The Practical 3: Translation into Curriculum

Joseph J. Schwab

The School Review, Vol. 81, No. 4. (Aug., 1973), pp. 501-522.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0036-6773%28197308%2981%3A4%3C501%3ATP3TIC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F

The School Review is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org
Fri Mar 7 11:11:53 2008

The Practical 3: Translation into Curriculum

JOSEPH J. SCHWAB
University of Chicago

Scholars, as such, are incompetent to translate scholarly material into curriculum. They possess one body of disciplines indispensable to the task. They lack four others, equally indispensable. As scholars, they not only lack these other four, but also, as individuals, they are prone at best to ignore and at worst to sneer at them. Possessors of the other four necessary disciplines have an equal handicap; they do not possess the discipline of the scholar; they do not know the bodies of knowledge which his discipline has produced; they are often overawed by him. Yet, all five disciplines are necessary, and the curriculum work their possessors do must be done in collaboration. They must learn something of the concerns, values, and operations which arise from each other's experience. They must learn to honor these various groupings of concerns, values, and operations, and to adapt and diminish their own values enough to make room in their thinking for the others. They must bring these partially coalesced bodies of judgmental factors to bear on the body of scholarly materials.

These three operations—*discovery* of one another by collaborators, *coalescence* of what is discovered, *utilization* of the coalesced body of concerns as tools for generating new educational materials and purposes—take place, not serially, but simultaneously. The first two take place as the third is undertaken. The process is carried forward in a spiral movement toward a body of generated educational alternatives and choices among them—choices which

satisfy entirely no one party to the collaboration but which do satisfy the collective more than does any other constellation of educational means and purposes among those considered.

Agents of Translation

What are the five bodies of experience which must be represented in the group which undertakes the task of curriculum revision?

Subject matter. — There must be someone familiar with the scholarly materials under treatment and with the discipline from which they come. Suppose the materials under consideration are historical; then a member of the group must be familiar not only with this body of historical material but must also know what it is to be a historian.

Learners. — There must be someone familiar with the children who are to be the beneficiaries of the curricular operation. This experience, too, must be manifold. It must include general knowledge of the age group under consideration: what it already knows, what it is ready to learn, what will come easy, what will be difficult, what aspirations and anxieties which may affect learning must be taken into account, what will appear to the child as contributing to an immediate desire or need. It should include intimate knowledge of the children under consideration — knowledge achieved by direct involvement with them. This is required in order to know the ways in which this unique group of children depart from generalities about similar children of the same age. These special attributes will include not only an impression of the direction and degree by which these children depart from the average on the scales used by the gatherers of general knowledge but will also include knowledge of attitudes, competences, and propensities not taken into account by the gatherers of general knowledge about children.

JOSEPH J. SCHWAB is professor of education and William Rainey Harper Professor of the Natural Sciences at the University of Chicago.

Knowledge of the children should include a range of information about their present state of mind and heart treated as a stage in development toward their probable destiny as adults. This should include some probabilities about their future economic status and function; what leisure they will enjoy; what adult aspirations and attitudes they, their friends, and neighbors are likely to have; what roles they will play in the family, their political community, their ethnic or religious community.

The milieus. — References to community suggest a third body of experience which should be represented in the curriculum-making group: experience of the milieus in which the child's learning will take place and in which its fruits will be brought to bear. The relevant milieus are manifold, nesting one within another like Chinese boxes.

These milieus include the school and classroom in which the learning and teaching are supposed to occur. What are likely to be children's relations to one another? Will the classroom group overlap the play or neighborhood group or any other group in which the children function? Will the children begin as friends and acquaintances or as strangers? Will their relationships be dominated by cliques or other subgroups? What structure of authority (or status) will characterize the relations of teachers to one another and to the educational leaders of the school? In what ways are these relations of adults in the school likely to affect the relations of teachers to students or to what and how the teachers are likely to teach?

Relevant milieus will also include the family, the community, the particular groupings of religious, class, or ethnic genus. What aspirations, styles of life, attitudes toward education, and ethical standards characterize these parents and, through their roles as parents, affect the children (as well as the character of what can and cannot be attempted in a curriculum)?

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 play-

ground 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 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.

Teachers. — So far, three bodies of experience are to be represented in the curriculum group: experience of the scholarly subject matter and its discipline, of the child, and of the child's milieus. Another required body of experience is knowledge of the teachers. This should include knowledge of what these teachers are likely to know and how flexible and ready they are likely to be to learn new materials and new ways of teaching. We need good guesses, too, about their personalities, characters, and prevailing moods: how they are likely to relate to the children, to one another, to the directors of the school, to visiting master teachers or scholars; how they tend to feel about themselves. It may be desirable to know something of their backgrounds: what biases they bring with them, what political affiliations they champion.

