
INTERNATIONAL
HANDBOOK OF
CURRICULUM
RESEARCH

EDITOR
WILLIAM F. PINAR

INTERNATIONAL
HANDBOOK
OF
CURRICULUM
RESEARCH

STUDIES IN CURRICULUM THEORY

William F. Pinar, Series Editor

Jagodzinski • Postmodern Dilemmas: Outrageous Essays in Art
& Art Education

Jagodzinski • Pun(k) Deconstruction: Experifigural Writings in Art
& Art Education

Heubner • The Lure of the Transcendent: Collected Essays by Dwayne
E. Huebner. Edited by Vikki Hillis. Collected and Introduced by William
F. Pinar

Pinar (Ed.) • Queer Theory in Education

Reid • Curriculum as Institution and Practice: Essays in the Deliberative
Tradition

Westbury/Hopman/Riquarts (Eds.) • Teaching as a Reflective Practice:
The German Didactic Tradition

Joseph/Bravman/Windschitl/Mikel/Green • Cultures of Curriculum

Doll • Like Letters in Running Water: A Mythopoetics of Curriculum

Morris • Curriculum and the Holocaust: Competing Sites of Memory
and Representation

Pinar (Ed.) • International Handbook of Curriculum Research

For more information about LEA titles, please contact
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, at www.erlbaum.com.

INTERNATIONAL
HANDBOOK
OF
CURRICULUM
RESEARCH

Edited by

William F. Pinar
Louisiana State University



2003

LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS
Mahwah, New Jersey London

Senior Acquisitions Editor	Naomi Silverman
Editorial Assistant:	Erica Kica
Cover Design:	Kathryn Houghtaling Lacey
Textbook Production Manager:	Paul Smolenski
Composition:	LEA Book Production
Text and Cover Printer:	Hamilton Printing Company

Copyright © 2003 by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by photostat, microform, retrieval system, or any other means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers
10 Industrial Avenue
Mahwah, New Jersey 07430

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International handbook of curriculum research / edited by William F. Pinar.

p. cm. — (Studies in curriculum theory)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8058-3222-X (casebound : alk. paper)

ISBN 0-8058-4535-6 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Curriculum planning—Research—Cross-cultural studies. 2. Education—Curricula—Research—Cross-cultural studies. 3. Curriculum change—Cross-cultural studies. 4. Comparative education. I. Pinar, William F. II. Series.

LB2806.15 .I595 2003

375'.0007'2—dc21

2002026368

CIP

Books published by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates are printed on acid-free paper, and their bindings are chosen for strength and durability.

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Introduction	1
I: FOUR ESSAYS OF INTRODUCTION	
Chapter 1 Curriculum and Teaching Face Globalization <i>David Geoffrey Smith</i>	35
Chapter 2 Thinking Globally in Environmental Education: Implications for Internationalizing Curriculum Inquiry <i>Noel Gough</i>	53
Chapter 3 The Triumph of Multiplicity and the Carnival of Difference: Curriculum Dilemmas in the Age of Postcolonialism and Globalization <i>Claudia Matus and Cameron McCarthy</i>	73
Chapter 4 A History of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI) <i>Norman V. Overly</i>	83
II: THIRTY-FOUR ESSAYS ON CURRICULUM STUDIES IN 28 NATIONS	
Chapter 5 Curriculum Studies in Argentina: Documenting the Constitution of a Field <i>Silvina Feeney and Flavia Terigi</i>	101
Chapter 6 The Development of Curriculum Thought in Argentina <i>Mariano Palamidessi and Daniel Feldman</i>	109
Chapter 7 Curriculum Inquiry in Australia: Toward a Local Genealogy of the Curriculum Field <i>Bill Green</i>	123

Chapter 8	The Decolonization of Curriculum in Botswana <i>Sid N. Pandey and Fazlur R. Moorad</i>	143
Chapter 9	The Curriculum Field in Brazil: Emergence and Consolidation <i>Antonio Flavio Barbosa Moreira</i>	171
Chapter 10	The Curriculum Field in Brazil in the 1990s <i>Alice Casimiro Lopes and Elizabeth Fernandes de Macedo</i>	185
Chapter 11	In Search of a Vision: How Brazil Is Struggling to Envision Citizenship for Its Public Schools <i>Silvia Elizabeth Moraes</i>	205
Chapter 12	“As Canadian as Possible Under the Circumstances”: A View of Contemporary Curriculum Discourses in Canada <i>Cynthia Chambers</i>	221
Chapter 13	Curriculum Studies in China: Retrospect and Prospect <i>Hua Zhang and Qiquan Zhong</i>	253
Chapter 14	In Search of a Quality Curriculum in Hong Kong <i>Edmond Hau-Fai Law</i>	271
Chapter 15	Learning for the Future in Estonia: Content Revisited and Reconceptualized <i>Urve Laanemets</i>	285
Chapter 16	Postmodern Paradoxes in Finland: The Confinements of Rationality in Curriculum Studies <i>Tero Autio</i>	301
Chapter 17	Understanding Curriculum in France: A Multifaceted Approach to Thinking Education <i>Denise Egéa-Kuehne</i>	329
Chapter 18	The Landscape of Curriculum Inquiry in the Republic of Ireland <i>Kevin Williams and Gerry McNamara</i>	367
Chapter 19	Curriculum Planning at the Threshold of the Third Millennium: The Israeli Case <i>Naama Sabar and Yehoshua Mathias</i>	381
Chapter 20	Curriculum Reform in Italy in a European Perspective <i>M. Vicentini</i>	401

Chapter 21	Japan's Struggle for the Formation of Modern Elementary School Curriculum: Westernization and Hiding Cultural Dualism in the Late 19th Century <i>Miho Hashimoto</i>	417
Chapter 22	Present State of Curriculum Studies in Japan <i>Tadahiko Abiko</i>	425
Chapter 23	Japanese Educational Reform for the 21st Century: The Impact of the New Course of Study Toward the Postmodern Era in Japan <i>Shigeru Asanuma</i>	435
Chapter 24	Curriculum Research: Evolution and Outlook in Mexico <i>Angel Díaz Barriga</i>	443
Chapter 25	Main Trends of Curriculum Research In Mexico <i>Frida Díaz Barriga</i>	457
Chapter 26	What Education Scholars Write About Curriculum in Namibia and Zimbabwe <i>Jonathan D. Jansen</i>	471
Chapter 27	Curriculum Theory in the Netherlands <i>Willem Wardekker, Monique Volman, and Jan Terwel</i>	479
Chapter 28	Contemporary Curriculum Research in New Zealand <i>Peter Roberts</i>	495
Chapter 29	Curriculum Theory and Research in Norway: Traditions, Trends, and Challenges <i>Bjorg B. Gundem, Berit Karseth, and Kirsten Sivesind</i>	517
Chapter 30	Back to Itacka: Curriculum Studies in Romania <i>Nicolae Sacalis</i>	535
Chapter 31	Politics and Theories in the History of Curricular Reform in South Korea <i>Yonghwan Lee</i>	541
Chapter 32	In Southeast Asia: Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand: Conjunctions and Collisions in the Global Cultural Economy <i>F. D. Rivera</i>	553
Chapter 33	Frame Factors, Structures, and Meaning Making: Shifting Foci of Curriculum Research in Sweden <i>Ulla Johansson</i>	575

Chapter 34	Curriculum Study in Taiwan: Retrospect and Prospect <i>Jenq-Jye Hwang and Chia-Yu Chang</i>	595
Chapter 35	Curriculum Development in Turkey <i>F. Dilek Gözütok</i>	607
Chapter 36	Subject, not Subjects: Curriculum Pathways, Pedagogies and Practices in the United Kingdom <i>David Hamilton and Gaby Weiner</i>	623
Chapter 37	A Random Harvest: A Multiplicity of Studies in American Curriculum History Research <i>Craig Kridel and Vicky Newman</i>	637
Chapter 38	Hermeneutics, Subjectivity, and Aesthetics: Internationalizing the Interpretive Process in U.S. Curriculum Research <i>Patrick Slattery</i>	651
	Author Index	667
	Subject Index	685

PREFACE

This international handbook of curriculum research reports on scholarly developments *and* school curriculum development initiatives worldwide. Thirty-six essays on 29 nations—plus four essays of introduction—provide a panoramic and, for several nations (on which there are multiple essays), an in-depth view of the state of curriculum studies globally. There is, to my knowledge, no other such volume, at least not in English. As a library, personal, and pedagogical resource, I know it will be of use to scholars and students worldwide. This text may usefully serve as a supplemental textbook in general curriculum courses and as the main text in courses devoted exclusively to internationalization, globalization, and curriculum studies. For prospective and practicing teachers in the United States and elsewhere, it contextualizes national school reform efforts. The collection contributes, I trust, to the complicated conversation that is the internationalization of curriculum studies and the formation of a worldwide field.

As this collection testifies, curriculum studies is a field that straddles the divide between contemporary social science and the humanities. Research in the field is sometimes quantitative, often qualitative, sometimes arts-based, and sometimes informed by humanities fields such as philosophy, literary theory, and cultural studies. It is influenced as well by social science fields such as psychology, political and social theory, and, not only in the United States (see, e.g., Ulla Johansson's essay on Sweden, this volume), by interdisciplinary fields such as women's and gender studies and postcolonial studies. I settled on the term *research* in the title to emphasize, despite its paradigmatic differences, the field's relative unity in the scholarly project of scholarly *understanding*—a term that includes theoretical as well as practical interests and initiatives.

As the field moves toward formalization within and across national borders, disciplinary infrastructure is being put into place. By the use of that term I intend to draw our attention to the interconnected character of intellectualization and institutionalization. I am thinking not only of those institutions with which we are preoccupied—schools—and how they structure our research; I am thinking of those institutional structures now in place and those we must build to support the academic field of curriculum studies, including professional and scholarly associations and societies, scholarly journals, and conferences, all of which support the intellectual and archival labor necessary for a field of study to come into (self-conscious) being. This interconnected character of our intellectual and institutional work at this stage of the field's development persuaded me, in the introduction, to situate the collection in the current movement toward the internationalization of curriculum studies, institutionalized in the

International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. I trust it is clear that I do not regard the movement toward internationalization as confined to that Association's history and future, although at this stage it is most visible there.

NOTE ON LANGUAGE

English was not the first language of most who have contributed chapters to the handbook. As a consequence, there are language constructions that may seem peculiar to those for whom English is their first language. However, these are always decodable and, moreover, often offer novel and instructive conceptualizations. Although we—both at LSU and at Lawrence Erlbaum—have worked to make the English accessible, we have decided to leave some unusual, but informative, conceptualizations unedited.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Naomi Silverman, senior editor at Lawrence Erlbaum, whose support for and commitment to this handbook project and to the larger project of internationalization have been and continue to be of inestimable importance. In addition to the handbook, Naomi persuaded LEA to co-sponsor (with Peter Lang Publishing and the LSU Curriculum Theory Project) the 2000 LSU Conference on the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies, at which the Committee of 100 (which became the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies) constituted itself. Moreover, Naomi supported the German *didaktik* book project mentioned in the introduction (and cited in the references). As well, Naomi has pledged her support for future projects in which curriculum studies around the world will be described in book form. I am grateful to you, Naomi.

I wish to acknowledge two LSU graduate assistants without whose labor this handbook would not have come to form. Seungbin Roh worked on the project in its early phases, and Nicholas Ng-A-Fook brought it to conclusion, reading the entire manuscript and making editorial suggestions. Thank you, Nicholas and Seugbin, very much. My thanks go as well to Professor Hongyu Wang for her editorial work on the essay on China. Finally, I wish to thank Professors Antonio Flavio Moreira and Janet L. Miller for suggesting the names of possible contributors.

—William F. Pinar
St. Bernard Parish Alumni Endowed Professor
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, U.S.A.

