



PNU University

E. S. P. For Curriculum And Planning

Mehran Farajollahi, Ph.D

امروزه کتاب‌خوانی و علم‌آموزی، نه تنها یک وظیفه‌ی ملی، که یک واجب دینی است.

مقام معظم رهبری

در عصر حاضر یکی از شاخصه‌های ارزیابی رشد، توسعه و پیشرفت فرهنگی هر کشوری میزان تولید کتاب، مطالعه و کتاب‌خوانی مردم آن مرز و بوم است. ایران اسلامی نیز از دیرباز تاکنون با داشتن تمدنی چندهزارساله و مراکز متعدد علمی، فرهنگی، کتابخانه‌های معتبر، علما و دانشمندان بزرگ با آثار ارزشمند تاریخی، سرآمد دولت‌ها و ملت‌های دیگر بوده و در عرصه‌ی فرهنگ و تمدن جهانی به‌سان خورشیدی تابناک همچنان می‌درخشد و با فرزندان نیک‌نهاد خویش هنرنمایی می‌کند. چه کسی است که در دنیا با دانشمندان فرزانه و نام‌آور ایرانی همچون ابوعلی سینا، ابوریحان بیرونی، فارابی، خوارزمی و ... همچنین شاعران برجسته‌ای نظیر فردوسی، سعدی، مولوی، حافظ و ... آشنا نباشد و در مقابل عظمت آنها سر تعظیم فرود نیاورد. تمامی این افتخارات ارزشمند، برگرفته از میزان عشق و علاقه فراوان ملت ما به فراگیری علم و دانش از طریق خواندن و مطالعه منابع و کتاب‌های گوناگون است. به شکرانه‌ی الهی، تاریخ و گذشته ما، همیشه درخشان و پربار است. ولی اکنون در این زمینه در چه جایگاهی قرار داریم؟ آمار و ارقام ارائه‌شده از سوی مجامع و سازمان‌های فرهنگی در مورد سرانه‌ی مطالعه‌ی هر ایرانی، برایمان چندان امیدوارکننده نمی‌باشد و رهبر معظم انقلاب اسلامی نیز از این وضعیت بارها اظهار گله و ناخشنودی نموده‌اند.

کتاب، دروازه‌ای به سوی گستره‌ی دانش و معرفت است و کتاب خوب، یکی از بهترین ابزارهای کمال بشری است. همه‌ی دستاوردهای بشر در سراسر عمر جهان تا آنجا که قابل کتابت بوده است، در میان دست‌نوشته‌هایی است که انسان‌ها پدید آورده و می‌آورند. در این مجموعه‌ی بی‌نظیر، تعالیم الهی، درس‌های پیامبران به بشر، و همچنین علوم مختلفی است که سعادت بشر بدون آگاهی از آنها امکان‌پذیر نیست. کسی که با دنیای زیبا و زندگی‌بخش کتاب ارتباط ندارد بی‌شک از مهم‌ترین دستاوردهای انسانی و نیز از بیشترین معارف الهی و بشری محروم است. با این دیدگاه، به‌روشنی می‌توان ارزش و مفهوم رمزی عمیق در این حقیقت تاریخی را دریافت که اولین خطاب خداوند متعال به پیامبر گرامی اسلام (ص) این است که «بخوان!» و در اولین

سوره‌ای که بر آن فرستاده‌ی عظیم‌الشان خداوند، فرود آمده، نام «قلم» به تجلیل یاد شده‌است: «إِقْرَأْ وَرَبُّكَ الْأَكْرَمُ. الَّذِي عَلَّمَ بِالْقَلَمِ» در اهمیت عنصر کتاب برای تکامل جامعه‌ی انسانی، همین بس که تمامی ادیان آسمانی و رجال بزرگ تاریخ بشری، از طریق کتاب جاودانه مانده‌اند.

