4.1 A Simplistic Tool for a Lethal Phenomenon

The twentieth century dawns on the United States of America with the rhythms, pulsations and nuances imposed by multiple transformations in the social fabric. Already begun in the last decades of the nineteenth century, such transformations were motivated by a new industrialism (and consequently new dynamics of capitalist exploration), which in itself brought about "not just a transformation in America's economic arrangements and in its social institutions" but "precipitated a moral crisis"[1]. This new industrialism brought about a new economic order which demanded "profound changes in the relationship between workers and workers, between workers and management, between workers and the workplace, and between workers and work"[2], and which would contribute to the formation of a "new American national identity"[3]. According to Pulliam, "westward expansion and the growth of industry, agriculture and population put vastly increased demands upon existing schools and required the building not only of new schools, but of whole new educational systems"[4]; in other words, "society demands much more of the schools than ever before"[5].

In this way, and in response to the successive changes occurring at an alarming rate, the awareness of the need for a national manual labor training movement began to consolidate; such a movement had already begun to emerge around 1876, propelled by the Russian tool exhibit at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition[6]. The success and the influential dynamics imposed by this movement owed much to Runkle, President of Massachussets Institute of Technology, and Woodward, Dean of O'Fallon Polytechnic Institute at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. Both attempted "reforming the professional education of engineers especially by seeking to infuse

---

[1] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946.* New York: Teachers College, p., 3.

[2] Op. Cit., p., 3.

[3] Op. Cit., p., 2.

[4] Pulliam, J. (1991) *History of Education in America.* New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, p., 83.

[5] Good, H. (1956) *A History of American Education.* New York: The MacMillan Company, p., 17.

[6] Cremin, L (1961) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957.* New York: Vintage Books. According to Cremin, "Americans have always loved a fair, and the great Philadelphia Centennial Exposition of 1876 was one of the best of them", p., 23.

into their training a more practical knowledge of tools and basic mechanics than was typical for that period".[7]

We are confronted by a movement that, in fact, was emerging as a social cure for delinquent children, children of poor classes, immigrants and racial minorities and as the 'socially-correct' answer for the social insertion of American Indians or African Americans who were continuing to work for the consolidation of their freedom, won in 1865[8]. In this crusade, Armstrong (for whom manual training was a form of correcting character defects of the African Americans), Washington (for whom manual training gave credible economic independence to the African American community) and Du Bois (for whom manual training had abandoned its true obligation: to contribute to social equality) stand out.

Similarly, in education, North Americans initiated a new cycle in the social project of Americanization, in accordance with the new and volatile demands imposed by an industrialism which was taking its first steps; such a project obviously countered the the humanist thrust supported by Harris and Eliot. If to the former, manual training was perceived as a danger given the fact that it served "to unite the critics of the educational system already existing"[9] and categorically refusing to accept that manual training had the same importance as the "so-called" subjects of science and literature; to the latter, vocationalism—the last stage in the manual training process—did not even warrant mention in his famous Report of the Committee of Ten[10]. This was one of the aspects that earned much criticism, although Eliot would admitted much later that manual training constituted "a very useful element in the curriculum"[11].

---

[7] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 112.

[8] With regards to the theme relating to slavery, and despite lacking adequate space here to portray it, I believe that history should begin to interpret the end of slavery more as a conquest of the slave than a gift from the slave owner, who abolished a hateful process of human civilization. The way it is referred to as the "Abolition of slavery" allows it to be understood as a gift offered to people who until then had been considered subhuman rather than as a substantive conquest of a race that would mark the course of human civilization and would enforce the construction and deconstruction of new social compromises, to which, for the majority of them, education played a role.

[9] Harris, W. (1889) Report of the Committee on Pedagogics. National Education Association. *Addresses and Proceedings*, p. 417.

[10] *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (1894) National Education Association. New York. American Book Company.

[11] Eliot, C. (1908) Industrial Education as an Essential Factor in our National Prosperity. *National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education*. Bulletin 5. New York: The Society, pp., 9-14, p., 10.

However, and aware of the enormous power held by the humanist view and conscious that Harris would not easily relinquish his 'windows of the soul', Woodward saw it as necessary not to annihilate traditional education. In this way, he agreed it was imperative to highlight that a "'new' education includes the 'old'"[12], keeping the essential parts of traditional education intact while advancing with an educational structure which incorporates two areas: "the wing of natural science which the humanistic curriculum had undervalued" and "manual training which completes the old education"[13]. Furthermore, for Woodward, a compromise with Harris was not impossible, especially since his "full-fledged pedagogical rationale for manual training"[14] was powerful "in furnishing the knowledge and experience, in establishing the major premises essential to logical reasoning"[15], an opinion that is corroborated also by Butler, for whom "manual training is mental training through the hand and eye"[16].

Notwithstanding the criticism it garnered, manual training would come to be enforced in the schools as a social strategy which, in no way forgetting the icons of traditional education, was seen as establishing a bridge between the past and the future. In the words of Kliebard, "as a vehicle for resurrecting and preserving nineteenth-century ideals and as a way of coming to terms with the new industrial society, manual training had a powerful appeal"[17].

However, we are considering a movement which had been constructed around ambiguity. For example, if some defended manual training anchored to the consolidation attempt of a determinded moral code—Armstrong's case—and others assumed the fundamental character of manual training was to lead to better economic conditions—Washington''s case, the fact is that others contributed to the ambiguity which characterized the movement, since they "were capable of crafting their messages to their audiences"[18]; such permeability would, in fact, come to contribute

---

[12] Woodward, C. (1885) Manual Training in General Education. *Education* (5) , pp., 614-626, p., 614.

[13] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 113.

[14] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 6

[15] Woodward, C. (1890) *Manual Training in Education*. New York: Scribner & Welford ,p., 204

[16] Butler, N. (1888) *The Argument for Manual Training*. New York: E. L. Kellog, p., 379.

[17] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 6

[18] Op. Cit., p., 22.

to its vast acceptability. Thus, "manual training as a curricular reform achieved first respectability, then prominence, and finally acceptance in the councils of educational leaders and with the public generally because it was associated with moral redemption and pedagogical renewal, but the economic message was never absent"[19]. The seeds for the "social efficiency ideal"[20] were thus planted.

However, and just as Prosser stressed, "manual education has not met and cannot meet the needs of industrial education"[21]. Faced by constantly changing social demands, manual training evolved, step-by-step, into vocational education, "the most dramatic and (...) the most far-reaching of the successful curricular innovations"[22]. While the first, as an educational reform, had the virtue of not forgetting the past— "the era of the independent artisan and the dignity of the work associated with preindustrial America"[23], and of looking to the future—"the society that was being wrought by the new industrialism"[24], the second "projected a distinctly more explicit commitment to economic benefits both to the individual and to the nation"[25] without ignoring the restoration of the virtues of the past and the reinforcement of certain traditional images. The appeal to vocationalism increased progressively and, quite naturally, "the major impetus for vocational education began to shift from the relatively obscure journals of education and other professional forums to the larger social and political arena"[26]. By 1895[27], in the darkest pits of the economic depression which had exploded two years previously, the National Association of Manufactuers (NAM) emerged, which jointly with the American Federation of Labour (AFL) and

[19] Op. Cit., p., 24.
[20] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 107.
[21] Prosser, C. (1912) Discussion. *National Education Association*, *Addresses and Proceedings*, 50th Annual Meeting, pp., 928-932, p., 928.
[22] Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 111.
[23] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 24.
[24] Op. Cit., p., 24.
[25] Op. Cit., p., 25.
[26] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, pp., 116-117.
[27] By way of observation, Kliebard, in his book published in 1995, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, demarcates the year of 1896 as the emergence of the National Association of Manufactures. However, the same author, in a book later published in 1999 *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, designates the emergence of the National Association of Manufactures as in 1895. We opted for the date mentioned in the recent work since it has vocational education as its main focus; in other words, the whole investigation is directed in this sense, as opposed to the previous work (1995) in which vocational education is dealt with secondarily.

the National Society for the Promotion of the Industrial Education (NSPIE) would place vocational education in the midst of the curricular debate. In this context, NAM "made school policy a centerpiece of their deliberations"[28] which, by having the German model as the example to follow, was nearer to what some enterprises such as General Electric and Allis Chalmers had already begun doing from around 1870. They transformed the training and formation of workers by initiating a process of vocational formation that was organized and directed towards the necessities of the actual enterprise.[29]. Thus, "at one and the same time, public education would become an indispensable instrument for addressing matters vital to the national interest and to individual success"[30].

Similarly to what happened to manual training, vocational education, as a political project which necessitated a pedagogical justification in order to establish itself as a project of national identity, would come to endure moments of some criticism and upheaval. Although nearly everyone professed to be convinced of the effectiveness of the German model as applied to the North American reality, there were explosive conflicts between employers, employees and syndicates resulting from the fact that vocationalism is controlled by the employers, salaries were reduced because of the greater number of qualified manual labor, the insecurity at the workplace, and the constant need for requalifications. Furthermore, there were conflictual differences between the supporters of industrial and agricultural education, and it became important to stress the social and economic costs which such socio-economic reform would entail, especially since "vocational education has always been more expensive than the ordinary types of education"[31].

In 1906, the Commission on Industrial and Technical Education (the Douglas Commission) emerged to "investigate the needs for education in the different grades of skill", declaring that the educational system proved inadequate to the "modern

---

[28] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 117.

[29] Nelson, D. (1975) *Managers and Workers: Origins of the New Factory System in the United States, 1880-1920*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

[30] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 28.

[31] Snedden, D. (1912) Report of Committee on National Legislation. *National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education* (15), pp., 126-134, p., 126.

industrial and social conditions"[32]. Fundamentally crystalized at the level of common sense was the notion that the "public school curriculum with its traditional emphasis on academic subjects was meeting the needs of only a small minority of youth"[33], thereby concluding that "traditional education did not need to be supplemented; it needed to be replaced, at least for large numbers of America's schoolchildren"[34].

Thus, federal support was needed to finance the new teaching structure, and "the question of federal aid to vocational education, the joining of industrial trade training with farmer's interests was almost a political necessity"[35].

The first steps towards the implementation of a national system of industrial education were thus taken, borne of a strategy promoted by the National Society for Promotion of Industrial Education upon achieving a coalition, which incorporated the substantive interests of the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labour, the American Bankers Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Metal Trade Association and even local Unions[36]. In 1917, and as a consequence of the compromises reached by these various active forces of society, the Smith-Hughes Act, which guaranteed economic federal support for "vocational agriculture as well as trade and industrial education and home economics"[37] was issued. As is remarked on by Kliebard, "with money, powerful lobby groups, energetic leadership in high places and a sympathetic public, vocational educational was well on its way to becoming the most successful curricular innovation of the twentieth century"[38].

In the forefront of the vocationalist trend, in addition to Finney, Ellwood and Peters, one comes across Snedden ("probably the most eminent of the new breed of

---

[32] *Report of the Massachussets Commission on Industrial and Technical Eduication*. (1906). Boston: Massachussets Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, pp., 1-6.
[33] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 32.
[34] Op. Cit., p., 35.
[35] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 124.
[36] Fones-Wolf, E. (1983) The Politics of Vocationalism: Coalitions and Industrial Education in the Progressive Era. *The Historian* , 46, pp., 39-55.
[37] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 113..
[38] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 124.

educational sociologists"[39]) and Prosser (who, as we shall have the opportunity to see later on, would come to position himself as a pivotal figure in the life adjustment education movement), respectively Comissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Education in Massachussets. To Snedden the "curriculum is, of course, simply a well-documented series of plans and specifications expressive of the educational purposes of policy-makers on behalf of a specified group of learners"[40]; in other words, the "curriculum is a collection of subjects of study suited to the educational needs of a defined group of learners"[41]. The vocational educational movement would come to align itself perfectly with the way Snedden understood the school "as an agency of social control with social efficiency as the all-inclusive aim for education"[42]. Since "the last half-century has seen a multiplication of purposes in education, accompanied by comparatively little progress in relating these purposes to that portion of our population in which these purposes should mostly be realized"[43], Snedden noted the importance of understanding the lexical term 'objective'. He argued that it should imply "not merely direction, aim, or qualitative character of expected attainment, but also amounts, degrees of excellence, or other quantitative measures of the same"[44]. In this way, and having always as his scope, the "development of the 'efficient citizen', one whose vocational competence would contribute to his overall efficiency"[45], Snedden defended 'efficiency' as being "concerned with the individual's effectiveness in society and how much such social efficiency could be produced through education"[46]. As a curricular innovation, the roots of *Sneddism* can be found in the thought of Spencer (the problematization of knowledge), Ross ("a pioneer in the emerging field of sociology"[47]), Ward (although he rejected the optimistic vision of Ward according to which "knowledge would mitigate the unequal condition among

---

[39] Op. Cit., p., 95.

[40] Snedden, D. (1925) Planning curriculum research. *School and Society*, XXII, pp., 259-265, pp., 259-260.

[41] Snedden, D. (1920) *A Digest of Educational Sociology*. New York: Teachers College Columbia University, p., 237.

[42] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 81. My parentheses.

[43] Snedden, D. (1927) What's Wrong with American Knowledge of Education? In D. Snedden. *What's Wrong with American Education*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, pp., 36-63, p., 62.

[44] Op. Cit., p., 56.

[45] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 111.

[46] Op. Cit., p., 137

[47] Op. Cit., p., 28.

men"[48], Snedden accepted, just like Ward, the development of intellect in the educational process as subordinate to the acquisition of knowledge[49]) Dutton (the school is a source of inspiration for the whole community[50]), Devine (the nation's foremost social worker[51]) and Taylor.

It is with Dutton who in 1908 published *The Administration of Public Education in the United States*, an extensive work which would be prominent in the first two decades of the twentieth century, in which Snedden identifies the four major objectives of education: physical well-being, moral and social efficiency, personal culture, and vocational education[52]. Nevertheless, Snedden was not very taken by Dutton's notion of efficiency (he deviated a lot from the notions shared by both Ross and Taylor) thus Snedden announced greater identification with Ross's thinking, for whom vocational schools should be "as factory-like as possible"—the same cannot be said with regards to the rest. With regards to Spencer, Snedden, as would much later happen with Michael Apple, constructed his rationale based on what he himself defined as "an expansion of Herbert Spencer's question"[53]. Actually, according to Snedden, the Spencerian question "What knowledge is of most worth?", should be changed into the following form: "What kinds [of knowledge] and how much [knowledge]"[54]; in other words, for Snedden, the question formulated by Spencer needed to incorporate the "kinds, amounts and degrees of attainment of knowledge, skills, appreciations, aspirations, attitudes, tastes, ideals and other qualities [that] are of most worth in the cases of classes of learners of specified abilities, circumstance and potential opportunity?"[55]. His Ph.D., which had Devine as adviser, demonstrates the development of his "own program of education for social efficiency". Snedden, who saw "education, more than ever, as a kind of 'treatment' rather than the

---

[48] Op. Cit., p., 28.

