The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do
Author(s): Joseph J. Schwab
Source: *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Autumn, 1983), pp. 239-265
Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1179606
Accessed: 12/08/2010 13:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. 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/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=black.

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.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto and *Blackwell Publishing* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Curriculum Inquiry*.

http://www.jstor.org

The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors To Do

JOSEPH J. SCHWAB
Santa Barbara, California

This paper, by contrast to the three papers which precede it (See Appendix, Note 2) is a practical paper on the practical. Such a practical paper must necessarily exemplify arts of the practical insofar as this is possible in expository prose as against the natural language of the practical which is deliberative exchange and consideration among several persons or differing selves about concrete alternatives in relation to particular times and places.

The process of exemplification gives rise to certain stylistic qualities, some of which may annoy the reader. First, the structural elements of its syntax are not premises, argument, and conclusion but circumstances and alternative ways of changing them. In consequence, there are numerous examples. Second, some of these exemplify the same point as it might present itself under a variety of circumstances (an emphasis on the particularity of the practical). Third, there is extended consideration of details of many of these circumstances. Fourth, the quality of deliberative discourse is maintained by raising doubts to matters suggested. Finally, there are passages which would be digressions in normal expository discourse. Most are set within parentheses or brackets. Here, they exist as instances of the elastic boundaries characteristic of practical problems and of the need to pursue possible effects of considered solutions to practical problems into areas beyond the scope of the problem as formulated.

I should add that this paper stands on its own, despite its origin in predecessors. It does this by virtue of summaries, where necessary, of points made in the earlier papers.

© 1983 by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
CURRICULUM INQUIRY 13:3 (1983) CCC 0362-6784/030239-26$03.60

Curriculum

I stipulate the following conception of curriculum: Curriculum is what is successfully conveyed to differing degrees to different students, by committed teachers using appropriate materials and actions, of legitimated bodies of knowledge, skill, taste, and propensity to act and react, which are chosen for instruction after serious reflection and communal decision by representatives of those involved in the teaching of a specified group of students who are known to the decisionmakers.

I repeat: What is successfully conveyed. By committed teachers. Using appropriate materials and methods. Of legitimated matters. Which are chosen *via* serious reflection on alternatives. By those involved in the teaching of a specifiable and known group of students. Who will differ from time to time and place to place.

I add: Curriculum is not an endless collection of objectives. It is not decided in Moscow and telegraphed to the provinces whether Moscow be conceived as the specialist in biology, or the specialist in curriculum, or the teacher claiming academic freedom, or the legislator or parents, or students. All of these are involved. No one of them moreover, is the fountainhead of decision and choice except as particular circumstance convinces a majority of them that one be treated for a particular occasion or problem as the fountainhead. Curriculum is not necessarily the same for all students of a given age and standing. Nor does it differ necessarily in all respects for each and every student or school. Finally, curriculum is not something about which decisions can be certified in advance of trial as the best decisions. Some of these matters require further elucidation.

Objectives

Stricture on endless strings of objectives is a matter on which very much has been well-written. Here, then, I shall be content to emphasise two curricular objections to such strings. In the first place, but not of first importance, such strings often, even usually, anatomize matters which may be of great importance into bits and pieces which, taken separately, are trivial or pointless. Lists of objectives often so trivialize because they anatomize, not only a subject-matter, but teachers' thoughts about it, the pattern of instruction used to convey it, the organization of textbooks, and the analysis and construction of tests.

In the second place, and of first importance, ends or objectives can be defensibly selected only in the light of consideration of available or obtainable means, materials, and teaching skills; nor can ends chosen lead to means and materials which yield only the ends for which they were chosen. There are side effects to teaching devices as there are to pharmaceuticals and the side effects of teaching may be as dangerous, or as useful and suggestive of alternative uses, as pharmaceutical side effects. Therefore reflection on curriculum must take account of what

teachers are ready to teach or ready to learn to teach; what materials are available or can be devised; what effects actually ensue from materials and methods chosen, not merely how well they yield intended purposes but what else ensues. But none of these can be identified except as some ends or objectives are tentatively selected and pursued. Hence, curriculum reflection must take place in a back-and-forth manner between ends and means. A linear movement from ends to means is absurd.

Equality of the Commonplaces

I remarked above that, although no one contributor to curriculum decision is by nature the fountainhead of decision, any one of them may, under some circumstances, be adjudged the fountainhead for that occasion or problem. This point about occasional fountainheads is of personal as well as general importance since it bears on a carelessness of mine. I have said, perhaps too often, that the four commonplaces of education (teacher, student, what is taught and milieux of teaching–learning) which the contributors to curriculum decision represent, are of intrinsically equal importance. I have put such emphasis on this matter because curriculum decision has been so commonly based on subject-matter considerations alone, or political-communal considerations alone, or the individual child's want or need alone and so on. My repeated insistence on the *theoretically* equal importance of the several commonplaces has been repeatedly taken to mean that in all and every curricular debate, each of the commonplaces should be given equal weight.

This is not the case. There are times and places when the welfare of the state is of paramount importance (during threat of war for example) and what contributes most to the future happiness of individual students, or justice to a subject-matter, or the bents of teachers, must take subordinate positions. There are times when the state's welfare can be relegated to secondary importance in deference to what education might confer on individual lives. And both may be subordinated at times to the desirability of recruiting some of the best students to the service of a subject-matter.

Nevertheless, it is only by consideration of the present state of the curriculum, the present condition of students and surrounding circumstances, all in the light of all the commonplaces equally, that a decision to favor one or another is justified. Without such consideration, curricular planning results in errors which later require corrections which turn out to be another misemphasis requiring another correction, and so on indefinitely. Consider recent pressures for a large-scale core curriculum in the high schools to "correct" the indefinite electivism which arose from unconsidered primacy of student "wants and needs," an unexamined emphasis on subject-matter which will almost certainly require (if successful) a further "correction" to meet national and personal economic needs. The current concern about subject-matters (math and science) is another case in point: a "correction" of the "correction" generated by

the massive Moscovian curricular pressures of the early sixties. The now-dying press for "career" education and "basics," arising from heavy emphasis on supposed social needs for labor orientation and enough of the three R's to permit understanding of orders and instructions, is another case in point.

Moscow, The Provinces and Federalism

The plaint of my earlier papers on the practical is that professors of curriculum almost invariably seek to fight the revolution in Moscow and telegraph it to the provinces. They seek the right curriculum by consulting and constructing theories which they hope will be theories of curriculum. They conceive theory as being immediately applicable to every instance of its subject-matter. Hence, most act as if an adequate theory of curriculum, were it to be found, would tell us once and for all what to do in every grade and every stage of every school in every place.

I, on the other hand, assert that a diversity of needs, resources, and recipients of education characterize American times and places, and, hence, call for a diversity of curricula. The differences from curriculum to curriculum will often be small (though crucial), and may sometimes be of a substantial order. The construction of needed diversities entails attention by planners of curriculum to the *local.*

The locality I have in mind is exemplified by the locality of the students of a school, district, or town. They often are of a prevailing social class, ethnic or religious background which has its own view of what should be taught and learned and its own view of the value of education in general. They are often of a prevailing band of economic standings which determine what pressures are on them, what time and privacies they have for study. The place may be urban, suburban, or rural; Southern, Texan, or any other region of special characteristic; prevailingly industrial, managerial, or agricultural. These features will determine the exemplifications of adulthood and of a desirable life which students encounter and which determine, in some part, what they will expect from schooling and upon what they are most willing to devote their energies.

