Essay Reviews

Journeys of Expansion and Synopsis: Tensions in Books That Shaped Curriculum Inquiry, 1968–Present

WILLIAM H. SCHUBERT

University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, IL, USA

Abstract

In honor of the 40th volume of *Curriculum Inquiry*, I begin by claiming that pursuit of questions about what is worthwhile, why, and for whose benefit is a (perhaps *the*) central consideration of curriculum inquiry. Drawing autobiographically from my experience as an educator during the past 40 years, I sketch reflections on curriculum books published during that time span. I situate my comments within both the historical backdrop that preceded the beginning of *Curriculum Inquiry* and the emergence of new curricular *languages* or paradigms during the late 1960s and early 1970s. I suggest that two orientations of curriculum books have provided a lively tension in curriculum literature—one expansive and the other synoptic—while cautiously wondering if both may have evolved from different dimensions of John Dewey's work. I speculate about the place of expansion and synopsis in several categories of curriculum literature: historical and philosophical; policy, professional, and popular; aesthetic and artistic; practical and narrative; critical; inner and contextual; and indigenous and global. Finally, I reconsider expansive and synoptic tendencies in light of compendia, heuristics, and venues that portray evolving curriculum understandings without losing the purport of myriad expansions of the literature.

The curriculum field has a complex history or *journey*. The journey metaphor of curriculum invokes so many philosophical, personal, and ideological sagas that one might suspect there is no commonality. However, a degree of common commitment or shared interest among curricularists (past, present, and likely future) resides in a steadfast attention to a key question: What is worthwhile? This question has led to many variations and permutations, and authors of curriculum books have grappled with a tension between expansion and synopsis that continues to challenge curriculum thinking. The expansive—synoptic tension has become

Curriculum Inquiry 40:1 (2010)
Published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
doi: 10.1111/j.1467-873X.2009.00468.x

increasingly complicated in the 4 decades that *Curriculum Inquiry* has existed. A central purpose of this article is to stir wonder about this tension.[1] By no means is this article intended to be encyclopedic. Rather, it is my perspective, one of many possible interpretations of the growth of curriculum inquiry, gleaned from my experience in the field.[2]

My use of *curriculum inquiry* in the title of this article is a double entendre. It refers to both this journal and the central work of the field. Throughout this essay, I refer to *curriculum inquiry* as a synonym of *curriculum studies.* The term *curriculum inquiry*, a variation on Joseph Schwab's (1969) use of *curriculum enquiry*, can be seen as a precursor to *curriculum studies* as the curriculum field transitioned to more complex inquiries than often addressed in curriculum literature prior to the founding of *Curriculum Inquiry* in 1968. From the 1920s through most of the 1960s, the work of the field was often conceptualized as *curriculum development* (Pinar, 2008; Schubert, 2008a). So the double entendre retains *curriculum inquiry* to characterize the central work of the curriculum field as an homage to immense contributions of *Curriculum Inquiry* (on the anniversary of publication of its 40th volume) and to the understanding of the expansion and synopsis of the field. *Curriculum Inquiry* is the first scholarly curriculum journal I read as a doctoral student, and the work of Joseph Schwab is among the first curriculum theory I studied.

The journal *Curriculum Inquiry* symbolizes the task of communicating ideas about curriculum inquiry as well as the act of purveying new curriculum perspectives as they emerge, that is, central tasks of the curriculum field as a whole. The focus of this essay is on the tension between the expansion of curriculum ideas and the need to summarize them for dissemination, that is, to make them synoptic. A diverse array of literature, often overlapping. continues to expand, and becomes synoptic. Thus, expansive and synoptic dimensions of the field complement one another. The journey of curriculum literature has been and continues to be paved with *landmark texts,*[3] many of which are incorporated in this essay. Such texts have expanded curriculum inquiry for more than a century in a plethora of novel directions. At the same time, original attempts to provide synopses of the expansion without losing its purport are another variety of landmark texts.[4] Thus, key synoptic texts and reference works have provided expansive frameworks generative of new perceptions of possibilities. As a doctoral student in the early 1970s, I noticed both. I saw the field beginning to expand in new ways through works by Joseph Schwab, Maxine Greene, James B. Macdonald, Dwayne Huebner, and many more. Looking historically, I saw earlier expansions in works of Francis Parker, W. E. B. DuBois, John Dewey, Alfred North Whitehead, Carter G. Woodson, L. Thomas Hopkins, Philip Phenix, and Harry Broudy, among others. I wanted to have a comprehensive list of sources, so I began to make note cards that filled a rather large valise. I wanted to see a synopsis of major ideas, and found what I called synoptic texts in different eras. This article, then, is a recollection of my journey of understanding curriculum

inquiry during the past 40 years—a quest for what is worthwhile through expansive and synoptic literatures.

As a sidebar observation, admittedly one not yet developed fully enough, I wonder about the extent to which synoptic and expansive tendencies can be traced to John Dewey's influence. Thus, metaphorically if not empirically, I hope that curriculum scholars reflect on the possibility that expansive roots stem from Dewey's Chicago experience, while synoptic roots grow from his Columbia (and Teachers College) influence. At Chicago, Dewey's (1899, 1902a, 1902b) focus was on the Laboratory School that he founded—concerns that might be considered situational, practical, or even idiographic—seeing in the details innumerable lived experiments for exploring philosophical ideas. At Columbia, his scholarly work (1916, 1920/1948, 1922, 1927, 1929a, 1929b, 1934) was more sweeping—making broad statements about matters of democracy, education, philosophical reconstruction, human nature, politics, inquiry and logic, art, religion, and more—all the while heralding the need for situational insights in any given realm of experience. In these two tendencies, I see possibilities for gleaning increased understanding of the legacy of expansive and synoptic contributions in curriculum. I know this cannot be sustained as a solid argument; however, I urge readers to join me in metaphoric meandering or wondering about it. After all, Whitehead (1938) warranted a sense of wonder in his *Modes of Thought*, saying, "Philosophy begins in wonder. And, in the end, when philosophic thought has done its best, the wonder remains" (p. 168).

Beginning in 1968 as *Curriculum Theory Network*, *Curriculum Inquiry* has been a key player in notable transformations of curriculum studies. Its many essays, articles, and reviews are a compendium of precedent of a field in transformation. In this article I reflect on trends and contributions in curriculum inquiry—especially the expansive and synoptic—as curriculum scholars sought and continue to seek what is worthwhile. Moreover, since my own career in education parallels the duration of *Curriculum Inquiry*, I comment briefly on some of my own experiences in the curriculum field, having taken my first curriculum course in 1966, and prior to having begun my work in education as an elementary school teacher in 1967. In relating to my curriculum experience, I try not to be solipsistic, while providing a personal touch.

My commentary begins with a backdrop of curriculum literature that the past 40 years builds upon and then critiques through introduction of diverse *languages* or paradigms. Throughout the remainder of the article I strive to characterize significant dimensions of literatures: philosophical, historical, public, aesthetic, practical, critical, inner-contextual, and indigenous-global. Each contributes to expansive and synoptic tendencies and evokes questions about what the synoptic and expansive mean. One impetus behind synoptic efforts is to make expanding literatures meaningful without losing purport to curriculum workers in realms of policy, context, and practice. Derived partially from Dewey's work, I suggest that two rather different orientations of synoptic literature have had great

influence: the reconfigured overview or survey, and the eclectic encapsulation of literatures to fit dynamic situational needs. Increased expansion has naturally evolved as curriculum scholars lived the admonitions of Whitehead and Schwab. Whitehead (1929) said, "There is only one subject matter for education, and that is Life in all its manifestations" (p. 18), while Schwab (1969) put it, "It is clear, I submit, that a defensible curriculum . . . be one which somehow takes account of all these sub-subjects which pertain to man" (p. 307). In similar vein, I continue to assert that pursuit of what is worthwhile, why and how, is the basic curriculum question (Schubert, 1986, p. 1). Similarly, Pinar (2007) claims:

> The curriculum question in the United States—"What knowledge is of most worth?"—is not [a] quiet question. It is a call to arms as well as a call to contemplation; it is a call to complicated conversation. It is our uniquely vocational call. (pp. xviii–xix)

This harkens back to Herbert Spencer's (1861) expanded, yet synoptic, conceptualization of education as an intellectual, moral, and physical enterprise and his initial chapter in that work, titled, "What knowledge is of most worth?"

QUESTIONS OF WORTH

What is clear from the above and magnified through reviews of over a century of curriculum books (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980; Kliebard, 1986/2004; Schubert, 1986/1997; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; Schubert, Lopez-Schubert, Thomas, & Carroll, 2002; Marshall, Sears, & Schubert, 2000; Marshall, Sears, Allen, Roberts, & Schubert, 2007), and mentoring relationships or genealogies (Schubert, Lopez-Schubert, Herzog, Posner, & Kridel, 1988; Kridel, Bullough, & Shaker, 1996) is that intellectual permutations of the curriculum field have been increasingly diverse and multifaceted. In fact, it is difficult to find many common threads (apart from questions of worth) as the field has moved, and is still moving, from primary preoccupation with matters of curriculum development (to facilitate designs of state, church, or private funding entities) to cultural and societal curricula in many dimensions of life. Nevertheless, expansion has brought a range of interests that staggers the imagination—from forms of inquiry (see Short, 1991) to substantive interests of scholars in the field (see Jackson, 1992b; Connelly, He, & Phillion, 2008; Malewski, 2010; Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2010, in press). Nevertheless, two emphases honored for over a century remain at the forefront of curriculum inquiry. One is the expansion of considerations about what is worthwhile from many different vantage points, and the other is attempts to summarize or to make synoptic the complexity and expansiveness of considerations for busy practitioners and policy makers. A backdrop that sets the stage for 1968 onward is sketched below and revisited throughout.

SALIENT BACKDROP

As a common denominator in curriculum inquiry for more than a century, *questions of worth*, constitute a heuristic initiated by a historical saga of philosophers, social thinkers, religious leaders, scientists, literary figures, artists, parents, and community members since the dawn of civilization. With subsequent generations in mind, they implicitly and explicitly provide myriad perspectives and possibilities on what is worthwhile. When education became a separate area of study from general social thought, a sizable portion of such questioning was assumed to be the province of educational theorists—illustrated by Spencer (1861).

As time passed and as the emergent curriculum field was spurred by the philosophy of John Dewey, Francis Parker, and an array of Herbartians, reflection focused more on *experiences* that are worthwhile—knowledge being deemed a part of this larger experiential realm. It is clear that Dewey (1902a) saw the child and the curriculum in a reciprocal relationship, perhaps even as an identity—the child (spontaneous interests and all) as an embodied *curriculum* from which we can learn, and the curriculum as the child harboring little need for autocratically imposed subject matter. Spencer's social Darwinist position that acclaimed self-preservation as its goal along with its eugenic implications (Selden, 1999) was challenged by Dewey and earlier by Lester Frank Ward (1883), who Kliebard (2004) labeled a *social meliorist* in his critique of social Darwinism. The door opened wide for additional variations on the question of worth: what is worth needing, doing, being, becoming, overcoming, sharing, contributing, wondering, and more (Schubert, 2009b). Such questions are clearly implied in Dewey's (1916) definition of education, as "that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (p. 76). His image of education clearly is inclusive of both formal and informal education, and as I suggest here also inclusive of the synoptic and the expansive.

Nevertheless, pressures to clarify purposes within national political and corporate economic interests, coupled with the new experimental psychology of the early 20th century, issued in an era that assumed universal education could be fostered by precision of purposes, their steadfast implementation, evaluation, and subsequent revision. Thus, a positivistic ethos (exalting rigor to the point of *mortis*) influenced nascent curriculum inquiry through work of such scientific (sometimes *scientistic*)-minded researchers as Joseph Mayer Rice, Edward L. Thorndike, and the founders of IQ tests, while fathers of the curriculum field such as Franklin Bobbitt and W. W. Charters became enamored advocates of social efficiency curriculum work, often uncritically accepted a positivist orientation in their inquiries. Drawing upon Dewey's work, progressives and social reconstructionists (e.g., Harold Rugg, George Counts, Boyd Bode, William Kilpatrick, L. Thomas Hopkins, Theodore Brameld) resisted such positivism as best

they could, as did many kept on the outskirts of the field by racial and ethnic prejudice (e.g., W. E. B. DuBois, 1903; Carter G. Woodson, 1933; Horace Mann Bond, 1934; Jose Marti, 1979), even though they, too, asked questions of worth in ways that could have expanded curriculum inquiry. Pressures to perpetuate an authoritarian adherence to preordained objectives, however, undermined the participatory democracy these critics of the dominant view sought to attain through schooling.

By the 1930s, nearly 150 curriculum books (Schubert et al., 2002, p. 531) explored possibilities regarding what is of worth. Few educational leaders and policy makers had time to read them. Thus, the *synoptic curriculum text* (see Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980, pp. 76–77) was born—an imaginative invention of Hollis Caswell and Doak Campbell (1935). Along with their supplementary collection of key readings (Caswell & Campbell, 1937), the tone was set for an era of curriculum development and design that characterized the field until well into the 1960s. Caswell's central role in this had been established already with his school-based version of synoptic curriculum reform in Virginia in the 1920s, heralding curricular organization based on expanding horizons (i.e., home, family, neighborhood, community, state, nation, world), the mark of which is indelibly etched in graded textbooks to this day. Also, Caswell led the first academic department of curriculum (Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College, Columbia University), adding institutionalization to his synoptic renditions of curriculum literature. While synoptic texts were attempts to summarize the essence of the literature, often configuring it in novel ways, they inescapably left behind significant nuances and complicated debates of expanded literature.

Teachers College became a site of pilgrimages by would-be curriculum leaders from around the United States and many parts of the world, where they were taught by generations of scholars or *curriculum collectives*, loosely knit fabrics of key scholars who may or may not espouse shared ideas (Kridel, 2010, in press).[5] Predating Caswell and Campbell (1935) was a text derived from Teachers College professor L. Thomas Hopkins (1929), based more on questions revealed in his vast consulting experience than upon synopsis of extant literature; thus, it constitutes a synoptic beginning of a different kind—mostly heuristic and gleaned from practitioners. Caswell's notion of curriculum based on expanding horizons of student experience, also drawn from consultation with schools, differed from Hopkins's more biological model that likened educational growth to that of cells—expanding, differentiating, and integrating. Caswell's orientation persisted more fully than the integrated curriculum of Hopkins (1937). Perhaps Caswell's position resonated more readily with contexts of the times that accepted a survey-oriented synopsis of both curriculum experiences for children (a kind of synoptics of their experiential horizons) and of the curriculum field than did Hopkins. Or perhaps the acceptance of Caswell was due more to his powerful leadership in the field as chair of the

Department of Curriculum and Teaching and later president at Teachers College. Caswell and Hopkins represented quite different personalities, who influenced students and colleagues in perhaps the earliest collective of curriculum scholars. Synoptic work that built on the example of Caswell and Campbell surely includes that by Alice Miel (1946) and Florence Stratemeyer (Stratemeyer, Forkner, & McKim, 1947; Stratemeyer, Forkner, McKim, & Pasow, 1957). Others in this collective included Gordon Mackenzie, Stephen Max Corey, and Arthur Jersild. Miel (1946, 1952) and Corey (1953) were more situationally based, perhaps influenced by both Hopkins and Caswell; moreover, the action research of Corey and the cooperative curriculum development of Miel might be traced to Dewey at Chicago as much as at Columbia. This Teachers College collective of curriculum scholars could be said to have grown from the philosophy and social foundations of education collective at Teachers College, which included Harold Rugg, George Counts, Bruce Raup, Kenneth Benne, R. Freeman Butts, John Childs, George Axtelle, and others, who were indeed forerunners (along with their exemplar, Dewey) of curriculum inquiry as a separate area of educational studies.

The assertion that curriculum inquiry began at Teachers College could be readily disputed by those who see the University of Chicago as the birthplace of curriculum inquiry, locating it somewhere between John Dewey (prior to his move to Columbia in 1905) and Franklin Bobbitt, whose work emerged just prior to the 1920s. One could legitimately maintain that the crucible of curriculum studies at Chicago lay in a coterie of scholars that coalesced around John Dewey at the beginning of the 20th century: Alice Chipman Dewey (director of the Lab School), Ella Flagg Young (student of Dewey, school administrator, and first woman superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools), Jane Addams (founder of Hull House and exemplary pioneer social worker), Albion Small (noted sociologist), and George Herbert Mead (pragmatist philosopher). After Dewey's departure to Columbia in 1905, the educational ideology at Chicago was substantially altered by Charles Hubbard Judd, who had been mentored by Wilhelm Wundt at his psychological laboratory at Leipzig, and later under the presidency of Robert M. Hutchins took an intellectual traditionalist or humanist turn in the 1930s, reflected in Hutchins's co-creation of the *Great Books of the Western World* with Mortimer J. Adler.

The first decidedly curricular collective at Chicago was headed by Franklin Bobbitt (1918, 1922, 1924) who promoted an empirical method to derive objectives, called *activity analysis*, by patterning objectives from what seemed to be knowledge, skills, and dispositions evident in frequent activities of persons deemed successful. W. W. Charters (1923) added to the method by summarizing societal ideals as a comparable starting point to Bobbitt's activities, after studying with Dewey at Chicago and later moving to Ohio State University. The synoptic character of work by Bobbitt and Charters differed from the survey style of, say, Caswell and Campbell (1935)

or Stratemeyer et al. (1947, 1957), in that it lay in attempts to summarize capacities of persons deemed successful, and then to devise curriculum knowledge to convey them to students via instruction. Though usually classified as the paragon of social efficiency, with its image of mass production, Bobbitt moved steadily toward an individualized conception of curriculum, culminating in what appears to be a recanting of his generic emphasis on curriculum making. He declared, "Curriculum *making* belongs with the dodo and the great auk. . . . Curriculum discovery, one for each child and youth, takes its place" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 298). This sounds more Deweyan to me.

Judd's star student, Ralph Tyler, wrote about how to construct achievement tests in his first academic position at the University of North Carolina; based on this work, he was called upon to direct evaluation for the renowned Eight Year Study (see Aikin, 1942) at Ohio State University. In doing so, he was influenced by John Dewey (with whom he consulted about the Study), philosopher Boyd Bode, W. W. Charters, and others, before returning to the University of Chicago in 1938 to complete the final 4 years of the Eight Year Study, which, like the Laboratory School, was a fertile seedbed for the growth of curriculum ideas in practical educational situations.

Tyler's (1949) version of a synoptic text was much different from, and much briefer than, that of Caswell and Campbell (1935). Tyler concisely presented a heuristic of four questions derived from the Eight Year Study and other consulting work with schools and colleges. Referred to as the *Tyler Rationale*, his questions offer another kind of synopsis, not one that provides summative surveys or conclusions, but rather one that invokes situational responses. Of course, the questions selected imply a kind of conclusiveness. As dean of Social Sciences and university examiner at the University of Chicago, Tyler's interactions with Bobbitt, Hutchins, and Adler brought an increasingly variegated or eclectic perspective, and doubtless contributed to the dynamic collective of curriculum-oriented scholars that he helped establish at Chicago, including Joseph J. Schwab, Herbert A. Thelen, Harold Dunkel, Robert Havighurst, Benjamin Bloom, Kenneth Rehage, Philip W. Jackson, Allison Davis, Bruno Bettelheim, and Jacob Getzels. The kind of synoptic work engaged by these individuals was quite different from some of the aforementioned texts that emerged from Teachers College; it provided synopsis that was more *practical* to use the term as Schwab (1969) used it—an orientation implicit in Dewey's exemplary work in at the Laboratory School—likely influential for Schwab.

Prominent survey-oriented synoptic texts on curriculum development, planning, and design emanated from Teachers College, and moved to other university centers as scholars educated at Teachers College took university positions and began to publish. For example, J. Galen Saylor (University of Nebraska) and William Alexander (University of Florida), former students of Caswell at Teachers College, produced several variations

of a text on curriculum planning, beginning in the 1950s (Saylor & Alexander, 1954) a legacy of texts that extended into the 1980s (Saylor, Alexander, & Lewis, 1981). Spreading to other universities from Chicago, one can prominently see a different quality of synoptic and expansive work in that of John Goodlad and later Elliot Eisner. Goodlad's contributions included perspectives on curriculum inquiry (1979) and an empirical study of the state of schooling in America (1984), while Eisner (1979) drew from his vast experience in the arts and art criticism to create a perspective on curriculum design and evaluation, subsequent editions of which served as a synoptic reference throughout the 1990s and into the present century.

Both Teachers College and Chicago were seedbeds of synoptic statements of curriculum; however, key exemplars in each collective differed considerably in ways in which they expanded curriculum inquiry. Derived from Teachers College one finds more state-of-the-field summarizations, each producing new conceptual configurations, and among those from Chicago one finds more emphasis on synoptic configurations of theory tailored to understand particular situations or events in practice—a particular educational setting or relationship. Before Schwab (1971) wrote about the *arts of eclectic*, Chicago scholars exemplified eclecticism by drawing from strong liberal education contexts to illuminate particular places and practices. One might say that the corpus of liberal arts and sciences was a synoptic macrocosm from which curricularists could eclectically select ideas and research to be funneled to provide insight into the microcosm of actual events.

From Chicago and its descendents, too, was forged another kind of synoptic text, the compendium—taking the form of an encyclopedia or handbook. Such works invited key scholars to interpret areas of expertise on subcategories of curriculum. For instance, Ariah Lewy (1991), compiled and edited curriculum features for the prodigious *Encyclopedia of Education* published in London by Pergamon, creating *The International Encyclopedia of Curriculum* (Husen & Postlethwaite, 1994). Philip Jackson (1992b) edited the *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*, based upon a tradition of handbooks on teaching sponsored by the American Educational Research Association (AERA) since the 1960s. Jackson's exemplary volume was a pattern for the recent *Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction* (Connelly, He, & Phillion, 2008), which conveys a framework that begins with curriculum practice, situates it in context, and moves to theory. Michael Connelly was a former student of Schwab at Chicago, and Ming Fang He and JoAnn Phillion are Connelly's former students at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. As synoptic texts, these compendia were multiauthored, thus, illustrating a variation on situational synoptic character—setting forth one author's interpretation on an area of expertise—in contrast with the synoptic survey of a whole field or a broad topic of inquiry by one or more authors.

Surely, both collectives at Chicago and Columbia were of great intellectual and practical influence in the history of curriculum inquiry. What I want to do here is to push a bit more deeply into complications of this influence and suggest the need to perceive transformations of curriculum scholarship from Columbia and Chicago, suggesting possibilities that hopefully offer perspective for subsequent historical work. As curriculum scholars at Chicago, Columbia, and other universities moved and interacted, the initial distinctions become more blurred. Thus, more than empirical entities, they are likely to be productive metaphors. With this in mind, let us consider the remarkable emergence from Chicago, and of course from Toronto, of *Curriculum Inquiry*, and the character(s) of curriculum inquiry it wrought pertaining to expansion, synopsis, and more. After completing his Ph.D. at Chicago, Connelly (indubitably the principal force behind the creation of *Curriculum Inquiry*) worked with John Herbert, Joel Weiss, Leonard Berk, Ian Westbury, and others to move *Curriculum Theory Network* in 1976 to the current title. The character of this journal carries the indelible imprint of Joseph Schwab's notion of the *practical* with its Deweyan and Aristotelian roots.