[49] Ward, L. (1883). *Dynamic Sociology, or Applied Social Science as Based upon Statistical Sociology and the Less Complete Sciences*. New York: D. Appleton.

[50] Cf. Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, pp., 43-44. According to the author, Dutton was chosen by Snedden as his adviser in the Masters program.

[51] Op. Cit., pp., 6 and 72. According to the author, Devine was chosen by Snedden as his adviser in the Ph.D. program.

[52] Op. Cit.

[53] Snedden, D. (1927) What's Wrong with American Knowledge of Education? In D. Snedden. *What's Wrong with American Education*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, pp., 363-375, p., 371.

[54] Op. Cit., p., 371.

[55] Snedden, D. (1925) Planning Curriculum Research. *School and Society*, XXII, pp., 259-265, p., 260.

transmission of the cultural heritage"[56], believed that the "the ultimate aim of education" was "the attainment of the greatest degree of efficiency", an efficiency that could only be achieved through the school. Hence, Snedden, for whom science (just as for Spencer) was taken to be like a religion[57], believed that "efficiency should be a product of curriculum"[58], and that social control was fundamental to achieving it, through the determination of the objectives supported by a scientific basis.

The demand for vocational education, according to Snedden, "is rooted in the social and economic changes of the age [and] vocational education is not in conflict with liberal education, but is a supplemental form, and may be expected to reinforce it"[59]. Thus, for Snedden, a liberal education "is that which aims to broaden the intellectual and emotional horizon of the individual (…) and may be interpreted as that which concerns itself with the consuming, as opposed to the productive process in life"[60]. On the contrary, vocational education "is older than liberal education, for the simple reason that men have always had to have occupations involving more or less skill, by which they could earn a livelihood"[61] and is much more directed towards production rather than consumption, therefore presenting distinct objectives[62].

Quite naturally, for Snedden, vocationalism is one of the premises for the consubstantionalism of a democratic society[63], since it not only proves to be a socio-educational proposal that is sensitive to the multidifferentiated vocations adopted by each individual, but it is also the one which guarantees effective specialization of a citizen. In his own words, "the best work of our age is that which is dominated by the tendency toward specialization (…). The division of labor is the key to modern efficiency"[64]. In essence, Snedden upheld the desirability and the feasibility of

---

[56] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 77.

[57] Bode, B. (1924) Why Educational Objectives? *School and Society*, 19, pp., 533-539.

[58] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 43.

[59] Snedden, D. (1910) *The Problem of Vocational Education*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, pp., 81-82.

[60] Op. Cit., pp., 4-5.

[61] Op. Cit., p., 9.

[62] Snedden, D. (1920) *A Digest of Educational Sociology*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

[63] Snedden, D. (1921) *Sociological Determination of Objectives in Education*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

[64] Snedden, D. (1905) Conditions of Developing Special Teachers of Drawing and Manual Training in Every School. West. J. *Education*, X, pp., 301-305.

uniformity with an increasingly greater flexibility in the curricular field. In other words, the "system of 'fitting for a probable destination'" was Snedden's definition of 'flexibility', which would imply that mobility "rested in the more adequate preparation one possessed for one's place in life"—in short, in 'vocational efficiency'[65].

However, according to Snedden, vocational education would come to receive significant resistance on the part of some of the movements situated in the educational field, in general and in the curricular field, in particular. Although Dewey "never outlined an explicit plan for vocational education, nor did he write extensively on the subject"[66], he was opposed to the fact that the vocationalization of the curriculum seemed to "undermine the most important function of education, the fostering of intellectual and moral growth". Moreover, Dewey proposed that a curriculum directed only towards technical efficiency makes education "an instrument of perpetuating unchanged the existing order of society instead of operating as a means of its transformation"[67]. Dewey added that "the kind of vocational education I am interested is not one which will 'adapt' workers to the existing industrial regime; I am not sufficiently in love with the regime for that"[68]. However, for Bagley[69], Flagg, Young[70] and Du Bois[71], the vocationalization of the curriculum was an instrument for perpetuating and reinforcing race, gender, and class lines.

Bagley, although a believer in social efficiency, disagreed with Snedden, perceiving the dichotomy liberal/consumer education versus vocational/producer education as simplistic divisions with restricting perspectives. He proposed a distinction between "specific education and general education"[72]. Bagley,

---

[65] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, pp., 121-122.

[66] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 232.

[67] Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and Education. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: MacMillan, p., 369.

[68] Dewey, J. (1915). Education *vs*. Trade-Training – Dr. Dewey's reply, *The New Republic*, 5, pp., 40-42, p., 42.

[69] Bagley, W. (1914) Fundamental Distinctions Between Liberal and Vocational Education. *National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings*, 52nd Annual Meeting, pp., 161-170.

[70] Young, E. (1915) Industrial Training. *National Education Association. Addresses and Proceedings*, 53red Annual Meting, pp., 125-127.

[71] Du Bois, W., & Dill, A. (1912) *The Negro American Artisan*. Atlanta: Atlanta University Press.

[72] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 130.

furthermore, warned against the risks of the social stratification proposed by *Sneddism*, highlighting that liberal education did not necessarily have to follow the same steps, ends and objectives as vocational education. Bagley added that "a stratified society and a permanent proletariat"[73] are the bases for the national efficiency proposed by advocates of *Sneddism*. Nevertheless, he continued by noting that "whenever our people have been intelligently informed regarding what this type of efficiency costs, they have been fairly unanimous in declaring that the price is too high"[74]. Similarly, for Hullfish, Snedden had completely mixed up the true sense of the meaning of democracy and of democratic education by fragmenting liberal education from vocational education, and thus, not perceiving the mind as a unit[75].

Snedden, for whom the function of the school was not as an institution of transformation of society[76], endured strong criticism, be it by those who saw his educational theory as directed to consumption or those who pointed to the class-based stratification inherent to his model. Finney and Ellwood, who shared so many points of view with Snedden, would come to take a critical position. The former moved away from the essentialist and segregationist perspective of the school, arguing that the latter should fight for the dilution of social injustice and for the consolidation of a democratic culture[77]. The latter perceived the foundation of the educational objectives proposed by Snedden as reductive, restricted to "practical educational problems"[78]. For Kilpatrick, Snedden's efficiency-based centralism led to the construction of an educational atmosphere described as a "leveling, stupifying, deadning drift toward uniformity and beurocracy"[79]. Bode, an educational philosopher like Dewey, found Snedden's proposal reductive and undemocratic. According to Bode, the separation of the vocational from culture was a lethal plan that would lead to the development of the multiplication of a race/class/gender elite[80]. Furthermore, there is Bode's refusal to accept that the scientific approach was the the only valid source to determine

---

[73] Bagley, W. (1914) Fundamental Distinctions Between Liberal and Vocational Education. *National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings*, 52nd Annual Meeting, pp., 161-170

[74] Op. Cit., pp., 161-170.

[75] Hullfish, G. (1924) Looking Backward with David Snedden. *Educational Review*, LXVII, pp., 61-69.

[76] Snedden, D. (1934) Education and Social Change. *School and Society*, XL, pp., 311-314.

[77] Finney, R. (1917) Social Studies in Junior High School, *Journal of Education*, 86, pp., 633-634.

[78] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 136.

[79] Op. Cit., p., 136.

[80] Bode, B. (1924) Why Educational Objectives? *School and Society*, 19, pp., 533-539.

educational aims, stressing that democracy should be understood as "a progressive humanization of the social order"[81]. For Bode, instead of the curriculum being limited to scientifically-determined objectives, as proposed by Snedden, it was important that the curriculum did not ignore the "historical perspective"[82]. Counts, associated himself with the perspective proposed by Bode, denouncing the selectiveness of the curricular proposal conveyed by Sneddism, arguing that the "school will become an instrument for the perpetuation of the existing social order rather than a creative force in society"[83]. Snedden's reply to the round of criticism followed soon thereafter. For Snedden, the society, the school, and the curriculum were going through a complicated period: "the times are out of joint. America is sick"[84].

With the galloping advance of industrialization, vocationalism was to evolve into an increasingly social-efficiency-based doctrine. In the words of Judd, "business has in recent years demanded sweeping changes in education in order to prepare more efficient workers"[85]. Furthermore, "business is eager to see a revision of the school curriculum"[86]. According to Kliebard, "the impetus for that change came partly from the world of manufacture" and "given that imperative, manufacturing processes and industrial management were beginning to supply the metaphors critically needed to transform the way the curriculum was conceived and understood"[87]. According to Davenport, "the most significant educational fact today is that men of all classes have come to look upon education as a thing that will better their condition; and they mean by that, first of all, something to make their labor more effective and more profitable; and second, they mean something that will enable them to live fuller lives"[88]. Fundamentally, and as is reiterated by Krug, "the spirit of reform in American society demanded an explicit social mission for the schools, and many sought to supply its

---

[81] Bode, B. (1927) *Modern Educational Theories*. New York: MacMillan, p., 14

[82] Op. Cit., p., 119.

[83] Counts, G. (1930) *The American Road to Culture. A Social Interpretation of Education in the United States*. New York: John Day, p., 126.

[84] Snedden, D. (1935) Social Reconstruction: A Challenge to Secondary School. *Pennsylvania Schoolmen's Week*, pp., 48-54, p., 48.

[85] Judd, C. (1923) How Modern Business May Aid in Reconstructing the Curriculum. *School and Society*, XVIII, pp., 281-287, p., 281.

[86] Op. Cit., p., 287

[87] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, pp., 44-45.

[88] Davenport, E. (1909) *Education for Efficiency*. New York: D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers, p., 11.

definition"[89]. Just as forewarned by Kliebard, "of the varied and sometimes frenetic responses to industrailism and to the consequent transformation of American social institutions, there was one that emerged clearly dominant both as social ideal and as an educational doctrine. It was social efficiency"[90]. The school increasingly came to be seen as a mechanism of social control, structured along the basis of efficiency criteria. Quite naturally "efficiency became more than a byword in the education world: it became an urgent mission"[91], a mission that runs through the metamorphoses of the premises of Ross and Taylor's doctrine.

Ross's doctrine "provided Snedden with the doctrine of social control"[92]. According to Krug, "the term social control, popularized by sociologist Edward Ross (…) represents an idea as old as society itself"[93]. For Ross "society is always in the presence of the enemy, and social control is, in a significant sense, a compilation of the weapons of self protection in the arsenal of society. (…) Education was one of the most effective of those weapons in society's arsenal"[94]. It was Ross's belief that "the system of control, like the educational system, is charged not with revising the structure or functions of society, but with shaping individuals"[95], in other words, that the efficiency of the social system of which the individual is a part, is tested by the power the latter has to mold it. Furthermore, according to Ross, the North American school was infested by an intellectual bias that prevented the assumption of an efficient system of social control[96].

Taylor personifies the other ingredient of the social efficiency ideology: "efficiency itself"[97]. Actually, Taylor—for many, the "prophet of a new order in

---

[89] Krug, E. (1964) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 245.

[90] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 77.

[91] Op. Cit., p., 77.

[92] Drost, W. (1967) *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 28.

[93] Krug, E. (1964) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p., 249.

[94] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 80.

[95] Ross, E. (1896) Social Control. *American Journal of Sociology*, pp., 518-534, pp., 519-520.

[96] Op. Cit., pp., 519-520.

[97] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 81.

industrial society"[98]—believed in social efficiency as a mechanism which permitted the reduction of human error and the consequent increase in production[99]. As a social doctrine, social efficiency emerged intimately linked to the notion and the belief in progress. In fact, and according to King, "no discussion of education for social efficiency would be complete without some attempt to view it in its relation to these broad problems to race-welfare and race-improvement"[100]; in other words, "social efficiency, to be genuine, must be worked out with some reference to its ultimate relation to human welfare"[101]. Emerson, who proposed twelve principles which are the foundation of the efficiency doctrine[102], stressed that "efficiency brings about greater results with lessened effort"[103].

In essence, "since the opening of the twentieth century, the evolution of our social order has been proceeding with great and ever-accelerating rapidity [and] all classes are aspiring to a full human opportunity. Never before have civilization and humanization advanced so swiftly"[104]. On par with this transformation there appears a vision of education as a mechanism of social control and as a social service, in essence the vision of an education determined by the standards of social efficiency[105].

In this way, social efficiency was presented through a rigorous discourse, especially since, as Taylor and also Ross emphasized that the human being has a natural tendency for laziness, that must, mercilessly, be fought[106]. According to Taylor, if man fails to work as he should, then he should be forced to do it as it should, in reality, be done[107]. Taylor believed that scientific management guaranteed

---

[98] Op. Cit., p., 82.

[99] Taylor, F. (1911) *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

[100] King, I. (1913) *Education for Social Efficiency*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, p., 282.

[101] Op. Cit., p., 282.

[102] "(1) clearly defined ideals; (2) common sense; (3) competent counsel; (4) discipline; (5) the fair deal; (6) reliable immediate, adequate and permanent records; (7) dispatching; (8) standards and schedules; (9) standardized conditions; (10) standardized operations; (11) written standard-practice instructions; (12) efficiency reward". Emerson, H. (1917) *The Twelve Principles of Efficiency*. New York: The Engineering Magazine Co., pp., 59-367.

[103] Emerson, H. (1917) *The Twelve Principles of Efficiency*. New York: The Engineering Magazine Co., p., 40.

[104] Bobbitt, J. (1918) *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co, p., i.

[105] Krug, E. (1964) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

[106] Taylor, F. (1903) Shop Management. *Transitions of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers*, 24, pp., 1337-1480.

[107] Copley, F. (1923) *Frederick W. Taylor: Father of Scientific Management*. Vol 1. New York: The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

that the true interests of the employees and employers were precisely the same[108], a fact which would dilute the conflict between both classes, especially since their interests were mutual. The principal object of management is to ensure the mutual prosperity of employers and employees which means "not only higher wages than are usually received by men of his class, but, of more importance, it also means the development of each man to his state of maximum efficiency"[109].

Taylor, who readdressed some of the concepts proposed by Halsey, at the end of the nineteenth century—the need for a restructuring the traditional remuneration system by a package of incentives in accordance with the levels of productivity—took advantage of the volume of criticism that had established itself around inefficiency and the obselete approaches which were taken in the industrial world, proclaiming a new doctrine which would fight wastefulness[110]. According to Emerson, "this national inefficiency, this national wastefulness, this national squandering of current and future material" [111] can be remedied by means of a recourse to the principles of efficiency. In the words of Davenport, "no man (...) educated or uneducated, has a right to be useless"[112]. Here, we find a social movement which began to have repercussions in various sectors of society. Actually, and as is documented by Wilentz, "what began as a blueprint for rearranging authority in the workplace turned into a design for modern living itself"[113].