Such matters are crucial factors in decisions about curriculum. For example, to ignore socio-ethnic views of what is worth learning is to fail to teach well what a larger view determines to be desirable or is to put resources in the service of an aspect of instruction which is unnecessary. To be innocent of the constrictions on time and privacy which students enjoy at home may well mean to impose burdens of learning which the students of that place cannot bear. In similar fashion, to ignore the exemplifications of adulthood and a good life which characterize the place is to fail to utilize student energies which press for fuller expression in some direction or is, by complement, to fail to see the need for special mobilization of student energies for the pursuit of other goals. Similar localisms affect the teacher of a school or district, the resources in the

community for instruction and for examples of matters taught, and the availability of financial support for one or another aspect of education.

It is this very locality of instances of the subject-matter of a theory which theorists necessarily ignore in order to make theories theoretical, that is, to confer on them a required universality by taking account only of the elements common to all members of their universe. There is a second weakness of such theories: they are almost always psychological theories of one kind of psychology or an another, *or* political-economic theories, *or* sociological *or* epistemological. Each such theory usually takes account of only one of the commonplaces that together constitute education, hence such theories are incomplete.

As a corrective alternative to such theoreticism, I have proposed cultivation and use of two sets of arts which treat, respectively, the need for localism of curriculum and the need for adaptation of theories to one another and to the educational problems on which they are brought to bear. I call these arts, employing an ancient tradition, arts of the practical i.e. prudence and deliberation, *and* arts of eclectic.

These theses about the practical and the arguments supporting them have generated a certain amount of discussion, both by way of approval and condemnation. Ironically, even some highly theoretic discussion has been evoked (e.g., "What is the true (sic) nature of theory and practice?"). The theses and arguments have not, however, conspicuously transformed curricular theorists into practitioners. Discussants, including myself, have suggested three reasons for this failure: that curricularists are unfamiliar with the arts of deliberation and eclectic and unprepared to master them; that the practical is not particularly respectable academically and professors of education desperately pursue academic respectability; that the bureaucratic structure of American education provides no pathway for exercise of the arts of practice by professors of education.

The first of these, unfamiliarity with the practical and eclectic arts, is being dealt with by groups of involved friends and colleagues.[1] The second reason, pursuit of academic respectability must, it appears to me, be dealt with only indirectly. In this paper, I deal with the third, a path for professorial involvement in the practical. I shall do so by first describing the character and usefulness of a new role or office to be installed in individual schools or small school systems. I shall then indicate the initial higher education which would prepare men and women to fill this office, and the professorial scholarly activity which would continuously refresh those who fill this office. Such preparation and refreshment would be practical functions of professors of curriculum. So much for starting points. Let us proceed.

The Office—Its Forerunner

Let us suppose that School X has decided to institute a continuing watch and correction of its curriculum. Who shall take on the task? The first

answer, the principal, will not fly, at least not in the United States. At a graduation party of teacher candidates a year or so ago, one young man, allowed to speak for five minutes as a reward for excellence of record, said, in effect; "I'm going into teaching because that is the route to becoming a principal and a principal is what I want to be. He runs things and gives orders and is obeyed." It would be unfair to suppose that the young man was representative of the bents of principals generally, as far as his expressed wish for getting and exercising power is concerned. With respect, however, to his emphasis on a managerial function, he may not be far wrong. I know of no data on principals' wishes in this respect nor even of a reliable way to discover them. I do know that managing is what most principals mostly do.

One review of research, emanating from The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, suggests that only half of elementary school principals actually attempt to improve instructional programs and this half, I suspect, do only a little toward this end and rarely sustain an effort until it has been successful. This need not be because of psychological bents but because there is so much managing to be done. There is, first, the work of the school to do, that is, watching over the attendance and work of teachers, the attendance and behavior of students, the availability of supplies and materials, the selection of new teachers as needed, the distribution of times and places of teachers, courses, and programs. Then there are money sources to be located and exploited: community relations to be maintained; and communication lines with School Boards and Superintendents to be kept open and useful to the school. For sustained and continuing watch over curriculum, another agency is required.

Once we set aside the traditional assignment of the task to the principal, it becomes obvious that the nature of curriculum change, that is, identification of the places where change is wanting, the borrowing or invention of alternative ways of fulfilling identified wants, deliberation on the costs and benefits of these alternatives, and, at last, their initiation with convinced and ready teachers, requires, not one person, but a group. A group is required, first of all, by the dependence of warranted decision on all the commonplaces, that is, the considerations they remind us to take into account in making decisions and the need to examine circumstances for the relative weighting of the commonplaces which is appropriate to this time and place. The commonplaces demand a group because no one person adequately commands the concrete particularities of all the commonplaces. What should be taught, how teaching should run, who is available to do it, which students most need the change in question, are each matters requiring their own expertise or experience.

A group is further required in order to make likely the invention of some diversity of appropriate alternatives. Again, a group is required to deliberate on these alternatives, for, though inner deliberation on an extensive matter is possible, it is extremely difficult, especially because it requires a state of nonbias with respect to emphasis on one commonplace or another. There is still another need for a group which will be raised at a more appropriate moment. Hence, the question has changed. It is

no longer who shall do it, but who shall constitute the group who shall do it.

The first answer to the question of who should be a member of the group is the teacher. Again, and louder: THE TEACHER. There are two major reasons for this emphasis. First, the children of the school as learners: their behavior and misbehavior in classrooms: what they take as "fair" or "unfair" in the course of teaching-learning: what rouses hopes, fears, and despairs with respect to learning: what the children are inclined to learn: what they disdain and what they see as relevant to their present or future lives, are better known by no one than the teacher. It is he who tries to teach them. It is she who lives with them for the better part of the day and the better part of the year.

There are important generalities about learning which can be proferred by some kinds of psychologists. There are some desirable and undesirable tendencies on the part of teachers which are best known by certain other social scientists. But the generalities of psychology require particularization to these teachers here and now. And what social scientists may know about the behavior of teachers in the classroom (a) will not be invariant from teacher to teacher and (b) is unlikely to be accompanied by knowledge of effective ways to alter undesirable and encourage wanted behaviors.

The second reason for insisting that the teacher be first-named member of the curricular group is a matter it has taken decades for us to learn or, at least, to realize we must take into account. Some scholarly specialists very likely would correct this to read, ". . . to which to capitulate." It is simply this: teachers will not and cannot be merely told what to do. Subject specialists have tried it. Their attempts and failures I know at first hand. Administrators have tried it. Legislators have tried it. Teachers are not, however, assembly line operators, and will not so behave. Further, they have no need, except in rare instances, to fall back on defiance as a way of not heeding. There are a thousand ingenious ways in which commands on what and how to teach can, will, and must be modified or circumvented in the actual moments of teaching. Teachers practise an art. Moments of choice of what to do, how to do it, with whom and at what pace, arise hundreds of times a school day, and arise differently every day and with every group of students. No command or instruction can be so formulated as to control that kind of artistic judgment and behavior, with its demand for frequent, instant choices of ways to meet an ever varying situation. (The personal practical knowing in back of this kind of teacher judgment is currently under study at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education with early results which are extremely interesting). Therefore, teachers *must* be involved in debate, deliberation, and decision about what and how to teach. Such involvement constitutes the only language in which knowledge adequate to an art can arise. Without such a language, teachers not only feel decisions as impositions, they find that intelligence cannot traverse the gap between the generalities of merely expounded instructions and the particularities of teaching moments. Participation in debate-deliberation-choice is required for learning what is needed as well as for

willingness to do it.[2] There is an obvious moral here for teacher-training. Persons involved in teacher-training might well puzzle over it.

