

A VOLUME IN CURRICULUM WINDOWS

Curriculum Windows

*What Curriculum Theorists of the 1950s
Can Teach Us About Schools and Society Today*

edited by

Thomas S. Poetter | Don C. Murray | Peggy Larrick

M. A. Moyer | Esther Claros Berlioz

Kelly Waldrop



THOMAS S. PORTER

KELLY WALDROP

Curriculum Windows

A volume in
Curriculum Windows
Thomas S. Poetter, *Series Editor*

This page intentionally left blank.

Curriculum Windows

**What Curriculum Theorists
of the 1950s Can Teach Us
About Schools
and Society Today**

edited by

Thomas S. Poetter

Don C. Murray

Peggy Larrick

M. A. Moyer

Esther Claros Berlioz

Kelly Waldrop



INFORMATION AGE PUBLISHING, INC.
Charlotte, NC • www.infoagepub.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress
<http://www.loc.gov>

ISBN: 978-1-64113-818-5 (Paperback)
978-1-64113-819-2 (Hardcover)
978-1-64113-820-8 (eBook)

Copyright © 2020 Information Age Publishing Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Foreword: Curriculum Windows: The 1950s.....	vii
Preface: 1950s Volume	xix
Introduction: Curriculum Windows of the 1950s.....	xxiii
1 Calling a Truce: Rudolf Flesch and the Reading War	1
<i>Esther Claros Berlioz</i>	
2 There Were Bugs in the Window	17
<i>Adam H. Frank</i>	
3 We Will Not Teach in Fear: Reclaiming Our Voice in the Complicated Conversation	33
<i>M. A. Moyer</i>	
4 Creativity and the Windowless Classroom.....	45
<i>Don C. Murray</i>	
5 A Personal Exploration of My Journey From Nongraded to Graded	61
<i>Serian Jeng</i>	
6 Bloom’s Taxonomy: Six Decades of the Cognitive Domain	77
<i>John Chambers</i>	
7 Looking in the Residence Hall Window to the Future.....	91
<i>Colleen E. Bunn</i>	

vi ■ Contents

8	Creating the World Outside Your Window.....	107
	<i>Daniel L. Coleman</i>	
9	2016: The New 1957.....	121
	<i>Robyn Jordan</i>	
10	The <i>Tyler Rationale</i> : A Model of Curriculum Architecture.....	139
	<i>Vijay Kesharao Paralkar</i>	
11	Florence Stratemeyer: A Visionary Forgotten	151
	<i>Kevin Fitzgerald</i>	
12	Tea With Taba.....	167
	<i>Peggy Larrick</i>	
	About the Co-Editors	185

FOREWORD

CURRICULUM WINDOWS

The 1950s

I congratulate Tom Poetter, Kelly Waldrop, and the whole array of authors of this volume for helping to bring greater perspective by learning about the still valuable curriculum ideas and practices from the 1950s. I once did a presentation on the 1950s at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) which was subsequently published in the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* (Schubert, 2000). My selections for discussion included some similar and some different books from those chosen by this team of authors. I have no problem with that, since there are many ways to determine the contemporary worth of curriculum books. After all, the basic curriculum question, as I have long maintained is: What is worthwhile? (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980; Schubert, 1986; Schubert, 2009; Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, & Carroll, 2002; He, Schultz, & Schubert, 2015). In fact, in Craig Kridel's (2010) *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*, one of my articles is called *Worth, What Knowledge is of* (Schubert, 2010a, p. 950). Thus, I want to situate my comments in this Foreword around the ways the question of worth is addressed by the books selected and the authors presenting the books.

As in my forewords to each of the other Windows volumes, I comment from a personal stance about my experiences with the decade in question.

For me the 1950s was a starting point for me with curriculum. I entered first grade in a small town in Indiana called Butler in 1950. My father was a school administrator, teacher, and coach in a nearby K–12 school that was so small it had no town—merely a congregation of farms called Scott Center. My mother took a hiatus from her secondary school teaching career to teach me at home from the time I was born to my entry to school. My great aunt was my teacher in first grade, and other relatives were educators who surrounded my schooling for the next 12 years.