It was through the belief in the struggle against wastefulness that the doctrines of Ross and Taylor begin to impregnate the educational system. Bennett, for whom "the prime essential of all good management is elimination of waste"[114], perceived that the combat against wastefulness in the schools entailed the "reorganization of the curriculum by the elimination of all antiquated materials and all that is not essentially

---

[108] Taylor, F. (1911) *Scientific Management Comprising Shop Management. The Principles of Scientific Management; Testimony before the Special House Committee*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
[109] Op. Cit., p., 9.
[110] Nelson, D. (1975) *Managers and Workers: Origins of the New Factory System in the United States, 1880-1920*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
[111] Emerson, H. (1917) *The Twelve Principles of Efficiency*. New York: The Engineering Magazine Co., p., 10.
[112] Davenport, E. (1909) *Education for Efficiency*. New York: D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers, p., 15.
[113] Wilentz, , S. (1997) Speedy Fred's revolution. *New York Review of Books,* 20, pp., 32-37, p., 32.
[114] Bennett, H. (1917) *School Efficiency, A Manual of Modern School Management*. Boston: Ginn and Company, p., 215.

practical"[115]. Education for efficiency is not exactly a "sentiment, it is business; it is not charity, it is statesmanship"[116]. In 1918, "social efficiency as a curriculum theory was almost at its zenith"[117] and in 1920 the North American curriculum was vocationalized and the background issue was no longer what form would be taken on by the curriculum but who would control it[118]. As stated by Kliebard "1918 was a vintage year in curriculum"[119]. He added:

> not only because of the appearance of Franklin Bobbit's *The Curriculum*, which was the first full-length book on curriculum, but also because of Alexander Inglis' brilliant *Principles of Secundary Education*, which, although not exclusively a curriculum book, was concerned primarily with curriculum questions. In 1918 too, the Teachers College Record published an article by one of the younger members of the Teachers College faculty, William Kilpatrick. That article, "The Project Method" was later to have a profound effect on the activity movement in curriculum. Finally, the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education issued its Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education with its widely quoted seven aims, a report which set the fashion for the consideration of curricular objectives[120].

Along the same lines of thought, one finds Schubert, for whom "the year 1918 marks a time of certainty that the curriculum field was likely to be quite permanent on the education horizon"[121] thanks to three major contributions: "William Herald Kilpatrick published an article entitled 'The Project Method' in *Teachers College Record* […] The publication of *The Curriculum* by Franklin Bobbit […] and NEA's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (1918) report entitled *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*"[122]. Also noteworthy is that for Tyler, "the first time curriculum-making was viewed as a profession was in the twenty-sixth *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Both parts, one and two,

---

[115] Op. Cit., p., 215.

[116] Davenport, E. (1909) *Education for Efficiency*. New York: D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers, p., 12.

[117] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 99.

[118] Op. Cit.

[119] Kliebard, H. (1968) The Curriculum Field in Retrospect. In P. Witt (ed). *Technology and Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 69-84, p., 71.

[120] Op. Cit., p., 71.

[121] Schubert, W. (1986) *Curriculum. Perspective, Paradigm and Possibility*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, p., 75.

[122] Op. Cit., p., 75.

in 1927, were devoted to curriculum-making theory and practice. That's where it first became a recognized specialization"[123]. Notwithstanding the fact that many authors credit Bobbitt as the author of a work[124] which dates the birth of the curriculum field, the fact is that the constitution of the curriculum as a "self-conscious field of study", actually does not owe itself exclusively to this or to that other work, to this or to that other author, but to a combination of studies, works and authors which would take determining steps with regards to what would constitute the curricular field in the twentieth century.

The explosion of students at the secondary school level in the first two decades of the twentieth century "who had no aspirations to college attendance (...) led to increasing interest in finding principles for curriculum organization based on perceived student needs rather than on the logical organization of the academic disciplines"[125]. According to Cruikshank, the "break came with the 1918 report Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education"[126], in fact, "a major landmark in secondary education in United States"[127]. The document, prepared by a commission led by "Snedden's protégé, Kingsley"[128], a mathematics professor, is "perhaps the most widely [and powerful] list of educational aims (...) based on Spencer's approach"[129]. According to Pulliam, "while providing some theoretical basis for the later development of a truly comprehensive secondary school, the Commission is best known for issuing its seven *Cardinal Principles* for Secondary Education"[130] that became standard objectives for teachers, school boards and administrators, namely, "(1) health, (2) command of fundamental processes, (3) worthy home membership, (4) vocation, (5) civic education, (6) worthy leisure, and (7) ethical character"[131]. This

---

[123] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 389.

[124] Bobbitt, J. (1918) *The Curriculum.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

[125] Cruikshank, K. (2000) Integrated Curriculum and the Academic Disciplines: The NCTE Correlated Curriculum of 1936. In B. Franklin (ed) *Curriculum and Consequence. Herbert Kliebard and the Promise of Schooling.* New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 178-196, p., 178.

[126] Op. Cit., p., 178.

[127] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958.* New York: Routledge, p., 96.

[128] Op. Cit., p., 97.

[129] Levine, D. and Ornstein, A. (1981) *An Introduction to the Foundations of Education.* Dallas: Houghton Mifflin Company, p., 333.

[130] Pulliam, J. (1991) *History of Education in America.* New York: MacMillan publishing Company, p., 93.

[131] Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* (1918) , Bulletin, n° 35. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp., 11-15.

is a document which expresses a combination of goals that "are still to be found in one form or another in statements of major goals of contemporary education". As is highlighted by Kliebard, Kingsley "produced the document that proved to be the capstone of the quarter-century of furious efforts at curriculum reform that began with the Committee of Ten"[132]. In essence, and as is stressed by Kliebard, Kingsley translated the conception of general education proposed by Snedden (vocational education for the producer and liberal education for the consumer) into "the famous seven aims [that] followed in rough outline the conclusions of the effort of Spencer of more than a half century before to base the curriculum on categories of vital life activities"[133]. Snedden would nevertheless come to criticize the Report (a criticism that he took care to indicate was not on a personal level, especially since he considered Kingsley "one of the exceptional educational leaders"), classifying it as "almost hopelessly academic", having been produced in an atmosphere of "serene scholastic aloofness"[134], and accusing the commission of being concerned with"the liberal education of the youth"[135].

Three years after the *Douglas Commission Report*, Ayres published "one of the first avowedly 'scientific' treatises in education"[136], *Laggards in our Schools*[137]. Unlike the *Douglas Report*, which indicated some concern for the well-being of 25,000 children to whom the school meant little or nothing, Ayres's study, concerned itself with retardation and elimination from an efficiency perspective. The major concerns included in the *Douglas Comission Report*, were reduced in Ayres's treatise to a logic of "simple efficiency and cost-effectiveness"[138]. The reduction of waste required the application of standards used in industry, according to Ayres[139]. As a

---

[132] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 97.
[133] Kliebard, H. (1999) The Liberal Arts Curriculum and its Enemies: The Effort to Redefine General Education. In M. Early & K. Rehage (eds). Issues in Curriculum: A Selection of Chapters from Past NSSE Yearbooks. *Ninety-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part II. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp., 3-25, p., 20.
[134] Snedden, D. (1919) The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. *School and Society*, 3, pp., 520-527, p., 522
[135] Op. Cit., p., 526
[136] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 88.
[137] Ayres, L. (1909) *Laggards in our Schools: A Study of Retardation and Elimination in City Schools Systems*. New York: Charities Publication Committee.
[138] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 89.
[139] Ayres, L. (1909) *Laggards in our Schools: A Study of Retardation and Elimination in City Schools Systems*. New York: Charities Publication Committee.

curative measure, Ayres elaborated an *Index of Efficiency* "by which school systems could measure their rates of productivity as a prelude to curricular and structural change"[140].

A year after the publication of Taylor's work[141], Bobbitt published an article *The Elimination of Waste in Education*, relaying the importance of scientific management for schooling. The article, which is based on a model used in a school system in Gary, Indiana, describes the manner in which Taylor's principles are applicable to the model which was drawn by Wirt, whom Bobbit described as an educational engineer. In addition to relating scientific management with time management, Bobbitt stressed that Taylor's fourth principle – 'work up the raw material into the finished product for which it is best adapted' - could be applied to education, in general and to Wirt's model, in particular. For him, educating "the individual according to his capabilities"[142] required "that the materials of the curriculum be sufficiently various to meet the needs of every individual in a community; and that the course of training and study be sufficiently flexible that the individual can be given just things he needs"[143]. Wirt, a former student of Dewey's in Chicago, attempted to construct a school model in accordance with the principles proposed by Dewey, in which the school was understood as an "embryonic community life, active with types of occupations that reflect the life of the larger society and permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history and science"[144].

In this way, the thesis defended by Bobbitt did not ignore his acquired experience as instructor in the Philippine Normal School in Manila, nor the work he later developed at Clark University nor the experience he obtained in Gary, even though it was based on an analogy of the model designed by Taylor. He theorized that "if the school were a factory, the child raw material, the ideal adult the finished product, the teacher an operative, the supervisor a foreman, and the superintendent a manager, then the curriculum could be thought of as whatever processing the raw material (the child)

---

[140] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 51.
[141] Taylor, F. (1911) *Scientific Management Comprising Shop Management, the Principles of Scientific Management, Testimony before Special House Committee*. New York: Harper.
[142] Bobbitt, J. (1912) The Elimination of Waste. *Elementary School Teacher*, 12, pp., 259-271, p., 269.
[143] Op. Cit., p., 269.
[144] Dewey, J. (1900) *The School and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p., 44.

needed to change him into the finished product (the desired adult)"[145]. As for social needs, Bobbitt believed that "technological growth had created a social interdependence which required social cooperation for human welfare"[146], and on activity analysis, he thought that "instead of starting with an analysis of the subjects, or like Spencer, with the knowledge that will best prepare man for his life activities, (...) [start] with an analysis of the life activities themselves"[147].

In 1918, Bobbitt published *The curriculum* in which he insisted that "it was not enough to develop new curricula: there was also a need to learn more about how new curricula can best be developed"[148].

Bobbitt, one of the proponents of the social efficiency ideology, saw the school as a space for the production of individuals, just like a factory, proclaiming that "education is a shaping process as much as the manufacture of steel rails; the personality is to be shaped and fashioned into desirable forms"[149]. Education, for him, "is a shaping of more delicate matters, more immaterial things"[150], in other words, "an enormously more complex process because of the great multitude of aspects of the personality"[151]. Thus, "education is a social process (...) is the process of recivilizing or civilizing anew, each new generation (...) and society's performance of this recivilizing function we call education"[152]. For Bobbitt, "man is not a mere intellectual reservoir to be filled with knowledge. He is an infinitely complex creature of endlessly diversified action"[153], in other words, for the author, the more prominent characteristics of man are not "his memory reservoir, whether filled or unfilled, but action, conduct, behavior. Action is the thing of which his life is made. In his activity

---

[145] Seguel, M. (1966) *The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years*. New York: Teachers College Press, p., 80

[146] Op. Cit., p., 83

[147] Op. Cit., p., 84.

[148] McNeil, J. (1977) *Curriculum. A Comprehensive Introduction*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, p., 287.

[149] Bobbitt, J. (1913) Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City School Systems. In S. Parker (ed.) *Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 7-96, p., 12.

[150] Op. Cit., p., 12.

[151] Op. Cit., p., 12.

[152] Bobbitt, J. (1925) Education as a Social Process. *School and Society*, XXI, nº 538, pp., 453-459, p., 453.

[153] Bobbitt, J. (1924) The New Technique of Curriculum Making. *The Elementary School Journal*, 25, (1), pp., 45-54, p., 45.

he lives and realizes the ends of his existence"[154]. He believed that behavior determines life and that man "primarily ... is not a knower, but a doer"[155].

The curriculum developer has, consequently, two important functions to perform. On the one hand, s/he must determine the consumer market desires in terms of finished products, and on the other hand, s/he must determine the more efficient manner to produce the finished products. These functions are intimately linked to the notion of standards control which is referred to in the first two of the eleven principles of management proposed by Bobbitt: (1) definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product and (2) where the material that is acted upon by the labor processes passes through a number of progressive stages on its way from the raw material to the ultimate product, definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product at each of these stages"[156]. In other words, the curriculum developer must act as a social agent, determining the needs of society and the final product of schooling must coincide with the needs of society. Consequently, Bobbitt added that "the standards must of necessity be determined by those that use the product, not by those who produce it"[157], namely, "standards are to be found in the world of affairs, not in the schools"[158].

In the beginning of the second decade, he published *How to make a Curriculum*[159], wherein he developed his objectives and activities approach, enumerating more than eight hundred objectives and activities connected with the needs of the students, such as the "ability to care for teeth, eyes, nose and throat; ability to keep the heart and blood vessels in normal working conditions [as well as] spelling and grammar"[160]. Fundamentally, Bobbitt understood the importance of the construction of the curriculum-making process as the first step for the implementation of an efficient curricular management: "we need principles of curriculum making. (...) We had not learned that the studies are means not ends"[161]. According to Schubert, Bobbitt

[154] Op. Cit., p., 45
[155] Op. Cit., pp., 46-47
[156] Bobbitt, J. (1913) Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City School Systems. In S. Parker (ed.) *Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 7-96, p., 11.
[157] Op. Cit., p., 35
[158] Op. Cit., p., 35.
[159] Bobbitt, J. (1922) *How to Make a Curriculum.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
[160] Op. Cit., pp., 14-28.
[161] Bobbitt, J. (1918) *The Curriculum.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, p., 283.

advocated that "The curriculum should be formulated (…) by analyzing activities of adult life and transferring them into behavioral objectives"[162], a process which would come to be known as activity analysis.

Primarily, Bobbitt, who saw that professional agreement on a method of discovery is more important than agreement on the details of curriculum content, elaborated a method which helped to define the curriculum-making process as a step-by step approach: "the first step in curriculum-making (…) is to separate the broad range of human experience into major fields; (...)"the second step is to break down the fields into their more specific activities"; (...) "the third step is to derive the objectives of education"; (...) "the fourth step is to select from the list of objectives those which are to serve as the basis for planning pupil activities"; and "the fifth step is to lay out the kinds of activities, experiences and opportunities involved in attaining the objectives"[163].

For Bobbitt, the curriculum was characterized by "that series of things which children and youth must do and experience by way of developing abilities to do the things well that make up the affairs of adult life"[164], even though he acknowledged that the activities and experiences of the children do not all occur in the schooling domain, as suggested in the following definition he proposed for curriculum:

> The curriculum may, therefore, be defined in two ways: it is the entire range of experiences, both undirected and directed, concerned in unfolding the abilities of the individual; it is the series of consciously directed training experiences that the schools use for completing and perfecting the unfoldment. Our profession uses the term usually in the latter sense. But as education is coming more and more to be seen as a thing of experiences, and as the work-and-play-experiences of the general community life are being more and more utilized, the line of demarcation between directed and undirected experience is rapidly disappearing. Education must be concerned with both, even though it does not direct both[165].