INTERNATIONAL
HANDBOOK
OF
CURRICULUM
RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

William F. Pinar

Louisiana State University

This is, I believe, the first international handbook of curriculum studies. As such, it represents the first move in postulating an architecture of a worldwide field of curriculum studies. By worldwide, I do not mean uniform. As I have noted on another occasion, at this stage of formulation, curriculum studies tend to be embedded in their national and regional settings, often stipulated by national educational policies and/or in reaction to them (see Pinar, in press). This fact is evident in the chapters comprising this handbook. The point has a political dimension; it may work against the cultural and economic imperialism associated with the phenomenon known as *globalization*. In the preamble to the recently established (spring 2001) International Association for the Advancement, that point was prominent:

The Association is established to support a worldwide—but not uniform—field of curriculum studies. At this historical moment and for the foreseeable future, curriculum inquiry occurs within national borders, often informed by governmental policies and priorities, responsive to national situations. Curriculum study is, therefore, nationally distinctive. The founders of the IAACS do not dream of a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization and uniformity the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens. Nor are we unaware of the dangers of narrow nationalisms. Our hope, in establishing this organization, is to provide support for scholarly conversations within and across national and regional borders about the content, context, and process of education, the organizational and intellectual center of which is the curriculum. (www.iaacs.org)

I regard this book as a companion event to the formation of International Association; both provide to the field much-needed infrastructure. Also important in this regard are Bjorg Gudem and Stefan Hopmann (Eds.), *Didaktik and/or Curriculum*, the proceedings of the 1995 Oslo conference, William E. Doll, Jr., William F. Pinar, Donna Trueit, and Hongyu Wang (Eds.), *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies*, selected proceedings of the 2000 LSU Conference on the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies, a meeting that followed a 1999 LSU Conference which focused on the intersec-

tions and divergences between philosophy of education and curriculum studies worldwide. At the 2000 LSU conference, the organizational meeting was held—and the Committee of 100 formed—which led to the eventual establishment of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies.

I chaired that organizational meeting, held on April 30, 2000, in Pleasant Hall on the LSU campus at which the Committee of 100 constituted itself. With the endorsement of those present, I called into “session”—I use quotation marks because our meetings were always over the Internet—a Provisional Executive Committee comprised of Ted Aoki (representing North America), Bjorg Gundem (representing Europe), Sid Pandey (representing Africa), Antonio Moreira (representing South America), and Qiquan Zhong (representing Asia). I served as secretary. During the final 4 months of 2000 and the first 4 of 2001, the committee met and formulated a constitution to propose to the Committee of 100. That proposed constitution was presented in March and ratified in April 2000; nominations were made and elections held during May–July, after which the Provisional Executive Committee disbanded and a new administration—to serve until 2004—moved into place to lead the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (IAACS). Information concerning IAACS officers, members, and the constitution are accessible via the Association’s Web site (www.iaacs.org).

At the LSU meeting in April 2000, informal agreement was reached regarding future meetings: The October 2003 meeting will be held in Shanghai, the 2006 meeting in Europe (perhaps Finland), the 2009 meeting in Africa (perhaps South Africa), the 2012 meeting in South America, and in 2015, the organization returns to North America. Proceedings from each meeting may be published, both in book form and in the IAACS scholarly journal. As well, I foresee handbooks, subsequent to this one, to be published perhaps every 10 years. These can become important markers of the field’s advancement worldwide.

As the first such handbook, the present volume bears a heavy burden. Although I worked for as comprehensive a coverage as possible, I failed to secure chapters describing the history and present state of curriculum studies in a several important countries, perhaps most conspicuously Germany. I trust this particular failure on my part will be mediated by the appearance, just 2 years ago, of the Westbury–Hoptmann–Riquarts edited volume on German “didaktik,” also published by Lawrence Erlbaum. Part of the difficulty I faced had to do with the lack of infrastructure, a difficulty future handbook editors—thanks to the existence of IAACS—should not face. Despite this limitation, there are significant, even ground-breaking, chapters from several contributors. All the chapters provide provocative glimpses into scholarly activity of those committed to the advancement of curriculum.

For four of those nations in which there are well-established and/or especially active fields, I solicited more than one chapter. (Regarding those countries with more than one contribution, I ordered the chapters according to the chronology of their content, not alphabetically according to authors’ names.) This is *not* to say that those nations with one chapter (and those nations not represented at all) do not enjoy productive fields. Considerations of space forbade inviting multiple chapters from all nations with well-established and active fields. My motive was to provide more detailed commentaries from several nations—among them Argentina, Brazil, China, Japan, Mexico, and the United States—to allow readers something akin to a “photographic blow-up” of scholarship in certain areas, and to help readers gauge the broad level of generalization and conceptualization on which contributors were forced to operate. I believe readers will agree that sophisticated and sufficiently detailed portraits were achieved. My thanks to each of the contributors for their intellectual labor and commitment to the project.

FOUR ESSAYS OF INTRODUCTION

The handbook opens with four essays of introduction. These essays treat issues that traverse national boundaries. First, David Geoffrey Smith elaborates issues concerning the globalization of curriculum studies. Smith discusses the historical evolution of the term and, in so doing, explores several implications of globalization for the field of curriculum studies. He argues that there are three forms of globalization operating in the world today: Globalization One, Two, and Three. By "Globalization One," Smith refers to the *dominant form* associated with the revival of so-called radical liberalism, or neo-liberalism, dating back to the administrations of U.S. President Ronald Reagan and U.K. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s. Globalization Two refers to the various reactions around the world to Globalization One, reactions spanning the spectrum from accommodation to resistance. Globalization Three refers to those conditions that may now be emerging to support a new global dialogue regarding sustainable human futures.

As becomes clear, *globalization* no longer refers only to such matters as trade between peoples and groups or even to various intercultural exchanges. Now globalization refers to those developments that may be functioning, in Smith's words, "to form a new kind of imaginal understanding within human consciousness itself. As a species, we may be imagining ourselves in new ways, especially with respect to issues of identity and citizenship." If so, we are imagining ourselves differently, according to nation and culture, as well as those forms of economic development that structure the various nations and cultures.

"Human self-understanding," Smith writes, "is now increasingly lived out in a tension between the local and the global, between my understanding of myself as a person of *this* place and my emerging yet profound awareness that this place participates in a reality heavily influenced by, and implicated in, larger pictures." Such a tension evokes, he suggests, not only a new sense of place, but also a new response to the world. It is a response one may feel before one can think, "given that so much about what seems to be going on is experienced preconceptually precisely because no one, no authority can tell me exactly what is happening." Consequently, globalization engenders "new kinds of identity crises," among them the erosion of national identities and the unprecedented losses of indigenous languages and cultures under the homogenizing pressures of global capital.

It is within these crises of identity that Smith finds vexing questions for curriculum studies, questions about epistemological authority, about how knowledge is produced, represented, and distributed, and questions too about the nature of curriculum work. Within the dominant mode of globalization theory, neo-liberal market theory, Herbert Spencer's classic question of the 19th century—What knowledge is of most worth—has been displaced by another: How much is knowledge worth? This question, Smith continues, begs another question: Is knowledge to be the ultimate arbiter of worth?

"The most important challenge for curriculum work in the new millennium," Smith suggests, "may be to develop the ability to deconstruct precisely *as* theory the unquestioned assumptions underwriting regnant forms of global economic procedure." Without such analyses, curriculum work, even when conducted explicitly in the name of justice and equity, will be in complicity with the politics of globalization. The key, Smith argues, is to find ways through complicity—through the complexity of globalization—to change the thinking that constructs it. This essay helps us do that and, in fact, furthers one strand of international conversation by asking: How do we understand curriculum in terms of politics, culture, economics, identity, and history? More particularly, how do the forms of globalization that Smith identifies inform the character of curriculum in the

various nations, regions, and locales? Smith provides initial answers to these questions in his considerations of effects of Globalization One on curriculum reform developments in North America, Singapore, South Africa, Japan, the Caribbean region, and Mexico.

In the second essay introducing the collection, Noel Gough thinks globally about environmental education, focusing on the implications of such intellectual labor for the internationalization of curriculum studies. Despite its somewhat marginal status in the field of curriculum studies, environmental education is, Gough argues, a significant site for understanding curriculum internationally for at least two reasons. First, international organizations such as the United Nations and its agencies (e.g., UNESCO) have made substantial contributions to the development of environmental education over the past three decades. Second, the subject matter of environmental education is international and/or global in scope.

The global character of many environmental issues certainly implies that environmental educators should know how to *think globally*. But, Gough argues, after nearly 30 years in which the phrase *thinking globally* has circulated within discourses of environmental education, the concept remains “largely unexamined and undertheorized.” Part of the problem, Gough suggests, has to do with environmental educators’ uncritical acceptance of popular assumptions about the universal applicability of Western science. In so doing, he continues, environmental educators have tended to assume that Western scientific understandings of global environmental problems and issues provide an adequate basis for thinking globally. Environmental educators are not alone in making such assumptions, and Gough suggests that implications for other forms of curriculum work might follow from examining the limits to thinking globally in environmental education.

Gough recalls a number of studies in the history and sociology of scientific knowledge that demonstrate that Western science is a specific way of *thinking locally*, and that recognizing its local (rather than global) character enhances, not diminishes, its potential contribution to international knowledge generation and utilization. Gough suggests that understanding Western science as *one* among *many* local knowledge traditions might enhance its contribution to understanding and addressing the global environmental crisis. Additionally, understanding Western epistemologies as just *some* among *many* local knowledge systems that can be deployed in curriculum work might enhance their contributions to understanding curriculum internationally. From Gough’s perspective, producing a “global knowledge economy” in /for an internationalized curriculum field can be understood as creating transnational “spaces”—among them, perhaps, the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies—in which local knowledge traditions can be “performed” together, rather than trying to create a global common market in which representations of local knowledge must be translated into (or exchanged for) the terms of a universal discourse. Gough’s view provides sophisticated legitimation for a worldwide field of curriculum studies that is not uniform—that is, in fact, possibly antiglobalization in its intentions and effects.

Claudia Matus and Cameron McCarthy summarize “several critical developments now transforming social and cultural life outside and inside schools around the globe,” which have “enormous implications for pedagogical practice and the educational preparation of school youth.” These include: (a) *globalization*, which Matus and McCarthy define as “the intensification and rapidity of movement and migration of people, ideas, and economic and cultural capital across national boundaries”; (b) “the proliferation of new images, identities, and subjectivities now facilitated by the Internet,” among them “TV, film, radio, newspapers, popular music, and aesthetic culture generally”; (c) stimulated by these is an “intensification of the work of the imagination of the

broad masses of the people,” which is to say, the appearance of “new interests, needs, desires, and fears gestated and amplified in the cultural landscape and aesthetic culture of the new media”; and (d) the generation of “new critical discourses and technologies of truth ... to address the challenges of this new historical period,” among them cultural studies, postmodernism, multiculturalism, and postcolonialism. “Against the tide of these currents of change,” Matus and McCarthy point out,

educational thinkers, particularly in the United States, have tended to draw down a bright line of distinction between the established school curriculum and the teeming world of multiplicity and hybridity that now flourishes in the everyday lives of youth beyond the school. These educators still insist on a project of homogeneity, normalization, and the production of the socially functional citizen.

One consequence of this self-isolation from critical scholarship has been the under-theorization of concepts such as *culture* and *identity*—concepts Matus and McCarthy note, that are integral to curricular projects such as multiculturalism.

Matus and McCarthy problematize how the field has addressed the topics of cultural identity, cultural difference, and cultural community, concepts of striking educational significance during this period of rapid globalization. They read mainstream (i.e., technical or modernist) approaches to education and culture against the more critical possibilities of knowledge production and ethical affiliation that are explicit in postcolonial theory, postcolonial literature, art, and popular culture. Such issues of cultural identity and the organization of knowledge in schooling are pivotal, Matus and McCarthy argue, during this time of deepening cultural balkanization and curricular insulation in educational institutions—an insulation they argue is indeed precipitated by that proliferation of difference accompanying globalization.

In the final essay introducing the handbook, we return to matters of infrastructure for internationalization. Here we read of the genesis of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI), an ongoing organization. When I contemplated the idea of an international curriculum studies organization, I sought advice from Professor Norman Overly, the author of the WCCI essay. My request for the meeting was, in part, a matter of deference: Professor Overly had long been associated with that group, and I did not want the association I had in mind to be competitive with WCCI. Although he expressed no resistance to my idea, he was not enthusiastic about the prospects for an international curriculum conversation.

Professor Overly made two points. First, he warned that currency exchange problems make the matter of dues complicated. As a consequence, administrators—often with budgets for such professional opportunities—are able to join the association and attend international meetings. Dues would mean that junior faculty could not easily join and attend meetings. I kept this warning in mind as the Provisional Executive Committee and I worked (during fall 2000 and spring 2001) to formulate a constitution. We agreed to charge no dues to individuals; we did agree to ask affiliating organizations to make a donation. (Any funds that accrue, I hope, can begin to form a scholarship fund for travel to IAACS meetings, especially for graduate students and junior faculty, especially those working in nations and regions where currency exchange rates make international travel especially expensive.)

Norman Overly’s second point concerns international politics. Rather than focusing on issues concerning curriculum studies. Overly reports, a number of WCCI members and conference participants, over the years, had used those opportunities not to discuss and debate curriculum matters, but instead to imagine themselves as representatives of their respective nations and carry on (often aggressive) attacks on

curriculum scholars from other nations, whom they imagined, evidently, to be diplomatic representatives of those nations. The overall effects was to depress spontaneity, collegiality, and exchange over curriculum matters while reproducing global political disputes among those who enjoy few opportunities to resolve them. Overly discusses this point in his chapter (this volume).

