which often means technical control.

Deskilling and the separation of conception from execution are seen as complimentary processes. Deskilling involves a long process in which labor is divided and redivided to increase productivity, reduce inefficiency, and control both the cost and impact of labor. What this usually means is taking relatively complex jobs, which require quite a bit of skill and decision-making by the worker, and breaking them down into specified actions with specified results so that less skilled and less costly personnel can be used, or so that the pace and outcome of work can be better controlled. One of the more effective strategies is to incorporate control into the actual productive process itself, so that the worker need do little more than load and unload the machine, a strategy which often reduces labor cost and thereby increases profits.

When jobs are deskilled, the knowledge once controlled by the worker goes somewhere, usually to management. Knowledge is now separated from execution. The control of knowledge enables management to do the planning, away from the point of production; the role of the worker is simply to execute the plan to the specifications, and at the pace, set by management. Since new techniques may be needed to do the new work and to run the new machines, workers may need to be reskilled.

Apple believes the school to provide "an excellent microcosm for seeing these kinds of mechanisms of control in operation,"[84] and that through the processes of control, subtle ideological transformations are taking place. One example is the increasingly pervasive reliance in schools on prepackaged sets of standardized curriculum materials, complete with given objectives, all the content and materials needed, prespecified teacher actions and appropriate student responses, and diagnostic and achievement tests which are coordinated with the system. The whole process is defined as precisely as possible by people external to the classroom situation.

Concurrent with the use of packaged curricula is the deskilling of the teacher. It is no longer necessary for teachers to use the skills once deemed essential to the craft of working with children, such as curriculum deliberation, curriculum planning, and the designing of teaching and curricular strategies for specific groups and individuals based upon an intimate knowledge of those people. Because these skills are less often required, they atrophy.

In order for teachers to implement the new curricula, they need to be reskilled, and there is evidence across the country of this reskilling going on in teacher training institutions, inservice workshops, professional journals, and the funding patterns of state and private philanthropic organizations. Specifically, increased skills in the use of behavior management techniques and in systems management strategies are being incorporated into curriculum material and built into teacher repertoires. These can be seen as promoting the ideological visions of management in which predictability, accountability, and efficiency are central features. Says Apple, "As teachers lose control of curricular and pedagogic skills to large publishing houses, these skills are replaced by techniques for better controlling students."[85]

Two of the more notable consequences of the deskilling-reskilling process, and the separation of conception from execution, are that teachers become more isolated from students, and from their colleagues. In the classroom, teachers become managers. Students need little overt interaction with teachers or peers since procedures are easily learned, and standardized. In this context, "individualization" refers merely to the pace at which a student proceeds through the material. In the faculty room, little interaction is necessary among teachers at the level of classroom practice. This severs one of the formerly strong bonds between teachers, and as they move apart from one another it becomes more difficult for them jointly to maintain control over curricular decisions. Teachers become unattached individuals, divorced from their colleagues and the actual stuff of their work.

All of this gets into schools, says Apple, not necessarily because of any conspiracy to change schools, on the part of industrialists or anyone else, but through the cumulative effect of several features characteristic of our larger social, economic, and political context. One explanation is that schools are lucrative markets, actively sought by publishers who, like any other business, would like to increase profit by higher volume, the standardization of product elements, and the stimulation of product purchase and repurchase. Standardized curricula, with consumable units, are a step in this direction. The National Defense Education Act, which provided the equivalent of cash credits to school districts who purchased this new material created by the private sector, helped it along, as did a view in the cold war climate of the 1950's and 1960's that teachers were unsophisticated enough by themselves to produce the scientists, technicians, and stable workforce which was needed, thereby encouraging the development of "teacher-proof" materials. Furthermore, the whole process looked so "scientific," based as it was on the principles of behavior and learning psychology, that it raised the prestige of schooling in a society in which science had become a value, and served to deflect criticism and secure funding.

Until serious theoretical alternatives are developed and become part of the public consciousness, Apple sees little chance of changing things in any significant way. The logic of technical control is solidly entrenched, in no small way due to the unique fact that it can, when uncritically examined, integrate into one discourse seemingly contradictory ideological positions, and thereby generate support from each of them. Administrators and managers need accountability and control; teachers need something "practical" to use with their students; the state needs efficient production and cost savings; parents want "quality education" that "works;" and industrial capital needs efficient producers. The utility of this discourse is not lost upon state bureaucrats, who are well aware that they need to be perceived as having rational and accountable procedures in order to legitimate their own activities as "the state."

Before moving to suggest a possible way out of all this, Apple pauses to reflect on the kind of individual "produced" in the current system. Student behaviors, after all, are as prespecified as those of their teachers. Because the notion of curriculum has been reduced to the mastery of sets of competencies and skills, the mark of a "good" student is his possession and accumulation of those skills. These can be thought of as his "cultural capital" which he can identify himself as an individual. The emerging concept of "individualism" is not cast in the terms of autonomy and control over one's destiny, but "careerist individualism." The individual "earns" a particular job through his attainment of skills learned in school, and then keeps and enhances his career by following rules he also learned in school. The "career individualist" is geared toward organizational mobility and advancement by following technical rules. He has a rules orientation - he is aware of them and in the habit of following them; he is more dependable - he will perform according to the rules, at a relatively consistent level, and will get the job done; and, he will internalize the goals and values of the enterprise for which he works.

In his concluding remarks about how individuals might liberate themselves from the oppression engendered in the bureaucratic structures typical of our society, Apple speculates about the possible impact of neo-Marxist social research presently being developed but which has not yet been focused very much on schools. Specifically under investigation is a "principle of contradiction," which appears to have two meanings. One meaning is that within the interlocking web of institutions there are always contradictory forces at work which appear to operate in powerful but as yet dimly understood ways to modify each other, singly and in concert. Another meaning seems to be that individuals do not always react to forces in ways that one might expect if a simple cause-effect mechanical relationship of force to object is assumed. Sometimes people react in ways that are intended to subvert the power of the force. Apple points to evidences of both forms of contradiction in schools. At the institutional level there are examples of strong school staffs or districts which have resisted successfully the encroachment of standardized curricula into their domain, and stood firm in opposition to the demands of an industrial community for an education which was more likely to produce workers with the specific skills and attitudes which industry said it needed. These schools were not as aware of, though, or as successful in resisting more covert and subtle practices consistent with the logic of technical control. At the level of the individual, Apple points to teachers who close the classroom door and do what they decide is best, or hurry to get the required curricula out of the way in order to get on with other things. Furthermore, there are teachers who chose deliberately certain contents which will first illuminate, then contradict, the messages of form. These resistances, however, as significant as they might be as exemplars, tend to be too localized to have any general impact on schools, and frequently those who practice them are not very much more aware of what they are doing than are their colleagues who are trying in good conscience to do what they believe to be expected of them.

It may be the case, suggests Apple, that when the principle of contradiction is better understood, and when the general corpus of neo-Marxist research and insight is more publically known and accepted, the work of emanicipation may begin in earnest.

Traditional Conceptions

The purpose of this brief section is to present a sketch of traditional thinking about schooling and curriculum as Pinar and Apple perceive it. This sketch is a compilation of concepts extracted and paraphrased from the primary sources reviewed in this chapter. "Traditional" is loosely interpreted to include contemporary as well as historical modes of thinking which Pinar and Apple identify as being dominant.

What is remarkably obvious is that Pinar and Apple share very similar perceptions. They may ground their reconceptualizations in different theoretical systems, but their analyses of that which they are against are coincident. What seems almost to astonish both men is that mainline educational thinking has ignored, or even been blind to, the basic valuative nature of its theories and practices. In their view, the underlying assumptions of traditional thinking have too long remained unexamined, and the ethical character of traditional activities has been insufficiently challenged.

Traditional thinking about schooling and curriculum is seen as having borrowed extensively from bureaucratic models originally designed to enhance industrial production, and from an outmoded brand of positivistic thinking about empirical science. From these two bases has emerged a predominant systems approach to schooling, featuring essentially an input-process-output agenda for curriculum theorizing and schooling practice. This approach has been reinforced by an increasing reliance on behavioral psychology and learning theory, both of which in turn have been themselves strongly influenced by a positivistic view of science.

Both theorists view the tradition as guilty of insufficiently promoting the individual. Schools and curricula have been fashioned primarily to meet the needs of the institution or of some other group which not only had the power, but also believed it had the need and the right to decide for the recipients of schooling what it was that they would learn to think, to feel, and to do. In the process, the person has become objectified, a thing to be, as the factory metaphor expresses, produced by the school. Efficient, mass production has become a controlling ethic, and the goal has become successive generations of graduates who have been socialized to the status quo; who, having become lost to themselves, will accept an identity conferred upon them by society or at least play the game of following the rules well enough not to cause much trouble. The ultimate consequence of this processing, programming, and standardization of students is the production of a generation of graduates even less aware of the social, political, and economic webs of influence which have shaped them, the injustice of their treatment, or any sense of what they can or should do about it.

Notes

[1] Barbara J. Benham, "Curriculum Theory in the 1970's: The Reconceptualist Movement," Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3 (Winter 1981), 162-170.

[2] William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[3] Benham, p. 164.

[4] Benham, p. 167.

[5] Benham, p. 168.

[6] Benham, p. 168.

[7] Pinar, The Reconceptualists, p. xi.

[8] William F. Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," in Curriculum and Instruction, eds. Henry A. Giroux, Anthony N. Penna, and William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981).

[9] Pinar, "Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 88.

[10] Pinar, "Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 89.

[11] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, ed. William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[12] Kliebard, "Persistent Issues," pp. 41-43.

[13] Kliebard, "Persistent Issues," p. 45.

[14] Kliebard, "Persistent Issues," p. 46, quoted from Richard S. Peters, Education as Initiation (London: George S. Harp, 1964), p. 47.

[15] Kliebard, "Persistent Issues, p. 47.

[16] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, ed. William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[17] Kliebard, "Bureaucracy," p. 56.

[18] Kliebard, "Bureaucracy," p. 58.

