

LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Leaders in Curriculum Studies

Intellectual Self-Portraits

Edmund C. Short and Leonard J. Waks (Eds.)

SensePublishers

Leaders in Curriculum Studies

LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Series Editor:

Leonard J. Waks
Temple University, Philadelphia, USA

Scope:

Leaders in Educational Studies provides a comprehensive account of the transformation of educational knowledge since 1960, based on rich, first-person accounts of the process by its acknowledged leaders.

The initial volume, *Leaders in Philosophy of Education: Intellectual Self Portraits*, contains personal essays by 24 leading philosophers of education from North America and the United Kingdom. The current volume, *Leaders in Curriculum Studies: Intellectual Self-Portraits*, contains similar essays by 18 leading curriculum scholars. Subsequent volumes are planned for history of education and other fields of educational scholarship. The series provides unique insights into the formation of the knowledge base in education, as well as a birds-eye view of contemporary educational scholarship.

Until the 1950s school teachers were trained for the most part in normal schools or teacher training colleges. The instructors were drawn from the teacher corps; they were not professional scholars. In the late 1950s plans were made to bring a higher level of professionalism to teaching. In the United States, the remaining normal schools initially became state colleges, and eventually state universities. In the United Kingdom, the training colleges were initially brought under the supervision of university institutes; eventually teaching was transformed into an all-graduate profession.

Commentators on both sides of the Atlantic argued that if education was to become a proper field of university study then educational scholarship itself would have to be transformed. Scholars were recruited into educational studies from social sciences and humanities disciplines to contribute to teacher education and to train a new generation of educational scholars in contemporary research methods. Under their influence the knowledge base for education has been completely transformed. In addition to major accomplishments in philosophy, history, sociology and economics of education, interdisciplinary work in educational studies has flourished. The series documents this transformation.

Leaders in Curriculum Studies

Intellectual Self-Portraits

Editors:

Edmund C. Short

University of Central Florida, Orlando, USA

Leonard J. Waks

Temple University, Philadelphia, USA



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-8790-850-8 (paperback)

ISBN 978-90-8790-851-5 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-8790-852-2 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,

P.O. Box 21858, 3001 AW

Rotterdam, The Netherlands

<http://www.sensepublishers.com>

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved © 2009 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Foreword <i>Reba N. Page</i>	ix
Introduction: In Anticipation of these Essays <i>Edmund C. Short</i>	xvii
On Being a Scholar/Activist in Education <i>Michael W. Apple</i>	1
My Journey in the Curriculum Field: Looking back with Hope <i>Miriam Ben-Peretz</i>	15
Curriculum Studies: Inward Journey, Disciplined Inquiry, and Creative Linkages <i>Louise M. Berman</i>	27
Bridges from Then to Now and from Them to Us: Narrative Threads on the Landscape of 'The Practical' <i>F. Michael Connelly</i>	39
The Path Stumbled Upon <i>Bill Doll</i>	55
Growing up Urban <i>Elliot Eisner</i>	67
Connecting Action with Research <i>John Elliott</i>	77
Personal History and Curriculum Study <i>Ivor F. Goodson</i>	91
The Scenic Route <i>Maurice Holt</i>	105
Pivotal Events and People in my Career <i>M. Frances Klein</i>	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chance Encounters and Consequential Choices <i>Herbert M. Kliebard</i>	129
The Primacy of the Particular <i>William F. Pinar</i>	143
Life is a Curriculum <i>William A. Reid</i>	153
What's Worthwhile? Playing with Ideas in Loving Company <i>William H. Schubert</i>	165
What's Worth Recalling? <i>Edmund C. Short</i>	179
"It Sounds Like a Good Idea, But will it Work?" <i>Malcolm Skilbeck</i>	189
Luck, Flow, Remarkable Creatures and Me: Life in the Golden Age of Curriculum <i>Laurel Tanner</i>	203
Curriculum Theory and the Problem Of Knowledge: A Personal Journey and an Unfinished Project <i>Michael F. D. Young</i>	219
Afterword: Reflections on Curriculum Studies Since 1960 <i>Leonard J. Waks</i>	231
APPENDICES	
A. In Appreciation <i>Edmund C. Short</i>	237
B. In Memoriam <i>Edmund C. Short</i>	255

PREFACE

This volume, the second in the series *LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES*, brings together 18 personal essays by established scholars in curriculum studies, detailing their early life experiences, first encounters with teaching, curriculum work and scholarship, periods of graduate study and early work in curriculum studies, and emergence as leaders, followed by summaries of their bodies of mature work and reflections on the current challenges and opportunities in the field.

A few words must be said about how these particular authors were selected for inclusion. The General Editor of the series, Leonard Waks, contacted the co-editor of this volume, Edmund Short, in 2006 while the volume on *LEADERS IN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION* was being prepared and asked whether he would be interested in editing or co-editing a companion volume in Curriculum Studies. Short replied that he would be pleased to co-edit the volume as an equal partner. The two co-editors had both been on the board of editors of *Curriculum Inquiry* and had been colleagues at Penn State in the 1980s and early 1990s. Waks provided the initial vision of the volume. Short, a founding editor of *The Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* and a compiler of an on-line database of significant work in curriculum studies, brought to the task his comprehensive knowledge of its literature.

As co-editors we first agreed upon criteria for selection. We restricted ourselves to scholars in general curriculum studies that have been active in the field for at least thirty years and are now either retired or nearing retirement. We agreed to show partiality for senior scholars who have retired from teaching but are still intellectually active, understanding that if we did not acquire self-portraits from these authors now we might not have another opportunity. We each then prepared an initial list of possible authors based in North America, The United Kingdom and Australia for the volume and after several modifications these lists were combined. After much discussion we then selected a small first group of authors to invite. We made some inquiries to determine whether those were all in sufficient good health to prepare intellectual self-portraits, in the process eliminating two proposed authors. We then invited these initial authors to contribute and also to suggest other contributors. Most of these scholars accepted the invitation promptly and made useful suggestions about other possible contributors. These were added to our combined list, from which, after much discussion, the remaining authors were selected. In the course of the project reasons of health or conflicting obligations compelled a few authors to withdraw. The resulting volume can not be considered a comprehensive list of *THE* leaders in general curriculum scholarship since the 1960s. All of the authors of these self-portraits have, however, made significant and widely acknowledged contributions and the volume provides much new insight into the development and contemporary state of the field.

PREFACE

The contributions of other retired or nearly retired curriculum scholars who deserve to be recognized but could not be included as authors in this volume are highlighted in an Appendix, IN APPRECIATION. Another appendix, IN MEMORIAM, pays tribute to still other curriculum scholars from the past.

The contributions of those scholars providing leadership to the field today while remaining in the prime years of their careers also deserve attention, although it has not been possible to provide it in this volume. The editors express the hope that at some time in the future a second series of these intellectual self-portraits shall be devoted to these contemporary leaders. The editors also want to express their deep appreciation to Reba Page for contributing the Foreword to this volume.

FOREWORD

Curriculum studies seems to have always had something of an identity problem. In its early years, the identity problem was simply that not much attention was given to the field's identity. For the most part, curricularists took for granted that they were to assist schools in crafting curriculum programs, objectives, and the content of specific school subjects and, in the meantime, alternative traditions within curriculum studies were forgotten. Later, when the nature and purpose of the field were put in question, the identity problem was elaborated in a rich proliferation of theories, methods, and discourses. But it was then exacerbated by uncivil wars and/or eerie silences that arose among the competing camps. The identity problem has also always been inflected by external developments, including broad societal shifts and, more recently, increasing intervention in curriculum by formal government (local, state, and federal) and by a growing number of informal interest groups. I can recall encountering the identity problem as a doctoral student in the early 1980s. What exactly was entailed in declaring an interest in curriculum? Was one signing on to "do" curriculum? To work with teachers to design the school subjects, whether singly or as a whole? To consider all educative experiences, both in and out of school? To advise policymakers intent on curricular reform? To criticize scholarly work in curriculum studies, with a view toward contributing to it?

This collection of eighteen "intellectual self-portraits" written by "leaders in curriculum studies," along with sketches composed by the editors of the contributions of fourteen other leaders, casts a bright light on the identity of the field and its evolution in the recent past. All of the scholars were born around the time of the second World War and came of age during a expansive period for school curriculum and curriculum studies—roughly 1960 to 1980. The essayists trace the often oblique avenues by which they became interested in curriculum; their significant contributions to understanding it; the impact on the field of both its internal dynamics and external conditions; and speculation about the field's future. Whether readers are new to curriculum studies, experienced veterans, or members of other "tribes" who nevertheless work in curriculum, they will find considered reflections on the nature of a field that, as all the essayists suggest, is *both* theoretical *and* practical.

By age, I am a member of "the WW2 generation" represented in this volume. Like the authors, I experienced the high hopes and energetic interest that educators and American society invested in curriculum, as expressed, for example, in unprecedented infusions of federal dollars through *The National Defense Education Act of 1958* and *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*. However, unlike the authors, I took a longer and somewhat more circuitous route into curriculum studies, beginning my doctoral studies in Curriculum and

Instruction at the University of Wisconsin, Madison in the summer of 1980. Only then did I learn that there was a long-established field of study that made curriculum its object, and that the burst of innovations in curriculum design and discourse from the mid-1950s through the mid-1970s was historically unusual. Given my later entry into curriculum studies, I read the essays in this volume appreciatively, with deep interest in the intellectual, practical, and professional developments these authors initiated and sustained. I also read them for their insights into the evolution of the more complex political situation within and surrounding the field, specifically the worrisome evidence of the field's limited ability to influence practice and policy. But learning more about where curriculum studies has been, as this volume makes possible, we in the field may better re/cognize where and what it is today.

THE ESSAYS

The autobiographical essays in this volume, both individually and as a collection, make for wonderfully accessible and engaging reading about curriculum studies. The authors write like Nina Totenberg speaks on National Public Radio—with distinctive accents that, above all, are personable, intelligent, and aimed at making contact with an audience. Deftly, the authors weave together memories of their lives, emotions, developing ideas, and the field of curriculum studies. Their accounts *invite* our engagement with curriculum studies—that amorphous, variegated, hard-to-discern terrain. To paraphrase Geertz writing about ethnography (1973, p. 19), these essays “fix” fleeting curriculum discourse into an “inspectable” form so that we can re/consider the field's enduring questions and our answers, most centrally, what knowledge is worth teaching and learning, and why?