Curriculum making. — The final required body of experience has to do with the curriculum-making process itself. Each representative of a body of experience must discover the experience of the others and the relevance of these radically different experiences to curriculum making for a partial coalescence of these bodies of experience to occur. These are necessary, "concurrent preliminaries" to the actual process of making a defensible curriculum which has some likelihood of functioning effectively. They are necessary preliminaries which are highly unlikely to occur of themselves. The usual developing behavior of such curriculum groups operating without a representative of this fifth body of experience is one of resentful or resigned submission of three of the group to a fourth.

It is easy for the scholar-specialist to overawe the group and to impose the character and structure of his discipline as the correct model for the character and structure of the curriculum. Only if the representative with knowledge of and sympathy with the children intervenes as an equal in the deliberation is the discipline represented by the scholar likely to be treated as a *resource* of

education rather than as a model for it.

It is easy for the representative of the children to overwhelm the scholar with his warnings of what children will and will not, can and cannot do, thus opposing his expertise—what children *have* habitually done in older curricula taught by methods appropriate to them—to the efforts of the scholar to urge trial of new purposes by new means.

It is also possible for the representative of the milieus to urge successfully the conventional caution that a member of a complex structure cannot hope to change the whole of which he is a mere part, or even effect a partial change contrary to prevailing habits and attitudes. Similarly, it is possible for the representative who knows the teaching group to urge conformity of the curriculum to what teachers currently can and are willing to do.

Three Functions of the Curriculum Specialist

One vital task of the representative of the curriculum-making process is to function as a countervailing force of these common tendencies. It is he who reminds all others of the importance of the experience of each representative to the (curriculum-making) enterprise as a whole. It is he, as chairman, who monitors the proceedings, pointing out to the group what has happened in the course of their deliberations, what is currently taking place, what has not yet been considered, what subordinations and superordinations may have occurred which affect the process in which all are engaged.

The first function of the curriculum specialist concerns these preliminaries to the curriculum-making process, the second concerns curriculum making itself.

Embodiments.—It is the curriculum specialist who knows the concrete embodiments, the material objects, which are the indispensable constituents of a curriculum. It is a mistake to suppose that a curriculum-planning group can safely and appropriately terminate its activities merely with statements of purposes and explanation of the reasons for choice of these rather than other purposes.

Curricular purposes, and reasons for them, must be communicated by language, by formulation. Such formulations will

inevitably fall short of encompassing the full meanings and real intentions of the parties to the curricular deliberation. The meanings which matter are those which determine whether a given text, a given pattern of teaching, a given treatment of a topic, when examined and momentarily submitted to, is both felt and seen to be appropriate to the curriculum which has been envisaged. These meanings lie in the whole course of the deliberations which created them. The meanings lie as much in what was decided against as in what was decided for. They lie in the reasons for rejection of alternatives as much as in the reasons for preferring those which are preferred. They lie in nuances of expression in the course of the deliberation.

These are meanings which are impossible to encompass in a formulation to be read and acted upon by individuals who were not privy to all the deliberation and become related to it only later through a terminal formulation of its chosen purposes and reasons. Others, not privy to the deliberation, cannot, like bronze molders, take a terminal statement of purposes as a pattern and, from it, realize a curriculum, constructing materials for students, guides for teachers, and patterns of teaching and learning which are appropriate.

Equally, however, a curriculum-planning group can rarely afford either the time or the expertise necessary for the construction of embodiments of the curriculum. Others must be enlisted in that effort in collaboration with the planning group, a collaboration which proceeds by formulation followed by discussion of what the reader of the formulation has garnered from it, followed by trial construction of a bit of concrete curriculum, followed by scrutiny of this trial by the planning group, followed by discussion of it among both makers of the bit and planners, followed by a corrected bit or an additional bit, and so on.

The second function of the curriculum specialist is to instigate, administer, and chair this process of realization of the curriculum.

Values.—There is another way in which terminal formulation fails to encompass and communicate the real intentions of a planning group. This second inadequacy stems from the deep psychology of intentions. Educational intentions are specified and projected *values* of the planning group, values possessed and understood in terms broader than education and much broader

than any one concrete bit of educational curriculum. The breadth and generality of these values are so great that only in a rare instance can a merely rationally guided concrete specification of a stated educational intention be confidently identified (by merely rational means) as embodying or satisfying one or more of the broad values held by the planning group. Only if there is added to rational scrutiny of a proposed segment of a curriculum the felt experience of it, an undergoing of it in imagination and empathy, only then can it be identified with some confidence as probably appropriate.