دانشگاه پیام‌نور با گستره‌ی جغرافیایی ایران‌شمول خود با هدف آموزش برای همه، همه‌جا و همه‌وقت، به‌عنوان دانشگاهی کتاب‌محور در نظام آموزش عالی کشورمان، افتخار دارد جایگاه اندیشه‌سازی و خردورزی بخش عظیمی از جوانان جویای علم این مرز و بوم باشد. تلاش فراوانی در ایام طولانی فعالیت این دانشگاه انجام پذیرفته تا با بهره‌گیری از تجربه‌های گرانقدر استادان و صاحب‌نظران برجسته کشورمان، کتاب‌ها و منابع آموزشی درسی شاخص و خودآموز تولید شود. در آینده هم، این مهم با هدف ارتقای سطح علمی، روزآمدی و توجه بیشتر به نیازهای مخاطبان دانشگاه پیام‌نور با جدیت ادامه خواهد داشت. به‌طور قطع استفاده از نظرات استادان، صاحب‌نظران و دانشجویان محترم، ما را در انجام این وظیفه‌ی مهم و خطیر یاری‌رسان خواهد بود. پیشاپیش از تمامی عزیزانی که با نقد، تصحیح و پیشنهادهای خود ما را در انجام این وظیفه‌ی خطیر یاری می‌رسانند، سپاسگزاری می‌نماییم. لازم است از تمامی اندیشمندانی که تاکنون دانشگاه پیام‌نور را منزلگاه اندیشه‌سازی خود دانسته و ما را در تولید کتاب و محتوای آموزشی درسی یاری نموده‌اند، صمیمانه قدردانی گردد. موفقیت و بهروزی تمامی دانشجویان و دانش‌پژوهان عزیز آرزوی همیشگی ما است.

دانشگاه پیام‌نور

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
Chapter 1: In Search of Curriculum	1
Chapter 2: Curriculum Goals and Objectives	21
Chapter 3: Knowledge and Theories about Curriculum	45
Chapter 4: Curriculum Work and Professional Practice	69
Chapter 5: Creating Curriculum	87
Chapter 6: Curriculum Designs	101
Chapter 7: Organizing Course Content	121
Chapter 8: Policy Making and Planning Curriculum	137
Chapter 9: Implementing and Managing the Curriculum	171
Chapter 10: Evaluation in Curriculum Work	189
References	211
ANSWER KEY	213

Preface

Curriculum as a word is not a recent invention. Referring to a dictionary, you find that curriculum is from a Latin word, *curre* (Probably of earlier Greek origin), referring to the running of a course as in a chariot race. Schooling could also be envisioned as a course to be run or gone over in the same way that a racecourse is a confined, known experience with a beginning and end. Questions about purposes, content, and instruction in schooling were part of the larger knowledge revolution about the nature of American society playing out at the turning of the 19th into the 20th century.

This book is about concept of curriculum and how to do curriculum work. Depending on how broadly educators define or employ the term, curriculum typically refers to the knowledge and skills students are expected to learn, which includes the learning standards or learning objectives they are expected to meet; the units and lessons that teachers teach; the assignments and projects given to students; the books, materials, videos, presentations, and readings used in a course; and the tests, assessments, and other methods used to evaluate student learning.

Different chapters of this book will take the reader from a conceptual understanding of the curriculum to the exact construction of school programs. Following a general curriculum cycle of analyzing, designing, implementing, and evaluating, the reader will begin with defining purpose in school work and an introduction to the basic tasks of curriculum work. In Chapter 1 historical constructions of curriculum are discussed. It represents that Understanding curriculum beyond definitions requires other ways of thinking about it-as a concept,

activity and as experience. While in Chapter 2, aims, goals, and objective are defined and distinctions between curriculum and instructional goals and objectives explained. Knowledge and Theories about Curriculum, structure of Discipline, Education Perspectives and Learning theories are negotiated within chapter 3. chapter 4 makes readers familiar with Knowledge and Theories about Curriculum work classifications. the book then provides the reader with detailed information about Origins of curriculum development as curriculum work and Key factors in curriculum development while talks about conception of curriculum development (Chapter 5) then introduces a selection of major design concepts and attempts and general design patterns(Chapter 6).the rest of book dedicated to Organizing Course Content and Establishing priorities among topics or units (chapter 7) and Policy Making, its Characteristics and Planning as prerequisites of effective and successful Curriculum are also discussed thoroughly (chapter8). Management in curriculum work, Implementing and Managing the Curriculum to Form a curriculum management strategy are going to be under debate in chapter 9. Finally, Chapter 10 provides insights into Evaluation in Curriculum Work and process of assessment and evaluation and concerns about scope, sequence, continuity, balance, and their relationship as the fundamental internal features of curriculum for developing promising school curricula. As the reader proceeds through this book, the development process in curriculum work will unfold and logical order of content helps them understand actual construction and several interesting characteristics of curriculum.