I return to this topic shortly; however, as another aspect of backdrop, I want to suggest *Curriculum Inquiry* and other journals may be considered as both expansive and synoptic texts, because the articles made available in them expand the field, and simultaneously the particular selection and orientation of articles configure a synoptic inclusiveness the obverse of which is exclusiveness. Therefore, it must be noted that other prominent curriculum journals also provided synoptic and expansive visions. For instance, the *Journal of Curriculum Studies* (also initiated in 1968), like *Curriculum Inquiry*, provided *international* perspective (meaning principally the British Commonwealth, Western Europe, and the United States) and leanings toward practical and eclectic deliberation as depicted by Schwab, though both published a great array of literature from a variety of countries throughout the world. Beginning in 1979, the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* has provided a synoptic venue for a diverse array of expansive perspectives that brought reconceptualized curriculum studies in a number of diverse directions. *Educational Leadership*, the main journal of the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD; started in 1943), provides a synoptic digest from curriculum and administrative literature that speaks to concerns of school leaders. ASCD implemented its long-time executive director's, Gordon Cawelti's, ideal of a research journal to inform practice took the form of the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, lasting from 1985 to 2005. Additionally, ASCD's World Council for Curriculum and Instruction has maintained a journal, since 1987, that engages participation from a wide array of nations from Asia, Latin America, Africa, Australia and Oceana, as well as from North America and Europe. Between 1980 and 1990, *Phenomenology and Pedagogy* expanded hermeneutic phenomenology in curriculum studies. From the American Association of

Curriculum and Teaching (AATC), *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue* (initiated in 1998) depicts the interplay of curriculum with teaching as a basis for facilitating reflection of curriculum work in schools, while the *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy* has addressed the praxis of pedagogy with curriculum from critical, cultural, and postmodern orientations since 2003, as the journal of the Curriculum and Pedagogy group. *Curriculum* in Britain (initiated in 1979, by the Association for the Study of Curriculum) and in Australia *Curriculum Perspectives* (journal of the Australian Curriculum Studies Association, begun in 1980) and *Curriculum and Teaching* (started in 1985) have garnered theoretical interest that is inclusive of practitioner perspectives. The International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (IAACS) American affiliate, AAACS's *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, provides an outlet for national and international curriculum work as an electronic journal. IAACS engages curricularists from over 30 participating nations from all regions of the world. Of worthy note, too, is a graduate student–oriented journal, *Journal of Critical Inquiry Into Curriculum and Instruction (JCI~>CI)*, that existed from 1998 to 2004 as an outlet principally for doctoral students in the curriculum field, the articles from which are to be published soon (Huber-Warring, 2010, in press). Two curriculum organizations publish proceedings, which should be noted: *Curriculum Canada* by the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies, since 1979, and The Society for the Study of Curriculum History, which was inaugurated in 1977, with proceedings occasionally published, including an anniversary book version edited by Craig Kridel (1989). These journals have been open to a variety of curriculum scholarship; each could be considered synoptic of a certain constituency of interests, and at the same time each has helped expand the field. Moreover, it is worth noting that many international associations and publication sources are not mentioned, especially those not available in English. Self-critique should acknowledge the need for fuller inclusion of such sources, especially those offering indigenous perspectives, to be a project in years ahead. At the same time it is worth acknowledging progress made by both the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction and the IAACS toward such ends, as well as the international inclusiveness of journals mentioned here.

In addition to curriculum collectives at Chicago and Teachers College, I wish to note three prominent U.S. state universities with long traditions (stretching to the 1940s and earlier) that are relevant to synoptic curriculum inquiry: Ohio State University, University of Wisconsin, and the University of Illinois. Though not as directly connected with Teachers College or Chicago, both exerted tacit influences on curriculum protagonists at these three universities, as well as emerging others. At Ohio State, Charters and Tyler joined Boyd Bode to forge a unique combination of traditions from Dewey, Judd, Bobbitt, and others. Bode (1938), like Dewey (1938), was integrally involved in an attempt to reconcile child-centered and social

reconstructionist factions of the progressive education movement, sadly to little avail. Bode's principal student, Harold Alberty (1947), a former school administrator in the Cleveland area, produced a synoptic curriculum text that focused on secondary curriculum, with special emphasis on what he named *core curriculum*. As he refined it in subsequent editions of his synoptic text with Elsie Alberty (1962, 1969), core curriculum was developed as relationships between student interest and world problems (e.g., war, competition, constraint). Alberty (1953) identified several levels of core curriculum—the most conservative being the joining of two or more subject matters around a teacher-determined interest and the most radical cultivated subject matter and experience to enhance pursuit of personal life interests and desire to contribute to the public good. Thus, the synoptic is experienced in the learner's life itself, as part of the process of learning and growing. Alberty's principal student in curriculum was Paul Klohr, who mentored (formally and informally) many who moved the field in new directions, forging reconceptializations of curriculum studies.

At Wisconsin, Virgil Herrick (1956, pp. 107–112) called for synopsis with his term *organizing center*, and also joined with Ralph Tyler (Herrick & Tyler, 1950) to organize a 1947 Chicago-based conference of prominent curriculum scholars (including Hollis Caswell and Gordon Mackenzie from Teachers College, J. Paul Leonard from Stanford, Edgar Dale from Ohio State, B. Othanel Smith from University of Illinois) to recommend expanded theoretical contextualization of curriculum work. Edward Krug (1950) expanded historical perspective to curriculum planning and emphasized a synoptic understanding of the history of secondary schooling (1964). Later, Herbert Kliebard expanded understanding of curriculum history and continued synoptic variations in two ways: through synoptic selection of books of readings with his Teachers College mentor Arno Bellack (Bellack & Kliebard, 1977) that harkens back to the Caswell and Campbell (1937) collection, and most fundamentally with his history (1893–1958) of the curriculum field (Kliebard, 1986, and several subsequent editions) in the spirit of Cremin's (1961) historical work at Teachers College.

At the University of Illinois in the 1950s and 1960s, two synoptic texts were produced that dominated their era: *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development* (Smith, Stanley, & Shores, 1950, 1957) and *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education* (Broudy, Smith, & Burnett, 1964). The former, presented a substantial overview of curriculum in cultural context, along with complex options on central topics that paralleled (if not derived from) the Tyler Rationale (Tyler, 1949), alternative modes of curriculum inquiry that foreshadow discussions of paradigms, change and revision, and an advocacy of core curriculum derived from the aforementioned work of the Albertys as well as from that of Faunce and Bossing (1951). The Broudy et al. (1964) text dealt with the complicated possibilities of complement and contradiction that invigorate pursuits of democracy and excellence, particularly focusing on ways the disciplines contribute to self-realization (a

central feature of Broudy's [1954/1961] philosophy of education) and democratic transformation for secondary students and the society writ large.

Ways to summarize and reconfigure the state of the nascent curriculum field were hardly limited to those at the five universities noted above. For instance, J. Minor Gwynn (1943), of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, had a long-established synoptic text based on an analysis of social trends, that was revised for more than 2 decades and Hilda Taba (1962) a research associate and a protégé of Ralph Tyler on the Eight Year Study, created a much-heralded synoptic text throughout the 1960s. Ronald Doll (1964) summarized the field in a manner geared for teachers and administrators, which saw a series of revisions through the ninth edition in 1996, providing impetus for other synoptic texts that provide curriculum perspectives that address educators who lead schools more than those who seek careers in academe. Such audiences are addressed today through a wide range of approaches, from Marsh and Willis (2007) to Ornstein and Hunkins (2008). Synoptic texts in the spirit of Caswell and Campbell (1935), Smith et al. (1950), Taba (1962), Tanner and Tanner (1975), Eisner (1979), my own attempt (Schubert, 1986), as well as those of Decker Walker (1990) and George Posner (1992), and subsequent editions or reprints of several of these continue to introduce future scholars to curriculum studies and constitute a leading method of synoptically perpetuating expanding knowledge of the curriculum field (Rogan & Luckowski, 1990; Rogan, 1991). Productive new synoptic variations by Pinar et al. (1995), Marshall et al. (2000, 2007), Short (2005), and Pinar (2006) are discussed later.

In summary, then, two lines of influence traceable to John Dewey result in quite different synoptic orientations. At Teachers College the orientation was twofold: the first derived from Caswell's leadership through a state-of-the-field text survey and reconfiguration of knowledge (Caswell & Campbell, 1935), and the second patterned after their accompanying collection of primary source articles (Caswell & Campbell, 1937). At Chicago, the synoptic emphasis was also twofold: one that parlayed extant knowledge to questions derived from practice and the other offering original interpretative statements by selected scholars who published interpretations of a subcategory of curriculum scholarship in compendia. When Dewey founded and cultivated his University of Chicago Laboratory School, 1896–1904, his emphasis was on dynamically evolving questions concerning school and society (Dewey, 1899), child and curriculum (1902a), and educational situations (1902b)—perceiving curriculum inquiry as transactions among teachers and students in particular contexts as they seek to understand particular matters. This Deweyan configuration is clearly a precursor to Schwab's practical and eclectic inquiry that seeks to understand dynamic commonplaces, which will be discussed more fully later. At Columbia, however, Dewey had relatively minimal connection with Teachers College and its laboratory school, and his work on education

became more theoretical, synoptically surveying issues and ideas to provide holistic perspective on the broad topics he chose to address, such as democracy and education (Dewey, 1916). With the exception of his work with his daughter Evelyn Dewey (Dewey & Dewey, 1915), the corpus of his writing was less tied to practice, even though Jesse Newlon, George Axtelle, L. Thomas Hopkins, and others valued Dewey's perspectives in their leadership at the Horace Mann Lincoln Laboratory School, and sometimes communicated with Dewey about this. Still, the intellectual and practical distance between Dewey's role as Professor of Philosophy at Columbia and his advisory capacity at Teachers College and its laboratory school may have invoked more of a summative, synoptic, and historical survey influence on the faculty of Teachers College. In contrast, at Chicago it may be that his practical purposes within the Laboratory School wrought a kind of synoptic character that eclectically combined, adapted, and modified theories to meet the flow of situational needs, thus, expanding educational insights from an experimental posture. Such distinctions began to change, however, by the early 1960s, and they became intertwined to the extent that curriculum inquiry at Chicago, Columbia, Ohio State, Illinois, and Wisconsin, as well as universities populated by those connected with any of these exhibited a blend that can be found at many other institutions of the day: Stanford; Harvard; UCLA; Arizona State University (where there have been many more curriculum scholars), where there has been a coterie of curriculum scholars; Indiana University; University of Minnesota; University of Toronto (OISE); University of Florida; University of Texas; George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University; Pennsylvania State University; among others. Ensuing inquiry raised questions about languages or paradigms of inquiry, and the field was afire with a sense of new possibility.

NEW CURRICULAR LANGUAGES VIS-À-VIS EXPANSION AND SYNOPSIS

These trends were continued by scholars initially influenced by traditions that evolved at Teachers College and Chicago and ultimately other aforementioned universities, many times by virtue of having been a doctoral student, a faculty member, or having been less formally influenced by scholars in established or emergent collectives. For instance, the synoptic textbook authored by Daniel and Laurel Tanner (1975), the year I received my Ph.D. at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, exhibits the synoptic influence of Caswell and Campbell (1935). In my doctoral studies I learned to appreciate the key synoptic text produced in the 1950s by my adviser, J. Harlan Shores. He was one of its authors, all of whom were at Illinois when the book was published (Smith, Stanley, & Shores, 1950, 1957). The Tanner and Tanner text continued with revisions in the next 3 decades, and also provided historical perspective in greater magnitude

than any synoptic text before it. Their emphasis on curriculum history reflects the influence of sweeping historical renditions of educational history by Teachers College professor and president Lawrence Cremin's (1961) award-winning *The Transformation of the School*, considered by many to be the definitive history of progressive education. One of Cremin's former students, Mary Louise Seguel (1966) authored the first history of the curriculum field. Like Seguel, Laurel Tanner was a graduate at Teachers College while Daniel Tanner received his Ph.D. at Ohio State, experiencing the legacy of collectives that included Boyd Bode, W. W. Charters, Harold Alberty, Edgar Dale, William Van Til, and Ralph W. Tyler. Both Tanners, however, were influenced greatly by faculty at Teachers College, interactions with Ralph Tyler, and by study of Dewey's Laboratory School at Chicago (Tanner, 1997).

Further illustration of the merging of tendencies initiated at Teachers College and Chicago is the Tanners' commitment to combat ahistoricism in the curriculum field by gathering prominent scholars whose roots trace to Chicago and Teachers College (as well as to major state universities) to organize the Society for the Study of Curriculum History (SSCH) at Teachers College in 1977. Founding members included established scholars from Teachers College, Chicago, and the several other universities already noted. As one of the youngest founding members and later president of SSCH, I saw firsthand the emergence of historical scholarship on curriculum that expanded the field and caused me to realize that both broad surveys and detailed histories of particular persons or situations were needed. While historical surveys provide broad perspective, cases sustain nuanced understanding. Realization that both could be preserved through collections of primary documents and articles is illustrated by Edmund C. Short (a student of Stratemeyer at Teachers College) and George Marconnit (1968) in an edited volume that set a tone that beckoned for collections of readings that has been responded to since 1968 (e.g., Eisner & Vallance, 1974; Pinar, 1975; Orlosky & Smith, 1978; Beyer & Apple, 1988/1998; Ornstein & Behar-Horenstein, 1994, 1999; Flinders & Thornton, 1997, 2005, 2009; Stern & Kysilka, 2008).

In the mid- to late 1960s, it became clear that new ways of thinking, languages, or discourse communities had to be included in the field's lexicon. Expansive new languages had to be reconciled with synoptic accounts. By the time Connelly and others emerged from Chicago to create the series of events that resulted in *Curriculum Inquiry* at OISE, the field already had begun to percolate anew. Novel orientations to thought pushed curriculum discourse in new directions, historical awareness being one of these, with advocacy and criticism alike emanating from Teachers College, Chicago, Ohio State, Wisconsin, Illinois, and more centers of curriculum consideration. In several guises, the advocacy was for new curricular languages (perhaps equivalent to paradigms) to understand curricular phenomena. At Teachers College in the 1960s, for instance, Philip

Phenix (1964) elaborated alternative realms of meaning or epistemological lenses, and Dwayne Huebner (1966) implored those concerned with curriculum to expand beyond dominant technical and scientific languages to include political, ethical, and aesthetic ones. Similarly, at Teachers College, Maxine Greene (1965, 1967, 1973) built upon existentialist, literary, and artistic perspectives to add tragic and imaginative perspective to pragmatic legacies. And at Chicago, Joseph J. Schwab (1969, 1970, 1971, 1973) condemned preoccupation in education and social sciences with language of the *theoretical*, urging a *practical* and *eclectic* orientation, drawing from both Aristotelian and Deweyan roots. At the same time, Philip Jackson (1968) prepared educators for the idea of hidden curriculum in a study of learning that derives from the context of classroom life; this led to studies of the moral implications of classroom life (Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993; Hansen, 2001). Also in the 1960s, James B. Macdonald and others (Macdonald & Leeper, 1966) sustained focus on the interplay of language and meaning in curriculum discourse, and introduced critical theory and ideological critique (partially based on work by Paulo Freire [1970] and Ivan Illich [1970]) to the curriculum field through the ASCD and other sources (Macdonald, Wolfson, & Zaret, 1973; Macdonald, 1974). Macdonald and Huebner had been fellow doctoral students at the University of Wisconsin—both having been mentored by Virgil Herrick. Attention to mentorship leads me to advocate more study of the lives of educators (e.g., Kridel et al., 1996; Waks, 2006; Short & Waks, 2009). Because I contend that more writers should situate their writing within their autobiography, I am attempting to do so here, as doubtless already must be surmised. I now elaborate.

SITUATED AUTOBIOBIOGRAPHY VIS-À-VIS EXPANSION AND SYNOPSIS

Obviously, in this brief portrayal, I reiterate a few autobiographical notes interspersed earlier, which can hardly be prevented in an effort to provide a coherent exposition.

It was in the midst of this percolating fervor, this complexity and expansion, that I began to fully encounter the curriculum field. As a beginning Ph.D. student in 1973, I became fascinated with the work of Greene, Huebner, and Macdonald because it resonated with study of philosophy, literature, and arts that I earlier had pursued as a self-directed in-service education program to invigorate my work as an elementary school teacher. Such study helped me create the person I was becoming, and my teaching experience convinced me that a *person becoming* was the central message I needed to convey to my students, and I strove to do so by example, though I rarely succeeded as well as I hoped. A spirit of becoming educated needed to be embodied in my being, and could not be reduced to lesson plans,

behavioral objectives, syllabi, and curriculum guides. By example, I hoped to encourage students to proactively develop their own becoming.

As a doctoral student, I wanted to reconcile this becoming person that I strove to be with the heritage of curriculum development literature represented in my study with Harlan Shores (Smith et al., 1950, 1957). Perhaps I glimpsed the need for autobiographical work that has permeated the field over the past 3 decades in the United States (e.g., from work by Pinar [1975], Pinar & Grumet [1976], Grumet [1980], and J. L. Miller [1990] to examples of curriculum scholars engaging in it such as provided by Sears & Marshall [1990], Willis & Schubert [1991], Pinar [1994], Waks [2006], Pinar [2004], and Short & Waks [2009]). Given this salient thread of curriculum work that accompanied the first 4 decades of *Curriculum Inquiry*, I am compelled to situate myself in the saga of curriculum studies, noting briefly my encounter with emergent literatures. Thus, without inappropriately making this about myself, I want to show that transformations in the field have personal character—illustrating that anyone who has been part of the field contributes to it personally as well as intellectually. So I continue here with a brief depiction of my entry into curriculum—my curriculum of curriculum, if you will.

I entered graduate school as a Master's student at Indiana University in summer 1966, and two of my initial curriculum readings were the synoptic text by Smith et al. (1957) and the inaugurating text of post-Sputnik curriculum reform by Jerome Bruner (1960), *The Process of Education*. Besides this curriculum, I was introduced to educational philosophy, history, and social foundations by A. Stafford Clayton, Philip G. Smith, Malcolm Skilbeck, and Stanley Ballinger. The history and philosophy emphasis, especially Dewey's work, spoke to curriculum studies by opening a cavern of precedent about questions of worth. After completing the Master's, I became an elementary school teacher and studied curriculum leadership in summer 1968 with Harold Spears (1951), former superintendent of San Francisco. During the next 8 years of teaching I remained glued to questions of worth—asking them with colleagues, friends, especially with children, and in solitude. As already noted, I devised my own professional development to supplement and supersede "in-service" days, by frequenting libraries, bookstores, galleries, museums, and many other relationships with philosophers, playwrights, poets, artists, novelists, psychologists, filmmakers, and friends from many walks of life. I encountered the emergent curriculum literature of the day, and it spoke to me in powerful new ways. Since the Smith et al. (1957) text had captured my attention as a Master's student, I explored the possibility of studying with Shores at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. In 1973, I began my Ph.D. work, and felt that I was experiencing a transformation in the field I was just getting to know as I gleaned insights via study with J. Myron Atkin, Harry Broudy, Bernard Spodek, Louis Rubin, Fred Raubinger, William Connell, Ian Westbury, Thomas Sergiovanni, James Raths, Hugh Petrie,

and others in education, as well as Hugh Chandler in the Department of Philosophy.

At the conclusion of my Ph.D. studies in 1975, I embarked on a 30-some year career (still in progress) in higher education at the University of Illinois at Chicago. When I attended my initial AERA annual meeting in Washington, DC, I could see the field in a state of division—like a glacial crack—between *traditionalists* and *conceptual empiricists* on one hand in Division B (then traditionally named *Curriculum and Objectives*) and neoprogressives or radicals referred to as *reconceptualists* (Pinar, 1975) on the other. Beginning in the early 1970s, many of this diverse array of reconceptualist scholars had created conferences that preceded what later would be called Bergamo conferences[6] joined with other scholars in the AERA Special Interest Group (SIG) on Creation and Utilization of Curriculum Knowledge. Following previous chairs, Edmund Short and George Willis, I became chair of that SIG, which garnered a membership of over 300 for a short period of ferment, before gradually transforming Division B to change its name to Curriculum Studies and redefine its work as intellectual and practical studies of myriad pathways of human and social transformation.[7]

At the 1975 AERA annual meeting, I witnessed Schwab critique,[8] as the scientist he so justifiably was, the propensity to pattern educational research after a misguided image of what science was about; he declared that statistics was an inept proxy for scientific thinking and that too many educational researchers grasped merely that surface of much deeper phenomena. Likewise, when social scientists turned to theory, Schwab said that natural scientists had already moved beyond theory to embrace situational analysis. Meanwhile, many educational researchers were still mimicking statistics, and others were stuck in a *theoretic* language of overgeneralization. Schwab's call, in his first major article on *practical inquiry* (Schwab, 1969, expanded in 1970) was to move past the lure of certainty in theoretic work to the practical, quasi-practical, and eclectic—a point quite congruent with Dewey's *Quest for Certainty* (1929c) and his *The Sources of a Science of Education* (1929b).

At the 1976 AERA annual meeting in San Francisco, I found myself in a session[9] with George Willis, Max van Manen, and Francis Hunkins, and remarkably noticed James Macdonald and Dwayne Huebner enter the surprisingly large audience. After our presentations, I reflected on how amazing it was for young scholars to *meet* their bookshelf. So, I began to imagine sessions that might more fully bring my library to life; thus, over the next several years, I used AERA annual meetings to gather together key scholars (as was the impetus over the years in earlier sessions organized and chaired by Louis Rubin[10]), especially those who I thought might engage in the move from emphasis on curriculum and objectives (often facilitating state and corporate designs) to curriculum inquiry or curriculum studies (postprogressive perspectives exploring individual and

societal transformation). For instance, in 1977, in New York, I brought together Mauritz Johnson, Maurice Eash, Decker Walker, Michael Apple, and William Pinar. In New York in 1980, I organized two sessions: one with Maxine Greene, Michael Apple, Mario Fantini, and Elliot Eisner, and the other with Philip Jackson, Ralph Tyler, Madeleine Grumet, and Max van Manen. Based on the two sessions in 1980, I developed a paper that was published in *Curriculum Inquiry* (Schubert, 1982), wherein I argued that curriculum inquiry was expanding steadfastly from an exclusive focus on schooling back to a focus on education as a holistic function of societal life, as it had been treated before curriculum became a specialized area of study. Striving to understand expansive and synoptic character in curriculum inquiry more fully, while not distorting the traditions that were objects of critique, in Los Angeles in the 1981 AERA, I convened several sessions: Ralph Tyler, P. H. Taylor, Robert Stake, William Reid, and Harry Broudy, another on the influence of Tyler with commentary by Gordon MacKenzie and Lee Cronbach, and still another with B. Othanel Smith, John Goodlad, George Beauchamp, Edmund Short, and Ralph Tyler.[11]

Now, over a quarter century later, in this article, I want to continue that wondering about the expansion of curriculum studies. During the 40 years since *Curriculum Theory Network* charted the path of *Curriculum Inquiry,* I have witnessed immense expansion, proliferation, and diversity. At the same time, I have striven to ascertain how curriculum scholarship has summarized, or might summarize, that expansion in ways meaningful to novice scholars, practitioners, policy makers, and the public. As I comment on this phenomenon, I return implicitly and explicitly to the following questions: What are key literatures that have continued the expansion? In what ways do curriculum scholars try to rein them in, make them synoptic, to enhance their communication to curriculum workers and policy makers? Additionally, in what ways are key ideas so complex that they repel or defy synopsis, making synoptic ventures uncomplicate that which should remain complex? What questions emerge as key curriculum heuristics?

I attempt to respond to such questions as I present several categories of literature that have had expansive and synoptic impact on curriculum inquiry during the past 40 years that *Curriculum Inquiry* has played a major role in the field: historical and philosophical literatures; popular, policy, and professional literatures; aesthetic and artistic literatures; practical and narrative literatures; critical literatures; inner and contextual literatures; and indigenous and globalization literatures. Each of these contributed to my own evolving perspective on curriculum inquiry, and they all stemmed from my early and sustained interest in Dewey, particularly in the philosophical, popular, aesthetic, and practical languages that appear to me to be incarnated from Dewey, whose expansive perspective compounds the problem of conveying it synoptically.

HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURES

As an undergraduate I was deeply intrigued by the array of courses known as *liberal arts*—all of which I thought coalesced in philosophy. At the same time I knew I needed job preparation, so I also pursued course work for certification as a teacher. Wanting a job that allowed my continued exploration of life's deepest *mysteries and events*[12] (see Ulich, 1955), I chose education, because I had gained so much from pursuing my own beginnings in liberal education. I wanted to offer young persons early opportunities to question life's meanings and to ask what is worth being and doing. Nonetheless, I was depressed with education courses that focused more on techniques and recipes than on meanings in and commitments to life. In an undergraduate philosophy of education class in my senior year, however, I was introduced to the perennial organization of philosophical inquiry; categories such as metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology helped me think more fully about who I was becoming and what I wanted to do in life. For me, these categories were initially a great expansion from personal pondering or bull sessions with peers that partially helped me reflect on life as a teenager. While these synoptic philosophical categories expanded my horizons, they inhibited my perspective as well—steering my focus away from, say, philosophy of culture, language, colonization, identity, and more. Still, I wondered why teacher preparation was more training than education. In any case through the liberal arts and especially through philosophy of education, I glimpsed the need for asking and living *what's worthwhile questions* and this glimpse has grown into a gaze that has given impetus to my life and work ever since.

Something similar seems to have happened among those who founded the curriculum field. Somehow they wanted to gaze deeply into what knowledge and experiences are worth pursuing to lead fuller and more socially reconstructive lives. The bifurcated parentage of curriculum must have been befuddling. One parent that led to focus on objectives and rigid lesson plans, lay in psychology, emphasizing the *how* of education, and neglected consideration of the *what* and *why*. Perhaps sensing this, many early scholars in the curriculum field turned to the other parent, philosophy and history of education. While history and philosophy are often considered separate disciplines, in education the two emerged together. Departments of history and philosophy of education foreshadowed social foundations of education and more recently parented educational policy studies. My first home in academe, the Department of History and Philosophy of Education at Indiana University, was the source of my focus on this second educational parentage—namely, in the work of John Dewey. From then onward, his work gave me impetus to address myriad dimensions of what is worthwhile for myself and contributions to educational and curricular studies.

Ancestral treatises that gave birth to the curriculum field can be found in most books of readings and secondary sources in educational foundations. I particularly resonate with the work of Robert Ulich in the 1940s and 1950s, used amply in classes of Harry Broudy. Ulich's (1950) *History of Educational Thought* and the companion collection, *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom* (1947/1954) capture the spirit of early curriculum thought by showing how excerpts by philosophers, theologians, and other social thinkers have shaped struggles over what is worthwhile for individuals and societies. Ulich's treatments in these books and in others are surprisingly inclusive of non-Western, as well as Western, sources—especially for the 1940s and 1950s. In the early 1990s, I joined with four other colleagues to select excerpts from documents that influenced American curriculum in what I would call a synoptic collection of readings that also expands knowledge of formative influences on contemporary curriculum (Willis, Schubert, Bullough, Kridel, & Holton, 1993). Although this book begins in the 1600s, more than half of the inclusions are from the 20th century and would surely be considered early perspectives on curriculum inquiry. The book's content symbolizes curriculum inquiry as a hybrid of philosophy, philosophy of education, and the burgeoning curriculum field.

Continuing the saga of early perspectives at Chicago and Teachers College, I am captivated by Dewey's negotiations when President William Rainey Harper attempted to lure him to the University of Chicago from a prestigious position in the Philosophy Department at the University of Michigan. Dewey asked that there be an integrated position at Chicago to combine the natural synergy among philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy, and that there be a laboratory school wherein ideas pertaining to this integration could be developed and studied. Clarifications included that psychology be seen, not behaviorally, but with the pragmatist purport found in Dewey's *Psychology* (1887) and William James (1890) on the topic, and that the laboratory school be a center of learning about individual and social growth, democracy, and education—not a demonstration or teacher training school. After accepting the job at Chicago in 1894 and creating the Laboratory School from 1896 to 1904, Dewey's inquiry was largely on the educational situation (Dewey, 1902b), the interactions among child and curriculum (1902a), school and society (1899), and their dynamic consequences. When Dewey left for Columbia, he left a *practical* legacy at Chicago—a novel variation on being synoptic, noted earlier, in the sense of parlaying extant theories to make sense of situations in the flow of action, much as Schwab (1969) later developed. One might even see this emphasis as more *idiographic* than *nomothetic* to use parlance of other Chicago scholars Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba (1957). The complex interplay between the expansive and synoptic suggests that, while the distinction is valuable, synopsis and expansiveness blend dynamically. There are both practical (which elicits idiographic vision) and theoretic (which is more nomoth-

etic) modes of being synoptic. To elaborate, synoptic origins at both Columbia and Chicago may be traced to Dewey—though a Dewey with different purport at each location. In the Department of Philosophy at Columbia, the scope of Dewey's writing was not primarily focused on educational situations. It was more pervasive as evidenced in *Democracy and Education* (Dewey, 1916) and other philosophical works, for example, *Human Nature and Conduct* (Dewey, 1922), *The Public and Its Problems* (Dewey, 1927), *Experience and Nature* (Dewey, 1929a), *Art as Experience* (Dewey, 1934), and *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (1920/1949). This broad survey of perspectives in the field constitutes one mode of being synoptic, and the other consists of tailoring and adapting theoretical perspectives to meet needs in extant situations. Moreover, as the field expanded to include an increasing diversity of perspectives, surveys became multifaceted and often unwieldy—making the survey difficult or nearly impossible. The interpretation of *synoptic* as creating an eclectic response to a given situation, in view of the diversity of extant knowledge, is indeed complicated and challenging. This state of inquiry had considerable influence on curriculum studies as the curriculum field emerged and transformed. It is not merely a matter of seeing the field as either continuously expanding or as being summarized; rather, what seems to be of utmost import is to better understand ways in which undulations of expansive and synoptic events have influenced and continue to affect conceptual developments in the curriculum field to date.

While it is clear that synoptic and expansive events influenced the character of curriculum thought that emerged at both Chicago and Teachers College, it seems incontrovertible that both grew from the influence of Dewey and other progressive educators. At Chicago, the collectives from early through mid-20th century cumulatively spawned such scholars as Lee Cronbach, John Goodlad, Herbert Walberg, Elliot Eisner, Lee Shulman, Ian Westbury, Michael Connelly, Karen Zumwalt, Ilene Harris, Tom Roby, Peter Pereira, Lauren Sosniak, David Hansen, Rene Arcilla, and Robert Boostrom. Now, some years after closure of the famed Department of Curriculum and Philosophy in the Division of Social Sciences, Chicago regrouped to institute a small, new education faculty (which has included, for example, Tony Bryk, Marvin Hoffman, and Charles Payne) who focus on urban education issues of schooling relative to race, class, gender, and politics. Regardless of its closure, the several curriculum collectives at Chicago would surely be conceived as having pioneering influences on expansion and synopsis of curriculum, by exemplary eclectic use of liberal education in educational situations.

At Columbia, aforementioned collectives of social foundations and curriculum scholars at Teachers College paid homage to Dewey and were known for their work in philosophy and history of education from the 1920s through the 1960s. Hollis Caswell was part of this group and helped fold an emphasis on philosophy of education into the Department of

Curriculum and Teaching. Edward L. Thorndike, a founder of the field of Educational Psychology, exerted much influence, too, on what curriculum studies would become. Contemporary curriculum studies, as represented in the pages of *Curriculum Inquiry*, is a product of both parentages, although it seems to me to have been influenced most by the philosophical, social, and historical foundations. This is commensurate with the contemporary character of the AERA Curriculum Studies Division. Clearly, this emphasis was perpetuated by the first generation of curriculum scholars at Teachers College, noted earlier, and those who were still active during the beginnings of *Curriculum Inquiry*, such as Alice Miel, Florence Stratemeyer, Arno Bellack, Arthur W. Foshay, Harry Passow, Dwayne Huebner, as well as Lawrence Cremin the noted historian, and Maxine Greene and Philip Phenix in philosophy. Although the last three were not members of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, their influence clearly redounds in curriculum studies. This collective, and the one that preceded it, influenced in different generations those who became noted curriculum scholars at other major universities: Philip Jackson who went to Chicago; Herbert Kliebard and Michael Apple who migrated to Wisconsin; Galen Saylor who went to Nebraska; Edmund Short who became established at Pennsylvania State; Laurel Tanner who went to Temple; Louise Berman and Steven Selden at Maryland; William Alexander and Glen Hass who migrated to Florida; Gerald Firth at Georgia; and William Ayers whose career is at the University of Illinois at Chicago. From Chicago, Jackson's former students Karen Zumwalt and David Hansen are currently mainstays in curriculum and philosophy at Teachers College. So, one could say that cycling among Chicago, Teachers College, and other major universities (e.g., Harvard, Stanford, Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Pennsylvania State, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Toronto) became indeed prominent. The point here is not comprehensiveness; instead, it is to illustrate the complication of transformative transactions among scholars, institutions, and ideas that shaped the quest for worth and the nature of synoptic communication of continually expanding curriculum knowledge that emanated initially from Teachers College and Chicago.

The past 40 years of *Curriculum Inquiry* witnessed an expansive flow of ideas about worth and a diversity of synoptic presentations thereof, which itself constitutes a worthy history. Permutations abounded and demanded explanations of the state of the field, igniting a new spark of educational history among curriculum scholars. As noted earlier, curriculum scholars realized the need to make their scholarship less ahistorical, taking a cue from monumental works by Cremin (1961, 1980, 1988), and following Seguel's (1966) rendition of the field's formative years (highlighting contributions of Charles and Frank McMurry, Dewey, Bobbitt, Charters, Rugg, and Caswell). Others followed suit in diverse ways. In addition, another kind of history was exemplified by Ruth Elson (1964) in her analysis of social and cultural values in 19th-century textbooks. Tanner and Tanner

augmented the impact of subsequent editions of their 1975 synoptic text with their *History of the School Curriculum* (Tanner & Tanner, 1990). Similarly, works such as Schubert and Lopez Schubert (1980), Franklin (1986), Schubert (1986/1997), and Kliebard (1986), provided general antidotes to the ahistorical character of the curriculum inquiry. Such work was influenced, by the previously noted Society for the Study of Curriculum History (see Kridel, 1989), founded in 1977 by Laurel Tanner, with support from O. L. Davis, Lawrence Cremin, Arno Bellack, Daniel Tanner, Hollis Caswell, Arthur W. Foshay, and many others.

Cremin (1976) also inspired inquiry into nonschool education or public education writ large, as exemplified by Tyler (1977), Bremer (1979), and each of these initially influenced my own call to understand curricula outside school (Schubert, 1981, 1982), not only in nonschool institutions that proffer educational objectives such as museums (Fantini & Sinclair, 1985), but in all dimensions of teacher and student lives (Schubert & Schubert, 1982), or as Bernard Bailyn (1960) admonished the seeking of educational history anywhere culture is transmitted across generations. I would add an emphasis on *transformed* across generations in addition to *transmitted*. The evolution of curriculum history has taken many turns, one of which is to portray curriculum from racial, ethical, and cultural perspectives that are not in the mainstream, sometimes referred to as revisionist history, such as Joel Spring's (2010, in press) histories of education in the lives of African Americans, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and Asian Americans. One can see similar emphases in James Anderson's (1988) history of the education of Blacks in the U.S. South, Charles Payne's (1996) rendition of education of African Americans in freedom schools, Gloria Ladson-Billings's (1994) conceptualization of culturally relevant pedagogy, Geneva Gay's (2000) advocacy of culturally responsive teaching, and William Watkins's (2001) exposure of White architects of Black education. Other highly noteworthy avenues of historical curriculum work include Ivor Goodson's (1983) history of subject matter, international history (Goodson, 1988), and teacher identities and lives as history (Goodson & Walker 1990; Goodson & Hargreaves, 1996); educational biography (Kridel, 1998); autobiography (Van Til, 1983/96; Short & Waks, 2009); feminist historical perspective (Grumet, 1988; J. L. Miller, 1990, 2005; Lather, 1991, 2007); history of educational events, such as the Eight Year Study (Kridel & Bullough, 2007); oral history (Davis, 1991); and school history (Semel, 1992; Meier, 1995). Considerable historical work continues to recognize diverse and relevant perspective or precedent that already exists within the curriculum field, for example in the following: O. L. Davis (1976); Peter Hlebowitsh (2005); William Wraga (1994); Wesley Null (2003, 2008). Moreover, sometimes such work is criticized, deemed irrelevant, and rejected too quickly by radical scholars, as Hlebowitsh (1993) admonishes us to consider.

Philosophical and historical sources have provided a seedbed for exploration that occurred during the first 40 years of *Curriculum Inquiry* and acknowledges a debt to pragmatist and progressive educational traditions, for which Dewey (1899, 1902a, 1902b, 1916, 1929b, 1931, 1938) and James (1890, 1899) are founders, as revealed in writings of Kilpatrick (1926), Bode (1927), Rugg (1927), and Counts (1932). Of course, some educators arose from traditions that were not pragmatist. For example, Alfred North Whitehead (1929) built upon philosophy of process, while his student, Bertrand Russell (1926) drew upon analytic philosophy. Harry Broudy (1954/1961), who studied with Whitehead and Ulich at Harvard, also expanded the range of philosophical perspectives that inform curriculum inquiry, including Nelson Goodman's aesthetics, Michael Polanyi's personal knowledge, and the self-realization emphases of Abraham Maslow—attempting to meld classical realism with democratic theory and humanistic psychology. Broudy's colleague, B. Othanel Smith, a student of Rugg at Teachers College, exemplified a unity of the pragmatic and the analytic in curriculum discourse of the 1950s. By the mid-1960s, philosophers of education began to build upon a more expansive array of scholarly sources. Philip Phenix (1961, 1964) drew upon a range of philosophy of science and theology to address matters of the common good and the epistemology of meaning. Toward the end of the 1960s, throughout the 1970s, and onward, Maxine Greene (1965, 1967, 1973, 1978, 1988, 1995) brought to both philosophy of education and curriculum theory perspectives from existentialism, phenomenology, and critical theory, as well as a range of artistic and literary sources.

Curriculum scholars from the 1980s to present turned to critical perspectives of more philosophers and social-cultural theorists than can be systematically reviewed in this article. Any list that approximates completeness would be legion. A mere sampling reveals that curriculum scholars build upon existentialist literatures (e.g., Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Martin Heidegger), critical literatures of ideological or cultural analysis (e.g., the Frankfurt School, from Karl Marx to Jürgen Antonio Gramsci, Basil Bernstein, Walter Benjamin, Jürgen Habermas, Richard Bernstein, Pierre Bourdieu, Paulo Freire, Paul Willis), racial literatures (e.g., Derrick Bell, W. E. B. DuBois, bell hooks, Martin Luther King, Jr., Audre Lorde, Toni Morrison, Cornel West, Malcolm X), poststructuralist and postmodern literatures (e.g., Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, Paul Ricoeur, Richard Rorty, Ferdinand de Saussure, Michel Serres), feminist scholarship (e.g., Judith Butler, Nancy Chodorow, Germaine Greer, Sandra Harding), and cultural theorists (e.g., Mikel Bakhtin, Homi Bhabbi, Stuart Hall, Edward Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak).

Obviously, these are only some of the historical and philosophical perspectives and a few of the scholars upon which contemporary curriculum theorists draw. The point is that curriculum studies are patently interdisci-

plinary and eclectic. While any given curriculum theorist may draw heavily from one philosophical, political, or social tradition, one would expect to see selections from other traditions in their work. For instance William Watkins (1993, 2001) draws amply on Marx and other critical theorists relative to social and economic class, and on literature of W. E. B. DuBois, Malcolm X, and other commentators on race. Janet L. Miller (2005) cites feminist cultural scholars such as Judith Butler and Peggy Phelan, and literary critics such as Brenda Marshall and Shoshana Felman, and philosopher of education, Maxine Greene. Patti Lather (2007) builds feminist methodology upon works of such diverse scholars as Walter Benjamin, Judith Butler, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, François Lyotard, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Gayatri Spivak.

The mere listing of a few names hardly does justice to the work of those illustrated above. Their expansiveness transcends the synopsis provided by categories such as those I chose to list. In concluding a draft of this section, I listed a large and still incomplete range of contemporary established curriculum scholars, whose work is rooted in philosophical and historical sources (and even that label deflates the intellectual identity of each of them). Such listing seems futile and unproductive, unless they were treated biographically or autobiographically, or at least if a content analysis were provided of bibliographies in their publications. I will include this list as an endnote to encourage work that illuminates roots of perspectives upon which each draws.[13] Edmund C. Short and Leonard J. Waks (2009) move valuably toward such an endeavor with a simple, though highly insightful, question. They asked scholars in curriculum studies to identify books that have influenced them. Such self-identification is a window into sources of their work that efficiently shortcuts, though could be productively combined with, tedious content analysis of citations in their work. Selecting philosophical and social theorists (not other curriculum theorists) from illustrative authors the following indicates a rich resource of influences on curriculum inquiry: Michael Apple highlights Raymond Williams, Alfred Schutz, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Karl Mannheim, Pierre Bourdieu, Basil Bernstein, and Antonio Gramsci; Louise Berman includes Martin Buber, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Paul Ricoeur, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Paul Tillich; Michael Connelly selects John Dewey, Alasdair MacIntyre, and Michael Polanyi; Bill Doll notes Gregory Bateson, John Dewey, Martin Heidegger, M. Serres and B. Latour, and Alfred North Whitehead; Elliot Eisner includes Suzanne Langer, John Dewey, Lawrence Cremin, and Nelson Goodman; Ivor Goodson includes Pierre Bourdieu, Emile Durkheim, and C. Wright Mills; Maurice Holt identifies Alasdair MacIntyre, John Ralston Saul, and Stephen Toulmin; Laurel Tanner refers to Henry S. Commanger, James B. Conant, Lawrence Cremin, Merle Curti, and John Dewey.[14]

These are merely a few of the many examples that a book-length treatment should include, a task we pursued several years ago in another venture (see Schubert et al., 2002). The point is not to slight anyone not

included in the relatively small sample of individuals having been cited to provide illustrations of philosophical and historical sources of expansion and synopsis in the work of curriculum theorists. Clearly several citations could be listed for each and more; however, to do so would take more than the generous share of this issue of *Curriculum Inquiry* extended to me by the editors. Additionally, I realize this section is longer than those that follow because, in a large sense, it gave rise to each of them. In fact, it would not be unwarranted to claim that curriculum inquiry (curriculum studies) is a practical instantiation of history and philosophy of education. Though presented as separate and parallel topics, which they are, the categories of literature presented below are also partially subsets of historical and philosophical literatures. For instance, in literatures discussed in the next section, the question of summarization (making synoptic) of historical and philosophical expansion comes to a head. In fact, I should admit that in writing this article I am acting both synoptically and expansively. The categories I use depict expansion while their boundaries bespeak synopsis, and a worthy synopsis provides seeds for further expansion.

POLICY, PROFESSIONAL, AND POPULAR PEDAGOGICAL LITERATURES

While many kinds of public literature influence or actually are curriculum, I select three to discuss here that are more interrelated than one might expect at first glance: policy statements, professional development, and popular pedagogical stories.

In the United States, policy statements on curriculum have a long history that hearkens back at least to the renowned committee reports of at the end of the 19th century under the auspices of the National Education Association (NEA), when scholars (such as William T. Harris, Charles Eliot, Francis Parker, Charles DeGarmo, Frank McMurry, Charles McMurry, and John Dewey) played key roles in their formulation. Unlike many curricular policy statements of today, these reports grew out of heated debate within the (albeit nascent) curriculum field; their names are familiar to us: Committee of Ten (NEA, 1893), Committee of Fifteen (NEA, 1895), Committee on Economy of Time (National Council of Education, 1913), and the Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education's Cardinal Principles Report (NEA, 1918), as well as the 90-some reports of the NEA's Educational Policies Commission from 1938 through the late 1950s. Post-Sputnik curriculum reform, after 1957, initiated the end of extensive involvement of NEA and other professional and scholarly associations in developing curriculum policy for schools. The occurrence of Sputnik gave license to federal policy makers in the United States to do what they had long desired—shift control of U.S. education from decentralization to states and localities, as constitutionally provided,

to national levels by defining school matters as national defense problems rather than educational problems (R. W. Tyler, personal communication, October 12, 2009). Though I say more of corporate influence on curriculum in a later section, here I highlight the fact that the National Defense Education Act (1958) and associated government agencies and corporate foundations constituted a new era of federal policy making for education and curriculum that expands through its progeny: *A Nation at Risk* ((National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983); *America 2000* (U.S. Department of Education, 1991); and *No Child Left Behind* (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Although this is but an illustration, albeit drawn from curriculum policy in the United States, it shows a saga of moving scholars away from policy making that affects school curriculum in the United States, and puts decision making in the hands of federal government officials and corporate leaders. Thus, it raises questions about the extent to which similar shifts of authority exist in other nations throughout the world; thus, more critical and complex historical studies of curriculum policy are imperative.[15]

As policy decision makers in the United States shunned academic participation from the 1970s to present, policy moved into the hands of politicians and business leaders, while educational leaders and teachers were *given* professional development to comply with the policy mandates. As the NEA lost influence in the policy realm, a new organization was formed to provide education (call it *in-service education*, *staff development*, or *professional development*) for school leaders. The ASCD was created under the umbrella of NEA in 1943, as a merger of the Society of Curriculum Study and the Department of Supervision and Directors of Instruction. The paramount question facing ASCD was how to convey insights and understandings of curriculum scholars in meaningful ways to practitioners who had little time to embrace complex arguments. In essence, this was about being synoptic in a way that did not lose the complex expansive perspectives of the field. At first, ASCD "lobbied ceaselessly for *democratic* as opposed to *authoritarian* curriculum change" (Kliebard, 2004, p. 178). The orientation to democracy of the initial 2 decades of ASCD, however, must be seen as situated within a post–World War II back-to-basics conservatism that harbored a faith that condemned Deweyan progressivism for softness and insinuated that it squelched American military and economic prowess. The Progressive Education Association (PEA) had already faded away due to internal conflict between social reconstructionists and advocates of child study. Moreover, from President Dwight Eisenhower to educational critics such as Arthur Bestor, Admiral Hyman Rickover, and Rudolf Flesch, pressures emanated to prevent Deweyan participatory democracy in education and elsewhere. It became unpatriotic, even worthy of blacklisting, to claim that American institutions, especially schools, were not democratic. So, even if schools and other institutions looked autocratic, it had to be assumed that they were democratic.

By the early to mid-1960s, however, the prominent Civil Rights Movement and Peace Movement issued critiques of schooling that featured the irony of autocratic practices under the billboard of democracy. In a critical enclave within ASCD, emergent theorists, especially James B. Macdonald and his colleagues (e.g., Bernice Wolfson, Esther Zaret, Dwayne Huebner, Alex Molnar, Michael Apple) advocated such critique from the inside. Building upon radical elements in Dewey, the social reconstructionist heritage of Counts, Rugg, and Theodore Brameld, as well as critical theory and existentialist sources, these ASCD scholars explored new depths of meaning for schooling that purports to be democratic. By the 1970s, they moved outside an exclusively North American and Western European worldview to appreciate Ivan Illich's (1970) call for *Deschooling Society*; to wit, Macdonald et al. (1973) produced *Reschooling Society*, and 2 years later *Schools in Search of Meaning* (Macdonald & Zaret, 1975), wherein Paulo Freire's (1970) work on literacy with Brazilian peasants was used to frame meaning through a focus on an indigenous naming of the world through experiential perspectives of the oppressed rather than merely accepting *languages* of oppressors. This was followed by a book-length selection of prominent papers from a Milwaukee curriculum conference that continued the line of precursors to Bergamo (Molnar & Zahorik, 1977). All of these radical writings were published by ASCD, giving more widespread visibility to questions that Michael Apple (Huebner's former student and close colleague of Macdonald) asked more adamantly than anyone in the curriculum field at the time: Whose knowledge? Who benefits? Who is harmed by the ways policy and practice answer questions about what is worthwhile? This added a profoundly new twist to the lexicon of questions about what is worthwhile that guided curriculum inquiry.