The essays appeal because each offers a novel account, replete with fascinating, even quixotic anecdotes and musings. For instance, who would guess that Elliot Eisner, now Professor Emeritus at Stanford, learned the art of persuasion at the young age of nine, while working in a salaried position selling shoes? I love that Mick Connelly points to geography as a source of inspiration, when he notes that the ranch he grew up on in western Canada fed his imagination and, in later visits, restored it. I am amazed to learn that Bill Doll and I fall into the category of “six degrees of separation”—we were both studying at The Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore in the late 1960s and early 1970s when Derrida and deconstruction arrived from France, although Bill was a doctoral student in philosophy while I was taking one course a semester [Mom's night out] in Hopkins' extraordinary night-school. I have some trouble imagining Maurice Holt, Bill Reid, and Michael F. D. Young working in the corporate sector—in computer design, bank management, and Shell Oil. Their eventual “flight to” curriculum studies is surely our gain. I am particularly moved by John Elliott's story about a brother from whom he was differentiated because the brother did not pass the 11+ exam and was ineligible to attend grammar school—a distinction also created in my family when my youngest sister, unlike an older sister, was not chosen for the honors track in middle school. I am also struck by Elliott's speculation that his productivity as a

scholar may be an effort to make his world less insecure—an idea Miriam Ben-Peretz also expresses. I find myself cheered by Louise Berman’s devotion to the education of young children and by the professional autonomy she was able to exercise in teaching, in part because principals and superintendents not only allowed but encouraged her to develop innovative courses. As a grandmother, I can only hope there are still such talented and brave educators working in schools. And Malcolm Skillbeck’s marvelous work in Australia, aimed at managing a curriculum that was simultaneously centralized and local, reminds me of my own interest in the paradoxes of community and individualism expressed in the school curriculum in the U.S.

If the essays are intriguing in their idiosyncracies, they are even more impressive in the fluency with which the authors use their individual histories to illuminate the field of curriculum studies they eventually joined. For example, Bill Reid links his first day of kindergarten, when the Froeblich-inclined teacher respected his right to refuse morning prayers rather than insisting on compliance, with his much later interest in teaching, education, and political activism—all of which, “in their various ways, provoked me into thinking seriously about curriculum questions.” Ivor Goodson displays excerpts from early personal journals and from a newspaper report based on observations and interviews in his classroom to convey how he developed his ideas about the kinds of curricula with which working-class “lads” might engage. Laurel Tanner describes her many conversations with some of the older statesmen in curriculum and education (e.g., Cremin, Goodlad, Jackson, Tyler) and their significant influence on her research and professional activities. Michael F. D. Young connects his path into curriculum studies through his checkered relationship with Basil Bernstein, including his recent move away from phenomenology and social constructivism to social realism and “powerful knowledge.” Herbert Kliebard confounds vocationalism and vocational counselors by noting that he never knew what his life would be like and that he never had a life plan, much less a plan to become a professor of curriculum. Francis Klein tells of finding curriculum studies through the influence of the director of the small elementary school in Florida where she taught—none other than John Goodlad. And Michael Apple asserts that “something happened to me at Columbia. I found a way, a ‘vocation,’ that enabled me to combine my interests in politics, education, and the gritty materialities of daily life in schools.” His first of many books would examine curriculum and ideology.

COMMON THREADS

If readers also consider the essays as a collection, not just as separate pieces, they will discern a number of commonalities, indicative of shared disciplinary experiences. I will mention several I noticed. The first is generational. As a cohort, the authors share a particular historical moment—the Great Depression, World War II, the Bomb, and the post-war economic boom with, among other things, its broad extension of schooling to previously excluded segments of the population—what Young calls the “massification” of education, including higher education. They

encounter and then inhabit newly available selves produced by the times, including university-professor-as-mere-mortal, in contrast to born-to-the-manor. Some readers will notice that all but four of these leaders are men, and that all are white. All move away from their home communities to take distant jobs, and all make international associations. Imagine the culture shock involved in leaving New York City for the Midwest—or vice versa! Most describe middle-class origins, several describe growing up in poor families, and no one describes an extraordinarily wealthy family. Yet all found their way into academic positions and illustrious careers at prestigious universities. Several write about university life in the early 1960s, casting it as a time when professors were not pressed to publish-or-perish, and therefore could spend time developing not only fine research agendas, but curricular programs in the university and in K-12, collaborations with their local as well as national and international colleagues, sustained engagement with students in and out of classes, and active participation in the events of the culture.

A second thread is that all eighteen authors began the journey toward curriculum studies by working for a time, and several for many years, as K-12 teachers. The experience marked them. Several tell of initially entering teaching for instrumental reasons, because they needed to support themselves or avoid the draft; a few also note that, wanting to be of use, they had lost interest in pursuing a strictly academic discipline that had been compelling when they were undergraduates. Many describe spending their first years simply learning how to teach—"watching the veterans," one says. In time, however, K-12 teaching proved a rite of passage. The authors developed commitments to transforming schools, school knowledge, and practices in education. In the process, they themselves were transformed, particularly by a desire to obtain better knowledge about education and to put it to good use, in and out of schools. Turning to graduate studies in education, they learned they had intellectual talents and ambitions they had not suspected. In their graduate studies, usually without plan, they happened upon a course in curriculum studies—and, as the phrase is, the rest was history.

A third thread common to the essays is that the authors became active participants in and constructors of a social network. In a sense, they *are* the field of curriculum studies—people who demonstrated that curriculum could be an object of inquiry and a practice. Their work must be reckoned with by anyone learning about and acting in curriculum.

The social network is dense, reflecting both institutional genealogies and relations originating in scholarly and professional projects. A repeated motif described by the essayists is the deep care with which established professors advised them when they arrived in their classes. A professor might start off with a new student but, at some point, recognize that the student's interests would be better served by another professor, and then, in an extraordinarily generous and attentive act, would refer the outstanding student to the other professor.

The social network was significantly expanded through the steadfast efforts of this cohort of scholars. They founded and then sustained journals specific to curriculum, such as *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *Curriculum Inquiry*, and *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, and thereby provided hitherto unavailable outlets for research about

curriculum. They also developed book series focused on curriculum with outstanding publishing houses. They contributed to the growth of professional organizations, including Division B (Curriculum Studies) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI), the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, Professors of Curriculum, the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (IAACS), and so forth.

Seen as a social network, curriculum studies also seems to reflect and re-create a shared worldview or discourse across members (despite the field's many discourses). Expressed tacitly and sometimes explicitly in the essays, it may distinguish the field from other specializations within educational studies, such as educational psychology, educational administration, or policy analysis. For example, all of the essayists in this volume seem to assume that curriculum studies is a theoretical *and* practical field, not a pure or basic science, even as they differ on what is meant by theory or practice (cf. Schwab, 1969), how theory and practice are related, which of the two should be foregrounded, and how either is best taken into account. Similarly, the authors seem to take as a given that predetermined objectives, standards, activities, and assessments of curriculum are futile, if not downright miseducative (particularly if they are structured to give little attention to how or whether "emerging," local lessons, however relevant or student-centered, build on one another and develop depth and a direction). Many of the authors indicate an egalitarian or democratic stance rather than the stance of an expert, but they leave open the issue of the authority their own work about curriculum should command. All of the authors indicate, directly or indirectly, that curriculum is a political and moral endeavor, although not all theorize politics or virtue. And most of the essayists are "utopians," as Miriam Ben-Peretz puts it, who despite evidence documented in their own research of the difficulties of implementing school reforms or reaching curricular decisions, "run away from the insecurity of life . . . and from injustice and ignorance *to* the vision of a better future" [my *emphasis*].

A last common thread in the essays is the oft-noted lack of consensus within the field about how curriculum is best conceptualized. The decades of the 1960s and 1970s were a theoretically vital period—"fertile," Berman says—and a variety of theoretical perspectives were developed: Bill Reid and Decker Walker's elaboration of Schwab's emphasis on the practical and deliberation; Bill Pinar's reconceptualism; the "new" sociology of curriculum of Michael Apple and Michael F. D. Young; the turn to curriculum history, made by Herb Kliebard, Laurel Tanner, and Ivor Goodson. Debate about the new theorizations was joined, and revived the central questions of the field—what educative experiences should a curriculum include and why; should different curricula be provided *to* different groups of students; what should be the scope of a curriculum and how should it be organized; how should a curriculum be taught, and how evaluated; and who should determine a curriculum?

Notably, the divisions and debates of the past are muted in the present essays. Lingering oppositions are voiced, to be sure, but off-handedly, even back-handedly. Robust debate seems to have been displaced by a dull, but perhaps safer or more politic live-and-let-live distance in which speakers take turns stating their

diverse positions but then fail to engage with each other to explore the differences or to locate possible common ground. Instead of embracing its diverse orientations as evidence of the multifaceted nature of curriculum, the field seems caught in slow splintering. Sharing a deep concern for curriculum and curriculum studies and holding many and diverse ideas about them, how *will* we pursue civil engagement with each other and with others outside curriculum studies over significant educational issues?

LESSONS FOR THE FIELD

Considering the future of curriculum studies, we in the next cohort of the field might take a page from this cohort's essays about their experiences, ideas, accomplishments, and sometimes explicit advice. A central concern today is that the influence of curriculum studies in regard to curriculum practice and policy is waning. To address the concern, we might reflect on both the internal developments and external influences that the essays suggest were important in the past and how they bear on the field today.

As a simple example, an internal feature of the field is the somewhat haphazard paths many of these leaders followed to eventually arrive at curriculum studies. We today might more explicitly and actively recruit students to curriculum. Once they are recruited, we might treat them as generously as did the advisors of these leaders (and as these leaders treated *their* students). Then new recruits may grasp the complex geography of the field they are joining, contribute to it, and guide *their* students into it.

We might also consider strengthening the social network of curriculum studies by developing stronger links with scholars and associations outside the field but who study and support curriculum. Thus, we might extend our research into levels of schooling and education outside of K-12, such as higher education or informal education, where research is more often focused on issues of access rather than questions about what—what curriculum—students will gain access to. Such linkages might support a web that can both enhance and display the field's intellectual resources. An intriguing comparison of curriculum formation, status, and authority in physics and gender studies suggests that the high status, abundant resources, and professional autonomy enjoyed by physics is not due simply to the “hard” knowledge it produces, in contrast to gender studies, but to its social organization within a thick web of long-standing, powerful associations that bridge to government, business, the media, and social movements (Slaughter, 2002). Curriculum studies might work to sustain and “thicken” its web.

If members of curriculum studies would have anything meaningful to say in on-going discussions over education and curriculum, they might address the field's long-standing internal divisions as well as the shared, often tacit assumptions, both voiced in many of the essays. This could entail reflecting on our own discourse(s) and the ideology it instantiates, as well as analyzing more politically-successful rhetorics. At bottom, careful, self-conscious attention to the language we use is crucial to scholarship that is both excellent and persuasive (cf. Milburn, 1992). As

Berman cautions, “hopefully, curriculum workers have learned to value civility so that conversation is not only critical but also encouraging.”

Graduate schools of education may be a seriously neglected point of contact between scholarship in curriculum studies and practice and policy in schooling and education. As the essayists recount, they were practitioners who turned to schools of education in search of tools they might use in addressing the questions they had about schooling and education. Currently on the minds of many of my students is what they describe as their inability to escape policy dictates, particularly those established in *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. One class explained to me that they are frequently “palmed” when teaching, that is, observers from the front office or the district office enter their classrooms carrying Blackberries to collect and record information about the classes. One tool I’ve offered in response is anthropological and social theory that clarifies the relationship between structure and agency. For instance, Ortner (2006) tracks the evolution of theory from the 1950s, when emphasis was placed on large sociocultural forces that determined human action, to the development of practice theory in the late 1970s and early 1980s, in which the focus shifted to how people “make” their worlds, and then a few years later, to the turns to history, politics, and culture that saved practice theory from becoming simply another story about the reproduction of the social order. As Ortner puts it:

Culture (in a very broad sense) constructs people as particular kinds of social actors, but social actors, through their living, on-the-ground, variable practices, reproduce or transform—and usually some of each—the culture that made them . . . [in practice theory] neither ‘individuals’ nor ‘social forces’ have precedence [but] there is a dynamic, powerful, and sometimes transformative relationship between the practices of real people and the structures of society, culture, and history. (p. 133)

With such a tool, my students can begin to look for and find themselves as culturally-constituted, “acting subjects,” rather than as simply subjected by “the system.” The structures will bear down, but their sensibilities about it and about themselves will be altered.

