DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 219 EA 029 864

AUTHOR Marshall, J. Dan; Kim, Pyeong-gook
TITLE The Great Refusal: Curriculum Transitions--The Seventies.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Research; *Educational History; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *1970s

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a history of curriculum research. It discusses how, by 1969, the conventional curriculum field in America had become irrelevant. This situation would change in the 1970s as curriculum research began its climb back toward legitimacy. During the decade, a new trend in synoptic curriculum efforts appeared--a more considered approach to delineating curriculum studies while attempting to situate the field in a historical context. This period also marked the rise of special-interest groups in curriculum studies, a development that allowed for the sharing of diverse ideas. Curriculum studies enjoyed new-found growth as curriculum theorizing hit its stride, borrowing heavily from schools of thought like European critical and neo-Marxist thinking, depth psychology, and feminist theory rather than the standard areas of developmental, humanistic, and cognitive psychology. To this dynamism was added the contributions of non-U.S curriculum scholars, many of whom explored curriculum and schooling from new vantage points. This influx was coupled with a renewed emphasis on the history of the curriculum field, which, in part, led to a revolt against scientism and rationality and prompted a shift from curriculum as a deductive science to curriculum as a practical art requiring negotiation, judgment, and reasoning. (Contains approximately 75 references.) (RJM)

The Great Refusal:
Curriculum Transitions -- The Seventies

by
J. Dan Marshall, Ph.D.
Pennsylvania State University

with
Pyeong-gook Kim
Doctoral Student
Pennsylvania State University

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Montreal, April, 1999

Note: Portions of this paper are taken from
Turning Points in Curriculum: A Contemporary American Memoir
by J. Dan Marshall, James T. Sears & William H. Schubert (in press).

The Time Had Come for Change

As the Sixties drew to a close, the post-WWII curriculum field had little to crow about, and insufficient energy to crow much at all. In a book titled Confronting Curriculum Reform (Eisner, 1970), Elliot Eisner offered a collection of papers presented at a 1969 Stanford curriculum conference. From his introduction, we learn of Eisner's belief that the curriculum field stood to benefit from what was then 15 years worth of "new curricula." Having identified the now familiar acronyms (BCSC, MACOS, etc.), he wrote that "these projects are important not only in their own right, but also because they provide the necessary conditions for building the empirical foundations of the field of curriculum" (p. 1).

The irony mustn't be lost, here: these numerous, heavily-funded projects which had found their way into the nation's schools; this 15-year feeding frenzy of high-profile, heavily-funded curriculum development efforts; these "new curricula" -- virtually none of this was attributable to the curriculum field or its particular membership. Yet we might be able to capitalize on the presence of these massive new empirical databases! We had a genuine identity problem in the late 1960s, evidenced in part, as Kliebard noted in 1967, "by the fact that a physicist is now gradually replacing a psychologist as the single most influential person in the curriculum field" (Kliebard, 1968, p. 83).

A mere five years after its creation within AERA, Division B -- then called "Curriculum and Objectives" -- was about to be rocked and rolled when Joseph Schwab made his now famous 1969 pronouncement that the field was moribund. The combined attention to the structures-of-the-disciplines, measurement and evaluation, curriculum knowledge and principles being generated from national curriculum projects, and the omnivorousness of behavioral objectives had

all but killed the curriculum field, Schwab believed. His paper, titled "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum," was the Stonewall of the contemporary curriculum renaissance.

For the curriculum field, Schwab's 1969 prognosis offered an inescapable wake-up call to identify and address our problems -- problems such as abstract categories of research and scholarship (Goodlad, 1969), inadequate sustained inquiry into an identified subject matter (Westbury, 1971), and an insufficient translation of research into practice (Short, 1985).

But problems like these were understood as *problems of convention* posed by thoughtful, respected leaders within a Caswellian, Tylerian curriculum field. Yet as Foshay and Beilin (1969) recognized in their 1969 contribution to the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, the field was experiencing a "very rapid transition" driven by a "new group of younger people . . . who sometimes angrily are taking control of the discussion" (p. 279). For these curricularists and their veteran colleagues and mentors, the problems of the field were not unlike (nor distinct from) the problems apparent throughout the United States and other countries in 1969. These troublemakers were less about fixing than about re-thinking the field, less about refining than about reshaping the field. With their help, the curriculum field would undergo a massive identity adjustment during what Wraga (1999) calls the "heady days" of the 1970s.

In short, by 1969, the conventional American curriculum field had become as seemingly irrelevant and illegitimate to growing numbers of its members as had "the Establishment," the military-industrial complex, patriarchal hierarchies, heterosexual orthodoxies, and conventional wisdom become irrelevant and illegitimate to growing numbers of social and political activists and counterculture members. Curricularists warmed the bench as large-scale curriculum projects failed due to their global orientation, teacher-proofing, discipline specificity, and more.

Curriculum people, themselves, had so technicized the Tyler Rationale that even the act of curriculum making had become an empirical science, ushering in an entire new field of study (evaluation) while placing teachers in a vulnerable new state of accountability without adaptability. This situation changed significantly during the 1970s.

Theorizing the Shift

What took place during that particular decade? How and why did our field change in certain ways? Toward what directions and in who's interests? One way to make sense of the changes in our field during the 1970s comes from David Pillemer's introduction to his book Momentous Events, Vivid Memories (1998).

Pillemer is a cognitive psychologist who studies personal event memories and specific life episodes -- phenomena only recently accepted as relevant and legitimate within his field. Any field of study (including its sub-fields) eventually develops its own inertia of conventional constraints with respect to its "working parameters" -- understandings and beliefs about the nature, purposes, and underlying beliefs of its work, the roles of its workers, etc. We might call this the "dominant culture" of the field.