This warning remains with me as well. In my opening night address to the 2000 LSU Conference on the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies, for instance, I discussed the problematics of my role in calling for an international conversation as an American. Of course, that acknowledgment of the problem hardly solved it, and the fact of international political tensions may well become the problem for IAACS that it has evidently been for WCCI. As IAACS' first president, I will work to persuade members to restrict criticism of other nations' policies to education and, specifically, *curricular* policies. It was for this reason that I declined many requests to make a statement as IAACS president regarding the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. I continue to believe that a focus on curricular issues makes it more likely that our debates and exchanges can stay focused on the *raison d'être* for being together—*our common cause*—the advancement of curriculum studies as indicated in the name of the association: the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies.

The WCCI came into existence on August 1, 1971. On that date, a sufficient number of ballots of the eligible voters was received in the offices of the (American) Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) to accept the initial constitution of the organization and to authorize the naming of officers (until the first election could be held). The prehistory of WCCI's founding moment dates many years earlier, however. It includes the activities of a dedicated group of internationalists—among them Alice Miel, Louise Berman, and Overly—who worked through the commissions and councils of ASCD for over 20 years to gain the attention and support of what Overly characterizes as “a generally unconcerned or even reluctant national membership for programming about international educational issues.” My hope is that this handbook—and the IAACS—will honor and extend the important work done by Miel, Berman, Overly, and their colleagues at ASCD and WCCI.

ESSAYS ON CURRICULUM STUDIES IN 28 NATIONS

The main section of the handbook opens with Mariano Palamidessi and Daniel Feldman's study of curriculum studies in Argentina. Palamidessi and Feldman note that the definition of *curriculum theory* in Argentina has tended to focus on historical and social rather than epistemological elements: “The curriculum is a culture construction and its meanings depend on the way in which a political-educative tradition is built.” They identify four periods in Argentine curriculum history, each with its own distinctive modes of production and dynamics of reception: (a) a period of centralized state regulation of schools and school knowledge (1880–1960), (b) a period of modernization characterized by a scientific emphasis in the university education courses and the emergence of experts and the appearance of curriculum theory (1960–1975), (c) the military dictatorship (1976–1983) characterized by political repression and a freezing of curricular debate, and (d) the return to democracy characterized by a proliferation of curriculum thinking (1984–2000).

During the 1990s, curriculum inquiry and research diversified in Argentina. Palamidessi and Feldman identify the following specializations and areas of initiative:

1. The planning, design, and organization of curriculum including attention to matters of content selection and emphasizing scientific and epistemological issues in the selection of school curriculum content. Scholarly production in this category formed much of the intellectual basis of the last decades' reform policies.

2. The governance and management of scholastic institutions. Scholarly works in this category have tended to analyze micropolicies and institutional cultures with an eye toward consensus building in both the education and public sectors. A number of scholars labor to explain the dynamics of institutional curricular processes in contexts of change, crisis, and uncertainty. Often these scholars propose conceptual tools for institutional planning. Such curriculum scholarship tends to be read by the ministries' technical staff as well as by school supervisors and directors.

3. The relationship among curricular policies, research, and school practices. Research in this category has focused on the development of curriculum in schools and the translation strategies that teachers and professors have employed, emphasizing rationales for curricular change.

4. The daily enactment of the school curriculum. In this category of research, scholars have focused on cultural issues, relying on the intellectual traditions of symbolic interactionism and neo-Marxism. Scholars working in this category of research have also drawn on ethnographic methodologies to analyze school experience as daily life, including issues of gender, identity, and teachers' work. Also in this category are studies of professionalization as well as studies of poverty and social marginalization.

5. The history of the curriculum and curriculum studies.

One problem the Argentine field faces, Palamidessi and Feldman suggest, is the absence of a sharp distinction between the intellectual field of education and the activities of official agencies—a problem America shares. Until the reconceptualization of U.S. curriculum studies during the 1970s, there was too complete an institutionalization of the field, with insufficient distance from the schools, state departments of education, and politicians' rhetoric.

After the military regime, there was an emphasis on political and sociological approaches, useful, Palamidessi and Feldman judge, for that moment of opening and democratization of the educative systems, but lacking a language of school improvement. Discourses on teaching and the school as institution remained in the context of the didactics—"a discipline with some difficulties to establish connections between what happens in classrooms, schools, and society." Argentine curriculum theory during the past 15 years has offered a site of intersection for both traditions.

A problem Silvia Feeney and Flavia Terigi identify in their chapter on curriculum studies in Argentina is the relatively few number of historical studies—a problem they help remedy themselves by writing a history of Argentine curriculum discourses for the period between 1983 and 1998. One major discourse Feeney and Terigi characterize as critical or sociopolitical, and this discourse has moved from a totalizing and utopian disposition to what North American readers recognize as identity politics, emphasizing ethnicity, gender, and cultural sphere generally. A second general discourse is also utopian—Feeney and Terigi characterize it as *the utopia of how* (in contrast to *the utopia of what* associated with the critical tradition)—but it focuses on "rationally directing the education of children, stimulated by new technologies, by scientific achievements in the field of cognitive psychology, and, often, by the prescriptions about what to teach and how in the curriculum."

Feeney and Terigi found that between 1983 and 1998, 29 books and 25 articles were published concerning curriculum. Many of these appeared after 1994. There is a "con-

centration of theoretical production on curriculum in the subject matters of design, development, and innovation of the curriculum," but, they judge, there remains "a weak structuring and a low relative autonomy of the field of curriculum studies in Argentina." There is evidence of imported traditions—Feeney and Terigi cite didactics as an example—and they conclude that the Argentine field suffers from a certain *satellization*. Although internationalization supports transnational communication, it would seem important for each nation (and/or region) to cultivate its own indigenous and conceptually independent strains of curriculum theorizing, inquiry, and research.

Perhaps there is a certain absence of infrastructure for the Argentine field because Argentina, Feeney and Terigi report, has few university departments of curriculum studies; the area is typically approached "within programs of education policy or didactics, the specialists of which are generally interested in research subjects that contribute little to the specific study of curriculum issues." There are few curriculum research projects underway as of this writing, and, they continue, there are no specialized journals that would support and encourage scholarly production in curriculum studies. For those interested in the curriculum field, opportunities have been primarily professional insofar as academic centers have, to date, provided little support. Perhaps the establishment of an Argentine Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies—with a scholarly journal—would contribute to the creation of the infrastructure necessary for the Argentine field to advance.

Bill Green begins his review of curriculum inquiry in Australia by noting that, as in Argentina and elsewhere, the field is relatively recent as a distinctive disciplinary formation. Only since the early 1980s has there been an official national organization (i.e., the Australian Curriculum Studies Association [ACSA], associated with the scholarly journal *Curriculum Perspectives*). Through its biennial conference and publication program, including its journal, ACSA provides a "certain measure of leadership with regard to formal curriculum inquiry." More recently, the Curriculum Corporation has provided "organizing oversight for the field, albeit from what tends to be an official, systemic, administrative orientation." What Green terms "the intellectual elaboration of curriculum thought and curriculum scholarship" has developed unsystematically, even sporadically, "overall ... instrumentalized, and largely technical in its orientation—subordinate[d] to policy."

Despite these conditions, there is, Green informs us, "an emerging presence in curriculum inquiry per se," and he names the scholarship of Noel Gough (see his chapter in this volume) as an example of "growing sophistication in the field." (Any serious student of the Australian scene would add Green's name as well.) In the remainder of the chapter, Green discusses the Australian scene, providing us with a "history of the present." Studies of the curriculum field in Australia are, Green tells us, still rare. There are as yet no major synoptic texts on the distinctive history and character of Australian curriculum and schooling, an understandable state of affairs given that the field, at least in its formal self-recognition, is still quite new. Green also points to "the archetypically *bureaucratic* character of Australian curriculum and schooling"—the fact that both have been dominated by an administrative logic—as another reason for the absence of interest in studies in Australian curriculum history.

As we saw in the case of Argentina, there is, Green notes, in Australian curriculum scholarship a heavy reliance on scholarship conducted outside the country. For the future, Green hopes to see "further investigations of the specificities and peculiarities of Australian curriculum work, both in its own right and in its historical, intertextual relation to the curriculum field more generally." He believes that the Australian field is "steadily gathering momentum" while still, as a field, somewhat "episodic and fragmented" and "under some threat, increasingly subsumed as it is within economic and

cultural policy." A distinctively Australian curriculum will provide, Green concludes, "an epistemology of location, and due account of Australia's distinctive positioning and placement in a historically changing world order."

In their study of "The Decolonization of Curriculum in Botswana," Sid N. Pandey and Fazlur R. Moorad observe that, "despite the escalation in demands for more and better education, not much reflection or research has been done on the nature of the curriculum and how it relates to the whole process of change." Pandey and Moorad argue that the present educational system in Botswana remains rooted in its colonial past; there remains a hierarchical class structure resistant to that order of social transformation required to realize national education goals. Pandey and Moorad provide a history of colonial and postcolonial education, employing both critical pedagogy and African notions of oneness (*ubuntu/botho*) to provide ethical and political grounding for a more emancipatory notion of education.

One example of such an ethical base for emancipatory education in Botswana is, Pandey and Moorad suggest, *Affirming Unity in Diversity in Education: Healing With Ubuntu*, by Maqhedeni Ivy Goduka. Born in the Xhosa tribe of South Africa, Goduka came of age under apartheid. For a time she lived and taught in the United States, Pandey and Moorad report, where she studied social reconstructionism, feminism, critical theories, deconstructionism, and other postmodernist theories. Goduka has been influenced by each of these traditions, as evident in her autobiographical narrative, a project for critical pedagogy she calls "healing with *ubuntu*." Pandey and Moorad argue that this notion is not only relevant for South Africa, but speaks also "to any setting where oppression has deprived people of their basic human rights." *Ubuntu/Yobuntu*, a concept borrowed from the Xhosa language, reflects values of respect and dignity for all humanity.

"To prepare ground for this pedagogy," Pandey and Moorad suggest, "the conception of curriculum must come out of its narrow confines to be reconceptualized." They conclude, "The narrowly conceived field of curriculum must give way to reconceptualizing curriculum theories and ideas to accommodate, appropriate, invite, and tolerate the old, new, outlandish, and so on to forge a new education including a vision of innovative curriculum, a project neglected until now, but must be undertaken in all immediacy to be decolonized." Decolonization will become an increasingly important subject, I suspect, in an internationalized field of curriculum studies.

In his study of the emergence and consolidation of curriculum studies in Brazil, Antonio Flavio Barbosa Moreira observes that, until the 1980s, an American influence was quite discernible in Brazilian curriculum studies. In the 1980s, American influence was rejected and European critical curriculum thought was imported to support the formulation of a more indigenous discourse—one more closely related to the unique educational problems faced by Brazil. Moreira chronicles the emergence of the Brazilian field during the 1920s and 1930s, continuing through to the 1970s, when courses on curriculum guaranteed their place in Brazilian universities and when specialized publications and research intensified. The new field of Brazilian curriculum studies, "although still in need of more autonomy," Moreira adds, has reached its maturity.

Moreira turns his attention to globalization—a phenomenon involving a "considerable movement of information and new knowledge." Such movement forces the realization that ideas do not exist in any pure state. In Moreira's view, "this movement [of information and new knowledge] suggests that there is a suspicion of ideas leaning toward a single culture in its pure state, uncontaminated by other manifestations, thus indicating a process of hybridization, in which the cultural elements of distinct origins and different hierarchies deterritorialize and reterritorialize." Moreira concludes with a call for studies that focus on curriculum practice in schools and universities—studies

that show how hybrid curriculum discourses materialize when teachers and students work together in classrooms. He suggests that such studies may help us understand “the readings, interpretations, resistances, and adaptations that are made amid the discursive restrictions and the limits that curriculum theorizing and curriculum policies help to establish.”

In their study of the curriculum field in Brazil during the 1990s, Alice Casimiro Lopes and Elizabeth Fernandes de Macedo note that the field of curriculum has been characterized by sociological rather than psychological approaches, focusing on curriculum as a forum for power relations. Studies emphasizing the field’s administrative and scientific traditions have been deemphasized. By the end of the first half of the decade, the effort to understand postindustrial societies as producers of symbolic goods, more than material goods, altered this political emphasis: The Brazilian field began to incorporate postmodern and poststructural approaches—a major influence in the 1990s. There are historical studies as well. Because these various scholarly orientations have become interrelated, Lopes and Macedo suggest that the contemporary Brazilian field is characterized by hybridism or hybridity, a point Moreira makes as well.