Finally, I join the essayists in suggesting the need for more sophisticated theories of educational politics than the field has used in the past, particularly in order to avoid a victim mentality not unlike that my students sometimes express. In this regard, I have found the work of historian Carl Kaestle (2003) particularly interesting. Kaestle argues that the role of the federal government in the U.S. is certainly larger and more intrusive than in the late 1950s. However, it has also experienced abrupt shifts in its focus, scope, and rationale since the mid-1970s, particularly in regard to curriculum, and those shifts are likely to continue, making the job of assigning responsibility for the direction of schooling and education a less certain endeavor than in the past. Complicating matters further, Kaestle suggests that informal but national interest groups have proliferated, and promote a variety of educational reforms. Such groups include traditional professional associations of educators, single-issue and multi-issue groups (e.g., homeschooling;

Business Roundtable), school-based groups (e.g., Coalition for Essential Schools), task forces and commissions, think tanks, foundations, and for-profit organizations. These groups cross-cut the formal structure of local, state, and federal governance so that what Kaestle terms the educational polity in the U.S.—the nationwide system by which education is governed—now has many entry points, is made up of shifting alliances, and includes groups that preach fervently to their specific choirs. The system, he concludes, allows for entrepreneurial as well as formal, governmental influence. If correct, Kaestle's ideas suggest that we, in curriculum studies, might better comprehend the complexity of the educational polity and the greater difficulty in mobilizing and tracing its influence. At the same time, the complex polity may be propitious for curriculum studies if it would seek to locate strategies and positions from within the vast array where it might contribute to on-going debates and practices over what knowledge is valuable and why. In short, the times may be right for curriculum studies to "reclaim a voice," as Linda McNeil once put it, and thereby sustain and extend the vital accomplishments of its recent past.

REFERENCES

- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (pp. 3–32). New York: Basic Books.
- Kaestle, C. (2003). *Mobilizing school reform from above: Five decades of federal and national strategies*. AERA Distinguished Lecture. Presented at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, April 23, 2003.
- Milburn, G. (1992). Do curriculum studies have a future? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 7(3), 302–318.
- Ortner, S. (2006). *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schwab, J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review*, 78(1), 1–23.
- Slaughter, S. (2002). The political economy of curriculum-making in American universities. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect* (pp. 260–289). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Reba N. Page
University of California, Riverside

EDMUND C. SHORT

INTRODUCTION: IN ANTICIPATION OF THESE ESSAYS

The essays in this volume are first-person accounts of the lives, the careers, and the intellectual contributions of eighteen leaders in curriculum studies who have been active in this academic field within Education in the period between the 1960s and today. Their intimate, fascinating stories are as diverse as the individuals themselves. Sometimes their stories traverse similar ground, as one would expect of people sharing the same academic specialty, but each story clearly turns out to be unique reflecting not only the specific background each one brings to that work but also the special focus within curriculum studies that each one chose to pursue.

Some, you will discover, have devoted their attention in curriculum studies to work in the “trenches” of ordinary schools and colleges, attempting to help make curriculum decisions that reflect sound knowledge of curriculum principles, processes, and practices. Some have taken “activist” roles in attempting to affect change in the systems and policies of curriculum and education more generally, reflecting in their work new knowledge that they and others have generated about how such change can be facilitated. Some have been engaged in the “stratospheres” of creating better theoretical and ethical models for possible adoption by curriculum practitioners and policy-makers, taking into account previously overlooked purposes, content, kinds of students, philosophical perspectives, and ways of teaching that would better encompass the ultimate educational needs of students. Some have focused primarily on producing “useful research” of various kinds that can inform curriculum practice and policies, frequently striking out in new paths of inquiry unknown or unused by their predecessors. Some have adopted formal research agendas within specific “disciplinary fields of inquiry” (historical, sociological, philosophical, humanistic, critical, etc.) that are more distantly related to curriculum policies and practices but which may ultimately influence them as well. And, some curriculum leaders represented in this volume, as might be expected, have engaged in a mixture of these various kinds of intellectual work at various times in their careers. All have made esteemed contributions to the field of curriculum studies.

All of these writers are considered to be generalists in curriculum studies. That is, they have chosen to make the broad issues and problems of curriculum the focus of their attention rather than the more narrow issues of some specific subject matter area or grade level concerns. Admittedly, some of these curriculum leaders have also at times given their attention to these related curriculum topics, but for the most part they identify themselves with more comprehensive curriculum matters that are concerned with the “whole” curriculum—such topics as its overall aims

and purposes, the place and kinds of knowledge and human experience within the educative environment, the design and structure of the components of the curriculum over the years students matriculate the curriculum and over the time span of given segments of the structured curriculum, assessment and accountability issues related to the entire curriculum, issues of access and equity among various student constituencies, out-of-school influences on student learning and the educational institution's ability to engender true learning, and the like. The leaders in curriculum studies that discuss their lives and work in this book clearly have specialized within this wide range of generalist curriculum topics, for no one can adequately attend to all of these at once. So, as you read these essays, look to see what kinds of intellectual problems in the curriculum field each of them undertook to work on at various times in their careers.

For those who have known these eighteen curriculum leaders or have read their works over the years, it will not be surprising to see recited in these essays many familiar ideas and studies with which they have been associated. What may be surprising are the personal touches they provide on the background and challenges of doing this work, the early influences that led them into the field of curriculum studies, the previously unknown bits of information they offer about their personal commitments and hopes for curriculum studies, and the modesty with which they assess the significance of their own contributions to curriculum studies. While each of these essays is a very brief introduction to these topics by their authors (sometimes they cite lengthier treatments of their lives and work published elsewhere), the essays do provide in relatively few words a wonderful look inside the minds and activities of these individuals, and collectively the essays offer the opportunity to review the contributions of eighteen curriculum leaders within a single volume. For the younger and future generations of curriculum scholars, the book will be a "gold-mine" of a record of a generation of leaders in curriculum studies, what they were like and what they did, that can be delved into for historical perspective on the field, for inspiration from thoughtful and highly motivated contributors from the past, and possibly for overlooked precedents and future possibilities for the future of curriculum studies.

These intellectual self-portraits of leaders in curriculum studies are a part of a tradition in educational scholarship for which antecedents exist in curriculum studies. Biographies and autobiographies of curriculum thinkers have appeared from time to time in the literature of the field. Mary Louise Seguel (1966) wrote about the professional and intellectual contributions of the McMurrys, Dewey, Bobbitt, Charters, Rugg, and Caswell, probably the earliest attempt to record the facts about any of our leading curriculum scholars. Kridel, Bullough, and Shaker (1996) included in their book of profiles of professors of education several who are associated with curriculum studies, among them, Tyler, Taba, Eisner, Albery, Stratemeyer, Miel, Caswell, Rugg, and Macdonald. Pinar, et al. (1995), in their compendium *Understanding Curriculum*, classified portraits of self and experience (curriculum vitae) as one form of autobiographical/biographical curricular scholarship that has long had both personal and historical significance, and cite several examples. Kridel presented a series of articles about several curriculum

scholars that appeared in eight issues of *JCT* in 1996-1997; Macdonald, Huebner, Taba, Miel, Eisner, and Klover were among those portrayed there. Marshall, et al. (2007), in their memoir of the curriculum field, employ both excerpts of writings and short vignettes about themselves written by leading curriculum theorists, including Foshay, Berman, Apple, Schwab, Janet Miller, and Giroux. The present collection of essays, *Leaders in Curriculum Studies: Intellectual Self-Portraits* (2009), is the first of which we are aware where such scholars have themselves written extended autobiographical accounts of their lives and intellectual contributions to curriculum studies. The limited number included in this volume suggests that future volumes of similar self-portraits by other leaders in the field would be desirable, for this and other accounts of significant contributors to curriculum studies provide both helpful models and enduring lessons for future leaders in the field.

While this volume does not include all the leading thinkers in curriculum studies, it does include many from the United States and the United Kingdom, one from Australia, and one from Israel, and thus presents a rather wide range of persons who have been leaders in curriculum studies during recent decades. From whatever country they originate, they have had to face very similar circumstances and challenges over this span of time, as you will note as you read about the historical contexts within which each of them has been working. The post-Sputnik period of the 1960s brought a burst of energy into the curriculum field with the rise of new discipline-centered curricula world-wide. The turmoil of the 1960s and 1970s over the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, with student protests and demands for minority rights in curriculum, were not limited to the United States, as you will see. Cold War issues of the 1970s and 1980s prompted shifts in political ideologies in many countries, and numerous attempts at reform in curriculum and more broadly in education brought into existence more centralized control and standardized curriculum than had been customary in earlier eras. By the 1980s and 1990s, the Reagan/Bush neoconservative dominance in the United States and the similar Thatcher/Major era in the United Kingdom had brought about a virtual absence of influence by most of the experts and scholars in the curriculum studies community (except perhaps in Israel). This community was left to doing scholarly criticism or international status reports or serving on high-level commissions to advise central authorities (which only occasionally seemed to act on such advice). Despite this marginalization of curriculum studies and its scholarly resources, many of our writers have kept quite busy in various domains of research and advocacy. And, we think, they have kept remarkably hopeful and determined to keep the voice of curriculum studies alive and productive, if not as audible in the policy realms as they might wish, at least in the province of students who study with them and read their research and writings.

It is probably not possible to grasp from the reading of the essays in this book what the current status of curriculum studies as an academic field actually looks like at the present time or what directions it will take in the immediate future. Not enough scope is represented here to determine that. However, some hints are to be found in what our authors say on this topic. For the sake of the future of curriculum studies, it would be well to take notice of any such assessments or leads you can

find in what these writers discuss. If you can do this and can extrapolate ideas of the same order from other sources in curriculum studies, it may be well to put your conclusions into the context of some previous “state-of-the-field” assessments from the past. Some of these historical sources that are perhaps worthy of looking up and attending to include the following: Mary Louise Seguel’s final chapter in *The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years* (1966); Ralph Tyler’s “Recollections of Fifty Years of Work in Curriculum” (1986); Geoffrey Milburn’s “Do Curriculum Studies Have a Future?” (1992); the last chapter in Pinar, et al. (1995), “Understanding Curriculum: A Postscript for the Next Generation”; and Chapter 10, “Imagining the Postmillennial Curriculum Field,” in Marshall, et al. (2007). These sources give a glimpse into where the field has been going over the last several decades and where it is likely to go in the next few years, at least in the view of some of its scholars. The writers in this present volume add some perspective to this tradition in what they say; none attempt a definitive statement on this.