Chapter 1

In Search of Curriculum

General Aims

The students are supposed to learn about the following concepts:
Historical Constructions Of Curriculum, Curriculum as History and Expectations

Behavioral objectives

After reading this chapter, you are expected to:

- Define the comprehensive concept of curriculum
- Define Curriculum as Concept
- Define Curriculum as Activity
- Define Curriculum as Experience
- Identify the purposes schools serve
- Identify the schools teach

HISTORICAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF CURRICULUM

Curriculum as a word is not a recent invention. It does not simply refer to what is taught in schools or imply a listing of subjects taught. It is more complex, a word from antiquity that has evolved in meaning. Referring to a dictionary, you find that curriculum is from a Latin word, *currere* (Probably of earlier Greek origin), referring to the running of a course as in a chariot race. Schooling could also be envisioned as a course to be run or gone over in the same way that a racecourse is a confined, known experience with a beginning and end. Beyond that initial definition, dictionaries variously define curriculum as an aggregate of courses of study given in a school, college, or university (sometimes cited collectively as educational institutions); a

2 E. S. P. For Curriculum And Planning

particular course of study; or both. Based on a consensus of dictionary sources, curriculum would simply mean "a course of study". However, if you search out what a "course of study" means, you come full circle - it is referred to as a curriculum! Left with that very limited dictionary definition, it will prove more fruitful to follow the trail about how this very complex word evolved through some very inventive times. Curriculum historians have traced the use of the word *curriculum* and its emergence into common use in books and published writings in the years from the 1890s to about 1918. However, to understand its emergence as an idea and as a discipline in the field of education, the tale begins earlier in the rise of new knowledge in 19th – century America.

Science and Technology

In the mid–19th century, a series of important publishing events signaled a revolution in ideas and knowledge about human life and the physical world in which we live. In 1859, after a 20-year wait, Charles Darwin published *The Origin of Species* (1859/1995). In this book, and the two that followed, he presented and defended his theory of evolution. It is reasonable to say that those publications forever changed the direction of the study of biology and influenced thinking in all areas of knowledge. At about the same time that Darwin was voyaging on the Beagle and formulating his theory, Jacob Bigelow published *The Elements of Technology* (1829) and introduced that concept to American science. That term, in modern garb, conjures up such things as cell phones and nanotechnology. Thus evolution and technology were born, and physical science and life would never be the same from that time on. Their appearance marks two turns in scientific thinking, a new view of the physical world, and, with Darwin's second book in his trilogy, *The Descent of Man* (1871), the emergence of a new field, the scientific study of the human species. What does this have to do with curriculum? It has to do with the influence of evolution on the rising new discipline of sociology; the emergence of a new family of knowledge, the social sciences; and the public articulation and wedding of two key ideas, freedom and

progress. Scientific ideas became the justification for freedom and progress, and together they became the purpose and content of what has become a distinctive American curriculum.

Freedom and Progress

In 19th-century America, one of the most influential sociologists was an Englishman, Herbert Spencer. Robert Nisbet sums up his influence this way, "It is impossible to think of any single name more deeply respected, more widely read among social philosophers and scientists, and more influential in a score of spheres, than was that of Herbert Spencer" (1980). Spencer coined the term *Social Darwinism*, which essentially encompassed the following ideas: (a) A person has freedom to do what he or she wills as long as that does not transgress the same right for others, and (b) the individual and society are organic and evolving, and progress could be achieved through movement toward identified goals for the improvement of both. Spencer held that knowledge was the means to freedom and progress and, in one of his famous lectures, asked, " what knowledge was of most worth?" It is a short trip from that question to the matter of passing that "knowledge " to members of the society so that social and individual progress could be achieved. In short, what Spencer was staking out was an original curriculum question, " what ought to be taught?" His answer was to use science, mathematics, and the emerging social sciences (political science, economics, sociology, and anthropology) as knowledge to achieve whatever ends were determined in the name of progress and freedom.

Questions about purposes, content, and instruction in schooling were part of the larger knowledge revolution about the nature of American society playing out at the turning of the 19th into the 20th century. Spencer's question about what should be taught initiated thinking about subjects and instruction, basic elements in schooling. In much the same way that Darwin had unsettled complacent science with his ideas about evolution, Spencer and others applied it to social betterment through science, albeit with a large dose of racism-it was white society that they addressed. Bigelow's science-driven technology

4 E. S. P. For Curriculum And Planning

idea, manifest in new applications of electricity, industrial machinery, the railroad, and wireless and other inventions, seemed to substantiate the arguments of Darwin and Spencer. The confluence of those strands seemed to suggest a new unity of knowledge that could lead to improvement in all spheres of American life.