I am likely the only writer for this book who lived during the 1950s. World War II ended 5 years before, I could feel the aftershocks as a preschooler. Whenever there is a war or other major catastrophe, public intellectuals and pundits alike look to change the educational system, as if it caused the war or catastrophe. In the 1950s there were several events of this nature, such as the Cold War, civil rights, ecological imbalance, the space race, and parochialism, among others. I encourage readers to think about how these events are connected with the books presented. I consider the books discussed in this volume chronologically, responding to the journey of my early life through schooling alongside publication of the books.

Vijay Paralkar helps readers see the importance of Ralph Tyler's (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, a book that I contend had more influence than any curriculum book in the field thus far. It was Tyler's course syllabus at the University of Chicago. His basic questions are a summation of work by diverse thinkers such as Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters of the social behaviorist or social efficiency curricularists, John Dewey and the progressives who promoted experientialist and reconstructionist thought, and Robert M. Hutchins or William C. Bagley of the liberal arts and sciences tradition. Tyler's contention was that for any curriculum improvement project it is necessary to address purposes, learning experiences, organizational patterns, and modes of evaluation that pertain to it. Dealing with these topics or questions requires a great deal of philosophical, psychological, scientific, and cultural understanding. Taken as a recipe by too many, Tyler clearly counters hope for easy answers in the book's conclusion, maintaining that a good curriculum problem-solver should start wherever the problem is and address repercussions that reverberate throughout the whole curriculum revision process, that is, each of the four topics. The basic topics of what has become known as the *Tyler rationale* are evident in topics treated in lesson plans, curriculum guides, policy documents, manuals for textbooks, and teaching materials all over the world. Although Tyler's book was originally published in 1949, many of the early volumes are dated 1950; therefore, it is fitting that it is included in this Windows volume about the 1950s. Without being conscious of it when I was a public school student, I was clearly influenced by the purposes, learning experiences, organizational patterns, and evaluation from 1950 to 1962, when I graduated from

high school. In teaching preparation and as a teacher I was continuously expected to deal with these topics. As a beginning professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Tyler visited Chicago often to go to offices at SRA (Science Research Associates) and the Spencer Foundation, or to return to the University of Chicago where he had worked from the mid-1930s into the 1950s, and to visit his daughter in a northern suburb. I got to know him at AERA in the late 1970s and he came to our home several times in the 1980s, and sometimes spoke on our campus. I was pleased to present him with an honorary doctorate of letters at our 1981 graduation ceremony at the old Chicago Stadium. Although Tyler's rationale has been critiqued, I appreciate his contributions, which were much more extensive than the rationale, and I am glad to see the book included in this Curriculum Windows edition.

Hilda Taba met Ralph Tyler as an immigrant scholar from Estonia who worked with him on the renowned Eight-Year Study (Aikin, 1942; Smith, Tyler, & Associates, 1942), after getting her PhD, chaired by William H. Kilpatrick at Teachers College, Columbia. Together, Taba and Tyler worked out many ideas. I remember Tyler telling me that when they were on the evaluation team of the Eight-Year Study, and at a meeting of the curriculum team comments were made about the need to have a rationale for curriculum that was as concise as the one they used for evaluation. Tyler said they sketched out the design of what would be the Tyler rationale on a luncheon napkin (Tyler, 1987; Tyler, Schubert, & Lopez Schubert, 1985). In the Windows volume on the 1960s, Taba's (1962) synoptic text, *Curriculum Development*, is discussed, and her work on intergroup relations (Taba, 1950) brought thoughtfully to us by Peggy Larrick was a precursor to that major book. Taba's emphasis on group processes was an insightful humanization to the more rational approach of Tyler. Additionally, Taba's case studies of instruction should make one realize that qualitative research has been with us longer than many realize. Another pioneer woman from the 1950s in the curriculum field was Alice Miel whose work on group relations (Miel & Associates, 1952) contributed similarly by building on her earlier declaration that curriculum change was a social process (Miel, 1946). Her mentor, Hollis Caswell along with Doak Campbell, were originators of the synoptic text (Caswell & Campbell, 1935). As I progressed through the elementary and junior high years of schooling, greater emphasis was placed on social processes.