We think you will enjoy reading these essays. We appreciate the effort each of these authors has made in providing these stories for public view.

REFERENCES

- Kridel, C. (1996, 1997). Hermeneutic portraits. *JCT: Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 12(1–4), 13(1–4), passim.
- Kridel, C., Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Shaker, P. (Eds.). (1996). *Teachers and mentors: Profiles of distinguished twentieth-century professors of education*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., Allen, L. A., Roberts, P. A., & Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Milburn, G. (1992). Do curriculum studies have a future? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 7(3), 302–318.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Seguel, M. L. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tyler, R. L. (1986). Recollections of fifty years of work in curriculum. *Journal of Thought*, 21(1), 70–74; reprinted in C. Kridel (Ed.). (1989). *Curriculum history* (pp. 172–177). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

MICHAEL W. APPLE

ON BEING A SCHOLAR/ACTIVIST IN EDUCATION

GETTING THERE

It was late in the evening and I had just come home after a day of teaching, filled with the combination of exhaustion, tension, and sometimes pure joy that accompanies working in schools. There was something waiting for me, a letter from Teachers College, Columbia University. I opened it with much trepidation. But the news was good. I was admitted to the Philosophy of Education program there. I had been accepted elsewhere, but this was the 1960s and in my mind “TC” was the place to be if one was deeply interested in challenging the taken for granted assumptions and practices of schooling. To tell the truth, I was surprised that I had been admitted. I had gone to two small state teachers colleges at night for my undergraduate degree, a degree that was not yet finished since I had to complete some required courses that summer. And while working full-time as a printer before my part-time undergraduate career was interrupted by the army, my grade point average was, to be honest, pretty horrible. Luckily, Teachers College focused on my post-army last two years of college work.

The army had “trained” me to be a teacher and many urban schools were facing a very serious teacher shortage. Thus, I began teaching without a degree in the inner city schools of Paterson, New Jersey, schools I had attended as a child, and then moved to teach in a small rural and strikingly conservative town in southern New Jersey for a number of years where I predictably had some run-ins with ultra-conservative and racist groups (see Apple 1999). I had also been a president of a teachers union, a continuation of a family tradition of political activism. I loved teaching; but I was more than a little distressed by the ways teachers were treated, by curricula that were almost totally disconnected from the world of the children and communities in which I worked, and by policies that seemed to simply reproduce the poverty that surrounded me. Having grown up poor myself, this was not something that gave me much to be happy about as you might imagine. Taken together, all of this pushed me toward applying for a Masters degree, with the aim of returning to the classroom. But something happened to me at Columbia. I found a way, a “vocation,” that enabled me to combine my interests in politics, education, and the gritty materialities of daily life in schools. I ultimately continued on for a doctorate.

Going to Teachers College during the late 1960s was a remarkable experience in many ways. It treated intellectual work seriously and pushed me and others to the limits of what was possible to read and understand. For me, coming from night school at small places, aside from a family tradition of radical literacy, this was one

of the first times I had been treated as if I could deal with some of the most complicated historical, economic, conceptual, political, and practical issues surrounding education. I loved it and was dismayed by it at the very same time. The reason for the dismay was because TC (and Columbia University as a whole) was basically next to Harlem and yet its relations with impoverished schools and with the Black and Latino communities nearby were spotty at best. This very fact provided students like me with a bit of kindling for the gritty anger that many of us already felt. This of course was complemented by the reality that Columbia was a deeply politicized environment at the time. The fact that I had already been an activist in anti-racist, anti-corporate, and anti-war movements meant that the pressure cooker of studying at Columbia had to be balanced with the demands of political action. Somehow I and others did it.

In philosophy of education, I worked with Jonas Soltis, a fine analytic philosopher and teacher and someone who recognized that there might be something worthwhile in my rough and not yet polished conceptual abilities. But Jonas also recognized that whatever my growing conceptual talents (and they were growing since he was indeed a good teacher), I was chafing at the lack of connection between the world of analytic philosophy and the struggles over curricula, teaching, and community participation in schools. He knew almost before I did that my real interests were centered on the politics of curriculum and teaching.

PERSONAL FAVORITES

Ideology and Curriculum, 3rd edition (New York: Routledge, 2004)

Education and Power, 2nd edition (New York: Routledge, 1995)

Teachers and Texts (New York: Routledge, 1986)

Official Knowledge, 2nd edition (New York: Routledge, 2000)

Cultural Politics and Education (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996)

Educating the "Right" Way, 2nd edition (New York: Routledge, 2006)

The State and the Politics of Knowledge (New York: Routledge, 2003)

Democratic Schools, 2nd edition (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2007).

The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education (New York: Routledge, 2009)

Near the end of my first year at TC, he sent me to see Alice Miel, the Chair of Curriculum and Teaching and someone whose contributions to democratic curriculum have not been sufficiently recognized. And Alice sent me to see Dwayne Huebner. Her suggestion had a profound impact on all that I have done.

Very few doctoral students had finished with Dwayne. He was demanding (of himself as well as his students) and he was among the

most creative critical curriculum scholars in the history of the field. He said that we needed to rethink all that we thought we knew about society, about schooling, about nearly everything. Dwayne sent me away with a list of more than fifty books to read—in philosophy, social theory, literature and literary theory, and curriculum history. For some this would have been off-putting. But for some reason, I took up the challenge and we met again—and again and again. I poured over the books.

It was a bewildering array and yet I began to see a pattern, a set of ways in which our common-sense must be and could be challenged. My political and pedagogic commitment to understanding and interrupting common-sense that was so much a part of my political and educational activity earlier and that became the central focus of my work as a scholar/activist throughout my career later on was given direction. If this was a test, I guess I passed it. Dwayne and I spent hours discussing the material. He questioned me; I questioned him. And a mutual bond was built that has lasted for a very long time.

Working with Dwayne Huebner was a deeply formative experience, as was becoming his teaching assistant. Dwayne sent me to the New School to take courses in phenomenology and critical social and cultural theory. He insisted that I get to know Maxine Greene well, a person who also had a major influence on me. In essence, I did a joint degree in curriculum studies, philosophy, and sociology under the direction of Dwayne, Jonas, and Maxine. This combination led to a dissertation that brought these traditions together, “Relevance and Curriculum: A Study in the Phenomenological Sociology of Knowledge,” at the same time as it provided both the foundation and many of the guiding questions for much of my later work on the relationship among education, knowledge, and power.

COMING TO WISCONSIN

Dwayne had done his PhD at Wisconsin. He and his close friend, the noted curriculum theorist James MacDonald, told stories of Wisconsin and of their experiences there, compelling stories that documented its excellence, its political tradition, and the ways in which it provided a space for critical work. As I was finishing my degree in the spring of 1970, there was a curriculum position open there. Dwayne and Jim’s major professor, Vergil Herrick—originally a colleague of Ralph Tyler at Chicago and one of the leading curriculum scholars of his time—had died and his position needed to be filled. Herbert Kliebard was the other curriculum studies person at Wisconsin. Herb had studied at TC under Arno Bellack, a person with whom I too had taken a number of courses, in the generation before mine. Herb’s work on curriculum history had already made a significant impression on me and others. When he called and an interview was arranged, I was more than a little happy—and filled with a bad case of nerves.

My first experience of Madison, Wisconsin was arriving in the midst of a large anti-war demonstration. The power of the demonstrations (and they continue today), the intellectual and political openness of the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies, the quality of the students there, the progressive political traditions of the state and the community, all of these combined to make me feel that I had found a home. No place is perfect, but Wisconsin continues to be a special place, an institution where I have spent nearly four decades.

KNOWLEDGE AND POWER—FIRST STEPS

Wisconsin provided the space for truly serious critical work, work that could be *engaged*. It was an ideal place to be a “scholar/activist.” In the early 1970s, in addition to the other writing I was doing on teacher education, on critical studies of curriculum and evaluation, and on student rights, I began the initial work on a volume that was to take nearly five years to complete, *Ideology and Curriculum* (1979/1990/2004).¹ (Luckily, I had gotten tenure in 1973 after only three years at Wisconsin, and was promoted to full professor after only three more years, so the pressure was off.) The aim of that early book was not only to revitalize the curriculum field, but also to challenge both “liberal” educational policies and practices and the reductive and essentializing theories of the role of education that had become influential in critical analysis, books such as Bowles and Gintis’s *Schooling in Capitalist America* (1976). In *Ideology and Curriculum*, I argued that education must be seen as a political act. I suggested that in order to do this, we needed to think *relationally*. That is, understanding education requires that we situate it back into both the unequal relations of power in the larger society and into the relations of dominance and subordination—and the conflicts—that are generated by these relations.

Others had said some of this at the time, but they were all too general. I wanted to focus on the connections between knowledge and power. Thus, rather than simply asking whether students have mastered a particular subject matter and have done well on our all too common tests, we should ask a different set of questions: Whose knowledge is this? How did it become “official”? What is the relationship between this knowledge and who has cultural, social, and economic capital in this society? Who benefits from these definitions of legitimate knowledge and who does not? What can we do as critical educators and activists to change existing educational and social inequalities and to create curricula and teaching that are more socially just?

During the writing of *Ideology and Curriculum*, I came into contact with a number of people in England who were doing similar critical work on the relationship between knowledge and power. The “New Sociology of Education” in England had nearly exactly the same intuitions and used many of the same resources as critical curriculum studies did in the United States. As my analyses became popular there, international connections were cemented in place. This led to my first set of lectures outside the United States in 1976 and created a set of intellectual and political bonds that continue to this day. I am certain that *Ideology and Curriculum* would not have been seen as such a major contribution without the political and academic influences of these colleagues in England.

A moment ago, I mentioned the kinds of questions that *I&C* raised. Yet, it is important to state that the volume was grounded in a large array of issues and literature. Indeed, *I&C* enabled me to synthesize a considerable number of the influences that had been working through me for many years. Let me note them here, since many people see such early work as simply an expression of Neo-Marxism. It is this, but it was so much more. It rested in such traditions as the following: cultural Marxism and Marxist theory; phenomenology and in particular

social phenomenology; the sociology of knowledge; analytic philosophy inside and outside of education; European critical theory; the philosophy, sociology, and history of science; aesthetics and the philosophy of art; political economy and studies of the labor process; the new sociology of education in England and France; and last but certainly not least, the critical and literary traditions within education and curriculum studies.

Thus, *Ideology and Curriculum* was meant to speak to a much larger array of educational, social, cultural, and political issues than some might have realized. And it certainly could not be captured by overly simplistic slogans such as curriculum “reconceptualization,” a term with a very weak empirical and historical warrant. I fully recognize that *I&C* bears the mark of its time. It devotes most of its energy to unpacking the role that curriculum and pedagogy play in cultural reproduction. It spends much less time than it should on a more dialectical understanding of knowledge and power and because of this is not as adequate in understanding transformations and struggles (see Weis, McCarthy, and Dimitriadis 2006). But this is taken up in the many books that followed. Yet, even with its limitations and silences, the fact that it has gone through multiple editions and has been translated into a very large number of languages means that I must have gotten something right.