---

[162] Schubert, W. (1986) *Curriculum. Perspective, Paradigm and Possibility*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, p., 75.

[163] McNeil, J. (1977) *Curriculum. A Comprehensive Introduction*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, p., 290.

[164] Bobbitt, J. (1918) *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, p., 42.

[165] Op. Cit., p., 43.

In this way and according to the principle of scientific management, the curriculum purpose rested on the determination of the more substantive knowledge for each subject, followed by the development of varied activities in which the learner/trainer would train in order to attain the finalities defined in the interim. Clearly for Bobbitt, the curriculum was a "mosaic of full-formed human life"[166].

Similarly, for Charters, the curriculum was perceived as a series of objectives that students must achieve by way of a series of learning experiences[167]. However, "it was through the improvement of teaching that Charters became interested in the curriculum, unlike Bobbitt, [for whom it was] through the improvement of the management of education"[168]. Charters "analyzed the life activities for their knowledge content, not for needed human abilities as did Bobbitt"[169]. Although, he delineated a method of curriculum-making that was very similar to Bobbitt's, the fact is that Charters would come to diverge from Bobbitt in the emphasis he conferred "to ideals and systemized knowledge in determining the content of curriculum"[170]. For Charters, the curriculum combined ideals and activities and, unlike Bobbitt, he paid special attention to knowledge in his method of curriculum making[171].

Charters denounced the situation of crisis in the curriculum by appealing to a reform in accordance with the principles upheld by the doctrine of social efficiency, namely, what was useless should be removed from the curriculum, replacing it instead with what would be socially useful. This would entail a detailed analysis of human life and the respective ideals which control such activities[172]. More so than Bobbitt, Charters "devoted himself to the actual task of activity analysis in a variety of fields"[173]. Charters advocated that the survival of a certain knowledge depended on the fact that that same knowledge met human needs, and this entailed the development of a rigorous method of acquisition of that same knowledge[174]. In Kliebard's words,

---

[166] Op. Cit., p., 43.
[167] Charters, W. (1923) *Curriculum and Construction*. New York: MacMillan.
[168] Seguel, M. (1966) *The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years*. New York: Teachers College Press, p., 94
[169] Op. Cit., p., 94
[170] McNeil, J. (1977) *Curriculum. A Comprehensive Introduction*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, p., 291.
[171] Charters, W. (1923) *Curriculum and Construction*. New York : MacMillan, pp., 103-106.
[172] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge.
[173] Op. Cit., p., 101.
[174] Charters, W. (1901) *Methods of Teaching: Developed from a Functional Standpoint*. Chicago: Row, Peterson and Co.

"the modus operandi that became associated with the major curriculum leaders like Bobbitt and Charters can easily be identified as activity analysis, but beyond the technical process lay a social doctrine sometimes vigorously proclaimed, sometimes half expressed. The doctrine was social efficiency"[175] which would come to impose on curriculum the necessity of the social utility of school subjects. Consequently, the social efficiency ideology rested on the curricular dichotomy of school subjects: "the academic and the practical"[176].

Nonetheless, the advocates of social efficiency would come to face much criticism. According to Bode, the social efficiency ideology failed to represent the ideal alternative for the educational system. According to him, the proposals of Bobbitt, Charters and Snedden respectively silenced "the ideal of progressively changing social order"[177]. Theirs was a direct application of Taylor's principle to education and a perspective of sociological determination of the educational objectives, aspects that are questionable since, as Bode highlights, democracy should not lead to schooling which only meets existing social conditions. Democracy is the progressive humanization of social order[178]. Counts, just like Bode, condemned the manner in which the selection of educational objectives was conducted, stressing that these only reflect the dominant interests of the American culture. According to Counts, "the inevitable consequence is that the school will become an instrument for the perpetuation of the existing social order rather than a force in society"[179].

For Kliebard, Bobbitt revealed some ambiguity in his curricular theorization. For example, in 1926 Bobbitt mentioned that "education in not primarily to prepare for life at some future time. Quite the reverse; it purposes to hold high the current living, (…) In a very true sense, life cannot be prepared for. It can only be lived"[180]. However, in 1936, he admitted that "while there are general guiding principles that enable parents and teachers to foresee in advance the long general course that is

---

[175] Kliebard, H. (1968) The Curriculum Field in Retrospect. In P. Witt (ed). *Technology and Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 69-84, p., 75.

[176] Op. Cit., p., 77.

[177] Bode, B. (1927) *Modern Educational Theories*. New York: MacMillan, p., 79

[178] Op. Cit.

[179] Counts. G. (1930) *The American Road to Culture. A Social Interpretation of Education in the United States*. New York: John Day. p., 126.

[180] Bobbitt, J. (1926) The Orientation of the Curriculum Maker. In G. Whipple (ed) Tthe Foundations and Technique of Curriculum Construction. *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part II, Bloomington: Public School Publishing Co, pp., 41-55, p., 43.

normally run, yet they cannot forsee or foreknow the specific and concrete details of the course that is to be actualized"[181].

Moreover, the social efficiency ideology was infused by patterns of segregation. As Levine argued, "we must stop teaching the 'average' child; the genius and the laggard cannot learn willy-nilly. We must also formulate a curriculum for these types of children"[182], thus crystallizing the notion of school as a selective agency. As King noted, "there are many forces at play in society that it is not desirable should appear in the school. This is partly due to the fact that society is far from perfect"[183]. Such segregation would come to pass not only at the level of class dynamics, but also with gender. In fact, Bobbitt, would also come to advocate for the need for a certain kind of gender segregation, since boys and girls require different types of leadership, namely, "boys require masculine leadership in many of their activities and the girls feminine leadership"[184]. To both Bobbitt and Charters, men and women had very distinct social destinies. According to Charters, who went as far as drafting a curriculum for homemakers[185], "we should define curriculum on the basis of what people are going to do"[186], in other words, "the social efficiency educators were primarily concerned with efficient performance in a future social role"[187], this position being quite distinct from that assumed by Hall, who believed we should consider interest to be a crucial criterion in determining a curriculum. This was also the case with *Taylorism*. In fact one of the functions of a 'human engineering' perspective in curriculum was to provide a place for a new class of 'experts'. Hence, we need to think about *Taylorism* in class terms as well. Since Michael Apple's analysis of 'controlling the work of teachers' in *Teachers and Texts*, teaches us great deal here, a little detour in our analysis is needed. As he argues,

---

[181] Bobbitt, J. (1934) A Summary Theory of the Curriculum. *Society for Curriculum Study News Bulletin*, 5 (12), pp., 2-4, p., 4.

[182] Levine, A. (1917) Better Schools Through Scientific Management. *Educational Foundations*, XXVIII, 10, pp., 593-596, p., 594.

[183] King, I. (1913) *Education for Social Efficiency*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, p., 178.

[184] Bobbitt, J. (1912) The Elimination of Waste in Education. *Elementary School Teacher*, 12, pp., 259-271, pp., 270-271.

[185] Charters, W. (1926) Statement. In G. Whipple (ed) The Foundations and Technique of Curriculum Construction, Part II. The Foundations of Curriculum Making. *The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Bloomington: Public School Publishing

[186] Charters, W. (1926) Curriculum for Women. *Bulletin of the University of Illinois*, 23 (27), pp., 327-330, p., 327.

[187] Op. Cit., p., 327.

as a management technology for deskilling workers and separating conception from execution, Taylorism was less than fully successful. It often generated slowdowns and strikes, exacerbated tensions, and created new forms of overt and covert resistance. Yet its ultimate effect was to legitimate a particular ideology of management and control both to the public and to employers and workers. Even though it did not succeed as a set of techniques, it ushered in and finally brought acceptance of a larger body of ideological practices to deskill pink-, white-, and blue-collar workers and to rationalize and intensify their labor[188].

It is in this context that Michael Apple stresses that "Taylorism is significant not just because of its widespread application to labor in general, with the growth of time and motion studies and atomistic strategies to separate conception from execution in factories and offices in the early years of the [last] century", but also because of its "considerable consequence in education"[189]. Drawing from Kliebard, Michael Apple argues that "the most accepted models of curriculum planning still in use have their roots originally in Taylorism"[190]. Challenging any sort of euphemisms, Michael Apple highlights that "many of the techniques now being proposed in or standing behind the reports for evaluation and testing, for standardized curricula, and for 'upgrading' and rationalizing teaching, e.g. systems management and management by objectives, competency-based testing and curriculum development, reductive behavioral objectives, and so forth come from similar soil"[191]. Moreover, Taylorism, as Michael Apple stresses, "perhaps the archetypical attempt by capital to control people's work [did] not come 'directly' from dominant groups in an unmediated fashion. Its was much more complicated than this and requires a more subtle appraisal of class dynamics both outside and inside education"[192]. Again, Michael Apple's scrutiny deserves to be highlighted,

---

[188] Apple, Michael (1986) *Teachers and Texts. A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. New York: Routledge, p., 40.

[189] Op. Cit., p., 140.

[190] Kliebard, *Apud*, Apple, Michael (1986) *Teachers and Texts. A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. New York: Routledge, p., 40.

[191] Apple, Michael (1986) *Teachers and Texts. A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. New York: Routledge, p., 40.

[192] Op. Cit., p., 140.

What Taylorism accomplished was not only a restructuring of the labor process so that it was more coordinated and under greater supervisory control [but also] it went further [and] accomplished this restructuring by substituting 'truly scientific approaches' developed by engineers, for the older 'rule of thumb' methods of management. In so doing, it provided these once independent engineers with some semblance of the autonomy they were themselves losing, given what was happening to their own positions. [Thus], techniques of control such as those associated with scientific management can often be paradoxical. They can both serve to reproduce capitalist social relations 'and' be the result of class conflict at one and the same time. Caught in a contradictory position 'between' capital and labor, engineers develop ways to express their own interests and solve the problems generated by their altered location in the social division of labor and the increased concentration of capital[193].

In fact, at the very beginning, those with capital rejected Taylorism since they knew it would create many social crises. Thus, and drawing from Michael Apple's analyses, Taylorism often was about creating and legitimating a new class of people, of professional engineers. Engineers previously had been craftsmen on the shop floor, who when they got really skilled,were given partly managerial positions, but they were still based on the shop floor, and they had all the workman's knowledge, because they still workers. Thus, one of the things that efficiency and human engineering wanted to secure was a place between capital and labor for a newly emergent middle class occupation—professional expertise. Undeniably, Taylorism was really about creating and legitimating a new class of professional experts.

Returning to an earlier argument on Michael Apple's perspective towards *Taylorism* (quite pertinent we trust), we stressed that on September 1918, "the most dramatic event in the evolution of the movement to reform the curriculum"[194] was the appearance of an article by Kilpatrick published in Teachers College Press: *The Project Method*. Kilpatrick, who was "sharply critical of traditional education [presented a] clear alternative to the reforms being promoted by the social efficiency interest group" [195]. His method proposed the "conception of wholehearted purposeful

---

[193] Op. Cit., p., 141.
[194] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 137.
[195] Cremin, L (1964) *The Transformation of School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957.* New York: Vintage, p., 217.

activity proceeding in a social environment"[196]. This proposal clearly had a social purpose and was not centered solely on the child. Its purposeful activity entailed four stages: "purposing, planning, executing, and judging" [197], noted that the child had to learn, to search, compare, think why and finally make hisor her own decisions, while the teacher acted as a guide, but not as a source of information or a recipient of knowledge. Kilpatrick, unlike the position adopted by Bobbitt and Charters, believed that education should be considered "as life itself and not as mere preparation for later living"[198], adding that for years, Americans "increasingly desired that education be considered as life itself and not as a mere preparation for later living"[199].

Fundamentally, Kilpatrick's project method "became the major alternative to scientific curriculum making for those reformers who saw school's traditional curriculum as sadly irrelevant to modern times"[200]. Bode as well as Childs and Kilpatrick were respectively considered as innovators and bearers of new ideas, although Bode did not hesitate to comment that Kilpatrick's definition of "wholehearted purposeful activity" [201] caused some confusion with the notion of interest. Bagley likewise revealed himself to be skeptical towards Kilpatrick's proposal since the prime function of education was "to place the child in possession of his spiritual heritage"[202].

However, the more elaborate and the more powerful criticisms originated from Kliebard. He draws on Lovejoy, who observed that the men who determined the intellectual patterns in the first two decades of the twentieth century were characteristically "espirits simplistes—minds which habitally tend to assume that simple solutions can be found for the problems they dealt with"[203]. Such a presumption of simplicity causes extremely complex issues such as "What knowledge is of most worth" to be treated "by easy means as observing and counting and

[196] Kilpatrick, W. (1918) The Project Method. *Teachers College Record*, 19, pp., 319-335, p., 320.
[197] Kilpatrick, W. (1926) *Foundations of Education*. New York: MacMillan, p., 213.
[198] Kilpatrick, W. (1918) The Project Method. *Teachers College Record*, 19, pp., 319-335, p., 323.
[199] Op. Cit., p., 323.
[200] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 141.
[201] Bode, B. (1927) *Modern Educational Theories*. New York: MacMillan, p., 142.
[202] Bagley, W. (1921) Projects and Purposes in Teaching and Learning. *Teachers College Record*, 22, pp., 288-297, p., 292.
[203] Lovejoy, A. (1936) *The Great Chain of Being*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p., 7.

measuring, and if worse comes to worst, by consensus"[204]. Kliebard continues to draw on Lovejoy in noting that "if anything characterizes the thinking of early curriculum specialists and, to some extent our own thinking, it is the desire to enumerate and particularize, hence our faith in *the* six principles of good school-community relations or *the* four or five or nineteen steps in curriculum development"[205]. Exemplary of this perspective are Bobbitt's books *How to make a Curruculum* which discriminates hundreds of objectives, and *The Curriculum* in which the whole of the social efficiency doctrine is laid out:

> the central theory is simple. Human life, however varied, consists in the performance of specific activities. Education that prepares for life is one that prepares definitely and adequately for these specific activities. However numerous and diverse they may be for any social class, they can be discovered. This requires only that one go out into the world of affairs and discover the particulars of which these affairs consist. These will show the abilities, atitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge that man needs. (...) They will be numerous, definite, and particularized [objectives]. The curriculum will then be that series of experiences which children and youth must have by way of training those objectives (...) that series of things which children and youth must do and experience by way of developing abilities to do the things well that make up the affairs of adult life; and to be in all respects what adults should be[206].