As Pillemer describes it, struggles to legitimize the new and different within an established field arise when *insiders with attitudes* begin to look differently at *and* outside of their field's extant body of theory and research while simultaneously producing new forms of inquiry and practice from within the field's available nooks and crannies. These acts of "defiance" were made easier in his case because significant memories -- his recognizable, commonly shared subject matter -- were difficult to dismiss out of hand. The struggle was greatly advanced, not surprisingly, when "respected leaders in the field" elected to acknowledge, if not embrace these

new ideas and efforts through specific, high profile publication events in respected journals. And when all of these actions take place within larger political, social, and cultural contexts which permit agents and structures to accept once outrageous ideas and actions -- well, things change.

Backlash to such change will inevitably arise from those who self-identify as guardians of the field's conventions. Moreover, specific new ideas and practices do not always prove long-lasting. However, successful incursions into dominant culture are not necessarily judged by "shelf-life," nor, for that matter, by whether or not the new work is finally accepted as initially proposed. Incursions of this sort are deemed successful when they result in lasting disturbances to conventional constraints, in the exposition of inherent problems and dilemmas, in the debunking of long-held, harmful ideas and practices, and in even a temporary sullying of the status quo. For the object of such struggle is not necessarily to win the argument, outsmart the enemy, or bury the foe, but rather to be recognized as a legitimate voice within a changing, more complex conversation. This is how David Pillemer understands the road to legitimacy in terms of studying momentous events and vivid memories within today's field of cognitive psychology; it's also how we can begin to understand the importance of the decade of the 1970s in spawning today's contemporary field of curriculum.

The Larger Context

The 1970s was a decade of important change in curriculum work, in part because it was a decade of important change. Full stop. The Seventies in America was an era of chaos, crisis, and change bracketed by the social ferment of the Sixties and the "greed is good" Reagan era. From the perspective of the post-Reagan Nineties, the Seventies were, in some ways, *a disaster waiting to happen*: our over-consumption of technology and natural resources, our over-

indulgence with sexual freedom and freedom of expression, and our over-reliance on federalism and individualism. It was a decade-long series of national ruptures: the ecological Armageddons of Three Mile Island and Love Canal; an economy of stagflation -- with production declining by 10 percent, official unemployment reaching 9 percent, inflation touching 18 percent, interest rates rocketing to 20 percent, the Dow Jones Industrial Average falling below 600, and our first trade deficit since 1888; a meltdown of political credibility with the publication of the Pentagon Papers, the later Watergate revelations, and the hearings of the House Select Committee on Assassinations. It was a decade when OPEC and the Pacific Rim nations challenged American economic superiority, Iranians and Vietnamese challenged America's military superiority, activists at Wounded Knee, Attica, and Kent State challenged America's moral superiority, and the tragedies of Apollo 13 and Yom Kippur challenged our technological superiority. This decade marked the collapse of the steel industry, creating the "rust belt" of riot-torn midwestern and northeastern cities, as well as the collapse of New Deal liberalism marked by the emergence of populist conservatism evidenced in Howard Jarvis' 'Proposition 13,' Jerry Falwell's 'Moral Majority,' and Anita Bryant's 'Save Our Children.'

The Seventies was also *a time of modernist conflict*. The war in Vietnam continued as Nixon's "incursion" into Cambodia sparked campus violence. International tensions continued in the Middle-East as Arab countries invaded Israel on Yom Kippur and quadrupled oil prices in a 12 month period. The century of Pax Americana continued with CIA-backed coup d' etats as the ancestral remnants of Pax Britannica imposed direct rule on Northern Ireland. It was a world divided: the Cold War certainties of communism and capitalism, the economic disparities of North-South, and the philosophical differences of East-West. It was a geo-political chess game

of Détente, Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), the fall of the Shah and Somoza, the "China card," and Olympic tragedy, protest, and boycott.

Nationally, the Supreme Court adjudicated but did not resolve the abortion conflict while violence erupted over forced-busing. Such troubles appeared in TV sitcoms like the top-ranked "All in the Family," where an embattled Archie lived with his intellectual "meathead" son-in-law near the upwardly mobile Jeffersons, as well as in real life -- where embattled motorists fought at neighborhood gas stations over a few gallons of fuel.

The decade witnessed the building of infrastructures both on the Left and the Right. In response to the energy crisis came groups like New Hampshire's Clamshell Alliance and David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission. In response to the feminist movement Congress passed the Equal Rights Amendment, activating groups such as the Concerned Women for America and the Eagle Forum. In response to the crisis of faith in politics came Liberation Theology and the Moral Majority. In response to voter apathy and alienation arose the Citizens Party and the American Party as well as the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress. It was the time of Earth Day and May Day, of DDT and SST, of public interest research groups and voter referenda, of MIRVs and MXs.

Often characterized as the "me decade," the existential Sixties turned into the pragmatic (some say narcissistic) Seventies. This was a transitional era wherein many activists turned inward and liberationists turned outward, an era of self-obsession and self-reliance marked by the collapse of idealism and the resurgence of cynicism: Studio 54 and The Farm, Zen centers and food co-ops, How to be Your Own Best Friend and The Greening of America, Altamont and Farm Aid, pet rocks and preppy alligators.

It was a time, too, of transformation: Karl W to John-Paul II, "Good Housekeeping" to "Ms." magazine; from activists Tom Hayden and Angela Davis to Representative Hayden and Professor Davis; from Big Blue to Small is Beautiful; from the Beatles to Queen; from the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to the War Powers Act, from the death of John Wayne to the $16 million inauguration ceremony of Ronald Reagan.

In short, the 1970s manifested a paradigm shift in our sense-making which arrived in time for us to begin to bring the postmodern condition into focus. Ditto for the curriculum field.

The Curriculum Field of the Seventies

Curriculum literature of the 1970s contains several formal reviews of curriculum research and scholarship -- telltale signs of any scholarly field. In 1977, Johnson characterized three features of our field as "particularly significant": (1) pre-occupation with the state of the field, (2) debate over the scope of the field, and (3) revolt against scientism and rationality. We'll borrow these in order to frame our thoughts.