EXPANDING THE DYNAMICS OF POWER

I&C was the first step on what became a long journey, for other books regularly followed as I understood more and as I was taught by the criticisms of other scholars and activists throughout the world and certainly by my doctoral students from all over the world at Wisconsin. (There is a reason I regularly thank the Friday Seminar in each of my books. The Ph.D. and Masters students in that group have been more than a little influential in my development and keep my honest at all times.).

Two other books followed—*Education and Power* (1982/1995) and *Teachers and Texts* (1986). That set of books formed what somehow came to be known as the first “Apple trilogy.” The two additional volumes both corrected some of the errors and spoke to some of the silences in *I&C* and expanded the dynamics of power with which we had to be concerned to include gender and race. They focused on the power and contradictions of resistance and struggle both inside schools and in the larger society. They critically examined what was happening in curricula and in teachers’ labor through a process of deskilling, reskilling, and intensification. They illuminated the political economy of the “real” curriculum in schools—the textbook. And they analyzed the spaces where possible counter-hegemonic action could take place.

The path I was on now was even more involved and the relations and realities I was trying to understand were even more complex. These issues demanded more attention. But looking back on the first set of volumes, I can now see more clearly that they led me from a largely neo-Marxist analyses of social and cultural reproduction, to an (unromantic) emphasis on agency, to treatments of teachers’

work and lives, to an enlargement of political and cultural struggles to complement (but definitely not abandon) my original focus on class, and more recently to sustained critical analyses of how powerful movements and alliances can radically shift the relationship between educational policies and practices and the relations of dominance and subordination in the larger society, but not in a direction that any of us would find ethically or politically justifiable. All of these efforts over the years have been grounded in a sense of the significance of cultural struggles and of the crucial place that schools, curricula, teachers, and communities play in these struggles.

UNDERSTANDING CONSERVATIVE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS IN EDUCATION

Another series of books followed—this time four volumes—these focusing much more directly on the ways in which power worked currently and on how we might interrupt these relations. In volumes such as *Official Knowledge* (1993/2000), *Cultural Politics and Education* (1996), *Educating the “Right” Way* (2001/2006), and *The State and the Politics of Knowledge* (2003), I spent a good deal of time showing that it is social movements, *not* educators, who are the real engines of educational transformations. And the social movements that continue to be the most powerful now are more than a little conservative. In essence, I have claimed that if you want to understand how to engage in a successful large scale pedagogic campaign that changes people’s common-sense about legitimate knowledge, teaching, and evaluation—indeed about schooling in general—examine those people who have actually done it. I hadn’t abandoned my previous concerns with knowledge and power, but I now had better tools. And the politics were now even more pressing since educators all over the world were facing a set of conservative attacks that were deeply damaging to any education worth its name.

For exactly these reasons, over the past decade and a half I have been engaged in a concerted effort to analyze the reasons behind the rightist resurgence—what I call “conservative modernization”—in education and to try to find spaces for interrupting it. My aim has not simply been to castigate the Right, although there is a bit of fun in doing so. Rather, I have also sought to illuminate the dangers, and the elements of good sense, not only bad sense, that are found within what is an identifiable and powerful new “hegemonic bloc” (that is, a powerful set of groups that provides overall leadership to and pressure on what the basic goals and policies of a society are). This new rightist alliance is made up of various factions—neo-liberals, neo-conservatives, authoritarian populist religious conservatives, and some members of the professional and managerial new middle class. These are complicated groups, but let me describe them briefly.

This power bloc combines multiple fractions of capital who are committed to neo-liberal marketized solutions to educational problems, neo-conservative intellectuals who want a “return” to higher standards and a “common culture,” authoritarian populist religious fundamentalists who are deeply worried about secularity and the preservation of their own traditions, and particular fractions of the professionally oriented new middle class who are committed to the ideology

and techniques of accountability, measurement, and “management.” While there are clear tensions and conflicts within this alliance, in general its overall aims are in providing the educational conditions believed necessary both for increasing international competitiveness, profit, and discipline and for returning us to a romanticized past of the “ideal” home, family, and school.

I have had a number of reasons for focusing on the alliance behind conservative

PUBLICATIONS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED ME

- Dwayne Huebner, “Curricular Language and Classroom Meanings,” James B. Macdonald and Robert R. Leeper, Eds. *Language and Meaning* (Washington: ASCD, 1966), pp. 8-26.
- Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961)
- Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (New York: Oxford University press, 1979)
- Alfred Schutz, *Collected Papers Volumes I-III* (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1962-1966)
- Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963)
- Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1936)
- Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983)
- Basil Bernstein, *Class, Codes, and Control Volume III*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977)
- Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971)
- Paul Willis, *Learning to Labor* (New York: Columbia University press, 1981)

modernization. First, these groups are indeed powerful, as any honest analysis of what is happening in education and the larger society clearly indicates. Second, they are quite talented in connecting to people who might ordinarily disagree with them. For this reason, I have shown in a number of places that people who find certain elements of conservative modernization relevant to their lives are not puppets. They are not dupes who have little understanding of the “real” relations of this society.

My position is very different. I maintain that the reason that some of the arguments coming from the various factions of this new hegemonic bloc are listened to is because they are connected to aspects of the realities that people experience. The tense alliance of neo-liberals, neo-conservatives, authoritarian populist religious activists, and the professional and managerial new middle class only works because there has been a very creative articulation of themes that resonate

deeply with the experiences, fears, hopes, and dreams of people as they go about their daily lives. Worries about economic insecurity, about the destruction of communities, about feelings of powerlessness, about a lack of respect, about bureaucratic inaction and intransigence—all of these are based in real things that very many people experience in their daily lives. The Right has often been more than a little manipulative in its articulation of these themes. It has integrated them within racist nativist discourses, within economically dominant forms of understanding, and within a problematic sense of “tradition.” But, this integration could only occur if they were organized around people’s understanding of their real material and cultural lives.

The second reason I have stressed the tension between good and bad sense and the ability of dominant groups to connect to people's real understandings of their lives—aside from the continuation of the profound respect for Antonio Gramsci's writings about this that was so visible even in my early work—has to do with my belief that we have witnessed a major educational accomplishment over the past three decades in many countries. The Right has successfully demonstrated that you need to work at the level of people's daily experiences, not only in government policies. The accomplishment of such a vast educational project has many implications. It shows how important cultural struggles inside and outside of schools actually are. And, oddly enough, it gives reason for hope. It forces us to ask a significant question. *If the right can do this, why can't we?*

I do not mean this as a rhetorical question. As I have argued repeatedly in this next set of four books, the Right has shown how powerful the struggle over meaning and identity—and hence, schools, curricula, teaching, and evaluation—can be. While we should not want to emulate their often cynical and manipulative processes, the fact that they have had such success in pulling people under their ideological umbrella has much to teach us. Granted there are real differences in money and power between the forces of conservative modernization and those whose lives are being tragically altered by the policies and practices coming from the alliance. But, the Right wasn't as powerful thirty years ago as it is now. It collectively organized. It created a decentered unity, one where each element sacrificed some of its particular agenda to push forward on those areas that bound them together. Can't we do the same?

I believe that we can, but only if we face up to the realities and dynamics of power in unromantic ways. And this means not only critically analyzing the rightist agendas and the effects of their increasingly mistaken and arrogant policies in education and so much else, but engaging in some serious criticism of some elements within the progressive and critical educational communities as well. Thus, as I argued in *Educating the "Right" Way*, the "romantic possibilitarian" rhetoric of a good deal of the writing on critical pedagogy is not sufficiently based on a tactical or strategic analysis of the current situation nor is it sufficiently grounded in its understanding of the reconstructions of discourse and movements that are occurring in all too many places. The often mostly rhetorical material of critical pedagogy simply is unable to cope with what has happened. Only when it is linked much more adequately to concrete issues of educational policy and practice—and to the daily lives of educators, students, and community members—can it succeed.

This, of course, is why journals such as *Rethinking Schools* and books such as *Democratic Schools* (Apple and Beane 1995; Apple and Beane 2007) that connect critical educational theories and approaches to the actual ways in which they can be and are present in real classrooms become so important. Thus, while I may have been one of the originators of critical theory and critical pedagogy in the United States, I also have been one of its internal critics when it has forgotten what it is meant to do and has sometimes become simply an academic specialization at universities.

The story of how the book I mentioned above, *Democratic Schools* (Apple and Beane 1995, 2007), came about may be a good way of showing what I mean here. Along with other people, I've argued that it is essential that critical educators not ignore the question of practice. That is, we must find ways of speaking to (and learning from) people who now labor everyday in schools in worsening conditions which are made even worse by the merciless attacks from the Right. This means that rather than ignore "mainstream" organizations and publications, it's important to occupy the spaces provided by existing "mainstream" publication outlets to publish books that provide *critical* answers to teachers' questions about "What do I do on Monday?" during a conservative era. As I hinted at earlier, this space has too long been ignored by many theorists of critical pedagogy.

This is where *Democratic Schools* enters as an important success. One very large "professional" organization in the United States—the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)—publishes books that are distributed each year to its more than 150,000 members, most of whom are teachers or administrators in elementary, middle, or secondary schools.

At first I emphatically said "No"—not because I was against such a project, but because I believed quite strongly that the best people to do such a book would be those practicing critical teachers and administrators who were now engaged in doing what needed to be done "on Monday." In essence, I felt that I should be their secretary, putting together a book based on their words, struggles, and accomplishments. If ASCD was willing for me to play the role of secretary, then I would do it. But I had one caveat. It had to be a truly honest book, one in which these critical educators could tell it as it really was.

After intense negotiations that guaranteed an absence of censorship, I asked Jim Beane to work with me on *Democratic Schools*. Both of us were committed to doing a book that provided clear practical examples of the power of Freirian and similar critically democratic approaches at work in classrooms and communities. *Democratic Schools* was not only distributed to most of the 150,000 members of the organization, but it has gone on to sell at least an additional 100,000 copies. Thus, nearly 250,000 copies of a volume that tells the practical stories of the largely successful struggles of critically-oriented educators in real schools are now in the hands of educators who daily face similar problems.

The publication and widespread distribution of *Democratic Schools*—and the recent publication and translation into multiple languages of the enlarged 2nd edition—provides one practical and strategic instance of making critical educational positions seem actually doable in "ordinary" institutions such as schools and local communities. Not unimportantly for me personally, it keeps me connected to the realities of curricula and teaching that sent me to Teachers College in the first place.

LEARNING FROM OTHERS

My understanding of these political and educational issues, of the dangers we now face and of what can and must be done to deal with them, is grounded not only in

my early political experiences, in the gritty realities of working with children in urban and rural schools, in the research I've carried out on what schools do and do not do in this society, or in my and Jim's work with practicing educators on building more critical and democratic curricula and teaching strategies. It also has been profoundly affected by the extensive international work in which I have been fortunate to engage in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere. For example, beginning in the mid-1980s, I began to go to Brazil to work with the Ministry of Education in the southern city of Porto Alegre and to give both academic and more popular lectures at universities and to teacher union groups. Most of my books had been translated there. Because of this, and because of similar theoretical and political tendencies in the work coming out of Brazil and my own, I developed close relationships with many politically active educators there. This also meant that I developed not only an ongoing relationship with activist educators and researchers in the Workers Party throughout Brazil, but just as importantly an even closer relationship with the great Brazilian critical educator Paulo Freire grew as well.