One of Miel's colleagues at Teachers College, Columbia, was Florence Stratemeyer, who Kevin Fitzgerald brings to our attention. Stratemeyer's (1952) *Guides to a Curriculum for Modern Living*, is an accompaniment to her synoptic text (Stratemeyer, Forkner, & McKim, 1947), which was revised and expanded in the 1950s (Stratemeyer, Forkner, McKim, & Passow, 1957), focusing the matter of worth on *persistent life situations*. The idea of

Guides was to make the ideas even more germinal to application by curriculum coordinators in school systems and by teachers in classrooms. I like to think of it as a sort of revival by SAGE Publications which has instituted *guides* in many areas of study, such as the *Guide to Curriculum in Education* that I recently edited with Ming Fang He and Brian Schultz (He, Schultz, & Schubert, 2015), reference books being a new kind of synoptic portrayal of the field of curriculum studies. As I refer to synoptic texts by Taba (1962), Miel (1946), and Stratemeyer et al. (1947, 1957), and as I consider Tyler (1949) a highly concise synoptic skeleton of what he felt curriculum designers and developers should consider as they address the question of worth, I feel a great need to mention what I consider the greatest synoptic text of the 1950s; this was a massive undertaking with progressive leanings in which B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores (1950, revised in 1957) showed the worth of addressing the array of educational foundations in the process of curriculum development, change, and revision. Harlan Shores was my doctoral mentor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1950/1957) also emphasized the need to consider the core curriculum that Harold Alberty (1947) set forth in his synoptic text for secondary school curriculum workers. Taba, Stratemeyer, Miel, Caswell, Campbell, Alberty, Smith, Stanley, Shores, and more inspired me to write *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility* (Schubert, 1986), as a synoptic text for the 1980s and onward.

Henry Harap (1952) was also a strong proponent of the core curriculum as were Faunce and Bossing (1951), a year earlier. The core curriculum of those days was nothing like the term *core* means today. These curriculum authors of the 1940s and 1950s were heavily influenced by John Dewey (e.g., 1916 & 1938) and saw the core of teaching and learning to be individuals, their communities and cultures, so that centers of concern should be the deep interests of students, teachers, and others who surround them. As one probes deeply into one's interests, one realizes that they can be enlightened and advanced by the disciplines of knowledge and the practical and personal wisdom of everyday living. In this time of a core that fuels testing and accountability and serves the wishes of the top percent, I am glad that Colleen Bunn decided to help us see that the original core of Harap and other curriculum scholars of the 1950s is far different. If you get a chance to read Joel Spring's (2013) novel satirizing the contemporary image of core curriculum with a rotten apple core on its cover, I recommend it as at least a temporary antidote to today's educational oppression.

Matt Moyer rightly calls us to revisit Arthur Bestor's (1953) *Educational Wastelands*. Bestor was an academic, a historian, who joins many over the years who blamed schools for woes of society. Like Alan Bloom (1987) of the 1980s, Bestor thought all would be better if a rather formalistic liberal arts education and the skills that supported it were available for all. He

considered catering to student interests as contributing to the wasteland in which he thought schools floundered by substituting the frivolous for the rigorous. He did not believe that advocates of the core curriculum, mentioned in the foregoing paragraph, were right in assuming that pursuit of interests would lead to study of genuine human interests through the disciplines of knowledge. Critics of schooling, such as Bestor, abound today; the skills they advocate for accessing liberal education are not deemed relevant by non-privileged socioeconomic class students who search for worth through other spheres of life and disregard school. While privileged classes, from which Bestor drew his experience, benefit more from being surrounded by privilege and its institutions throughout their lives. Institutions of liberal education are attuned to their way of life. Most others have little access to it.