State of the Field

Johnson found our field "more vigorous and popular" in 1977 "than at any time in the sixty years since curriculum and its development first attracted serious attention," exhibiting a level of scholarship "rare in the field's first forty years" (p. 2). We were busy and communicative.

Affiliates within any field of scholarship communicate with each other in both formal and informal ways. One form of scholarly communication takes place through the offering of "reviews of research." In 1973, Walker (1973) noted that ever since AERA's Review of Educational Research (RER) took up the practice of devoting entire issues every three years to

curriculum studies, authors of these works would bemoan the lack of research undertaken since the previous review had appeared. RER ceased this practice in 1970, leaving such reviews to appear in other journals as well as the Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Even a cursory reading of entries in this Encyclopedia (published in 1960, 1969, and 1982) provides evidence for the most skeptical reader that the curriculum field was mutating during the 1970s.

Another, more routine avenue for formal scholarly communication is the publication of articles in refereed scholarly journals and books designed for those in one's field of inquiry. Prior to the late 1960s, refereed curriculum scholarship was regularly shared through several AERA publications (ER, RER, and AERJ) as well as the journals Educational Leadership, School Review and Interchange. In 1968, Canadian curriculum scholars at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education began publishing Curriculum Theory Network -- retitled Curriculum Inquiry in 1976. One year later, the Journal of Curriculum Studies debuted in England. However, by the early 1980s the curriculum field would also welcome the US journals JCT and the Journal of Curriculum & Supervision as well as the Australian journal, Curriculum Perspectives. We created more journals to serve our burgeoning and increasingly eclectic conversations which were seldom welcomed from within by mainstream curriculum scholars (or journal editors and reviewers).

We also find evidence of popularity and vigor in book-length publications of the decade. Curriculum books continued to pour forth, with the master's level synoptic text remaining popular. Like most synoptic texts of the 1970s -- the amalgamistic sort presented as ideology-free -- curriculum development remained central while curriculum evaluation grew in prominence. Yet as Schubert noted at the end of that decade, "Books on curriculum, especially synoptic texts, almost invariably treated larger contextual forces as mere influences, rather than curriculum as one

thread in a fabric of forces that influence the induction of the young into adult life" (Schubert, 1979, p. 15).

During this decade, however, a new trend in synoptic curriculum efforts appeared -- a more considered approach to delineating curriculum studies while attempting to historically situate the field. The still-popular exemplar is Tanner and Tanner's 1975 publication, Curriculum Development: Theory Into Practice.

In addition to published communication, representatives of scholarly communities actually talk with and at each other formally (via conference presentations) and informally (in study groups, informal networks, and while *not attending* formal presentations at conferences). By the late 1960s curriculum people had begun talking a lot more to each other, particularly through informal networks. While a group known as the "Radical Caucus" met for several years in the late 1960s and early 1970s at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD -- which was, until the 1970s, the field's primary professional organizational meeting), an informal "Curriculum Theory Study Group" was also meeting at the annual AERA conference. Within two years after AERA legitimized the existence of Special Interest Groups (SIGs) in 1969, 45 members of the curriculum field held their first (informal) SIG meeting. According to Willis (Short, Willis & Schubert, 1985, p. 25), "In many ways the history of the SIG can best be explained as . . . a success in providing opportunities for scholars and researchers to study curriculum by sharing their ideas, *however diverse* [emphasis added]" We know this group, today, as the Critical Issues in Curriculum SIG. Again -- we needed new and even different meeting forums not only because we were having difficulty breaking into

mainstream forums but because those forums were, even then, overly large, pretentious, and impersonal settings.

As many veteran curriculum workers will recall, the late 1960s and early 1970s were awkward and unusual times for both ASCD and AERA. ASCD had slowly begun re-creating itself as a mainstream organization which would speak directly to school practitioners, losing its appeal along the way not only to "radical" curriculum workers but university-based curriculum and supervision scholars in general. During the same period, AERA was working its way through organizational debates about whether or not to create additional divisions, permit the formation of SIGs, and restrict its membership to bona fide researchers.

While internal struggles continued over which directions these large, formal organizations would take their annual spring gatherings, an alternative, autumn curriculum conference appeared. In contrast to the invitational curriculum conferences frequently held throughout the 1960s at universities like Chicago, Stanford, Wisconsin (Madison), Teachers College, and Ohio State, 1973 marked the year when William Pinar (then at the University of Rochester) hosted the first in a series of contentious gatherings attended largely by a growing band of *curriculum miscreants.*

The 1973 founding conference thematically mapped the various projects of the 1970s curriculum renaissance as political, historical, and autobiographical and simultaneously invited dissension among, across, within, and outside of these projects. These divisions coincided in some obvious ways with the affiliation of each year's conference organizer between 1973 and 1978 (see Marshall, Sears & Schubert, in press; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery & Taubman, 1995).

Through powerful ideas, regular communication, and coalition building, little by little, year after year, new turf was identified and old turf refashioned by curriculum workers during the

1970s. Individuals and small groups had grown to sizable collections of irreverent curricularists meeting and talking regularly, managing to publish articles and collections of their work in book form as they struggled to re-draw the boundaries of "appropriate" curriculum scholarship.

Scope of the Field

Curriculum studies enjoyed this resurgent health and popularity in part because the field was growing and expanding its scope-- new and exciting for newcomers, newly exiting for its veteran members. We had a good deal to intellectually work through in the 1970s, much of it around issues of form and substance. Reviews of curriculum research during that decade illustrate a set of curriculum debates about "the meaning of curriculum and curriculum development as aspects of educational practice and on the dimensions and health of the field of curriculum as an area of study. And within each of these . . ., there is a debate within a debate . . . [regarding] which definitions should prevail . . . [and] whether agreement on definitions is necessary or possible, or even desirable" (Johnson, 1977,p. 2). Yet as these debates continued and grew more heated, conventional curriculum work intensified, particularly within policy and measurement realms. Ironically, these were precisely the directions that Joseph Schwab did *not* want the field to head. Schwab -- the person who *directed* "the turn taken by curriculum writers in the Seventies" (Schubert, 1980, p. 242) -- was much concerned about the values of the social and behavior sciences turning completely in the neo-positivist direction (i.e., empirical design and measurement seeking broad generalization). His own antidote was a move in a different direction -- toward the practical and quasi-practical. Numerous predecessors and peers, though, had moved elsewhere.