New discourses are emerging, especially those valorizing culture, and in particular multicultural and cultural politics. As a consequence, Lopes and Macedo suggest, it becomes increasingly difficult to specify the boundaries of the Brazilian curriculum field. They write:

This increasing imprecision, due to the undefined nature of the cultural capital to which it is associated, seems to us to be of some concern, because, at times, it disregards the specificity of education and curricular processes. With this, we do not wish to deny the importance of the flow of meanings established between different fields and subjects.... Within this perspective, as different flows of meaning come together, this may prove to be profitable for the curriculum field inasmuch as researchers manage to reevaluate discussions on the curriculum by trespassing on the traditional divisions established between areas of knowledge, thus taking better advantage of the elements available in their original field.

Silvia Elizabeth Miranda de Moraes focuses on a different aspect of Brazilian curriculum studies—namely, how this field is struggling to help rethink the key concept of *citizenship* in public education. She notes that the public school system in Brazil is undergoing profound curricular and administrative reform, animated by assessments that have prompted action by the Ministry of Education. As outlined in a document entitled “The National Curricular Parameters” (PCN), Brazilian curricular reform is structured around three main axes: (a) a new interdisciplinary vision of knowledge; (b) the inclusion of ethics, cultural pluralism, environment, health, and sexual orientation as transversal themes; and (c) to support the implementation of these reforms, each school is to develop its own pedagogical project.

Moraes situates current curriculum reform by situating it in a short history of the Brazilian curriculum. She then describes contemporary reform, concluding with an account of her own participation in it, relying on Habermas’ theory of communicative action. Moraes acknowledges that “the school’s sphere of action is limited, but our hope is that it will little by little shake up the whole system. Perhaps very soon we shall see the good results of this silent revolution.” She concludes by quoting Habermas: “Against the horizon of an emerging global public sphere, such trends could signal the beginning of a new universalist world order.... This is naturally no more than a hope—indeed a hope born of desperation.”

In her review of curriculum scholarship in Canada, Cynthia Chambers reports that many Canadian curriculum theorists have focused on the hidden curriculum, and spe-

cifically its function in reproducing social injustice. One domain of such scholarship concerns indigenous education. Such work challenges Western epistemology by articulating (in Western terms) an indigenous metaphysics. Other scholarship has focused on violence toward women—for instance, the massacre at the University of Montreal in 1989. That incident provoked scholarly narratives of resistance and redemption and teaching against the grain.

A second major domain of Canadian curriculum scholarship is phenomenological and hermeneutical in character. In reply to the question, “What might be the substantial interest that phenomenology holds for curriculum in Canada?,” Chambers answers: “Perhaps phenomenology’s focus on lived experience—the particulars of life lived in a specific place in relation to others—enabled scholars to at once be critical of the abstract discourses dominating curriculum and the violence they do the earth and children.”

Although phenomenological inquiry aspires to make understanding possible, Chambers suggests, hermeneutic inquiry “identifies both the barriers to that understanding and the conditions that make it possible.” Barriers to understanding can be located in both the discourse and the historicity of the educational situation or event, as well as in the life history and self-formation of the interlocutors and their collectivities.

The potential of the hermeneutic imagination to traverse national and cultural boundaries, enabling dialogical encounters among communities of difference,

makes hermeneutics crucial for Canada, a country that is both colony (first politically of France and Great Britain, later economically of the United States) and colonizer (if indigenous people and later the French, within its own borders). Hermeneutics has made possible “cross-cultural mediation” in Canadian curriculum—for example, between dominant cultures and indigenous peoples. (Chambers, this volume)

The educational success of curricular conversations may depend, Chambers continues, on the self-reflexivity of the conversationalists, including their willingness to tell the (difficult) stories, to question the stories they tell, as well as to listen carefully to what others are saying. Chambers comments: “Autobiography and narrative inquiry offer creative ways to enter such conversations while carrying on the interpretive (i.e., the creative, linguistic, and political) work necessary for the conversations to continue.” Autobiography, including feminist autobiographical theory and practice, is a major domain of contemporary curriculum research in Canada.

In recent years, the concept of *place* has emerged as a key concept in the effort to understand curriculum autobiographically and biographically. “Memory and history, both individual and collective, are,” Chambers points out, “located in particular places, giving rise not only to concrete experiences, but local, personal, regional, and national identities. Curricular scholarship ignores the place of Canada in our peril.” Chambers (1999) challenged curricular scholars and workers in Canada to write from a heightened sense of place, “to find and write in a curricular language of our own, to seek and create interpretive tools that are our own, and to use all of this to map a topography for Canadian curriculum theory, one that is begun at home but works on behalf of everyone.”

There has also emerged in recent years considerable scholarly interest in arts-based curriculum inquiry, characterized by “reading poetry or literary texts instead of essays, dancing instead of sitting, performing stories instead of giving lectures, all in an effort to illustrate curriculum artistically” (Chambers, this volume). Contemporary curriculum theory and practice in Canada, including arts-based inquiry, has been profoundly influenced by postmodernism. Chambers characterizes postmodern culture as moving from past to present, unity to fragmentation, representation to a constant deferral of

meaning, nationalism to global capitalism, and nature to text. Not a field submerged in the (postmodern) present, however, Canadian curriculum studies also investigates the past, especially the colonial past, as well as the future, specifically the dangers of globalization, the creation of a borderless global economy, and the dismantling of public institutions such as education (except to the extent it is training workers and consumers for the global economy). In contemporary Canadian curriculum scholarship, there is a call for intercivilizational dialogue—a call to which I hope this collection, as well as the IAACS, lends support.

Chinese cultural traditions are, Hua Zhang and Qiquan Zhong explain, nurtured and shaped by three main philosophies: Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. Correspondingly, there are three main traditions of curriculum wisdom in China: Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. Chinese curriculum thought is not recent; the Chinese term for curriculum, *ke-cheng*, first appeared in Confucian classics during the Tang Dynasty (618-907). During the 20th century, there have been four distinct periods, which Zhang and Zhong characterize as: (a) learning from the United States (1900–1949), (b) learning from the Soviet Union (1949–1978, during which the field of curriculum is replaced by the field of instruction), (c) the reemergence of curriculum field (1978–1989), and (d) the current movement toward independence for Chinese curriculum studies. Zhang and Zhong identify the following four features of Chinese curriculum research: (a) Curriculum research started early in China, but experienced an uneven developmental journey; (b) Chinese curriculum research is bound up with ideology; (c) Chinese curriculum theory depends on curriculum practice excessively; and (d) Chinese curriculum research has emphasized the study of curriculum history, connecting the exploration of curriculum development principles organically with the study of curriculum history.

In terms of prospects for the Chinese field, Zhang and Zhong make two points: (a) curriculum development will remain the dominant paradigm of Chinese curriculum research for the foreseeable future, and (b) the paradigm of *understanding curriculum* is the future direction of Chinese curriculum studies, meaning that the subservient position education occupied vis-à-vis ideology “has come to an end.”

The field of curriculum studies has become a new and vigorous research specialization, attracting many researchers. Nearly every teachers’ university and college has established a department of curriculum and instruction or center for curriculum research. This infrastructure provides “a solid basis for possible new theoretical explanations in an increasingly interdependent and changing global society.” Zhang and Zhong conclude:

To elaborate on what it means to know and be educated for the Chinese must be based on reflections of our own traditions and international conversation; nor can it be done without cultural, political, economical, global, and spiritual understanding of curriculum. Understanding curriculum at deeper levels must be accompanied by the difficult task of transcending the direct and concrete daily needs of curriculum practice, so that the critical and creative potential of theory can be released. The Chinese curriculum field will maintain its strong tradition of historical studies, attempt to inform curriculum research by traditional curriculum wisdom, participate and contribute to worldwide curriculum discourses, reflect on the reality of curriculum practice, and construct, finally, its own curriculum theory.

This phase of constructing a nation’s own curriculum theory is identified by other scholars as well as a sign of the field’s advancement or, to use Moreira’s metaphor, *maturity*.

Writing from Estonia, Urve Laanemets suggests that in the present historical period education has acquired a new meaning and mission: the construction of human identi-

ties. The specification of identities from the local and regional toward the more global can work against, Laanemets argues, educational innovation. There remain “too many atheoretical and ahistorical curriculum documents used at the beginning of the 21st century.” In the West as well as in postsocialist countries such as Estonia, Laanemets suggests that curriculum specialists maintain a balance between tradition and innovation. “It is particularly important to distinguish between the old and valuable and the old and outdated,” she writes, for “if we fail to make this distinction, it may happen that some traditional human values may get lost and influence social stability within the country or even beyond.” Yet such curricular questions cannot remain focused within national borders, she continues, because “no curriculum can exist in isolation and no national curriculum can ignore international developments.” How to negotiate such complexity? Laanemets suggests the following questions:

How diverse can diversity be? What can we accept and what is unacceptable considering our cultural and moral values and recognized traditions? What can we benefit from and what can we offer to the world? What has to be the common core of educational content and aspirations of the “knowledge society,” if cohesion of societies and the world is desired? Can a global or European dimension really unite the nations, although language learning is really difficult to implement or that cultural diversity can be hard to accept? What are the strategically meaningful fields of knowledge and skills globally and regionally?

To illustrate how these questions might guide the curriculum scholar, Laanemets turns to language learning as “the central axis of global educational content.” The task now, she writes, is “to develop flexible curricula, which would allow us to react and make changes in them according to the developments in technologies and culture.” National curriculum decision making requires wide participation of all involved: students, teachers, parents, publishers, teacher trainers, employers, and so on. “All curriculum decisions are,” Laanemets notes, “restricted by their adequacy for implementation.... Accordingly, different ideas, approaches, and structures can be used in different times.... It all depends on our powers of understanding the research and practical experience, those of conceptualization and reconceptualization of curricula and learning under diverse circumstances in the changing world.”

In his study of “Postmodern Paradoxes: The Confinements of Rationality in Curriculum Studies,” Finnish curriculum scholar Tero Autio makes the case that, although “the national imagery has been and arguably continues to be a major source of [curricular] ideas and practice, the infusion of the global horizon has nevertheless become more dominant even within national boundaries.” This means that even nations’ “restructuring” measures—“what overtly seems to be dissimilarity and national idiosyncrasy”—turns out to be strongly influenced by common, global trends. The same reform rhetoric that in one national context has been promoted by centralization measures (Autio uses the example of the United Kingdom) may in another be advocated by decentralization efforts. (Autio points to the United States; decentralization efforts are also underway in, for instance, Latin America [see Silva, 1993].) Underlying both national reform rhetorics, Autio argues, is the same process, if on two levels. Systemically, reform is driven by the *marketization* of the education, which includes the hegemony of Tylerian models of goals linked with standardized assessment tools. On the level of the school and teachers’ work, restructuring employs business notions of *accountability*, *competitiveness*, and *performativity*.

Autio describes what he regards as unifying or globally shared themes as they are expressed on the level of national curricula, with particular attention to the influence of

the Tyler Rationale: “the symbolic icon for the current curricular developments in the restructuring of education.” Autio focuses on views that challenge a notion of curriculum understood as a proceduralism, concluding with an instructive discussion of Wolfgang Klafki’s “critical-constructive Didaktik” and the American reconceptualization of curriculum studies.

Denise Egéa-Kuehne describes five domains of educational research in France: *science(s) de l’éducation*, *philosophie de l’éducation*, *pédagogie*, *didactique(s)*, and, most recently, *curriculum*. In her description and history of these sectors of scholarship, we see “how they intersect, blend, and complete, each vying to develop its own identity and define its own specially, while the same scholars may work in more than one of these domains.” It has only been within the few years, Egéa-Kuehne tells us, that scholarly attention has been paid to the concept of curriculum. Such scholarship has tended to occur outside the field of education, in departments of sociology and history; curriculum as a separate field of study has not yet emerged in France, although several researchers have acknowledged it is “the subject of interesting approaches.” Although there are semantic problems with the word *curriculum* in France—the terms *programmes d’études* or *plan d’études* are more frequently used, although with somewhat different meanings—at least one French scholar (Forquin) “deem(s) that the curriculum issue should be at the center of any thinking and any theory of education.”

For Egéa-Kuehne, “the gaps and/or spaces of dissension and overlap among the fields of education studies (i.e., educational sciences, pedagogy, didactics, curriculum, philosophy of education) are sources of dynamic, rich reflection, and production of knowledge.” Moreover, it is not possible or desirable to reconcile these diverse educational discourses. There is, in her view, “some danger in settling for an easy consensus, for facile ‘transparency,’ because, while claiming to speak in the name of intelligibility, good sense, common sense, or [supposedly] the democratic ethic, this discourse tends, by means of these things and as if naturally, to discredit anything that complicates this model.” Clearly, the conditions are present in France for the evolution of a dynamic field of curriculum studies.