Oddly enough, unlike many critical educators in the United States I actually had not been strongly influenced by Freire. While Freire's arguments were indeed poetic and powerful, they had less of an impact on me. As we became friends over the years, our conversations were less those of teacher and taught—although I respected him immensely. They were more those of relative equals who often agreed but sometimes disagreed. For example, I believed that Freire was much too romantic about the question of content. He seemed too easily to assume that almost automatically oppressed people would discover what was crucial to know. I wanted much more attention to be paid to the *what* of the curriculum. It was only later that I realized that my ongoing public and private discussions with Freire had indeed had a lasting effect on me.

These international connections were—and continue to be—crucial in the development of my work. Later on these were to be joined by intellectual and political connections in Japan, Korea, China, and elsewhere in Asia, in Spain, Portugal, Norway, and other nations in Europe, and especially in Latin America. Thus, the international discussions, debates, and co-teaching, and the academic and political activity in which I engaged in these nations, always have had a powerful impact on me and have led me to develop what I hope are more nuanced understandings both of the ways in which context and history matter and of the multiple kinds and forms of dominance and politics that exist. Thus, for example, I am now much better able to think through what roles different kinds of government/economy relations and histories (strong or weak, capitalist or state bureaucratic socialist, strong or weak labor movements) play. I also am now much more aware of how different traditions of religious impulses and movements with their varying strengths and weaknesses operate. Furthermore, the significance of histories of racial subjugation and gendered realities—and similar dynamics—are now clearer than they were before. Finally, I have come to have an immense amount of respect for the creative resiliency and political and educational courage of people in what we in the North somewhat arrogantly call the “Third World.” Thus, words that we tend to treat as nouns—housing, food, education—I now even more than earlier

very much recognize as *verbs*. They require constant effort, constant struggle and constant organized and personal action.

These ongoing and deepening international relations and experiences provide some of the reasons that in these more recent books I have argued that the North needs to be taught by the South, with the development of the Citizen School and participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre for example being more than a little significant in this regard. Similar things could be said about my involvement with the struggles of the once banned but now legal teachers union in Korea.

FURTHER PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

In the previous section of this chapter, I tried to be honest about complex issues that I've attempted to understand and about how much I have learned from others internationally. Of course, no person, and certainly not me, can ever be fully aware of what drives her or his intellectual and political efforts. What I do know is that it is more than a little important for me to remember how my work was formed out of the time I spent teaching in one of the poorest communities in the United States and then in a very conservative rural area. I think that this has acted as a reality check, as did my role as a president of a teachers union.

But this is not all. The fact that I had grown up poor, but in a strongly politically active family, was significant, as was my activity while still a teenager in anti-racist mobilizations. Added to this were the years I spent working as a printer before and then during part of the period of time I was going to night school for my initial college degree. Coming from a family of *printers*—that most radical bastion of working class struggles over literacy and culture—meant something. It demanded that literacy and the struggles over it were connected to differential power. Theory and research in education, hence, was supposed to *do something* about the conditions I and many other people had experienced. As a result, this has also meant for me that I have never felt totally comfortable within the academy or with an academic life. Indeed, if I lose the discomfort, I fear I will lose myself.

What does this mean to those people who still want to affix an easy label to me and my work. To be honest, I am not one who responds well to labels. I am not in a church, so I am not worried about heresy. I am not simply a “neo-Marxist,” a “sociologist,” a “critical curriculum scholar,” or someone in “critical theory” or “critical pedagogy.” Nor am I someone whose roots can be traced simply to something like “phenomenology meets Marxism.” As I showed in the list of my early influences, a commitment to the arts—written, visual, and tactile—and to an embodied and culturally/politically critical aesthetic, have formed me in important ways as well. It may be useful to know in this regard that the “W” in Michael W. Apple stands for Whitman—the poet of the visceral and the popular, Walt Whitman, who like me came from New Jersey. Furthermore, as a film maker who works with teachers and children to create aesthetically and politically powerful visual forms, this kind of activity provides me with a sense of the importance of the very act of creation, of knowledge being something people can *make*, not simply “learn.”

When I look back over the most recent books I've written at this stage of my career, it now seems that I still am attempting to deal with the same questions about the relationship between culture and power, about the relationship among the economic, political, and cultural spheres, and about what all this means for educational work, with which I started more than three decades ago. And I still am trying to answer a question that was put so clearly by George Counts when he asked "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?" Counts was a person of his time and the ways he both asked and answered this question were a bit naïve. But the tradition of radically interrogating schools, of asking who benefits from their dominant forms of curricula, teaching, and evaluation, of arguing about what they might do differently, and of asking searching questions of what would have to change in order for this to happen—all of this is what has worked through me and so many others throughout the history of the curriculum field and education in general.

I stand on the shoulders of many others who have taken such issues seriously and hope to have contributed both to the recovery of the collective memory of this tradition and to pushing it further along conceptually, historically, empirically, and practically. If we think of democracy as a vast river, it increasingly seems to me that our task is to keep the river flowing, to remove the blockages that impede it, and to participate in expanding the river to be more inclusive so that it flows for everyone.

NOTE

- ¹ Many of my books have gone through multiple editions, with revisions to the original arguments and the inclusion of what is often a good deal of additional material. I've employed the "/" symbol to indicate the varying dates of each edition, but the reader should understand that each edition may have very significant changes. When a new and expanded edition has been published by a different publisher, I have listed it separately. In addition, I have edited a large number of books that have also been important to the development of my arguments. But in the interests of space, I haven't listed them here.

REFERENCES

- Apple, M. W. (1979/1990/2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. W. (1982/1995). *Education and power*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. W. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1993/2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education: The John Dewey lectures*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1999). *Power, meaning, and identity*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Apple, M. W. (2001/2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., et al. (2003). *The state and the politics of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (Eds.). (1995). *Democratic schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Democratic schools: Lessons in powerful education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Weis, L., McCarthy, C., & Dimitriadis, G. (Eds.). (2006). *Ideology, curriculum, and the new sociology of education: Revisiting the work of Michael Apple*. New York: Routledge.

Michael Apple
University of Wisconsin, Madison

MY JOURNEY IN THE CURRICULUM FIELD: LOOKING BACK WITH HOPE

My writing an intellectual self-portrait reflects several premises:

- In practical domains, like education, psychology, and social work, there exists an intricate relationship between theory and practice. On one hand, theory informs practice; while on the other hand, practice affects and modifies theory. Shulman, whose ideas and work are a central influence on my intellectual development, wrote extensively about the wisdom of practice and practioners. He quotes David Hawkins (1966) who maintained that:

... science has never started in a social vacuum, but has grown typically out of the interplay of Theorizein and those practically achieved mappings of nature embodied in the working arts. (cited in Shulman, 2004, p. 257)

In light of this premise, I describe further on my own practical experiences in curriculum matters.

- The development and growth of knowledge, in all disciplines, depends, among other things, on interactions and personal associations among scholars, nationally and internationally. Hirst claims that:

...we become who we are only by the exercise of our individual capacities in relating to others and by participating in, or reacting to, all manner of socially constructed practices of which we are the heirs. (Hirst, 2005, p. 8)

The work of scholars does not take place in a void; it depends to a large extent on personal and societal context. Akkerman et al (2006) claim that “collaboration in work settings allows professionals to come into contact with ideas and approaches of other professionals, enabling them to reflect on their own ideas and approaches and to consider alternative ideas and approaches” (p. 146). One of the accompanying effects of this general phenomenon is the transfer of ideas from generation to generation through teaching. An example of this history of ideas is the ongoing influence of Schwab on his students, Shulman and Fox, and through them on researchers like me. I include the story of interactions with colleagues in the account of my empirical and conceptual work.

- My own work was shaped by my personal experiences. Moving from country to country, and living in times of war and insecurity, made me distrust any possibility for fixed and prescriptive curricula, which have pre-determined outcomes, to be

valid in the reality of the world. Moreover, living in a multi-ethnic, and multi-cultural country has convinced me that curriculum materials have a double role in society; they have the power to shape a communal ethos, but need to be flexible so that they can serve, as well, the needs of diverse communities. This is the basis for my notion of “curriculum potential”, which I extended to “policy potential”, and will focus on further in this chapter.

- It is possible to discern an “inner logic” in the development of themes of inquiry. In my case, there was a movement from a focus on curriculum development, and the nature of curriculum materials, to interactions between teachers and curriculum, to teacher development, teacher education, and, finally, to policy-making. My empirical studies and publications reflect this inner logic.

The description and analysis of my journey in the curriculum field starts in the present, stopping at various stations on the way back to finish at the beginning – my early years, my family roots, schooling. The reason for this change in the usual chronological order is my belief that describing my present involvement in curriculum and educational inquiry uncovers the synthesis between curricular practice and theory, between personal experiences and ongoing study, between autobiography and external events and influences.

THE PRESENT

My book on *Policy Making in Education: A Holistic Approach Responding to Global Changes*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield (in press) has its roots in my experiences in curriculum development and policy making, on the one hand, and my studies in the areas of curriculum, teaching, and teacher education, on the other. This book is related, as well, to my role as a biology teacher in high school long ago, and to my intensive involvement in the development of curriculum materials for the Israeli junior high school in the area of biology and ecology.

The book reflects where I am now regarding policy-making and the role of curriculum in this endeavor. I build on some of Schwab’s notions concerning the commonplaces. By “commonplaces,” Schwab (1964; 1973) means those topics and parameters that require attention by planners involved in curriculum development. Schwab suggests the following “commonplaces” for curriculum development: subject matter, learner, teacher, and milieu. Schwab argues that all of these topics must be coordinated so that none is passed by in the process of planning curricula. In my present book, I suggest the following commonplaces for policy-making: scientific background, agents, learners, milieu, and media. The *scientific background commonplace* concerns the knowledge base for making decisions about a policy in education that adequately responds to the current effects of globalization.

The *agent or stakeholder commonplace* covers several important players in the policy field: executives, bureaucrats, educators, parents, as well as organizations like teacher unions and other interest groups. Their interactions, motivations, and power relations are essential determinants in policy-making. The *learner commonplace*, referring to students’ cultural background, age, and knowledge base, must be

accounted for in the process of policy-making. The *milieu commonplace* is an important component in any attempt to plan and implement policy. Milieu is a composite of various parameters in the social and physical realm. The milieu of policy-making includes the economic situation and the political climate. The cultural environment, as well, is meaningful for policy-making. The *media commonplace* constitutes a novel commonplace in educational planning. In the changing world of the 21st century, media are an active player in policy-making. Written, oral, and visual texts voice a range of concerns, critiques, and proposed agendas, thereby demanding the attention of policy-makers.

As in curriculum development, it is essential to co-ordinate considerations of all four commonplaces, so it is my claim that representatives of the commonplaces of policy-making have to be involved in the deliberations of policy makers. My model of policy-making uses another curriculum concept, namely, Bruner's notion of "spiral curriculum". The spiral curriculum, according to Bruner (1996), is built upon previous learning experiences and eventually reaches the highest level of abstraction. At the spiral stage the policy reaches the highest level of specification of goals and strategies for policy in education, building on the previous phases of deliberation.