Since the 1980s, however, ASCD has catered less to curriculum scholars and oriented their publications, *Educational Leadership* and a multitude of books to assist school leaders in meeting mandates in state and federal education policy pronouncements, rather than by informing them about critiques of such policies. The most popular ASCD authors had become largely translators of research and scholarship into models often used for professional development and other consulting with schools. While curriculum scholars played a significant role in ASCD prior to the 1980s, the Association made several successful efforts to increase membership, which vastly increased the percentage of principals and central office curriculum consultants, thus, diminishing the impact of curriculum professors. The ensuing lack of critical edge was likely brought by the need to sell consultancies to affluent school districts or those in impoverished areas that had benefited from federal funding. In any case, from the 1980s to present a new breed of curricularists emerged, represented by Madeline Hunter, Arthur Costa, Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Robert Marzano, Harvey Silver, Thomas Armstrong, and Grant Wiggins. These authors have had great appeal for school leaders and have gained greater entrée to schools in the United

States than those who are fully engaged in university work as curriculum scholars. Scholars such as David and Roger Johnson and Robert Slavin illustrate exceptions in that they are thoroughly involved in research and simultaneously do large-scale consulting with schools. Some wonder, however, if most of the author-consultants should be recognized as contributors to curriculum inquiry or if they are primarily profiteers. Others see them reaching school needs in ways that most academics cannot seem to provide. This state of affairs continues and constitutes a commentary more focused on what is prized in the highly competitive ethos in which schools are immersed than on the decision making of school leaders about what is worthwhile. Still, we should not avoid inquiry about the extent to which fundamental questions of worth are addressed through consultations that schools hire, or if the synoptic treatment of such issues is diluted too much. School leaders are shaped (almost forced) to crave systems that provide evidence requested by policy makers, evaluators, and a public taught to see education as a business with quarterly reports that take the form of test scores. Given this orientation in which they are situated, prominent writer-consultants may or may not be mainly entrepreneurs in league with the corporate world; however, they function with realization that their influence would be terminated if they rocked the boat of the ruling class. Thus, their only chance to influence is to do so within the constraints provided. In contrast, full-time scholars are too often discounted, simply ignored, or silenced from policy debates by receiving, from agents of the ruling class, the opportunity to say whatever they wish to each other—to be as critical of the established powers as they wish, as long as they publish in journals that few read, argue among themselves about ideas at obscure conferences and in abstruse publications—tacitly agreeing not to share such ideas with the general public or with educational policy makers. In contrast, if they wish to land consultancies with schools, they cannot advocate the need to fundamentally alter the dominant social, political, and economic system that has defined what schools are. Those who offer curricular perspectives that challenge or question the dominant competitive ethos are relegated to talk among themselves.

Teachers, too, are expected to play under such rules. Some teachers during the past 40 years, however, have not *bought* the role they are expected to play in the sorting machine (Spring, 1989). They have perceived its sham while advocating for young persons. Some of these teachers had not been trained by conventional state certified teacher education programs nor were they kept in line by accrediting agencies. Patterned somewhat after the outlook of A. S. Neill (1960), the radical British schoolmaster of Summerhill, teachers such as Sylvia Ashton-Warner (1963), John Holt (1964, 1981), Herb Kohl (1968, 1998), Jonathan Kozol (1967, 2005), George Dennison (1969), and more recently John Taylor Gatto (1992, 2001) have authored autobiographical memoirs of their teaching experiences—reinventing and augmenting progressive orienta-

tions, which scholars often labeled as *romantic* (e.g., Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972). Several of them have continued to write throughout their careers, criticizing educational policy and practice long after their teaching careers in the schools had concluded. Widely read by peer teachers and the general public, they were often given short shrift by curriculum scholars, perhaps because they did not couch their work in the literature of curriculum studies. Nevertheless their work has served as precedent for contemporary teachers and activist scholars who write about teacher experiences with a background in curriculum studies (e.g., Ayers, 1992/2001; Schubert & Ayers, 1992; Meier, 1995; Schultz, 2008; Michie, 1999/2009; He & Phillion, 2008), enabling their work to appeal to scholars in curriculum studies as well as to teachers.

A major question remains: Why is it that earlier scholar-practitioners such as Holt, Ashton-Warner, Kohl, Kozol, and Gatto have been given short shrift by full-time curriculum scholars in universities? Perhaps it is because their work was written as stories, almost as autobiographical novels, rather than as accepted scholarly discourse. If one looks deeply within such stories, central ideas of curriculum inquiry reside there, especially probing questions of worth and indictments of bureaucratic impediments that make it difficult for teachers to address them. Each story embodied within the teacher storyteller points toward yet another kind of synoptic event, though when many such stories are encountered, they seem unwieldy and unduly expansive. To summarize central threads of richly expressed stories of teaching unravels their fabric. Perhaps, this lack of nomothetic conclusiveness is another reason teacher stories have been taken less seriously by academics. By the early 1990s, however, story became more fully included in scholarly discourse (Carter, 1993), doubtless based on academic credibility given to story or narrative by Coles (1989), Connelly and Clandinin (1990), Goodson and Walker (1990), Witherell and Noddings (1991), Schubert and Ayers (1992), Goodson and Hargreaves (1996), and Egan (1997). Acceptance of narrative and story can be seen as a pathway into another dimension of curriculum inquiry: artistic literatures.

AESTHETIC AND ARTISTIC LITERATURES

After experiencing the power of the arts and literature to shape my life as a college student, and later realizing their power to help me imagine teaching in elementary school, I sought to learn more of the value of the arts in education during doctoral study. I was convinced that the arts inextricably connected my propensity to philosophize with my desire to imagine possibilities. Experience with the arts enabled me to perceive patterns and resonate with the flow of teaching experiences. I recall telling Harry Broudy of my interest in imaginative and speculative philosophy, saying that these were the tools I found most helpful as a teacher and thus

wanted to pursue more deeply as a Ph.D. student. Broudy ironically advised me, during the heyday of educational philosophers' intrigue with analytic philosophy or conceptual analysis, that if I wanted to study about language and grammar, I should study philosophy, but if wanted to learn of human nature and the aesthetics of educational endeavors, I should study languages, arts, and literature! Broudy's (1972/1994, 1979) notion of *enlightened cherishing* spurred my study of philosophy and the arts, helping me realize that such study was not merely nice, but necessary. Strangely, however, as much as the arts have been a major force in society, their acceptance in curriculum inquiry has been largely recent.

It was in pursuing the corpus of Maxine Greene's work and that of Elliot Eisner that I felt permission, though I knew I did not need it, to tap the arts for curricular understanding. Curriculum inquiry, however, during the past 3 decades, has brought the arts more fully to center stage. The early works of Greene and Eisner are formative and continuing influences on this emphasis in both similar and different ways. Greene (1965, 1973) arranged literary and artistic images to compose essay mosaics of philosophical and political interpretation (Greene, 1988), advocating imaginative construction of democratic public spaces (Greene, 1995). Eisner drew upon experience in several forms of visual art to suggest expressive alternatives to behavioral objectives (Eisner, 1969), to pattern educational evaluation and program design after connoisseurship and criticism in the arts (Eisner, 1985), and later (Eisner, 1991) to expand such evaluation into arts-based curriculum inquiry or educational research writ large (Barone & Eisner, 1997). An overall message of his work holds that aesthetic or artistic imagination shapes novel forms of cognition and curriculum (Eisner, 1994); thus, he has proposed schooling based upon aesthetic modes of knowing (Eisner, 1998). The far-reaching implications of work by Eisner and Greene have been interpreted by many they inspired; collections by Ayers and Miller (1997) and Pinar (1998) on Greene, and Urmacher and Matthews (2005) on Eisner.

Several of Eisner's well-established students have taken his ideas in new directions. Elizabeth Vallance (1991) has elaborated educational criticism as a form of inquiry, Robert Donmoyer (Donmoyer & Kos, 1993) has related artistic portrayal to at risk students, Gail McCutcheon (1995) has shown artistic perception as integral to teachers as curriculum developers, and Tom Barone (2000, 2001) explores realms of literary nonfiction for curricular insights. Barone and Eisner (1997) have continued to elaborate arts-based inquiry and an AERA SIG on the topic has been active for over a decade. Extensions of narrative inquiry, stemming from Connelly and Clandinin (1990), have drawn powerfully upon art, especially in work of Ming Fang He (2003) who portrays her experiences of living and learning *in-between* cultures through both *tales on canvas* and *tales in words* (pp. 152–156). Artistic portrayal, developed as *portraiture* by Sarah Lawrence-Lightfoot (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997), constitutes another related

approach to qualitative research, and is exemplified in *The Good High School* (Lightfoot, 1983).

The example of Maxine Greene in drawing upon literature for educational insight has been taken up by many curriculum scholars, such as Madeleine Grumet (1988) and Janet L. Miller (1990, 2005). In an effort to address the place of art and literature in educational inquiry, George Willis and I invited numerous curriculum scholars[16] to autobiographically portray influences of a work or genre of art on their perspective regarding curriculum and teaching (Willis & Schubert, 1991). The stories in this collection reveal that the arts (literature, music, dance, painting and sculpture, film) have expansive qualities that reach into nonschool curricular realms such as homes and communities (Lopez-Schubert, 1991). Stories are also synoptic in their capacity to capture situations; hence, they are a curriculum and their author or artist, composer or actor, director or performer is a curriculum developer. Yet, the synoptic possesses expansive attributes that enable those who experience art to envision new places and times, and to understand with new perspective of the Other. At the 2000 AERA annual meeting in New Orleans, for example, Gary Knowles and Ardra Cole initiated arts-based installations of curriculum ideas and events, enabling perspective on curriculum through diverse media (e.g., poetry, painting, music, story, drama, sculpture), illustrating the vast array of possibilities for understanding as contrasted with the dominant paper presentation form used at conferences. Knowles and Cole (2008) have continued to develop work that shows how the arts can be bases of inquiry in diverse ways,[17] showing that seeds planted in curriculum inquiry have grown into a salient dimension of qualitative research. Relative to curriculum, however, the arts have remained a key resource for life-history research.

Thus, what I have seen emerge in the past 4 decades, since I began teaching, has furthered my early intuitive inkling that experience with the arts invigorated the philosophical meanderings and imaginative wonderings at the depths of my teaching self. Today, I not only use the arts and literature in most of my courses, I encourage doctoral students to develop dissertations that explore novels, plays, poetry, musical, and artistic works as seldom tapped repositories of educational insight. Moreover, experiencing the arts enables me to engage more fully in the practical work of teaching and mentoring with greater *artistry*, as Louis Rubin (1984) applied the term to education. I hope that more educators will recognize the value of perceiving patterns in the flow of educational experience—a kind of aesthetic awareness that resonates with, identifies and fosters good practice. Philip Jackson (1998) writes of lessons about the profound influence the arts can have on individuals, derived from Dewey's image of art, and concomitant insights the arts offer educational practice. In a large sense the arts as a basis for curriculum inquiry is far from esoteric; it is practical. I now turn to *practical inquiry* called for by Joseph Schwab (1971), an orientation imbued with the *arts of eclectic*—a process that necessitates great aesthetic sensibility.

PRACTICAL AND NARRATIVE LITERATURES

The most germinal work in the curriculum field on practical inquiry was first published by Joseph Schwab (1969) under the title of "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum" in *School Review*, followed by a slightly revised and elaborated version published by the National Education Association (Schwab, 1970). NEA was a somewhat surprising and unlikely source, because it had been effectually removed from scholarly discourse and its policy-oriented advocacy since its Educational Policies Commission reports and post-Sputnik reform, as noted earlier. Schwab (1969, 1970) castigated highly generalized prescriptions as *theoretic* and advocated a paradigm shift to languages of the *practical* and *eclectic*. Schwab's use of *theoretic* and *practical* derived from a hybrid of Aristotle and Dewey, evolving from Schwab's earlier essays on liberal education, science, and education (see Westbury & Wilkof, 1978). For Schwab, *theoretic inquiry* had its formal cause or problem source in large-scale states of mind that agglomerated situations by subtracting nuance and situationally specific aspects; the material cause or subject matter of theoretic inquiry sought law-like generalizations in emulation of Newtonian laws of motion or gravitation, its method of inquiry or efficient cause is simplistic induction of alleged truths and hypothetical deduction upon them; and the end of theoretic inquiry or its final cause is knowledge qua knowledge. As an alternative to the theoretic, Schwab called for a new *language* or shift of paradigm (Kuhn, 1962/1970) from theoretic to practical inquiry. Contrasted with the theoretic, *practical inquiry* addresses problem sources as actual states of affairs, envisions a subject matter of inquiry that seeks situational insights, methods of inquiry that realize understandings derived from interaction with phenomena, and ends of inquiry that enhance decision and action that are ethically and politically responsible. Schwab addressed Aristotle's *productive* inquiry more indirectly, through a second paper on the practical that focused on the *arts of eclectic* (Schwab, 1971), noted earlier, wherein he elaborated the need for practical inquiry to (i) match theories to extant situations; (ii) adapt, tailor, combine, and modify theories to fit situational needs; and (iii) anticipate alternatives relative to dynamic situations through repertoires of understandings derived from experience and study by practical inquirers. Finally, Schwab (1973) elaborated the productive by depicting curricular commonplaces (teachers, learners, subject matter, milieu) that could be understood in ways that resemble Francis Bacon's tables of invention, matrices devised to understand dynamic interactions (perhaps similar to *transactions* as developed by Dewey [1916] and elaborated by Dewey and Bentley [1949]) among these commonplaces. Due to the idiosyncratic interplay of commonplaces, Schwab (1983) later concluded that each school or set of schools in a district needs to continuously monitor the dynamic balance among them and their consequences.

The work of Michael Connelly expanded Schwab's conceptions of practical inquiry into in-depth studies of teacher deliberation. From collaboration with Freema Elbaz (1983), one of his earlier doctoral students, Connelly wrote much about the *personal practical knowledge of teachers*. This was parlayed into work that related the place of teachers in curriculum planning with another former student, Jean Clandinin (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988), with whom Connelly maintained a lasting relationship during which time they expanded emphasis on personal practical knowledge to a more fluid image of *stories of experience* (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), wherein strategies of narrative inquiry were developed and portrayed (Clandinin, 2006), and expanded in ways summarized by Craig and Ross (2008). The situating of such expansive work in practical contexts also made it synoptic in character.

Two other dimensions of narrative interpretations of teachers' lives and works are currently being proffered. One is an application of Schwab's work in China by Connelly, Ian Westbury, Cheryl Craig, Shijing Xu, and Yuzhen Xu in Beijing. In taking the foregoing ideas to China, these scholars joined collaboration with Miriam Ben-Peretz (a Schwab student, now from the University of Haifa), and several distinguished Chinese scholars (Ding Gang and Ye Lan of East China Normal University, Chen Xiangming of Peking University, and John Lee of Chinese University of Hong Kong). The other dimension is a transformative culturally oriented strand of recent work by Connelly and advanced in a variety of ways by several of his former students: Carola Conle, Ming Fang He, JoAnn Phillion, Elaine Chan, Betty Eng, and Candice Schlein, among others. Phillion and He (Phillion, He, & Connelly, 2005) led Connelly to move teacher experience and narrative into a multicultural landscape, evolving from work by He (2003) that explored transcultural experience in ways that cultivate curricula of shared interests through encounters among diverse immigrant populations (He et al., 2008). She has continued to refine perspectives and possibilities of curricular experiences in exile (He, 2010, in press). These novel expansions of practical inquiry into a global perspective offer considerable potential for adaptation within a range of world cultures that engage insights of indigenous populations.

Emphasis on the practical is clearly an orientation that can be characterized as synoptic. Contrary to novice responses to his critique of the theoretic, Schwab clearly did not diminish the import of theory, which lies at the heart of both liberal education and serious synoptic work. In-depth awareness of an array of extant theories is necessary for engagement in the arts of eclectic. One who does not know theories cannot match or tailor them to situations, and one who is not immersed in theoretical work cannot readily engage in the *anticipatory generation of alternatives* (Schwab, 1969). Thus, practical inquiry is synoptic in the sense of bringing the relevant dimensions of macrocosmic array of theories to bear eclectically on any given microcosmic curricular situation. But what is a *curricular situation*?

Schwab's (1983) advocacy of something meaningful for curriculum professors to do might lead one to conclude that schools are the only venue for curriculum inquiry and deliberation or that the school level is the basic unit for deliberation. Both of these positions are worth challenging. Schwab's (1973, pp. 366–367) own emphasis on the expansiveness of milieu counters the position that school is the only or even primary educational setting. After discussing manifold complexities of in-classroom milieus relative to friendships, relationships, cliques, other subgroups, and relations among students, teachers, and educational leaders, and how all of the above affect and effect what is taught and learned in school, Schwab launches into less charted territory about origins and consequences of such relationships in the larger social milieus within which schools exist, saying:

> Relevant milieus will also include the family, the community, the particular groupings of religious, class, or ethnic genus. (p. 367)

After discussing the need to understand aspects of parental lifestyles, their ethical standards, roles, and character, he moved milieu farther into the community, adding:

> These milieus suggest others. What are the relations of this community to other communities of the same religious, ethnic, or class genus? What similarities or differences of rite or habit characterize them? What are the relations of the entire religious, ethnic, or class genus to the other genera which constitute the town or city and are represented in miniature by the children of each genus as they interact with children of other genera in the playground and public school? What are the conditions, dominant preoccupations, and cultural climate of the whole polity and its social classes, insofar as these may affect the careers, the polity and its social classes, insofar as these may affect the careers, the probable fate, and ego identity of the children whom we want to teach? A dominant anti-intellectualism, a focus on material acquisition, a high value on conformity to a nationwide pattern and on the cloaking of cultural-religious differences are possible influences. (p. 367)

It seems clear, then, that continued development of Schwab in the United States and Canada, relates to two kinds of expansion. One is a call for curriculum inquiry in sites outside of school (Schubert, 1981), which does not negate asking if the school level is the basic level for deliberation about the balance of the commonplaces. Instead, it sees school as one among many venues for practical curriculum inquiry, for example, homes, families, television, music, sports, movies, videogames, nonschool organizations, peer groups or gangs, communities and their cultures. The other kind of expansion focuses more specifically than the level of school systems or even individual schools; it suggests that meaningful curriculum deliberation exists within classrooms, particularly in dynamic relationships among teachers and learners even more than in conceptualized and articulated deliberations among professionals. Precedent for this resides in the

history of progressive educational practices and in that of integrated or core curricula that build upon progressive practices. This expanded deliberation explores curriculum matters in lived experience of teachers and learners as they reflect together on what to do, why, and how to do it. The spirit and example of such work is amply available (see Alberty, 1947, 1953; Pratt, 1948; Apple & Beane, 2006; Beane, 1993, 1997, 2005; Dewey, 1902a, 1916; Hopkins, 1937, 1954; Schubert, 1982, 1989; Schubert & Schubert, 1981; Schubert & Schubert, 1982; Schultz, 2008). Its organizing center (Herrick, 1956) is practical deliberation in everyday relationships about the continuous reconstruction of teachers' and students' lives and the balancing of milieus in which they are embedded. It is captured by progressive educator, Caroline Pratt (1948) in the title of a book charting her experience as a teacher: *I Learn From Children.* This emphasis supports increased study of the lived experience of students and gives credence to their views about the worth of such experience ((Erickson & Schultz, 1992; Nicholls & Hazzard, 1993; Pollard, Thiessen, & Filer, 1996; Thiessen & Cook-Sather, 2007; Erickson et al., 2008).

As I transition to additional literatures, I realize that a substantial portion of this article is devoted to implications of the practical in curriculum inquiry. This is not only because practical inquiry has been a major emphasis of articles in *Curriculum Inquiry* over the years; it is primarily due to the significant influence of the practical in curriculum thought since 1969. Practical inquiry has had considerably more than idiosyncratic influence, and as Jackson (1992a) shows, Schwab's language of the practical had pervasive implications, ones I see as variations on a Deweyan vision of synoptic texts that have helped give birth to other categories of curriculum literature that have evolved during the tenure of *Curriculum Inquiry.* The briefer discussion of other categories of literature throughout the remainder of this article does not diminish their significance; the presentation of each should be seen as already partially discussed in this section and the preceding ones, because of their derivation from concerns advanced early by Dewey and those he influenced, such as those who called for new curricular languages. The work of Schwab helped me understand how and why I resonated so well with Dewey's philosophy as a teacher. In all of my teaching, Dewey has been a centerpiece in my eclectic strivings to bring a range of philosophy, art, science, and literature to bear on understanding curriculum in the lives of students with whom I have worked. This enabled me to learn from them as much as they learned from me. In mysterious ways, the expansiveness of the literatures I found edifying has been recalibrated synoptically in relating with my students. Throughout my career, I have tried to express the need to eclectically fashion elements from a wide array of literatures to bear on the practice of education in any given situation (Schubert, 1980). Thus, I surmise that I have continuously strived to synoptically bring to consciousness the literatures I had embodied.

CRITICAL LITERATURES

Upon my arrival as a beginning assistant professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1975, I was met with rapid immersion in highly segregated, economically impoverished urban communities. Often my undergraduate and graduate students knew more of the realities than I did, because many had grown up in them. In this context, the emergent critical literatures of the day took on increased relevance for me. When Paulo Freire, Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, or others raised questions about the kind and quality of ways schools reproduce knowledge—questions of whose knowledge and who benefits —I could see those I cared about who did not benefit. Such questions expanded my gaze to political, historical, and ideological roots of school and other educational experience. I could see curriculum as problematic, oppressive, and detrimental, and was struck by the fact that curriculum was not merely what curriculum scholars, policy makers, or educational leaders thought up and bestowed upon students. It was a societal and cultural construction that privileged some and hurt far too many.

Prior to the expansion of curriculum inquiry from the late 1960s to present, matters of context and history were seen too often as mere influences on curriculum development—forces to be alerted to, known about, and overcome in order to pursue purposes and objectives that could be established independently of such influences. Such was evident in many synoptic texts, which contained short introductory sections on social influences on curriculum, presenting them in a way that made me think they were obstacles that could be sidestepped if curriculum developers were watchful as they pursued their goals. My urban experiences taught me differently and spurred me to look anew at the evolution of critical literatures and the work of John Dewey, W. E. B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, George S. Counts, Harold O. Rugg, and more recently Maxine Greene, James B. Macdonald, and Dwayne Huebner. They raised the possibility that statements of purpose (and anything connected with them) are themselves functions of the historical and contextual context, as did Joel Spring (1972) who pioneered insight into the power of context and the force of history, emphasizing the linkage of national and corporate forces with education.

If we return to Schwab's critique of theoretic inquiry, though not ostensibly based in critical theory, it is possible to cast an interpretation that the federal initiative to usurp U.S. curricular policy desecrated involvement of both curriculum scholars and the public as participants in democratic political and educational processes. Has not this initiative continued as corporate and federal collaboration took control by establishing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, under the National Defense Education Act? How can large-scale policy making from afar do other than inappropriately generalize, negating situational needs and interests? Should such efforts be seen as expansions of curriculum inquiry

into public spheres or as a synoptic move that summarizes complex curriculum discourse into overgeneralized political and economic parlance and mandates that ensue from it? In any case, from the mid-1960s to present, if U.S. curriculum researchers wanted to acquire funding for their efforts, they needed to comply with federally defined purposes embedded in calls for research proposals from such arms of governmental and corporate functioning as the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health, and many more. It is valuable to see this state of affairs in the context of the public relations movement surrounding and following World War I, when Edward Bernays (1928) showed the corporate world how to devise *charitable* foundations to parade their generosity, taking public and professional minds off seldom-restrained pursuits of greed. Government and corporate funding priorities effectually defined research, service, and teaching agendas for any who secured their funding. Such a movement implicitly bespeaks theoretic inquiry, and *No Child Left Behind* (*NCLB*; U.S. Department of Education, 2002) has taken a similar stand directly by defining research as discovery of only large-scale, highly generalized data, which must omit that which does not generalize across situations. Following the same path, governmental think tanks, seldom involving curriculum scholars, established curricula via control of funding and creation of a *manufactured crisis* (Berliner & Biddle, 1995) in an ever-escalating barrage of *bullshit* [as characterized in Harry G. Frankfurt's (2005) *On Bullshit*] contained in reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), *America 2000* (U.S. Department of Education, 1991), and *NCLB*, all based on the unquestioned assumption that the central reason for schooling or educational reform is national competitiveness! Thus, they inadvertently or intentionally shun such purposes as enlightenment, insight, understanding, wisdom, cultivation of curiosity, imagination, dedication, wonder, or making oneself into a better person and helping the world become a better, more peaceful place for human beings and other living things. Reiterating, much policy holds that the highest purpose of education is enhanced national competitiveness.