The case is similar for Rudolph Flesch, who scorned those not privileged and bemoaned that most students could not read well. He blamed on schools rather than on the socio-economic and political plight of those who do not live in privilege, as Esther Claros Berlioz helps readers see. This, too, is a familiar strain today. Like Bestor, Flesch was an author, an advocate of liberal arts education for all, who emphasized skills taught apart from the pursuit of meaning. Flesch was also an early readability expert who made his mark with his book with a catchy title, *Why Johnny Can't Read* (1955). The teaching of reading through phonics and other skills-based approaches does not show the value of literature for cultivating our lives, as had long been advocated by Louise Rosenblatt (1938) in *Literature as Exploration*. Mentored by John Dewey, Rosenblatt built on Dewey's idea of *transaction* (Dewey, 1916; Dewey & Bentley, 1949) which superseded interaction and in literature showed the need to focus on how reader and literature evolve via symbiotic connections. Nonetheless, Flesch's tirades were easier to understand by those who had not grown from transaction with literature. Answering the question of worth with skills and factoids was safer, too, during the McCarthy era of *red scare* and *blacklisting*. Literature, social critique, and scientific or mathematical reasoning, and heaven-forbid, the arts and humanities, could indeed challenge the cloud of unknowing that covered imagination of too much of the public. It was taboo.

The education that I was afforded in the small town midwestern United States was basically skills and information oriented. After I attended first and second grade in a K–12 school building in town, we moved to my grandparent's farm located two miles east and I attended a tiny one-room brick school building where my grandmother had taught for at least two, maybe three, generations. Grades 1 to 4 were one row each. Grandma (twin of my 1st grade teacher) was a good skills and knowledge teacher. She and her sister loved to read and worked their way through much of town's Carnegie Library. Liberal arts exposure for her students came when she

read books aloud to us, for example, by Charles Dickens, Mark Twain, and others. Listening to novels gave me my first glimmer of how my life might be transformed by transacting with works of literature that could help create me. In the early 1950s one-room schools still were scattered across the countryside. A mile down the road was the Grade 5 through 8 school which had a very able teacher, Mrs. Scoville, but she retired when I was in Grade 4, and I could not go to school in Butler because I lived on a farm out of town. Teachers were run out of the 5–8 school by tough farm kids almost as soon as they arrived, so my parents paid tuition for me to attend Pleasant Lake School, where my father was principal, about 20 miles away for the next 3 years, Grades 5, 6, and 7. School consolidation was still a few years away.

The White curriculum field, alas, barely recognized the plight of African Americans (not to mention Native Americans, Latino/a Americans, and Asian Americans). There were few, if any, who were considered curriculum scholars in the 1950s, except in separate places that the dominant curriculum field rarely visited. That is doubtless why Daniel Coleman chose Ralph Ellison (1954) and why Robyn Jordan chose Richard Wright (1954) and called the work of these brilliant writers windows for *curriculum*. Their inclusion is an insightful contribution, and symbolically adroit, given the 1954 case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. I have often used Ellison's *The Invisible Man* and Wright's *Black Boy* in my graduate classes at UIC. However, I admit that when I was in high school, or even college, in the 1950s and 1960s, I never heard of either of them. Moreover, I was scarcely aware of the work of civil rights educators such as Fanny Lou Hamer, Ella Baker, Charlie Cobb, Bob Moses and many others in the Freedom Schools. In a large sense, their teaching and curriculum were even more progressive, especially with a critical praxis edge, than what purported to be progressive education in largely White, often middle or upper middle-class America. In any case, the remarkable insight of these two chapters is seeing Ellison and Wright books as curriculum. To include them is to see curriculum as the whole of life. I have called for attention to the *outside curriculum* (Schubert, 1981, 2010a, 2010b), and I see the quasi-autobiographical *Invisible Man* as life history. Regarding Richard Wright, I see *Black Boy* (Wright, 1945) in the same manner and *Black Power* (Wright, 1954) as a manifestation of a person represented in *Black Boy* as he becomes radicalized, since the actualization of black power derives from the person writ large. As I take stock of my life, now in my 70s, I see the curriculum of who I am as a manifestation of all that I have experienced, surely not from schooling alone. Fortunately, it is beginning to be studied in that way through cultural studies and many other realms of understanding (e.g., Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; He, Schultz, & Schubert, 2015; Au, Brown, & Calderón, 2016). Thus, I contend that a valuable use of curriculum ideas is to relate them to any of the life's experiences that shape our being in the world.