Curriculum and Instruction

The problem was, what means of delivery could best serve to get the new message of the scientific gospel into society? The American solution, which took many years to achieve, was to provide this knowledge through some form of common schooling. What was taught prior to the new knowledge was variously referred to as "content" or "subject matter," based on disciplines of knowledge and the exercise of the mind consistent with the prevailing *faculty psychology* –a 19th-century concept of learning that saw the mind as consisting of separate powers, or faculties. The unwieldy task of enumerating or listing individual subject matter in addressing "what was to be taught" begged for a solution, some collective term. New pedagogical ideas entered the schooling dialogue and further complicated the matter of which subjects or what content. For example, in the 1880s and 1890s, the popular Herbartian movement in education used the term *method* in ways that seem synonymous with content or subject matter. Method might also imply instruction or a template for devising a lesson plan addressing what was to be taught and how to do it.

This apparent mingling of subject matter and instruction as pedagogy seemed confusing: Were the matters of the subjects to be taught and instruction in those subjects the same or separate issues? Did it make any difference? These new pedagogical issues, the separate articulation of content issues from instructional ones, marked the emergence of new and important matters of practice. In pedagogical terms, instruction was understood to mean the delivery of what was to be taught. There remained the matter of the "what" that was to be delivered. The idea of using curriculum as a concept subsuming and replacing such words as content or subject matter had yet to gel. Notwithstanding its early appearance in the title of John

Dewey's 1902 signal publication *The Child and the Curriculum*, the concept of curriculum had not gained educational prominence. It was not easy to replace the traditional use of subject matter and content designations with an economical word for what was taught in schools. The problems of meaning—using curriculum as synonymous with instruction, or implying both when using the term pedagogy—those matters of clarification also vexed curriculum's emergence as an area of study, a distinct, separate one of scholarly interest within the larger field of education.

The Applied and Academic Traditions

Exactly what was curriculum? What did it mean? From a Spencerian point of view, curriculum was "knowledge" to be transmitted, specifically that which was of "most worth." The issue was, then, just a matter of deciding which kind of knowledge. When Spencer asked his question, he did so from an academic point of view to advocate the application of scientific knowledge in the study of human evolution. Events and emerging ideas about the nature of society and the future would provide different and often competing meanings for curriculum and signify it in different ways. Mere definitions would not suffice; curriculum had to have attributes, defining qualities that would give it shape. That kind of thinking meant to conceptualize a new meaning for curriculum, a process that played out over the course of some 50 years, a period roughly from Dewey's 1902 publication *The Child and the Curriculum* to Ralph Tyler's *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, published in 1949. Two developments affected the conceptual process, the rise of the social sciences and the question of the practical and academic nature of curriculum work. The rise of the social sciences, particularly sociology, shifted the focus to the study of human social institutions, of which schools were one. The second development, the matter of assigning responsibility over curriculum, centered on institutional decisions about whether curriculum was a practical or academic enterprise.

By the 1920s, activities such as curriculum development in mainly urban school districts gave curriculum a practical, applied,

6 E. S. P. For Curriculum And Planning

dimension. Various state departments of education provided guides for doing curriculum development. Curriculum work meant curriculum development, at least at the school and teaching level. Publications from the National Education Association and the progressive Education Association also spread the word about developmental processes and activities. However, it was at the academic level that the greatest influence was achieved.

Academicians, specifically those who would influence prospective teacher-those such as Boyd Bode at Ohio state ; John Dewey at Chicago; and William Heard Kilpatrick, Harold Rugg, and George S. Counts at Teacher College, Columbia-were among many who published influential books about curriculum .These books were mainly of two orientations, those focusing on practical matters and those on the theoretical. Discussion about the practical focused on purposes for schooling and what content would best achieve those purposes, an early dialogue about aligning purposes and curriculum. Given contemporary discussions about purposes, you can understand that the debate was as lively then as now. The second approach was theoretical, not in the scientific sense but in a form that came to be called *curriculum theory*.

These were proposals advocating a specific curriculum presented with extensive logical argument and representative examples of organization and content. With rare exception, what these texts represented were "ought to be" and "how to" perspectives rather than reports or suggestions based on research or scholarly studies of curriculum work. These developments meant, in effect, that curriculum was dividing into two distinct areas of work, one of academic text development and theorizing, the other of the school practitioner and curriculum development. The meaning of curriculum depended on what was expressed through text authority rather than what was known through practice, specifically through practical curriculum development activity. This was the great divide, the theory-based knowledge encountered in preparing to teach on the one hand and what was actually found about curriculum in the reality of school practice on the other hand. What influenced meaning and

practice was what was published and disseminated about curriculum. Texts became the influential source, not the stories of practical work in schools and classrooms.