[19] Kliebard, "Bureaucracy," p. 61.

[20] Kliebard, "Bureaucracy," p. 67.

[21] Pinar, The Reconceptualists, p. xii.

[22] Pinar, "Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 92.

[23] Pinar, "Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 93.

[24] Pinar, The Reconceptualists, p. xiii.

[25] William F. Pinar, "A Reply to My Critics," in Curriculum and Instruction, eds. Henry A. Giroux, Anthony N. Penna, and William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981).

[26] Pinar, "Reply to Critics," p. 394.

[27] Pinar, "Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 93.

[28] Pinar, "Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 94.

[29] Pinar, The Reconceptualists, p. xiv.

[30] Pinar, "Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 95.

[31] William F. Pinar, "Sanity, Madness, and the School," in his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[32] Pinar, "Sanity," p. 359.

[33] Pinar, "Sanity," p. 360, cited as "Sartre as quoted by Friere in 1970."

[34] Pinar, "Sanity," p. 361.

[35] William F. Pinar, "The Analysis of Educational Experience," in his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[36] William F. Pinar, "Currere: Toward Reconceptualization," in his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[37] William F. Pinar, "Search for a Method," in his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[38] Pinar, "Analysis of Experience," p. 385.

[39] Pinar, "Analysis of Experience," p. 388.

[40] Pinar, "Analysis of Experience," p. 392.

[41] Pinar, "Analysis of Experience," p. 391. Pinar credits this conceptualization to R.D. Laing.

[42] Pinar, "Currere," p. 396.

[43] Pinar, "Currere," p. 400.

[44] Pinar, "Currere," p. 409.

[45] Pinar, "Currere," p. 412.

[46] Pinar, "Currere," p. 412.

[47] Pinar, "Search for Method," p. 416.

[48] Pinar, "Search for Method," pp. 416-417.

[49] Pinar, "Search for Method," p. 418.

[50] Pinar, "Search for Method," p. 418.

[51] William F. Pinar, "The Abstract and Concrete in Curriculum Theorizing," in Curriculum and Instruction, eds. Henry A. Giroux, Anthony N. Penna, and William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981).

[52] Pinar, "Abstract and Concrete," p. 432.

[53] Pinar, "Abstract and Concrete," p. 433.

[54] Pinar, "Abstract and Concrete," p. 434.

[55] Pinar, "Abstract and Concrete," p. 434.

[56] Pinar, "Abstract and Concrete," p. 437.

[57] Michael W. Apple, Education and Power (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).

[58] Michael W. Apple, "Rationality as Ideology," rev. of Review of Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of Twentieth Century Liberal Education Policy, by Walter Feinberg, Educational Theory, 26 (Winter 1979), p. 121.

[59] Michael W. Apple, "Ideology, Reproduction, and Educational Reform," Comparative Education Review, October 1978, p. 370.

[60] Michael W. Apple, "The Process and Ideology of Valuing in Educational Settings," in Educational Evaluation: Analysis and Responsibility, eds. Michael W. Apple, Michael Subkoviak, and Henry Lufler Jr. (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974).

[61] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 6.

[62] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 6.

[63] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 6.

[64] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 17.

[65] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 8.

[66] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 12.

[67] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 13.

[68] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 19.

[69] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 22.

[70] Apple, "Process and Ideology, p. 29.

[71] Michael W. Apple, "Scientific Interests and the Nature of Educational Institutions," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, ed. William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[72] Apple, "Scientific Interests," p. 130, note 18 states the main thrusts of Halbermas' position to be put forth in Trent Schroyer, "Toward a Critical Theory for Advanced Industrial Society," ed. Recent Sociology, no. 2, ed. Hans Peter Dreitzel (New York: Macmillan, 1970), 210-34.

[73] Apple, "Scientific Interests," p. 129.

[74] Michael W. Apple, "The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, ed. William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975).

[75] Apple, "Hidden Curriculum," p. 104.

[76] Apple, "Hidden Curriculum," p. 105.

[77] Apple, "Hidden Curriculum," p. 114.

[78] Apple, Comparative Education Review, 1978.

[79] Apple, "Ideology, Reproduction, and Reform," p. 372.

[80] Apple, "Ideology, Reproduction, and Reform," p. 372.

[81] Apple, "Ideology, Reproduction, and Reform," p. 373.

[82] Apple, "Ideology, Reproduction, and Reform," p. 374. Credit for the statement of the problem in this form given to Pierre Bourdieu and Jean Claude Passeron, Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (London: Sage Publications, 1977).

[83] Michael W. Apple, "Curriculum Form and the Logic of Technical Control: Building the Possessive Individual," in his Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).

[84] Apple, "Curriculum and Control," p. 253.

[85] Apple, "Curriculum and Control," p. 255.

CHAPTER 5

THE APPLICATION OF A FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING TRADITIONAL CONCEPTIONS, AND EXISTENTIAL AND STRUCTURAL RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS, OF EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

Introduction

As stated in Chapter 1, the major purposes of this study are to provide a framework through which the major themes of two identifiable groups of reconceptualists can be accommodated to each other and to their perceptions of the mode of thinking which they believe to be dominant, and to employ the framework in an attempt to provide for teacher educators a greater degree of conceptual clarity regarding reconceptualist criticisms and alternatives.

As explained in Chapter 3, the framework consists of a two dimensional matrix which will facilitate the display, analysis, and cross-referencing of five selected characteristics of traditional and reconceptualized views of curriculum and schooling. The characteristics of the view to which the framework calls attention are the questions that are asked, the sources which are explored for answers, the conception it has of curriculum, the conception it has of school in society, and its conception of value.

In this chapter, the content of the works of William Pinar and Michael Apple which were reviewed in Chapter 4 are recast in terms of the categories of the framework, and then distilled to a few synoptic terms which are placed in the cells of the matrix. This chapter is organized into three main sections, reflecting the three categories along the abscissa of the framework: Traditional Conceptions as Perceived by Reconceptualists; Reconceptualization: Existential (Pinar); and Reconceptualization: Structural (Apple). Within each section, the five categories identified along the ordinant of the framework are considered in the sequence in which they appear. Each section further includes a display of the appropriate column of the framework with the synoptic terms placed in the cells. Each section concludes with comments about the view as a whole.

Traditional Conceptions as Perceived by Reconceptualists

Recasting of Concepts into the Categories of the Framework

Questions Asked. The questions that traditional thinkers are perceived as asking are basically the same four identified by Ralph Tyler: What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?; What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?; How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?; and, How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? This perception is consistent with those of other theorists presented in the review of "Traditional Curriculum Thinking" in Chapter 2. Traditional curriculum and schooling people are seen as having made few, if any, serious collective efforts to make Tyler's questions themselves problematic in an attempt to understand the values residing in the assumptions out of which the questions were originally framed. Neither have there been very many serious, collective attempts to understand the explicit or latent ethical dimensions of practices which these questions have generated. This lack of reflectivity, both by Tyler and those whose work continues under his influence, is considered by the reconceptualists to have rendered the curriculum field philosophically naive, at best.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "Tyler Rationale," and "philosophical naivete."

Location of Answers. The answers which have characteristically evolved from the questions posed by Tyler are seen to have been grounded in three theoretic sources. These sources, in turn, are seen as having been influenced by a reductionistic view of science inherent in the philosophy of positivism, which tries to pose all questions as technical problems to be solved by engineering rationality, and rejects as "merely metaphysical" all questions it cannot handle. One of the sources is psychology and learning theory, particularly a psychology featuring a behavior-consequence, stimulus-response approach. A second source is an industrial model of bureaucratic organization which values predictability, standardization, and efficiency in the service of controlled production. A third source is a form of social theory which promotes socialization and consensus as its conceptual values and goals.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "behavioral psychology," "industrial bureaucracy," "consensus sociology," and "empirical analysis."

Conception of Curriculum. Given the influence of sources such as those identified, curriculum has come to be seen as having characteristics metaphorically expressed as "the factory model." More specifically, curriculum has become a controlled production process systematically employed to obtain preconceived ends. The ends are specific and uniform student knowledge, skills, and attitudes which will socialize the student into the extant society and equip him to play a maintenance role within it. Specific treatments are designed and sequenced to increase the probability of students achieving those ends. This orientation toward curriculum is seen as consistent with the Latin *currare*, "a course to be run." Pinar and Apple agree with Kliebard's assessment that most curriculum work is ahistorical and ameliorative, dedicated as it is to work within the conceptual limitations of the dominant model and sources to fine-tune educational thought and practice.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "currare," "system," "pragmatism," and "uniform."

Conception of School in Society. The conception of the function of how the school is to perform in society serves to legitimate both the conception of curriculum and the theoretical bases from which it is nurtured. In the traditional view, the extant culture is given to be transmitted to and endorsed by students. The role of the school is not to produce negotiators or reformers of culture; but, rather, persons who will either accept society as it is or work within set parameters of acceptable activity to improve it. In other words, the role of the school is to minimize conflict and promote a consensus view that society is basically acceptable the way it is, and to produce graduates equipped to do what is necessary to maintain the extant political, social, and economic order. The school is expected to perform this function efficiently, and effectively.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "production," maintenance," and "consensus."

Conception of Value. Several conceptions of value and valuing are evident in the characterization of traditional thinking presented in the first four categories. One thing that is obvious is that a particular conception of "science" has become a constitutive value, assumed without challenge and setting limits within which all subsequent theorizing, practice, and debate is expected to occur. Traditionalists are seen as believing this view of science to be value-neutral, but employable in securing and maintaining those things which society values. What society appears to value above all is itself, which leads it to define the value of the individual in terms of his relationship to society, and to view the student as one who should be filled with society's values rather than create his own. Pinar and Apple believe traditionalists to be unaware of many of the value

TABLE 5.1 Traditional Conceptions as Perceived by Reconceptualists

	TRADITIONAL CONCEPTIONS AS PERCEIVED BY RECONCEPTUALISTS
QUESTIONS ASKED	- Tyler Rationale - Philosophical Naivete
LOCATION OF ANSWERS	- Empirical Analysis - Behavioral Psychology - Industrial Bureaucracy - Consensus Sociology
CONCEPTION OF CURRICULUM	- Currare - System - Pragmatism - Uniform
CONCEPTION OF SCHOOL IN SOCIETY	- Production - Maintenance - Consensus
CONCEPTION OF VALUE	- Science - Transmission - Status Quo - All Terms in Prior Categories

assumptions undergirding or the ethical implications accompanying their theories and practices.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "science," "transmission," "status quo," and "all terms in prior categories." A rationale for the final term is provided in the comments regarding traditional thinking viewed as a whole.