What we usually distinguish as ends and means—stated curricular intentions and curricular materials—are more realistically seen as elements in a maturation process by which values are realized reflexively. A value is embodied in a stated educational intention but only equivocally and imperfectly. The stated intention then serves as an imperfect guide or pattern for construction of a curriculum bit. Experience of the curriculum bit reduces by a little the equivocation of the stated intention and illuminates a little more the value which lies at its roots. Substitution of another curriculum bit, or modification of the first may follow from the illuminating experience but there will also be reflexive modification of the formulated intention itself or modification of the way it is understood. It may even be discarded or replaced. The underlying value which gave rise to the stated intention has itself come closer to the surface and may be better understood. The value may even be so well illuminated that it becomes accessible to scrutiny, criticism, and change. At least, we may hope that, though the value may not be examined with an eye to changing it as a living value of the curriculum planner, it will be scrutinized with an eye to whether it should be imposed upon the student by way of the curriculum.

Instigation, encouragement, and monitoring of this process is a third function of the curriculum specialist.[1]

Size of a planning group.—Although five bodies of experience must be brought together to effect translation of scholarly materials into defensible curriculum, it does not follow that five persons are required. The group may be smaller or larger than five. It may be smaller to the extent that two or more of the required bodies of experience may be found in one person. The

member who knows the child may also know the milieus of the teachers. The scholar may have adequate, living experience of the child or teachers.

There are also reasons why the group should be larger than five. Our knowledge of social milieus and of the development of children is knowledge produced out of the variform disciplines of the behavioral sciences. Different investigators in these sciences go about their enquiries in different ways, guided by differing conceptions of problem, method, and principle of investigation. More than one useful body of knowledge arises about an approximately common subject matter. Too often, the purveying possessor of such knowledge possesses only one of the several useful bodies of knowledge about the subject matter in question and needs to be complemented and corrected by another purveying specialist who knows another of the relevant bodies of knowledge.

The same pluralism holds for scholarly disciplines. There are dozens of critical conceptions of the novel and the short story. There are manifold conceptions of the character of historical investigation and knowledge, of moral-political behavior, of the ways in which appropriate religious behavior should be determined. Some measure of these pluralisms should be represented in the curriculum-making group if the embodiment of doctrine is not to be so narrow as to invite rejection when it sees the light of day.

Even experience of the curriculum might well be supplied in more than one person. For one such person will be possessor of values of his own as well as of curricular expertise. Consequently, only one such person in the role of chairman might well suppress some aspects of the deliberation rather than evoke them. If the notion of two chairmen is bizarre, then let us say, at least, that some additional person should be present to monitor the behavior of the chairman, someone alert to the movement of discussion, alert to its purport and removed from both the discipline under translation and from the educational purposes it is intended to serve.

Material to Be Translated

Defensible educational thought must take account of four commonplaces of *equal* rank: the learner, the teacher, the milieu,

and the subject matter. None of these can be omitted without omitting a vital factor in educational thought and practice. No one of them may be allowed to dominate the deliberation unless that domination is conscious and capable of defense in terms of the circumstances. Despite the educational bandwagons which bear witness to the contrary, neither child nor society nor subject matters nor teachers is the proper center of curriculum. Indeed, the short merry life of many bandwagon curriculums often has arisen from just such overemphases: the child-centered curriculums of Progressivism; the social-change-centered curriculums of the 1930s; the subject-matter-centered curriculums of recent reforms; the teacher-centered curriculums which may arise from unionism.

Coordinating four commonplaces.—Coordination, not superordination-subordination is the proper relation of these four commonplaces. We can demonstrate this by considering the possible domination of one in the light of another. Imagine a child-centered planning which emphasizes above all else the present inclinations of students, the interests they bring with them or those which can be aroused by the shrewd placement of provocative objects and events in the educational space. In a curriculum so initiated and thoughtfully planned, the other three commonplaces will not be ignored. Indeed, they may be honored but in a subordinate role. The milieus will be honored as limiting conditions. They will be examined with an eye to predicting interests and facilitating planning of curricular activities. The milieus will also be honored as targets of education by emphases in which collaboration of children, establishment of "rules of the game," and the role of umpire made necessary by rules, constitute socializing aspects of the curriculum. Subject matters will be honored by being the source from which and by which selection is made of the provocative objects and events which serve as catalysts of curricular activity. The teacher will be honored as the person who will most often serve in the role of umpire and serve more extensively as the more mature member of the learning community.