The curriculum field was, indeed, moving in many directions away from its neo-positivist roots during the 1970s. Curriculum theorizing hit its contemporary stride during this decade, borrowing heavily from schools of thought like European critical and neo-Marxist thinking, depth psychology, sociology of knowledge, phenomenology, literary criticism, feminist theory, and existential philosophy rather than the standard areas of developmental, humanistic, and cognitive psychology upon which the field had grown to rely. Despite this cornucopia of intellectual bases which combined to push the field into a new era, it was collectively understood by many skeptics as a broad path of criticism.

Within his 1976 review of curriculum literature, Walker carefully discussed what he called this "writing in the partisan vein" -- political expressions of concern ranging from mild to "devastatingly radical indictments" of the dehumanizing effects of life resulting from bureaucracies like schools. While acknowledging that most curriculum writers experience "critical interludes in a larger body of work," with "[o]nly George S. Counts and Boyd Bode, among major historical figures in the field, [as] exceptions," Walker finds "dozens of articles . . . [criticizing] current thought and practice [being published in the Seventies]. Such writing appears to have become the preferred mode of work for a number of established figures in the field . . . as well as for many younger writers." These partisan critiques seemed to signal, to Walker, "the emergence of curricular criticism as a mode of inquiry in its own right." Such work, he noted in the mid-1970s, would eventually combine to undermine the credibility of the long-held view that curricula are stable, explicit, rationally responsive, features of schools (Walker, 1976, p. 289). And that it did.

Additionally, and in some respects in relation to that body of critical inquiry in combination with the resurgence of interest in the field's social reconstructionist or "political" tradition, came a powerful and compelling collection of non-US curriculum scholars, many of whom explored curriculum and schooling from new vantage points and through different lenses. As noted earlier, the field's first two journals originated outside the United States. Too, some US curriculum theorists had long been exploring curriculum ideas in relation to what one writer called "moddish continental philosophy." For these and numerous other reasons (significant changes in university growth, technology, and publishing, for example) the conventional US curriculum conversation opened up to international voices. No exploration of our field could miss the unmistakably important internationalization of curriculum studies which took place during the 1970s.

Pursuit of history proved to be another distinguishing characteristic of the curriculum field during this period. Tyack's The One Best System (1974) appeared as curriculum historians explored our history for the National Institute of Education's Curriculum Development Task Force, commissioned in 1975. What seems to have awakened interested curriculum workers was the sharp, so-called revisionist turn in educational history exemplified in Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools (1971); The Great School Legend (1972); Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (1972); Roots of Crisis (1973); Education and Social Control (1975); and Schooling in Capitalist America (1976). These "new histories" of American schooling raised troubling questions about the complicity of curriculum workers in helping to create and sustain unjust and undemocratic schools.

Not surprisingly, an interest in curriculum history followed: ASCD's yearbook celebrating America's bi-centennial (Davis, 1976); Louise Tyler's A Selected Guided to Curriculum Literature: An Annotated Bibliography (1970); and the reprinting of a 1948 book titled Bibliographic Essays on Curriculum and Instruction. The curriculum field had discovered its roots.

As noted previously, the 1970s found curriculum people forming new networks and interest groups. The field's newly-acquired appetite for exploring its past (not to mention its members' concerns with the growing body of revisionist curriculum history) prompted the creation of yet another sort of special interest group. In 1977, a group of respected curriculum veterans gathered at Teachers College to discuss the importance of historical study within the curriculum field, eventually forming the Society for the Study of Curriculum History (SSCH), which had its first official meeting in Toronto in 1978. To this day, the SSCH continues to thrive, formally meeting each year immediately prior to AERA's annual meeting.

So far we've seen that the curriculum field grew not only vigorous and popular but also wider and deeper during the 1970s. Much of this activity was prompted by dissatisfaction with its dominant conventional beliefs and practices, resulting in what Johnson called a "revolt" surrounding the Seventies.

Revolt Against Scientism and Rationality

Johnson (1977) identifies this revolt as key among the many cross-currents within this decade's curriculum scholarship -- "a revolt against the excessive influence of the psychologists and other social scientists who . . . are accused of increasing the control which those with sufficient power can exercise over other human beings . . ." (p. 3). He likens the milder forms of

this revolt to the ideas found in Persig's Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance between romantic (humanist) and classical (analytic) orientations, though he recognizes a "more extremist position" concerned with "furthering a particular political-social ideology. . ." (p. 3). He compared then current revisionist historians and radical philosophers and social scientists to the "liberal social reconstructionists of forty years ago" and wondered whether the most radical, revolutionary critics should be called "curriculum scholars" at all. Partisan? Extremist? Ideological? What was going on in the 1970s to prompt such descriptors?

To be overly simplistic, what was happening -- intellectually -- within the 1970s curriculum field had to do with paradigmatic epistemological shifts. The field was evolving enough to blossom and embrace Habermas's tri-paradigmatic framework (empirical-analytic: scientism, explanatory & technical knowledge; situational-interpretive: situationally-specific meaning-making [phenomenology]; and critical: fundamental values, interests, assumptions and implications for action [critical social theory]), though it would -- as most of us now recognize -- go *well* beyond this simple framework during the 1980s and 1990s.