What teachers do we need? A few schools are fortunate in having some teachers who are especially ingenious at thinking up ways of solving problems of what and how to teach. We need representatives of those teachers. There are, second, the teachers who will, if they are persuaded of its worth, undertake the altered teaching which arises as a solution to the problems in hand. They must be represented.

In addition to ingenious teachers and teachers who represent the area of schooling under discussion, there should also be at least one teacher-representative of an area remote from that under discussion. She could be a teacher of literature when the problem under discussion concerns science. She could be a teacher of the social studies when the problem concerns literature. This representation is desirable because a curricular change in any area of schooling which leaves the rest of the curriculum unaffected is rare indeed. At the least, a change in one area of the curriculum adds or subtracts from the money, student time and student interest addressed to other aspects of the curriculum. More specifically, a change in substance or emphasis in the teaching of literature may directly affect, say, the teaching of history and the social sciences. The converse also holds. Consider, for example, the close connection between the moral-social import of a George Eliot novel and the content of social studies texts or a history of the 19th Century. Scientific materials will exhibit similar connections with literature and the social studies. The heredity-environment issue is one case in point. Biological studies of population growth and legislative considerations of contraception and abortion is another. The role and nature of emotion seen in novels and short-stories have intimate ties to what psychologists may affirm, deny, or leave unmentioned.

How many teachers? Two of the ingenious would be helpful indeed, especially because such people stimulate one another. Two (or three if the school is on the biggish side) of the possible users of the change is a necessity if the recommendations of the curriculum group are to have weight with remaining teachers affected by the proposed change. Of course, if only a few teachers will be involved in use of the change, all of them should be in the curriculum group or in one of its subcommittees. At least one, possibly two, representative(s) of remote subject areas will be needed.

The other members of the curriculum group can be discussed more briefly.

The principal is an indispensable member of the group, not only for the sake of the group's curricular work but for the sake of the school as a whole. He contributes to the success of the curricular work in four ways. In the first place, his knowledge and approval of the curricular change which may be proferred is critical to effective installation of the change, i.e., its adoption by willing and understanding teachers. This holds especially for teachers not involved in the group's work and for

new teachers arriving after the work is done. This arises from the hierarchical administrative structure of most schools and the mythos of authority.

Second, the principal, if long in his post, will have fullest knowledge of the smallest but most potent social milieu which affects teaching and learning, that is, the milieu of the school itself. He will know the tradition, the taboos, and requirements passed on from established to younger teachers of the school. He will know better than others in the school what status the school labors under or enjoys vis a vis the school board and those who influence its decisions. He will know what funds are available or whether it is wise to divert funds from present activities to a newly proposed one. He is likely to be aware of wants and attitudes among parents and neighbors of which the teachers are unaware. All of these are germane to curricular decision.

Third, the absence of the principal from the curricular group would elevate the Curriculum Chairmanship, the new school office for which we are at this moment preparing the background, to that of an administrative office. This would be fatal to its holder's pursuit of his task, as we shall describe it. He must be, and be seen by teachers, as one of theirs.

Fourth, involvement of the principal in group membership will, in many cases, serve both as a way for him to participate in curriculum decision *and* as a persuasive way. It will be a way, pure and simple, in the many cases where principals have felt that the pressure of time imposed by other duties forbade concern in curriculum structure. It will be so because membership in a group as against leadership, permits the principal some flexibility in apportioning the time devoted to the curricular tasks. Others share in the thinking; he can absent himself on occasion. It will be a persuasive way to involve him in curriculum since the typical administrator will be reluctant to have an important undertaking proceed without some cognizance and contribution by him.

Finally, it is obvious that establishment of a Curriculum Chairman as head of a group which can alter curriculum without participation of the Principal is to establish a dual, competitive administration of the school. Such a state of affairs would not be tolerated by principals, would complicate the maneuvers of teachers vis a vis the administration, including the temptation to set Chairman and principal at odds with one another, and would confuse the efforts of parents and citizens concerned with the school.

A curriculum ought to be known by the persons it produces, as well as by other signs and standards. In schools generally, an approximation to such knowledge is supplied by the results of standardized achievement tests of various kinds. These would most certainly be consulted by our group. In many consolidated schools and schools of small towns and cities, an additional and broader source of information is available; that is, persons who employ the school's graduates, work with them, and see their behavior in the neighborhood and at public functions. Such persons should be represented on our curricular group. (Obviously, what is seen

of young persons at work and play cannot be blamed or credited only to the schools. This must be a matter for discussion in the group and possibly for research.)

For this role, a superb choice would be a member of the local school board. He is peculiarly appropriate because of several functions and qualities combined in him. First, he is a non-school member of the community, hence he has a set of biases which differ from those of school men and women. He is elected or appointed to the school board because he represents powerful or numerous members of the community with whom, presumably, he remains in communication. He is not only, however, a peculiarly apt representative of the community, he is also a member of the school board. As such, his service on the curriculum group should generate knowledge of what the schools do and why they do it, knowledge which school boards do not, as a rule, possess in plenitude. He would inevitably carry back to the board meetings some of this knowledge and attitudes altered by its possession. This would, I think, convey to school boards a degree of the same sort of commitment which participation in curriculum decision making confers on teachers.

In many instances, it will not be possible to coopt a member of the school board. They are full time workers elsewhere in most cases, and the desirable ones for our purposes are frequent attendants at board meetings. Their time is further consumed by letters and phone calls of parents and others and by the labors engendered by these communications. In such cases, it might be possible to coopt two board members who would attend a few early meetings of the curriculum group together, then alternate in attendance at the group's meetings. If board members are unavailable, the function under consideration might well be served by an active, recent retiree with similar recent immersion in the school community, a newspaper editor or publisher, or someone whose work, such as banking, insurance, or housing, has brought him into touch with a wide variety of the citizenry. There is little more to be said at this level of the hypothetical.

Thus far, five sorts of persons constitute the regular members of our curricular group: three sorts of teachers, the principal, and a school board or business community member. There is one other: a representation of students. My suggestion of such a representation is no mere hangover from the fury of the rebellious sixties. It is made for two good educational reasons. First, students can tell us some things about the effects of what and how we teach which no others can. Second, their participation in curricular decision can provide a sense of proprietorship in their school lives, a realization that learning is something more than an arbitrary imposition, and that what they are asked to learn is more than the product of mere adult whim. (Such changes in attitude touch on two of the most frequently voiced reasons or excuses for minimal participation in schooling.)

Student representation would, of course, vary from level to level and from place to place. It would vary in number of representatives, in kind, that is, those with vote, with voice but not vote, etc., and in manner of

selection (by administrative appointment, by teacher nomination followed by teacher election or administrative appointment, by student nomination and faculty selection, etc.) We must beware, however, lest we be guilty of a fault common at the college level, that is, choice of students for their incapacity to participate or for their responsiveness to the blandishments of the powerful, "company men." Such "representatives" are quickly seen to be fraudulent by the remainder of students, and consequently create alienation instead of closer ties.

The roster, so far, of those who constitute the regularly attending members of the curriculum group are these: four to six teachers representing faculty members of three interests; the principal; a school board member or substitute; one or two representatives of students; a total of circa nine.

A brief glance at the commonplaces will show us what we have taken into account in shaping this group and what remains to be considered. Obviously, we have dealt with some of the particularities which represent student and teacher. We have dealt with the closest encircling mileux. We have yet to consider, then, what is taught, that is, the "subject-matter" in the usual but misleading language *and* the larger milieux. To anticipate, we shall find that additional group members suggested by consideration of these factors need be only occasional attendants.