Summary Terms, the Framework, and Comment

Table 5.1, "Traditional Conceptions as Perceived by Reconceptualists," presents that portion of the framework displayed in Table 3.1 which catalogues the characteristics of traditional thinking as analyzed in this chapter. The terms used to summarize each category have been placed into the cells of the matrix.

What should be noted is that the three terms listed in the "Conception of Value" cell are implicit in the preceding categories, and in some instances are synonyms for terms in those categories. There is, for example, an obvious similarity between "status quo" in "Conception of Value," "consensus" in "Conception of School in Society," and "consensus sociology" in "Location of Answers," all of which are perceived to be "philosophically naive," as stated in "Questions Asked." Similar congruences exist among other terms. These correlations exemplify the points originally made in Chapter 3 that the categories of the framework are not discrete, and that value positions reside in all categories. For this reason, the phrase "all terms in prior categories" has been added to "Conception of Value."

Furthermore, considering the traditional conception as a whole warrants the conclusion that there is a remarkable degree of internal consistency and coherence in traditional thinking, at least as perceived by Pinar and Apple, if not indeed in reality.

Reconceptualization: Existential (Pinar)

Recasting of Concepts into the Categories of the Framework

Questions Asked. Clearly and consistently, the question which holds all of Pinar's work together is "What is the nature of the educational experience?" His focus is the individual's awareness of his actual experiencing of education, and his goal is finally to arrive at insights that help answer the existential questions "Who am I?" and "How can I find myself?" Pinar is convinced that in contemporary society, of which traditional education is but one agent, the individual becomes easily lost to himself and in some sense owned. Pinar suggests that the existential questioning can begin only after one becomes aware of being owned, and begins to ask "Whose am I?" and "How can I liberate myself?"

The questions which summarize this section for the framework are "What is the nature of educational experience?", "Who am I?", and "How can I find and free myself?"

Location of Answers. For Pinar there is ultimately one single source of answers, but it is accessible through several intermediate and interconnected routes. The single source is what Pinar calls the lebenswelt, the preconceptual and usually unconscious world of domain assumptions and lived experiences which define the self. The lebenswelt is not recognized by "science," and is unapproachable via empirical investigation. Rather, the historical, philosophical, and literary methodologies and insights characteristic of existential philosophy, Marxist sociology, and phenomenological psychology will more likely take one through the Whose am I? question to the door of the lebenswelt. Given the perverse strength and complex nature of the forces which have shaped and imprisoned one's consciousness, fighting through it calls for persistent, hard, and, for Pinar, necessarily intellectual work.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "lebenswelt," "intellection," "existential philosophy," "Marxist sociology," "phenomenology," and "historical, philosophical, and literary analysis."

Conception of Curriculum. Consistent with the emphasis placed on the importance of the self in existential philosophy, the conception of curriculum Pinar works with features the education of the self, by and for the self. He develops a methodology for this called Currere, the same as the Latin currere, which denotes the experiencing of running a course. Currere calls for a regressive intellectual description of one's past experiencing, a progressive intellectual description of one's imagined future, an analytic psycho-analysis of one's phenomenologically described present, and a synthetic assessment of the dialectical relationship between the self and the larger political and social context and web in which the self resides. Currere is seen as ongoing, never complete in any final sense, but its continued use will help liberate the concrete individual from abstraction by granting him access to his lebenswelt.

The terms which summarize this category for the framework are "currere," "the self," and "liberation."

Conception of School in Society. Although Pinar does not speak directly to this point except to lay bare and criticize what he perceives to be the repressiveness of traditional thought and practice, one can by implication derive a view of what schools should be doing. It seems reasonable to infer that Pinar believes it to be the responsibility of society, and hence for schools as powerful institutions within society, to serve and promote the individual by helping him become more self-aware and self-loving. Furthermore, schools should equip students to deal in an aware and transforming way with the restrictive forces and inequities in the social, political, and economic contexts in which they find themselves. In order to promote this, schools should induct students into the methodology of currere, and, since intellectual activity is essential to the method, the intellect presumably should be developed. One dimension of this is explicitly clear: teachers themselves must engage in currere in order for them to be able to lead students into it.

The terms which summarize this category for the framework are "promote individual," "practice currere," and "alieviate injustice."

TABLE 5.2 Reconceptualization: Existential (Pinar)

	RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS
	EXISTENTIAL (PINAR)
QUESTIONS ASKED	- What is the Nature of the Educational Experience? - Who am I? - How can I Find and Free Myself?
LOCATION OF ANSWERS	- Lebenswelt - Intellection - Existential Philosophy - Marxist Sociology - Historical, Philosophical and Literary Analysis
CONCEPTION OF CURRICULUM	- Currere - The Self - Liberation
CONCEPTION OF SCHOOL IN SOCIETY	- Promote Individual - Practice Currere - Alleviate Injustice
CONCEPTION OF VALUE	- Self as Valuable - Self as Originator of Value - Justice - All Terms in Prior Categories

Conception of Value. It is clear in Pinar's work that the individual is perceived to be inherently valuable, and furthermore, that the individual is the source and creator of the values he holds. Pinar makes no attempt to "prove" human value; he assumes it, and the rest of his theorizing proceeds from this assumption. Also evident in Pinar's work is that some concept of justice is valued, as is indicated by a sense that not only is it necessary for a person to become self-aware, but also that he be actively at work in creating social conditions which will promote the possibility of similar self-awareness for others, thereby alleviating the injustice of oppression.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "self as valuable," "self as originator of value," "justice," and "all terms in prior categories."

Summary Terms, the Framework, and Comment

Table 5.2, "Reconceptualization: Existential (Pinar)," presents that portion of the framework presented in Table 3.1 which catalogues the characteristics of Pinar-as-exemplar of the Existential orientation in reconceptualism as analyzed in this chapter. The terms used to summarize each category have been placed in the cells of the matrix.

As was the case in the analysis of the traditional conception, the terms used to summarize each category identified in the framework are frequently synonymous or congruent with the terms in other categories. Similar overlap occurs in the analytical narrative. For example, the "Questions Asked" narrative concludes with the suggestion that the "Whose am I?" question needs to be explored as part of the movement through consciousness to the lebenswelt. This statement would be equally at home in the "Location of Answers" or the "Conception of Curriculum" sections. Also, the "Conception of School in Society" section concludes with "should" statements that might equally be subsumable in the "Conception of Curriculum" section. In the judgement of this writer, this phenomenon is not due to imprecision in language or in the categories of the framework, but is once again indicative of the degree to which the categories interpenetrate one another, not just in the framework, but in the reality of theoretic discourse as well.

Reconceptualization: Structural (Apple)

Recasting of Concepts into the Categories of the Framework

Questions Asked. The question which serves to organize and provide continuity for Apple's work relating to education is the same as Pinar's, "What is the nature of the educational experience?" However, whereas Pinar moves in the direction of analyzing the felt dimensions of experiencing, Apple turns to develop a clearer understanding of the way the external world works to create those educational experiences. More specifically, Apple asks questions such as What are the social, political, and economic relations which have produced educational experiences characteristic of our time?, What is the role of the school in the social order?, and How can we make schools more just institutions? Apple's basic strategy is to question the unquestioned, to make problematic the unchallenged, assumptive basis upon which traditional thinking is constructed, and to investigate the latent and usually hidden consequences of traditional educational practice.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "What is the nature of educational experience?", "What are the structures which influence schooling?", and "How can schools promote social justice?"

Location of Answers. Clues regarding the source of answers are obvious in the form of Apple's questions. He obviously sees politics and economics to be structurally related, and in some sense "determining" forces in society; he sees schools to be related to those forces and playing some role with respect to them; and, he sees schools to be guilty of being unjust. The address of issues such as these is characteristic of social, political, and economic theory, and it is to the Marxist scholars to whom he specifically turns. As does Pinar, Apple identifies the methodologies of historical, philosophical, and language analysis to peel back the layers of theoretical interpretations of the subject he wishes better to understand. He investigates both the actual practices of schools and the theoretical explanations for these practices as part of his search for understanding.

although proportional power may shift from time to time within the web, the institution with the greater power at a particular time exerts the greater force. Given these dynamics, it is at least logically possible that schools could, in ways not yet adequately understood, become a force for social reform in the direction of a more equal and just distribution of cultural resources.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "web of interaction," "power," and "distributive justice."

Conception of Value. A notion of social justice figures large in Apple's work. The important thing to notice in Apple about justice as a value is that it functions not only as an end to be pursued in its own right, but as a means to promoting something of greater value, the individual human being, whose worth properly resides not in his material or cultural accumulations, or in his power, or in his social class, race, gender, or anything else, but in his basic humanity. Apple does not develop a theory of justice, and he devotes little of his writing to providing a rationale for it. Frequently only a sentence or two makes explicit reference to it. Unmistakeably and undeniably, however, a valuing of justice is the energizing center of his work.

The terms which summarize this category for the framework are "human value," "social justice," and "all terms in prior categories."

although proportional power may shift from time to time within the web, the institution with the greater power at a particular time exerts the greater force. Given these dynamics, it is at least logically possible that schools could, in ways not yet adequately understood, become a force for social reform in the direction of a more equal and just distribution of cultural resources.

The terms which summarize this section for the framework are "web of interaction," "power," and "distributive justice."