In the words of Kliebard, "in one passage, is the quintessence of early curriculum thinking: the simplistic approach to a complex problem, the strong emphasis on specification and enumeration, even the suggestion of a differentiated curriculum for different social classes"[207]. In essence, the social efficiency ideology struggled against that which Ellwood derided as "education (...) as soft affair", in other words, an education that is "very far from furnishing the discipline which life requires"[208]. For Levine, "education is a mass of conflicting principles (…) a strange welter of

---

[204] Kliebard, H. (1968) The Curriculum Field in Retrospect. In P. Witt (ed). *Technology and Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 69-84, p., 73.
[205] Op. Cit., pp., 73-74
[206] Bobbitt, J. (1918) *The Curriculum.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, p., 42.
[207] Kliebard, H. (1968) The Curriculum Field in Retrospect. In P. Witt (ed). *Technology and Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 69-84, p., 74
[208] Ellwood, C. (1914) Our Compulsory Education Laws, and Retardation and Elimination in our Public Schools. *Education*, XXXIV, pp., 572-576, p., 572.

incongruous theories and educational aims that are hardly recognizable because of the painful lack of a common terminology, and yet, psychology is a science everybody knows—only it is told in the language that nobody understands"[209]. The advocates of social efficiency, when confronted by a social and cultural instrument such as the curriculum, opt for simplistic solutions and ignore the fact that they had in hand dangerous tools, which cut off so many presents and futures of thousands and thousands of generations. In this sense, we perceive that the curriculum in the hands of social efficiency educators was converted into a lethal weapon constructed on the basis of the linearity of the imposed arguments, arguments which still influence curriculum. Curiously, it would actually be thanks to such simplicity, in opposing, for example, Dewey's conceptual model (the theory of recapitulation) and Hall's (the theory of the culture-epoch) which, according to Kliebard, would contribute to the implementation of social efficiency notions in the twentieth century. It was all simple. There was only the need to determine objectives, reducing them to a series of stages, an idea that was a clone of *Taylorism*[210]. This notion of simplicity that is well embedded in the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* would prove to be "a fundamental assumption in subsequent work in curriculum"[211].

Fundamentally, Bobbitt and Charters, who "lived in auspicious times [in which] mental discipline as a theoretical basis for the curriculum was almost dead by the early of twentieth century"[212], established themselves as the major promulgators of the behavioral and scientific movements in the curriculum. Both continued the work developed by Spencer and Rice and established a bridge between these and that which years later would come to be known as the Tyler rationale.

In the words of Kliebard, "proceeding from the root metaphor of the school as a factory and the curriculum as a production process, school children became 'raw material' and the teacher the overseer of the production process, making sure that the products were constructed according to the specifications laid down and with a

---

[209] Levine, A. (1917) Better Schools Through Scientific Management. *Educational Foundations*, XXVIII, 10, pp., 593-596, p., 594.

[210] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge.

[211] Kliebard, H. (1968) The Curriculum Field in Retrospect. In P. Witt (ed). *Technology and Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 69-84, p., 75.

[212] Kliebard, H. (1975) The Rise of Scientific Curriculum Making and its Aftermath. *Curriculum Theory Network*, 5 (1), pp., 27-38, p., 27.

minimum of waste" [213]. Nonetheless the opposition was increasingly stronger. We are referring to the social reconstructionism movement, which will be dealt with in greater detail.

4.2 The Emergence of Ralph Tyler

Although the opposition to the creation of a scientifically controlled curriculum was becoming increasingly greater, the fact is that Bobbitt was able to introduce "a potent new vocabulary into curricular discourse, and this metaphorical language came to control what was deemed to be right and proper in curricular design. Derived directly from the manufacturing process, that language also served to define the overarching purposes of schooling"[214]. This perspective was consolidated by 1930 when the *National Society for the Study of Education* (NSSE) published its *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook* which combines two parts *Curriculum Making: Past and Present* and *The Foundations of Curriculum Making*. The first part delivered strong criticism against traditional schooling while the second part came to be seen as a point of reference with regards to curriculum making[215]. The committee, which included some relevant names such as Rugg (Chairperson), Bagley, Bobbitt, Charters, Counts, Judd, and Kilpatrick recognized the necessity for curricular reform as well as the necessity of creating a guideline for curriculum making. The characteristics of an ideal curriculum were drawn out (some of which are still relevant today). These included the ideal curriculum, which "focuses on the affairs of human life; deals with the facts and problems of the local, national and international community; enables students to think critically about various forms of government; informs and develops an attitude of open mindedness; considers students' interests and needs as well as opportunities for debate, discussion and exchange of ideas; deals with issues of modern life and the cultural and historical aspects of society; considers problem-solving activities and practice in choosing alternatives; consists of carefully graded organization of

---

[213] Kliebard, H. (1999) *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College, p., 53

[214] Op. Cit., p., 53

[215] Whipple, G. (ed) (1930) Curriculum Making: Past and Present. *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I*, Bloomington: Public School Publishing; and Whipple, G. (ed) (1930) The Foundations of Curriculum Making. *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, Bloomington: Public School Publishing;

problems and exercises; deals with humanitarian themes, and purposeful and constructive attitudes and insights"[216].

In the course of the twentieth century, it is noteworthy that there is no single doctrine which can obliterate the others. In fact, "by 1930 curriculum reform had become a national preocupation"[217]; however, "many of the curriculum reforms that were emerging in the decade of the thirties represented not so much a victory for one position over the other as a hybridization of what were once distinct and easily recognizable curriculum positions"[218]. As a curricular document, the Twenty-Sixth Yeabook of NSSE would determine the course that the field followed, having a profound influence on the *Eight Year Study*, a study that was launched by the Progressive Education Association, from 1932 to 1940, "probably the most ambitious of the efforts to stimulate curriculum reform at the local level"[219]. This most pertinent and powerful curriculum experiment ever carried in the United Sates of America[220], started with the purpose of resolving the overwhelming social crisis. In the words of Tyler:

> with the onset of the Great Depression in 1929, new demands for change came with such force that they could no longer be denied. Youth in large numbers, unable to find work, enrolled in high school. Most of these new students did not plan to go to college, and most of them found little meaning and interest in their high-school tasks. But still they went to school; there was no other place for them to go[221].

Not surprisingly, an old issue emerged. After the work of the Committee of Ten, "complaints were being voiced about alleged domination of the high school

---

[216] Rugg, H. (1930) The School and the Drama of American Life. In Whipple, G. (ed) (1930) Curriculum Making: Past and Present. *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I*, Bloomington: Public School Publishing, pp., 3-16.

[217] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 179.

[218] Op. Cit., p., 180.

[219] Op. Cit., p., 182.

[220] Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (1995) *Curriculum Development Theory into Practice*. Columbus : Prentice Hall.

[221] Tyler, R. (1976) (ed) *Perspectives on American Education. Reflections on the Past…Challenges for the Future*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, INC, p., 38.

curriculum by the colleges"[222]. This complaint gained momentum by the early 1930s; in other words, it "became clear in the minds of curriculum reformers that the colleges were the principal impediment to curriculum reform at the secondary school level"[223]. An increasingly larger division between colleges and high schools caused the *Progressive Education Association* to attack the problem[224]. According to Tyler, "The Progressive Education Association appointed a Committee on the Relation of School and College, to recommend what they could do to reduce the rigidity of the high school curriculum and to make it more effective for the wide range of students they were getting"[225]. In essence, there was a need to demonstrate that a new curriculum drafted in accordance with the needs and the interests of the students would be as effective as a curriculum drafted around the traditional tests and university admission requirements. This was a landmark in the field of curricular investigation which attempted to demonstrate that the students are able to have success in college, even when coming from a secondary system that opts for a curricular draft organized around the needs and the interests of the students.

With the exception of Fordham, a college that never did accept the idea of shifting its entrance requirements, "for eight years, schools would be permitted to develop curriculum that they believed to be appropriate for their students"[226] and "during that time, their graduates would be admitted to college without prejudice because of not having met the typical college entrance requirements"[227]. However, "in exchange for that freedom, there would be an evaluation program", based on a concept that would later come to be known as formative evaluation; in other words, it meant that "what we had to do in evaluation was to provide information, as best we could collect it, which would help the schools to continue to revise and improve their programs as we went along"[228]. In fact, it was due to the difficulty experienced in the evaluation of the study (the schools actually got to abandon the project), that Bode, as a member of the

---

[222] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 183.
[223] Op. Cit., p., 183.
[224] Tyler, R. (1976) (ed) *Perspectives on American Education. Reflections on the Past…Challenges for the Future*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, INC, p., 38.
[225] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 71.
[226] Op. Cit., p., 71.
[227] Op. Cit., p., 71.
[228] Op. Cit., p., 71.

directing committee" suggested Tyler could lead the evaluation process. According to Bode, "We've got a young man at our university who approaches testing quite differently. He starts out with 'What are your objectives? What are you trying to do? Instead of starting out with 'I've got the test already for you'"[229]. The *Eight Year Study* met the most profound wishes of the social efficiency ideology which increasingly led the crusade against waste in education, although, as is indicated by Worthen and Sanders, the critics believed that the students would not perform well in college[230].

In fact, Tyler, "became nationally visible in 1938 when he carried his work with The *Eight Year Study* from the Ohio State University to the University of Chicago, where he simultaneously became chairman of the department of education and university examiner—sufficient responsibility for three people"[231]. Quite naturally, The *Eight Year Study* "gave strong impetus" to the "infusion of behaviorism in curriculum thinking"[232] mainly due to Tyler who argued that "the first step in improving validity is to define clearly the types of behavior which we are trying to teach"[233]. It was assumed that "education is a process which seeks to change the behavior patterns of human beings"[234]. Consequently for Tyler, "the educational system is ... more than the school system"[235], and it has three major functions in society: (1) "to enable young people to acquire the understanding, skills, and attitudes required for constructive participation in the economic, political, and social life of a democracy; (2) to allow for mobility within society; and (3) to help each person to achieve all that he is capable of achieving"[236]. Thus, and despite Tyler denying having constructed a rationale, the fact is that he confesses that the *Eight Year Study* not only

---

[229] Bode *Apud* Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 72.

[230] Worthen, B. & Sanders, J. (1987) *Educational Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. New York: Pitman Publishing.

[231] Goodlad, J. (1976) Introduction. In R. Tyler (ed.) *Perspectives on American Education. Reflections on the Past…Challenges for the Future*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, INC, p., 8.

[232] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 184.

[233] Tyler, R. (1931) More Valid Measurements of College Work. *The Journal of the National Education Association*, 20, pp., 327-328, p., 327.

[234] Smith, & Tyler, R. (1942) *Appraising and Recording Student Progress*. New York: Harper & Brothers, p., 11.

[235] Tyler, R. (1978) Conserving Human Resources. The School Dropout. In R. Tyler (ed) *From Youth to Constructive Adult Life: The Role of the Public School*. Berkeley: McCuthan Publishing Company, pp., 122-126, p., 123.

[236] Op. Cit., p., 122.

stimulated him "to construct a comprehensive outline of the questions to be answered and the steps to be taken in developing a curriculum"[237] especially since it was a "monumental curriculum project for that time"[238], but it also stimulated the emergence of later studies such as The Michigan Study, headed by Parker, The Southern Association Study, The Negro High School Study"[239]. Tyler, other than recognising that The Eight Year Study allowed him to remark that "that you oughtn't to overlook the difference between an educational system which is based on the view that it primarily serves the state, and a system which is helping us, we the people, to educate our children"[240], similarly stresses some significant deductions that the study allowed; namely, the "widespread acceptance of the idea that schools could develop educational programs that would meet the needs of all students, recognition by colleges that the entrance testing was a viable selection tool, and the recognition by educational practitioners of the value of defining educational objectives in terms of the behavior patterns students are encouraged to acquire"[241].

The roots of Tyler's rationale can be found in the influence of his parents ("I certainly would put my father and my mother as very important in the notion of responsibility"), in religion ("if by the sense of religion you mean the view that the purpose of life is to help improve the nature of humankind and make them more and more civilized"), in Joseph Taylor (a professor at Doane College), in Herbert Brownell (who "emphasized the need for students to learn inductively … Never be deductive"), as well as in Judd (Tyler's Ph.D. adviser), Charters ("I worked under him for nine years and learned many things from him", especially how to lead group research), Hutchins ("I was influenced" by, "his sense of mission"), Counts (who "was helpful as a professor in one course in which I did the studies of the immigrants, in this case the Polish coming to Chicago and their education"), in the practices of Dewey ("I met with him several times to discuss The Eight Year Study, and his writings have been profoundly influential in my thinking about education"), by his

---

[237] Tyler, R. (1989) New Dimensions in Curriculum Development. In G. Madaus & D. Stufflebeam (comp. & eds) *Educational Evaluation. Classical Works of Ralph Tyler*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp., 201-221, p., 201.

[238] Op. Cit., p., 201.

[239] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 65.

[240] Op. Cit., p., 103.

[241] Pagano, J. (1999) The Curriculum Field. Emergence of a Discipline. In W. Pinar (ed) *Contemporary Curriculum Discourses. Twenty Years of JCT*. New York: Peter Lang, pp., 82-101, p., 96.

students Taba, Cronbach, McGuire, Raths, Frutchey and, last but not least, Bloom Goodlad , (the last two are probably "the two best known" of his Ph.D. students)[242]. In August 1923, he recieved his Master's degree and in 1925 his Ph.D. According to Tyler, Judd insisted on the fact that there was no alternative to the observation of the social phenomenon. He said, "the substance of education is going to come from the observation and work with persons learning, not from books. You can write books about what you learn but the substance comes from the observation and experiment with people learning"[243]. While Thorndike had formulated a "theory of very specific associations"[244]; in other words, the necessity for a meticulous specificity in the learning tasks ("adding 9 to 8 is a different task from 8 to 9"[245]), Judd, on the other hand, advanced with a theory of generalization, that is, "the important thing was helping the student to seek to generalize"[246]. The words of Judd to Tyler at his dissertation defense demonstrate, in some way, not only Judd's thinking, but also the influence it exerted over Tyler: "Tyler, we at Chicago don't count units and things, we count what you know and what you can do"[247]. Intrinsically, if Thorndike had formulated "a theory of learning which involved the idea that learning consisted of building up connections between specific stimuli and specific responses", Judd "at about the same time Thorndike was stating his theory, formulated a theory of learning called generalization which viewed learning as the development of generalized modes of attack upon problems, generalized modes of reaction to generalized types of situations"[248].