Classroom Teachers and Curriculum Scholars

The academic/school community divide also influenced the development of curriculum work in a broader sense. Conceptualizing and mapping out curriculum and curriculum work was moving along two paths. Going in one direction were those pursuing curriculum as an academic function. Steering a different course were those advocating the practical, understanding curriculum through its use by practitioners in schools and classrooms. The voices multiplied. Some addressed curriculum as the need to differentiate knowledge according to specific purposes. Other assumed the mantle of formal academic knowledge and asked which of the disciplines were of most worth in forming curriculum content. Still other forsook the knowledge issue in favor of beginning with aims or purposes to be served, or centering on the child, and then determining what knowledge or experience would meet those needs. Curriculum scholars have categorized those perspectives in various ways, calling them orientations, philosophical positions, ideologies, and so forth.

Taken collectively, these suggest two things. First, that curriculum was evolving as a larger focus beyond merely selecting "knowledge" There were other possibilities, other reasons for organizing curriculum, particularly those growing out of new knowledge from the social sciences about the relationships among people, society, its institutions, and what knowledge would serve their progress. Second, there was a growing differentiation between curriculum and instruction. New interest in the study of teaching, learning, and schooling-the progressive Education Association's Eight-Year study during the 1930s was one example-began to focus on the research complexities in working with curriculum and instruction, separately or in combination.

Whereas the general trend was toward research about learning and instruction and less about curriculum per se, the separate interests gave impetus to new interpretations and ideas about what constituted

the world of curriculum. There was an interest in searching out and building a foundation of knowledge about curriculum, and there was increased interest in the nature of the classroom and particular aspects of teaching as curriculum. The acts of teaching and learning highlight several interesting characteristics of curriculum. It is knowledge; it is practice. It is the relationship between knowledge and practice. It is content, as in science or literature, and it is a process, as in a particular way to think in and with each subject. Curriculum is also place-bound; it has the characteristics of being in a location, usually a classroom. Teachers and students in those places tend to be isolated, and creatively studying this "curriculum-in-context" is not easily done with traditional quantitative research methods. However, the availability of new qualitative methods from the social sciences—case study and ethnographic methods, for example—provided new tools of inquiry to study the classroom and teaching as micro units. Using those methods, researchers and other practitioners could explore and illuminate curriculum and, of course, other contextual elements such as instruction. A second advantage of the new inquiry methods was that the object of study was "happening"; it was in use. The reformulation of how and what to study, the recasting of how to look at curriculum as something alive rather than inert, propelled changes in thinking about curriculum and its constituent nature. Much of that impetus was owed to what came to be called the Tyler Rationale.

CURRICULUM INQUIRY AND THE TYLER RATIONALE

If a deeper understanding of curriculum was to be achieved, it had to begin with a rethinking of what was known and the articulation of new ways of thinking about and studying curriculum. The dilemma in advancing the notion of curriculum was twofold. There was a sense that traditional ways of studying curriculum—the speculative, logical, and theoretical—were unprogressive. Second, unlike other fields, such as the social and natural sciences with their growing traditions of foundational knowledge based on research, no similar inquiry tradition was developing, either generally in education or particularly about schooling and curriculum.

Competing Curriculum Ideas

Schooling discussion were not bereft of ideas. The reality was much discussion advocating one position or another but lacking any evidence validating a particular one. How does a *curricularist*, defined as anyone who works with curriculum, such as the teacher or the scholar, accept as valid certain new ideas about curriculum and purposes for schooling as well as linkages between purposes and curriculum? By the mid-1930s, the major focus was on the aims of schooling, and the force of curriculum thinking and work was on establishing the legitimacy of one of three main contending views. The traditionalist promoted knowledge and subject matter. A second group wanted curriculum to serve social purposes. A third thought curriculum should focus on the learner. The foundation for arguing any position was essentially logical scholarly argument, speculation, and theory. What was lacking was a way to establish the legitimacy of any one of the three views being advocated. There was no research-based knowledge to guide curriculum work or substantiate one set of proposals or theories as better than any other. What curriculum study needed was a fresh approach to inquiry that would lead to a new core of knowledge about curriculum and ways to study it in addition to the existing discourse of scholarly argument and theory building.

Curriculum Inquiry and Tyler's Work

Refocusing curriculum work meant asking new questions and devising new methods to study and guide curriculum work. The catalyst was Ralph Tyler's formulation of a way to think and do curriculum and instructional work that essentially derived from his experience as evaluator for the seminal 1930s Eight-Year study of the progressive Education Association.