Recall that it was our over-reliance on the empirical-analytic framework that Schwab and so many others were expressing concern about in the late 1960s. Epistemologically, our field had always lagged behind other areas of study. As Schubert explained in 1979 (pp. 18-19):

> A lag persisted between curriculum and more established areas or disciplines of study. . . . Methodologically, curricularists, like other educational researchers, emulated social scientists who, in turn, emulated successes of natural sciences. When natural scientists moved from heavy reliance on statistics to formulation of theory, social scientists gave prime concern to statistics . . . When natural scientists moved from theory to situational

analysis, social scientists began to develop theories, and curricularists expressed a need (Herrick and Tyler, 1950) for theory and speculated about what it might entail. Substantively, the case is similar [within our field].

For example, existential psychology and philosophy, made central by Sartre, Camus, Jaspers, Heidegger, Kafka and others by the 1920's and 1930's, did not find legitimacy and relevance within the curriculum field until the 1970s.

During the decade of the Seventies, our field struggled mightily with itself with regard to the nature of curriculum work. No longer did we take for granted that our labor was simply neutral and operational, for we now had to confront the growing acceptance of those who saw curriculum work as a normative struggle. Short (1987) suggested that the most significant shift in the field during this period was *from* curriculum as a deductive science or means-ends empirical-analytic arena of inquiry *to* curriculum as a practical art requiring negotiation, judgment, and reasoning. "That is to say, all curriculum decisions . . . are essentially moral and political rather than technical and deductive in type, and the arts of deliberation are at the core of this kind of thinking and decision-making" (1987, p. 8). Not only Schwabian, this shift encompasses political, economic, and ideological work, humanistic and artistic work, more naturalistic forms of empiricism, and historical work. He concludes by stating that "the greatly expanded and varied research efforts in the field of curriculum . . . have been energized by a conceptual breakthrough of considerable proportions in the form of this new normative conception of curriculum" (Short, 1987, p. 10).

But what exactly did this 1970s revolt against scientism and rationality *look and sound like*? Interestingly, the May, 1969 Stanford curriculum conference that introduced this paper

contained a powerful example not only of the language and ideas underlying this "revolt," but of the kinds of responses to such positions that would continue throughout the 1970s. James Macdonald, one of three "curriculum generalists" among the conference's numerous subject specialists, suggested in his presentation that education should be grouped within the humanities and not the sciences because "its activity is made up of problems in social policy, social decision-making, and social action. These all demand alternatives, choices, values, and action. . . ." He eventually concluded: "The implications of this assertion are that the logic of the aesthetic, social, and moral disciplines is more central and appropriate for curriculum development than the logic of scientific or technological areas" (p. 121).

Macdonald's respondent, Richard E. Schutz, a former Professor of Education at Arizona State and then Director of the Southwest Regional Laboratory in Los Angeles, had plenty to say in response to Macdonald's presentation. For example: "Macdonald's paper is representative of a growing academic tendency to use confession of guilt and verbal self-flagellation as a prelude to passing moral judgment on the institutions and ideas which are viewed as determinants of the unfortunate status that has been defined" (p. 135). Schutz continued (remember, this exchange took place in 1969): "The images produced by this rhetoric are something I'd expect to experience on a bad trip, but not while reading a professional paper" (p. 135). He *continued*: "Macdonald appears to be heavily influenced by the currently popular academic religion which seeks the three R's -- responsibility, relevance, and revolution -- all via judgments of the symbolic rather than the empirical environment" (p. 136). He later chided: "Rejecting the possibility of an objective curriculum 'out there,' Macdonald forfeits a good deal of human experience" (p. 137).

But the absence of "an objective curriculum 'out there'" was precisely what the 1970s would expose: the curriculum field emperor stripped of clothing before our very eyes!

Almost a decade later, Ted Aoki (1978) reviewed several "bellwether signs in curriculum inquiry," including Jerome Bruner's 1971 ASCD presentation in which he sought to de-emphasize curriculum's focus on the structures of disciplines, situating the disciplines within broader social contexts while placing more attention on social values and priorities. Aoki also praised the efforts of art educators, in particular, for their efforts to work outside of "the constraining mold of [curriculum] tradition" (Aoki, 1978, p. 3).

Moving into a discussion of curriculum generalists who were recognized during the 1970s for their troublesome and persistent incursions into the dominant field, Aoki went on to acknowledge specific individuals who pressed for greater attention to "the different levels and kinds of value perspectives that are involved in curriculum thinking" and who expressed concerns about underlying curricular assumptions as well as traditional modes of thought that "rest on ... models and language systems that are applied to designing educational environments and to a large portion of educational research" (Aoki, 1978, p. 3).

> Ultimately, Aoki recommended that those doing curriculum inquiry develop a general recognition of the *epistemological limit-situation* [emphasis added] in which current curriculum research is encased, i.e., a critical awareness that conventional research has not only a limiting effect but also to some degree a distorting effect on new possibilities in curriculum research. Accordingly, we need to seek out new orientations that allow us to free ourselves of the tunnel vision effect of mono-dimensionality. (p. 4)

This move would include looking *away from* the Anglo-Saxon tradition (in which empirical analytic epistemology is primary) toward the "Continental Schools of Metascience" (where interpretive and dialectic epistemologies are primary) (Aoki, 1978).

While all of this may have sounded terribly theoretical (and even meta-theoretical), the curriculum field's revolt against scientism and rationality during the 1970s was as "real" and "practical" and obvious as the noses on our faces. Here's just one example.

As Kimball pointed out in 1975, while the early Seventies produced a growing emphasis on what he referred to as "a relational view of curriculum development, evaluation, and adoption or rejection, and an orderly process of decision-making," the Man: A Course of Study (MACOS) story seemed symbolic of our 1970s transitional status. In short, while MACOS "worked" in terms of its scholarly integrity, materials, methods, and the like, it would eventually be "disappeared" because its *purposes* created negative political pressure from the U.S. Congress (see Conlan, 1975). In Kimball's words:

> Thus, we are brought full circle . . . that the fundamental [curriculum] questions are questions of purpose. Curriculum researchers can no more remain indifferent to the value questions implicit in choices of objectives than can any other group of scientists. Yet so often the [curriculum] research studies seem almost antiseptically neutral about these very matters. (1975, p. 7)

Normative matters such as these took center stage during the 1970s.