What is taught in a school falls, for our present purposes, into two categories. One consists of skimmings or thoughtful selections from the outcomes of customary fields of academic enquiry, such as physics, literary criticism, history and arts used in, or derived from, such fields, for instance, reading, writing, measurement, careful observation, and calculation. The other category consists of nonintellective propensities to act or respond to things, persons, and events. Examples in this second category would be honest reporting, collaboration, charity toward less effective others, interest and welcome toward differing others, readiness to deal with the unexpected and the repetitive, and deferral of gratification. These two categories will each require its own kind of specialist.

For the first category, the specialist will obviously be a professorial academic. It is worth noting, however, that academics are of different kinds, not all of them equally desirable as counsellors to our curriculum group. One kind consists of those whose forte is thorough knowledge of the content of upper-level textbooks and whose limitation consists in restriction of their involvement in the academic to this knowledge and to that which they learned in the course of doctoral candidacy. A second kind adds to such thorough knowledge a participation, to one degree or another, in contributing to this knowledge, of engaging in research. The third and rarest sort is one who has not only participated in research but has also reflected on the modes of enquiry or creation in his field. Such a person differs from the second kind by knowing enough of the past of his field of enquiry to know that the modes of enquiry currently practised are but one or a few among more numerous alternatives. Knowing this, he knows also that unqualified truth and falsehood are not properties of the fruits of enquiry, whether they be in the hard sci-

ences, the soft, or in fields of enquiry which do not claim to be sciences. He knows that conclusions are not only based on evidence which is rarely entirely sufficient but also upon decisions as to what shall constitute the problems of enquiry, what shall pass for data, and what principles are currently used to interpret data.

When an academic matter is under consideration by our curricular group, a member of the third class of academic, though somewhat frightening as seen through my description, is by far the best advisor. This follows from what is probably the most durable, widespread and self-destructive fallacy of American school men and women: the belief that there is an eternally true, ineluctable content of school subjects, such as mathematics, biology, physics, and an almost equally fixed basis of social studies and history. Consequently, "teaching" in these subjects is largely "telling," written or oral, with little thoughtful attention to argument and evidence; even less concern with alternatives and their different strengths and weaknesses; still less with consideration by students of what is yet to be known and how it might be sought through enquiry.

This mistaking of the habitually taught for the durable truth stands as one of the great barriers to any curricular change and as the greatest of barriers to change which will not, in its turn, become virtually religious dogma.

The academic whom we have described as of the third kind is, by reason of his critical grasp of his field, best qualified to insure that the curricular group will consider a range of legitimated bodies of knowledge and skills (recall our stipulated definition of curriculum). He is also an advisor who can and will be aware of evidences and arguments, experiments and discoveries, weaknesses and omissions in what is known. These matters, argument, evidence, and so on, may themselves be legitimate and highly useful matters for curricular inclusion.

Specialists of the third kind are rare. They tend, however, to be much more willing to contribute some of their time to secondary-primary school efforts at improvement than are those of the second kind. Persons of the second kind usually consider themselves much too busy. Members of the third kind may, consequently, be hard to find in nearby universities. In that case, I do NOT suggest entire substitution of a member of the first or second kind. Rather, I suggest that a member of the first kind be a source of first suggestions and largest participation and that a member of the third kind be sought from afar if necessary, despite the costs, and brought to the curricular group, if only for one extended meeting, to comment on the suggestions of the first advisor. Without, of course, embarrassment of the first advisor by naming him, if he chooses to be absent from such a meeting.

I add that it will be extremely helpful to the success of the curriculum group effort if the first advisor be asked for titles and authors of advanced texts which contain exposition of the matters he expounds and suggests. Scrutiny of such texts often reveal qualifications and doubts which are omitted in oral discourse. Their availability and use will also profitably reduce the frequency of attendance required from the advisor.

Where the curricular problem in hand concerns what we have called nonintellective propensities, the relevant specialist will be of another kind entirely. He may be an artist, a former convict or alcoholic, a man of wealth, a mother on relief, a widow or widower, a professional marriage counsellor, arbitrator or parole officer. Who he is will be determined by the propensities under consideration. A good advisor may be found in one who has suffered and mastered a problem, such as grief, alteration of habitual behavior, control of power, deprivation. One who regularly advises or assists persons who have such problems may be the helpful person for the curricular group. Again, whether the potential counsellor be one who has mastered a kind of problem or one who helps such sufferers, there will be some who have only mastered the problem or given their advice and others who have reflected on what they have done. The latter is worth looking for.

There is one further group of persons from whom consultations may be sought, social scientists. There can be need to consult one or another kind of psychologist: psychiatric, emotional, cognitive, or "learning." A few sociologists can provide useful advice on likely group behavior. Ethnographers have begun to seek and discover much useful information about teacher behavior and schoolroom behavior of both teachers and students. With such persons, with the possible exception of ethnographers, it is, however, important to remember their penchant for generalization, a penchant on which we have earlier remarked at greater length.

A last word about the makeup of our curricular group. We are fortunate, indeed, that the functions of those named in the last several paragraphs can be served by only occasional attendance. There are the obvious reasons for being pleased: the business elsewhere of these persons and the cost of obtaining their services. There is a third reason: the need for regular members of our curricular group to discover one another and to create from the diversity of members a coherent and effective group. This process requires that the group be and remain of a reasonable size, eight to ten members. It is also much aided in its work by remaining the same group from meeting to meeting. The latter condition dictates that the occasional attendant be seen as such, as an advisor or commentator, and not as a pro tem member of the group. It may even be desirable in the interest of coherence that some of the occasionals be consulted on their own home grounds rather than in the meeting place of the curricular group. It may be desirable that they be consulted on occasion, not by the group as a whole, but by a subcommittee which will report back to the group.

[The alert reader may well have noted that in the beginning of our discussion of nonregular participants in the group (some ten paragraphs back, concerning subject-matter specialists) we referred to them as additional group members. The name given them then progressively changed: from group members to non-regular attendants, to advisors, to counselors, to consultants. This gradual shift of title illustrates a classic difference between the theoretic and the practical and the incomplete usefulness of each. The persons represented by these several titles were

brought to our attention by consultation of the commonplaces, which constitute a highly general, "theoretic" treatment of education as a whole. Only as we moved away from the commonplaces to consider these persons as persons of a certain character affecting the behavior of a particular group and its particular members, a matter of practicality, did the importance of these persons in their relations to the group and suggestions for control of these relations become matters of concern.]

To return to our subject, we now have a curriculum group of eight to ten members composed of teachers, students, the principal, and a schoolboard or community member. These persons constitute an explosive mixture and one not particularly competent to solve curricular problems, which brings us to our next step.

The Group: Its Chairman

It is the chairman's task to move the group to effectiveness. Let us see what that will involve but let us move more briskly than we have, since, after all, our concern for the curriculum group and its chairman is preliminary to consideration of new teaching and new scholarly roles for Professors of Curriculum.

The Chairman's contributions to the effectiveness of the group are of two kinds: the performance of tasks which complement those of the group; activities with the group or with specific members of it designed to enhance their competence. The contributions to enhanced competence will consist mainly of reducing or removing barriers to collaboration among members of the group, barriers arising from biases, stereotypical responses toward one another, and omissions in the earlier education of members of the group. Let us consider these first.