Benjamin Bloom, a former student of Tyler at the University of Chicago, is perhaps best known for his *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Cognitive Domain* (Bloom, 1956), which launched him into a stellar professorial reputation in his own right. The import of Bloom's *Taxonomy* is well-captured by John Chambers as he reminds us that Bloom's categorization of a hierarchy of six levels of cognitive development has generated benchmarks of curriculum, instruction, and evaluation from the 1950s to today. Teachers and curriculum developers are still taught to balance curriculum from lower and less complicated levels of memory, comprehension, and application to higher order thinking of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. They are still asked to construct lesson plans that stem from measurable behavioral objectives at these different levels. Out of his work Bloom's students and colleagues in subsequent decades developed taxonomies in affective, social, and physical domains. In the early 1970s, as a teacher looking for summer work, I was invited by the Institute of Educational Research in Downers Grove, Illinois, to write behavioral objectives and test items for higher levels of cognitive education appropriate to studying works of literature. Apparently, teachers and curriculum makers wanted computer banks (a novel thing at the time) on higher order thinking. I found these easy to conceptualize and write. Nevertheless, as a teacher, I preferred to use Bloom's taxonomy as one of many sets of categories to stimulate my imagination. As I planned to teach, or in the very act of teaching, I would ask myself if I was emphasizing one level, say memory or comprehension, too much, wondering if I should add more analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. After all, Francis Bacon taught us that a well-designed set of topics can be a heuristic device from which to imagine action. These became known as *Baconian tables of invention*. I used Bloom's taxonomy to enhance my inventiveness as a teacher.

This leads directly to Don Murry's chapter on Laura Zirbes's (1959) call to imagine in her *Spurs to Creative Teaching*. When I completed 6 years of teaching in elementary school, I applied for and received a sabbatical leave to pursue a PhD full time for two summers and an academic year at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I knew I would need to accomplish as much as possible, so without knowing of Laura Zirbes or her book, I thought seriously about what I had learned as a teacher and how I might use that as a *spur*, if you will, to do a dissertation. I also wondered about what spurred the best ideas and approaches I developed with students. I decided that the best of my teaching ideas and practices were honed by growing as a person by study of philosophy, literature, the arts, sciences, and alternative knowledges, and by meeting individuals and groups with diverse interests. I decided that my emergent philosophical perspectives and repertoire of imagination were my best tools. I could carry them with no valise, for they were embodied within me. They enhanced my daily and momentary reflection with friends, in solitude, and while transacting with children

as I taught. They helped me create learning experiences and understand the consequences of potential and actual practices. Thus, my dissertation (Schubert, 1975) was an attempt to unearth and explicate myriad sources of the imagination or creativity as teaching and curriculum are invented. I now see Laura Zirbes as a leading curriculum scholar of the 1950s who still admonishes us to do this. Zirbes' contributions to the Laboratory School of The Ohio State University advanced creative dimensions of John Dewey and the progressives. My own work in creating an open-space demonstration elementary school in Downers Grove, Illinois, with differentiated staffing and progressive practices in the late 1960s and early 1970s, involved a continuous struggle to keep creativity alive. Associated with the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the school was a demonstration school for many who wanted to construct creative versions of teaching for the 1970s.