Conception of Value. A notion of social justice figures large in Apple's work. The important thing to notice in Apple about justice as a value is that it functions not only as an end to be pursued in its own right, but as a means to promoting something of greater value, the individual human being, whose worth properly resides not in his material or cultural accumulations, or in his power, or in his social class, race, gender, or anything alse, but in his basic humanity. Apple does not develop a theory of justice, and he devotes little of his writing to providing a rationale for it. Frequently only a sentence or two makes explicit reference to it. Unmistakeably and undeniably, however, a valuing of justice is the energizing center of his work.

The terms which summarize this category for the framework are "human value," "social justice," and "all terms in prior categories."

TABLE 5.3 Reconceptualization: Structural (Apple)

	RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS
	STRUCTURAL (APPLE)
QUESTIONS ASKED	- What is the Nature of the Educational Experience? - What are the Structures Which Influence Schooling? - How can Schools Promote Social Justice?
LOCATION OF ANSWERS	- Marxist Social Theory - Historical, Philosophical, and Language Analysis
CONCEPTION OF CURRICULUM	- Creation of Meanings - The Power of Form - Participatory Control - Active Justice
CONCEPTION OF SCHOOL IN SOCIETY	- Web of Interaction - Power - Distributive Justice
CONCEPTION OF VALUE	- Human Value - Social Justice - All Terms in Prior Categories

Summary Terms, the Framework, and Comment

Table 5.3, "Reconceptualization: Structural (Apple)," presents that portion of the framework in Table 3.1 which catalogues the characteristics of Apple-as-exemplar of the Structural orientation in reconceptualism as analyzed in this chapter. The terms used to summarize each category have been placed into the cells of the matrix.

Once again the permeable boundaries of the categories are visible, indicating that the categories of the framework themselves exist in an interlocking web of mutual influence in much the same way that Apple sees the institutions of society being related.

Summary

Table 5.4, "Completed Framework for Examining Traditional, Reconceptualized Existential, and Reconceptualized Structural Thinking about Curriculum and Schooling," places Tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 back into the context of the total framework.

That Pinar and Apple share a common set of perceptions regarding the traditional mode of thinking about curriculum and instruction has already been noted. The single column in the framework for clarifying traditional thought as perceived by Pinar and Apple visually reinforces that point.

Furthermore, the framework serves, as noted earlier, to make more readily visible the way, and the extent to which, each theory considered as a whole is a unified system of compatible and interrelated concepts. Such coherence is one of the distinguishing features of a good theoretical system, good not necessarily in the sense of accurate or true, although that may also be the case, but good in the sense of having internal logical coherence. The framework makes clear that each of the three theories presented are good theories, at least to the extent that they are cohesive in terms of the categories of this specific framework.

What the framework also serves to do, and this is more in line with the purposes behind developing the framework in the first place, is to bring into sharp focus the similarities and differences that exist between the Existential and Structural orientations in reconceptualism. This clarity has two benefits. One benefit is that each viewed in contrast to the other stands out more clearly in its own right. The other is that the increased degree of clarity enhances the deriving of possible and clear implications of reconceptual thinking for undergraduate programs of teacher education in liberal arts institutions, which is addressed in Chapter 6.

An analysis of the Existential and Structural columns of the framework reveals several notable similarities and differences between the theories of Pinar and Apple. In the category "Questions Asked," both theories indicate a desire better to understand the educational experience. However, whereas Pinar develops a line of questioning which turns the focus into oneself, Apple develops a line of questioning directed outward to the social structures which act externally to shape the individual. That the individual is indeed shaped is recognized by both.

TABLE 5.4 Completed Framework for Examining Traditional, Reconceptualized Existential, and Reconceptualized Structural Thinking About Curriculum and Schooling

	TRADITIONAL CONCEPTIONS AS PERCEIVED BY RECONCEPTUALISTS	RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS	
		EXISTENTIAL (PINAR)	STRUCTURAL (APPLE)
QUESTIONS ASKED	- Tyler Rationale - Philosophical Naivete	- What is the Nature of the Educational Experience? - Who am I? - How can I Find and Free Myself?	- What is the Nature of the Educational Experience? - What are the Structures which Influence Schooling? - How can Schools Promote Social Justice?
LOCATION OF ANSWERS	- Empirical Analysis - Behavioral Psychology - Industrial Bureaucracy - Consensus Sociology	- Lebenswelt - Intellection - Existential Philosophy - Marxist Sociology - Historical, Philosophical, and Literary Analysis	- Marxist Social Theory - Historical, Philosophical, and Literary Analysis

	TRADITIONAL CONCEPTIONS AS PERCEIVED BY RECONCEPTUALISTS	RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS	
		EXISTENTIAL (PINAR)	STRUCTURAL (APPLE)
CONCEPTION OF CURRICULUM	- Currare - System - Pragmatism - Uniform	- Currere - The Self - Liberation	- Creation of Meanings - The Power of Form - Participatory Control - Active Justice
CONCEPTION OF SCHOOL IN SOCIETY	- Production - Maintenance - Consensus	- Promote Individual - Practice Currere - Alleviate Injustice	- Web of Interaction - Power - Distributive Justice
CONCEPTION OF VALUE	- Science - Transmission - Status Quo - All Terms in Prior Categories	- Self as Valuable - Self as Originator of Value - Justice - All Terms in Prior Categories	- Human Value - Social Justice - All Terms in Prior Categories

In the category "Location of Answers," both theorists indicate a preference for using historical, philosophical, and literary methodologies for analysis, and both look to Marxist social theory as a source of answers. The difference between the theorists at this point is that for Apple, Marxist social theory, or more precisely, the work of social theorists working in the Marxist tradition, is virtually the sole source of insights and answers. For Pinar, Marxist perspectives are useful for understanding some of the dynamics involved in "Whose am I", but he relies more heavily on existential philosophy and phenomonological theory to help unpack the personal meanings of the educational experience. Both men rely heavily upon the intellect to do the work of the analysis.

In the category "Conception of Curriculum," one once again finds both similarities and differences. Both men are still trying better to understand meaning, and both recognize the power of the school to impose meanings upon the individual. Furthermore, both view the imposition as oppressive, and want to build curricular methodologies leading to liberation, or, as Pinar puts it, an emancipation from the ideological capture of self as abstraction. For Apple, liberation begins to occur when teachers and students being to take back some of the power to control, in a direct participatory way, what happens in schools. The biggest difference at this point between Pinar and Apple is that for Pinar the methodology of curriculum, currere, although a strategy anyone may employ, derives its content wholly, exclusively, and uniquely, from the intellections and the lebenswelt of each individual person. For Apple, however, the content may be socially or politically negotiated and may be standardized for all persons to some extent.

A valuing of justice is the dominant shared feature of the category "Conception of School in Society." Both men see justice as existing within a rights-responsibility relationship; in other words, each individual has the right to have his worth as individual promoted by others in society, but each individual is also under obligation to promote that same individual worth in others. To do both, in non-selfish and non-exploitive ways, is to promote justice. Consistent with his desire for uncovering the true nature of the existing self, Pinar wants teachers in schools to practice, model, and bring into student awareness the method of currere. Consistent with his desire to understand the structural relations and power in society, Apple wants teachers in schools to bring to student awareness those very concepts.

Given the consistent pattern of similarities and differences in Pinar's and Apple's thinking up to this point, one would expect that pattern to be repeated in the category "Conception of Value," and indeed it is. Predominant throughout, and isolated here for emphasis and summation, is the strong valuation by each theorist of the individual human being, and the affirmation of justice as a controlling ethic for society. Although Apple is not as clear as Pinar is about where values might be ultimately grounded (Pinar grounds all valuation in the existential self, whereas Apple appears to be more receptive to some form of social contracting), both assume and strongly affirm that to be clear about one's values is a first order concern, inasmuch as all subsequent action, if it is to be rational, must be built upon a conscious awareness of and commitment to those values.

But awareness of and commitment to values is not enough. Kliebard, as noted in Chapter 2, observed that it makes all the difference in the world what one's guiding philosophy is. As seen by the reconceptualists, the problem with the traditional mode of thinking about curriculum is not that it lacks values. On the contrary, one of the major contributions of Pinar and Apple is that they show traditional thinking to be strongly value-based, and they identify what those values are. Neither is the problem with traditional education that its value system is inchoate or inconsistent. As the framework for analysis helps make clear, there is value-consistency in thought and practice about curriculum and schooling in the traditional model. The problem with traditional thinking is not even that traditionalists, as seen by the reconceptualists, are unaware of the value dimensions of their work, although this state of affairs certainly continues to contribute to the problem.

At base, the problem with traditionalist thinking, as judged by the reconceptualists, is that the values with which it works are the wrong values. The basic error of traditional thinking is seen to be its acceptance of, reliance upon, and commitment to theoretical bases for educational thought and action which are rooted in the reductionistic view of science characteristic of the philosophy of positivism. The reconceptualists do not take issue with empirical thought per se'. At the very least, the methods of empirical research could be useful in documenting the unequal and unjust state of affairs that human beings face in the world today. Nor do the reconceptualists take issue with rationality. That they prize rationality is evident not only in their explicit statements affirming it, but also in the intellectual rigor and style of their critical analyses. What the reconceptualists object to is not only that a reductionistic view of science undergirds traditional thinking, but that it has taken-over the field totally. The view of science held by traditional thinking has elevated that form of science from a tool to a value. It functions to set limits on the range and form of questions that can be asked, and it dictates the sources of answers, which it has also influenced. By extension, it directs conceptions of what curriculum is, and conceptions of the proper role of the school in society.

The consequences of a world-and-life view such as this are seen to be devastating for the individual and for society. It has led to the abstraction of the concrete individual and dehumanized him. It has led to a manipulative ethos of schooling. It has led to defining value, even the value of human being, in terms of utility. Its engineering approach to conceptualizing and solving human problems leaves it blind to insights available only through aesthetic experiencing and hermeneutic inquiry, and has led to the ruling-out of existence as "merely metaphysical" all knowledge and belief claims incapable of empirical verification. In total, it functions to maintain and continually reproduce a wrongfully unequal and unjust social order.