My present book expounds the essence of some of my own writing in curriculum, teaching and teacher education. I have always viewed these three domains of education as interwoven and closely linked, in theory as well as in practice. Without teachers and the act of teaching curriculum and curricular materials remain deserted books on shelves. Many of my publications have dealt with this relationship.

Relating to curriculum materials, I contend that they are more complex and richer in potential than can be expressed in any list of preconceived goals and objectives. Teachers might use the curriculum potential embedded in the materials in ways which go beyond the explicit intentions of the developers, for different goals, adapting them to their own educational context, using the curriculum potential embedded in the materials (Ben-Peretz, 1990). In analogy to "curriculum potential", I suggest the term "policy potential" in my book on policy-making. The notion of "policy potential" means that policy statements may be adapted to fit specific local contexts. For instance, the general policy recommendations of the matriculation reform committee in Israel to reduce the number of external examinations required adaptation to the needs of religious communities, where specific religious subject-matter disciplines had to be added to the list of compulsory matriculation examinations.

In the following parts of this chapter, I'll relate to some major influences on my work, and will dwell briefly on several stations on my journey, as practitioner in curriculum development, and as researcher in the curriculum domain.

At the end of this autobiographical chapter, I mention my home background and its influences on my development as scholar and teacher. The chapter concludes with my view of the field, its opportunities, and reasons for optimism.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

In my case, curriculum practice came before theory. Once one knows how curriculum development progresses in naturalistic circumstances (Walker, 1971), the ground is ready for conceptual and empirical studies. This was my experience. In the year 1967, a phone call introduced me to the practice of curriculum development. At that time, the Ministry of Education in Israel initiated a Center for Curriculum Development to respond to the curricular requirements of the newly established junior high school. About a dozen highly regarded teachers in different subject matter domains were sent to the University of Chicago for a year to study curriculum.

One person in the group was Moshe Silberstein, who was a biology teacher. The phone call came from him, he had heard about me, a biology teacher at a high school in Haifa, and asked me to join the first curriculum development team in biology in the new Center. Our team consisted of five biology teachers with diverse experiences. Moshe Silberstein chaired the team as expert in curriculum development. Our task was set by a group of scholars in biology who decided on the content and scope of the biology curriculum for the first grade of the new junior high school (the seventh school year). The scholars had chosen to adopt an ecological, system approach in biology for the whole junior high school. The first grade students in junior high-school were supposed to focus on: “animals and their environment”; the second grade students on: “plants and their habitat”; and the third grade students on: “people in nature”. I was involved in all three parts, first as a member in the team chaired by Moshe Silberstein, and later as chair of the team developing the “people in nature” materials. I soon became involved in the various components of the curriculum endeavor, development, implementation and evaluation. This work lasted several years and was influential in my work as a curriculum scholar.

CURRICULUM RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS – INTERACTIONS
AND INFLUENCES

For personal reasons, I returned to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem rather late, after years of teaching and curriculum work. My good fortune led me to become the doctoral student of the late Seymour Fox, himself a student of Schwab. Through his lectures and mentoring, Seymour Fox provided me with a framework for doing and studying curriculum. He introduced me to Schwab’s notions of the commonplaces of curriculum development, emphasizing the role of the practical in this process. The four commonplaces: subject matter, learner, teacher, and milieu became the basis for my doctoral thesis, the development of a scheme for curriculum analysis. This scheme was used for analyzing curriculum materials in science education and for analyzing teacher guides.

I would like to emphasize the importance of meetings and interactions with scholars in different parts of the world and their impact on my own work through sabbaticals, conferences, as well as invitations to lecture and teach in several

universities in North America and Europe. International links are the soul of academic development in all fields of knowledge, providing the basis for collaborations and co-operations. Hermans (2001) states that “cultures and selves are seen as moving and mixing and as increasingly sensitive to travel and translocality” (p. 243) and emphasizes the importance of dialogical relationships. I feel that I have been extraordinarily blessed in this respect.

I returned to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) for several years for summer semesters, and started there an ongoing professional cooperation with Mick Connelly, who used to be chair of the Curriculum Department at OISE and was for many years the editor of *Curriculum Inquiry*. The work and writings of Connelly were a highly significant influence on my own work. Back in 1972, Connelly had already argued that teachers have a role in curriculum development besides central developers (Connelly, 1972). Several studies carried out by myself, or in collaboration with Connelly, Silberstein and Tamir, showed that teachers tended to use curriculum materials in different ways, as choice makers, adaptors or creators (Connelly & Ben-Peretz, 1982; Ben-Peretz, & Silberstein, 1982; Ben-Peretz & Tamir, 1981).

My interest in teachers, as users and implementers of curriculum materials encountered in their daily teaching, led me finally to propose the term “curriculum potential” for the manner in which teachers moved beyond the boundaries of the curriculum prepared externally to school realities in the curriculum department at the Ministry of Education, or at curriculum centers in universities. The notion of curriculum potential meant that curriculum materials, though they express the intentions of their developers, do not prevent their manifold use by teachers for different purposes. This approach reflected the reality of classroom practice, and opened possibilities of adapting centrally prepared materials to specific educational situations, “freeing teachers from the tyranny of texts” (the subtitle of my book: *The Teacher-Curriculum Encounter*, 1990).

After several years of going to OISE, my connection with Michigan State University started in 1987. At that time Lee Shulman was a leading scholar at MSU.

I learned from Lee Shulman, and continue to learn from him since then. His influence on my work expresses itself in several ways. Shulman’s view of teachers as wise professionals whose knowledge about teaching is highly valuable, and whose studies of teaching deserve the status of any scholarly work (Shulman, 2004) has been the focus of much of my work with teachers. My book: *The Teacher-Curriculum Encounter* (1990), as well as my book on *Learning from Experience* (1995), reflect the approach that teachers are autonomous and thoughtful decision makers, developing professional knowledge. Lee Shulman is a role model in many ways. He succeeded in establishing schools of research in education, based, for instance, on his idea of “pedagogic content knowledge”, and has shown time after time that scholars in education have a commitment to society, to withdraw from the ivory tower of university life into the realm of practice and policy making.

Another scholar who was influential on my thinking and writing is Marilyn Cochran-Smith of Boston College who represents similar approaches, and I have learned much from her writings and from personal meetings with her. Marilyn

PERSONAL FAVORITES AMONG MY OWN WORKS:

Ben-Peretz, M. (1990). *The teacher-curriculum encounter: Freeing teachers from the tyranny of texts*, in the series: Curriculum issues and inquiries. New York: The State University of New York Press.

Ben-Peretz, M. (1995). *Learning from Experience: Memory and the Teacher's Account of Teaching*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ben-Peretz (2008). *The Lifecycle of Reform in Education from the Circumstances of Birth to Stages of Decline: Causes, Ideologies and Power Relations*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Cochran-Smith wrote extensively on teacher research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Cochran-Smith, 2001, 2006). She argues persistently for social change and social justice and for the role of teachers and teacher education in this process. Some of my own studies and publications reflect

these orientations (Ben-Peretz & Steinhardt, 2001; Ben-Peretz, 2001; Ben-Peretz, 2003; Eilam & Ben-Peretz, 2006.).

Several colleagues at Michigan State University (MSU) became close colleagues and friends, among them Sharon Feiman-Nemser, whose work on teacher education and mentoring enlightened me, and led to some of my publications on teacher education. Our professional and personal connection continues until today. Sharon Feiman-Nemser is currently Mandel Professor of Jewish Education at Brandeis University, and we share an interest in research in Jewish education.

In my work I was influenced by several European scholars, among them I'll mention Sally Brown from the University of Stirling, Scotland, and Friedrich Wilhelm Kron from Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz, Germany. I first met Sally Brown at a conference on science teaching in Israel, we became good friends and did some collaborative work; our major joint project was the Routledge International Companion to Education (Moon, Brown, & Ben-Peretz, 2000). Together with Friedrich Kron, Sally Brown and I collaborated in planning and implementing ongoing international symposia on schooling, teaching, and curriculum that moved from Mainz, to Cambridge, to Haifa and to Stirling (Ben-Peretz, 1990a). Several publications emerged from these symposia. Friedrich Kron and I shared, as well, an interest in teachers' reactions to their teaching contexts, and published a joint paper on a study of teachers' professional self-images in different contexts (Ben-Peretz, Mendelson & Kron, 2003). Being motivated by an egalitarian ideology, we also studied the implementation of gender-related curriculum materials in German high schools (Ben-Peretz, Kron & Giladi, 1988).

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES IN POLICY-MAKING

As part of my involvement in the world of practice, I was asked several times by the Ministry of Education in Israel to chair policy-making committees. I view

policy-making in education as being strongly related to curriculum issues, and I see some commonalities between the process of curriculum development and policy-making. One of these committees concerned the reform of matriculation exams, and one the reform of teacher education. The committee on reform in the Israeli matriculation examinations was appointed by the Minister of Education in 1993 in order to examine a possible reform in the matriculation policy, a central facet in Israel's national secondary school assessment program. It is important to note that matriculation certificates are required for acceptance into Israeli universities and colleges (except for the Israeli Open University). Thus, matriculation examinations are high-stake exams, creating stress for students, teachers, and parents.

The committee, chaired by me, operated for one and a half years. Members of the committee represented different stakeholders and interest groups concerning matriculation reform, such as teacher unions and university representatives. In the process of deliberations, several dilemmas and conflicts arose. One dilemma concerned cultural knowledge. Should all students share a common core of knowledge, or should the emphasis be placed on the cultures of diverse and heterogeneous student populations? Conflicting interests led committee members either to call for policy that met personal and societal needs by promoting excellence, or to press for a commitment to equity and social integration. The new assessment policy included in the final report, *Bagrut [Matriculation] 2000: The report of the committee to examine matriculation examinations*, submitted to the Minister of Education in 1994 represented ideological and practical compromises (Israel Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sport, 1994).

The impetus for appointing a committee on reform of teacher education was the current state of teacher education in Israel. One of the reasons for re-examining the nature of teacher education was the growing awareness of the unique challenges involved in educating citizens of the 21st century, in the face of globalization trends. The main expectation voiced by interest groups outside the committee was that the initiation of a change in teacher education would spark change in the education system as a whole.

Some of the final recommendations of the committee presented to the Minister of Education concerned the curriculum of teacher education programs. Teachers are perceived, first and foremost, in the widest sense, as educators. As such, they should possess intellectually wide horizons in many disciplines, expertise in their discipline of choice, as well as a solid knowledge base about the various cultural heritages of society, and a commitment to democratic values. The committee outlined these needs and recommended both the inclusion of a liberal arts education and the nurturing of cultural heritage as part of recommended curricula for teacher education programs.

As can be seen in this brief overview of my activities in policy-making in Israel there is a strong connection between policy-making in education and curricular themes. Some of these issues were treated in my publications, linking theory with practice (Ben-Peretz, 1995, 1999, 2003, 2004).