By 1959, I was in high school, having returned to Butler from Pleasant Lake, because school consolidations had been sweeping the country. Of course, I did not know that James B. Conant was responsible for the consolidation movement. Nonetheless, I could attend school in town school in town. Workshops, in-services, and courses taken by my mother, who had resumed her teaching career as a math and social studies teacher, along with my other high school teachers, opened their teaching to new forms of educational practice practices (ala Dewey, Harap, Tyler, Taba, Goodlad and Anderson, and Stratemeyer), creativity (ala Zirbes), multiple levels of thinking (ala Bloom), and more. Most remained with the more efficiency-oriented Tyler, and the intellectual traditionalist such as Bestor and Flesch. They did not depart far from the traditional and autocratic past, although their progressive workshop experiences did shine through at times. The one-room country schools were closed, and their students were swept into towns they surrounded. The next step of consolidation was to bridge communities together by creating larger schools that could provide more academic opportunities, modern facilities, and guidance for students entering a more cosmopolitan, neoconservative, and neoliberal world. All this, as Adam Frank helps us realize, was perpetuated by James Bryant Conant, a chemistry professor and president of Harvard. With a big grant through his friend Frank Keppel, president of the Carnegie Foundation, Conant (1959) sent his book, *The American High School Today*, to most of the school boards in the nation. Thus, Conant's view of what was worthwhile for students in the United States took precedence over what other curriculum scholars were writing. They did not have the funding and Ivy League status. The large, comprehensive high schools he imagined were readily implemented, and are still with us today, giving Conant immense status in the history of U.S. curriculum practice. Conant (1964) further ensured the longevity of his image of the high school, again with the help from Keppel and Carnegie, by influencing the design of teacher preparation in *The Education of*

American Teachers. Although not primarily regarded as a curriculum scholar, Conant had more direct influence on what high schools became for the remainder of the twentieth century than most any other individual. This is largely the case because the curriculum reform that Conant created was not merely a change in subjects taught or learning experiences designed; rather, it was a change in the structure of schools and of communities. To me, this means that Conant's curriculum was not only the courses and other substantive innovations, but the changed school and community structures. Students learned from that as well. Conant's changes were not without critique. Counter-culture educators of the 1960s and 1970s, and small school advocates of the 1980s and 1990s criticized large impersonal schools and said the sense of community had been effectually destroyed by them. But that is another story, partially told in other Curriculum Windows volumes.

Nonetheless, part of the critique began almost as soon as the high school reformation ala Conant began. Focusing more on elementary schools, John Goodlad and Robert Anderson called for less rigidity relative to grade levels. As Serian Jeng enables readers to see, the concern expanded for greater flexibility of school organization and provision of curriculum and instruction to meet the diverse needs, interests, and abilities of students. By *non-graded*, Goodlad and Anderson (1959) sought to overcome the staid organization of schools as lockstep enterprises. Within a decade, architects caught wind of this desire (and along with the fashion of sensitivity training) and sold educators and the public on construction of open-space schools. In the Chicago area where I was, the Disney Magnet School may have been the first and two open-space schools in Downers Grove, Bellaire and El Sierra (where I taught—yes, not La Sierra), were prominent for visits from leaders from school who wanted to get on the open-space bandwagon. The whole idea of non-gradedness, however, is a serious innovative alternative wherein students are grouped and regrouped for meaningful experience. Goodlad studied with Tyler at the University of Chicago, and Goodlad was a major figure for over half a century. He began teaching in rural one-room schools in Canada, the kind I attended in Indiana with my grandmother as the teacher. These rural schools were natural multi-grades with ample opportunity for students to tutor one another across grade lines. My experience in the open-space school from 1969 to 1973 had surprising similarities to my one-room school experience from 1952 to 1954. One of my favorite contributions of John Goodlad was his emphasis on school ambience as characterized in his Study of Schooling published in his most widely acclaimed book, *A Place Called School* (Goodlad, 1984). Today's oppressive schooling is ripe for studies of ambience in view of the stresses upon educators and students today.

I hope my comments shed perspective that illuminates pervasive influences of curriculum books from the 1950s for today. The authors of individual

chapters will doubtless add to your appreciation of the contemporary relevance of these curriculum ideas and practices. Again, I commend Tom Poetter, Kelly Waldrop, and the contributing authors for making books discussed here come alive for subsequent generations of curriculum workers and teachers as they ponder and practice what is worthwhile despite stifling conditions.