Pinar, Apple, and other reconceptualists do not see themselves as merely offering some suggestions for the modification and improvement of current educational theory and practice. They view the issue as almost infinitely larger. What they are contesting and attempting to reconceive are the very bases upon which educational thought and practice are constructed. The driving force in all of their work is the vision of a world which values and nurtures each human being equally and justly, liberating him from the oppression and dehumanization which presently characterize his life not only in schools, but in the rest of his world as well. Reconceptualists recognize that the work to be done to attain the actualization of the vision is massive. Reconceiving must occur at all levels of thought and action, in all institutions of society. One wonders with them whether work of such magnitude can ever be fully conceived, much less accomplished. They believe, however, that to have their vision is to be committed to working to operationalize it, and they challenge others to join them in trying to come to grips with the issues. They believe that not to get involved in the work of reconceptualizing and changing the conditions of mankind is to give tacit endorsement to things as they are.

CHAPTER 6

POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS OF RECONCEPTUALISM FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS

Introduction

On the first page of this study the statement is made that reconceptualism, if substantiated, may have powerful implications for undergraduate programs of teacher education in liberal arts institutions. The thinking that produced that statement also led to the hypothesis that a framework which clarified reconceptualism could also, once the task of clarification has been completed, be employed to bring those clarified concepts to bear on programs of undergraduate teacher education in liberal arts institutions to provide new insights into the characteristics of those programs. It was assumed that some programs of teacher education would continue to be housed in liberal arts institutions, that professional teacher educators who worked in those programs take their work seriously enough to want their programs to be as good as possible, and that their interest in providing good programs would lead them to view the new insights made available by reconceptualists as opportunities to rethink and perhaps improve their programs.

The purpose of this chapter is to do what the hypothesis suggests, that is, to use both the structure of the framework and the content of the framework to re-conceive undergraduate teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions. This reconceiving is not directed at any specific teacher education program in any specific institution. It is reasonable to suggest that the framework could be employed with such specificity, but that would rightfully be the task of people who participate directly in those programs, in a manner suggested in Chapter 7. Rather, the framework will be used as a structure of concepts from which to discuss the situational and programmatic characteristics which most undergraduate liberal arts teacher education programs are likely to have in common, and to introduce an exploration of how the liberal arts context might be positively significant.

To facilitate the discussion, this chapter is further divided into two main section, "Analysis of Situational Characteristics" and "Analysis of Programmatic Characteristics," and concludes with a summary.

Analysis of Situational Characteristics

Both Pinar and Apple, and especially Apple, stress that in order to understand a human being or a human institution, one must recognize that the person or the institution exists within a social context of similar entities among which powerful and often subtle forces are at work which serve to shape and set certain limits for thought and action. As a participant in that context a person or institution can also be a shaper as well as be shaped, but the interest here is to bring to attention the institution, or more specifically, the program of an educational institution which is directly engaged in the education of teachers, as being situated in a context of shaping forces. This is not to suggest that teacher education programs ought not to have autonomy in some sense within liberal arts institutions. It is reasonable to argue that the undergraduate education of teachers is work rightfully belonging only to those whose expertise equips them for such education, and that they deserve not only freedom within the institution, but also the commitment of adequate resources for the doing of the work in the best possible manner. Rather, what is being recognized here is that the character of a teacher education program in a liberal arts institution is influenced by the character of a number of forces operative in the context in which the program is inescapably situated. Four such forces are identified and their influence discussed: the view of liberal arts education held by the larger institution, the expectations of the clients the program serves, the requirements of state and voluntary accrediting agencies, and the literature and concepts of the field of education. What will become evident in the discussion of these forces is that each exerts an influence in each of the five categories of the framework; that those influences are sometimes contradictory, but more frequently reinforce each other; and, that each impacts directly the programmatic characteristics of teacher education.

As first suggested in the overview of liberal arts education in Chapter 2, most specific conceptualizations of liberal arts education coalesce into one of two dominant orientations. One was identified as featuring study in the disciplines, the other as favoring using knowledge and procedures available in the disciplines in the direct service of solving social problems. The study in the disciplines view was identified as the one most dominantly officially endorsed and operative in the curriculum organization of liberal arts institutions. In this view, faculty are organized into departments reflecting the disciplines, and programs of study for students are designed first to introduce students to a spectrum of disciplines in introductory courses, and then to more intense major study in one of them, reinforced by minor study in a cognate discipline. The primary intent of such a structure is to produce in students the mastery of an already organized body of knowledge, and the methodology for understanding it and perhaps advancing it. It is assumed that such a program of exposure to a spectrum of disciplines, and advanced proficiency in one of them, will provide in students a measure of understanding and wisdom which will equip them to handle the specific requirements of whatever occupational or citizenship situations in which they may later find themselves. For the duration of the student's life in the institution, knowledge is valued as an end in itself, unfettered by any demand to harness it by or slant it toward the more pragmatic needs of any particular vocation or issue.

Within this orientation, teacher education programs are suspect for two reasons. One is that "education" is not perceived to be a discipline, but rather a field derived from disciplines which might be better studied in their own right. The other reason is that education is perceived to be too oriented toward the pragmatic demands of a particular vocation, leading it to spend too much of its time and other resources in the service of producing technical competence rather than wisdom, and limiting the students' opportunity to develop wisdom by requiring them to spend too much of their time and other personal resources in the development of the skills of teaching.

It is not the intent, here, to enter into a debate about the relative merits of the discipline view of liberal arts education, or the accuracy of its perception of teacher education programs, although such discussion certainly needs to occur. What is of interest to this study is to use the framework for analysis developed in this study to speculate about what it would mean for teacher education if it were to attempt to align itself with the assumptions and structures of the study in the disciplines view. "Align" is the signal word here, recognizing at the outset that the view of liberal arts education under discussion here would operate contextually to shape the theoretical concepts and practices of the teacher education program.

It is likely that the amount of time currently typically spent in courses dealing with the specific materials and methods of teaching particular subjects at particular grade levels would be proportionately reduced so that prospective teachers could spend more time in courses designed to reflect the questions liberal arts institutions of this sort set for themselves, represented in the overarching question "What is the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of mankind?" Given the relative recency of empirical inquiry, the preponderant sources of answers are the disciplines such as philosophy, history, and literature, as well as science, and it is in these that prospective teachers would become more extensively active. By both precept and model, the conception of curriculum advanced would be study in the disciplines, and the conception of the role of the school in society would be the transmission of the accumulated cultural heritage as organized by the disciplines. Running through all categories would be a primary valuing of extant knowledge, traditional methodologies for obtaining it, and traditional categories for organizing it. Teachers educated in such programs would be expected first to be subject matter specialists, who in a relatively small number of more specialized professional courses will have learned techniques sufficient to help them package and present subject matter in a manner appropriate for the level of the capacity to understand it of their students. In the concepts of Bruce Joyce reviewed in Chapter 2, both the instructional and nurturant effects of teacher education so conceived and practiced would be the production of teachers who view themselves as conservators of culture, rather than social reformers or champions of the emancipation of the individual.

The second overarching orientation in liberal arts education was said to be a view which valued knowledge and the methodologies for securing it, but not as ends in themselves. Knowledge was to be consciously valued in terms of its direct and explicit application in solving specific problems faced by man-in-the-world. It was further stated that although such statements frequently are present in the stated rationale of liberal arts institutions, and are frequently espoused by individual faculty members, there are in fact few liberal arts institutions which are structurally organized, either in the grouping of faculty or in the programs of study designed for students, to implement this view. Faculty and curricula tend still to be organized according to the disciplines, and the acquisition of knowledge and academic intellectual skills appear to remain as the dominant goals. In liberal arts institutions with this orientation, a program of preprofessional teacher education is seen far more favorably, offering a specific instance of the officially stated institutional rationale. Teacher education is seen as using knowledge to provide a service to mankind which not only itself is an address of an issue of human experience in the world, but equips people themselves to deal better with their own life situations.

Putting this in terms of the categories of the framework, a liberal arts institution making a serious effort to organize its curricula to use knowledge to address the issues and problems of life in the world might well expect that the teacher education program be similarly organized. The basic questions asked in such programs might well be "What are the problems people face in this world?" and "How can schools and teachers be used to alleviate or solve those problems?" The sources consulted for answers would be the disciplines, ranging broadly across them for whatever knowledges and methodologies they had to offer which could be utilized. The conception of curriculum would likely be, consequently, interdisciplinary, and organized around the issues or problems identified. The function of school in society would be to help all people make a better life for themselves. Conceptions of value residing in this would center on some notion of the good life, the attainment of which will be more fully realized when the problems are solved.

The extent to which teacher education programs actually are consistent with the official vision and sense of purpose of the institution may actually hinge on a number of variables internal to the institution, such as the kind and amount of resources the institution makes available, the degree to which the institution maintains accountability for program quality, the characteristics of the students it attracts, and the quality of the education staff. There are, however, as identified in the paragraph introducing this section, three more contextual forces which operate in powerful ways to influence the actual characteristics of the teacher education program.

Perhaps the most powerful of these other three forces are the expectations of the clients which the program serves, particularly the preservice teacher and the schools which will employ those teachers. The pressure exerted by the preservice teacher is less powerful and less direct than that of the schools, but not insignificant. Students in teacher education programs arrive with at least twelve years of experiences as consumers of education, generally thoroughly socialized to accept as normative the characteristics of schools as they have experienced them. Many arrive with clear notions of particularly "good" teachers they want to emulate, or of particularly "bad" teachers whose influence they want to counteract. They tend to believe that what they have a right to expect in exchange for their tuition is training, including an apprenticeship, in the technical skills which will make them good teachers in schools as they perceive schools to be. They expect that they will learn these skills in courses offered by the Education department. Other courses required by the institution for graduation are generally perceived as perhaps helping them to be a "better person," but are generally not perceived as having very much direct relevance or utility in making them better teachers. Similarly, courses required in the specifically identified teacher education program which are not organized around training in specific teacher acts are typically viewed as perhaps "helpful" or "interesting" but really not as important as the skills-oriented courses. These expectations are well known by professional teacher educators, some of whom endorse them, and others of whom attempt to modify them by engaging students in a critical analysis of the limitations of those expectations and introducing a broader perspective. It is not being suggested here that teacher education curricula have been organized the way they are because of the expectations of preservice teachers, but rather that the expectations do induce conscious attempts by teacher educators to reaffirm or disconfirm them in the courses they teach.