Despite having written hundreds and hundreds of documents, reflecting on the problems of the curricular field, Tyler would mark the curricular field not only by his participation in The Eight Years Study and in the conference on curriculum theory "Toward improved curriculum theory"[249] held in 1947, at the University of Chicago,

---

[242] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, pp., 396-402.
[243] Op. Cit., p., 398.
[244] Op. Cit., p., 41.
[245] Op. Cit., p., 41.
[246] Op. Cit., p., 41.
[247] Op. Cit., p., 399.
[248] Tyler, R. (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p., 42.
[249] Herrick, V. & Tyler, R. (1950) (comp) & (ed) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. *Papers Presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Despite having been held in 1947 the conference texts were only published in 1950.

but also by the publication of a small book of 128 pages entitled *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*[250]. The conference, which included the participation of Herrick, Caswell and Tyler, among others, had as its objective to "develop a more adequate theory of curriculum"[251], a task that was not easy since "the writers in the field of curriculum, when considering the problem of currciculum theory, hold a number of differing points of view"[252]. In fact, the "curriculum of America schools [had] been subject to a wide variety of theoretical formulations during the past half-century"[253]. According to Caswell, "one important source of confusion in curriculum theory is the failure of some students to recognize clearly the foundations upon which such theory must rest"[254]. Hence, he continues, "the foundations of the curriculum are to be found in the conception of the values of culture and society and of the individual—how he learns and how he develops. This means that philosophy, sociology, and, in particular, psychology are basic to curriculum theory"[255]. Quite naturally, the task of the curricular specialist is "to draw from these fields a consistent body of basic principles, to interpret these principles and to apply them to education". In this way, it is erroneous to base a theorization of the curriculum on just one specific principle. The curriculum is immeasurably complex and its comprehension and orientation depend on the formulation of a comprehensive curricular theory.

Likewise, for Tyler, for whom "less progress has been made with regard to the organization of learning experiences than with the other aspects of curriculum"[256], the response to the issues related to the complexity of the curricular organization ["how can the learning experiences for next week and next month best reinforce those of this week and this month? How can the learning experiences of this semester not only reinforce those of last semester but go more deeply and more broadly into the field?

---

[250] Tyler, R. (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[251] Herrick, V. & Tyler, R. (1950) Preface. In V. Herrick & R. Tyler (comp. & ed.) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. *Papers Presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., iii-iv, p., iii.

[252] Op. Cit., p., iii.

[253] Caswell, H. (1950) Sources of Confusion in Curriculum Theory. In V. Herrick & R. Tyler (comp. & ed.) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. *Papers Presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 110-117, p., 110.

[254] Op. Cit., pp., 110-111.

[255] Op. Cit., p., 111.

[256] Tyler, R. (1950) The Organization of Learning Experiences. In V. Herrick & R. Tyler (comp. & ed.) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. *Papers Presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 59-67, p., 59.

How can the learning experiences in English be related to those in social studies?"[257]] could only be obtained "in the light of a comprehensive theory of curriculum organization based upon the psychology of learning and upon experience and experimentation in schools"[258]. In other words, for Tyler, "without a comprehensive theory for guidance, the organization of the curriculum is likely to be partial, spasmodic, and relatively ineffective"[259]. Tyler believed comprehensive curricular theory should be sensitive to five aspects: "(1) the function of organization; (2) extent of learner's experiences to be organized; (3) the organizing elements; (4) the organizing principles; (5) the organizing structures"[260]. Hence, for Tyler, comprehensive curricular theory was, fundamentally, an organizational theory that "should outline the nature of an organizing scheme that can achieve an efficient cumulative effect in curriculum learning and explain why such a scheme is effective"[261]. In other words, "the theory should explain what is required for effective sequencing (vertical organization) and effective integration (horizontal organization), and why"[262].

The issue of curricular theory based on an organizational foundation leads us to another issue: curricular planning in the development of the curriculum, a theme that was problematized by Herrick. According to Herrick, "curriculum development is essentially the result of corporative effort and by its very nature must draw upon many kinds of competencies"[263]. Therefore, "if the school curriculum of children and youth are to be improved, teachers must become more competent in dealing with the important decisions about curriculum; that these important decisions are more effective when a pattern of factors is considered; and that these important decisions are more consistent and open to evaluation and improvement when both the decisions and the pattern of factors considered are seen as part of some understandable curriculum structure or design"[264]. Herrick, for whom curricular planning was important not only because it made teachers question their own practices, advanced

---

[257] Op. Cit., p., 60.
[258] Op. Cit., p., 59.
[259] Op. Cit., p., 59.
[260] Op. Cit., pp., 61-66.
[261] Op. Cit., p., 67.
[262] Op. Cit., p., 59.
[263] Herrick, V. (1950) What Should be the Organizing Elements of the Curriculum. In V. Herrick & R. Tyler (comp. & ed.) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. *Papers Presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 37-50, p., 37.
[264] Op. Cit., p., 37.

eleven propositions[265] around which curriculum design developed. He is quite adamant in calling for clarification regarding the bases which consubstantiate the curriculum design: "any curriculum design or plan, if it is to become effective in improving curriculum, must make explicit and clear the bases upon which curriculum decisions are made"[266].

Tyler, who thought that the "school curriculum [was] commonly defined as all of the learning which is planned and guided by the school, whether or not it is carried on in classes, on the playground, or in other segments of the pupil's lives"[267], entered the educational arena at the peak of the movement centered on objectives, a movement which appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century "from those who were impressed by the progress of science and technology and believed that the same kind of progress might become possible in the field of education if a proper scientific approach were to be adopted there also"[268]. The focus of this movement was made as much by Bobbitt, as by Charters, both being concerned about the interpretative reading that was allowed for by the educational purposes.

Bobbitt[269] argued that the context of contemporary society demanded precision and specificity, indicating that the teachers should determine their objectives in a non-technical language so that students and parents could understand them. Furthermore, there was the need to distinguish between the objectives for the curriculum as a whole and the objectives of progression for each class or age group. Such a stance was to be taken up by Charters[270], for whom the necessity of clarifying educational purposes was a crucial process. Hence, we need to determine what he called the ideals of education, followed by identifying the activities which such ideals would entail, and finally, the analysis of the ideals as much as the activities, in terms of units of work, and in accordance with human capacity. Fundamentally, Charters advocated a curriculum reduced to units of work, allowing for better control of each of the various stages which made it up.

---

[265] With this regard, *vide* Op. Cit., pp., 40-50.

[266] Op. Cit., pp., 40 and 49.

[267] Tyler, R. (1950) The organization of Learning Experiences. In V. Herrick & R. Tyler (comp. & ed.) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. *Papers Presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 59-67, p., 59.

[268] Kelly, A. (1989) *The Curriculum, Theory and Practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing, p., 50.

[269] Bobbitt, J. (1918) *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

[270] Charters, W. (1923) *Curriculum and Construction*. New York: MacMillan.

In this way, Bobbitt and Charters imposed a scientific and behaviorist element to their analysis of the curricular field, intending to introduce into educational practices precise and scientific methods, which were beginning to show dividends in other areas of the social and human activity, particularly in industry. The interest in the test expanded in an attempt to establish a relation between the pre-specification of the objectives and evaluation of the performance; this relation would prove to be one of the central curriculum issues[271]. A major step was taken by the objectives approaches, and not only by Tyler, "the next major exponent of the objectives approach"[272]. His "original aim was to design scientific tests of educational attainment and his solution to this problem was to suggest that this could be done most readily and easily if a clear statement had been made of the kind of attainment that was being aimed at"[273]. Later, Bloom who was a disciple of Tyler introduced a new dimension into curricular planning, with the division of objectives into three categories—the cognitive, the emotional and the psychomotor—offering thus, a detailed list of the most ambitious classification of the objectives in the cognitive domain that was ever known[274].

For Lundgren[275], Tyler is situated in a new form of theoretical elaboration of education and of the curriculum. According to Connell[276], this new form emerged as the consequence of an epoch (the first half of the twentieth century) that was marked by enormous educational ambition, in which new and audacious ideals were formed, the relation between education and society was reformulated, and in which new practices and experiences emerged which would give rise to substantial transformations at the level of teaching content, methods and objectives. In a society that was increasingly blinded by a belief in an efficient educational system, it is not surprising that educating the masses was motivated less by the desire to provide everyone with a worthwhile education, and more through the impositions of a society that was increasingly characterized by social inequality and social segregation. Although not without resistance, education was increasingly seen as preparation for the working world. In this regard, the words of Tyler himself in a paper delivered at

---

[271] Kelly, A. (1989) *The Curriculum, Theory and Practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
[272] Op. Cit., p., 51.
[273] Op. Cit., p., 51.
[274] Op. Cit.
[275] Lundgren, U. (1983). *Between Hope and Happening: Text and Context in Curriculum*. Vic. Deakin University.
[276] Connel, R. (1980) *A History of Education in the Twentieth Century World*. Canberra: Curriculum Development Program

the University of Wisconsin in 1967, in The Virgil Herrick Memorial Lecture, are clearly enlightening: "Today, education is a necessity for everyone in order to participate in our complex social, civic and industrial life"[277].

In 1949, Tyler published *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, which had originally served as the basis for one of the course syllabi supervised by him at the University of Chicago, entitled *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*[278], and which, while being neither a "textbook, for it does not provide comprehensive guidance and readings for a course [nor] a manual for curriculum construction since it does not describe and outline in detail the steps to be taken by a given school or college that seeks to build a curriculum"[279], it is a book that "attempts to explain a rationale for viewing, analyzing and interpreting the curriculum and instructional program of an education institution"[280]. However, and as is stressed by Kemmis[281], when his book reached the hands of individuals who are not used to thinking, Tyler's ideas changed into everything that the author himself negated. Actually, Tyler proposed a clear definition of educational objectives that should be formulated in terms of content and of behavior, a line of thought that was later followed by Bloom.

The book offers a rationale (as shall be analyzed further ahead, but we note here that Tyler was opposed to labels) that "begins with identifying four fundamental questions which must be answered in developing any curriculum and plan of instruction": "(1) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? (2) What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? (3) How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? (4) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?"[282]. In fact, for Tyler "many educational programs do not have clearly defined purposes"[283], notwithstanding the

---

[277] Tyler, R. (1968) The Virgil E. Herrick Memorial Lecture Series. In R. Tyler *The Challenge of National Assessment*. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, p., 2.
[278] Tyler, R. (1989) New Dimensions in Curriculum Development. In G. Madaus & D. Stufflebeam (comps and eds) *Educational Evaluation: Classical Works of Ralph Tyler*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp., 201-207, p., 202.
[279] Tyler, R. (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p., 1.
[280] Op. Cit., p., 1.
[281] Kemmis, S. (1988) *El Curriculum : Más Allá de la Teoría de la Reproducción*. Madrid: Ediciones Morata.
[282] Tyler, R. (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p., 1.
[283] Op. Cit., p., 3.

fact that "no doubt some excellent educational work is being done by artistic teachers who do not have a clear conception of goals but do have an intuitive sense of what is good teaching, what materials are significant, what topics are worth dealing with and how to present material and develop topics effectively with students"[284]. Another fundamental stage was ingrained in the assumption that "the teacher can provide an educational experience through setting up an environment and structuring the situation so as to stimulate the desired type of reaction",[285] which means that "the teacher must have some understanding of the kinds of interests and background the students have"[286]. The effectiveness of the learning experiences depended, according to Tyler, on the way they were organized. Therefore, and because "important changes in human behavior are not produced overnight"[287], Tyler suggests "three major criteria to be met in building an effectively organized group of learning experiences: continuity, sequence and integration"[288]. To conclude, Tyler refers to evaluation as "a powerful device for clarifying educational objectives"[289], alerting us to the fact that "unless the evaluation procedure closely parallels the educational objectives of the curriculum the evaluation procedure may become the focus of the student's attention and even of the teacher's attention rather than the curriculum objectives set up"[290]. For Tyler, "evaluation becomes one of the important ways of providing information about the success of the school to the school's clientele"[291].

Readopting Kemmis's thought, the work of Tyler, seemingly without 'meaning' to, provides a pertinent summary of the techniques desired by many teachers for their practical day-to-day activity, given its informative, clear and coherent character, which is based on four aspects: (a) the vision of the student (derived from contemporary psychology); (2) the society outside the school (gathered from sociology and the philosophy of education and based on the conception of the knowledge necessary for the modern industrial society and for the well-being of humanity); (3) the knowledge of the contents (specified by the authority of the particular specialists of each of the areas of knowledge); and (4) the curriculum

---

[284] Op. Cit., p., 3.
[285] Op. Cit., p., 64.
[286] Op. Cit., p., 64.
[287] Op. Cit., p., 84
[288] Op. Cit., p., 84
[289] Op. Cit., p., 124.
[290] Op. Cit., p., 124.
[291] Op. Cit., p., 125.

elaboration process (based on technical knowledge such as the words, the selection of content, its organization and sequence in accordance with psychological principles and the determination and evaluation of the adequate methods of transmission, using behaviorist objective specification technology). In fact, for Tyler "since tests had proved useful in selecting and sorting military personnel, it seemed that similar tests could be developed for civilian conditions, and for children and youth as well as young adults"[292].

Frequently referred to as "the father of ... educational evaluation"[293] Tyler, however, warns of the dangers of labels, which besides being superficial, in one way or another, often weaken the true meaning of the terms:

> I invented the term 'evaluation' when applied to educational procedures, so if naming the child, as the godfather names babies, makes you father, then I am. And when it began to be a cliché and evaluation meant so many different things to different people, I invented the term 'assessment' and that's what we used next. (…) The problem is that something is labeled, like the Tyler rationale, and pretty soon, it is the form that is in people's minds, not the substance. Forms, like cosmetics, are so much easier to adopt than changing your personality. And that kind of business makes it necessary periodically to change labels because the labels became clichés representing something like Dewey's "Do-I-have-to-do-what-I-want-to-do" sort of cliché – which was not what Dewey said at all, but a way of quickly labeling it. And then it's lost[294].

Tyler, after stressing that certain objectives ("To Present the Theory of Evolution", "The Colonial Period", "To Develop Critical Thinking"[295]), not only do not define the final purpose of education, but also hardly specify what the students should do with such elements, indicated that they are so broad that they become quite useless. He

---

[292] Tyler, R. (1974) Introduction. A perspective on the Issues. In R. Tyler & R. Wolf (eds) *Crucial Issues in Testing*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, pp., 1-10, p., 4.

[293] Ridings, J. (1989) An Interview with Ralph Tyler. In G. Madaus & D. Stufflebeam (comps. & eds.) *Educational Evaluation: Classical Works of Ralph Tyler*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp., 243- 274, p., 261.

[294] Tyler, R. (1989) J. Ridings An Interview with Ralph Tyler. In G. Madaus & D. Stufflebeam (comps. & eds.) *Educational Evaluation: Classical Works of Ralph Tyler*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp., 243- 274, pp., 261-262.