—William H. Schubert

REFERENCES

- Aikin, W. M. (1942). *The story of the Eight Year Study*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Alberty, H. (1947). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Au, W., Brown, A. L., & Calderón, D. (2016). *Reclaiming the multicultural roots of the U.S. curriculum: Communities of color and official knowledge in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Bestor, A. (1953). *Educational wastelands*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Bloom, B. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York, NY: David McKay.
- Caswell, H. L., & Campbell, D. S. (1935). *Curriculum development*. New York, NY: American Book Company.
- Conant, J. B. (1959). *The American high school today*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Conant, J. B. (1964). *The education of American teachers*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J., & Bentley, A. F. (1949). *Knowing and the known*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Ellison, R. (1954). *The invisible man*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Faunce, R. C., & Bossing N. L. (1951). *Developing the core curriculum*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Flesch, R. (1955). *Why Johnny can't read, and what you can do about it*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. Hightstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J., & Anderson, R. (1959). *The non-graded elementary school*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Harap, H. (1952). *Social living in the curriculum: A critical study of the core in action in grades one through twelve*. Nashville, TN: George Peabody College for Teachers.
- He, M. F., Schultz, B. D., & Schubert, W. H. (Eds.). (2015). *Guide to curriculum in education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kridel, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Miel, A. (1946). *Changing the curriculum*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century.
- Miel, A., & Associates. (1952). *Cooperative procedures in learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1938). *Literature as adventure*. New York, NY: D. Appleton-Century.
- Schubert, W. H. (1975). *Imaginative projection: A method of curriculum invention* (unpublished dissertation). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

- Schubert, W. H. (1981). Knowledge about out-of-school curriculum. *Educational Forum*, 45(2), 185–199.
- Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Schubert, W. H. (2000). Curriculum studies: State of the art, 1950s. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 16(2), 93–99.
- Schubert, W. H. (2009). What's worthwhile: From knowing and experiencing to being and becoming. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 6(2), 21–39.
- Schubert, W. H. (2010a). Worth, what knowledge is of. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies, Volume 2* (p. 950). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Schubert, W. H. (2010b). Outside curricula and public pedagogy. In J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz, & J. Burdick (Eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling* (pp. 10–19). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. L. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1950). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. Yonkers-on-the-Hudson, NY: World Book.
- Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. New York, NY: Harcourt.
- Smith, E. R., Tyler, R. W., & Associates. (1942). *Appraising and recording student progress*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Spring, J. (2013). *Common core: A story of school terrorism*. North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace.
- Stratemeier, F. B., Forkner, H. L., & McKim, M. G. (1947). *Developing a curriculum for modern living*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Stratemeier, F. B. (1952). *Guides to a curriculum for modern living*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Stratemeier, F. B., Forkner, H. L., McKim, M. G., & Passow, A. H. (1957). *Developing a curriculum for modern living*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Taba, H. (1950). *Elementary curriculum in intergroup relations: Case studies of instruction*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Harcourt.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R. W. (1987). *Education: Curriculum development and evaluation: Oral history transcript*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Tyler, R. W., Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. (1986). A dialogue with Ralph W. Tyler. *Journal of Thought*, 21(1), 91–118.
- Wright, R. (1945). *Black boy*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- Wright, R. (1954). *Black power*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Zirbes, L. (1959). *Spurs to creative teaching*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

This page intentionally left blank.

PREFACE

1950s Volume

By now you know that you have picked up a volume assembled by doctoral students in curriculum studies at Miami University that addresses curriculum books/theorists from the 1950s. The goals for the course they took with me to generate these chapters were to study the curriculum field, and as a result of their study of these past works, in particular, to open windows of ideas and thoughts that bridge the timelessness and timeliness of these classics for the field both in terms of today and tomorrow.

As I have tried to make clear on other projects involving doctoral students in curriculum courses where the goals for the class are to develop a history together that is curricular through the study of curriculum texts and the exercise of complicated conversations—in order to understand more about the broad, wide field and history of curriculum studies, and to try on for size the activity of curriculum theorizing through which the students actually produce a piece of publishable scholarship that contributes to the important, democratic end of curriculum understanding (Poetter, 2010; Pinar, 2012)—the results will always be mixed. That doesn't mean there is no book, that the project should be shelved, just because the work is going to be, of course, uneven.