More direct and powerful are the expectations of the schools which hire teachers. As pointed out by Joyce in Chapter 2, the primary purpose of teacher education is believed to be the provision of personnel to work in schools as they are, and therefore the typical teacher education program reflects and reinforces current schooling practices as normative. These normative practices have been characterized by Goodlad, also cited in Chapter 2, as a process of formal schooling occurring during certain hours of the day, which features a common-ends, common-means concept of either-ors. The normative processes, and the theoretic and value bases upon which they are founded, are expressed in much greater detail in the view of traditional education reported in Chapter 4. The schools which hire the graduates of teacher education programs, whether located in a liberal arts institution or elsewhere, tend to want employees who may be able to help improve the school program by, using Kliebard's language, ameliorating whatever inadequacies exist, but who overall will work to maintain the basic structures and values of the institution rather than challenge or seek to subvert them. The point here is that the attractiveness of its graduates in the marketplace, as measured by the success of graduates in securing and keeping employment as teachers, is an important concern to professional teacher educators, whose professional reputations and security are significantly linked to the public perception of the adequacy of their students. It is highly probable that teacher educators and teacher education programs producing teachers who are ignored or rejected by client schools will find themselves in a great deal of jeopardy.

The expectations of the student-clients and employer-clients are at most point congruent, and they can be represented as a single set to be viewed through the categories of the framework. In this case, although one is likely to find a high incidence of expressions which seem to value individualized education, self-realization for students, and humanistic education, the actual operant system of questions asked, sources consulted for answers, and conceptions of curriculum, school in society, and value coincide with those perceived by the reconceptualists to be typical of traditional thinking.

As summarized in Chapter 4, a dominant feature of traditional modes of thinking about curriculum and schooling, a feature recently raised to even greater prominence by theorists labeled by Pinar as conceptual-empiricists, is the establishment of a particular understanding of "science" as a controlling value. This value is the single most influential feature of the two remaining forces external to teacher education programs which significantly influence their character. One is the set of criteria for program accreditation currently used by state and voluntary accrediting agencies; the other is the professional literature currently made available to the field in professional periodicals and journals.

Although there is currently some difference among various state accreditation procedures and criteria, that the state should accredit institutional programs of teacher education, and certify the graduates of those programs, is an assumption seldom seriously questioned or contested. That accreditation be performed by independent agencies, such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), is frequently contested, but since participation in a program such as NCATE is voluntary, institutions may opt out of the contestation by disassociating themselves. The reason that both state and voluntary accrediting agencies are mentioned here, even though teacher education programs are legally subject only to state accreditation, is that the criteria used by the state and voluntary agencies is becoming increasingly uniform, making it commensurately difficult for institutions to subject themselves, voluntarily or mandatorily, to alternative forms of program evaluation proceeding from and embodying alternate sets of value assumptions regarding what constitutes an accreditable program of teacher education. Since the criteria employed by the state are increasingly coincident with those of voluntary accreditation agencies, neither institutional lack of participation in voluntary organizations nor efforts to change their standards are of very much immediate pragmatic significance.

The NCATE standards,[1] and increasingly those of the states, stipulate a number of requirements, two types of which are of particular interest here. Among the requirements are those calling for teacher education emphases which appear to be very much in the spirit of both Pinar's and Apple's vision of a more equal and more just society. Specifically, for example, there are standards regarding multicultural dimensions, i.e., prospective teachers are to be equipped to teach, and teach about, culturally "different" minorities who are increasingly being "officially" enfranchised as legitimate residents in a "pluralistic" society; there are standards regarding handicapped students, i.e., prospective teachers are to be equipped to provide quality education individually adapted to "insure" that handicapped students receive as close to a "normal" education as possible; and, finally, there are standards calling for increased client participation, ranging across current students, graduates, employees, and local school and community people, in affecting decisions about teacher education programs, policies, and procedures in a given institution. The implementation of practices called for by standards such as these seems to indicate that a new set of questions is being asked, and that conceptions of curriculum and the function of school in society are being changed.

There are also, however, increasingly rigorous standards calling for a much more conscious, regular, and empirically sophisticated monitoring of all phases of the teacher education program. It is expected increasingly that the characteristics of incoming students be documented, and that some sort of screening procedures be in place to insure that only the "right" kinds of individuals be admitted; that the treatments administered to students in the program be carefully specified and their effectiveness verified; that the goals of the program be specified in advance in observable and measureable student knowledge, skills, and attitudes; that student attainment of these specifically identified outcomes be evaluated; and, finally, that all information presumably gained from this monitoring process be funneled back into the program in the form of program adjustments. This monitoring is to be focused upon the practices geared toward the new "multicultural" and "handicapped" standards as well as all other program emphases.

Whereas standards of the first sort identified were reminiscent of the call for a more just and equal society, standards of the second sort are much more reminiscent of the traditional model as perceived by the reconceptualists. Nowhere evident in the current, typical accreditation criteria are standards calling for an understanding of the educational experience in the sense that Pinar wants to understand it, and nowhere is there evidence that there are standards in the spirit of Apple, calling for an investigation of the complex web of social, economic, and political forces which act to repress individuals and maintain an unequal and unjust social order. Instead, what is consistently evident is that the Tyler rationale continues to frame the questions, and that behavioral psychological, social, and industrial theories are being relied upon for answers. Curriculum as a course to be run, as uniformly as possible, in a systematic way continues to be the apparent conception, and the conception of school (both the teacher education institution and the client school) in society appears still to be the production of graduates who are socialized to the dominant social values and who will work to maintain, or perhaps ameliorate, them. Through it all the positivist, reductionistic view of science seems even more strongly reaffirmed as a dominant controlling value. The most significant point to be made about this is that teacher education programs which do not meet these criteria can be put out of business by the state. The pressure upon programs to conform to state accreditation criteria is tremendous.

This same reaffirmation of science is everywhere evident in the final force which acts as identified earlier in this discussion, outside of the teacher education program to shape it. This force is the literature of the field as presented in professional periodicals and journals. It is realized that what appears in these publications must be understood as being mediated by editorial boards, and that much of what is generated for boards to read is the outgrowth of projects tied to funding patterns and priorities which provide the resources for projects. It does not seems to be the case, however, that the peculiarities of editors, editorial boards, or funding priorities need to be appealed to in order to explain the articles which characterize the liaterature of the field over the past decade. The literature, almost irrespective of particular origin or place of publication, is generally all of one piece. It is essentially about the power of "science," sometimes contested but more often affirmed, to improve educational theory and practice. Teacher educators in liberal arts institutions tend not to be themselves engaged in "scientific" educational research, but except to educators with strong personal research interests, working primarily in large, research-oriented institutions, this does not seem to be a major problem. When is being made problematic in this discussion at this point is that the non-researching teacher educator (particularly one who works in a small liberal arts institution) who desires to stay current with the work in his field is a consumer of the work of others, and most of what is available to him continues to be cast in the "scientific" mode.

What becomes clear, finally, through this discussion, inspired and organized by the structure and content of the framework employed in this study, is that programs of undergraduate teacher education in liberal arts institutions have a difficult time being distinctive in any sense of the term except that if they can attract a "more able" student for the program, they might be able to "produce" a more able graduate. Admittedly, the two dominant liberal arts orientations sketched in this study call for outlooks and practices in teacher education which vary in significant ways from those called for in what has been characterized as the scientific mode of thinking. The difference is not that the liberal arts mentality predisposes it somehow to take a stand against setting goals or determining whether or not reasonable efforts are being made to attain those goals or to determine whether they are being reached. The essential difference is that the assumptions and methodologies of empirical science are not single-mindedly relied upon to frame the questions, answers, or underlying values upon which liberal arts teacher education is based. Teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions are rightfully expected to participate in actualizing the liberal arts vision, and are indeed influenced by it. It should be noted also, however, that there exists a strong conservation and transmission emphasis in liberal arts education as actually practiced which is very compatible with traditional thinking and schooling. Furthermore, the combined power of the other three contextual forces identified in this discussion is awesome, and it appears to be the case that liberal arts teacher education programs may be much more similar to than they are different from those housed in non-liberal arts institutions. It is to those "programmatic characteristics" that this discussion now turns.

Analysis of Programmatic Characteristics

The specific characteristics of teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions are prefigured in the discussion of the structural characteristics, and are summed up adequately in Joyce's analysis as reported in Chapter 2. The typical teacher education program, he observes, includes methods courses which deal primarily with traditional curriculum areas and introduce trends of the time, theory courses which may be intended to promote autonomous decision-making but are clearly separated from and differentiated from the pragmatism of methods, and apprenticeships which are notoriously conserving of current normative schooling practices. Individual programs may vary in arrangement or proportion of these three elements, but there appear to be few, if any, which delete from or add to these basic three.

The purpose of the discussion in this section is to sketch out the characteristics of these three categories of the typical program, and then to locate them as a group within the larger liberal arts context. As was the case in the prior section, the structure and content of the framework generated for this study will be used to organize and focus the discussion.

In the typical undergraduate teacher education program it is the methods courses which tend to serve as the hub and main distinguishing feature. Methods courses are utilitarian by design and intention, their purpose being to induce teachers into normative schooling practices and ways of thinking about schooling practice. It is the methods courses that are the primary focus of clients, accreditation agencies, and of the research reported in the literature of the profession.