Drawing from critical theory, the philosophical and social thought of Jürgen Habermas, Antonio Gramsci, curriculum theorist Michael F. D. Young, and educational ethnographer Paul Willis, Michael Apple's (1979, 1982) work was original, among U.S. curriculum theorists beginning in the mid-1970s in its focus on the profound connections between curriculum and ideology. At about the same time, and drawing on similar sources as well as those seen as roots of cultural studies, Henry Giroux (1981) developed a new sociology that derived from the Frankfurt School and the praxis of Paulo Freire (1970), among others. The intervening years have incorporated many lines of critical thought to offer a robust critique of interactions of class (Anyon, 1980, 1997), race (Watkins, 2001), gender (Lather, 2007), ethnicity (Spring, 2010, in press), culture (He, 2003), language

(Nieto, 2000), place (Callejo-Perez, Fain, & Slater, 2004), and sexual orientation (Sears, 2005). Only one example of many possible authors for each of these topics is listed, and the topics symbolize others that are emerging as sources of critical analysis vis-à-vis such matters as ability/disability, health, age, appearance, sexual orientation, membership, poverty, and religion or belief. Like the personal interpretation of Schwab, with which we concluded the practical section, a question clamors for response: How can critical awareness become embedded in human relationships with students as principal players? Today's critical curriculum inquiry often focuses on global injustices and will be addressed in a later section, which I take up again after focusing on literatures that expand critical perspectives toward global, indigenous, and other diverse perspectives. In concluding this section I recall how Shirley Grundy (1987) discussed the contestation between curriculum as product and praxis in situations of lived experience, while John Nicholls (1989) focused on the incommensurability between the competitive ethos and democratic education. All of this raises key questions about relationships between the local (especially interpreted as within the learner) and the global. Thus, it is important to turn to literatures that strive to hold both inner and contextual dimensions of human experience in provocative and heuristic *tensionality* (Aoki, 1991).

INNER AND CONTEXTUAL LITERATURES

As a teacher and then as a professor, I became preoccupied less with the stuff of how to make or develop curriculum as an external influence on students and more with how to influence the seamless process of helping them develop as persons. For me, this harkened back to Deweyan progressivism, especially Dewey's (1920/1948) emphasis on the continuous reconstruction of individual and society as reciprocal sides of educational experience (Dewey, 1938), as well as Alberty (1953) on highest levels of core curriculum and Hopkins (1954) on the emerging self. As a professor, especially, I moved from wanting doctoral students to amass in a semester background in our field that took me 20 years to grasp. I even tried to cajole students using power tests, creative games, conference simulations, writing letters to professors, and finally decided that all I needed to do was periodically ask each student to express how curriculum literature spoke to their emerging selves within unique contexts of their educational experience and to relate how that emergence redounds into their sense of possibilities for subsequent experiences that they anticipate—what I have called one's *curriculum curriculum*[18] or journey of understanding curriculum studies (Schubert, 2003). This relates to Dewey's (1916, p. 76) earlier quoted characterization of education as reconstruction of experience, adding to meaning, and influence on subsequent experience. It also

reflects Schwab's (1969, 1971, 1973) parlaying of ideas, research, and theories to meet needs of situations while pursuing anticipatory generation of alternatives, all in the interest of continuously monitoring interactions among the commonplaces of teachers, learners, subject matters, and milieus.

My initial involvement in scholarly curriculum conferences quickly taught me that peers shared my concern that curriculum was about addressing who we are and might become—not merely about the acquisition of detached knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Thus, I resonated with emergent strands of curriculum literature that addressed inner lives of teachers and learners as well as the contexts that situate them. This expansive strand was synoptically encapsulated when William Pinar (1975) perceptively brought together several curriculum theorists (e.g., Huebner, Greene, Macdonald, Apple, Kliebard, Cremin, George Willis, Ross Mooney), who abided by different drummers, calling them *reconceptualists.* Pinar was careful not to claim that this diverse array of scholars held the same ideology or philosophical perspective. Nevertheless, I assert that many of those known as *reconceptualists* did have at least one common interest within their diversity. Pinar (1975) introduced it as *currere* and with Madeleine Grumet (Pinar & Grumet, 1976) elaborated vis-à-vis their own emergent understandings. *Currere,* the active form of curriculum, could be understood as the gerund *theorizing* rather than the noun *theory. Currere* refers to individuals or groups reconceptualizing their lives and worlds through *progressive-regressive-analytic-synthetic* processes that enhance present living by reflecting on the past—choosing what of it to honor and develop and what to discard in the process of anticipating and forging possibilities. Such theorizing drew upon a greater diversity of sources than did curriculum theory, policy making, and practices of those Pinar (1975) called *traditionalists* and *conceptual empiricists.* Traditionalists catered to service for schools and their bastions of support in state or private authorities, and conceptual empiricists strove for credibility through positivistic research patterned after outmoded notions of natural and social sciences and calls for research proposals by governmental and private funders.

Basic attributes of reconceptualized curriculum theorizing were summarized by Paul Klohr (1980), student of Alberty and mentor of Pinar, as follows: organic view of nature; experiential basis of method; preconscious experience; new sources of literature (e.g., existentialism, phenomenology, radical psychoanalysis, critical theory, Eastern thought, literature, arts, literary criticism, subaltern perspectives); liberty and higher levels of consciousness; means and ends that include diversity and pluralism, political and social reconceptualization; and new language forms (e.g., practical, ethical, political, aesthetic). Sometimes criticized by proponents of critical theory for focusing more on the internal than on political or ideological critique, reconceptualist theorizing sought balance between the political and personal (Pinar, 2004). This, as I have conceived it, must be addressed

through democratic participation in what Maxine Greene refers to as *public spaces* (Greene, 1988). It must also explore the psychoanalytic depths (Britzman, 1998, 2006) that can yield personal meaning and self-understanding.

Expansions of curriculum inquiry into the breadth and depth of composing lives (Bateson, 1989) have synoptic implications, illustrating again the complex interaction between expansion and synopsis. In such pursuits the synoptic can be seen as a deeply human process of bringing resources of humanity to bear on a continuously evolving understanding of one's place in the world. Thus, being *synoptic* is not merely a bringing together of extant literatures. Rather, the term indicates myriad and diverse life processes of those in search of meaning and purpose. It pertains to the ways in which accumulated ideas, practices, cultural orientations, personal experience, and contradictions are embodied within persons as they engage with the world—what I like to call an evolving *theory within persons* (Schubert & Lopez-Schubert, 1980, pp. 347–348; Schubert et al., 2002, p. 500).

The broader notion of synoptic was captured in a novel way, not in ways used before in synoptic texts, but in an historically situated rendition of numerous discourses that focus on the titular process captured in *Understanding Curriculum* (Pinar et al., 1995): history, politics, gender, race, phenomenology, aesthetics, poststructuralism and postmodernism, theology, and international perspectives, as well as institutional discourses around curriculum development, teachers, and students. With this textual diversity, curriculum inquiry became more distanced from preoccupation with development of prescriptions for schooling and became positioned to study *currere* in the lives of teachers and students in and out of school—thus, embracing though not equating with cultural studies. Texts by Janet L. Miller (1990, 2005), Madeleine Grumet (1988), Susan Edgerton (1996), Patti Lather (2007), and William Pinar (2001, 2006, 2007) are illustrative of the synoptic act of bringing together curriculum, cultural studies, and other diverse texts or discourses to understand the lived experience of *currere*. Other scholars tap these and more lenses to explore the inner lives and contexts: William Stanley (1992), William Doll (1993), Doll and Gough (2002), and Patrick Slattery (2006) offer varied postmodern perspectives; Deborah Britzman (2006) illuminates radical psychoanalytic perspectives; Mary Aswell Doll (2000) and Nelson Haggerson (2000) provide mythopoetic awareness; and Marla Morris and John Weaver (2002) explore memory in a (post-) Holocaust era. The work of Henderson and Kesson (2004) on curriculum wisdom interprets many of the foregoing reconceptualist issues and concerns as germane to the development of arts of practical wisdom that can enhance the contributions of school leaders.

Curiously, some curriculum scholars critiqued the influx of the above discourses, claiming that the reconceptualized field was too intellectualized and did not speak to everyday, practical matters of curriculum development and design. Others countered, seeming to want a return to the past that smacked more of *strategery* (a term comic Will Farrell used to satirize George

W. Bush on *Saturday Night Live*) than sensible curriculum development and design, crafting without comprehending its disembodied and decontextualized relation to lived experience. In short, the accusation came down to ivory tower research and theory that fit the sportscaster use of the term *academic*, as in the phrase, *this game is academic*, meaning that the outcome is already decided and of no more consequence. So when Craig Kridel (1999) analyzed 20 years of presentations at the Bergamo conferences, some expected the categories to reveal inconsequential, navel- gazing topics. Astonishing to many, however, his inquiry determined that the largest category of presentation topics was teacher education. Some could not understand how this was the case. The explanation lay in a reconceptualized image of teacher education, not one usually practiced as predetermined objectives, implemented as imposed curriculum design. Instead, teacher education at these conferences was based on a vastly different form of curriculum design, one that addressed the *currere* of the teacher educators, the evolving theory within them. If teacher educator experience at such conferences helped them reconceptualize their perspectives and commitments, it was assumed that they might do the same with the teachers who were their students, and that they, in turn, would address living theory within their students in or outside schools—envisioning assumptions that guide their living. This form of teacher education, like the progressive core or integrated curriculum, is substantially different from that of most teacher education programs that emphasize product-oriented objectives, standards, and mandates of accrediting agencies. In fact, it is so far removed from the dominant image of education that I want to express it in the words of John Dewey (1933) after he claimed to have visited a Utopian society that had discarded preordained curricula and objectives:

> The most Utopian thing in Utopia is that there are not schools at all. Education is carried on without anything of the nature of schools, or if this idea is so extreme that we cannot conceive of it as educational at all, then we might say nothing of the sort at present we know as schools. (p. 7)

Dewey goes on to explain that such education is only possible if the greatest impediment is abolished, namely, the *acquisitive society*. During the past 2 years I have developed a book that I see as a meditative riff on Dewey's Utopians (Schubert, 2009a), an exploration of love, justice, and education in hope that such human attributes might overcome the rampant acquisitiveness threatening life on Earth. I return to this briefly in the conclusion. For now, I simply want to emphasize that curriculum conferences that challenged my sense of perspective, paradigm, and possibility over the years (AERA, Professors of Curriculum, Bergamo, Curriculum and Pedagogy, AAACS, AATC, AESA[19]), have been a prime source of my professional development (teacher education) as a professor.

Educators and curriculum theorists of many persuasions have educated me for over 30 years. For example, they have provided diverse insights into

lived pursuits of personal meaning and public commitment (J. P. Miller, 1988; Ayers, 2004a; Freire, 2007) inspiring active cultivation of the inner and contextual. From a phenomenological and hermeneutic perspective, Max van Manen (1986, 1990, 1991) has helped me look deeply into the internal life-worlds of meaning and pedagogical relationship, their *tone* and *tact* in lived experience. Influenced by Dutch phenomenological pedagogue M. Langeveld, curriculum theorist Ted Aoki (2005), and philosopher Martin Heidegger, among others, van Manen's germinal contributions have kinship with work of many scholars, such as Valerie Prokalow, Terrence Carson, David Smith, Stephen Smith, and David Jardine, as well as those who contributed to the aforementioned journal that van Manen founded: *Phenomenology and Pedagogy* (1980–1990).

Numerous scholars mentioned throughout this section provide an emphasis that might be characterized as personal history or philosophy. I see each person's history and evolving philosophy as a synoptic text—living, expanding, and evolving. This encourages me to urge continued expansion of literatures in efforts to give the synoptic greater purview—making it more inclusive. In this light it seems imperative to diminish boundaries, mend rifts, and strive to overcome divisions that impede collaboration.

INDIGENOUS AND GLOBALIZATION LITERATURES

My experience with education in the urban area of Chicago helped me be more aware of a diverse array of cultures in the United States, and this experience has naturally led me to seek understanding of origins of diverse cultures in Eastern and Western Europe, Africa, Latin America, Asia, and Oceania. Meeting educators, students, and activists in the United States and from many parts of the world has led me to become more conscious of the value of indigenous knowledge and the destructive force of globalization on such knowledge. This, in turn, has prompted me to question fervently stated curricular statements that advocate knowledge acquisition of alleged worth, so I continue to ask: Worthwhile for whom? Whose knowledge? Who benefits and who is harmed? Following the 9–11 devastation of the World Trade buildings and many inhabitants in New York City, I worked with a loosely knit group of graduate students, faculty, activists, and independent scholars in Chicago to address curricular issues connected with globalization, war, terrorism, colonization, oppression, and peace.[20] This, in turn, increased my consciousness about and desire to help overcome massive and tragic inequities all over the world throughout history—at least in whatever small way I could. Such work led me to seek perspectives that were non-Western, non-White, transnational, cross-cultural, transcultural, or worldly—a search to find hope and possibility for humanity. Interests derived from the midst of my experience continue to compel me to bring together literatures that speak to the larger scope of my personal concerns as an educator.

The literatures I have encountered are partially an expansion of several of the other literatures already discussed—especially the critical and the inner and contextual. Both of these categories emphasize the need to be inclusive and they critique problems of exclusivity. Even if not done intentionally, exclusion is obvious in the dominant curriculum field that has been disproportionally White, male, Western European, and American. Whether this phenomenon has been derived from conscious design or whether it is a function of emergence in a slanted society, critical and contextual curriculum scholarship have clearly revealed this bias in the literature. This new configuration of literature, however, is more than an extension of the critical and the contextual. Work being done on many fronts is of such significance that it represents a new force that has come into its own and now resides at the center of the curriculum field.

Indigenous and global concerns are significant parts of an even broader range of considerations that need to be addressed in this literature which has become a consideration among curriculum scholars throughout the past 2 decades (see Banks & McGee Banks, 2004; J. L. Miller, 2005; Connelly et al., 2008; Gaztambide-Fernández & Thiessen, 2009; Malewski, 2010; and Sandlin et al., 2010, in press). The range of contemporary topics is immense and can only be sampled here, making my use of *indigenous* and *global* proxies for a wide range of emphases that could make the title of this section much longer than makes sense for a title.[21] For example, indigenous knowledge seldom has been accorded credibility in the face of colonization, a force which can hardly be relegated to the distant past only. In fact literature on globalization and my personal conversations with my former doctoral student William Watkins help solidify my supposition that globalization is a new form of colonization. In fact, I have called it the BIG Curriculum—a powerful propagandizing force that infuses and transcends school curriculum (Schubert, 2006) with a manifest destiny that bespeaks colonization. As I reflect on such matters, I see the term *postcolonial* as essentially deceptive, because one form of historical colonization almost invariably flows into another; thus, the term *neocolonial* may be much more accurate than *postcolonial*, and *decolonization* also may be a similar misnomer, making *recolonization* a preferable term. A focus on indigenous knowledge and problems of colonization leads to the inclusion of diverse perspectives on culture, raising key questions. Should the term *international* be used, or does it privilege nation-states, thus, national competitiveness that has driven education in many nations, especially the United States, since the 1980s? Is curriculum inquiry enhanced when the term *culture* is invoked rather than *nation*, since it can be argued that indigenous cultures often are not represented in the language of nationality (Prakash & Esteva, 1998; Esteva & Prakash, 1997)? Can the perceptive idea of *worldliness* (J. L. Miller, 2005; Pinar, 2009) help transcend difficulties of both national and cultural languages in curriculum studies? Such questions cannot be answered here; however, they open inquiry to a breadth and depth of

theorizing that curriculum studies did not address until recently. The impact of globalization and its degradation of indigenous cultures necessitate the inclusion of ecological inquiry, for there is much insight about relationships with the earth embedded in indigenous knowledge, which is disregarded by the empire building of globalization. Eco-feminism is a major source for understanding such issues, as is the issue of *abundance* in curriculum (Jardine, Friessen, & Clifford, 2006). The point here is that there exists a realm of curriculum literature that is moving ahead with great force. I am striving to learn about its several lines of inquiry and want to acknowledge it, knowing full well that I can only sketch its purport here. I assert, too, that boundaries among mentioned literatures are blurred, and that commenting on several illustrative strains of inquiry below is not intended to convey separate realms. Much in them is of one piece—hopefully of one peace.

This complex area of study sets prominently at the center of curriculum discourse today, and speaks directly to the abolition of curricular insulation. It seeks to involve in curriculum inquiry many who have been intentionally or unintentionally shut out of salient discussions about what is worthwhile vis-à-vis education. Interactions, over the years and especially today, with those who have been *othered*, left outside—within the United States (Native Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Asian Americans, and others), as well as those from diverse cultures or nations of the world—have convinced me that far too many groups go unrecognized for insights that are necessary to acknowledge. The deculturalization and concomitant inequity exposed in the histories of these groups in the United States by Joel Spring (2010, in press) is emblematic of worldwide acts of deculturalization. All human beings doubtless wonder about such matters as what is worth needing, knowing, doing, experiencing, being, becoming, overcoming, and sharing, while the field of curriculum studies has been unquestionably White, British-Eurocentric, male, and imbued with practices that are largely corporate. Given this, the desire found in the field today to broaden cultural, linguistic, political, ethical, metaphysical, axiological, and epistemological perspectives is indeed heartening—flowing with possibility. The following are illustrative, though surely nowhere near comprehensive.

Living with indigenous peoples, as portrayed in the work of Madhu Prakash and Gustavo Esteva (Prakash & Esteva, 1998; Esteva & Prakash, 1997) has revealed their incredible capacities to deal with dilemmas and problems—ways we with Western orientations can only begin to understand as grassroots *pragmatist* or *postmodernist*. Nevertheless, such functioning is too often dismissed pejoratively as *primitive*; thus, non-Western perspectives are rapidly disappearing as languages and cultures are diminished by today's versions of colonization, enslavement, religious fervor, and imperialism at rates not unlike that of the disappearance and extinction of species of plants and animals.

Reflection on colonization (post- or neo- or de- or re-) raises the dread of existentialism, and worse. The work of Linda Tuhiwai-Smith (2001) illustrates ways in which colonized mind-sets and practices infiltrate or even create research methodologies that purport to be free of bias. Most nations, if not every nation, and nationalism itself, are built upon a compost heaps of conquest, genocide, and oppression of those deemed lesser beings. Examples critiquing the North American and Eurocentric scene include Molefi Asante's (1991) treatises on how contributions of those from African cultures were made invisible, Ronald Takaki's (1993) historical renditions and cultural perspectives on race and ethnicity from diverse conclaves of America, Sandy Grande's (2004) portrayal of Native American social and political thought, and an exploration of the impact of White supremacy by Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn (2009). Colonization is not only being studied as a mere historical artifact, it is treated as a function of today's nationalism conjoined with corporatism as the neocolonial power that sucks diversity into homogeneity through a more devastating curriculum than even perpetuated by the Roman Empire.

The focus on the ecological by Wendell Berry (2009), other naturalists, and by Flo Krall (1994) and C. A. Bowers (1992, 2001, 2006) in curriculum circles portends the devastation of realms (commercialized by barons of greed) that should remain as *commons*—water, air, lands, ideas, imaginings—available to and shared by all. Such an ecological perspective, and advocacy of the commons, sees all species as sharing in planetary well-being, and speaks against privileging humans above other species.[22]

Exploration of indigenous feminist perspectives, often derived from cultures labeled *third world*, reveals grassroots work that draws vital connections between daily life and collective action, pedagogy and theory, to challenge patriarchal histories by integrating literatures and experiences of migration, displacement, spirituality, slavery, sexism, classism, racism, imperialism, colonization, ageism, ableism, speciesism, and other bases of oppression, repression, and suppression (e.g., Narayan, 1997; Mohanty, 2003/2005). Nina Asher (2007) has brought postcolonial and third world feminist perspectives to bear on multicultural curriculum matters.

Narrative interpretations of transcultural experiences move beyond transnational or international, both of which maintain the residue of national supremacy. *Transcultural* implies a kind of bridge between cultures for those who have voluntarily or involuntarily found themselves in a state of exile, as Ming Fang He (2010, in press) illustrates through narratives of revisioning and cultivating an orientation that embraces, criticizes, and transcends cultures in China, Canada, and the United States. Drawing upon my (Schubert, 1986) framework of curriculum perspective, paradigm, and possibility in the United States, John Chi-kin Lee (Lee & Wong, 1996; Lee, 2002) adapts and develops a line of inquiry in curriculum, teaching, and school reform in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Mainland China. David Hansen (2007) has also made a valiant effort to pull together ethical

visions of education, offering significant curriculum implications, from philosophers, theologians, and activists from around the world. Ethical visions are clearly involved in considerations of worth, a common concern of curriculum inquiry.

The focus on globalization has two very different interpretations. The first pertains to the assertion that the world is a smaller place, due to increased communication and transportation, and would be better off if it simply cooperated more fully. This *cooperation*, however, is couched within neoconservative and neoliberal promotion of a new kind of patriotism that exalts empire, which the second interpretation of globalization decries as cultural imperialism. This second emphasis is what I have called the BIG curriculum of imperialism and argue that it needs to be exposed, critiqued, and overcome, because it fosters expansion of a homogeneous world culture (Schubert, 2006) of Westernized clothing, fast food, homogeneous mass media experience, such as sports, music, and unlimited products for perpetual consumption. This is increasingly criticized by diverse public pedagogies as chronicled by Henry Giroux (2000, 2004), Peter McLaren (McLaren & Faramandpur, 2004), Pauline Lipman (2004), Alex Molnar (2005), and Joe Kincheloe (Kincheloe, Steinberg, & Gresson, 1997; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2004), and much more, which appears in a handbook on public pedagogy by Sandlin, Schultz, and Burdick (2010, in press). The substantial scene of anti-imperial work, a worldwide political phenomenon, is deeply curricular (though not usually counted as curriculum literature) and includes writings that speak to expansive publics by such authors as Noam Chomsky (2003, 2005), Howard Zinn (Zinn, 2002; Zinn, Konopacki, & Buhle, 2008), and Rashid Khalidi (2004). Within the field of curriculum inquiry those who address educational or curricular ramifications of anti-imperial work include John Willinsky (1998), who advocates the need to critique how the world is divided by empire and Nel Noddings (2006) who parlays her work on caring (Noddings, 1992) into critical lessons that students should address in the face of a society filled with injustice. Working with Donaldo Macedo, Chomsky (2000) and Zinn and Macedo (2004) have also addressed educational implications of empire and globalization. The kind of curriculum inquiry that emerges is very close to the ground—opening teachers, students, families, and communities to worlds less traveled.

I recognize this section to be incomplete, and admit that this is due to my lack of knowledge about indigenous knowledges around the world. In this lack, I think I symbolize too much of the curriculum field, and am heartened that inquiry is advancing in many diverse ways to understand indigenous knowledges, skills, and values, and to expose the effects of globalization and neocolonization upon them. Such work, of course, raises questions about how we might think about questions of worth, and even whether (ironically) questions of worth themselves are worthwhile as a basis for curriculum inquiry. It may even be that indigenous knowledges offer

alternatives to worth as the common element in curriculum inquiry. Clearly, we must foreground more fully questions about whose knowledge and experience is privileged and whose is diminished or squandered. The expansion of curricular perspectives that can be considered in this effort is astounding. To what extent is it even possible to grasp, express, and convey them synoptically? It is obvious that such questioning provides incredibly complex work for the curriculum field and is indicative of its vitality for the years ahead.