Despite these honorings of the other commonplaces of education, the dominance of the fourth, the children, creates clear and present ground for worry with respect to the subject-matter

factor. What of the many things the children may *not* learn which they need to know? We hear this core concern reverberate in the question: Can any planner, any teacher, know enough, know variety enough, and choose wisely enough among so many bodies of knowledge to plant in the learning area the appropriate provocatives of interest and learning? We hear the concern echo again in the question, But what if the "provocative" objects do not provoke? These worries are not allayed by assurances that a knowledge which is needed in the days when the child is no longer a child will be sought and learned. We know of nothing and are given nothing in the way of evidence to support this assurance.

In such worries we are tacitly affirming that subject matter—bodies of knowledge, of competences, of attitudes, propensities, and values—constitute the most inclusive and most telling checklist of possible desirables and possible human interests which mankind possesses. It is this characteristic of subject matter which makes it one of the commonplaces of education.

This characteristic of subject matter appears to argue for subject matter as the ruling commonplace of curricular deliberation. But recall what occurs when subject-matter concerns initiate the planning of curriculum. Subject matters are bodies of knowledge. As knowledge, they tend to shut out other educables: competences, attitudes, propensities, values. As *bodies* of knowledge, they are organized. There is a thread which leads us from one bit of subject matter to the next. Each bit appears to be contingent on what went before and to make necessary what comes after. It becomes difficult to *select* from a subject matter those parts which are defensible in the curriculum because they serve the child, the teaching function, or the polity. In a curriculum enterprise which begins in an effort to adapt a given subject matter to curricular purposes, it is virtually impossible to question whether that subject matter as a whole is desirable in the curriculum and whether it should be given much or little time and energy—inevitably taken from other subject matters or other curricular activities.

There is also ground for worry with respect to the child. Is this subject matter worthy now or in the future of the time and energy demanded of the child? Has there been generous and just concern for the amount of time apportioned to it, relative to time appor-

tioned to other subject matters, on the basis of what is better and worse for children? Or has the decision been made by the weightiness, the dignity, the current esteem, in which the subject matter is held or because the curriculum planners are dominated by lovers of that subject matter? We hear this concern reverberate in the question whether every subject matter is equally accessible or equally useful to all children, or whether individual differences, regional differences, and many other grouping differences among children ought not to determine how much of a given subject matter should be taught, what different selections ought to be made for different children, and what different versions and emphases, even in a single selection of content, should be made in the interest of the needs and abilities of different children. The reverberation is heard again as we wonder whether the heavy hand of self-interested adulthood may not be bearing too heavily on childhood and whether the past and what the past found useful may be weighing too heavily on the present and the future.

Through such worries we affirm that, in a consideration of a subject matter as affording materials for curriculum, one vital criterion must be what is best or good or satisfying to the learner as a child, as a human being, and as a citizen.

Our worries in these two cases taken together affirm that the commonplaces must be coordinate in the planning of curriculum. Amid the concerns of child-centered planning, we note the vital role of organized subject matter. Amid concerns for subject matter, we note the vital role of the child's present and future.

Maintaining coordinacy.—All this fails to speak directly to the practical problem of how to maintain coordination. The practical problem arises from the fact that a group of men is rarely commissioned or financed to think about *education.* (If they were, half of the practical problem would disappear, since that very commission raises all the commonplaces to equal visibility.) Instead, men are usually commissioned and financed to think about satisfying manpower requirements or about how to "modernize" the curriculum in biology, in social studies, in physics, in English. Such questions immediately raise the flag of one commonplace above others.

Four factors, no one sufficient in itself, no one indispensable, are concerned in maintaining coordination. First, there is the makeup of the planning group. Ordinarily the nucleus of a group

commissioned to translate a body of scholarly material into curriculum is drawn from the disciplines to be dealt with. The members of this nucleus make the curricular decisions. Men who represent the child, the teacher, and the milieu are usually drawn in only as subordinate temporary "consultants" who speak their pieces and depart. Their pieces are inadequate. They can speak only in generalities. They cannot speak to problems of the subject matter because they have not been peers in the discussion of it. They cannot speak to concrete curricular alternatives because they have not been parties to the generation of these alternatives from the scholarly body of material. The design of the deliberating body guarantees that commonplaces other than that of the subject matter will be effectively silent.

Part of the solution is obvious: representatives of all four commonplaces must be included in the deliberating group from the start. Almost as obvious is the need that these representatives be men who are not overawed by the scholar. But let us go farther. Let us require that the first order of business be an explanation of the scholarly material by the representative of that material to the skeptical minds of the remainder of the group. Let these unawed skeptics question the specialist closely, pointedly, indeed, personally, on all matters that are unclear, on all unsupported assertions about the importance or the character of his field and of the particular body of materials to be treated. Let there be questions about adequacy of problem and of evidence in the scholarship which produced the material. Let there be questions about the existence of competing questions and competing solutions. In brief, let us establish from the beginning the place of the scholarly member as only one among many and not the "first among peers."