Methods courses seldom promote a notion of currere such as Pinar has in mind, nor do they promote a participatory model of liberation for student by involving them in the creation of meanings as Apple meant it. What they do promote is an input-process-output way of thinking about curriculum development, instructional design and strategizing, and evaluation. The expectation is that the newly-trained teacher will be able to specify in advance certain desired student knowledge, skills, and attitudes, design an efficient sequence of classroom events which will produce those outcomes, and establish the criteria by which student achievement of those outcomes will be precisely measured. To support teachers in the actual implementation of lessons so conceived and designed, teachers also learn in methods courses a variety of manipulative strategies for rewarding students whose behaviors conform to the teachers' expectations, and modifying or extinguishing those behaviors which do not. The whole enterprise is theoretically undergirded by behavioral psychology, with support from consensus forms of sociology and from industrial bureaucracy. In other words, the methods courses are conceptually and programmatically "traditional" in the sense of that term established in this study.

Apprenticeships are also important components of typical programs, and are intended to serve two purposes. One purpose is to provide a forum in which prospective teachers may practice the methodologies they have been learning and hone their skills. The other purpose is to provide a setting in which teacher educators can judge the adequacy of the prospective teacher's attainment of those skills. Increasingly there is the expectation, due in large part to the influence of accrediting agencies, that the intended knowledge, skills, and attitudes demonstrated in the apprenticeship, and the criteria by which they be judged, be as precisely specified in measureable terms as those the prospective teacher is expected to generate in his or her apprenticeship. Moreover, the apprenticeship dimension of the program is being expanded. In the state of Ohio, for example, teacher training programs must provide not only the typical student-teaching apprenticeship, but also three hundred hours of clinical and field experiences in addition to, and almost entirely prior to, student teaching.[2] Students are encouraged to "experiment" with alternative strategies during their apprenticeships, and they may in fact develop strategies different from and superior to those of the classroom teacher with whom they work, but given the overriding maintenance orientation of the schools, and the ameliorative characteristics of curriculum theorizing, the experimentation is expected to occur within a set of parameters which will conserve the extant normative practices and functions of schools in our society. The purpose at this point of the discussion is not to introduce debate about apprenticeships, but to make the point that the apprenticeship, intimately tied to methods courses and located in traditional school classrooms, can be viewed as being as much as expression of traditional models of thinking as are the methods courses which generate them and the classrooms which house them.

Finally, methods courses, even without the inclusion of apprenticeships, tend to outnumber all non-methods courses combined, with the exception perhaps of programs for the preparation of secondary teachers, which are dominated first by subject matter, then methodology. The non-methods courses are usually called "foundations," and typically include some investigation of the psychological, sociological, historical, and philosophical underpinnings of current schooling practices. "Underpinnings" is the key term here, suggesting that the role of foundations courses is not to equip students to explore values and create methodologies consistent with them, but rather to provide a conceptual backdrop which will serve to illuminate and legitimize the methodologies currently endorsed. This is frequently not the view of the function of foundations courses put forth by those who teach them, but in some sense their objections are ineffective, if not irrelevant, for at least two reasons. One is the already noted tendency of prospective teachers to view these courses as not really relevant in any pragmatic way to teaching; the other is the relative silence in methods courses and apprenticeships regarding foundational perspectives other than those which underwrite the technological orientation of contemporary thought and practice in teaching methodology.

What is evident in this brief discussion of the programmatic characteristics of teacher education in liberal arts institutions is that there is very little evidence in the typical "professional" program of courses which distinguishes the program as "liberal arts." The specific programmatic characteristics derive from the forces operative in the characteristic context, forces which operate extraneous to, independent of, and probably with greater formative and controlling power than that exerted by the philosophical orientation of the liberal arts institution in which the program is located. In the last analysis, it appears that a strong case can be made for the argument that teacher education programs, in liberal arts institutions as well as elsewhere, are a major force in legitimizing and re-producing in successive waves of new teachers what has been characterized as the traditional mode of thinking about curriculum and schooling.

Summary

The discussion in this chapter has advanced the view that teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions do not have the characteristics one might expect them to have if they were cast in the mold of liberal arts education. If there is in fact any warrant for the assumption that teacher educators would view the insights of the reconceptualists and the framework which has organized them as opportunities for rethinking their programs, then it would appear that opportunity is pounding on their doors, and that there may be a great deal of rethinking to do. The view of liberal arts teacher education programs as they actually exist in practice advanced in this discussion is that there is very little distinctively liberal arts about them; they are in all respects virtually synonymous with the traditional mode of thinking as it is perceived by the reconceptualists, and as catalogued in the framework used in this study. Borrowing from Pinar and Apple the concept of institutions existing in and being shaped by a context of interactive forces, liberal arts teacher education was investigated in those terms, and three powerful contextual forces were identified which, each in its own way but also in concert, serves to shape the three main programmatic elements which themselves work in concert to shape the prospective teacher. Two net effects of this operation of forces were identified, one being that there appears to be little about teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions which distinguishes them in any significant way from teacher education programs in other institutions, and the other being that teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions, as do others, serve to legitimize and reproduce the traditional mode of thinking about curriculum and schooling. If Pinar and Apple are correct in their assessment that traditional education is a major force in continually reproducing an unequal and unjust society, then the activities of liberal arts teacher education programs in the service of traditional education is a matter of serious concern.

There are several objections which might be raised regarding this discussion. One objection might be that the analysis has been cast in terms too general to distinguish particular features of liberal arts teacher education programs which serve to counteract or motigate the dominance of "science." Another objection might be that even though these programs on the surface do appear to be as they have been described, a closer look would reveal that the students' experiences in the liberal arts curriculum outside of and in addition to the professional sequence of courses has equipped them with qualities and habits of thought which are philosophical, historical, and literary as well as scientific, and that this has important consequences for what students really learn in the teacher education program. A third objection might be that the case for the influence of outside forces has been overstated, meaning perhaps that the range of client expectations is broader and less rigid, or that accrediting agencies operate in ways other than those described, or that professional educators are not really influenced very much by the literature of the field.

It is hoped that other objections, and other descriptions and analyses would be raised in response to this study, for such responses would be consistent with the purpose of this chapter, which has been not to judge, but to call into question and discussion the operative assumptions, the actual programs, and the explicit and latent consequences of liberal arts teacher education. Suggestions for specific uses to which the framework and reconceptualist theory can be put toward continuing and extending the discussion are made in the following, final, chapter.

Notes

[1] *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*, (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1979).

[2] *Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers*, (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, 1975).

CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

One of the limitations of this study stated at the outset was that the writer held a positive bias both for liberal arts education and for reconceptualist theories of education. This study has served to reaffirm and strengthen both biases. That the role of education in society be meaningfully understood by liberal arts educators remains a matter of deep concern, and in the estimation of this writer, once one has seriously encountered insights regarding school and society such as Pinar and Apple and other reconceptualizers present, one can never view "traditional" curriculum theorizing and schooling practices in quite the same way again.

The motivation to undertake this study was mentioned in the introduction of Chapter 3 to be to provide a partial response to Huber's question about what it would take to help preservice teachers learn to translate reconceptualist theory into practice. The answer implicit in this study is that one must begin by bringing to the awareness of teacher educators the existence of reconceptualized thought, by providing some means of clarifying that thought in more manageable and familiar terms, by suggesting how the work of reconceptualists might have some bearing on the work of the teacher educators, and by pro-

viding for teacher educators a structure for and a challenge to enter into their own analyses and discussion of the issues involved. It is anticipated that if and when liberal arts teacher educators follow through with this, their involvement will initiate changes not only in the way they think about their work, but also in the content and procedures of their actual work with student teachers, thereby advancing the answer to Huber's question, and even perhaps in a small way initiating a more generalized reconceiving of educational thought and practice which may help make society more equal and just.

If Pinar's estimate that only 3-5 percent of the nation's curricularists and education professors are actively engaged in reconceptualizing, the remaining 95-97 percent who are traditionalists or conceptual-empiricists appear to represent a considerable obstacle to optimism that the work of the reconceptualists can make any difference. It is this writer's contention, however, that there exists within the "traditional" category a significant number of people who would be sympathetic, if they knew about it, to the work the reconceptualists are attempting to do. They might be considered as "second stage" people in Pinar's three-stage model of the emergence of a reconceptualist; they are people who have been acculturated to and are working within the tradition, but who, sensing that something important is missing, have become dissatisfied. If this contention is accurate, the reconceptualizations will not be entirely dismissed, as Apple has observed to have happened, as "merely metaphysical" or actively resisted as too threatening. On the contrary, given the

extent to which the unrelenting demands of undergraduate teacher education can exhaust the personal resources of the professional teacher educators, and the sense of futility that can accompany an awareness of the complexity of seriously considering attempting to develop alternative educational theories and practices on one's own, the emerging and intensifying theoretical work of persons such as Pinar and Apple may represent for these restless or tired traditionalists a re-energizing hope and lead to a renewal of effort.

It is a further contention of this writer that a significant number of such persons exist among the ranks of those working in liberal arts institutions, and it is primarily to them that the following summary and recommendations are addressed.

Summary and Recommendations

The main contention of this section is that even though the framework for analysis designed for and used in this study, and the content it catalogues, has some limitations, it nevertheless may still be employed fruitfully in a number of ways as a tool which can assist the reviewing and reconceiving of teacher education programs in liberal arts institutions.

It is important to note at the outset the limitations of the framework and its employment in this study. One of the limitations was anticipated, but should be restated here. It is conceivable that in spite of this writer's consistent attempt to report objectively the actual content of the selected works of Pinar and Apple, a positive bias toward the work may have influenced its reporting. The strong internal consistency within each of the works of these authors, and the repetitive thematic consistency across their respective works increases the likelihood that the works have been summarized and reported accurately, but it is still possible that this writer's judgement of which points to leave out or to subsume into more inclusive statements, given that each work could not be presented in its entirety, may have been influenced by this writer's bias or the limits of his power to perceive which he brought to the literature.

A second limitation is related to the first. Specifically, there is much in the work of Michael Apple which is not reported in this study. Apple is an active neo-Marxist theorist, and much of his writing is a record of his participation in a highly-sophisticated ongoing development of Marxist theory with other neo-Marxists. Those portions of his work in which that theory is specifically and directly brought to bear on educational thought and practice have been reported, but not the rest. It is indeed possible that there is more in Apple's work that could have been relevant to this study, but was beyond the present powers of perception and understanding of this writer.