How, then, can we move toward summarization or conclusion? In revisiting the central features of expansion and synopsis—striving to be mindful of matters of worth, who benefits, and obstacles to addressing these pillars of curriculum inquiry—I conclude by reconsidering compendia or reference works on curricular matters, next turning heuristic synopses that foster expansion, then reflecting on the potential of focusing on diverse venues of curriculum experience, and finally pointing toward next landscapes of curricular exploration.

THE EXPANSIVE AND SYNOPTIC REVISITED AND RECONSIDERED

The central purpose of this article is to both overtly and tacitly address the expansive and synoptic character of curriculum inquiry. To do so I progressed from questions of worth as an organizing center, to interpretation of an historical backdrop for addressing such questions, including the emergence of diverse languages for understanding curriculum matters, partially situating this portrayal in my lived experience with curriculum inquiry. The main body of the article has discussed expansive and synoptic dimensions of several categories of curriculum literature: historical and philosophical; policy, professional, and popular pedagogical; aesthetic and artistic; practical and narrative; critical; inner and contextual; and indigenous and globalization. The matter of synopsis and expansion in curriculum inquiry involves a complex relationship. Thus, I conclude by addressing three kinds of response to this relationship: (1) reference works or compendia, (2) heuristic approaches, and (3) curriculum venues. All three have roots in Deweyan philosophical perspectives. Finally, I share my emergent perspective on the relationship between expansive and synoptic work in curriculum inquiry.

Compendia

Clearly, relationships between expansion and synopsis in curriculum inquiry have been addressed by reference works or compendia that have been created to convey the state of the field to other scholars and a range

of other publics. The curriculum handbooks of Rubin (1977a, 1977b), Jackson (1992a), Connelly et al. (2008), including the special issue of *Curriculum Inquiry* (Gaztambide-Fernández & Thiessen, 2009) that provides thoughtful responses to Connelly et al. (2008), represent for scholars a synoptic quality that hovers between the general synoptic text by a single author and an eclectic creation of a synopsis of knowledge that speaks to a practical situation. Like handbooks, encyclopedias (e.g., Lewy, 1991; Kridel, 2010, in press) provide such perspective that is especially directed to practitioners, policy makers, the mass media, and the general public.

Prior to these ventures, little precedent for such work existed for compendia in the curriculum field, except for the occasional themed productions of the *Review of Educational Research* on curriculum, or more general articles on curriculum topics in reference works such as *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* by AERA and the *Encyclopedia of Education* by Macmillan Publishers. Significantly, other exemplary handbooks that markedly expand curriculum inquiry include the following: *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (Pinar, 2003), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004), *Handbook of Public Pedagogy* (Sandlin et al., 2010, in press), and *Curriculum Studies Handbook: The Next Moment* (Malewski, 2010).[23] Additional, noteworthy though quite different, compendia include a dictionary of curriculum concepts by Colin Marsh (2004) and a continuously updated electronic bibliography of curriculum publications produced by Edmund C. Short (beginning circa 2005).

These compendia symbolize a blending of traditions of response to tensions between the synoptic and expansive that I have suggested can be derived partially from Dewey. The situational concern of Dewey (1902b) at his laboratory school in Chicago, re-expressed and elaborated in Schwab's (1969) practical inquiry represents expansion with every instance in which it is practiced, wherein there exists a unique eclectic parlaying of theories and extant knowledge to synoptically fit needs of particular circumstances. Reference works provide an expansive array of theory, yet each article in any such work is a synoptic rendition of a given author's reconfiguration of some aspect of the field. The more sweeping accounts of philosophical, social, and educational matters that Dewey provided at Columbia symbolize and likely served as exemplar for those who created synoptic texts in the Caswell and Campbell (1935) tradition, supplemented by selected influential primary sources (Caswell & Campbell, 1937). Such collections are compendia in their own right as exemplified today by Stern and Kysilka (2008) and Flinders and Thornton (2009).

Interestingly, all of these reference works show the expansion of curriculum inquiry and portray the diversity of curriculum knowledge and literature; thus, taking all the articles in any given compendium together, one finds a kind of synopsis of the field, often called a state-of-the-art or state-of-the-field presentation. Any such presentation concomitantly is generative of new expansions or even reconfigured synoptic treatments.

Consequently, though a bit ironical, what might appear wholly synoptic, also fosters expansion. Whenever an editor selects an author, it results in expansion of the field's portrayal, by virtue of the unique slant of expertise of that author. Moreover, what initially appears largely expansive, a novel perspective, can be seen as a new synopsis or an imaginative recasting of ideas and experiences pertaining to the subtopic of concern. Any expansion and any synopsis, thus, also can be seen as a heuristic device that inspires the next generation of queries, expansions, and synopses.

Heuristics

One can find periodic attempts to pose key questions as heuristic devices in the curriculum field, both historically and contemporaneously. These stimulate expansion, and by virtue of their steadfast focus, are also synoptic. I began this article by referring to Spencer's (1861) query about what is most worth knowing, and I asserted that variations on this question have been binding threads in the curriculum field since the 1890s. Dewey's implied questions about relationships among school, society, children, curriculum, democracy, experience, and education, and his call to continuously reconstruct one's experience to gain meaning in action permeate his work. His implicit questioning was more situational in Chicago at the Laboratory School, and at Columbia he asked more pervasive questions. In both settings, some of those influenced by Dewey chose to make the essence of curriculum inquiry coalesce around sets of key questions. Others offered similar heuristic devices to both corral and unleash curriculum inquiry. For instance, several of Dewey's protégés and critics (William C. Bagley, Frederick G. Bonser, Stuart Courtis, Franklin Bobbitt, Werrett W. Charters, Ernest Horn, George S. Counts, Charles H. Judd, William H. Kilpatrick, George A. Works) in the curriculum field, led by Harold Rugg (1927) from Columbia, devised a set of 18 questions, a synoptic statement, and individual rebuttals in an attempt to find and express synoptic attributes that would give coherence to a rapidly diversifying field. Their commentary and questions still seem contemporary when I show them undated to practicing educators today. In the same era, drawing from vast consultative experience in schools, L. Thomas Hopkins (1929) composed eight pages of questions in small print as a table of contents for his *Curriculum Principles and Practices*. From experience with the Eight Year Study (Aikin, 1942; Smith & Tyler, 1942), Ralph Tyler (1949) fashioned what is now called the Tyler Rationale—doubtless the most influential set of questions (on topics of purposes, learning experiences, organization, and evaluation) that the curriculum field has pervasively witnessed, especially when considering its influence on lesson plans, textbooks and other instructional materials, teacher education, and key aspects of curricular policy and practice for more than half a century.

Tyler's questions, however, inappropriately have been used as recipes by those who design curriculum policy from afar (e.g., state departments, ministries of education, central offices of large school districts) more than they have been pondered as heuristics by those embedded in teaching and learning situations—teachers and learners themselves. As noted before, but worth repeating, other scholars (including Tyler himself) offered practical antidotes to overgeneralized policy making based on such questions; examples can be found in advocacies of integrated curriculum (Hopkins, 1937, 1954), core curriculum (Alberty, 1947, 1953), Schwab's (1969) *practical* inquiry that sees the classroom or other places of teaching and learning as centers of curriculum deliberation (Schubert, 1989), and more recently in James Beane's (1993, 1997) work built from that of Dewey, Hopkins, and others. In such advocacies, the organizing center of curriculum resides in the lives of student and teacher relationships and deliberation on *what's worthwhile* becomes a key heuristic that stimulates questioning of their own experience. Such pursuits accentuate meaning in curricular experience and as Beane (2005) and Nicholls and Thorkildsen (1995) have argued, give reasons for learning.

When Michael Apple (1979/2004) and others amended curricular focus on *what's worthwhile* by asking for serious consideration of *whose knowledge* is deemed or should be deemed worthwhile, greater complexity became evident, as illustrated in the powerful and critical questions advocated by contributors to two volumes prepared by Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1995; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2004). After completing *Curriculum Books: The First Hundred Years* (Schubert et al., 2002), we attempted to reflect on the rising crescendo of nearly 3,500 curriculum books over the course of a century. What questions, we wondered, emerged time and again to characterize the work of the curriculum field. We arrived at a list (pp. 525–526), which I present here in a somewhat reorganized and slightly rephrased fashion.

- What's worthwhile?
- What's worth knowing, experiencing, doing, needing, being, becoming, overcoming, sharing, and contributing?
- What can be done to increase meaning, goodness, and happiness in lives of the young—in all our lives?
- What prevents focus on this in schooling and in other forms of education?
- How does the nexus of power (corporate, military, governmental, religious, media) that strives for empire, prevent progressive educational practices?
- How can alternative forms of inquiry and modes of expression counter hegemonic practices?
- How do class, race, gender, ability, health, membership, age, appearance, place, belief, ethnicity, sexual orientation, status, nationality,

reputation, and other factors influence education and other opportunities?
- How can the lore of educators (parents, teachers, educational leaders, policy makers) and students themselves contribute to insight about matters mentioned in these questions?
- How can we focus more broadly on education, seeing schooling as only one of several educative forces that shape us, our identities, and commitments?
- How can we better understand intended, taught, null, hidden, and learned or embodied dimensions of curricula in schools and outside-of-school venues (e.g., in homes, families, marriages, friendships, churches, communities, gangs, peer groups, radio, television, movies, computers, video, videogames, popular print, sports, stores, clubs, dance studios, music, art, hobbies, jobs, and more)?
- How can we understand curriculum matters through multiple modes of inquiry (e.g., philosophical, historical, biographical, narrative, empirical, scientific, case study, ethnographic, artistic and aesthetic, critical, feminist, critical race theory, phenomenological, hermeneutic, postmodern, evaluative, theorizing, queer studies, practical action inquiry, autobiography and autoethnography, ecological, and more)?
- How can we understand each other's autobiographies and aspirations empathically?
- How can we build on strengths with faith in the goodness of human potential?[24]

These questions clearly provide another way that this article could have been organized.[25] Each question could have been treated as a heuristic to which curriculum inquiry has responded historically and currently, and they all point to next phases that could be expanded. Moreover, these questions could be coupled with a plethora of citations that demonstrate the attention that curriculum scholars have already given to them, thus, providing a temporary synoptic account at any given time. However, to organize this article around such questions was not my organizational purpose, although I do recommend it for future work. The reason for presenting these questions here is to illustrate continuation of the heuristic tradition that has permeated and invigorated curriculum inquiry for over a century. It concisely clasps a multitude of issues and concerns in synoptic form, and simultaneously releases the clasp to unveil an expansion of venues for exploration.

Venues

By *curriculum venues*, I (Schubert, 2008b) refer to the following array of curricula that have been identified, in recent years, as necessary to explore:

intended, taught, experienced, learned, embodied, hidden, tested, null, and outside curricula. Individually, each of these curricular varieties expands the realm of consideration vis-à-vis curriculum problems, and conceptualized together they provide a synoptic perspective on what constitutes curricular phenomena. Each venue can be made more robust through lenses of the literatures or languages that have populated the field. Historically, Dewey (1938), foresaw such considerations when he wrote of *collateral learning* (p. 48) which became a precursor to several of these venues, especially the hidden curriculum. Nonetheless, until the 1960s, the intended curriculum was too often the *end all* and *be all*. Intended purposes were the subject of curriculum evaluation and the taught curriculum was monitored to see if intentions were, in fact, accurately implemented. Teachers' variations on the intended curriculum were rarely deemed thoughtful advances; instead they were (and for the most part, still are) seen as deviations to be put back on the *correct* track. The tested curriculum usually samples a small set of outcomes that are *evaluated* soon after curricula are experienced. The experienced curriculum is far more robust than samples assessed. Notably, study of long-term consequences has been virtually nonexistent, and still is, in terms of either application of knowledge and skills in life, or in terms of what became embodied in the persons who experienced any given curriculum, that is, that which became part of sources of meaning and inspiration in their reflection and action. Work by Philip Jackson (1968) drew more attention to hidden curricula through his analysis and interpretations of perspectives *taught* by organizational patterns of classroom life, and Norman Overly (1970) called for a range of inquiries into the *unstudied curriculum*. Decker Walker (1974) encouraged study of curricular consequences, first identifying significant features within a given practical context, and then seeking personal and social consequences of these features, pondering what accounts for stability and change in these features, what accounts for participants' judgments about their worth, and finally what features should serve what purposes in any given situation. Similarly, in an era when goal-based evaluation ran rampant, Michael Scriven (1977) posited *goal-free evaluation* which intentionally ignored preordained goals; he argued that goals or driving forces in any educational situation should be discovered through detailed ethnographic-like observations of practice, from which observers could ultimately deduce what goals must be, saying something like, "Given what we observed, these must be your goals." Such discovered goals, embedded in practice, were to be compared and contrasted with statements of goals in curriculum guides or public relations materials.

Scholars imbued with critical theory exposed hidden curricula (Anyon, 1980, 1981) that grew from social, political, and economic structures of society, providing a literature portrayed at an early juncture by Giroux and Purpel (1983), and elaborated later through studies by McLaren (1986/1989). Meanwhile, Elliot Eisner (1979) and his students explored what they

called the *null curriculum* and its relationship to *implicit* (a variety of hidden curricula) and *explicit* (intended or stated) curricula—wherein *null* referred to that which is not taught but might be or could be, or that which would be deemed expendable in the face of budget cuts, for example, the arts or health. Such exploration can reveal marked differences between taught and learned curricula, since what educators insist they have taught may not be congruent with what students actually learn. In comparison with other aforementioned curricular venues, the *tested curriculum* seems relatively insignificant—a narrow band of skills and information that can be inscribed easily in multiple choice test formats. Nevertheless, it is increasingly given outlandish credibility in public and policy circles, due to public relations efforts of dominating societal forces. Adding to the complexity provided by these curricular venues, I have advocated increased study of *outside curriculum* (Schubert, 1981, 1982, 1986/1997, 2008b, 2010) in such realms of life as families, homes, peer groups, nonschool organizations, communities, and mass media. Each outside area explicitly or implicitly harbors a *curriculum* of intentions, hidden messages, null or neglected offerings, overt and covert teachings, formal or informal tests and evaluations, lived experiences, and embodiments of meaning. For instance, the impact of media experiences is illustrated by Macedo and Steinberg (2007), revealing curricula that greatly influence literacy and meaning in the lives of children and youths.

One could easily surmise that the literature on varied venues for curriculum inquiry is primarily evidence of expansion; however, portrayal of these curricular venues is a synoptic act of pulling together diverse entities that give a more holistic portrayal of the configuration of experiences that shape any given life in and out of school. Such an act creates what might be called an *ecological* image of diverse curricula that holistically, through dynamic interrelationships, shape human beings in their midst. Perceptions of educators who strive to see their students as dynamically influenced by both school curricula and outside curricula embedded in nonschool experiences can be enhanced by viewing both school and nonschool experiences through curricular lenses, for example, Dewey's (1916) images of the *logical* (disciplines) and *psychological* (interests); Alberty's (1947, 1953) several levels of *core* curriculum; Tyler's (1949) sources of purpose that traverse among society, the individual, and the disciplines; Tyler's (1949) key questions about *purposes*, *learning experiences*, *organization*, and *evaluation*; Hopkins' (1954) curricular approaches that he labeled *authoritarian, revolt or child-centered,* and *need-experience*; Frymier's (1967) focus on *actors*, *artifacts*, and *events*; Berman's (1968) process-oriented curriculum that emphasized *perceiving, communicating, loving, knowing, decision making, patterning, creating,* and *valuing* as alternatives to conventional subject areas; Freire's (1970) distinction between *banking* and *problem posing* pedagogy; Schwab's (1969, 1973) *commonplaces* of *teachers*, *learners*, *subject matter*, and *milieu*; Walker's (1971) naturalistic model of curriculum development and policy making

that moves from *platform*, through *deliberation*, to *design*; van Manen's perceptive sensitivity and thoughtfulness regarding pedagogical *tone* (1986) and *tact* (1991); Pinar's (1975; Pinar & Grumet, 1976, 2004) notion of *currere* and *curriculum discourses* (Pinar et al., 1995), already characterized; Eisner's (1979/1985/1994) *implicit*, *explicit*, and *null* curricula, noted above; Egan's (1997) *story form* and *mythic*, *romantic*, *philosophic*, and *ironic* stages; W. E. Doll's (1993) contrasting of modern and *postmodern* thought with advocacy of curriculum perspective that includes understanding of the import of flux, recursion, indeterminacy, fluid relationships, and multiple interpretations vis-à-vis curricular experience; and Apple's (2004) *hidden curriculum* and *new hegemonic relations*. These represent only the tip of an iceberg of categories that could be used to explore and illuminate educational life in and out of schools through curricular lenses. To move toward understanding of those to be taught it would seem imperative to comprehend the larger corpus of their experience as curricula shape who they are and continue to become.

Reconsiderations and Possibilities

As I reconsider the literatures of curriculum inquiry discussed in this article, I see the expansive and synoptic in each. Are they opposite sides of a rotating coin, a yin and yang? In its focus on the situational, the practical appears to turn to the expansive—each circumstance characterized more by accumulated nuance than by generality; whereas, the synoptic resides in attempts to deliberatively summarize extant perspectives to cultivate decision and action—synopses for a particular practical setting. Nevertheless, the expansive and synoptic blend and complicate, making any abrupt distinction between them blurred and complex. In review, how do the several literatures illuminate this complexity?

Historical, philosophical, and particularly critical perspectives expand curriculum inquiry into a vast array of contexts (social, cultural, economic, political, linguistic, historical) that actually create curriculum rather than curriculum being created while merely contending with such forces; nevertheless, the critical shows that such contexts accumulate to ideology that must be seen holistically, if a synoptic perspective is to be inclusive. Literatures that float between the inner and contextual can see curriculum as *currere*, that is, one's simultaneous striving to synoptically understand oneself, while realizing that this is impossible without expansion to the host of milieus that contribute to who one is, might become, and contributions one might make. Thus, curriculum inquiry has returned to sources from which it was derived (history, philosophy, and other social foundations of education) after its sojourn in the *how-to* of schooling. Again, curriculum inquiry explores roots of that which is or should be worthwhile in diverse *schools* of thought philosophically and historically. This, of

course, represents expansion; nevertheless, it simultaneously opens new forms of synoptic texts—ones that help expand a sense of complexity of the field and of curriculum work, such as Marshall et al. (2007), in which a postmodern pastiche is created by combining personal stories of curriculum scholars, renditions of large social events, interpretations of curricular phenomena and encounters, extended excerpts of key texts, and related bibliographies.[26]

To digress momentarily from review of the several literatures as bases of illuminating the expansive and synoptic, it is valuable to historically acknowledge that the expansive-synoptic relationship has been anticipated in earlier sources. For instance, as noted earlier, Getzels and Guba (1957) used *idiographic* and *nomothetic* to differentiate between situational and general knowledge in educational research—terms that partially parallel Schwab's (1970) distinction between *practical* and *theoretic* inquiry. A central strain of synoptic curriculum work at Teachers College was more nomothetic and theoretical, while that at Chicago there existed a tendency to be more idiographic and practical. Schwab, however, shows that any abrupt bifurcation along these lines is detrimental, and clarifies a fluid or dynamic interplay between the practical and the theoretic. His *arts of eclectic* (Schwab, 1971) show that practical deliberation and action are fashioned from a fabric of both theoretic knowledge and personal experience, in much the way that Dewey (1929b) characterizes the practice of educational science and its flow of consequences, wherein resolution is never fully made; rather, continuously being made (p. 77). In such a spirit, the tension between synoptic and expansive cannot be resolved fully by a traditional Deweyan integration of dualistic opposites, which might in fact be less Deweyan than Dewey was himself! Nevertheless, I recall in the documentary film on Maxine Greene's life (Hancock, 1999), that while she expressed appreciation for much of Dewey's philosophy, she criticized his instrumentalist assumption that all dilemmas seem to be soluble in progressive and pragmatic mind-sets. By contrast, in literature and existentialist philosophy there is a tragic sense of life that cannot be resolved. As Camus makes clear (see Hanna, 1958), we must learn to live in contradiction. The scholarly syndicated columnist, Sydney J. Harris (1965) referred to this as a process of holding apparent opposites in a *dynamic tension*, and Ted Aoki (1991, pp. 182–184) refers to the need to live in *tensionality*. Ming Fang He's (2003, 2010, in press) emphasis on thriving in exile within both a sense of home and homelessness bespeaks a dynamic tension embedded in expansion and synopsis. We must learn to see possibility as well as disadvantage in being in exile, wherein we become strangers in what were once familiar lands, cultures, identities, and world views (Greene, 1973).

This surely invokes the value of aesthetic literatures, to which I turn again momentarily; however, first I consider its relevance to practical concerns. Many practitioners ask how this discussion can relate to the daily work of educators in schools. Much of importance in this regard depends

on our response to the question: Can the expansive be made synoptic without losing its purport? The popular and professional literature represents a key challenge. While curriculum leadership literature is synoptic, it runs the risk of distortion by oversimplifying or providing watered-down versions of complex ideas. Principals are often called curricular or instructional leaders of schools; yet, their certification programs may have only one curriculum course that barely scratches the expansive depth and breadth of curriculum studies. Popular stories of teachers are problematic as curriculum inquiry as well if authors do not relate their stories to accumulated ideas in curriculum literature. Therefore, do curriculum scholars not need to address directly both leadership literature and popular teacher stories, relating both to extant curricular discourses? To do this would constitute novel synoptic renditions vis-à-vis an expansive literature.[27] The use of the term *novel* here is not only selected to connote new, it is to invoke the arts and to suggest the need for expression of curricular insights aesthetically as story or novel-like renditions.

In aesthetic and artistic literatures the synoptic and expansive are eclectically embedded, much as they are in the practical. Historically, artistic expressions reveal the nomothetic within idiographic portrayals, general understandings in the particular situations, philosophical jewels of personal and public meaning embedded in stories of nuanced lives. As such, these depictions implicitly show more fully than they explicitly tell. Aesthetic capacities to perceive subtle patterns of great influence cannot be overemphasized. Meanings aesthetically perceived include expansive derivatives of synoptic configurations, harbingers of larger perspectives, such as the perils of globalization. Literatures on expansion of empire, for example, are often created by indigenous artists and authors, who courageously address and critique synoptic curricula of conquest that praise colonizers. This topic clearly invokes an immense need that has recently been addressed in curriculum inquiry. It directly explores previously excluded insights within and impositions upon indigenous lives, understandings, and sources of meaning. To meet such diversity is expansive and to include it is synoptic, both of which raise myriad questions for curriculum inquiry.

Thus, heuristic efforts in curriculum inquiry must vigilantly monitor the effects of inclusion and exclusion to ascertain how the synoptic produces synthesis or eclecticism that fosters diversity within larger unities. Similarly, the diversity of questions addressed in curriculum inquiry can be stabilized when attention to the key question (What is worthwhile?) provides a check and balance. However, the question of worth cannot be fully addressed without being imbued with questions such as: Why is it worthwhile and for whose benefit or detriment? How can injustices of benefit and detriment be recognized, exposed, overcome, transformed, and transcended?