A second desirable factor leading to coordination of commonplaces is a process of evaluation of tentatively accepted bits of curriculum, a formative evaluation which operates *concurrently* with the deliberations. This formative evaluation is to be done in course; it is to be done in order to improve curricular materials before they are widely distributed. This "improvement" must go considerably beyond the usual. The usual concern is for the efficiency with which the curricular bit serves the stated intention which generated it. We are concerned, in addition, with clari-

fication of the intention itself and of the values from which it arises. Consequently, the character of the evaluation, its timing, and use require specification.

It should be an evaluation which goes beyond tests of efficiency and aims at methods which will break the limits imposed by the stated intention. I have in mind an evaluation procedure in which the evaluator joins the experimental teacher in the classroom situation in which the materials are tested. Teacher and evaluator engage in an alert, sensitive watch to identify reactions and responses of children as they deal with the materials being evaluated, with a special eye for reactions and responses *un*anticipated in the stated intention. From these reactions and responses, evaluator and teacher, with the collaboration of the curriculum specialist member of the planning group, select those which they deem most representative of unanticipated characteristics of the curriculum bit and most significant in the education and development of the child. The frequency and intensity of these selected untoward reactions are then evaluated. Most important of all, the selected reactions are disclosed to the planning group in *two* embodiments—not only in the usual statistical report, but also in a direct confrontation of members of the planning group with the student behaviors themselves. Teacher and evaluator stage demonstration classes (and class aftermaths) for the deliberating body. This is the confrontation through which the planners will be able to go beyond rational scrutiny of what they are doing toward a felt experience of what they are proposing to do to and with the children. This is one way in which the child, as one important commonplace of curriculum consideration, can speak for himself.

Scholarship as Curriculum Potential

Let us consider two important attitudes which should be taken toward scholarly materials when they are translated into curriculum. First, they must be treated as *resources*. The import of this can be conveyed by an instance of its negation and an instance of its affirmation drawn from the field of literature.

The statement which introduces "Discussions of the Short Story" reads: "A short story is neither plot nor character nor statement nor style; it is simultaneously plot and character and statement

and style. In language a short story records moving character reflecting an attitude toward existence. The elements of the experience are separable only for the pleasures of discussion. For authoritative communication with any story, we return to the complicated experience of the story itself."[2] The author is asserting (*a*) a definition of the character of the "scholarly" material under treatment, a definition which asserts precisely and completely the character of the material, and (*b*) that translation of short stories into curriculum must, by whatever means will work, treat the short story as what it is. The curriculum must realize the short story as what it is; the curriculum must realize the short story in the minds and hearts of the student in its full character or try to do so as far as the condition of the students permits.

The passage is thus a sterling instance of refusal to use scholarly material as a curriculum resource. It insists on conformity of the curriculum to the nature of its source materials. The domination of subject matter is made complete; the other commonplaces are ignored; the "malleable" student is to be given the shape indicated by the material.

Compare that with a passage taken from "Literature in the Revitalized Curriculum."

> In more recent time . . . the new English [has been] rather much under the supervision of the academic. . . . We are now, in my view on the threshold of the fourth stage, which I shall call the Humanitarian. If there is a "new English" . . . it has taken the development of the imagination, conceived in the most liberating sense, as its ultimate aim. . . . The imagination is no narrow faculty, but filters through and colors every part, every corner of our lives. Let us take for example the matter of morality. . . . The curriculum should be open to a great variety of values and visions, including those that rub against the grain of society. . . . As the teacher is concerned with developing and expanding the student's total imaginative capacity, so he must be concerned with all aspects of the imagination . . .[3]

This author, too, starts from a characteristic of the scholarly material. But, unlike the first, he moves immediately to concern himself with what service this characteristic can perform which is good and satisfying for students. By this move, he illustrates what is meant by the treatment of scholarly material as curricular resource. The curriculum is not to conform to the material; the

material is to be used in the service of the student.

The use of scholarly material as a resource for curriculum can be perverted, and its perversion is as pernicious educationally as deprival of it is. Perversion consists of warping the scholarly materials out of their character in order to force them to serve a curricular purpose which fascinates the planners. Such perversions are exemplified by terminal formulations which begin, "How can we use science (or literature, or history, or moral dilemmas) to achieve *x*, *y*, or *z* ?" where the *x*, *y*, or *z* originate the deliberation and the scholarly materials are dragged in by the heels. The perversion consists in degrading subject matter to the role of servant.