Tyler's Rationale, as it has come to be known, bridged the curriculum dualities—curriculum as what was to be taught in schools and curriculum as a scholarly body of knowledge, and curriculum as knowledge building about content to be taught and as knowledge about the processes to construct that knowledge. Using Tyler's Rationale gave curriculum a new meaning and prompted the search

10 E. S. P. For Curriculum And Planning

for additional ways to study curriculum and create new knowledge. Curriculum was moving beyond definitional discussion, theory formulation, and speculative curriculum development practices. Looking at curriculum from the perspective of the university scholar or the teacher practitioner meant encounters with complexity and greater levels of abstraction, a perception that there were more layers of curriculum knowledge to be uncovered. The new knowledge required validation through research, practice, or both.

In effect, curriculum work could evolve from Tyler's Rationale; it suggested a cycle of knowledge production about curriculum functioning in a disciplined way, joining together practitioners in all phases of curriculum activity in a bounded discourse community. This does not mean a community of kindred souls all enveloped in the same ideas. It does mean a community with a disciplined sense of itself, one that is framed by a common focus in a discussion with different views: A belief that progress is made through the creation of knowledge, acceptance that in the creative process there will be a struggle to maintain an equilibrium of engagement, and awareness that curiosity-the casual observation or unexpected question-could change or challenge that balance. Tyler's contribution to curriculum is much like Darwin's contribution to biology; it change and recentered discussion and energized the search for knowledge through different methods of inquiry.

Tyler's Rationale added a new dimension to understanding curriculum. It was no longer a matter of understanding by definition; rather, curriculum would be understood in different ways. The process Tyler's envisioned moved curriculum from a passive to an active mode. Curriculum in the old, passive sense had functioned as a speculative venture about knowledge to be taught, arguments over subject matter inclusions, or theories about how to frame a curriculum. Tyler's introduced a way to "think about" and "do" curriculum that could be used by anyone anywhere. It opened up a range of different ways to understand curriculum-through a definition, as a concept, and by experiencing it-and to give meaning to it in all its form-form the

simple and concrete use of a textbook to the complex and abstract formulation of a single K-12 curriculum.

CURRICULUM RECONCEPTUALIZED AND REDEFINED

As noted previously, a brief definition for curriculum would be "a course of study." You or I might define curriculum as "all the subject taken in school" –history, languages, and physics, for example. Neither definition would be in error, and either would convey a simple meaning that would be understood, at least by any American. There appears to be some consensus that curriculum is some kind of a planned experience, that it relates to learners, and that it has a location, the school. Beyond those elements, the characterization vary. There is a sense that those definitions can only provide surface meanings. Students of curriculum, especially scholars, have for years attempted to establish a standardized meaning for curriculum, and they will continue to do so. Understanding curriculum beyond definitions requires other ways of thinking about it-as a concept, as an activity, as experience.

Curriculum as Concept

Concepts are complex meaning wrapped into one or several word. They are meaning created by conceptualization, a process of elaboration using ways to think about something, as in picturing, perceiving, imagining, or experiencing it. As a way of creating meaning, concepts go beyond accepted definitions, descriptions, or simple sensory experience. To think conceptually is to use your mind to create knowledge about something-intrinsic knowledge already possessed and the external knowledge that must be acquired. Moving through the process of defining, describing, and conceptualizing, you encounter tiers of knowledge, a migration from surface to deeper meaning involving degrees of simplicity and complexity. Moving from the simple and concrete to the complex and abstract in thinking is a passage through knowledge creation. In a sense, this is moving from general to more specialized meaning. For example, the word *car*, *vehicle*, and *automobile* are a set of concepts. Each is different, yet

12 E. S. P. For Curriculum And Planning

each relates in limited ways to the others. A car is an automobile and a vehicle; it can also be a vehicle but not an automobile, as in a train "car" that is a piece of railroad rolling stock. Vehicles include more than cars, but an automobile has a specific set of attributes and anything else either has them or it doesn't. The applicability of meaning to such concepts involves levels of simplicity, complexity, concreteness, and abstractness. Curriculum can be made immediate and concrete, as in textbooks or guides you can see, touch, and read. A student and teacher can experience curriculum in a classroom. The classroom serves as a context, a set of circumstances that can shape meaning you acquire about curriculum as you experience it.