The student members of the group constitute one problem for the Chairman. They must see themselves as genuine members of the group and see that others see them so. This poses a problem for obvious reasons: students are habitually treated in school as patients, not as agents, undergoers rather than actors, and will suspect that such a relation will continue. Teachers and principal may find it awkward to communicate with students as genuinely fellow-members of the curricular group. The Chairman of the group can meet this problem by functioning simultaneously as a model for teachers and the principal and as an example for the students. He will do so by raising at the earliest possible moment of the first meeting of the group, perhaps as the initial move of that meeting, a point addressed first to students because it is one they are best able to corroborate, question or deny: for example, his moot interpretation of some student attitudes or behaviors. His action, his manner in raising the question, the direction of his eyes and attention to students will constitute the modeling-example to teachers, principal, and students alike. To soothe possible ruffled feelings, he may then turn to teachers with the same invitation to comment. Such an early action also reinforces the status of the Chairman as one who must seek comfort and collaboration

in order to proceed. There will also be need to teach teachers (and, perhaps, the principal) that the principal, in his service as member of the group, is a peer. This could be done by conspiracy, an arrangement with the principal that he voice a view that the Chairman can and will question and on which he can ask teachers to comment, affirm, deny.

There may be other matters of stereotype to be dealt with but these suffice to indicate the quality of one sort of tact and rhetoric which the Chairman must have learned in order to do his job.

With respect to biases, one of the commonest of those which constitute a barrier to collaboration among members of the group lies between teachers on the one hand, and specialist-scholars, whether of subject-matters or of educational behavioral sciences, on the other. The barrier consists, on the side of scholars, of snobbery toward nonspecialists, often expressed as a benign and irritating patronage of teachers, coupled with demand for thoroughgoing evidence when opinions are set forth by teachers. It consists, on the teacher's side, of subservience to specialist status or habitual use of a quite different kind of convincing "evidence." The former is seen in acceptance of specialists' views as authoritative, whether relations of the views to the viewer's specialism make the views authoritative or not. It also takes a form on which I shall remark in a moment. The difference in the two groups' view of evidence is shaped by the great confidence of many teachers in the personally experienced incident or the vivid anecdote conveyed by a peer, whether these be adequate samples of the matter in question or not. The conflict between teacher view and specialist view of evidence is further complicated by a usual inexperience of teachers with what passes for scholarly evidence and scholarly questioning of evidence. This arises, not only from inexperience with formal enquiry but also from unfamiliarity with their report in scholarly journals. The latter is an unfamiliarity which can be laid at the door of their teacher-training.

This biased barrier to collaboration cannot be overcome by simple and quickly used devices. It requires frequent and tactful direction of specialists' attention to their own lay views based on vivid experience or personal anecdote; on the perennial uncertainty of scholarly evidence, instances of past reversal of scholarly views and modes of enquiry (e.g., on the lifelong stability or ability of aptitudes; and the recent passage from overwhelming Skinnerism to weedlike growth of cognitive psychology). These commentaries may often be carried on in private between Chairman and specialist, with appeal for cognizance of teachers' inexperience of scholarly views of evidence. On the teachers' side, the situation requires from the Chairman equally tactful, and, again, perhaps, with teachers apart from other members of the committee, illustrations of the limited background of personal experience and the possible weaknesses back of personal anecdote together with positive comment on the usefulness of anecdote and experience as bases for particularization of the inevitably general character of scholarly conclusions, and hence, of the need for teacher modification of specialists' views.

Teachers' unwarranted confidence in the personally experienced can

also be shaken by locating other teachers who can relate contrary instances. The specialist's notion that his generalities are immediately applicable to the schoolroom situation can be treated by pointing out to him, perhaps, again, in private and certainly with tact, the many instances in a day and the serious moments in a life in which action must be taken though evidence for one or another alternative cannot be sufficient by scholarly standards; e.g., the choice of a wife or an investment or whether to choose this moment to cross the street.

As remarked above, a further consequence often ensues from teacher subservience to specialist status. It consists of teacher imitation during curricular debate of what they take to be the marks of scholarly procedure. One of these is insistence on elaborate experiment where classroom trial may suffice. The other consists of demand for precise definition of all "key" terms, a demand which serves to postpone curricular modification indefinitely.[3]

The demand for elaborate experiment can be met by pointing out that such experiment is the province of specialists and can be suggested to some of them, while indicating at the same time the usefulness of classroom trial to the formulation of problems for scholarly research which is germane to education, that is, schoolroom problems, and the further usefulness of classroom trial as a necessary complement to bring home to teachers that their trial of curricular modifications is as much a contribution to knowledge as it is to educational practice, that is, a blunting of the unnecessarily sharp distinction between knowing and doing.

So much for the Chairman's treatment of biases. The instances are sufficient to indicate additional matters which should be conferred by his education: once again, tact, and command of small-group rhetoric; a reasonable familiarity with the outcomes of current and recent research in the education-directed aspects of the behavioral sciences, and a good grounding in philosophical summaries of scientific investigation, of the truth-status of its outcomes, and of the characteristics of common experience.

In addition to removing barriers to communication among members of the group, the Chairman will need to evoke and maintain an appropriately deliberative mode of discussion. The problem of evocation arises from the near-universal inexperience of most of us with deliberation. We are flooded with news of a quite different mode of treatment of an issue, that of debate. The adversary structure of our law courts, the adversary pattern of legislative sessions and the drama of attack-defense-counter-attack of most newspaper-radio-television commentators constitute a ubiquitous model. That legislative committees, corporate boards, group decisions of managers of all sorts, carry on discussion in a quite different manner is unknown to most of us, since these groups usually carry on their work without an audience.

The problem of maintenance of deliberation consists mainly of seeing to it that once the relative importance of the four commonplaces has been dealt with deliberatively and agreed upon, the subsequent delib-

erations adhere to this agreed-on ratio. This problem arises because groups of all sorts, including those which are habitually deliberative, are prone to perseverate on one or another commonplace whose consideration is initiated by chance or by the assertiveness of some particular member of the group.

Means for dealing with the problem of evocation of deliberation are best conveyed by illustration. Hence, let us suppose that a well-understood and agreed-upon problem confronts the group. The Chairman asks for suggested solutions. After a pause (one of our absurd conventions is that no one speaks first) a teacher responds, persuaded perhaps by the Chairman's lifted eyebrow: "Well, I think that what we should do is . . ." Another teacher, acting according to the well-worn pattern of debate, replies, "I don't agree. I think we should . . ." The Chairman then reenters the discussion: "There may be other suggestions but let us deal a bit with these two, first." He turns to a third member of the group, chosen on the basis of prior knowledge of the members, and asks, "Mr. Jones, what do you see as the strengths of the first position?"

Mr. Jones may say that he prefers the second. Directly to Mr. Jones, the Chairman remarks that in fairness and to make his own record-keeping comprehensible (he clearly is making notes on what is going on) the first-stated option deserves first attention, and remarks, "Go ahead." If Mr. Jones had immediately addressed the first option, the Chairman would have asked him to do a similar job on the second. Mr. Jones represses his impulse to take the other side and tries to address the question. He may even have to ask the first speaker to repeat her initial proposal.

The Chairman then asks another member to identify strengths seen in the second proposal. When these are on the table, he invites other members in general to add or subtract or comment otherwise. When these begin to run down, the Chairman turns to weaknesses, especially possible-probable unwanted consequences, of the two proposals on the table.

Thus the Chairman affords the group an alternative to the pattern of debate, a deliberative process in which all pool their ingenuities, insights, and perceptions in the interest of discovering the most promising possibilities for trial, rather than forming sides, each of which look only to the strengths of a selected one alternative, hence discarding any means of coming to decision except eloquence and nose-counting. It might be noted that the Chairman affords the example out of the group's own mouths and not by setting himself up as the model.