Three Faces of Scholarly Material

The second attitude to be taken toward scholarly material when it is translated into curriculum is that scholarly material possesses three faces, *is* three different things. It is, first, that which it conveys, its purport. A piece of historical material is an account of what happened to someone somewhere. That event as it happened to those people at that time is one of its faces. A short story conveys a moral dilemma or a vision of a social class or the operation of a facet of human character. Any one of these constitutes one of its faces. A body of scientific material tells us something about a grouping of phenomena. That is one of the faces of a piece of scientific material.

A piece of scholarly material is also that which produced it. It is the outcome of an originating discipline, a coherent way of bringing a body of principles, methods and problems to bear upon some inchoate mass in order to give it order and meaning. A short story is the outcome of a discipline which selects material, clothes it in a certain language, gives it a certain form, and selects and uses certain devices in order to evoke a certain effect. A piece of scientific material is the outcome of a discipline which predetermines the character of some selected grouping of phenomena in order to formulate questions which it can answer by means of the techniques presently available to it.

Third, a piece of scholarly material is a compound object, a complex organization requiring certain access disciplines. There are numerous questions which must be addressed to a short story before that story will reveal itself fully. There are different

questions which must be addressed to a piece of history or science before one of them will reveal its full purport.

Constant awareness of the existence of these three faces in every piece of scholarly material is crucial to the translator into curriculum because each face possesses and suggests its own richness of curricular possibility. The purport may have many curricular uses and this is the face to which most curricular efforts are addressed. But the other two faces have curricular potential as great or greater. Where the purport speaks to those curricular possibilites which can be summarized under "knowing that," the two disciplinary faces speak to the curricular possibilities summarized under "knowing how."

The potential curricular values of access disciplines to a complex work are clear. Access to the intricate content and structure of a short story, a lyric poem, a psalm, a work of plastic art, or music is access to a highly durable and virtually inexhaustible source of satisfaction.

Access to a scientific work is access to ground for critical judgment which avoids the misinformation, the extremes of belief, and the confusion which are often the outcomes of popular renderings of such materials. Access to the structure of argument, whether toward political or moral action, is access to a judgment about the better and worse commitment of our time, our energy, and our developing character. Access to historical works is access to one of the factors which determine who we think we are, what problems we think we have, and how we ought to act. In general, possession of such disciplines is possession of avenues toward freedom of thought, feeling and action. The potential curricular values for the young of the originating disciplines, such as rhetoric toward production of argument, science toward production of warranted conclusions about natural things, history toward interpretations of the past, are less obvious. Their potential for the young becomes clearer when we note what it might mean to convey such disciplines to them.

We do not mean that all the young are to be made into expert historians, investigators, artists. This is fatuous. We do not mean merely that the young are to be given thin versions of some scholarly discipline to pursue as a hobby. We mean that we ought to consider as curricular possibilities the conveyance of such knowledge about and exemplary experience with originating

disciplines that the student (1) is better prepared to master those disciplines which give access to the finished outcomes of the scholarly disciplines; (2) is equipped with insight into the methods and principles of an originating discipline sufficient to add a critical component to his access disciplines. The attempt to *write* a lyric poem and to have one's effort submitted to analysis conveys aspects of the character of lyric poetry, aspects to be sought in the reading of lyric poems, which no mere instruction in the reading and analysis of lyric poems can convey. The attempt to formulate a scientific problem, however simple, and to carry out the investigation required by the problem, is to learn about questions to be addressed to scientific material which no mere lectorial presentation can convey. To grasp some of the many ways in which different historians conceive the character of historical knowledge, to identify the facts pertinent to each history, and to seek out these facts is to understand the kind of history one is reading at a given moment. It is a means of realizing the limitations of a particular kind of history as one among a number of ways of throwing light upon the past and interpreting the present, and it enhances competence to judge the dependability of the history under scrutiny. At the same time, the student's ability to read such a history is enhanced. He knows more of the questions to be addressed to the text and is better prepared to extract answers to these questions from the text.

In some cases, our stricture against conveying a thin version of a scholarly discipline and encouraging its actual use can be an overstatement. Simple versions of some scholarly disciplines may be of serious use to some laymen. Rhetoric is one. Since the good of every man is bound up in the communities of which he is member, the decisions made by such communities affect him. Thus, his ability to affect consensus is clearly an ability which redounds to his benefit. Casuistry, the discipline by which principles (especially moral and religious principles) are scrutinized for their relevance to a situation demanding choice and action and adapted to the case, is another discipline which can redound to the benefit of both individual student and the moral, religious, and political communities of which he is part. Some first-hand experience of scientific disciplines vastly sharpens one's understanding of what consitutes reliable and sufficient evidence for conclusions.