These questions cannot be fully answered, and neither can the historical hypothesis that John Dewey, the great grandparent of curriculum inquiry,

might have spawned two lineages: one expansive, idiographic, and practical and the other synoptic, nomothetic, and theoretic. Yet, even these distinctions do not work well enough, for the synoptic can be idiographic or it can be nomothetic, practical or theoretic. What is increasingly clear to me is that the synoptic and the expansive, though never integrated as one, must work together. Many who descended from Dewey's work in Chicago, built on his example of idiosyncratically attending to the child, curriculum, teachers, and society in educational situations, while others were influenced by his work at Columbia, where with sweeping strokes, he sought to understand larger phenomena such as education, democracy, educational science, experience, and the curriculum field. Such perspective, however, can spawn ideas transformed to meet practical interests and needs. Over the years, however, cross-fertilization of these two emphases yielded diverse forms of blending of both at Columbia, Chicago, and other research universities. Today, the use of such categories is best relegated to the continuous perception, cultivation, and reconstruction of tendencies in complex theoretical and practical work, rather than use of them for bifurcated classification.

Thus, we should appreciate the precedent of diverse lineages of curriculum inquiry and heed Dewey's advice (1938) to cut beneath superficial contestation between the progressive and traditional, proceeding deeper than the contending parties or dualistic oppositions have delved (p. 5). The same advice pertains to abrupt distinctions between the synoptic and expansive. My suggestion simply is to pose a possible way of benefiting from both the expansive and the synoptic emphases in curriculum inquiry literature, since any distinction loses its usefulness if extended too far. Awareness of this caveat doubtlessly lies behind Schwab's (1969) call for attention not only to the practical but also to the quasi-practical and eclectic. So, there may be interesting similarities in early intellectual trends emanating from the University of Chicago, Teachers College, and aforementioned state universities such as Ohio State, the University of Illinois, and the University of Wisconsin, all of which have early histories in the curriculum field; however, these should be taken with a large grain of salt. Why? Should such sources continue to dominate? How encompassing are they? Should they, should we all, become more fully part of a *worldliness* that envelops multitudes of perspectives, especially from the experience of the indigenous, the oppressed, or colonized—a worldliness of which I hope to learn more (Pennycook, 1994; J. L. Miller, 2005; Pinar, 2009)?

A central point that should not be neglected is that while literatures of the past 40 years have added complexity, diversity, and transformative vitality to the substance and form of curriculum studies, there is a vital legacy of curriculum inquiry that preceded the establishment of *Curriculum Inquiry* that needs to be kept alive. Exemplified by Dewey, diverse literatures of yesterday (as well as those of today) complicated expansive and synoptic dimensions of the quest for what is worthwhile. As noted earlier, Dewey

(1933) identified an insidious problem that faces education, a greed that today propels empire building, calling it the *acquisitive society* (p. 7), referring again to what he learned from his alleged visit to Utopia:

> The Utopians believed that the pattern which exists in economic society in our time affected the general habits of thought; that because personal acquisition and private possession were such dominant ideals in all fields, even if unconsciously so, they had taken possession of the minds of educators to the extent that the idea of personal acquisition and possession controlled the whole educational system. . . . They said that the great educational liberation came about when the concept of external attainments was thrown away and when they started to find out what each individual person had in him from the very beginning, and then devoted themselves to finding out the conditions of the environment and the kinds of activity in which the positive capacities of each young person could operate most effectually. (p. 7)

Reflection on Dewey's indictment of acquisitiveness, as noted earlier, inspired me to explore ideas from philosophers, religious leaders, educators, social theorists, activists, artists, and literary figures, who offer perspective for instantiating love and justice in education that might help overcome acquisitive society or at least quell some of the rampant acquisitiveness that saturates our world (Schubert, 2009a). Acquisitiveness seems to me to be germane to the tension between expansion and synopsis. At least it raises questions. To what extent do we expand curriculum discourse to cultivate humanity and to what extent do we do so merely to expand our curriculum vitae (CV), that is, our acquisition in competition with the CVs of others? When we create a new synopsis, do we not do so to offer a context of knowledge for others, from which they may draw eclectically to pursue their needs and interests? If so, dare we stop with the theoretic end that Schwab (1969) condemned as insufficient, knowledge qua knowledge, rather than knowledge for insight and understanding that is morally and politically responsible? This is certainly not to argue that expansive and synoptic tendencies are dire products of acquisitiveness, though they may sometimes fall into acquisitive traps. On the side of positive potential, they offer impetus to push boundaries that mitigate acquisitive society through cultivation of transformative configurations of imaginative possibility. Nonetheless, curriculum scholars in an acquisitive society must guard against eristic for self-perpetuation rather than collaboration toward the common good.

Thus, I conclude with a call for collaboration to overcome acquisitiveness. Acquisitiveness carries the dastardly curse of transforming well-meaning critique into personal attack and thereby preventing cooperative pursuit of curriculum insight and understanding. Acquisitiveness forces a competitive mindset wherein denigration of the work of others trumps mutual sharing of experience and study. What a major contribution to curriculum inquiry it would be if we who are curriculum scholars could be exemplars who strive to overcome acquisitiveness for the sake of cultivating

humanity and the planetary environment—being wide awake (Greene, 1978) to curriculum critique and possibility, potential contributions from one another and especially from those heretofore excluded from curriculum discourse. We desperately need to immerse curriculum inquiry in the waters of diversity and complexity—the contested understandings flowing through diverse groups in our own societies and those worldwide. Realizing that in striving to be transnational or transcultural, however, we cannot merely transplant understandings and ways of being from localized and indigenized roots. Insights born in struggles of colonized, indigenous, suppressed, repressed, and oppressed peoples need to be understood as seedbeds of vitality in curriculum inquiry.

Toward such ends, curriculum inquiry must be community in the making, wherein curriculum theorists, policy makers, and practitioners listen carefully to one another, share diverse perspectives, experience free, imaginative, and thoughtful inquiry into curriculum matters that matter most so we can take to heart the concerns of disenfranchised individuals and groups, and work into the contradictions, complexities, and diversities of everyday life in curricula of schools and societies. Curriculum scholars need to work with all members of society (including one another) to engage in critical dialogue (Freire, 1970), exemplify the spirit of democracy (Dewey, 1916), eschew acquisitiveness (Dewey, 1933), transgress orthodoxy (Hooks, 1994), teach toward freedom (Ayers, 2004b), release imagination (Greene, 1995), revitalize the commons (Bowers, 2006), and invigorate strength to love (King, 1963), courage to dream (Freire, 2007), and humanity to cultivate (Nussbaum, 1997) as we pursue personal meaning and the common good—ever-enlivening journeys of synopsis and expansion in curriculum inquiry.

NOTES

1. To wonder, I think, is enough to do. Forty years is daunting to speculate, and impossible to define or even clarify. Instead, I am content and invigorated to have opportunity to share my ponderings. I share my sense of wonder and speculation with the hope and intent of growing together with other scholars in the field, rather than engaging in barbed eristic with them.

2. Others who have obviously lived different paths within the curricular realm would have different stories and protagonists; they would derive different categories of thought and literature, and would offer additional perspectives on current and future developments. I would relish reading stories of others about their experiences in the curriculum field.

3. The term *landmark texts* has been suggested in conversation with Ming Fang He, and is a term that suggests for me books and articles that have moved curriculum studies in new directions. Such texts could include innovative synoptic treatments as well as expansive works that add to the complexity of work in the

field and derive from many sources, including indigenous and subaltern ones, some of which are yet to be discovered. I am grateful to Ming Fang for this term and for numerous suggestions regarding this essay.

4. I tried to develop a statement of categories of landmark texts in the interest of enhancing the disciplinarity to advance curriculum studies. The working document is called *Possibilities, Recommendations, and Suggestions for the AAACS Project to Advance Curriculum Studies Through Disciplinarity*—on the AAACS Web site of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, 2009. I hope that its refinement and revision will be helpful to other curriculum scholars under the new committee that is continuing the work.

5. Articles by Craig Kridel, Tom Thomas, and William Schubert in the *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* (Kridel, 2010, in press) illustrate collectives at historically prominent centers of curriculum studies.

6. The emergence of the terms *traditionalist*, *conceptual empiricist*, and *reconceptualist* is clearly set forth in work of William Pinar (1975, 1978), and the continued development of this intellectual strain of curriculum theory is chronicled in Pinar et al. (1995), as are the conferences, especially in Chapter 4 of that work.

7. The early contributions of the AERA SIG on Creation and Utilization of Curriculum Knowledge, now called the AERA SIG on Critical Issues in Curriculum and Cultural Studies, are interpreted by Short, Willis, and Schubert (1985), indicating a major effect of this SIG and Bergamo conferences on the transformation of the Curriculum Studies Division (Division B) of AERA from an emphasis and title that focused on objectives to one that focused on the larger intellectual sphere of curriculum studies. By 1983 the title of Division B had changed to the present one: Curriculum Studies.

8. J. J. Schwab's talk at the April 31, 1975 AERA meeting in Washington, DC, was entitled *Curriculum theory: The practical and the educational.*

9. The session title was *Curriculum inquiry: Three perspectives on realization of integrative concepts of critical consciousness*, April 22, 1976, in San Francisco, with presenters F. P. Hunkins, M. van Manen, and W. H. Schubert, and discussants G. Willis and D. R. Chipley.

10. Louis J. Rubin was well known for intellectual "talk show"–style sessions at AERA, wherein he would challenge such frequent participants as Ralph Tyler, Harry Broudy, Jack Getzels, Maxine Greene, and others with provocative questions that encouraged them to respond impromptu. Having been a student in Rubin's classes at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, I recalled a similar pedagogical technique used by him with students and at AERA attended his conversational sessions whenever possible. Rubin often added that he deemed the informal conversations at AERA to be the most thought-provoking events there, and he wanted to instantiate them in the form of sessions, which he did for over 20 years.

11. Because these were all symposia that I organized and chaired and not single authored, I am referencing them here rather than in the reference list. The 1977 session in New York with M. Johnson, M. Eash, D. Walker, M. Apple, and W. Pinar was on April 8 and titled *Priorities in curriculum scholarship: Toward*

separatism or synergy. The 1980 session in Boston with M. van Manen, R. Tyler, M. Grumet, and P. Jackson was on April 7, and titled *Curriculum knowledge and student perspectives: Exploring the relationship*, while the other with M. Greene, E. Eisner, M. Apple, and M. Fantini was on April 8, and titled *The expanding domain of curriculum inquiry: Assessment and recommendations*. The three sessions at the 1981 AERA in Los Angeles were *Neglected but necessary sources of curriculum knowledge*, with H. S. Broudy, R. Stake, R. W. Tyler, and P. H. Taylor (with W. A. Reid delivering his paper and commenting), on April 15; *Ralph W. Tyler in retrospect: Contributions to the curriculum field*, with L. J. Cronbach, G. MacKenzie, R. W. Tyler, and K. Strickland as co-chair, on April 15; *Reflections and recommendations on the creation and utilization of curriculum knowledge*, involving G. Beauchamp, J. Goodlad, E. C. Short, B. O. Smith, and R. W. Tyler, on April 16.

12. In response to what many consider the introductory essay on existentialism in education by Ralph Harper (1955), Ulich (1955) responded by calling for education to center on "great events and mysteries of life: birth, death, love, tradition, society and the crowd, success and failure, salvation, and anxiety" (p. 255).

13. Jean Anyon, Michael Apple, Peter Applebaum, William Ayers, Bernadette Baker, Landon Beyer, Deborah Britzman, Richard Butt, Mary Aswell Doll, William Doll, Susan Edgerton, Michelle Fine, David Flinders, Bernardo Gallegos, Noreen Garman, Geneva Gay, Henry Giroux, Jesse Goodman, Ivor Goodson, Beverly Gordon, Noel Gough, Carl Grant, Peter Grimmett, Madeleine Grumet, Ming Fang He, James Henderson, Annette Henry, David Jardine, Stephen Kemmis, Kathleen Kesson, Joe Kincheloe, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Patti Lather, Nancy Lesko, Allan Luke, Dan Marshall, Cameron McCarthy, Linda McNeil, Janet Miller, Petra Munro, Marla Morris, Hugh Munby, Pedro Noguera, Reba Page, Charles Payne, William Pinar, Tom Popkewitz, Danielle Raymond, William Reynolds, Patrick Roberts, Tom Russell, James Sears, Steven Selden, Patrick Slattery, Christine Sleeter, John Smyth, Shirley Steinberg, William Stanley, Angela Valenzuela, Max van Manen, William Watkins, John Weaver, Tony Whitson, John Willinsky, Geoff Whitty, George Willis, and Michael F. D. Young.

14. The 18 authors who included autobiographical renditions are Michael Apple, Miriam Ben-Peretz, Louise Berman, Michael Connelly, Bill Doll, Elliot Eisner, John Elliott, Ivor Goodson, Maurice Holt, Frances Klein, Herbert Kliebard, William Pinar, William Reid, William Schubert, Edmund Short, Malcolm Skilbeck, Laurel Tanner, and Michael Young. Some of these listed influences that included mainly other curriculum scholars or chose not to provide a list; thus, they are not included in illustration of philosophical influences. Clearly, their other work indicates paramount influence by philosophers and other social theorists.

15. The arrogance of U.S. self-importance in many spheres leads too often to lack of credibility given to insights from other cultures. It also leads to forceful imposition of U.S. perspectives on others, including curricular frameworks. A reprehensible part of the illustration resides in the alleged *leadership* of curriculum studies by the U.S. scholars, and the concomitant ignorance on behalf of too many U.S. scholars, including myself, and policy makers of curriculum in other nations throughout the world. We need to ask more assiduously: When scholars from the United States are taken as beacons of curriculum insight, is it

more of a function of the United States as a globalizing power wielder, or is it due to a thoughtful appreciation of insights in frameworks advanced?

16. Elliot Eisner, Maxine Greene, Lou Rubin, Harry Broudy, Madeleine Grumet, Bob Donmoyer, Wells Foshay, Jim Henderson, Ann Lynn Lopez Schubert, Wanda May, Gail McCutcheon, Ken Kantor, Jose Rosario, Sue Stinson, Landon Beyer, Bill Ayers, Michael Apple, Francine Shuchat Shaw, Beau Vallance, Janet Miller, Bill Pinar, Nelson Haggerson, Delese Wear, Richard Butt, Noreen Garman, Max van Manen, Joel Taxel, Noel Gough, Alex Molnar, George Willis, and myself.

17. In a book series with Backalong Books and the Centre for Arts-Informed Research, Knowles, Cole, L. Neilsen, and others have produced several volumes that deal with diverse aspects of the arts in inquiry: theses and dissertations, visual inquiry, theorizing, writing, and more.

18. By *curriculum curriculum*, I refer to one's curriculum for studying curriculum.

19. American Educational Studies Association, a scholarly group that focuses on social, philosophical, historical, political, and cultural bases of education.

20. Such work was facilitated by the steadfast efforts of Ann Lopez-Schubert (1952–2006) between 2001 and 2006, who relentlessly tapped many book, journal, and Internet sources for worldwide alternative reports and perspectives to understand deleterious effects globalization that stemmed from corporate, nationalistic, and militaristic greed.

21. The original title of this section was something like "Indigenous, (De-, Post-, Neo-) Colonized, Ecological, Third World Feminist, Transcultural, and Globalization Literatures." Even if the list were continued for a few more lines, it would not capture the vitality of inquiry experienced in the field today.

22. Though just one example, I wonder about the educational community's realization of this perspective when I reflect on AERA's recent rejection of a proposed SIG on Critical Interspecies Education. Was it rejected because it allegedly was deemed to overlap with the interests of other SIGs on ecology or environmental matters, or was it partially because the proposed topic was deemed silly by those ensconced in dominating epistemologies, presumably assuming that acceptance would diminish the conventional rigor that is believed to spawn credibility?

23. Additionally, as Dennis Thiessen has reminded me, an explosion of handbooks and encyclopedias over the past 2 decades has occurred in numerous academic fields, education being prominent among them. Handbooks in such areas of education as social foundations, leadership or administration, policy studies, educational change, teaching and teachers, diverse research traditions, and the several subject areas often contain one or more chapters on curriculum, curriculum studies, curriculum inquiry, or curriculum theory. Even when they do not use such labels, they have considerable content and citation overlap with the general area of curriculum studies.

24. Indeed, this is the kind of faith that I suggest is necessary for educators generally and curriculum scholars in particular as they work on any project that has

controversial dimensions. They should seek to learn from one another and engage in the kind of genuine dialogue that they often advocate for others.

25. In fact, I would like very much to work on such an article.

26. I feel privileged to have played a small part in this venture.

27. I recommend Schultz (2008) as an example of showing how stories of teaching can be directly situated within curriculum literature to inform innovative educational practice and policy.

REFERENCES

Aikin, W. M. (1942). *The story of the Eight Year Study*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Alberty, H. (1947). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.

Alberty, H. (1953). Designing curriculum to meet the common needs of youth. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Adapting the secondary school program to the needs of youth*, The 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (pp. 118–140). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Alberty, H., & Alberty, E. (1962/1969). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.

Anderson, J. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education, 162*(1), 67–92.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(1), 3–42.

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban education reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Aoki, T. T. (1991). Sonare and *videre*: Questioning the primacy of the eye in curriculum talk. In G. Willis & W. H. Schubert (Eds.), *Reflections from the heart of educational inquiry: Understanding curriculum and teaching through the arts* (pp. 182–189). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Aoki, T. T. (2005). *Curriculum in a new key*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Apple, M. W. (1979/2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1982/1995). *Education and power*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (Eds.). (2006). *Democratic schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Asante, M. K. (1991). *Afrocentricity*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Asher, N. (2007). Made in the (multicultural) U. S. A.: Unpacking tensions of race, culture, gender, and sexuality in education. *Educational Researcher, 36*(2), 65–73.

Ashton-Warner, S. (1963). *Teacher*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ayers, B., & Dohrn, B. (2009). *Race course: Against white supremacy*. Chicago: Third World Press.

Ayers, W. (1992/2001). *To teach: The journey of a teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ayers, W. (2004a). *Teaching the personal and the political: Essays on hope and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ayers, W. (2004b). *Teaching toward freedom*. Boston: Beacon.

Ayers, W., & Miller, J. L. (Eds.). (1997). *A light in dark times: Maxine Greene and the unfinished conversation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bailyn, B. (1960). *Education in the forming of American society*. New York: Vintage.

Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Barone, T. (2000). *Aesthetics, politics, and educational inquiry.* New York: Peter Lang.
Barone, T. (2001). *Touching eternity: The enduring outcomes of teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (1997). Arts-based research. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (2nd ed., pp. 71–116). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
Bateson, M. C. (1989). *Composing a life.* New York: Penguin (Plume).
Beane, J. (1993). *A middle school curriculum: From rhetoric to reality.* Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.
Beane, J. (1997). *Curriculum integration: Designing a core of democratic education.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Beane, J. A. (2005). *A reason to teach: Creating classrooms of dignity and hope.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Bellack, A. A., & Kliebard, H. (Eds.). (1977). *Curriculum and evaluation.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools.* New York: Longman.
Berman, L. M. (1968). *New priorities in curriculum.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Bernays, A. (1928). *Propaganda.* New York: Liveright.
Berry, W. (2009). Inverting the economic order. *The Progressive, 73*(2), 18–25.
Beyer, L., & Apple, M. W. (Eds.). (1988/1998). *The curriculum: Problems, policies, and possibilities.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Bobbitt, F. (1922). *Curriculum making in Los Angeles.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Bobbitt, F. (1924). *How to make a curriculum.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Bobbitt, F. (1941). *The curriculum of modern education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
Bode, B. H. (1927). *Modern educational theories.* New York: Macmillan.
Bode, B. H. (1938). *Progressive education at the crossroads.* New York: Newson.
Bond, H. M. (1934). *The education of the Negro in the American social order.* New York: Prentice Hall.
Bowers, C. A. (1992). *Education, cultural myths, and the ecological crisis: Toward deep changes.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Bowers, C. A. (2001). *Educating for eco-justice and community.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.
Bowers, C. A. (2006). *Revitalizing the commons: Cultural and educational sites of resistance and affirmation.* Lanham, MD: Fairfax.
Bremer, J. (1979). *Education and community.* Sheparton, Australia: Waterwheel Press.
Britzman, D. P. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Britzman, D. P. (2006). *Novel education: Psychoanalytic studies of learning and not learning.* New York: Peter Lang.
Broudy, H. S. (1961). *Building a philosophy of education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. (Original work published 1954)
Broudy, H. S. (1972/1994). *Enlightened cherishing: An essay on aesthetic education.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press and Kappa Delta Pi.
Broudy, H. S. (1979). Arts education: Necessary or just nice? *Kappan, 60*(5), 347–350.
Broudy, H. S., Smith, B. O., & Burnett, J. (1964). *Democracy and excellence in American secondary education: A study in curriculum theory.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Callejo-Perez, D. M., Fain, S. M., & Slater, J. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Pedagogy of place: Seeing space as cultural education.* New York: Peter Lang.
Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 22*(1), 5–12, 18.
Caswell, H. L., & Campbell, D. S. (1935). *Curriculum development.* New York: American Book Company.
Caswell, H. L., & Campbell, D. S. (Eds.). (1937). *Readings in curriculum development.* New York: American Book Company.
Charters, W. W. (1923). *Curriculum construction.* New York: Macmillan.
Chomsky, N. (2000). *Chomsky on miseducation* (D. Macedo, Ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance.* New York: Metropolitan Books.
Chomsky, N. (2005). *Imperial ambitions.* New York: Metropolitan Books.
Clandinin, D. J. (Ed.). (2006). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories: Teaching and the moral imagination.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Education Researcher, 19*(5), 2–14.
Connelly, F. M., He, M. F., & Phillion, J. A. (2008). *Handbook of curriculum and instruction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Corey, S. M. (1953). *Action research to improve school practices.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.
Craig, C., & Ross, V. (2008). Cultivating the image of teachers as curriculum makers. In F.M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 282–305). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Cremin, L. (1961). *The transformation of the school.* New York: Knopf.
Cremin, L. (1976). *Public education.* New York: Basic Books.
Cremin, L. (1980). *The American education: The national experience, 1783–1876.* New York: Harper.
Cremin, L. (1988). *The American education: The metropolitan experience, 1876–1980.* New York: Harper.
Davis, O. L. (Ed.). (1976). *Perspectives on curriculum development: 1776–1976.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Davis, O.L., Jr. (1991). Historical inquiry: Telling real stories. In E. C. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 77–78). Albany: State University of New York Press.
Dennison, G. (1969). *Lives of children.* New York: Random House.
Dewey, J. (1887). *Psychology.* New York: Harper & Brothers.
Dewey, J. (1899, revised 1915). *The school and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Dewey, J. (1902a). *The child and the curriculum.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Dewey, J. (1902b). *The educational situation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1920/1948). *Reconstruction in philosophy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Dewey, J. (1922). *Human nature and conduct*. New York: Henry Holt.
Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: Henry Holt.
Dewey, J. (1929a). *Experience and nature*. New York: Norton.
Dewey, J. (1929b). *The sources of a science of education*. New York: Liveright.
Dewey, J. (1929c). *Quest for certainty*. New York: Minton, Balch.
Dewey, J. (1931). *The way out of educational confusion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Dewey, J. (1933, April 23). Dewey outlines utopian schools. *New York Times*, p. E7.
Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Penguin.
Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
Dewey, J., & Bentley, A. F. (1949). *Knowing and the known*. Boston: Beacon.
Dewey, J., & Dewey, E. (1915). *Schools of tomorrow*. New York: Dutton.
Doll, M. A. (2000). *Like letters in running water: A mythopoetics of curriculum*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Doll, R. C. (1964). *Curriculum improvement: Decision making and process*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Doll, W. E., Jr. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Doll, W. E., Jr., & Gough, N. (Eds.). (2002). *Curriculum visions*. New York: Peter Lang.
Donmoyer, R., & Kos, R. (Eds.). (1993). *At-risk students: Portraits, programs, policies, and practices*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. New York: Signet.
Edgerton, S. H. (1996). *Translating the curriculum: Multiculturalism into cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
Egan, K. (1997). *The educated mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Eisner, E. W. (1969). Instructional and expressive objectives: Their formation and use in curriculum. In W. J. Popham (Ed.), *AERA monograph on curriculum evaluation: Instructional objectives* (pp.1–18). Chicago: Rand McNally.
Eisner, E. W. (1979/1985/1994). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of educational programs*. New York: Macmillan.
Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan.
Eisner, E. W. (1994). *Cognition and curriculum reconsidered* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
Eisner, E. W. (1998). *The kind of schools we need*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Eisner, E. W., & Vallance, E. (Eds.). (1974). *Conflicting conceptions of curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. London: Croom Helm.
Elson, R. (1964). *Guardians of tradition: American schoolbooks of the nineteenth century*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1992). Students' experience of the curriculum. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 465–485). New York: Macmillan.
Erickson, F., Bagrodia, R., Cook-Sather, A., Espinoza, M., Jurow, S., Shultz, J., et al. (2008). Students experience of school curriculum: The everyday circumstances of granting and withholding assent to learn. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 198–218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Esteva, G., & Prakash, M. S. (1997). *Grassroots postmodernism: Beyond human rights, the individual self, and the global economy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Fantini, M., & Sinclair, R. (Eds.). (1985). *Education in school and nonschool settings.* 84th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Faunce, R. C., & Bossing, N. L. (1951). *Developing the core curriculum.* New York: Prentice-Hall.
Flinders, D. J., & Thornton, S. J. (Eds.). (1997/2005/2009). *The curriculum studies reader.* New York: Routledge.
Frankfurt, H. G. (2005). *On bullshit.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Franklin, B. M. (1986). *Building the American community.* London: Falmer.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.
Freire, P. (2007). *Daring to dream: Toward a pedagogy of the unfinished* (Organized and presented by Ana Maria Araujo Freire; Alexandre K. Oliveira, Trans.). London and Bolder, CO: Paradigm.
Frymier, J. (1967, March). *Around and around the curriculum bush, or in quest of curriculum theory.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Professors of Curriculum, Dallas, TX.
Gatto, J. T. (1992). *Dumbing us down: The hidden curriculum of compulsory schooling.* Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
Gatto, J. (2001). *The underground history of American education.* New York: Oxford Village Press.
Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Gaztambide-Fernández, R., & Thiessen, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Curriculum Inquiry, 39*(1).
Getzels, J., & Guba, E. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. *School Review, 65,* 423–444.
Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Giroux, H. A. (2000). *Stealing innocence: Corporate culture's war on children.* New York: Palgrave.
Giroux, H. A. (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism.* Aurora, ON: Garamond Press.
Giroux, H. A., & Purpel, D. (Eds.). (1983). *The hidden curriculum and moral education.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school.* Hightstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill.
Goodlad, J. I., & Associates. (1979). *Curriculum inquiry.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
Goodson, I. (1983). *School subjects and curriculum change.* London: Croom Helm.
Goodson, I. (1988). *The making of curriculum.* London: Falmer.
Goodson, I., & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Teachers professional lives.* London: Falmer.
Goodson, I., & Walker, R. (1990). *Biography, identity, and schooling: Episodes in educational research.* New York: Falmer.
Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Greene, M. (1965). *The public school and the private vision.* New York: Random House.
Greene, M. (1967). *Existential encounters for teachers.* New York: Random House.
Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger.* New York: Wadsworth.
Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Grumet, M. R. (1980). Autobiography and reconceptualization. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 2*(2), 155–158.
Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. London: Falmer.
Gwynn, J. M. (1943). *Curriculum principles and social trends*. New York: Macmillan.
Haggerson, N. (2000). *Expanding curriculum research and understanding: A mythopoetic perspective*. New York: Peter Lang.
Hancock, M. (1999). *Exclusions and awakenings: The life of Maxine Greene* [Motion picture]. (Available from Hancock Productions, 505 West End Avenue, New York, NY, 10024)
Hanna, T. (1958). *The thought and art of Albert Camus*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, Gateway Edition.
Hansen, D. T. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Hansen, D. T. (Ed.). (2007). *Ethical visions of education: Philosophies in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press in association with the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century.
Harper, R. (1955). Significance of existence and recognition. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Modern philosophies of education. Fifty-fourth yearbook (Part I) of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 215–253). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Harris, S. J. (1965). *Dynamic tension*. Lecture at Manchester College, North Manchester, IN.
He, M. F. (2003). *A river forever flowing: Cross-cultural lives and identities in the multicultural landscape*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
He, M. F. (2010, in press). Exile pedagogy: Teaching in-between. In J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz, & J. Burdick (Eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling* (pp. 469–482) New York: Routledge.
He, M. F., & Phillion, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Personal~passionate~participatory inquiry into social justice in education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
He, M. F., Phillion, J., Chan, E., & Xu, S. (2008). Immigrant students' experience of curriculum. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 219–239). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Henderson, J. G., & Kesson, K. (2004). *Curriculum wisdom*. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
Herrick, V. E. (1956). *The elementary school*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Herrick, V. E., & Tyler, R. W. (Eds.). (1950). *Toward improved curriculum theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hlebowitsh, P. S. (1993). *Radical curriculum theory reconsidered*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Hlebowitsh, P. S. (2005). *Designing the school curriculum*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
Holt, J. (1964). *How children fail*. New York: Delta.
Holt, J. (1981). *Teach your own: A hopeful path for education*. New York: Delta Seymour/Lawrence.
Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
Hopkins, L. T. (1929). *Curriculum principles and practices*. New York: Benjamin H. Sandborn.
Hopkins, L. T. (Ed.). (1937). *Integration, its meaning and application*. New York: Appleton-Century.
Hopkins, L. T. (1954). *The emerging self in school and home*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
Huber-Warring, T. (Vol. Ed.). (2010, in press). *Storied inquiries in international landscapes: An anthology of educational research*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Huebner, D. (1966). Curricular language and classroom meanings. In J. Macdonald & R. Leeper (Eds.), *Language and meaning* (pp. 8–26). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Husen, T., & Postlethwaite, N. (1994). *The international encyclopedia of education.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
Illich, I. (1970). *Deschooling society.* New York: Harper & Row.
Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.
Jackson, P. W. (1992a). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 3–40). New York: Macmillan.
Jackson, P. W. (Ed.). (1992b). *Handbook of research on curriculum.* New York: Macmillan.
Jackson, P. W. (1998). *John Dewey and the lessons of art.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Jackson, P. W., Boostrom, R. E., & Hansen, D. T. (1993). *The moral life of schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
James, W. (1890). *Principles of psychology.* New York: Holt.
James, W. (1899). *Talks to teachers on psychology and to students on some of life's ideals.* New York: Norton.
Jardine, D., Friesen, S., & Clifford, P. (2006). *Curriculum in abundance.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Khalidi, R. (2004). *Resurrecting empire.* Boston: Beacon.
Kilpatrick, W. H. (1926). *Foundations of method.* New York: Macmillan.
Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (1995). *Thirteen questions: Reframing education's conversation.* New York: Peter Lang.
Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (2004). *The miseducation of the West.* New York: Greenwood.
Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., & Gresson, A. D., III. (Eds.). (1997). *Measured lies: The bell curve examined.* New York: St. Martin's.
King, M. L., Jr. (1963/1981). *Strength to love.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
Kliebard, H. M. (1986/1993/2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893–1958.* New York: Routledge.
Klohr, P. R. (1980). The curriculum field—gritty and ragged? *Curriculum Perspectives, 1*(1), 1–7.
Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Kohl, H. (1968). *36 children.* New York: Signet.
Kohl, H. (1998). *The discipline of hope: Learning from a lifetime of teaching.* New York: Simon & Schuster.
Kohlberg, L., & Mayer, R. (1972). Development as the aim of education. *Harvard Educational Review, 42*(4), 449–496.
Kozol, J. (1967). *Death at an early age.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation.* New York: Crown.
Krall, F. (1994). *Ecotone: Wayfaring on the margins.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Kridel, C. (Ed.). (1989). *Curriculum history.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Kridel, C. (Ed.). (1998). *Writing educational biography: Explorations in qualitative research.* New York: Routledge.
Kridel, C. (1999). The Bergamo Conferences, 1973–1997: Reconceptualization and the curriculum theory conferences. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Contemporary curriculum discourses* (pp. 509–526). New York: Peter Lang.

Kridel, C. (Ed.). (2010, in press). *International encyclopedia of curriculum.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Kridel, C., & Bullough, R. V., Jr., (2007). *Stories of the Eight Year Study and rethinking schooling in America.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Kridel, C., Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Shaker, P. (Eds.). (1996). *Teachers and mentors: Profiles of distinguished twentieth-century professors of education.* Hamden, CT: Garland.
Krug, E. A. (1950). *Curriculum planning.* New York: Harper & Brothers.
Krug, E. A. (1964). *The shaping of the American high school.* New York: Harper.
Kuhn, T. (1962/1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart.* New York: Routledge.
Lather, P. (2007). *Getting lost: Feminist efforts toward a double(d) science.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. D. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Lee, J. C. K. (2002). *Curriculum, teaching and school reforms: Educational development in the new century.* Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
Lee, J. C. K., & Wong, H. W. (1996). *Curriculum: Paradigms, perspectives and design* (2nd ed.). Hong Kong: Chinese University Press; Taiwan: Ng Nam Press.
Lewy, A. (Ed.). (1991). *The international encyclopedia of curriculum.* London: Pergamon.
Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). *The good high school.* New York: Basic Books.
Lipman, P. (2004). *High stakes education: Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform.* New York: Routledge Falmer.
Lopez-Schubert, A. L. (1991). Wondrous possibilities: On the value of an artful setting in childhood. In G. Willis & W. H. Schubert (Eds.), *Reflections from the heart of educational inquiry: Understanding curriculum and teaching through the arts* (pp. 153–160). Albany: State University of New York Press.
Macdonald, J. B. (1974). A transcendental developmental ideology of education. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory* (pp. 85–116). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Macdonald, J. B., & Leeper, R. R. (Eds.). (1966). *Language and meaning.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Macdonald, J. B., & Zaret, E. (Eds.). (1975). *Schools in search of meaning.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Macdonald, J. B., Wolfson, B., & Zaret, E. (1973). *Reschooling society.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Macedo, D., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (2007). *Media literacy: A reader.* New York: Peter Lang.
Malewski, E. (Ed.). (2010). *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment.* New York: Routledge.
Marsh, C. (2004). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum.* London: Routledge.
Marsh, C., & Willis, G. (2007). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches: Ongoing issues.* Columbus, OH: Pearson.
Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., Allen, L., Roberts, P., & Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary curriculum memoir* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., & Schubert, W. H. (2000). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary curriculum memoir.* Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
Marti, J. (1979). *On education: Articles on educational theory and pedagogy, and writings for children from "The age of gold."* New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

(Essays and stories written by Marti between 1875 and 1900, edited by P. S. Foner)
McCutcheon, G. (1995). *Developing the curriculum: Solo and group deliberation.* New York: Longman.
McLaren, P. (1986/1999). *Schooling as ritual performance.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
McLaren, P. (1989/2002). *Life in schools.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
McLaren, P., & Faramandpur, R. (2004). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism: A critical pedagogy.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem.* New York: Beacon Press.
Michie, G. (1999/2009). *Holler when you hear me.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Miel, A. (1946). *Changing the curriculum.* New York: Appleton-Century.
Miel, A. (1952). *Cooperative procedures in learning.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Miller, J. L. (1990). *Creating spaces and finding voices.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Miller, J. L. (2005). *Sounds of silence breaking.* New York: Peter Lang.
Miller, J. P. (1988). *The holistic curriculum.* Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) Press.
Mohanty, C. T. (2003/2005). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Molnar, A. (2005). *School commercialism.* New York: Routledge.
Molnar, A., & Zahorik, J. (Eds.). (1977). *Curriculum theory.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Morris, M., & Weaver, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Difficult memories: Talk in a (post) Holocaust era.* New York: Peter Lang.
Narayan, U. (1997). *Dislocating cultures: Identities, traditions, and third world feminism.* New York: Routledge.
National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
National Council of Education Committee on the Economy of Time. (1913). *The report.* Washington, DC: NEA & United States Government Printing Office.
National Defense Education Act (1958). Public Law 85-864, 85th Congress of the United States of America, September 2, 1958.
National Education Association Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies. (1893). *The report.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.
National Education Association Committee of Fifteen of Elementary School Studies. (1895). *The report.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.
National Education Association Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. (1918). *The report.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.
Neill, A. S. (1960). *Summerhill: A radical approach to child rearing.* New York: Hart.
Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Nicholls, J. G., & Hazzard, S. (1993). *Education as adventure: Lessons from the second grade.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Nicholls, J. G., & Thorkildsen, T. A. (Eds.). (1995). *Reasons for learning: Expanding the conversation on student-teacher collaboration.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education.* New York: Longman.
Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in school: An alternative approach to education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2006). *Critical lessons: What our schools should teach.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Null, W. (2003). *A disciplined progressive educator: The life and career of William Chandler Bagley.* New York: Peter Lang.
Null, W. (2008). Immigrant students' experience of curriculum. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 478–490). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Orlosky, D., & Smith, B. O. (Eds.). (1978). *Curriculum development: Insights and issues.* Chicago: Rand McNally.
Ornstein, A. C., & Behar-Horenstein, L. S. (Eds.). (1994/1999). *Contemporary issues in curriculum.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2008). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Overly, N. (Ed.). (1970). *The unstudied curriculum: Its impact on children.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Payne, C. (1996). *I've got the light of freedom.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* New York: Longman.
Phenix, P. H. (1961). *Education and the common good: A moral philosophy of the curriculum.* New York: Harper & Brothers.
Phenix, P. H. (1964). *Realms of meaning.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
Phillion, J. A., He, M. F., & Connelly, F. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Narrative and experiences in multicultural education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Pinar, W. F. (1978). The reconceptualization of curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 10*(3), 205–214.
Pinar, W. F. (1994). *Autobiography, politics, and sexuality.* New York: Peter Lang.
Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1998). *The passionate mind of Maxine Greene: "I am . . . not yet."* Hamden, CT: Falmer.
Pinar, W. F. (2001). *The gender of racial politics and violence in America.* New York: Peter Lang.
Pinar, W. (Ed.). (2003). *International handbook of curriculum research.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Pinar, W. F. (2006). *The synoptic text today: Curriculum development after the reconceptualization.* New York: Peter Lang.
Pinar, W. F. (2007). *Intellectual advancement through disciplinarity.* Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
Pinar, W. F. (2008). Curriculum theory since 1950: Crisis, reconceptualization, internationalization. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 491–513).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Pinar, W. F. (2009). *The worldliness of a cosmopolitan education: Passionate lives in public service.* New York: Routledge.
Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. R. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum.* New York: Peter Lang.
Pollard, A., Thiessen, D., & Filer, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Children and their curriculum: The Perspectives of primary and elementary school children.* London: Falmer.
Posner, G. J. (1992). *Analyzing the curriculum.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Prakash, M. S., & Esteva, G. (1998). *Escaping education: Living as learning within grassroots cultures.* New York: Peter Lang.
Pratt, C. (1948). *I learn from children.* New York: Harper & Row.
Rogan, J. M. (1991). Curriculum texts; the portrayal of the field: Part II. *Journal of Curriculum Studies 23* (1), 55–50.
Rogan, J. M., & Luckowski, J. A. (1990). Curriculum texts; the portrayal of the field: Part I. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22*(1), 17–40.
Rubin, L. J. (Ed.). (1977a). *Curriculum handbook: Administration and theory.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Rubin, L. J. (Ed.). (1977b). *Curriculum handbook: The disciplines, current movements, instrumental methodology, administration, and theory.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Rubin, L. J. (1984). *Artistry in teaching.* New York: Random House.
Rugg, H. O. (1927). *Foundations of curriculum making.* Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.
Russell, B. (1926). *Education and the good life.* New York: Harper & Brothers.
Sandlin, J. A., Schultz, B. D., & Burdick, J. (Eds.). (2010, in press). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling.* New York: Routledge.
Saylor, J. G., & Alexander, W. M. (1954). *Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
Saylor, J. G., Alexander, W. M., & Lewis, A. J. (1981). *Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
Schubert, W. H. (1980). Recalibrating educational research: Toward a focus on practice. *Educational Researcher, 9*(1), 17–24, 31.
Schubert, W. H. (1981). Knowledge about out-of-school curriculum. *Educational Forum, 45*(2), 185–199.
Schubert, W. H. (1982). The return of curriculum inquiry from schooling to education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 12*(2), 221–232.
Schubert, W. H. (1986/1997). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility.* New York: Macmillan.
Schubert, W. H. (1989). On the practical value of practical inquiry for teachers and students. *Journal of Thought, 24*(1 & 2), 41–74.
Schubert, W. H. (2003). The curriculum-curriculum: Experiences in teaching curriculum. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 5*(1), 9–22.
Schubert, W. H. (2006). Focus on the BIG CURRICULUM. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 3*(1), 100–103.
Schubert, W. H. (2008a). Curriculum in theory. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 391–395).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Schubert, W. H. (2008b). Curriculum inquiry. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 399–419).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Schubert, W. H. (2009a). *Love, justice, and education: John Dewey and the Utopians.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
Schubert, W. H. (2009b). What's worthwhile: From knowing and experiencing to being and becoming. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 6*(1), 21–39.
Schubert, W. H. (2010). Outside curricula and public pedagogy. In J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz, & J. Burdick (Eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling* (pp. 10–19). New York: Routledge.
Schubert, W. H., & Ayers, W. C. (1992). *Teacher lore: Learning from our own experience.* White Plains, NY: Longman.
Schubert, W. H., & Lopez-Schubert, A. L. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Schubert, W. H., & Lopez-Schubert, A. L. (1981). Toward curricula that are of, by, and therefore for students. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3*(1), 239–251.
Schubert, W. H., Lopez-Schubert, A. L., Herzog, L. A., Posner, G. J., & Kridel, C. (1988). A genealogy of curriculum researchers. *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 8*(1), 137–183.
Schubert, W. H., Lopez-Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books.* New York: Peter Lang.
Schubert, W. H., & Schubert, A. L. (1982). Curriculum as cultural experience in student lives. In W. H. Schubert & A. L. Schubert (Eds.), *Conceptions of curriculum knowledge: Focus on students and teachers* (pp. 49–57). University Park, PA: College of Education, Pennsylvania State University.
Schultz, B. D. (2008). *Spectacular things happen along the way: Stories from an urban classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review, 78*, 1–23.
Schwab, J. J. (1970). *The practical: A language for curriculum.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.
Schwab, J. J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79*, 493–542.
Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum, *School Review, 81*, 501–522.
Schwab, J. J. (1983). The practical 4. *Curriculum Inquiry, 13*(3), 239–265.
Scriven, M. (1977). Goal-free evaluation. In E. R. House (Ed.), *School evaluation: The politics and process* (pp. 319–328). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Sears, J. T. (Ed.). (2005). *Youth, education, and sexualities: An international encyclopedia.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.
Sears, J. T., & Marshall, J. D. (Eds.). (1990). *Teaching and thinking about curriculum: Critical inquiries.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Seguel, M. L. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Selden, S. (1999). *Inheriting shame.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Semel, S. F. (1992). *Dalton School: The transformation of a progressive school.* New York: Peter Lang.
Short, E. C. (Ed.). (1991). *Forms of curriculum inquiry.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Short, E. C. (2005). *Curriculum inquiry and related scholarship: A searchable bibliography of selected studies.* Retrieved July 8, 2009, from http://edcollege.ucf.edu/esdepart/cirs/main.cfm
Short, E. C., & Marconnit, D. G. (Eds.). (1968). *Contemporary thought in public school curriculum.* Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
Short, E. C., & Waks, L. J. (Eds.). (2009). *Leaders in curriculum studies: Intellectual self-portraits.* Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
Short, E. C., Willis, G. H., & Schubert, W. H. (1985). *Toward excellence in curriculum inquiry: The story of the AERA SIG on creation and utilization of curriculum knowledge.* State College, PA: Nittany Press.
Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1950). *Fundamentals of curriculum development.* Yonkers-on-the-Hudson, NY: World Book.
Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development* (rev. ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
Smith, E. R., Tyler, R. W., & Associates. (1942). *Appraising and recording student progress.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Spears, H. (1951). *The teacher and curriculum planning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Spencer, H. (1861). *Education: Intellectual, moral, and physical*. New York: Appleton.
Spring, J. (1972). *Education and the rise of the corporate state*. Boston: Beacon.
Spring, J. (1989). *The sorting machine revisited*. New York: Longman.
Spring, J. (2010, in press). Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Stanley, W. B. (1992). *Curriculum for utopia: Social reconstructionism and critical pedagogy in the postmodern era*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Steinberg, S. R., & Kincheloe, J. L. (Eds.). (2004). *19 urban questions: Teaching in the city*. New York: Peter Lang.
Stern, B. S., & Kysilka, M. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Contemporary readings in curriculum*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Stratemeyer, F. B., Forkner, H. L., & McKim, M. G. (1947). *Developing a curriculum for modern living*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Stratemeyer, F. B., Forkner, H. L., McKim, M. G., & Passow, A. H. (1957). *Developing a curriculum for modern living*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little Brown.
Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. N. (1975/1980/1995/2006). *Curriculum development*. New York: Macmillan.
Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. N. (1990). *History of the school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
Tanner, L. N. (1997). *Dewey's laboratory school: Lessons for today*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Thiessen, D., & Cook-Sather, A. (Eds.). (2007). *The international handbook of student experience in elementary and secondary school*. London: Springer.
Tuhiwai-Smith, L. (2001). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Tyler, R. W. (1977). Desirable content for a curriculum development syllabus today. In A. Molnar & J. Zahorik (Eds.), *Curriculum theory* (pp. 36–44). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Ulich, R. (Ed.). (1947/1954). *Three thousand years of educational wisdom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Ulich, R. (1950). History of educational thought. New York: American Book.
Ulich, R. (1955). Response to Ralph Harper's essay. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Modern philosophies of education, fifty-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (Part I, pp. 254–257). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Urmacher, P. B., & Matthews, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Intricate palette: Educational contributions of Elliot W. Eisner*. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An education strategy (Sourcebook)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Elementary and secondary education: No child left behind act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
Vallance, E. (1991). Aesthetic inquiry: Art criticism. In E. C. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 155–172). Albany: State University of New York Press.

van Manen, M. (1986/2002). *The tone of teaching*. London, ON: Althouse Press.
van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
van Manen, M. (1991). *The tact of teaching: The meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Van Til, W. (1983/1996). *My way of looking at it*. San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.
Waks, L. (Ed.). (2006). *Leaders in philosophy of education: Intellectual self-portraits*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
Walker, D. F. (1971). A naturalistic model of curriculum development. *School Review 80*(1), 51–69.
Walker, D. F. (1974). What are the problems curricularists ought to study? *Curriculum Theory Network*, *4*(2–3), 217–218.
Walker, D. F. (1990). *Fundamentals of curriculum*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich.
Ward, L. F. (1883). *Dynamic sociology*. New York: D. Appleton.
Watkins, W. H. (1993). Black curriculum orientations: A preliminary inquiry. *Harvard Educational Review*, *63*(3), 321–338.
Watkins, W. H. (2001). *The White architects of Black education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Westbury, I., & Wilkof, N. (Eds.). (1978). *Science, curriculum, and liberal education: Essays of Joseph Schwab*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: Macmillan.
Whitehead, A. N. (1938). *Modes of thought*. New York: The Free Press.
Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Willis, G. H., & Schubert, W. H. (Eds.). (1991). *Reflections from the heart of educational inquiry: Understanding curriculum and teaching through the arts*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Willis, G. H., Schubert, W. H., Bullough, R., Jr., Kridel, C., & Holton, J. (Eds.). (1993). *The American curriculum: A documentary history*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
Witherell, C., & Noddings, N. (Eds.). (1991). *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, DC: Associated Publishers.
Wraga. W. G. (1994). *Democracy's high school*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Zinn, H. (2002). *You can't be neutral on a moving train*. Boston: Beacon.
Zinn, H., Konopacki, M., & Buhle, P. (2008). *A people's history of American empire*. New York: Harper Perennial.
Zinn, H., & Macedo, D. (2004). *Howard Zinn on democratic education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.