Curriculum as Activity

Studying how curriculum is created and used, what curriculum workers such as teachers actually do with it, gives specialized meaning to curriculum as an activity. Observing a teacher using the curriculum in a classroom adds an applied dimension. The knowledge about curriculum the teacher needs in order to use curriculum differs from the knowledge required in other worker roles. The particular roles of different curriculum workers also refine its meaning. Other professionals- professors, curriculum researchers, and curriculum specialists-may have work-or role-related needs that require a different conceptualizing of curriculum. The individual or role-related personal need to know, the level of understanding, and the knowledge requirements of a particular role or work context depend on the way people use curriculum and make decisions about it in their work.

Different activities define curriculum in different ways by how they represent curriculum and the kind of curriculum knowledge they use and in turn create about curriculum. What, for example, do a textbook company and a teacher have in common? Each is involved in curriculum work-the teacher in the fluid events of using the curriculum in the classroom and having to adjust it in relation to the students, time, plans, and other factors. The textbook worker is producing a static textbook, something inert until it is used. There are two dimensions at work that unite them. The teacher uses the text as

the platform for classroom work and is guided by it as it represents the curriculum. The textbook producer is creating the platform the teacher will use. There has to be congruence through the text as representing what the teacher needs and what the textbook company provides based on a common foundation of knowledge about curriculum and the purposes it is to serve.

Curriculum as Experience

Some things acquire meaning through our experiencing them. This is a special characteristic of curriculum. In your schooling, you passed through the curriculum mediated by the time and place of that journey. Your individual and shared encounters with the curriculum shaped individual and collective meaning of curriculum. If you asked a diverse sample of people from various states, of different ages, who attended different types of schools and asked them what they were taught in any grade, they would with minor variations describe a similar curriculum. They shared experiences in common even though these occurred in different settings.

Teachers and other school personnel who work with curriculum also experience curriculum but in a different way. They directly experience the curriculum as *curriculum-in-use*. This has multiple meanings. From the teacher's perspective, it is what is being taught—reading, literature, science, and so forth. From the student's point of view, it is what they individually attend to and receive or experience, an idiosyncratic process. Ask a group of students what they studied in school today and they will give you different answers that, taken as a whole, depict the curriculum. Parents and the general public also have perceptions of the curriculum-in-use. They observe and discuss from a distance. The distance from the event coupled with demands in the daily circumstances of living seem to scatter perceptions of the curriculum. For them, curriculum-in-use tends to become a selective remembering of what it was when they were in school. Parents who criticize "that new math" or suggest that teachers ought to get back to the "solid" subjects they had in school are reacting to the "then" and "now" aspect of curriculum-in-use.

A Curriculum, The Curriculum, Your curriculum

The idea of curriculum-in-use evokes other meanings attained in the curriculum experience: The curriculum is illuminated in teaching and learning; teachers teach the curriculum, students learn it. That shared set of experiences involves a general sense of engagement in a curriculum, one that is generic in nature; *the* curriculum, that which is intended and specific to the moment; and *your* curriculum, what is experienced personally. Considered as questions, what does experiencing a curriculum, *the* curriculum, and *your* curriculum mean?

The first encounter (what is a curriculum?) strives to characterize a generic, universal meaning for curriculum. There are essentially two views about that. The first is that curriculum embraces schools and schooling; it is what is taught there. The second view is that curriculum is not specific to a place or setting but can exist in many forms as a set of experiences put it thus: "[Homes], peer group, formal youth organizations, jobs, and the media profoundly influence children and youth. I submit these are curricula in their own right." In this latter view, curriculum could be anything and mean anything.

The second question (what is *the* curriculum?) refers to curriculum as *de jure* and as *de facto*. *De jure* refers to curriculum as a legal entity. It is established through constitutions and other laws prescribing what should be in the school curriculum, that is to say, what should be taught. By *de facto* is meant the actual, daily, moment-to-moment existence of curriculum in schools, the reality of what is taught in the classroom by the teacher and experienced by the students. The existence of curriculum is a fact; it is the curriculum-in-use. *Formal* curriculum (*de jure* in this sense) refers to what is made explicit in such documents as a state curriculum guide or course of study or teacher's lesson plan. It is *informal* in the ways it is adjusted by the teacher's decisions as it is taught, the modification or exclusion of what is formalized. Two other aspects of the informal curriculum have been labeled the *hidden curriculum* and the *null curriculum*. The hidden curriculum refers to unwritten, and often unintended, things students learn in school. An elementary student learns to walk in a line when moving, to wait turns for the drinking fountain, and to raise a

hand to speak. These and other rules are not stipulated in the formal, or de jure, curriculum; they are part of the hidden curriculum. There is also what Elliot Eisner (1994) refers to as the null curriculum: that which is not taught. This concept highlights the power of particular mindsets in education, which also affect decisions over what purposes the curriculum should serve. Eisner identified a "small chunk" mindset in curriculum practice, for example, in which factual details are emphasized over "big picture" understandings. These unifying observations, because they are not taught, are part of the null curriculum. As another example, until recently, the achievements of women and minorities also tended to be part of the null curriculum.