The possible benefit of mastery of simple versions of some

originating disciplines extends into the emotive realm. The ability to compose a lyric poem, or a moving statement of praise, of thanks, of awe, or of fear is a contribution to our ability to clarify and so to understand our emotions, to control them where control is desirable, to discharge them where discharge is desirable. By such means, melancholy can often be transformed into realistic grief rather than being allowed to deteriorate into pathological melancholia. A debt to the character or action of another person can be shaped into worthy gratitude rather than being permitted to degenerate into debthood or thoughtless worship. Some mastery of historical disciplines may enable us to organize and understand our own pasts, our personal histories, and thus to gain additional ability to think about our future and plan it.

Methods of Translation

The methods by which scholarly materials are translated into a defensible curriculum are not mere transformations of one kind or style of material into another. They are methods for assessing privations, perversities, errors, and misdevelopments in those who are to be recipients of the putative benefits of curriculum; then, methods for discovering in scholarly materials curricular potentials which serve the purposes which have been envisaged in the light of detected student needs; then, assessment of the probable advantages of one potential against others as a means toward educational benefits.

First Phase: Curriculum Effects

The method begins in two sources: (1) in knowledge of the young students and knowledge of their predecessors, now grown and exhibiting the good and bad effects of previous curriculums; (2) in a vision of the best student-grown (or several different "bests"), a vision deriving from the scrutinized values of the planning group. The method begins with an intertwining of two radically different strands: information and soul searching.

Each item of one strand must serve as an occasion for locating an item of the other. Each piece of information on the present condition of students or former students ought to be followed by voiced discoveries of how the planners feel about the condition in

question: whether it is approved, and why; if disapproved, what alternate condition or conditions ought to replace it. The planners should then invite statements of differences or concurrences of view on the desirability of replacing the condition and what might be done about it. Similarly, each statement of value or desired intention ought to evoke consideration of students or milieus as they are known or thought to be, with speculations on how they arrived at that desirable or undesirable condition.

This initial stage of the deliberation serves two purposes. First, precisely because the group is commissioned to concern itself with scholarly materials, it begins by emphasis on other commonplaces, especially the student and his milieus. Second, it is the prime means by which each planner begins to discover himself—his values and their projections into educational intentions—begins to discover his colleagues, and begins to discover the loci at which each must begin to modify or contract himself to accommodate his colleagues' views and arrive at a collegiality which can function effectively in pursuing the task at hand.

These purposes justify expenditure of considerable time, ten or fifteen two-hour meetings apportioned over as many weeks. The time should not be allotted, neither should one attempt to determine its end point by some estimate of achieved consensus. It should not be a move toward consensus, but an airing and accommodation which will continue in other guises in all stages of the deliberation. The terminus of this first phase should be signaled by a growing distaste for its continuance, a demand, generally agreed upon, that something more concrete take its place.

There is no warrant that men gathered together for the purposes outlined will discover anything of themselves or their colleagues or modulate their views to accommodate the views of their colleagues. Collegiality will arise only to the extent that a minimal capacity for shame and a degree of humility characterize each member of the group. It is "normal" for men to treat their own values as if they were well examined, to ignore contrary or different values utilized by others, and, most of all, to elevate automatically the area of their own expertise to the role of ultimate arbiter of matters under consideration. These "normalities," especially the arrogance of specialism, will wreck any attempt at responsible translation of scholarly materials into defensible curriculum. I know of no device

of chairmanship or tactic of administration which can avert this danger without the assistance of a measure of humility and shame among the participants.

The Second Phase: Discovery of Curriculum Potential

The second phase of the deliberation is occasioned by introduction of a piece of scholarly material whose potential for the curriculum is to be determined. This phase has two subphases. There must be, first, the generation of alternatives. The piece of scholarly material is scrutinized in its three existences (its purport, its originating discipline, and its access disciplines) for its curriculum potentials. The basis for inventiveness in this regard consists of the other commonplaces, as these have come to be envisaged in the phase of self-discovery. One figuratively turns the piece of scholarly material from side to side, viewing it in different lights. What use might it serve in the development of more critical loyalty to a community? What might it contribute to the child's resources for satisfying activity? What might it contribute to a moral or intellectual virtue held to be desirable by the planning group? To what convictions might it lead concerning conservation or reform of a community setting? To what maturation might it contribute?

The second subphase is entered when several pieces of scholarly material have been successfully treated in the first subphase. Now there are several potential curriculum bits competing for the time and energies of the students, for place in the curriculum. The second subphase is a process of choosing and deciding among the competing curricular bits, the intentions they seem to realize, the values they try to embody.