It need hardly be added that this initial example will do no more than afford an example to be tried by the group. They will fall back again and again into debate and the Chairman, again and again, will have to find means for bringing them back to deliberation. As meeting follows meeting, however, the group will not only be slowly habituated to deliberation but the best and brightest of them will early begin to discern its advantages over debate as means for their purpose, and hence becomes allies of the Chairman in turning combative moments back toward de-

liberation. My implied praises of deliberation here are not to be taken as condemning adversary methods in the solution of other kinds of problems. Debate has its own virtues.

The problem of maintenance as against evocation is, as noted, mainly a problem of ensuring appropriate emphasis among the commonplaces. There are at least three devices which the Chairman can bring to bear on the problem. In the course of participation in the deliberation, he can watch for moments when one or another alternative receives overwhelming support or condemnation from considerations which represent but one commonplace. At such moments he can raise a point against the favored or for the condemned, a point which clearly arises from consideration of a matter representing another commonplace. Second, he can explicitly but informally bring the company's attention to a perseveration on one or a few commonplaces and remind them of what remains on the agenda of commonplaces. Third, he can and will record his minutes of each meeting in a way that makes conspicuous the time spent or not spent on this or that consideration and present such minutes for perusal and approval at the beginning of each subsequent meeting.[4]

It is clear that these duties as Chairman require that his education have contained an extensive exposure to deliberative committee work, both as a member of a committee and as its Chairman. We shall return to this and other needs when we discuss his education as a whole.

All the above is, in one respect, premature. It is a discussion of the treatment of a curricular problem, though we have yet to say anything about the means by which problems of curriculum are discovered. We deal with this matter forthwith, though only briefly, since it suggests but one matter of importance about the needed education of the Chairman.

Curricular problems will be sought both at home and abroad. The search at home will use most of the usual procedures. For instance, there will be continuing visitation of classrooms. These will not begin, however, until teachers have been assured that the purpose of visitation is only to educate the Chairman concerning the scope and variety of teaching-learning which takes place in the school, and only after enough time has elapsed since the Chairman's appearance at the school for him to have been seen as a regular habitué of teachers' tables or cafeterias and their commonroom, as not dignified by a private secretary or a spacious office and as seen by teachers as one of theirs and not as an extension of the administration. There will be comparative study of standardized achievement and aptitude tests where they exist, of textbooks used and of obligations imposed by law or administrative fiat.

The search at home will also take place by means which are usually possible only when the searcher is a curriculum Chairman, charged with responsibility for such a search and with the time to do it. These unusual places of search will include streets and playgrounds of the school and community where the behaviors and propensities of students can be noted, and, when the Chairman has become a familiar figure to students, where informal talks with them about school affairs and students' lives in general can take place. The search will also take place through talks and visits

to the homes of parents and similar talks and visits with employers of the school's graduates, again, after appropriate introduction. He will also learn much through immersion in teacher-talk in lunch and commonroom and by explicit conference with teachers about satisfactions and dissatisfactions with what they do and do not do. These discussions may also include, from the Chairman's side, remarks on student failures, satisfactions and concerns as he has discovered them.

The search abroad will take place via two quite disparate activities. One consists of interschool visitation. The Chairman himself will visit schools of neighboring communities. He will identify schools to which he will arrange visitation by teachers of his school. With teachers of his own school he will identify teachers in other schools whose undertakings are sufficiently promising possibilities for the Chairman's school to warrant invitations to such "foreign" teachers to visit for discussion of his or her undertaking.

The other search abroad will take place through educational journals which are concerned with development in the national political economy and ethos, developments in subject-matters taught in schools, and developments in the behavioral sciences bearing on curriculum. There are at least four journals in North America of the requisite generality. *Teachers College Record, The Harvard Review, The American Journal of Education,* and *Curriculum Inquiry* come to mind. These would serve the Chairman and many of the teachers. Meanwhile, teachers might welcome access to journals which concern special subject-matters or particular segments of schooling, e.g., the biology teacher. I have in mind that schools might well maintain a small library of journals for use by their staff-members and the Chairman might well arrange for regular staff discussions of papers selected from such journals.

In earlier papers on the practical I have remarked on a peculiar characteristic of practical problems, that they are not given but taken. That is, in the words of John Dewey, one encounters problematic situations, conditions which are discomforting or disconcerting, but the concrete formulation of the problem requires delicate consideration of alternative formulations. This is to say that practical problems are well-realized only by application of arts of problemation. Needless to say, I expect that our Chairman's education will have included practice in application of these arts.

With the curricular problems defensibly formulated, solutions must be devised or discovered. Discovery can mean the Chairman's consultation of his own memory of curricular devices learned in his graduate education. It can mean his consultation of journals concerned with teaching in the subject-matter field under question, this in collaboration with appropriate teachers. It can mean consultation of the practices and experiments in schools of neighboring districts, again with teacher help. This collaboration with teacher plays three practical roles. It not only serves as aid in discovery of solutions to the curricular problem in hand but in cementing the collaborative relations of Chairman and teachers. Of greatest importance, perhaps, it brings to the classroom teacher an executive and creative

contribution to the role of "teacher," a sadly needed contribution of self-determination, variety and challenge. Beyond solutions discovered, others may be devised, again, through contributions of ingenious teachers, with or without collaboration of the Chairman.

We have, then, discovery and formulation of curricular problems, construction of alternative solutions, deliberation on and deliberative modification of these alternatives. There remains the task of instituting and testing the changes decided on. Institution of change, in the absence of such a role as that of curriculum Chairman, has had, as earlier mentioned, a long history of frustration of what has been called, significantly, "dissemination." "Dissemination" signifies the Moscovian revolution telegraphed to the provinces, precisely the procedure which the role of Chairman is intended to displace.

With a curricular Chairman, we have a mode of curricular change which arises at home, seeded, watered, and cultivated by some or all of the teachers who might be involved in its institution. Clearly, the question of trial has become a matter totally different from that of "dissemination," not withstanding the help which may have come from abroad by way of journals, consultants, and neighboring schools. I suggest that institution of such changes will pose no problem. Only trial will prove me right or mistaken.

As to trial of the curricular change, there is little to be said which is new. The teachers who try it will test the effect of its use on them and shape a view of its effectiveness. Tests (oral and written) some made at home, some standardized, will contribute their kind of evidence. Other teachers, not yet involved in the change, will visit the arenas of its trial. So will the curricular Chairman and, if possible, some of the others involved in its choice. And the Chairman will pursue consequences of the change, unintended as well as intended, into the highways and byways where students as students and as graduates show themselves for what they are. And so we come at last to the matter of education of a curricular Chairman, something for curriculum professors to do.

The Chairman: His Education and Refreshment

Let us first summarize the competences and knowledge which an ideal curricular Chairman requires. (What justifies appearance of an "ideal" in a practical paper on the practical? The answer is that it is the best available guide under the circumstances, for our problem bears on the character of schools and departments of education and these vary so significantly that a hypothetical, typical case cannot be constructed. Among the significant variations: the quality of their faculties and of the number of relatively good students who come to them; the resources afforded by the surrounding college or university; and above all, the risk-taking competence of the Deans or Chairmen involved, their readiness to rock the boat of faculty-members when the Dean's own reappointment is at stake.)

To return, the curricular chairman must be capable of skilful use of rhetorics of persuasion and elicitation. These rhetorics are needed, not as orator to audience, but as Chairman and member of a small group and in person-to-person dealings with individuals. Moreover, his use of these rhetorics must be skilled with respect to a diversity of conversants. He must do well with his peers: teachers and parents. He must deal with administrative and social elders: the school principal, professors of subject-matters and behavioral sciences, school board members and employers in the community. He must deal with juniors: students as encountered on street, playground and workplace.