MY ROOTS: EARLY YEARS AND THEIR INFLUENCES

I grew up in a family that was deeply committed to study and teaching. My father was an ordained Rabbi in a small town in the Ukraine, where his father and forefathers were Rabbis of the congregation. When he moved to Germany he became the Head of the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau. Study and teaching were his passion. When we were forced to leave Germany as refugees, and came to Haifa, he found a position as principal of an elementary school, but, still, continued his Biblical studies. My mother was born in Germany and was one of the few women who earned a Ph.D at the University of Breslau in 1913. She studied literature and art history. Our home was filled with books and it was taken for granted that both my brother and I would find our vocation in academic life, which we did. While at high school, I was fascinated by biology, but also attracted to education. At the age of fifteen, I even tried to write a book on the "Ideal School".

It might well be that my childhood experience as an immigrant in a new country, without mastery of the Hebrew language made me aware of the problems

PERSONAL FAVORITES AMONG OTHER SCHOLARS:

Shulman, L.S. (2004). *The Wisdom of Practice: Essays on Teaching, Learning, and Learning to Teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Westbury, I. & Wilkof, N.J. (Eds.) (1978). *Joseph J. Schwab Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education: Selected Essays*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

of creating positive and constructive classroom situations. These issues continued to pre-occupy me in my professional life. My first choice of studies was biology. Only at the Master

and Ph.D level I turned to education. I started as a biology teacher, became involved in curriculum development in biology, and finally entered academic life. The circle closed, from my first attempt to write a book on education, to my present book on policy-making in education.

My personal story had another deep impact on my scholarly work. Judaism pays paramount attention to memory; Jews are commanded to remember their ancient, as well as recent history. From the Exodus from Egypt and the momentous event of receiving the Ten Commandments in Sinai, to the horrific experiences of the Holocaust, Jews hallow memory. At home, my mother taught me the importance of memory as a way to gain insight into the present and future (Rabin, 1975).

This background raised my deep interest in memory and its role and function in the professional lives and development of teachers that led to my study of the memories of retired teachers (Ben-Peretz, 1995). The collection of stories of retired teachers in Israel provides a mode of reconstructing the history of practice over time. The book analyzes the manner in which teaching experience is transformed into professional wisdom. It found that different teaching situations influence the content of retired teachers' memories regarding their practice. This finding is in line with Cornbleth's (1990) argument concerning the impact of context on curriculum:

The relevant socio-cultural context of curriculum consists of those extra-systemic demographic, social, political, and economic conditions, traditions and ideologies, and events that influence curriculum and curriculum change (p. 31)

An interesting finding of my study of teachers' memories concerns the central role interpersonal relations with colleagues, students, administrators, and parents play in their professional lives. An echo of the centrality of interpersonal relations in professions can be found in my own intellectual self-portrait.

I believe that my most important contributions to curriculum scholarship are my publications concerning curriculum and policy potential, as well as my work connecting research on teaching to theories of memory. In the frame of studying teaching, I edited, along with Rainer Bromme, a volume on time in education (1990). This book relates to the instructional, curricular, sociological, and personal aspects of time. These publications express my conception of curriculum and its role in society.

CONCLUSIONS AND A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

I called this chapter "My Journey in the Curriculum Field: Looking Back with Hope". All human lives are a journey, whether short or long, and each person goes his or her own route. James Thurber has a wonderful saying:

All men should strive
to learn before they die;

what they are running from; and to; and why (cited in: Charlton, 1994)

Writing an autobiographical essay is a good opportunity to ask oneself these questions. It is not easy to understand what one is running from. In my own case, I believe that in my professional life I am running away from the insecurity of life in Israel, on the one hand, and from injustice, and ignorance, to the vision of a better future, on the other hand.

The curriculum field has known many transformations and upheavals, from the time that Schwab wrote about its moribund state (Schwab, 1969). We have learned much. We know how difficult it is to implement innovative curricula (for instance, Cohen and Spillane, 1992). We are aware of the political nature of the curriculum domain (Apple, Kenway, Kenway & Singh, 2007). We are much wiser concerning the role of teachers in the curriculum endeavor (for instance Schwab, 1983; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). Yet, throughout the decades, the curriculum enterprise continued to look forward with hope. MacDonald (1975) claimed that: "Curriculum design is a form of 'utopianism'" (quoted by Beyer and Liston, p. xvi), namely, a deep desire to change and improve the world, according to certain theories and ideologies. This motto strikes a special note for me as, at one time, I used to start my curriculum courses with a recording of a Hebrew song that says:

"You and I are going to change the world. Many have said this and failed,
and still, You and I are going to change the world."

As we all know, utopia is unattainable, but we still continue to strive for it, and curriculum is one of our ways.

Bruner defined curriculum as “animated conversation” (cited in Ben-Peretz, 2008, p. 73). I like this definition. It involves both learners and teachers actively in the process of teaching and learning while implementing curriculum materials. It might also be understood as relating to the ongoing interactions between curriculum and society. Society plays an essential role in developing and implementing curricula and has also long been viewed as one of the sources of curriculum objectives. There always has been hope in society, and among curriculum developers, that curriculum is a vehicle for improving the quality of life. This hope continues to the present. The animated curriculum conversation, which gives hope for a better future for mankind, must not cease.

REFERENCES

- Akkerman, S., Admiraal, W., Jan Simons, R., & Niessen, T. (2006). Multivoicedness in International Academic Collaboration. *Culture Psychology*, 12, 461–485.
- Apple, M. W., Kenway, J., Apple, M. W., Kenway, J., & Singh, M. (Eds.) (2007). *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (1990). *The teacher-curriculum encounter: Freeing teachers from the tyranny of texts, in the series: Curriculum issues and inquiries*. New York: The State University of New York Press.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (1990a). Die Rolle der Lehrer bei der Interpretation ihres Lehrplans. In U. Aselmaier, F. W. Kron, & G. Vogel (Eds.), *Lehrplan ohne Schuler?* (pp. 97–106). Band 2. Rheinfelden: Schaubel Verlag.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (1995). *Learning from experience: Memory and the teacher's account of teaching*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (1999). The matriculation examinations - their development and implementation. In E. Peled (Ed.), *The Jubilee book of education in Israel* (pp. 475–483). Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense. (H)
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2001). The impossible role of teacher education in a changing world. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 48–56.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2003). Curriculum reform in Israel: The power of individuals and other forces. In J. van den Akker, U. Hameyer, & W. A. J. M. Kuiper (Eds.), *Curricular landscapes and trends* (pp. 45–59). The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2004). Dilemmas and problems in the education of teachers. In J. Bashi, M. Ben-Peretz, & A. Bouganim (Eds.), *Education and professional training* (pp. 25–40). Jerusalem: The Jewish Agency for Israel, the Department for Jewish Zionist Education – Eliner Library.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2008). *The lifecycle of reform in education from the circumstances of birth to stages of decline: Causes, ideologies and power relations*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Ben-Peretz, M., & Bromme, R. (Eds.). (1990). *The nature of time in schools: Theoretical concepts, practitioner perceptions*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ben-Peretz, M., Katz, S., & Silberstein, M. (1982). Curriculum interpretation and its place in teacher education programs. *Interchange*, 13(4), 47–55.
- Ben-Peretz, M., Kron, F., & Giladi, M. (1988). *The hidden curriculum - sexist stereotypes of German teenagers - a case study in curriculum implementation*. Mainz, Germany: A research report for Johannes Gutenberg University.
- Ben-Peretz, M., Mendelson, N., & Kron, F. W. (2003). How teachers in different educational contexts view their roles. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(2), 277–290.
- Ben-Peretz, M., & Silberstein, M. (1982). A curriculum development case study in biology: Two levels of interpretation. *European Journal of Science Education*, 4(4), 377–389.

- Ben-Peretz, M., & Steinhardt, M. (2001). Multicultural encounters in the classroom: How new immigrants perceive the Israeli classroom situation. In M. Bar-Lev (Ed.), *Education in multicultural societies: Issues in teacher education* (pp. 123–138). Jerusalem: School of Education, The Hebrew University. (H)
- Ben-Peretz, M., & Tamir, P. (1981). What teachers want to know about curriculum materials. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 13(1), 45–54.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2008). Review: In search of pedagogy: The selected works of Jerome S. Bruner, Vol. I&II. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 14(1), 73–75.
- Beyer, L. E., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Curriculum in conflict: Social visions, educational agendas, and progressive school reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (2006). *In search of pedagogy: The selected works of Jerome S. Bruner (Vol. I & II)*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Charlton, J. (Ed.). (1994). *A little learning is a dangerous thing*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Constructing outcomes in teacher education: Policy, practice and pitfalls. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(11).
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2006). The future of teacher education: Ten promising trends (and three big worries). *Educational Leadership*, 63(6), 20–25.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher*, 28(7), 15–25.
- Cohen, D., & Spillane, J. P. (1992). Policy and practice: The relations between governance and instruction. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of research in education*, 18(1), (pp. 3–49). Washington, DC: American Research Association.
- Connelly, F. M. (1972). The functions of curriculum development. *Interchange*, 2(3), 161–177.
- Connelly, F. M., & Ben-Peretz, M. (1982). Teachers, research and curriculum development. In K. Leithwood (Ed.), *Studies in curriculum decision making* (pp. 199–210). Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York: Teachers College Press and Toronto: OISE Press.
- Cornbleth, C. (1990). *Curriculum in context*. England: Falmer Press.
- Eilam, B., & Ben-Peretz, M. (2006). Transitional societies: The Israel educational system's response to current societal, economic, and political changes. In J. Earnest & D. Treagust (Eds.), *Educational change and reconstruction in societies in transition: International perspectives* (pp. 29–45). Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Hawkins, D. (1966). Learning the unteachable. In L. S. Shulman & E. R. Keislar (Eds.), *Learning by discovery: A critical appraisal*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2001). The dialogical self: Toward a theory of personal and cultural positioning. *Culture & Psychology*, 7, 243–281.
- Hirst, P. (2005). In pursuit of reason. In L. Waks (Ed.), *Leaders in philosophy of education: Intellectual self-portraits*. SensePublishers.
- Israel Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport. (1994). *Bagrut [Matriculation] 2000: The report of the committee to examine matriculation examinations*. Jerusalem: Dr. Shlomo Ben-Elihau (Editor).
- MacDonald, J. B. (1975). Curriculum and human interests. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Moore, B., Brown, S., & Ben-Peretz, M. (Eds.). (2000). *The Routledge international companion to education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rabin, E. (1975). *Schattenbilder [Shadows]*. Tel Aviv: Massada. [in German]
- Schwab, J. J. (1964). Problems, topics and issues. In S. Eilam (Ed.), *Education and the structure of knowledge* (pp. 4–47). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review*, 78, 1–23.
- Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical: Translation into curriculum. *School Review*, 81, 501–22.

BEN-PERETZ

- Schwab, J. J. (1983). The practical 4: Something for curriculum professors to do. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 13(3), 239–265.
- Shulman, L. S. (2004). *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Walker, D. F. (1971). A naturalistic model for curriculum development. *The School Review*, 80(1), 51–65.
- Westbury, I., & Wilkof, N. J. (Eds.). (1978). *Joseph J. Schwab science, curriculum and liberal education: Selected essays*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Miriam Ben-Peretz
University of Haifa, Israel