[295] Tyler, R. (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 44-46.

reiterated that "the most useful form for stating objectives is to express them in terms which identify both the kind of behavior to be developed in the student and the content or area of life in which this behavior is to operate". In other words, for Tyler, there was the need to be more specific, in determining to which content a particular behavior is applicable, especially since it is of no use, for example, to talk of critical thought if the content or the type of problems on which the thought will focus, are not mentioned. Hence, for Tyler, "'To Write Clear and Well-organized Reports of Social Studies Projects' includes both an indication of the kind of behavior—namely, writing clear and well-organized reports—and also indicates the areas of life with which the reports are to deal"[296].

It was in the process of objectives analysis that Tyler positioned himself in opposition to the Committe of Ten. For Tyler, the report had a very profound effect on the North American secondary education for at least twenty-five years. The document was prepared by specialists of the different subjects and the suggested objectives were sought by many schools. However, Tyler adds, many "have criticized the use of subject specialists on the grounds that the objectives they propose are too technical, too specialized, or in other ways are inappropriate for a large number of the school students"[297]. Probably, Tyler adds, the inadequacy of many of the objectives suggested by the subject specialists originates from the fact that these are not correctly formulated questions:

> It seems quite clear that the Committee of Ten thought it was answering the question: What should be the elementary instruction for students who are later to carry on much more advanced work in the field? Hence, the report in History, for example, seems to present objectives for the beginning courses for persons who are training to be historians. Similarly the report in Mathematics outlines objectives for the beginning courses in the training of a mathematician. Apparently each committee viewed its job as outlining the elementary courses with the idea that these students taking these courses would go on for more and more advanced work, culminating in major specialization at the college or university level. This is obviously not the question that subject specialists should generally be asked regarding the secondary school curriculum. The question which they should be asked runs somewhat like

---

[296] Op. Cit, p., 47.
[297] Op. Cit, p., 26.

this: What can your subject contribute to the education of young people who are not going to be specialists in your field[298].

In this way, the great and complex question of the curriculum rests on its true essence: What is one to teach? This has always been a problematic issue, but, as was previously mentioned, by the end of the nineteenth century—with Spencer—it changed to: "What knowledge is of the most worth?"[299]. In the words of Tyler:

curriculum problems tend to be mostly problems of what is to be taught. Why is it important for children to learn these things? What evidence is there that they haven't already learned it or that it is appropriate to their age? And so on. Then the problems of what the objectives are and so forth. If you have thirty people you'll find most of the kinds of curriculum problems there. Then evaluation problems—the tendency to appraise students without reference to what it was they were supposed to learn[300].

For Tyler, Thorndike like Bobbitt and so many others (products of an "age of quickening interest in the scientific exploration of social and natural phenomena (…) an age of scientific enthusiasm not only among scholars, but also among the lay audiences that devoured the popularized science of such magazines as *The Forum, Popular Science Monthly, The Saturday Evening Post,* and *The World's Work* (…) an age of heyday optimism based on the widely held belief that science won the day, and now had only to transform the world"[301]) sought answers to "Herbert Spencer's insistent question "What knowledge is of most worth?".

According to Pagano, Tyler's work "dictates an operationalized sequence of linear steps leading from the formulation of goals and specifications of outcomes,

---

[298] Op. Cit, p., 26.
[299] Spencer, H. (1860) *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, pp., 84-85.
[300] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 52.
[301] Tyler, R. (1976) (ed) *Prospects for Research and Development in Education*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, p., 18.

identification of classroom experiences presumed to yield desired outcomes, and precise articulation of evaluation procedures to measure achievement or nonachievement of specified goals"[302]. As Tyler himself wrote, if "educational improvement in the later nineteenth century had come largely from the requirements of the American democratic experiment, (…) better schooling in the earlier twentieth century grew out of the transformations wrought by industrialism"[303], once more depositing an unshakable belief in the school as the instrument of consolidation of the dynamics imposed by industrialization.

Therefore, if the purposes of the school "are focused on developing certain patterns of behavior that are considered important to help students participate constructively in society and realize more fully their own personal potential"[304], then "the school curriculum is designed as a set of experiences that are expected to stimulate students to attempt these patterns of behavior, to afford them an opportunity to practice these patterns, to guide their efforts, and to continue the learning activities until the desired patterns of behavior have become established"[305]. It is in conformity with this that "the purpose of achievement testing is to ascertain whether, in fact, the students have acquired the desired behavior"[306]. Thus, the dynamics of evaluation gain strength (something that traversed the whole of Tyler's life[307]), which according to Tyler, "began as a means for selecting and sorting pupils, and the practices of testing that have been worked out since 1918 are largely the refining of means to serve these functions rather than other educational purposes"[308]. Alternatively said, "they are based upon the psychology of individual differences rather than upon the psychology of learning (…) an appropriate development under the societal conditions of the time"[309]. However, in the course of the century, the function of education was

[302] Pagano, J. (1999) The Curriculum Field. Emergence of a Discipline. In W. Pinar (ed) *Contemporary Curriculum Discourses. Twenty Years of JCT*. New York: Peter Lang, pp., 82-101, p., 95.
[303] Tyler, R. (1976) (ed) *Prospects for Research and Development in Education*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, p., 19.
[304] Tyler, R. (1974) The Use of Tests in Measuring the Effectiveness of Educational Programs, Methods, and Instrumental Materials. In R. Tyler & R. Wolf (eds) *Crucial Issues in Testing*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, pp., 143-155, p., 145.
[305] Op. Cit, p., 145.
[306] Op. Cit, p., 145.
[307] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 34.
[308] Tyler, R. (1974) Introduction. A Perspective on the Issues. In R. Tyler & R. Wolf (eds) *Crucial Issues in Testing*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, pp., 1-12, p., 4.
[309] Op. Cit., p., 4.

transformed and "the critical task is no longer to sort students but, rather, to educate a much larger proportion of students to meet current opportunities"[310].

In the words of Goodlad, "Tyler has been identified with and criticized for his contributions to what is sometimes called 'educational engineering'"[311], notwithstanding the fact that he would be the last one to defend his proposal as the only one. Despite the fact that no isolated form of information may be considered adequate to make comprehensive and sensible decisions about the school objectives, the fact is that, as was highlighted by Kemmis[312], the work *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* indicates that, according to Tyler, it is psychology which offers the best supporting arguments for the theory and elaboration of the curriculum, given the fact that it is on the psychological terrain that these bases for the curricular foundation are to be found. In other words, notwithstanding the fact that the study of the curriculum as a kind of hybrid subject drawing on varied sources with regards to its theoretical principles, it is clear that in Tyler's vision of the curriculum, a very special authority is ascribed to psychology for providing a certain learning technology. His work, Kemmis[313] adds, should be understood as a historical mark which very succinctly and clearly structured an eclectic theory—based on philosophy, sociology and psychology—with an accentuated emphasis on psychology. Consequently, the metatheory proposed by Tyler entailed both a curriculum theory, which assumes its guiding framework and its principles of external theoretical sources to be especially, but not only, from psychology, and, a curricular field, which primarily refers to learning and its perspective about the latter corresponds to technology derived from its mother subject (psychology) or mother subjects (philosophy, sociology, psychology).

Despite the references to philosophy and to sociology, Tyler, through his emphasis on curriculum development, centered his planning efforts around technical issues and, in this sense, obscured the educational principles that guide curricular practice in terms of actual educators, leaving their development to the scientific work of theorists

---

[310] Op. Cit., p., 6.
[311] Goodlad, J. (1976) Introduction. In R. Tyler. *Perspectives on American Education. Reflections on the Past…Challenges for the Future*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, INC, pp., 3-11, p., 5.
[312] Kemmis, S. (1988) *El Curriculum : Más Allá de la Teoría de la Reproducción*. Madrid: Ediciones Morata.
[313] Op. Cit.

outside the schools[314]. By placing the theoretical construct in the hands of psychologists, philosophers and sociologists, Tyler released teachers and administrators from having to assume such a responsibility. In fact, the curricular logic proposed by Tyler, created a kind of no-man's land (which he attributed to psychology, philosophy and sociology), a silenced and obscure a domain in which many of the fundamental issues of educational politics are played out. It is this nucleus of political decisions on education that Tyler silences by omitting a crucial analysis of the role played by powerful interest groups in the determination of the curriculum.

However, for Tyler, people failed to understand that his logic of curricular construction was based on the idea that the curriculum was an active, not a passive pursuit. This is clearly referred to in the following passage:

> Mostly they're people who think of the curriculum as something out there that they're looking at, rather than being involved in developing an education program for a school. In the latter case one asks: 'How am I going to develop one? I've got to have kids learning something. What is it they'll learn, and how would I select it to be sure that what they're learning is worth learning?' Then there's the question of how we're going to help them learn it. 'What do I know about learning? How should I set up an instructional program?' And 'How am I going to organize it so that they can build each year on what they've learned last year?' Finally, 'How can I evaluate the effectiveness of this educational program?'[315].

Therefore, for Tyler "these are the questions for people who are going to have to make a curriculum or to use a curriculum"[316]. In fact, according to Tyler, the popularity of his book is in fact due to his analysis being clear and meeting the major and most profound needs that the curriculum designers and utilizers have. In his own words, "the reason for the popularity of my little book is because most people that are really concerned with the curriculum other than those that are dilettantes sitting

---

[314] Op. Cit.

[315] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 388.

[316] Op. Cit., p., 389.

around wanting to talk about it, are people who have to make one or deal with one. There are very few books that help them that way"[317]. Tyler, furthermore, reiterated that a particular social theory of reform is based in the fact that "you can't reform in a significant way a social service just from the top down", stressing that "you can tell a minor how to do it. You can control it from above, but when it comes to enterprises that involve the individual having to make decisions, you've got to start helping them be able to make decisions"[318].

Of the bitter criticism of a number of readings and analyses that were made of the curricular field, Tyler commented that "it is fashionable to speak of the collapse, even the demise, of the public school in the United States". According to Tyler, "several best sellers [exploit this situation by holding] titles (...) which suggest the terrible conditions in some schools as seen by several concerned writers who also appear to be the prophets of doom"[319]. For Tyler, there was no reason for such an exacerbated pessimism, especially since, despite everything, major advances had been made and verified. In his own words, he argued, "Why would be one pessimistic? We're moving ahead with it. Look at the tremendous problems we've had with all this immigration. We've reached them bit by bit; they're learning"[320].

So far, we have traced out the development of a particular dominant tradition within the curriculum field, the behavioral systems management industrial model. However, we need to understand that a non-monolithic yet powerful progressive curriculum 'river' confronted this tradition, as we pointed out in an earlier chapter, and it is in that 'river' that Michael Apple swims. Before we turn our attention to the *Prosser Resolution*, that should be perceived as another benchmark within the field of curriculum studies, and since we previously discussed in detail this particular non-monolithic progressive 'river', in order to situate Michael Apple's work and thought—a 'river' in which the works of Bode, Counts, Rugg and others, should be highlighted, we need to stress here that what really gives Tyler power as 'the grande eagle' of the curriculum field is not just that he was capable of incorporating the

---

[317] Op. Cit. p., 389.
[318] Op. Cit., p., 94.
[319] Tyler, R. (1976) (ed) *Perspectives on American Education. Reflections on the Past ...Challenges for the Future*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, INC, p., 104.
[320] Tyler, R. (1987) *Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation. An Oral History Conducted 1985-1987*, by Malca Chall. Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley: The Brancroft Library, University of California, p., 413.

behavioral and testing tradition in his approach, but also the fact that Tyler was able to speak to the *Deweyan* tradition and as well as to the social reconstructionist tradition (that is to a particular non-monolithic counter-hegemonic traditions) without losing the leadership of dominance, and other dominant tendencies. That is why Tyler was so powerful. He really was able to incorporate both dominant and non-dominant traditions. Anticipating an issue that we will deal later on, this incorporation is also one of Michael Apple great contributions to the curriculum field. As he reminds us, hegemonic discourses work by incorporating processes, perspectives and needs from a vast array of social spheres, something that Tyler was able to do.

4.3 The Prosser Resolution

At the same time as the conference on curriculum theory, *Toward Improved Curriculum Theory*[321] was held in 1947, at the University of Chicago, and which we have previously mentioned—in other words, at the same time that curriculum theory was becoming visible, curriculum theorists were losing their power. The theory becomes less important, because after World War II but well before Sputnik, a particular constellation of struggles led to the demise of professional curriculum workers. In fact, curriculum theorists continued to lose their power. The involvement of The United States of America in World War II, which broke out on December 8, 1941, created profound alterations in the ways of thinking and, consequently, in the ways of acting in education, in general and in the curriculum, in particular. According to Kliebard, "although United States soil was not the site of active battle nor was the country the victim of massive bombardment, American schools would play their part on the home front"[322]. Not surprisingly, profound alterations at the level of certain courses were beginning to emerge, such as in physics and mathematics, which were taught differently with an emphasis "upon aeromechanics, aeronautics, auto mechanics, gunnery, and other aspects of modern life"[323].

---

[321] Herrick, V. & Tyler, R. (1950) (comp) & (ed) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. *Papers Presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Despite having been held in 1947, the conference texts would only be published in 1950.

[322] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 205.

[323] Smith, B. (1942) The war and educational program. *Curriculum Journal*, 13, pp., 113-116, p., 115.

Notwithstanding that social efficiency was prominent in the leadership of the curriculum field (the social and political context led social reconstructionism towards a non-patriotic approach, and child-centered education was severely criticized for its lack of social commitment), the fact is that "with the country fighting a war for democracy, the reordering of the curriculum to accommodate the mass of students was equated with the democratization of the curriculum"[324]. Thus, the social efficiency doctrine gradually began to lose the status of dominant curricular logic. The dominant form of curriculum right before World War II and, throughout World War II, until the post-war period, was called life adjustment education. Fundamentally, it was Bobbitt and Charters, with a smiling face. It involved task analysis (in other words, the humanization of Bobbitt's and Charters's doctrines). According to Cremin, "of all the postwar refinements of progressive education (…) none achieved the publicity or indeed the notoriety, of the so-called life-adjustment movement"[325]. This movement defended the use of the curriculum to focus on social problems, just as Bobbitt and Charters had done, but now the problems involved, brushing your teeth, dialing a telephone, and health, but in a very retrogressive and conservative way. In the words of Kliebard,

> As the trend toward the mixing of curriculum ideas persisted, however, social efficiency became increasingly more difficult to recognize in its once pure form. In a period when curriculum concoctions were being brewed on every side, it was life adjustment education that emerged in the mid-1040's as the sauce that captured the attention of the professional education community[326].

However, and although life adjustment was the dominant logic, the fact is that "social efficiency was its most potent ingredient"[327]. The transformation was far-reaching and in 1940 the Special Committee on the Secondary School Report, "What

---

[324] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 206.
[325] Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 333.
[326] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 206.
[327] Op. Cit., p., 206.