A third limitation has to do with the categories along the abscissa of the framework. Even though the reconceptualists frequently claim that one of the few things they agree about is that they disagree on important issues, the framework indicates an acceptance of the judgement of some reconceptualists that "existential" and "structural" orientations exist within the larger corpus of reconceptual

thought. This does not necessary mean that the two orientations actually exist (although this writer's own survey confirms their existence); nor does it mean that only these two orientations exist. If it turns out to be true that these two orientations represent two sides of the same issue, then one might expect a third orientation to emerge, one containing conceptual structures capable of bringing the existential and structural orientations together. Furthermore, only one author has been presented as an exemplar of each orientation. Had other authors been included, whose work "fit" into one category or the other but also may have had some distinctive features, the orientations may have been shown to have some different characteristics than those presented in the study and the framework.

A fourth limitation has to do with the categories along the ordinant of the framework. The categories were sufficiently defined so that they could be distinguished from one another, but were sometimes found to be too general to facilitate making distinctions within them. For example, within the cell "Location of Answers: Apple" the phrase "Marxist social theory" indicates a body of content from which answers may be extracted, whereas "historical, philosophical, and language analysis" indicates a set of procedures through which answers might be developed. Furthermore, the listing of categories in serial order made it difficult to represent visually how "Conception of Value" should be viewed as a category in its own right, yet also resided within every other category, serving to mediate and shape

decisions people make with respect to these categories. The statement "all terms in prior categories" was an attempt to deal with this.

These limitations suggest the first recommendation of how the framework might be further employed as a tool to assist the reviewing and reconceiving of liberal arts teacher education. To begin with, the framework itself may be reconceived and strengthened, making it a better tool. Certainly a parallel study would be in order to help deal with the question of bias, and a more competent analysis of further possible contributions available in Apple's neo-Marxist theorizing would certainly be worthwhile. A challenging or broadening of the "existential" and "structural" categories might be fruitful, and even more helpful would be modifications of the framework which will enable the making of finer distinctions within categories, or make more visible the relationship of the value category to the whole, or both.

Given that the framework might be improved, it may still be employable in its present form to structure productive thinking. At the institutional or departmental level, one procedure might be for people in specific liberal arts institutions to add a fourth, and even a fifth category along the abscissa, one labeled "This Institution," and other labeled "This Teacher Education Program," and then engage in a collective analysis of the new categories in terms of the five categories along the ordinant. The two new categories might be further divided into two categories each, one labeled "What We Say," and the

other labeled "What We Do." The value of such an exercise is that it would not only engage the participants in an analysis of who and what they really are, but would also allow cross-referencing with the existing categories for contrast and further clarification. One interesting modification at this level would be to construct an empty matrix, with the categories along the ordinate the same as those of the framework, but with the abscissa labeled "Liberal Arts Teacher Education" and sub-headings for graduates, students, or other clients to fill in, thereby using the framework to collect, organize, and prepare to deal with the perceptions of the institution residing in the larger community with which the institution deals.

At the individual level, a professional teacher educator might want to add a column along the abscissa for himself, labeled "My Conceptions," and engage in a process of reflective self-analysis compatible with Pinar's method of Currere. Or, a teacher educator might present the framework in its present completed form to students, have each add a category for himself, and then lead the students into a reflective analysis of the content, or origins, or implications of their own points of view. Such a strategy might also be used in courses or workshops with inservice teachers, administrators, or other key school personnel.

Similarly, additional categories might be placed along the ordinant to highlight a particular area of interest, such as "Conception of Instruction," "Conception of Discipline," "Conception of the Role of the Family," or "Conception of the Role of Administration." The need to supply content for the categories may lead to a program of related readings and self-initiated education or even more extensive, formal research.

All of these are merely suggestions, presented primarily to demonstrate that there are a number of ways the framework may be employed, thereby encouraging its use in one form or another. Other uses or modifications may be generated by the divergent thinking of those attracted to the basic framework. Two benefits deriving from the use of the model by liberal arts teacher educators can be identified at this point. One is that is will facilitate the familiarization of reconceptualism to teacher educators; the other is that teacher educators themselves will become active as reconceptualizers of their theories and practices regarding curriculum and schooling.

The single most important feature of the framework, and the source of the greatest benefits accruing from its use, is that it draws attention in a systematic way to both the existence and the importance of the value dimensions of educational thought and practice. The importance of this point will be readily noticed and affirmed by those truly desirous of promoting what they believe to be the positive distinctiveness of liberal arts teacher education.

In addition to the benefits available in using the framework as a device to structure individual or institutional reflection, there are identified within the cells of the framework particular suggestions for how one might go about actually doing the reflective and analytical work. As Pinar and Apple both explicitly state and exemplify in their own work, the analyses should be rigorously intellectual. Intuition and affect are certainly legitimate, but they must be intellectually rendered, not merely whimsical or ejaculatory. One should use the methods of empirical analysis whenever and wherever it is appropriate to do so, but one should also use the analytical methodologies of philosophy, history, and language study, and the hermeneutical and aesthetic methodologies characteristic of the arts. Such methodologies should be familiar to, and available within, a liberal arts institution, and must be put to use. Any procedures developed for employing these various methodologies should recognize that the process of locating the self, individually or institutionally, is ongoing, never completed in any final sense.

Recognizing that in some sense institutions, like individuals, have histories and anticipated futures, it would seem that Pinar's method of Currere could be used to some extent. Although it may not be legitimate to claim that an institution has a lebenswelt in the same way that an individual does, there does reside within an educational institution's sense of its mission and purpose a normative world-and-life view which may be approached via Currere, i.e., a "regressive" description of past experiences, a "progressive" description of imagined future experiences, an "analytic" rendering of past, present, and future experiences, and a "syntehtic" integration of what has been learned and an explanation of how the now-understood institution exists in dialectical relationship with the web of contextual political and economic forces in which it exists.

The dialectical relationship between the institution and its contextual forces might be further explored in terms of Apple's concept of institutions within the web being determined by, and determining, the actions of each other, and speculation about how the institution might act so as to have greater determining power.

A concept of intentionality is implicit in "act so as to have greater determining power," and serves to call to awareness the question of the ends toward which the determining power is directed. The end toward which Pinar and Apple direct their work, and the end toward which this study has been undertaken, is the end toward which individuals singly and collectively in liberal arts institutions should point as well. That end is best captured in the new question Apple posed for evaluators, and serves to conclude this study: Is my work truly contributing to the reconstruction of educational institutions so that they are more just and responsive?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, Michael W. "Curriculum Form and the Logic of Technical Control: Building the Possessive Individual." In his Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

----------. Education and Power. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

----------. "The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict." In Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Ed. William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------. Ideology and Curriculum. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

----------. "Ideology, Reproduction, and Educational Reform." Comparative Education Review, (October 1978), pp. 367-387.

----------. "The Process and Ideology of Valuing in Educational Settings." In Educational Evaluation: Analysis and Responsibility. Eds. Michael W. Apple, Michael Subkoviak, and Henry Lufler Jr. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

----------. "Rationality as Ideology." Rev. of Review of Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of Twentieth Century Liberal Education Policy, by Walter Feinberg. Educational Theory, 26 (Winter 1976), pp. 121-131.

----------. "Reproduction and Contradiction in Education." In his Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

----------. "Scientific Interests and the Nature of Educational Institutions." In Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Ed. William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------, ed. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

----------, Michael J. Subkoviak and Henry S. Lufler Jr., eds. Educational Evaluation: Analysis and Responsibility. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

Benham, Barbara J. "Curriculum Theory in the 1970's: The Reconceptualist Movement." Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3 (Winter 1981), pp. 162-170.

Boyer, Ernest L. and Arthur Levine. A Quest for Common Learning. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

----------. "The Process of Education Revisited." Phi Delta Kappan, (September 1971), pp. 18-21.

Christian Liberal Arts Education. The Report of the Calvin College Curriculum Study Committee. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Calvin College and W.B. Eerdmans, 1970.

Friere, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970. Translated from the Original Portuguese Manuscript, 1968, by Myra Bergman Ramos.

Giroux, Henry A., Anthony N. Penna and William F. Pinar, eds. Curriculum and Instruction. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981.

Goodlad, John I. The Development of a Conceptual System for Dealing with Problems of Curriculum and Instruction. The Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Contract No. SAE-8024, Project No. 454, 1966.

----------, and Frances M. Klein. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1970.

----------, et al. The Convention and the Alternative in Education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Huber, Margaret Ann. "The Renewal of Curriculum Theory in the 1970's: An Historical Study." Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3 (Winter 1981), pp. 14-84.

Joyce, Bruce R. and Marsha Weil. Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Joyce, Bruce R., Clark C. Brown and Lucy Peck, eds. Flexibility in Teaching. New York: Longman, 1981.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory." In Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Ed. William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------. "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective." In Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Ed. William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------. "Reappraisal: The Tyler Rationale." In Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Ed. William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Peters, Richard S. Authority, Responsibility, and Education. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1959.

----------. Education and the Education of Teachers. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.

Pinar, William F. "The Abstract and Concrete in Curriculum Theorizing." In Curriculum and Instruction. Eds. Henry A. Giroux, Anthony N. Penna, and William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981.

----------. "The Analysis of Educational Experience." In his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------. "Currere: Toward Reconceptualization." In his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------. "A Reply to My Critics." In Curriculum and Instruction. Eds. Henry A. Giroux, Anthony N. Penna, and William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981.

----------. "Sanity, Madness, and the School." In his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------. "Search for a Method." In his Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

----------, ed. Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Schwab, Joseph J. "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum." School Review, 78 (November 1969), pp. 1-23.

Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1979.

Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers. Ohio Department of Education. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, 1975.

Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962.

Tyler, Ralph. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1949.

Willis, George. "Curriculum Theory and the Context of Curriculum." In Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Ed. William F. Pinar. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 03142 9875