Your curriculum refer to the individual, personal understanding of curriculum what teachers, students, and others perceive as the curriculum. As a teacher, your curriculum is what you plan and engage through instruction. It is the taught curriculum. As a student, your curriculum is the received curriculum that you encounter under the direction of the teacher. Note that it is possible that what a teacher prepares, the intended curriculum, may not be what the students receive. Your curriculum is also historical. It includes the personal memories and remembrances often at odds with the reality of the contemporary curriculum in general or the particular curriculum-in-use.

Curriculum as History and Expectations

Mid-20th-century thinking among scholars in all areas of knowledge anticipated the advances to be made in human progress through science. The Salk polio vaccine, advances in jet propulsion and rocketry, the Great Society programs, and the civil rights movement seemed to reflect what General Electric claimed and Ronald Reagan spoke, "At General Electric, progress is our most important product." That comment about progress from the 1950s suggests the tone or theme of a particular phase in the historical development of schooling and curriculum in America. You will note that central to the social progress of the 1950s was the role of educational institutions and the potent empowerment they received from the famous post-World War II GI Bill. In 1944, the United States Congress created a vast "right" to a

schooling opportunity, first for returning veterans and later extended to all who served. The other direct recipients of that largesse were postsecondary training institutions, colleges, and universities-expansion of educational opportunities meant more schools and programs to meet the demands of returning veterans. The message was progress through education, and education for all meant from kindergarten through college. There was, however, no systematic linking of schooling from kindergarten through college, and only a minimal articulation of what learning or other requirements were necessary for entry at any particular point from kindergarten to college. The fundamental question was what did they need to know (knowledge) or to do (skills) preparatory to exercising their educational rights? This was the quintessential issue: the curriculum.

The upshot was that for the next 50-some years and into the 21st century, curriculum and its scope and sequence, from preschool to graduate school, became a primary concern. That learning flow became the focus of numerous reform efforts. Still, the questions remained. To the perennial one, what exactly is curriculum, were added several others. One -how do you go about doing curriculum? -prompted the study of curriculum as work, a collection of behaviors and decisions. A second focused on the dual character of curriculum, the content of what was taught and the process itself as something to be studied. A third followed from earlier wrestling with various meaning curriculum had begun to accrue, one anchored in fact, the other in future thinking. These are the questions of "how" the curriculum got the way it is and "what" it is likely to be in the future, twin reflections that frame thinking about the meanings of curriculum like bookends. Both depend on understanding that curriculum is a social product, a reflection of the society it serves. The curriculum and what it has come to mean have evolved through four epochs. During each epoch, some ideology or practice was added, forming a distinctly American system of schooling. Those constructions represent consensual responses American society made about the need for schools and the purposes for schooling. The organization and content of the curriculum suggest national values, what it means to be an American the knowledge, skills, and experiences that an American ought

to possess, and our place in the world. The curriculum reflects a collective sense of self, an American character, the institutional structures that are important, and the ideologies that power how we view the future.

Since before nationhood, American schooling traditions have been shaped by obvious and subtle issues and conflicts among various parties: public, parochial, private, political, lay, and professional. Among the enduring issues have been two: "what purposes should schools serve?" and "What should schools teach?" Both questions are curriculum questions because they arrive at the issue of curriculum substance, what is to be taught, the content, the "course to be run." The response given to one requires consideration of the other regardless of which is asked first. It is not a matter of the starting point; what curriculum has been, its past meaning, and what it will mean tomorrow are bookends framing what it means in the present.

A. Answer the following questions orally.

1. What does the term "social Darwinism", coined by Spenser, encompass?
2. What are the two dimensions that unite a textbook producer and a teacher?
3. What does "curriculum-in-use" imply for teachers and students?
4. "The curriculum" refers to curriculum as de facto; what does "de facto" imply here?
5. What does "the curriculum as de jure" mean?
6. What is the difference between formal and informal curriculum?

B. Fill in the blanks with the appropriate form of the given words.

1. Spenser held that ... was the means to freedom and progress.
2. Dictionaries variously define ... as an aggregate of courses of study given in educational institutions.
3. Curriculum is ...; it has the characteristics of being in a location, usually a classroom.
4. ... refers to curriculum as a legal entity.
5. Two aspects of the informal curriculum have been labeled and