In this subphase, the central problem consists of discovering the considerations which ought to be brought to bear on the alternatives. The resources from which to derive the appropriate considerations are the four commonplaces. From the subject matter: Is the purport of the material an important historical event or condition, for example? Is it good history, arising from well-validated facts, interpreted in a defensible way toward insights useful to our time and circumstance? From the milieu: Does it contribute toward improvement of a community? Is it likely to be acceptable to that community? If it is novel or disturbing, are there steps we can take to facilitate its acceptance? From the children: Is the

good it is supposed to do more urgent or more important than the goods served by competing curricular bits? Is it appropriate to the age and experience of the children under consideration? What consequences may it have for the relations of children to parents and to other significant adults? What effect may it have on the relations of children to one another? What effect may it have on the relation of each child to himself? From the teacher: Is he or she prepared to teach it as it should be taught? Can this training be successfully entered upon? Will the teacher be in sympathy with the values embodied in the curricular bit? If not, are there prevailing values among teachers which can be used to help enlist them in the service of the embodied values?

It is impossible to forecast the precise questions which ought to be asked of the alternatives under consideration. The appropriate questions are made appropriate by the character of each particular curricular bit, by the attitudes, values, and cognitive skills of the planners, by the community for which the planning is done, by the peculiarities of the children to whom the curriculum is to be submitted. Discovery of the "right" questions to ask depends in the last analysis on the deliberative skill of the planners and the alertness of the chairing curriculum specialist.

The role of the curriculum specialist here is one which derives from a most marked and peculiar characteristic of the deliberative process: it must compare incommensurables. The task is not merely a technical one of forecasting consequences and costs. It is not adequately stated as merely determining *the* value or good of the forecast consequences. For "the" value is in fact a number of different values: a valued contribution to the maturity of the child; a valued effect on the present state of mind of the child; a valued effect on the community. These different values are the incommensurables, which must be weighed against one another. There are no weighting factors which can be supplied to the deliberating group by which to simplify this process.

The special obligation of the curriculum specialist chairman is to ensure that the group hunt out, recognize, and juxtapose the different considerations which are pertinent. Even when the arrogances of specialists have been mastered and collegiality established, there will still be a tendency to perseverate, to maintain attention on the one cluster of values which, for whatever reason, has initially interested the group at the start of one of its

meetings. It is this perseveration which the chairman must interrupt. His task is to see that the deliberations of the group are appropriately saltatory—that the group turn from concentrating on the affective values to the child, for example, and consider the value of putative effects of the curriculum bit on parents, on the finances of the operation, on the personality of the school principal. Clusters of values left behind are revisited—again and again. The aim is not to make the deliberations less thorough but to ensure juxtaposition of incommensurables so that they will be weighed against one another.

The generation and consideration of alternatives do not follow one another in strict seriality. There must be alternatives to consider, hence some must be generated before the second subphase can be entered. But the deliberations involved in the consideration of alternatives are themselves rich sources of new alternatives. The moments when such flashes of invention occur to a member of the group must be honored, however important the considerations under discussion may appear to be.

Neither generation nor consideration of alternatives conclude when the planning group has agreed on the curriculum bits it proposes to sponsor. The processes of invention and choice run on through the operations of evaluation, earlier described and especially in that aspect of the evaluation which involves confrontation of the planning group with the untoward reponses of the children to the sponsored curriuculum bit. The confrontation is one way in which the child can enter the curricular discussion, and speak for himself. Other devices directed toward the same end —with reference to teacher and community as well as the child—should be sought.

This paper is the third of a series made possible by grants from the Ford and Guggenheim Foundations. It was presented at a conclave called by the Melton Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The two previous articles are "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum" (SR, November 1969) and "The Practical: Arts of Eclectic" (SR, August 1971).

1. For an illuminating statement of the role of the curriculum specialist, see Seymour Fox, "A Practical Image of the Practical," *Curriculum Theory Network*, no. 10 (Fall 1972).

2. Hollis Summers, ed. *Discussions of the Short Story* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1963).

3. James E. Miller, Jr., "Literature in the Revitalized Curriculum," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, no. 318 (April 1967), pp. 25-38.

http://www.jstor.org

LINKED CITATIONS

You have printed the following article:

The Practical 3: Translation into Curriculum
Joseph J. Schwab
The School Review, Vol. 81, No. 4. (Aug., 1973), pp. 501-522.
Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0036-6773%28197308%2981%3A4%3C501%3ATP3TIC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F

This article references the following linked citations. If you are trying to access articles from an off-campus location, you may be required to first logon via your library web site to access JSTOR. Please visit your library's website or contact a librarian to learn about options for remote access to JSTOR.

[Footnotes]

[1] **A Practical Image of "The Practical"**
Seymour Fox
Curriculum Theory Network, No. 10. (Autumn, 1972), pp. 45-57.
Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0078-4931%28197223%290%3A10%3C45%3AAPIO%22P%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M

NOTE: *The reference numbering from the original has been maintained in this citation list.*