For his study of curriculum in Hong Kong, Edmond Hau-fai Law chooses the “classic framework proposed by Tyler.” Law notes that, after 150 years of occupation, the British left Hong Kong (on July 1, 1997) with a system of education similar to the British system. Proposals for reforming the structure and contents of Hong Kong school curriculum started in October 1999. He reports that “Western practices in curriculum with an emphasis on experience-based and student-focused organization of learning have been a major theme in curriculum reforms in Hong Kong.” This fact he understands has a consequence of Hong Kong’s status as “a meeting place between East and West.” Consequently, Law believes that “Hong Kong’s experience in her search for a curriculum is a search for a compromise between Western ideas and Eastern practice in harmony.”

In their portrait of “The Landscape of Curriculum Inquiry in the Republic of Ireland,” Kevin Williams and Gerry McNamara note that the last decade has seen “vigorous and extensive” curriculum debate and inquiry. Participants have included curriculum specialists, philosophers, and sociologists, as well as those not directly involved in the academic study of education (e.g., representatives from industry and youth groups). Within the academic field, there exists, Williams and McNamara tell us, “an orthodoxy among curriculum theorists that is quite striking.” First, most share the same critical view of current curriculum practice; second, Irish curriculum scholars tend to avoid issues that give rise to genuine disagreement.

To illustrate, Williams and McNamara observe that, although much has been written about low achievement, disadvantage, and the dominance of terminal written ex-

aminations, the voice of curriculum specialists has been largely absent from public controversies over state-sponsored programs of relationships and sexuality education. Williams and McNamara suggest that one might expect the theme of Irish identity to be the subject of curriculum debate, but the issue features little in the scholarly literature. The main concern of curriculum inquiry in Ireland today concerns that problem of low achievement. Williams and McNamara conclude:

It seems safe therefore to argue that the current state of curriculum inquiry, in the broad context of school failure, alienation, and disaffection, is one of considerable alienation and disaffection. There is a feeling among curriculum thinkers and researchers that the process of curriculum reform has been heavily politicized in recent years. This process has enabled limited change, particularly the updating of subject syllabi, but has effectively restricted reform and even serious debate on the bigger questions of curriculum values, purposes, goals, and structures.

This problem of alienation and disaffection is hardly limited to Irish scholars, of course. It is a problem in U.S. curriculum studies and, I suspect, in all fields that have been distanced, in part by neo-conservative policies of marketization and in part by intellectual developments internal to those fields, from the schools. I return to this point in my concluding remarks.

M. Vicentini focuses her report of curriculum reform in Italy on debates concerning the university physics curriculum. Vicentini contextualizes her report within efforts to establish a European educational system that, while preserving national cultural identities, would support harmonization of existing systems across the continent. Italian curriculum reform has also been stimulated by the problems of underachieving and alienated students. Among the curricular issues that have surfaced include: (a) student workload, (b) the importance of English as a second language, (c) the organization of textbooks, (d) issues concerning the disciplines to be taught, and (e) the importance of computer literacy. Additionally, multicultural education is an important curricular issue, intensified by the recent arrival of many immigrants. Vicentini concludes that “the debate is actually quite heated and one has the feeling that it is driven more by the interests of the different sectors of the University staff than by a real interest in preparing better teachers for the schools of the future. Let us hope for the best.”

Naama Sabar and Yehoshua Mathias detect a shift from a uniform to a multifaceted curriculum in Israel. This shift reflects sociocultural developments in Israeli society—developments that call on curriculum planners to create new interrelationships between compulsory elements and those elements that are open to variability and reflect the broad range of educational and cultural interests in contemporary Israel. These include: (a) ideological polarization, (b) the revolution of minorities and the failure of the *melting pot* metaphor of cultural assimilation, (c) cultural pluralism and postmodernism, and (d) Israel’s entry into the postindustrial economy. Sabar and Mathias observe: “The polarization in ideology and values between sectors—for example, between the religious population and the nonreligious majority, and the strengthened status of national and cultural minorities—have demonstrated the shortcomings of the politics of a uniform and generally accepted curriculum.”

In recent years, there has been support for decentralized curriculum development, a schema in which teachers play a prominent role. Sabar and Mathias characterize this “new approach to curricula” as “more holistic” and as taking “teaching into account.” Under the influence of these ideas, the Ministry and various universities have worked with teachers to develop curricula; this development has, Sabar and Mathias report, increased teachers’ curricular autonomy. “While autonomy engenders many hopes,”

Sabar and Mathias conclude, "it is also a cause for more than a few concerns." It is not clear, for instance, in what direction the Israeli school is headed: Will it work to achieve social solidarity and integration by providing equal opportunity for all? Will it perpetuate gaps and express mainly the division and disparity between cultures and social groups?" In Sabar and Mathias' view, these questions comprise the principal test of the Israeli school in the years ahead.

Miho Hashimoto explicates Japanese curriculum reform during the 1870s period of modernization. It was during this period, she argues, that modern curriculum in Japan developed its unique structure and practical meaning. Hashimoto suggests that the modernization of Japan's school curriculum amounted to "a process of coating Western notions on the traditional values of curriculum." This occurred because "it was very difficult for the Japanese to change their own intrinsic value of curriculum, which they had formed over a long term, despite their interest in Western notions of education."

Like late 19th-century Japan, Hashimoto suggests, many nations today face "one homogeneous and standardized development of curriculum around the world." Unless scholars appreciate the complexity of local cultures' encounters with globalizing curriculum discourses or, as Hashimoto puts it, "unless we scrutinize the internal process of the struggle for the modernization of curriculum in the individual countries, our understanding of curriculum worldwide will be simplistic." She concludes:

I believe that curriculum studies must be based on in-depth understandings of the human nature. It is very important for one nation to establish a common base in order to understand the substantial meaning of other countries' civilization. Systematic transformation is possible in education, but it is very difficult to change the individual's values unless we understand the fundamental structure of human nature.

From the end of World War II to 1955, Tadahiko Abiko notes that curriculum development and inquiry in Japan were actively conducted by school teachers influenced by progressive notions imported from the United States. After 1955, state control was reasserted, and school curricula more closely followed national standards. State control was loosened in the 1980s, and in 1990, the Japanese Society for Curriculum Studies was founded and established on the principle that teachers, researchers, and education-related administrators should all work together for curriculum development. The Society has steadily attracted new members, and membership exceeded 700 in 2000, making it "one of the most pivotal academic societies related to pedagogy."

There are, Abiko reports, five major research groups in Japanese curriculum studies. The first group "critically analyzes political and social characteristics of curriculum"; the second focuses on curriculum development, emphasizing progressive, child-centered, open curricula, and integrated study to foster children's individuality and creativity; the third studies sociology of curriculum, focusing especially on analyses of hidden curriculum; the fourth criticizes public education from the perspective of Marxist educational philosophy; and the fifth, which includes school administrators, promotes school-based and teacher-led curriculum development. In addition to these five groups, there are two other groups: one composed mainly of the Japanese Teachers' Union, which develops its own curriculum proposals, and a second right-wing group.

In his study of "Japanese Educational Reform for the Twenty-First Century," Shigeru Asanuma analyzes "the basic structure and meanings in the curriculum reform in contemporary Japan." As in the United States, education in Japan has been used for political purposes. Politicians have invoked the image of a nation in crisis to mobilize public opinion to their political advantage. Although many publications report that strict discipline and intense pressures to perform on standardized examina-

tions have enabled Japanese children to score well above average on various tests of school achievement, it is not well known that a flexible and progressive curriculum policy was initiated in April 2000.

In this reform—undertaken by the Central Council of Education—the most critical issue faced by contemporary Japanese children was judged to be the difficulty of living their everyday lives, underscored by the increase in the number of Japanese children committing suicide. The Council found that this fact derives from the “overloaded national curriculum content” based mostly on traditional subjects. The Central Council of Education proposed a reduction in the number of school hours and minimum essentials of curriculum content for all children. In effect, the Council supported less academic competition. There is, Asanuma reports, no solid evidence to demonstrate that these reductions have led, or will lead, to reduced school achievement, as reflected in Japanese school children’s scores on International Educational Achievement tests.

How can one interpret contemporary curriculum reform in Japan? Asanuma tells us that contemporary reform cannot be understood in traditional Western curricular terms, such as discipline-centered curriculum versus child-centered curriculum. It must be situated in Japanese society, culture, and economy. Traditional curriculum, emphasizing the so-called *basics*, has done little to further children’s psychological development—a judgment, Asanuma points out, even Japanese conservative political leaders have shared. Indeed, conservatives have pointed to the underdevelopment of ego identity as one important constituent element in the social dilemmas Japan faces today. The Japanese, Asanuma argues, “have never tried to change their own subjectivity because they think it is not a problem in their own ego but in others.” Asanuma concludes, “For the Japanese, [contemporary] curriculum reform is a kind of cultural revolution, which sometimes accompanies pain and antagonism from the traditional groups, including socialist educators.”

Angel Díaz Barriga’s survey of curriculum research in Mexico begins with the acknowledgment that “the field of curriculum is an outstandingly practical domain.” The distinction between *theory* and *practice* was expressed at the beginning of the 20th century by Durkheim, a distinction, in Barriga’s view, that has led to “the conceptual impoverishment” of those disciplines that accepted it. In Mexico, curriculum studies has become a vast research field in which are studied “almost all the subjects that bear relation to the school system,” including the school as institution as well as a wide range of pedagogical practices. For some, in fact, *curriculum* has become equivalent to the entire concept of education sciences; this fact makes necessary a rigorous demarcation of its scholarly borders.

In Mexico, the development of the field of curriculum is “tightly linked with higher education.” Barriga understands this situation as a function of the high degree of curricular centralization in Mexico: “Study plans for the whole school system are made at a national level, a situation that causes a passive attitude in the teaching staff of the educative system.” Consequently, the themes of Mexican curriculum research “bear a close relation to the educational problematics of the higher school system.” Within the domain of Mexican educational research, Barriga continues, “curriculum research is gaining ground.” Curriculum research can be classified into three orders of research: (a) exclusively conceptual studies, (b) conceptual studies with empirical referents, and (c) proposals to elaborate study plans.

Mexican curriculum design addresses: (a) education in professional competencies, (b) curricular flexibility, (c) application of constructivism in teaching, and (d) the incorporation of new information and curriculum evaluation technologies. Additionally, several themes “affect the entirety of the curriculum practices,” among them: (a) education for peace and tolerance, (b) education toward the realization of human rights, (c)

education and environment, (d) education and gender, and (e) education and citizenship. Barriga concludes:

Curriculum research in Mexico is in a consolidation phase, and by that I am suggesting that there is a community of academicians who, from diverse traditions, have begun to conduct research in the field of curriculum. The conceptual and thematic diversity is huge, and I have intended merely to provide documentation of it. The greatest limitation curriculum research must defy is its reduced impact on basic education: As a matter of fact, the centralization of study plans constitutes an important obstacle that makes difficult the development of that kind of research.

The "Main Trends in Curriculum Research in Mexico," Frida Díaz Barriga reports, include: (a) a technologic-systemic trend, (b) a critical-reconceptualist trend, (c) a psychopedagogical trend, (d) a trend that deals with professional preparation and practice, and (e) an interpretive trend. Like her colleague, Barriga underscores that "it is difficult to fix the limits of what can be considered studies about curriculum with regard to the other areas of educational and psychological research." Research themes move across areas of specialization. The state of curriculum in Mexico is one of polysemy—a state of affairs reflected in the multiple meanings of the concept of *curriculum*. These include: (a) study plans and programs as products of formal curriculum structures; (b) learning and teaching processes; (c) the hidden curriculum and daily life in the classroom; (d) the preparation of professionals and the social function of teachers; (e) social and educative practice; (f) problems generated by the selection, organization, and distribution of curriculum contents; and (g) subjective interpretation of the subjects implied in curriculum. Such conceptual diversity has contributed, Barriga writes,

not only to the term's polysemy, but it has also occasioned that curriculum research lost its outline with regard to other areas of education research, like the study of learning-teaching processes, specific didactics, sociological studies about professions, intersubjectivity, education interaction processes, and even multicultural and gender studies, to cite only a few.... In Mexico, we can find positions that are not only divergent, but also completely opposed regarding what is curriculum and how curriculum research must be performed.

There is in Mexico "a proliferation of courses about theory and methodology of curriculum ... dedicated to the formation [preparation] of teachers, educational planners, psychologists, pedagogues, and even functionaries and people with decision-making power in the educative institutions." There is, as well, "an important tension in the field of curriculum development between research and educative intervention." On the one hand, there is a major increase in scholarly production and the diversification of the field. However, in Barriga's judgment, "those developments have not been sufficiently applied to the domain of educative intervention in terms of the dissemination and consolidation of the real practice of new curriculum experiences and projects in accord with the settings and discoveries of the studies conducted about curriculum." In Mexico, as elsewhere, "[t]he practice of curriculum design is not always congruent with the theoretical or methodological approaches." As is the case in many countries, much curriculum work remains technocratic.