In my opinion, in fact, just like most other volumes assembled by so-called “experts” or other types of scholarly inquirers on the journey toward and into new knowledge, the pieces here are all credible works of curriculum theorizing that can open windows to new ideas and new ways

of thinking about important ideas, concepts, theories, and practices in our field of study. However, to me there is no doubt that they represent a continuum of pieces in terms of quality, reach, and value. This is inevitable given that we all start and end in different places as students of the field and as inquirers/researchers.

Having said this, it's hard to pin down just which chapters here are the most and least valuable in terms of these aspects. When groups of student readers have sampled these chapters in draft form, chapters I thought to be *less* "complete," for example, readers often thought them to be *the most* interesting, informative, and/or inspiring. I can't come close to being able to explain this, except to say (a) that each piece is unique within the context of this work, though the writers did have a similar set of experiences along the way with each other and me in the course that spawned the project; and (b) that I hope each writer's idiosyncratic view, their insight and mental effort, comes through and takes us as readers to new places, through an open window perhaps, along our individual and collective curriculum journeys. Much depends on the writer *and* the reader. We will be interested in finding out what you think of the volume.

I also want to add here that I encountered a new phenomenon on this project related to the creation and production of the chapters that I hadn't encountered before with students on similar projects. In this case, more pieces that started out somewhat incomplete became stronger and in my opinion passed in stature others that were much stronger on their first draft and that made it to print with very little editing. I'm not sure what happened, but I think that in this case some of the authors of pieces that missed the mark the first time around found a new gear in their work and turned it on after the first round of feedback and through their editing stages. In a few cases, teams formed to strengthen manuscripts, and in other cases authors found individual peer reviewers who really helped them improve their writing. To a certain degree, in terms of coaching early drafts, I perhaps reached a stage at which my feedback wasn't so helpful anymore. Meaning, more eyes are better than one set on a manuscript sometimes; this proved to be the case for several chapters here, which is a true attestation to the strength and resolve of the authors and their friends in the course, who worked together at times to assure that manuscripts became of publishable quality.

I want to thank several students formally here for their help on the course and this book project. The student editors, noted on the cover, were Esther Claros Berlioz, Don Murray, Peggy Larrick, and Matt Moyer. Their work came at the middle to end of the project, working with individual authors to get their pieces in final shape for the proof. Kelly Waldrop, now a graduate of our program, has played a tremendous role all the way through this 8-volume project (this book is Volume 5, and the course for this project

took place in the Spring of 2016), helping to edit the pieces in their final stages and get them to print. Over the years, she has worked very closely with some authors to get them to the finish line. I never could have completed this work without her. Also, Esther Claros Berlioz provided the artwork for the cover. The 1950s group would be the last PhD group taking the course with me and publishing a book from the course. My favorite bird is the eastern bluebird, and I hoped that Esther could capture the beauty of that bird looking back at us from the outside through a window. I think it turned out splendidly, and I thank her for sharing her talent.

Last, I want to thank the Department of Educational Leadership at Miami University, especially past chairs Kate Rousmaniere, Michael Dantley, and Kathleen Knight Abowitz for naming me to teach the core seminar in our doctoral program that feeds this project. They and my colleagues in the department saw fit to give me a 7-year run with the course (2012–2018) so that I could teach a good course and work on this project with students. That is a very generous gift.

Last but not least, I want to thank the amazing students who helped compile this volume. They truly are talented, forward-thinking students who took this project very seriously. And despite their initial fears about being up to the challenge, they came through with flying colors. As I have said before on similar projects, I could have written all of these chapters myself, but the chapters wouldn't be nearly as diverse or interesting, and the truth is, the bottom line, that the students and I wouldn't have learned nearly as much! The chapters here reflect the “complicated conversations” (Pinar, 2012) that reflect the ongoing accrual of value of the curriculum field. Our hope is that these chapters advance further conversations about the field for our readers and reclaim windows into significant, foundational, important, and sometimes “lost” ideas in curriculum studies.

—**Thomas S. Poetter**
Oxford, Ohio

REFERENCES

- Pinar, W. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Poetter, T. (2010). Taking the leap, mentoring doctoral students as scholars: A great and fruitful morass. *Teaching & Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry & Reflective Practice*, 24(1), 22–29.

This page intentionally left blank.