Out of the Closet

We became a vibrant, expanding, and increasingly elaborate field during the Seventies, in no small part because growing numbers of curriculum workers were bent on bringing new, old,

and borrowed ideas into the conventional curriculum mix. This work went on quietly, around the fraying edges of the field -- until William Pinar, an alleged kingpin of this effort to overthrow curriculum convention, was invited to deliver the very first "State-of-the-Field" address to AERA's Division B in 1978 (Pinar, 1979a). Titled "Notes on the Curriculum Field," his presentation (and its subsequent publication) proved especially significant because, as he and his colleagues would later write, "As long as the movement to reconceive the field appeared marginalized in conferences attended mostly by those committed to the movement, the threat to the traditional field seemed to be contained." Following this high-profile address, however, "the situation for traditionalists became critical and intolerable" (Pinar, et al., 1995, p. 231).

Pinar's 1978 Division B address publicly welcomed the previously quiet and fringe-oriented work to change our field, opening the doors to a revisionist curriculum juggernaut. His address was no mere symbol of *a movement* seeking legitimacy and relevance, but rather an announcement to the field that *movement* was in fact underway.

As Schubert wrote in 1979: "the Seventies brought a castigation of the powers that dominated curriculum inquiry. Schwab's critique of the theoretic research paradigm . . . [was joined and expanded by calls for] inquiry that embraces the phenomenological, existential, literary, psychoanalytical, and other sources. [Today's curriculum scholars] clamor for freedom from the chains of domination by one epistemology. The criticism pertains to both curriculum inquiry and its relation to living outside of classrooms." It was during the 1970s that the positivistic flavor of curriculum research gave way to a range of different forms of inquiry and understanding which, themselves, represented what one writer called "mutually-supportive and protective enclaves of coalescing scholarship and scholars" (Short, 1987).

These were the years -- the 1970s -- when various traditions in curriculum studies were joined by and sometimes combined with new disciplines, producing the numerous discourses and texts which have become part of contemporary curriculum work as we know it today (see Pinar, et al., 1995). So much had changed in our field that by 1978, Ted Aoki would write:

> Today, I no longer feel discomfited as I did once when Bruner called for a moratorium, when Schwab pronounced the fact of the moribund state of curriculum inquiry, or when Magoon cried 'crisis' in educational research. There are now curriculum researchers with whose ventures I can strike a vibrant and resonant chord. Although not too long ago this chord sounded strange deep inside me, that strangeness is fading. (Aoki, 1978, p. 17)

Decline in the confidence of conventional curriculum thinking and practice bottomed out in the late 1970s, as did the decline in our national confidence. President Carter's "national malaise" speech of 1979 articulated America's overall anxiety. During the second half of his presidency, Carter presided over a nation under siege: the takeover of the Iranian embassy with its 444 day-by-day countdown on nightly television, an assassination attempt on the Chief of Allied Forces in Europe, and the successful assassination of the US Ambassador to Afghanistan. Despite successes with the Camp David Accords and Salt II, the Carter presidency was also under domestic siege: Ted Kennedy's electoral challenge; a recalcitrant Democratic Congress; and a significant tilt toward the political right.

From the ashes of the Seventies, slowly arose the Phoenix of political conservatism to dominate the remainder of the century, effectively challenging progressive assumptions about the role of the state in social and economic progress as well as individual and collective rights and responsibilities. The conservative onslaught of the 1980s began in earnest in 1979, with the

defeat of liberal Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and the election in England of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. A year later Americans voiced a resounding "no" to his question, "Are you better off now than you were four years ago?" and elected Ronald Reagan -- whose campaign proclaimed, "It's morning in America!"

The conservative backlash to Pinar's public recognition of the curriculum renaissance began in earnest in 1979, when Philip Jackson delivered Division B's second "State-of-the-Field" address. Responding to Pinar's 1978 address, Jackson titled his thoughts "Curriculum and Its Discontents" (Jackson, 1980). He identified a number of British, Swedish, and US curriculum workers as among the "discontents" who were busy shape-shifting the nature of curriculum work in two particular directions: one "toward a wide assortment of intellectual traditions" (which he characterized as "decidedly left of center"), the other a shift in direction between academics and practitioners, with some discontents moving closer to and others moving further from practitioners (Pinar, et al., 1995, p. 233). With calculated humor, Jackson pondered the changing nature and purpose of the curriculum field and expressed caution with regard to the presence and efforts of these discontents and their cacophonous theoretical efforts. But the corner had been turned long before.

Johnson had warned of this cacophony in 1977, recognizing that while scholarly activity in our field was extremely diverse, it may not produce much in the way of a foundation. "Perhaps we could make greater progress toward a sound theoretical foundation," he suggested, "if we diverted some of our scholarly energies away from metatheoretical discussions, ideological polemics, and medical bulletins regarding the health of the field" (Johnson, 1977, p. 7). But the curriculum field he had in mind was, as Huebner noted in 1976, already dead.

By the early Eighties the ideas shaping contemporary curriculum work had begun to proliferate in both number and sophistication. While much of this development is apparent through professional journal publications and conference presentations, curriculum books provide undeniable evidence that the state of the field had changed. Like a leaky faucet, the pre-1960s occasional drip of non-mainstream curriculum books -- grown from a persistent, throbbing drip to an unmistakable trickle during the late Sixties and early Seventies -- had become a slow but continuous flow by the early 1980s. Just as historical and international work had become valued and respected discourses within contemporary studies, more than a dozen curriculum books representing political, phenomenological, and other newly legitimized discourses were published in 1983, alone.