In their study of "Curriculum Theory in the Netherlands," Willem Wardekker, Monique Volman, and Jan Terwel point out that the Netherlands are wedged between political and philosophical spheres of influence—between the Continental (both German and French) and the Anglo-Saxon worlds, creating an in-between space for interpretations of education that are unique to the Netherlands. "Dutch thinkers," Wardekker, Volman, and Terwel write, "seem to have engaged mainly in connecting

and ‘trading’ in ideas developed elsewhere. This commercial background may also be a reason that conflicts of interest tend to be solved by pragmatic compromise rather than by open conflict—a tendency that has also left its traces in the school system and educational theory.”

This orientation toward commerce and industry, coupled with liberalism, translated into an empiricist and even positivist curriculum, Wardekker, Volman, and Terwel report, in which knowledge and abilities were prized more than personality development, the latter being regarded as a domain of the family and the church rather than the school. The position of the neo-humanist Gymnasium was accordingly devalued. Religious conflicts have also structured the Dutch school system and its curriculum. Protestants and Catholics each comprise about one third of the Dutch population, and each group has created its own organizations for nearly every aspect of public life, resulting in “a sort of voluntary religious apartheid system” that only began to break down during the second half of the 20th century, as secularization intensified. Each group claimed the right to decide the content of the school curriculum for its children; after a prolonged conflict, the issue was settled by creating the statutory right for any group to found its own schools, schools fully financed by the state as long as they conform to certain criteria of quality and number of pupils.

Curriculum theory in the Netherlands was, at first, empiricist (during the second half of the 19th century) followed (at the beginning of the 20th century) by a theological emphasis, what Wardekker, Volman, and Terwel term a *normative pedagogy*—that is, a “form of philosophy that concentrated on developing aims for education from a strictly normative (mostly Protestant Christian) perspective.” Curriculum theory changed again about 1940 or so, partly due to the demands for objectivity—demands supported by a growing secularization of society. From 1940 to 1970, curriculum theory in the Netherlands was dominated by

a Dutch adaptation of the religiously more neutral, neo-humanist, and idealist German philosophy of the *Geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik*, a term chosen to denote that its methods were inspired on those by the humanities rather than by natural science. It was based in part on the philosophical ideas of Hegel, and thus shares some of its sources with the theories of John Dewey and Lev Vygotsky (although at the time, Dewey was viewed mainly negatively in the Netherlands, and Vygotsky was virtually unknown outside the Soviet Union).

Later, Langeveld’s work was influential among some, especially Catholic, scholars. His child-centered emphasis resonated also with those who supported the progressive education movement. Langeveld’s scholarship was obligatory for students of teacher education until the late 1980s.

Influential at that time was American empirical curriculum theory, committed to empirical research designed to improve educational practice. “The ‘new’ curriculum theory was just about everything *Bildung* theory was not,” Wardekker, Volman, and Terwel write. “[I]t was empirical, down to earth, and transmission oriented, rather more sensitive to the ‘needs of contemporary society,’ and maybe, most important, closer to ‘common sense’ about education, which was still dominated by the empiricist view inherited from the 19th century; or maybe we should say that this empiricism had finally found an academic legitimation.” At present, university-based researchers continue to focus on issues of effectivity and learning theory. If there is revival of continental European thinking, either in the form of *Bildungstheorie* or the newer and more promising approach of sociocultural theory, Wardekker, Volman, and Terwel suggest, “the pendulum might swing back from an emphasis on document construction to understanding the curriculum.”

In Peter Roberts' review of "Contemporary Curriculum Research in New Zealand," we learn that as a field of academic inquiry, curriculum studies in New Zealand "never stands still." Important new theoretical currents have appeared each decade, as well as innovative reformulations of earlier traditions. During the last three decades of the 20th century, there were significant theoretical developments from Marxist, feminist, existentialist, hermeneutical, phenomenological, spiritual, biographical, and poststructuralist perspectives. Roberts writes:

There is, as Paulo Freire might have said, a healthy level of scholarly "restlessness" in the field: Intellectual curiosity, a commitment to debate and rigorous investigation, and a determination not to remain too certain of one's certainties are qualities in abundant supply within the international curriculum studies community.

Curriculum inquiry in New Zealand is as well the study of curriculum policies and practices. As such, curriculum scholars critique policy documents, evaluate curriculum programs in schools and other institutions, appraise and construct new models for teaching different subjects and analyze structures and systems for curriculum implementation at local, regional, and national levels. Such labor often requires an examination of wider political changes. Calls for a return to the basics, for instance, might be understood as one dimension of a conservative restoration; demands for sex education or information technology curricula in schools might reflect, Roberts suggests, "changing ideas and social practices among younger people." "Massive changes" on the New Zealand educational system—rationalized by the ideology of neo-liberalism and its insistence on making education a "free market"—have demanded considerable attention by curriculum scholars in recent years.

Despite curriculum becoming a public issue New Zealand, drawing attention and comment from a wide range of interested groups individuals, including academics, teachers, students, administrators, politicians, parents, and business people, the number of academic books published by New Zealanders on curriculum theory and the nature of curriculum studies as a field of inquiry is relatively modest. The situation—relatively few book-length treatments of key theoretical issues—might be explained, Roberts suggests, in part by the institutional history of curriculum studies in New Zealand. Curriculum subjects have traditionally been compartmentalized according to school subjects; the concern has been more with the teaching of the subject than with curriculum studies as a field of inquiry. This is reflected in the absence of curriculum studies as a research category in the major professional organization for educational researchers in New Zealand, the New Zealand Association for Research in Education. Roberts concludes:

I want to suggest, then, that although curriculum issues have attracted considerable comment in this country, a well-developed, multidisciplinary, interinstitutional program of curriculum studies is yet to emerge. This applies to both teaching and research. The lack of integrated, multilevel institutional course offerings in curriculum studies can be explained, in part, by time constraints and resource limits. These have been exacerbated by neo-liberal reform policies.

Norway, too, has recently undergone a period of thoroughgoing educational reform, report Bjorg B. Gundem, Berit Karseth, and Kirsten Sivesind. As is the case in many countries, curriculum studies in Norway since the 1960s and 1970s have tended to focus on the school subjects, in part due to political demands for a renewed emphasis on curricular content in terms of basic skills and a core curriculum. Research on curric-

ulum history has tended to focus on the history of educational systems, institutions, and educational legislation on the other.

The sociology of education and, particularly, the sociology of knowledge have effected a shift from more traditional orders of curriculum research (i.e., from atheoretical attempts to chronicle the development of a school subject) to studies of the nature of education, including analyses of the antecedents of curriculum change. Gundem, Karseth, and Sivesind observe that Norwegian curriculum research has developed along lines similar to curriculum studies in other Nordic countries.

In addition to the impact of the new sociology of education on Norwegian curriculum studies, Gundem, Karseth, and Sivesind cite the work of French educational sociologists such as Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron as a second and “overlapping influence.” Relatedly, the concept and phenomenon of *curriculum codes*—underlying curriculum principles—has also become important. A third trend has been inspired, in part, by American revisionist historians, but more so by a specific British tradition that stresses the social construction of school subjects. This third trend is evident in Bjorg Gundem’s studies on the development of English as a school subject, Britt Ulstrup Engelsen’s studies of the development of the literature component in the teaching of Norwegian, and Berit Karseth’s study of the development of new university subjects/courses of study at the University of Oslo. These studies elucidate a symbolic drift of school knowledge toward the academic tradition, and raise basic questions about social and philosophical explanation of the history of school subjects.

Gundem, Karseth, and Sivesind note that there seems to be a strong interest in examining the curriculum field from both empirical and theoretical points of view, employing a range of research methodologies. Additionally, there is a tendency to regard curriculum issues as embedded in complex philosophical, sociological, and cultural concerns. This complexity complicates efforts to classify specific curriculum studies. Therefore, a clear-cut description seems not possible or desirable. This may be reflected in the current interest in comparative studies. “For Norwegian curriculum studies,” Gundem, Karseth, and Sivesind conclude:

this challenge is complicated by a marked desire to find its own identity and, at the same time, see its role as subsumed within internationalization and the global society. A pertinent question to ask is whether Norwegian research on curriculum should in defining its tradition take as its starting point the imperatives of the national context and policies. As our overview shows, curriculum studies have, in a high degree, been open to international influences.

In his study of the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand, F. D. Rivera observes that one problem faced by those who speak “for the poor, the vulnerable, the dispossessed, and the marginalized” is “their lack of any systematic grasp of the complexities of globalization.” Rivera makes an intriguing proposal, one I hope IAACS can help actualize:

A new architecture for producing and sharing knowledge about globalization could provide the foundations of a pedagogy that closes this gap and helps democratize the flow of knowledge about globalization. Such a pedagogy would create new forms of dialogue among academics, public intellectuals, activists, and policymakers in different societies, and its principles would require significant innovations. This vision of global collaborative teaching and learning about globalization may not resolve the great antinomies of power that characterize this world, but it might help even the playing field.

Many significant changes that have recently taken place in the curricula of many developing countries are attributable, Rivera suggests, to the internationalization of market economies and the globalization of the cultural economies. The phenomena of globalization and internationalization demand that these countries (130 developing countries account for at least 60% of the world's population), despite their unstable resource capital (human and otherwise), compete with the developed nation-states. Attempts made by individual countries to internationalize their curricula are often stimulated by the perception that they *must* develop globalized curricula. For instance, almost all countries deploy a stateless science, mathematics, and technology.

In Southeast Asia, various regional cooperations have led to the development of common curricular interests in the areas of literacy, science, and technology, as well as technical, vocational, environmental, and developmental education. As a consequence, curriculum theorizing in developing countries in Asia has been, by definition, an internationalized process. Despite the end of colonial rule, the need for a globally competitive school curriculum, stronger performances by students on cross-culturally based international examinations, and intensifying attention to global education, provide sufficient evidence, Rivera argues, curriculum has emerged as *international text*. What Rivera terms the "always-already internationalized component of curricula" is supported as well by developing countries' determination to build more stable and stronger local economies, requiring articulation with an international market economy. This economy is understood to depend on information and technological knowledge. As a consequence, there are vigorous curriculum restructuring efforts in developing countries designed to support technological transformation.

The internationalization of curriculum in developing Southeast Asian countries has had, Rivera judges, both productive and destructive effects on the formation of identities, nationalism, and the preservation of local heritage. Because the histories of the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia have historically been constructed by various colonial regimes, Rivera suggests, "they appear as always-already conditioned toward globalization. Consequently, curriculum theorizing in these cases is more or less a projection of the historical conditions that shaped them." Curriculum theorists in these developing countries are often asked by their governments to incorporate curricular responses to globalization and internationalization in ongoing school restructuring. Curriculum theorists thereby become elites, so-called "transnational cultural producers and consumers" who form "a global class with few real cultural allegiances to the nation-state, but who nevertheless need new ideologies of state and nation to control and shape the populations who live within their territories. As these populations are exposed, through media and travel, to the cultural regimes of other nation-states, such ideologies of nationalism increasingly take on a global flavor." Such complex and contradictory relations between nationalisms and globalization will take, no doubt, curricular forms.

After 1990, Nicholae Sacalis reports, "an influx of Americanism has flooded the Romanian language and culture." In fact, "we may talk about an American 'invasion.'" But to understand this situation, Sacalis advises, "we should go back a little bit in time." After World War II, as Soviet troops occupied the country, many felt certain that the Americans would be arriving soon. Many Romanians, Sacalis tells us, "were so deeply convinced that ... they died, some in jail ... hoping that one day, sooner or later, the Americans would show up to rescue Romania." It would be 45 years before Americans finally arrived in Romania.

After communism was established, educational reform became a priority; in 1948, "a radical reform of education took place." "As a matter of fact," Sacalis tells us, "it was not a true reform, but an imposition of Soviet education on the Romanian school." Especially

impacted were humanistic studies at the university, where professors with doctorates taken abroad “were replaced, overnight, with illiterate party appointees.” At all levels, the curriculum was fashioned after Soviet models; many textbooks were simply translation of Soviet textbooks. Science ruled the Soviet curriculum. Consequently, among the subjects eliminated were cybernetics, sociology, psychoanalysis, and, of course, all philosophy, except, of course, dialectical materialism. Romanian culture “was divided in two: the good and allowed culture and the bad and forbidden culture.” When he obtained access to “forbidden culture,” Sacalis recalls, “[w]hat a cultural shock I had suffered. [I] felt abused all those years when I had to learn all kinds of stupid things and that official trash that passed as scientific socialism or materialistic philosophy.”