He must be experienced in deliberation, its antecedent arts of problemation and its coordinate arts of eclectic (of the latter, an explanatory word in a moment.) These arise in a context of teaching and learning, a context which involves bodies of theoretic knowledge applicable to understanding teaching and learning. Hence his need for what I have called arts of eclectic: arts by which useful parts of diverse bodies of theoretic knowledge are put together in relation to a practical problem of curriculum. The need for these arts is patent in all the Chairman's various dealings with his curricular group and its consultants.

He must be an able and habitual reader of "learned" journals which bear upon his professional function. These include journals which treat curriculum in various fields and levels of schooling. They include journals which convey an idea of the change and progress of fields of learning represented in school curricula. They must also include journals which convey an idea of changing patterns of social scientific enquiry bearing on teaching-learning. This habit, brought to bear on these journals, is necessary if our Chairman is not to be obsolescent five to ten years after taking on his function.

He needs ability to guide his teacher-colleagues to use of some journals. Through consulting journals which publish materials stemming from the behavioral sciences, teachers will learn something of scholarly standards of evidence, hence enhance somewhat their ability to overcome barriers to communication between specialists and teachers. It is by consulting and reporting on matters appearing in such journals that teachers will enhance the professional standing of their work and their recognizance of its professional character. It is by reading journals whose content is contributed by teachers for an audience of teachers that they will note that school curriculum vary from place to place and change from time to time. So much for the skills required by the Chairman. What of the knowledge he requires?

He will need to know curricular practices in his country, both current and past, insofar as such information is available. The question of current practice poses a problem since no one knows very much about what currently goes on in the diverse schools of the nations.[5] Knowledge of past practice, which is available, is required because of the tendency of the young to suppose that the world as they discover it between the ages of 5 and 25 is the way the world has always been. In the case of schooling, this means profound ignorance of numerous curricular practices and

purposes, including the many which bear and have borne on non-academic purposes by way of shaping taste, character, habits, and expectations, social-political attitudes and ways of earning a living. Knowledge which would come of a union of materials and points of view of L. Cremin and David Tyack would be appropriate. To these, we would need to add example and comment on changes and efforts at change of recent decades: the long controversy on the teaching of reading; the current hegemony of the notion that "reading" consists mainly of decoding visible marks into audible sounds, most else being "thinking;" the stultification of learning by restricting textbooks to a vocabulary accessible to all; the costly efforts of the '60's to reform science curriculas, and the recent Rand study of their effects; the "new" math and its fate; the self-interested efforts to teach "values clarification." (I should apologize for pointing the "self-interested" finger only at backers of "value clarification." Most efforts by college-university specialists to import their specialty into the schools are tainted in some degree by the wish to make jobs for their graduates, hence to keep their own.)

The potential Chairman will also require knowledge about the numerous behavioral sciences which contribute to guidance of educational practice: various psychologies, sociology, ethnography and so on. He needs this knowledge, not only for guidance of his own invention and judgment of curricular devices but in order to know on whom to call as consultant in curricular deliberations and what questions to ask such consultants.

In view of the uses to which he will put such knowledge, it must be a liberal knowledge in the most traditional sense of that adjective. The usual smattering of fact and allegedly verified dogma which constitute undergraduate survey courses is wholly beside the point. The similarly dogmatic skimmings which often constitute the courses designed by behavioral scientists for "outsiders" are also inadequate. These courses convey only a sample of what passes for knowledge in the field. What our curriculum Chairman needs, in addition, is sound knowledge of what the field investigates, what kinds of questions it asks of its subject in the course of enquiry, and what restrictions it places on the acceptability of answers. In brief, he needs to know about the problems, principles and methods of the field. He also needs to know something of the history of changes in these matters, since the behavioral sciences are notorious for the plurality of their principles and the frequency with which they change.

Our Chairman will need a similarly liberal nodding acquaintance with some of the academic fields from which school curriculas are drawn. He will need this acquaintance in order to recognize some of the various corruptions and selections which are made of these fields as they pass from their own communities of enquiry through the hands of textbook writers and curriculum makers into the versions which represent them in the schools; this to alert him to the ubiquity of such modifications, and to help him to judge their usefulness and cost when they touch his school.

These bodies of knowledge and skills constitute a substantial and challenging graduate curriculum, much of it beyond the purview of con-

ventional curriculum programs. How shall they be conveyed? A few suggestions follow. (I have not forgotten the Chairman's need for knowledge of non-intellective aspects of growing up, of ways in which circumstance inhibits their growth, and of ways in which their sustenance can be aided in the schools. However, the state of well-verified knowledge of such matters and the prevalence of passionately held doctrines concerning them are such that I am intimidated. I leave the problem to others or to the future.)

Consider, first, conveyance of knowledge and practice with respect to small-group and person-to-person rhetorical skills. I put this item first because it appears to be the most alien to existing graduate programs in curriculum of all my suggestions. It is also the locus of the most radical proposal I shall make with respect to alteration of such programs.

Conveyance of these rhetorical skills should begin, I think, in a formal course taught by a capable professor of rhetoric. Such persons are usually not and need not be members of an Education faculty. Their services would be borrowed from the Department of Rhetoric or Department of English Language and Literature in the institution of which our school of education is neighbor or part. The course would consist of demonstration and guidance in the identification, analysis and imitation of the rhetorical devices which form parts of current debate, in speeches, television programs, magazines, editorial pages, on current problems of politics, ethics, economics, education, and other social institutions and problems. Such a course would afford an introduction to the nature and practice of rhetoric, though not small-group rhetoric. Second, it would afford a valuable sampling of social forces and tensions which constitute one root of school curriculum, and introduce our students to the sources from which samplings of future debate on such matters can be obtained.

Since such a course is only an introduction and does not touch on small-group rhetoric and deliberation, a substantial additional experience must follow. It would consist of an extended practicum in deliberation and use of the rhetorics which will be the bread-and-butter of our Chairman's work. This practicum would begin in a semester-long participation in a curriculum deliberation chaired by a member of the Education faculty with experience in management of schools or collegiate-graduate departments or other office involving a substantial body of committee work. The deliberation would concern a simulated problem in a simulated school and body of circumstances with each student-member of the deliberative practicum taking on the role of one or another member of a curriculum group as earlier described. First establishment of a simulation of this kind is onerous but, once done, the modifications required to refresh it for succeeding waves of students is relatively easy. I have described construction and operation of such a simulation. (See Appendix.)

Participation in such a deliberative group would carry our candidate a second step, disclosing to him the modifications in large group rhetoric required by the vastly different structure of audience–speaker relations in a small committee group. In addition, it would introduce him to some of the problems involved in curricula, their alteration, and to the sorts

of persons involved in them. It would not convey sufficient facility in the use of small-group rhetoric nor any experience of chairing such a group. It is here that my most radical proposal arises.

I suggest that the doctoral dissertation of a candidate for curricular Chairman consist of a report, analysis and assessment of an internship, an internship which would place him, during his last year of graduate studies, in the office of curriculum Chairman in a real school with real problems and consisting of real people. This will, of course, require that some schools, neighboring the training institution or not, must be persuaded to collaborate in such an enterprise and pay the intern a stipend on the ground of its contribution to the on-going improvement of education, its own improvement with regard to teacher morale as well as curriculum, and the glory it would reap as a pioneer in such an undertaking. It would also require some supervision by the principal and probably some handholding by members of the candidate's graduate department.