Further evidence of movement in the once-dominant curriculum culture is found in the language used to characterize our work. Reading the entry devoted to research within our field in the 1982 Encyclopedia of Educational Research we find that "Although it often includes social and behavioral methodologies, curriculum scholarship is more properly denoted by the terms "inquiry," "studies," "theory," and "perspectives" rather than "research" (Schubert, 1982, p. 420). Though curriculum studies continued to include empirical research addressing school experiences, it had expanded by the early 1980s to include "analytic, conceptual, critical, and normative" inquiries into the seemingly unbounded world of educational experiences (p. 421). The representational importance of this language difference is perhaps best exemplified by the decision in 1981 to change the name of our own division within AERA from "Curriculum and Objectives" to "Curriculum Studies."

Conclusion

Like the field of cognitive psychology, the post-WWII curriculum field found its contemporary personae during the 1970s. The dominant epistemological and utilitarian culture of conventional curriculum work became suspect; alternative ideas and practices were borrowed, re-visited, and re-configured; respected leaders joined the insurrection; high-profile presentations and publications helped to legitimize the dissidence; and all of this unfolded during a time when the world around us was itself morphing beyond our wildest dreams. Things changed.

In his 1976 review of curriculum research, Walker predicted the central concern of the post-1970s curriculum field as a loss of identity. After recognizing "three broad paths proposed for the field in these [current] works: a technical-managerial path, a practical-public policy path, and a path of criticism" (p. 302), he went on to note that while not mutually exclusive,

> it is difficult to imagine a coexistence of much duration without some common ground of professional action and responsibility. If each group communicates among its own members exclusively, publishes in separate journals, concerns itself with different problems, seeks its own support and its own place in schools, universities, and government agencies, and makes its own distinctive contributions independent of the others -- then they will surely go their separate ways. Eventually, whatever conceptual unity may have existed to justify applying the single name 'curriculum' to them will have vanished." (1976, p. 303).

By the time we hit the 1980s, however, Walker's "broad path of criticism" had itself begun to implode as ruinously contentious rifts developed between many curriculum scholars over the nature, control and direction of these new theorizing efforts. The shifting coalition of

"discontents" began to unravel as the curriculum field moved into the Eighties. Debates within debates within debates would eventually become linked to internecine struggles, often as much about individual and collective *identities* as they were about individual and collective *ideas*. Having succeeded in distinguishing themselves from the dominant curriculum culture, many new curricularists began distinguishing themselves from each other as well.

The dominant culture of the conventional curriculum field had been -- and here, at long last, is the 'R' word -- *reconceptualized* during the 1970s. Toward what ends? In whose interests? Those difficult questions awaited later decades.

Bibliography

Apple, M.W. (1975a). *Making curriculum problematic*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Apple, M.W. (1975b). Scientific interests and the nature of educational institutions. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.)., *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 120-130). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Apple, M.W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

*Aoki, T.T. (1979). *Toward curriculum inquiry in a new key*. Curriculum, Media & Instruction Occasional Paper No. 2. University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 182 808)

Barrow, R., & Milburn, G. (1990). *A critical dictionary of educational concepts* (second edition). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bellack, A.A. (1969). History of curriculum thought and practice. *Review of Educational Research, 39*, 283-292.

Benham, B.J. (1981). Curriculum theory in the 1970s: The reconceptualist movement. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3*, 162-170.

Boyd, W.L. (1979). The politics of curriculum change and stability. *Educational Researcher, 8* (February), 12-18.

Conlan, J.B. (1975). MACOS: The push for a unified natioal curriculum. *Social Education, 39*, 389-392.

Davis, O.L. (Ed.). (1976). *Perspectives on curriculum development, 1776-1976*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Eisner, E.W. (Ed.). (1971). *Confronting curriculum reform*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Eisner, E. W. (1976). Educational connoisseurship and criticism: Their form and functions in educational evaluations. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 10*, 135-150.

Eisner, E.W. (1978). Humanistic trends and the curriculum field. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 10* (July-September), 197-204.

Eisner, E.W., & Vallance, E. (Ed.s.). (1974). *Conflicting conceptions of curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

•Feinberg, P.R. (1985). Four curriculum theorists: A critique in the light of Martin Buber's philosophy of education. *JCT, 6*(1), 5-164.

Foshay, A.W., & Beilin, L.A. (1969). Curriculum. In R.L. Ebel, V.H. Noll, & R.M. Bauer (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (4th ed., pp. 275-280).New York: Macmillan.

Franklin, B.M. (1975). *Technological models and the curriculum field: Some thoughts about a new curricular history*. Unpublished manuscript, University of South Carolina at Spartanburg.

Giroux, H.A. (1979). Toward a new sociology of curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 37* (December), 248-253.

Goodlad, J.I. (1969). Curriculum: State of the field. *Review of Educational Research, 39* (3), 367-375.

Grumet, M.R. (1989). Generations: Reconceptualist curriculum theory and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(1), 13-17.

Huebner, D. (1975). Curricular language and classroom meanings. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp. 217-236). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Huebner, D. (1976). The moribund curriculum field: Its wake and our work. *Curriculum Inquiry, 6,* 153-167.

Jackson, P.W. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 3-40). New York: Macmillan.

Jackson, P.W. (1980). Curriculum and its discontents. *Curriculum Inquiry, 1,* 28-43.

•Johnson, M. (1976). Needed research: Emphasis on the future. *Educational Leadership, 33* (7), 505-8.

*Johnson, M. (1977, October). *Review of research in curriculum*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeast Educational Research Association, Ellenville, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116 102)

Kearney, N.C., & Cook, W.W. (1960 [written in 1958]). Curriculum. , In C.W. Harris (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (3rd ed., pp. 358-365). New York: Macmillan.

*Kimball, R.B. (1975, October). *Recent research in curriculum*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeast Educational Research Association, Ellenville, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116 347)

Kliebard, H.M. (1968). The curriculumfield in retrospect. In P.W.F. Witt (Ed.)., Technology and curriculum (pp. 69-84). New York: Teachers College Press.

Klohr, P. (1980). The curriculum theory field -- gritty and ragged. *Curriculum Perspectives, 1*(1), 1-7.