In his study of South Korea, Yonghwan Lee observes that before Japan annexed the Korean peninsula as its colony in 1910, Korea had maintained its own educational system and curricula for almost 5,000 years. Traditionally, Koreans have prized the humanities, regarding the technical and practical subjects as vulgar. This was, in part, a matter of class division: The nobility learned Confucian ethics and philosophy, whereas the practical subjects were reserved for the common people. During the colonial period, Korean education was characterized by “Japanization and mobocracy.” *Japanization* was officially described as “educating subjects [to be] loyal to the Japanese Emperor” and *mobocracy* as “schools should educate aiming at making human workers according to the condition and standards of the people.” In actuality, Lee asserts, the educational policy of colonial Japan was to differentiate and discriminate the Koreans from the Japanese.

Korean liberation from Japan in 1945 was, Lee tells us, more apparent than real. The Potsdam Declaration ruled that Korea would be under the trusteeship of the United States and Russia. Ignoring the will of the Korean people, the nation was divided in two according to the interests of these two countries who simply replaced Japan as the colonial power. The U.S. military appointed Captain E. L. Lockard as the administrator of education in South Korea. Lockard organized the Korean Committee on Education, composed of 10 boards. Although Korean language and history textbooks were promptly published by a few Independent Movement groups that had operated underground during the Japanese occupation, many classes depended on what could be written on blackboards as well as materials mimeographed by teachers. Curricular content did not change much from that of the Japanese period. “In other words,” Lee writes, “despite getting their lost identity back (e.g., their own names, language, and history), they could not get rid of inertia because the Korean identity was not one they had won for themselves, but was one others had suddenly brought to them.”

The postwar years were followed by a period of subject-centered curriculum (1948–1962), an experience-centered curriculum (1962–1973), and a discipline-centered curriculum (1973–1981), followed by a period of humanistic curriculum (1981–1995). In Korean curriculum studies, the new sociology of education (from England) and conflict theory (from the United States) were introduced. This had the effect of stimulating “some Korean curricularists reconsider the nature of curriculum itself, which had been only of an administrative significance.” No American-style reconceptualization of the field has occurred, however.

In her study of curriculum research in Sweden, Ulla Johansson poses the following questions: (a) How have the research problems been defined, and what have the answers been? (b) Which interests and groups have the researchers served? She focuses on research published between 1990 and 2000. As is the case in nearly every country, Swedish curriculum research has been closely connected to school policy and school reform.

Beginning in the 1940s and continuing for approximately 30 years, Swedish curriculum researchers were engaged in efforts to provide politicians with knowledge to rationalize political decisions concerning the comprehensive school. At first, curriculum research was carried out within a scientific paradigm. Sharp distinctions were drawn between politicians who defined the goals of education and asked the questions on the one hand, and researchers who labored to provide answers on the other. Curriculum research was based on a linear input–output model of correlations. The curriculum researcher was a social engineer who produced knowledge for the schools. The teacher played the role of a technician who was expected to execute and follow the state’s directives.

During the 1980s, it became clear that the goal to create a uniform and democratic school had not been realized. Research followed, which concluded “that standardized solutions could not be applied to a complex and refractory reality, and thus the rational large-scale philosophy of planning, characteristic of the Swedish welfare state, was cracked.” Within Swedish curriculum studies, an attack on the scientific approach ensued, and a reconceptualization of the field followed, emphasizing political analyses.

More recently, Swedish curriculum research has been influenced by poststructuralism. Researchers emphasize the importance of language in the construction of curriculum, evidenced by the frequent use of the term *discourse* in many research reports. The intention of poststructuralist studies is to *deconstruct* the meanings of texts. Multiple interpretations of curriculum are possible and legitimate. Johansson notes that, in contemporary research, “the unstable meanings of curricular goals and content have been given the status of political truth.”

In the past, feminist curriculum research has been subsumed within political analyses, but in recent years it has emerged as an important sector of Swedish curriculum research. Much feminist curriculum research finds schooling reproductive of women’s subordination in society. The interplay between education and gender produces quite different trajectories for women and men in the labor market. Overall, Johansson reports, feminist curriculum studies show that the social construction of gender in schools is a multidimensional process; gender structures are both reproduced and challenged by education.

In his commentary on curriculum scholarship in Namibia and Zimbabwe, Jonathan D. Jansen reports that “the field of curriculum studies is underdeveloped in Southern Africa.” He notes that, in these two countries, there are few curriculum scholars and, therefore, relatively little research, theory, and writing about the curriculum. The curriculum scholarship that is conducted tends to be dominated by visiting professors, international consultants, or masters and doctoral students from Europe and North America. Despite the relative absence of curriculum scholarship generally, and scholarship produced by indigenous writers, specifically, “what has been nevertheless makes a critical contribution to curriculum writing in education.”

“The colonial histories of Zimbabwe and Namibia left an indelible legacy on the curriculum of these two nations,” Jansen writes, “and this legacy is reflected in the curriculum scholarship of Southern Africa.” This becomes evident in the first theme Jansen identified in curriculum scholarship in Zimbabwe and Namibia—namely, “writings about and against the colonial curriculum. These writings were in the main anti-colonial descriptions, analyses, and judgments about the nature and effects of this foreign curriculum.” The colonial curriculum was characterized as Eurocentric, dominated by European ideas and excluding African history, ideas, and movements.

The second theme Jansen identifies is evident in writings about curriculum innovations introduced after independence. In both Zimbabwe and Namibia, he reports, “ever major curriculum innovation became the subject of intense study by both na-

tional and international scholars eager to understand the possibilities and problems of changing the underlying ideological commitments of the inherited curriculum in forging a new social order." The third theme Jansen characterizes as "advocacy writings about what knowledge, ideas, and values the new education system should reflect after colonialism." The point of reference for these writings remains the system of colonial education and the Eurocentric curriculum it promoted. In Zimbabwe, Jansen notes, "these writings were deeply etched within the pre-independence socialist vision for education and curriculum." Jansen terms the fourth theme of curriculum scholarship in Zimbabwe "studies on the politics of curriculum—studies that analyze "the interface among politics, power, and privilege in the construction of curriculum in Southern Africa." In Namibia, for instance, writings on the politics of curriculum focused on the implementation of new language policies, identifying the ways in which political interests not only underpinned proposals for an English-only policy, but also explaining the limited success of such radical proposals in the schools and classrooms of the postcolonial Namibia. More recently, following a major restructuring of teacher education in Namibia, there has emerged scholarship on the politics of the teacher education curriculum.

The fifth theme of curriculum scholarship in Namibia and Zimbabwe concerns studies of school subjects; their nature, design, and organization; effects on learning and teaching; and attitudes among various classes of learners. In Southern Africa as elsewhere, "school subjects remain a powerful organizational reality in postcolonial institutions despite various initiatives for integration of subjects or interdisciplinary curricula." The sixth theme Jansen identifies concerns the administration of education and how patterns of administration influence curriculum planning in the two countries. A seventh theme has to do with examinations and assessment as part of the broader curriculum reform initiatives after colonialism. An eighth and final theme in the curriculum scholarship of Namibia and Zimbabwe concerns consultancy reports on curriculum reforms, typically those that received external funding from major international organizations such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the World Bank, the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), and others, such as the various United Nations agencies (UNESCO, UNICEF, etc.). There are, Jansen writes, "critical silences in the curriculum writings from Namibia and Zimbabwe on matters of grave importance in the society around it (e.g., a dearth of writings on HIV/AIDS and education despite that this represents the single most important health crisis in Southern African schools and society)."

Writing from Taiwan, Jenq-Jye Hwang and Chia-Yu Chang characterize the study of curriculum as "the foundation of curriculum development and innovation" in which there is "a close connection" with the social context of a country. Although the study of curriculum "may lead to a social change and can promote human qualities," it is "also influenced by the sociopolitical situation." Social and educational changes since the late 1980s have had the effect of diversifying the study of curriculum in Taiwan. Among the diverse discourses Hwang and Chang identify are: (a) an analysis of political ideology in curriculum, (b) multicultural curriculum, (c) curriculum research on foreign language teaching, and (d) gender studies. Emerging social problems include environment protection, sex education, parents' education, human rights education, drug education, computer literacy, moral education, and career planning, all of which receive curricular attention.

As they contemplate the future of curriculum studies in Taiwan, Hwang and Chang call for: (a) the establishment of more research organizations at national, local, and school levels; (b) greater coordination of existing institutes, schools, and nongovernmental agencies; (c) the invitation of more experts to support international and inter-

disciplinary collaboration; and (d) the formation of systemic and integrated research programs emphasizing scholarly collaboration. "The task of curriculum study," Hwang and Chang conclude, "belongs not only to scholars in the library, but also teachers on the spot, and the aim of curriculum study is not only to establish theory, but also to improve practice."

F. Dilek Gözütok reports that studies of school program development activities have improved systematically in Turkey, especially since the 1950s. Contemporary studies of curriculum development were furthered by the National Educational Development Project (1990), a project supported by the World Bank. This project aimed to develop and improve school programs, in particular to improve the quality of school textbooks and other instructional materials and help teachers employ them more effectively. A new curriculum was prepared by the Department of National Educational Research and Development of Education in accordance with the National Educational Development Project in 1993. In this chapter, Gözütok details these and subsequent curriculum development activities in Turkey.

In their review of curriculum studies in the United Kingdom, David Hamilton and Gaby Weiner begin by stating the basic terms of their analysis—namely, that "courses of study entail notions of social order," which is to say: "To follow a curriculum is to be inducted into a social order. From this perspective, curriculum practice has the intention to foster social identities." In this sense, then, "the visible curriculum and the hidden curriculum are rendered as inseparable." Hamilton and Weiner focus on four areas of curriculum and practice: (a) the association of curriculum with social order, (b) the growth of curriculum federalism in the United Kingdom under the shadow of the fragile hegemony of the supranational state, (c) the advancement of new pedagogic identities (e.g., those nurtured by educational feminism) as a means of injecting social justice into curriculum practice, and (d) the centralist promulgation of a school effectiveness ideology/discourse as a technology of professional and pedagogic differentiation.

Hamilton and Weiner note that the concept of *curriculum* first appeared in the European educational lexicon during the 16th century. The much older term, *curriculum vitae* (*course of life*), was redefined to denote courses of schooling. The concept of curriculum was linked to the appearance of the concepts *class* and *didactics*, as well as the redefinitions of earlier conceptions of method and catechism. The evolution of these concepts was embedded in two historical developments: (a) educational thought became reflexive as the view emerged that human beings could redirect their own destiny, and (b) educational thought began to imagine that human powers of redirection could be applied not only reflexively, but also to other people. "The link among curriculum, class, method, catechism, and didactic," Hamilton and Weiner explain, "was that alongside the emergence of these notions, educational practice turned toward the conceptualization, organization, and accomplishment of instruction."

Contemporary educational rhetoric in the United Kingdom is marked, above all, by a market-oriented, neo-liberal discourse in education. In this discourse, formal education becomes a "service rendered to individuals," rather than an obligation of the state to its citizens. "All that remains common to the provision of education in the United Kingdom," Hamilton and Weiner tell us, "is that compulsory schooling is divided into two stages: primary and secondary. But even this division is not uniform: Whereas statutory schooling begins at 4 years in Northern Ireland, the equivalent figure for England, Wales, and Scotland is 5 years of age."

Because recent curriculum deliberation in the United Kingdom has been, in general, a response to "the centralist, neo-liberal, free-market policies of the 1980s and beyond," it had focused more on "human subjects than school subjects" in its "consideration of curricula as pathways through schooling, themselves also pathways through life." In

this respect, curriculum practice and curriculum research in the United Kingdom attempt a “reconciliation of knowledge and pathways,” between questions of “What should they know?” and “What should they become?” Hamilton and Weiner argue that the following developments have animated and will continue to animate curriculum research in the United Kingdom into the 21st century: (a) the impact on curricula and pedagogy of devolution, federalism, and globalism in the United Kingdom; (b) the breakthrough texts of Freire and Bernstein in linking curriculum and pedagogy to the social and educational order, and in offering the possibility of pedagogical plurality; and (c) two educational movements of late modernity—educational feminism and school effectiveness research—which have sought, in different ways, to challenge both the curriculum order and social order. “The extent to which the balance is tipped toward the human subject and away from subject knowledge in forthcoming curriculum considerations (or vice versa) will be important,” Hamilton and Weiner suggest, “for the curriculum analysts and researchers of the future.”