The dissertation proper would derive from records of this internship: tape-recordings of deliberative sessions, diaries of the Chairman's activities apart from deliberative meetings, and assessments of the experience of working with him by the school Principal, the teachers and the others involved. The written dissertation and its tangible sources would be evaluated by the candidate's doctoral committee, and the candidate and his dissertation would submit to the same kind of oral defense required for any doctoral degree. So much for rhetorical skill and its conveyance.

I turn now to a triply useful device, one which will instill the skill and habit of consulting "learned" journals, provide means for repairing the commonly dogmatic skimmings of graduate courses, and make a substantial contribution to arts of eclectic. The device consists simply of replacing at least half of the lecture-listening and textbook reading which usually constitute graduate courses by a bibliography of scholarly papers which report researches in the behavioral sciences and criticisms of such researches. The researches treated and the papers which treat them would be selected jointly by a practitioner of a behavioral science and a professor of curriculum, and the two of them would jointly "teach" the seminar which follows.

Responsibility for conveying the substance of these papers to the group would be distributed among pairs of students. The members of a pair would individually read the paper or papers on which they are to report at a meeting of the group. They would then compare and discuss what they understood of the papers' conclusions, its experiments or other starting points, and intervening interpretations. They would agree on the strengths and weaknesses of the papers or agree to disagree. They would then write a precis of the paper and their assessment of it, a precis not to exceed, say, a close-packed, single-spaced typewritten page. The page would be duplicated and copies provided all participants in the seminar before it is to meet. At the meeting, one or both members of the pair will expand orally on the precis, respond to questions put by professors and fellow students, and conduct a discussion of the papers.

The joint leaders of the seminar would see to it that their respective interests are involved in the discussion, the behavioral scientist steering questions toward the research or criticism *per se,* the professor of curriculum steering questions toward application of the research to a curricular procedure, or toward joining results of the research to that of other papers read in other behavioral seminars in which the curriculum professor has accompanied the candidates.

A similar joining of forces by the professor of curriculum and a historian would develop and jointly chair a similar seminar on past, recent and present curricular practices and changes, again using a body of primary sources as at least half the resource material of the seminar. This seminar would, as the behavioral science seminars probably would not, invite practitioners of schooling, that is, principals, heads of departments, supervisors, experienced teachers, to speak to the seminar and respond to questions. Again, we have an eye on more than one educational purpose: not only contribution to liberal knowledge of curriculum but practice in person-to-person rhetoric, as seminarians question practitioners and respond to their replies.

A brief word, finally, about the scholarship which professors of curriculum would carry on under this regimen. To their present concerns, they would add enquiries which would inform, advise and refresh their former students working in the schools.

First, curricularists would revive a practice which characterized them in the first quarter of this century but has long been dropped. They would attend to what they perceive as evils and vicissitudes of our government and society. They would try to convince readers that these troubles exist, show the threats they pose, and suggest ways in which alteration of school practice might help ameliorate the conditions discussed. Such publications would, of course, depart markedly from the mores of "objective" scholarship. There might not be a correlation coefficient for page after page. The curricularists would, instead, take positions in debate, concern themselves with a variety of evils and problems, be founded on differing views of what constitutes the politically beautiful and good. As such, they would rouse thought and debate, among themselves and among their graduates. They would thus inject into the lives of educators an element of active intellectualism which is sadly wanting.

Some curricularists would perform a similar task with respect to the tastes, mores, and attitudes of our fellow citizens in their daily lives. They might question the ubiquity and intensity of competition in our way of life and ask how the schools might contribute to the lessening of it, or concern themselves with the inanities of television entertainment, or face the question of means by which schools could go beyond mere propinquity in lessening the xenophobias and racisms which afflict us. Some papers from curricularists might be addressed, not to colleagues and former students but to the public at large, thus assisting their graduates in more ways than one.

Chairmen at work in the schools would also learn to expect from their former professor periodic critical reviews of proposed and actual changes

and pressures for change in school curricula: analysis and judgment on, say, the uncritical insistence of legislators and some school boards on "equality" in the treatment of normals and the handicapped; the use of early childhood education merely for language correction; emphases on melting pot and contrary emphases on preservation of minority cultures; new views of the nature of high quality in literature and the arts; in brief, changes in knowledge and attitude which might be important in consideration of curriculum changes. And, of course, our Chairman would expect reports on advances in knowledge of learning processes and modes of teaching, as these might modulate efforts to improve school curricula.

Finally, he might expect publication by curricularists of thoughtful consideration of the role of the public schools vis-a-vis the many other agencies of education which characterize our time.

APPENDIX

(1) A brief version of this paper was delivered to professors of Curriculum, March 9, 1982.

(2) The antecedent papers which this one concludes are:
The Practical: A Language for Curriculum (1970).
The Practical: Arts of Eclectic (1971).
The Practical 3: Translation into Curriculum (1973).
All may be found in Joseph J. Schwab, *Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education,* Edited by Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

(3) Construction and operation of a simulation for decision-making may be found on pages 148-181 of Joseph J. Schwab, *College Curriculum*

(4) I am indebted to Elizabeth Vallance for an invitation (declined) which moved me to write this paper.

(5) A most idiot side-effect of emphasis on "behavioral objectives" is its tendency to induce manufacture of a separate means for each "objective" in view. Consequently, one of the more useful characteristics of the practical exemplified here is the multi-purposed role of its one proposed bureaucratic change. This change is labelled "something for Curriculum Professors to do" but it might properly be named for one of its several other functions. It is designed:
   (a) To put the special knowledge and special mode of knowing of teachers into greater service to schooling and to provide recognition of such contributions.
   (b) To enhance the possibility of attracting a greater number of daring experimental and intellectually active persons to the function of teaching.
   (c) To establish challenging, decision making, and collaborative functions as part of the role of teachers.
   (d) To provide a basis for teachers' recognition of themselves as masters of a special lore and competence, and constituting, in short, a profession by providing them, via journals, meetings, and visitations, with a sense of intellectual community *and* by

providing them with occasions on which they utilize representatives of other scholarly communities as resources to be judged, used, or not used as may seem appropriate.

(6) It is a way to enhance the occasions for the Principals to participate in their schools as *schools.*

(7) It is a way to enhance students' understanding of the roles of schooling by making students party to the planning of the school.

(8) Most of all, perhaps, it is a way to transform the impossible task of mere "dissemination" of curriculum to one of stimulating schools to devise and institute their own curricular ways of meeting a changing world.

NOTES

1. I have in mind especially Thomas Roby, Professor of Humanities, Kennedy-King College, Chicago; Peter Pereira, Professor of Education, Chicago; and William Reid, professor of Education, University of Birmingham, England.

2. What I have said above applies to every art, whether it be teaching, stone-carving or judicial control of a court of law. Every art has rules but knowledge of the rules does not make an artist. Art arises as the knower of the rules learns to *apply* them appropriately to the particular case. Application, in turn, requires acute awareness of the particularities of that case and ways in which the rule can be modified to fit the case without complete abrogation of the rule. In art, the form must be adapted to the matter. Hence the form must be communicated in ways which illuminate its possibilities for modification.

3. I am indebted to Margret Buchmann of the Institute for Research in Teaching, Michigan State University for comment on the latter.

4. I am indebted to Professor Seymour Fox of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, for developing and testing this procedure.

5. Perhaps in the not too distant future, however, Theodore Sizer, John Goodlad and the project reported as taking shape at Stanford University will begin to fill this conspicuous gap in our knowledge.