Macdonald, J.B. (1971). Responsible curriculum development. In E.W. Eisner (Ed.), *Confronting curericulum reform* (pp. 120 - 134). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Macdonald, J.B. (1975). Curriculum and human interests. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.)., *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 283-294). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

van Manen, M. (1978). Reconceptualist curriculum thought: A review of recent literature. *Curriculum Inquiry, 8*(4), 365-375.

Mann, J.S. (1975). Curriculum criticism. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.)., *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 133-148). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Marsh, C.J. (1992). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum.* London: Falmer.

Marshall, J.D., Sears, J.T., & Schubert, W.H. (in press). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir.* Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

•Mazza, K.A. (1982). Reconceptual inquiry as an alternative mode of curriculum theory and practice: A critical study. *JCT, 4*(2), 5-89.

McClure, R.M. (Ed.). (1971). *The curriculum - Retrospect and prospect: Seventieth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (Part I). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McNeil, J. (1978). Curriculum -- A field shaped by different faces. *Educational Researcher, 7* (September), 19-23.

Miller, J.L. (1978). Curriculum theory: A recent history. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 11*, 28-43.

•Molnar, A. (1992). Contemporary curriculum discourse: Too much ado about too much nothing.*Theory Into Practice, 31* (3), 198-203.

Pillemer, D.B. (1998). *Momentous events, vivid memories*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pinar, W.F. (1991). The reconceptualist approach. In A. Lewy (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of curriculum* (pp. 35-37). Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Pinar, W.F. (1988a). Introduction. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.), *Contemporary curriculum discourses* (1-13). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Pinar, W.F. (1988b). The reconceptualization of curriculum studies 1987: A personal retrospective. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 3*(2), 157-167.

Pinar, W.F. (1981). The reconceptualization of curriculum studies. In H. Giroux, A. Penna, & W. Pinar (Eds.), *Curriculum and Instruction: Alternatives in education* (89-97). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Pinar, W.F. (1979a). Notes on the curriculum field,1978. *Educational Researcher, 7*(8), 5-12.

Pinar, W.F. (1979b). What is the reconceptualization? *JCT, 1*(1), 93-104.

Pinar, W.F. (1978). The reconceptualization of curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 10*(3), 205-214.

Pinar, W.F. (Ed.). (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Pinar, W.F., & Grumet, M. (1981). Theory and practice and the reconceptualization of curriculum studies. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (Eds.), *Rethinking curriculum studies* (pp. 20-42). London: Croom Helm.

Pinar, W.F., Reynolds, W.M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P.M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Posner, G. (1976, November). *Approaches to curriculum research: An analysis and a proposal*. Paper presented to the Annual Curriculum Theory Conference, Milwaukee, WI.

Reid, W.A. (1978). *Thinking about curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Schaffarzick, J., & Sykes, G. (Eds.). (1979). *Value conflicts and curriculum issues: Lessons from research and experience*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Schubert, W.H.. (1982). Curriculum research. In H.E. Mitzel, J.H. Best, & W. Rabinowitx (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (5th ed., Vol.1, pp. 420-431). New York: The Free Press.

*Schubert, W.H. (1979, April). *Frames of curriculum knowledge production: Historical review and recommendations*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 608)

Schutz, R.E. (1971). Comments on "Responsible curriculum development." In E.W. Eisner (Ed.), *Confronting curericulum reform* (pp. 134-142). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Schwab, J.J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review, 78* (1), 1-24.

Schwab, J.J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79* (4), 493-542.

Schwab, J.J. (196). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *School Review, 81* (4), 501-522.

Sharp, R., & Green, A. (1975). *Education and social control: A study in progressive primary education.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Short, E.C. (1974). *Curriculum knowledge: Kinds and processes.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of Professors of Curriculum, Anaheim, CA, March 9.

Short, E.C. (1987, April). *Curriculum research in rtetrospect.* Paper presented to the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, Washington, DC.

Short, E.C. (1982). Curriculum development and organization. In H.E. Mitzel, J.H. Best, & W. Rabinowitx (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (5th ed., Vol.1, pp. XXX-412). New York: The Free Press.

Short, E.C., Willis, G.H., and Schubert, W.H. (1985). *Toward excellence in curriculum inquiry: The story of the AERA special interest group on creation and utilization of curriculum knowledge: 1970 - 1984.* State College, PA: Nittany Press.

Tanner, D. (1982). Curriculum history. In H.E. Mitzel, J.H. Best, & W. Rabinowitx (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (5th ed., Vol.1, pp. 412-420). New York: The Free Press.

Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1979). Emancipation from research: The reconceptualists' prescription. *Educational Researcher, 8*(6), 8-12.

Walker, D.F. (1973). What curriculum research? *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 5* (1), 58-72.

Walker, D.F. (1975). Straining to lift ourselves: A critique of the foundations of the curriculum field. *Curriculum Theory Network, 5* (1), 3-25.

Walker, D.F. (1976). Toward comprehension of curricular realities. In L. Shulman (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education, Volume 4* (pp. 268-308). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Westbury, I. (1969, February). *Problems in search of disciplined attention, or a discipline in search of its problems: A discussion of some assumptions in a curriculum theory.* Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 030 180)

Westbury, I., & Steimer, W. (1971). Curriculum: A discipline in search of its problems. *School Review, 79* (2), 243-267.

Wraga, W.G. (1999). "Extracting sun-beams out of cucumbers": The retreat from practice in reconceptualized curriculum studies. *Educational Researcher, 28* (1), 4-13.

* Identifies one of the key pieces resulting from our search strategy.

EA029 864

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Great Refusal: Curriculum Transitions - The Seventies	
Author(s): J. Dan Marshall, with Kyeong-gook Kim	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: April, 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: J. Dan Marshall	Printed Name/Position/Title: J. Dan Marshall, Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: Chambers Bldg., Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802	Telephone: 814-865-2239	FAX: 814-863-7602
	E-Mail Address: jdm13@psu.edu	Date: 1 June '99

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

-088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.