Because curriculum studies in the United States have been elaborated in a number of readily accessible texts, I have limited commentaries on the situation of curriculum scholarship in the United States to two chapters, the first historical, the second theoretical. In the first chapter, Craig Kridel and Vicky Newman provide a detailed report of research in American curriculum history. Animated by criticisms of the U.S. curriculum field of the 1960s and 1970s for its atheoretical and ahistorical concern for “basic principles” of curriculum, American curriculum historians have succeeded in making curriculum history an integral sector of scholarship in the contemporary field. With this accomplishment and recognition have come “divisions and conflict.”

Although their view of curriculum history research is expansive, for the sake of this overview, Kridel and Newman focus on the work two overlapping groups of curriculum historians: (a) members of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History (a group founded in 1977 that meets prior to the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association [AERA]), and (b) those participants within Division B (i.e., Curriculum Studies) or AERA, Section 4, Curriculum History. From their study of conference presentations and scholarly publications, Kridel and Newman identify eight contexts for curriculum history research. These include: (a) curriculum history as social/educational history, (b) subject areas, (c) case studies, (d) synoptic introductions, (e) memoirs and oral histories, (f) archival documents, (g) biography, and (h) unsilencing voices. Kridel and Newman comment: “These contexts of curriculum history scholarship permeate and cut across one another as well as across recognized forms of curriculum discourse: political, racial, gender, phenomenological, auto/biographical, aesthetic, theological, institutional, and international texts.”

Ultimately, Kridel and Newman see U.S. curriculum history scholarship as embracing two commonalities. First curriculum history is grounded in educational action. Many leaders in American curriculum history came to the area from a tradition of curriculum design and development immersed in educational practice (i.e., from the fields of curriculum, instruction, evaluation, and elementary and secondary education where involvement with the schools is assumed). A second common characteristic of U.S. curriculum history research pertains to “embraced understandings” toward both curriculum knowledge and interpretive perspectives.

Although Kridel and Newman do not endorse notions of “cultural and curricular literacy,” they do accept that certain knowledge seems to permeate most, if not all, American curriculum history scholarship (e.g., the work of Herbert Kliebard, Thomas Kuhn, Joseph Schwab, John Dewey, Maxine Greene, and Ralph Tyler). “But new directions in curriculum history,” Kridel and Newman add,

should raise the question of *how* these embraced understandings are remembered and, perhaps more important, how traditional methods of analysis become means for consolidation and perpetuation of the oppositions among approaches in the field. Our review suggests that among curriculum workers, curriculum historians, and educational historians, rifts in purpose and scholarship have diluted the strength of the field of curriculum history. We wish to assert, however, that the nonlinear bricolage of practice and interdisciplinary approaches to scholarship, and not the narrow notion of historical research, provides great richness and possibilities.

Patrick Slattery rethinks the effort to understand curriculum as international text in light of research in hermeneutics, subjectivity, and aesthetics. Slattery argues that “the intersubjective nature of hermeneutics serves as a model for contemporary efforts to internationalize curriculum research.” He believes that “a reconceptualized understanding of hermeneutics that foregrounds subjectivity and aesthetics” can support “the possibility of mutually collaborative projects for global justice and ethics.” Foregrounding aesthetics as an integral dimension of the hermeneutic project supports, in Maxine Greene’s phrase, “the release of imagination,” but, Slattery argues, “agency and creativity” as well, all “essential elements for envisioning alternative possibilities to the international modern pathos of political hegemony; fundamentalist religious intolerance; economic caste systems; worker displacement; cultural annihilation; environmental degradation; and racial, gender, sexual, socioeconomic, and ethnic oppression.” It is a “mutually interdependent understanding of hermeneutics, subjectivity, and aesthetics is a corrective not only to the current stalemate in the hermeneutic debates, but also has a language of possibility for international justice and cooperation in the postmodern era.” Slattery’s chapter illustrates well the hybridity of scholarly discourses now discernible in contemporary American curriculum studies.

NEXT STEPS

Several points become clarified in this first international handbook of curriculum research. As I suspected, the curriculum field is embedded in national and regional settings. Much curriculum work—research and curriculum development initiatives—functions in the service of school reform, stimulated and sometimes stipulated by governmental educational policy initiatives. As are elementary, middle, and secondary school teachers, the education professoriate is under intense pressure to improve the quality of educational experience, documented (too often from my point of view) in student scores on standardized examinations. Considerable curriculum scholarship worldwide is critical of the rhetoric of school reform; from this fact, we can conclude that the field is not merely a conceptual extension of the state’s political and bureaucratic apparatus. There is a relative intellectual independence. This last point is heartening to those of us committed to an intellectually autonomous, vibrant scholarly field of curriculum studies worldwide. However, it cannot be taken for granted because politicians’ manipulation of the political rhetoric of school reform represents an ongoing threat to the relative intellectual autonomy and freedom of curriculum scholars, not to mention of public school teachers.

It is also now clear that, to a considerable extent, the internationalization of curriculum studies has already occurred, except perhaps in the United States. Intellectual influences from the United States and the United Kingdom, especially in the area of critical curriculum thought (related to the new sociology of education), are evident in a number of non-North American fields. These influences do not seem to have been imported, in general, uncritically, but rather adopted somewhat self-consciously and for

specific and local purposes (although this may not have always been the case with earlier waves of conceptual imports, especially, U.S. “empirical” research). Antonio Moreira (this volume) argues that the importation of “foreign material” involves “interactions and resistances, whose intensity and whose potential ‘subversiveness’ vary according to international and local circumstances.” In the case of Canadian scholarship in phenomenology and hermeneutics (see Chambers, this volume), it is the United States that has been the importing nation (see Pinar et al., 1995, chap. 8). With the establishment of the IAACS and the publication of several international collections, including this handbook, the internationalization of the field will no doubt continue, perhaps at an accelerated rate. This reality asks scholars worldwide to become more knowledgeable, critical, self-conscious, and selective regarding the appropriation of scholarship from sources outside one’s homeland.

What would constitute the advancement of the worldwide field of curriculum studies? Each of us is obligated to answer that question for ourselves as individuals and together as a field. To contribute to the conversation among us, permit me here to speculate, limited no doubt by my own national contextualization. That limitation acknowledged, and given the portrait of the worldwide field discernable in this handbook, I suggest the following might constitute next steps we might take to advance the field worldwide.

As Bill Green observed in his chapter on Australian curriculum studies, “understanding curriculum inquiry both as an international (global) phenomenon and as a local, situated practice is a complex undertaking and a constant challenge.” I would emphasize that the project of understanding is both international *and* local, and that each of our national and regional fields might well be advised to support—through our teaching, scholarship, and scholarly journals, associations, and other forms of infrastructure—attention to both intellectual developments globally as well as locally. In the United States, for instance, for the first time an introduction textbook in American curriculum studies contained a chapter entitled “Understanding Curriculum as International Text.” However, inadequate (and now outdated) our chapter 14 is in *Understanding Curriculum* (Pinar et al., 1995), it was, for the American field, a first step. This handbook is a second. I trust the establishment of an American affiliate to the IAACS—the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (AAACS)—will provide additional needed infrastructure for the American field to undertake internationalization in earnest.

Attention to the local means not only attention to current, often politically instigated, waves of school reform. Indeed, to resist the danger of submergence in political rhetoric and overzealous governmental participation in the intellectual and psychosocial life of schools, curriculum studies as a field must labor to remain and/or become more intellectually independent. As Mariano Palamidessi and Daniel Feldman pointed out in their chapter on curriculum studies in Argentina, there can be an “absence of distinctions between state agencies and curriculum scholars in universities.” To advance this field, I submit, vigorous debate and differences in point of view—not only among ourselves but from politicians—must be supported. Curriculum scholars must become intellectuals as well as technical specialists with bureaucratic expertise governments and their agencies employ (Said, 1996). A sophisticated field of curriculum studies would occupy, it seems to me, a broad spectrum of scholarship, from the theoretical to the institutional, from the global to the local.

We might think of our scholarly effort to understand curriculum as supporting the *horizontality* of the field, ranging from the global to the local. It is clear to me, from the studies published here, that for the field to “advance” or “mature” (to employ Antonio Moreira’s formulation), the field must support *verticality* as well. That is to say, in each

nation or region, as well as worldwide, the field needs historical studies and, I would add, future-oriented studies, the latter evident in Sabar and Mathias' reflection on the future of education in Israel, and Chambers' report on curriculum studies in Canada.

Historical studies enable us to understand and work through the specificities of our national cultures and the embeddedness of curriculum theory and practice within them, as underlined, for instance, the Zhang-Zhong chapter on Chinese curriculum studies, the Lee chapter on Korean curriculum studies and the Abiko, Asanuma, and Hashimoto chapters on Japanese curriculum studies. In this sense, historical studies enable us to resist any uncritical acceptance of globalization. Within our specific national and regional cultures, historical scholarship means that we are less vulnerable to political slogans (e.g., the *privatization* and *marketization* of public education), and to the discursive and material manipulations by specific regimes of reason and power. Although internationalization supports transnational communication, it would seem to me important for each nation (and/or region) to cultivate its own indigenous (including scholarship on historically indigenous peoples; see Chambers, this volume) and conceptually independent curriculum theorizing, inquiry, and research.

I emphasize this point because it is clear—I am thinking now of David Hamilton and Gaby Weiner's chapter on the United Kingdom, but nearly every chapter could serve as an example—that the field remains much focused on school improvement. We are less focused on the intellectual project of understanding. Although the two are, of course, intertwined and synergistic, in the near term, at least, *advancement* might mean, certainly in the U.S. context, a certain shift in the center of gravity of the field; from an exclusive and often bureaucratic preoccupation with instrumental interventions in the school as institution to the intellectual project of understanding. Although hardly abandoning bureaucratic protocols aimed at institutional improvement, some segment of the field, it seems to me, must be devoted to curriculum theory and history (i.e., scholarly efforts to *understand* curriculum, including curriculum development and evaluation).

In doing so, there are, as several chapters in this collection make clear, important ethical and political dimensions to the labor of curriculum development and scholarship. We cannot pretend, as mainstream social science once did, to be neutral. Especially in those nations in reconstruction after emancipation from colonial regimes, ethical and political dimensions are explicit, as indicated in Rivera's chapter on the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand, in Jansen's chapter on Zimbabwe and Namibia, and in the Pandey–Moorad chapter on Botswana. "The narrowly conceived field of curriculum," Pandey and Moorad tell us, "must give way to reconceptualizing curriculum theories and ideas to accommodate, appropriate, invite, and tolerate the old, the new, the outlandish, and so on, to forge a new education, including a vision of innovative curriculum, a project neglected until now but must be undertaken in all immediacy to be decolonized." Not only are those engaged in decolonization engaged ethically and politically. Wherever we are located "in the non-place of Empire" (Hardt & Negri, 2000, p. 208), we are all politically and ethically engaged, and in local and global ways that can usefully be articulated and elaborated in our research. For those of us facing and resisting the privatization and marketization of public education, we are forced to negotiate among complex and conflicting professional responsibilities, which are structured and animated by ethical obligations and political commitments.

The accelerating complexity of our work as curriculum scholars calls us to make scholarly efforts at self-conscious understanding of our work and the work of teachers and students in the schools, all of us situated culturally, historically, and, we are acutely clear, globally. I hope the chapters in this collection make a significant contribution to such scholarly self-understanding and understanding of the field and, thereby, contrib-

ute to the *advancement* of the field. May this collection give us pause to reflect on our respective national and regional fields, and to inspire us to renew our commitment to them as well as to the advancement of the field worldwide. In those nations and regions without infrastructure, may associations and societies of curriculum scholars be formed, scholarly journals established, and the project of understanding (collectively as well as individually) furthered. Let us, together, construct an intellectually sophisticated field of curriculum studies, one worthy of those school teachers and students who labor to understand themselves and the world they inhabit. May the complicated conversation that is the internationalization of curriculum studies continue.

REFERENCES

- Chambers, C. M. (1999). The topography of Canadian curriculum theory. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 24(4), 1–14.
- Gundem, B., & Hopmann, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Didaktik and/or curriculum: An international dialogue*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics, and culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pinar, W. F. (in press). The internationalization of curriculum studies. In D. Trueit, H. Wang, W. E. Doll, Jr., & W. F. Pinar (Eds.), *Internationalization of curriculum studies*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Said, E. W. (1996). *Representations of the intellectual: The 1993 Reith lectures*. New York: Vintage.
- Silva, E. (1993, November 3–5). *Trends and challenges in curriculum decentralization in Latin America*. Santiago, Chile: Regional Office for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean [OREALC], UNESCO.
- Trueit, D., Wang, H., Doll, W., & Pinar, W. (Eds.). (in press). *The internationalization of curriculum studies*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Westbury, I., Hopmann, S., & Riquarts, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Teaching as reflective practice: The German didaktik tradition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.