High Schools Ought to Teach" appeared, preparing for the American Youth Commission. The referred committee included, among others, Prosser (who, as previously mentioned, established himself as the pivotal figure in the Smith Hughes Act), and Tyler who, in the meantime, was amassing a notable reputation in the curriculum field, thanks to his participation in The Eight Years Study.

The document[328], despite recognizing that the creation of the Board for Vocational Education in 1917 represented a major advance for the confirmation of the social function of the school, criticized vocational education, given its tendency to cultivate highly specialized skills, and, since many of these skills "fail to meet the needs of pupils because [they are] quite as specialized as were the traditional pre-professional jobs"[329]. Vocational education was, furthermore, intimately linked to segregation, given that the majority of students were left with a curriculum that was inappropriate "in preparing young people to take their place in adult society".[330] The criticism even stretched to the so-called "conventional subjects"[331], although, the great preoccupation of said document, centered on the need for preparing the student for his/her future involvement in society.

After the emergence of the *What High Schools Ought to Teach* report, two other major reports emerged: *Education for ALL American Youth*[332], in 1944, and *General Education in a Free Society*[333], in 1945, commonly known as *Redbook*. The former, besides highlighting the need to develop skills compatible with the needs of society, furthermore stressed that (already noted in the *What High Schools Ought to Teach* report) the "academic subject matter surviving in the high school curriculum, mainly serves the needs of the chosen few"[334]. The latter argued that the function of education "should be to prepare an individual to become an expert both in some particular

---

[328] American Youth Commission (1940) *What the High Schools ought to Teach: The Report of a Special Committee on the Secondary School Curriculum*. Washington: American Council on Education.
[329] Op. Cit., p., 10.
[330] Op. Cit., p., 10.
[331] Op. Cit., p., 27.
[332] Educational Policies Commission (1944) *Education for ALL American Youth*. Washington: Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, American Association of School Administrators.
[333] Committee on the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society (1945) *General Education in a Free Society*. Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
[334] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 210.

vocation or art and in the general art of the free man and the citizen"[335]; therefore, there should be curricular differentiation as a natural and typical consequence of the profound and complex social transformations that were taking place in society from the end of the nineteenth century. However, the *Redbook* included an analysis of the *Education for ALL American Youth* report, vis-à-vis the question of the academic subject matter, which, according to Kliebard, "represent[ed] a cautious, almost timid, reemergence of the traditional humanist ideal"[336]. The document was to receive both approval and criticism. Bagley[337], who argued for social efficiency as the supreme educational ideal[338] understood it as a report which opposed Eliot's selective doctrine; however, Bobbitt, stressed that it was absolutely correct to put emphasis on the formation of specialists. Although he approved of the distinction the report was able to establish between general education and special education, Bobbitt argued once more for the predominance of science in the resolution of curricular dilemmas, claiming they overturned medieval misconceptions[339].

In 1945, the United States Office of Education produced another study called *Vocational Education in the Years Ahead*, involving more than 150 people, again arguing that the high school did not adequately prepare the students for their future lives[340]. There was wide consensus that "the youth of the nation were not being adequately served by the high school"[341]. It was in this context that Prosser, in response to the challenges made by the committee, elaborated what would become known as the Prosser Resolution[342]:

---

[335] Committee on the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society (1945) *General Education in a Free Society*. Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p., 54.

[336] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 211.

[337] Bagley, W. (1945) The Harvard University Report on General Education in a Free Society, *School and Society*, 62, pp., 69-70.

[338] Bagley, W. (1905) *The Educative Process*. New York: MacMillan.

[339] Bobbitt, J. (1946) Harvard Reaffirms the Academic Tradition. *The School Review*, 54 pp., 326-333, p., 332.

[340] United States Office of Education (1945) *Vocational Education in the Years Ahead. A Report of a Committee to Study Postwar Problems in Vocational Education*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

[341] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 212.

[342] United States Office of Education (1951) *Vitalizing Secondary Education. Education for Life Adjustment*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

> It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form, the vocational school of a community will be able better to prepare 20 percent of the youth of secondary school age for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations; and that the high school will continue to prepare another 20 percent for entrance to college. We do not believe that the remaining 60 percent of our youth of secondary school age will receive the life adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens –unless and until the administrators of public education with the assistance of the vocational education leaders formulate a similar program for this group[343].

Thus, the conference members "request[ed] the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education to call at some early date a conference or a series of regional conferences between an equal number of representatives of general vocational education—to consider this problem and to take such initial steps as may be found advisable for its solution"[344]. According to Kliebard, the Prosser Resolution was "the opening salvo in the campaign for what became the life-adjustment education"[345]:

> What was needed was a curriculum attuned to the actual life functions of youth as a preparation for adulthood. Actually, in time, the original percentages that Prosser had enunciated (20 percent college-entrance, 20 percent vocational, 60 percent life adjustment) had become something of an embarrassment since they implied that the curriculum had to be reorganized for only a majority of the school population. Life adjustment education, in the line with its most immediate ancestor, social efficiency education, had to be applied to the total school curriculum[346].

As we were able to verify, life adjustment education was very closely linked to the lack of congruence between social realities and high school education, and despite having been found at the core of the Douglas Commission Report, it "was no longer

---

[343] Op. Cit., p., 29.
[344] Op. Cit., p., 29.
[345] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 212.
[346] Op. Cit., p., 213.

an isolated concern; it had become conventional wisdom in the educational world"[347].
In other words, here is a doctrine which had as its scope the adequacy of the high school to meet increasingly complex social demands. According to Douglas, the concept of life adjustment "stands for an adequate program of secondary education for fairly complete preparation for all the areas of living in which life adjustment must be made, particularly home living, vocational life, civic life, leisure life, and physical and mental health"[348]. This is a movement which, although it later faced much criticism, was able to count on a lot of support from the American society. In 1947, the Life Adjustment Conference was held, with the support of Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, with the intent of crystallizing the great points delineated by the Prosser Resolution[349]. The conference, according to Prosser, was a "golden opportunity to do something that would give to all American youth their education heritage so long denied"[350]. The National Association of Secondary School Principals similarly involved itself in life adjustment education. The association promoted some of the issues that were integral to life adjustment, arguing it could combat alarming drop-out rates, while also dealing with the lack of preparation for life, which, according to Collier, involved "preparation for post-secondary education, preparation for work, doing an effective day's work in school, getting along well with other boys and girls, understanding parents, driving a motor car, using the English language, engaging in recreational activities"[351].

   Life adjustment education would come to count on the support of the Catholic educators who read the Prosser Resolution as a document that was appropriate for the creation of a "vast network of terminal high schools", and who understood life adjustment education as the path to "steady and disastrous lowering of purely academic standards which has made a joke of college education"[352]. Faced by the imprint of segregation, which was permeating all educational reforms, in general, and

---

[347] Op. Cit., p., 220.
[348] Douglas, H. (1949) Education of All Youth for Life Adjustment. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 265, pp., 108-114, p., 114.
[349] Basler, R.(1947) Life Adjustment Education for Youth: Commission to Develop a Program for Universal Secondary Education. *School Life*, 30 (2), pp., 3-6. p., 6.
[350] United Sates Office Education (1948) *Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, p., 20.
[351] Collier, P. (1950) What is Education for Life Adjustment? *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, 34 (169), pp., 122-128, p., 125.
[352] Townsend, A. (1948), Implications Contained in the Life Adjustment Program Concerning the Tools of Learning. *Bulletin of the National Catholic Educational Association*, 45 (1), pp., 363-375, pp., 363-364.

the curricular reforms, in particular, "the rhetoric of life adjustment education was infused with a seemingly genuine concern for the mass of students not being served by contemporary secondary education, and this gave it a humanitarian appeal that reached into a variety of different quarters"[353].

Prosser, despite having been involved in the efforts to implement the Smith Hughes Act, had, however, warned of the dangers surrounding the increasingly discredited vocational education. Prosser argued that "our enthusiasm for vocational schools will lead us to establish them faster than we are able to secure teachers possessing not only academic and technical education but also the practical experience necessary in order to carry on the work successfully"[354]. For Prosser, a democratic society had begun to demand from the schools a curriculum that was very different from that proposed by vocationalism. In an article published with Allen, Prosser argued that "democracy as social organization (…) as a form of society" has two obligations: "first, to hold itself together; second, to make itself better"[355]. Furthermore, Prosser and Allen perceived that there was a *decalage* between the demands of democracy and the capacity for aid that the schools possessed towards meeting such demands. Thus, and by way of example, while in a democracy "citizens are required to meet many and varied demands for which they need help"[356], "the stratification of citizens is vertical and every avenue is open to every man"[357], "occupations are constantly changing in their demands and opportunities"[358], and "the interests and opportunities of citizens are constantly changing as they advance in life"[359], the fact is that "most school systems offer virtually a uniform and standardized training"[360], "education is stratified horizontally in most schools and all advancement is blocked for those who do not follow the regular path of credits and diplomas"[361], "most school systems give no

---

[353] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 217.
[354] Prosser, C. (1912) The Training of the Factory Worker Through Industrial Education. *National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education*, Nº. 15, Proceedings Fifth Annual Meeting, pp.,137-155, p., 153.
[355] Prosser, C. & Allen, C. (1925) *Have We Kept the Faith? America at the Cross-Roads in Education*. New York: The Century Co, p., 39.
[356] Op. Cit., p., 92
[357] Op. Cit., p., 93.
[358] Op. Cit., p., 92.
[359] Op. Cit., p., 92
[360] Op. Cit., p., 92
[361] Op. Cit., p., 93

assistance for meeting these changed demands"[362], and "most school systems ignore the whole problem"[363]. Such a rift was serious, given the fact that education was marked by conflicting creeds: on one hand, "the creed of the reactionary (…) the belief that education is primarily for the benefit of a limited group of superior individuals, that education is primarily preparation for the enjoyment of life, (…) that those unable to meet satisfactory standards in this form of education should be allowed without prejudice to go their way"; and on the other hand, "the creed of the progressive (…) the belief that education is primarily for social well being of this democracy and not for individual benefit, (…) that education is primarily preparation for the duties of life; that is life, (…) that every one can and should be educated so that he can work for himself and for society"[364]. According to Prosser and Allen, "education, not force, must be relied upon to secure stability and progress in a democracy"[365] adding that "this stability and progress depend upon the production of wealth through the conservation of natural and human resources. All education contributes to this conservation"[366]. Therefore, it is relevant not to ignore the class division with which Prosser adorned his social concept, highlighting that "any effective program for the training of the great mass of our factory workers should give careful consideration to certain difficulties growing out of differences in the sex, capacity, employment and economic condition of the wage earner, and in the social and industrial conditions surrounding him"[367].

In essence, life adjustment education "was the desire to transform general education from subjects representing common elements on the cultural heritage, as Harris had advocated since before the turn of the century, to functional areas of living"[368]. However, life adjustment education as a social movement began to experience strong criticism from the various sectors of society. In the words of Cremin:

---

[362] Op. Cit., p., 92.
[363] Op. Cit., p., 92. For a more detailed analysis of the 15 issues which separate the demands of democracy and the role that the school performs socially *vide*, pp., 92-94, of the work hereto referred.
[364] Op. Cit., pp., 154-156.
[365] Op. Cit., p., 19.
[366] Op. Cit., p., 19.
[367] Prosser, C. (1912) The Training of the Factory Worker Through Industrial Education. *National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education*, Nº. 15, Proceedings Fifth Annual Meeting, pp.,137-155, p., 137.
[368] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 220.

> The attack on the life adjustment movement was no isolated phenomenon; it came rather as part of a much larger crisis in American education that had been brewing at least since the early 1940's. There were, to begin, the prosaic problems of buildings, budgets, and enrollments created by the war. Few schools had been built since 1941; teachers had deserted the profession in droves; inflation was rampant; and the first of a flood of 'war babies' began to enter the elementary grades as early as 1946. Then too, there were the multifarious difficulties associated with deepening public concern over communist expansionism at home and abroad. And finally, though perhaps, less visibly, there were the voracious demands of an expanding industrial economy for trained and intelligent manpower[369].

According to Kliebard, "some of the attacks on the state of schooling in America at mid-century were concentrated on Satan and alleged political radicalism in the public schools"[370], in other words, "it was a frontal attack on the intellectual respectability of what passed for public education in America"[371]. Similarly, Cremin shared this perspective stressing that the social conditions of the time, associated to the "growing dissatisfaction among the intelligentsia" provoked the "deepest educational crisis in the nation's history"[372], adding that a "spate of books, articles, pamphlets, radio programs, and television panels burst upon the pedagogical scene, airing every conceivable ailment of the schools, real and imaginary"[373]. Cremin furthermore reiterated that as a consequence of this, the "most vigorous, searching and fundamental attack on progressive education since the beginning of the movement"[374] took place. In this way, and giving form to the conflict that was occurring, two works appeared in 1949, namely, Bell's *Crisis in Education*[375], and Smith's *And Madly Teach*[376]. The first, criticizes pseudo-patriotic complacency, stressing that "the elementary schools had failed to transmit the elemental wisdom of the race; the high schools seemed far more interested in coddling young minds than in strengthening

---

[369] Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 338.
[370] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 221.
[371] Op. Cit., p., 221.
[372] Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 339.
[373] Op. Cit., p., 339.
[374] Op. Cit., p., 339.
[375] Bell, B. (1949) *Crisis in Education: A Challenge to American Complacency*. New York: Whittlesey House.
[376] Smith, M. (1949) *And Madly Teach: A Layman Looks at Public School Education*. Chicago: Henry Regnery.

them; and the colleges, by surrendering to a vague utilitarian mediocrity, had deprived the nation of a humanely educated leadership"[377]. The second, although it reveals some crucial differences with regards to the former (for instance, "whereas Bell sought to strengthen the teaching profession, Smith directed his ultimate indictment against it"[378]), reiterates some of the positions transmitted by Bell, indicating that the schools "had failed miserably in teaching the most elementary skills, and education itself had been systematically divested of its moral and intellectual content"[379].

Education revealed the symptoms of a profound crisis, which in the words of Fuller were due to the "falsity of the basic assumptions from which education professors commonly proceed in their anti-intellectual activities", and to the "deterioration in the contemporary training of students, particularly in the high schools", as well as to the "substitution of 'societally significant' subjects for sound education in the humanities, the arts and the sciences" and to the "confusions and inconsistencies that dominate the thinking (perhaps my use of this word is inexcusably charitable), the utterances, and the activities of many education professors"[380]. Clearly, we are faced by an explicit criticism directed as much at the school system as at the teachers of education. The attack directed at the schools originated, not only from elements directly linked to the schools ("Bell wrote as an experienced educator"[381]), but also from individuals who were not linked to the schools ("Smith wrote as a layman and amateur"[382]).

However, as already identified by Caswell in 1952, in the Steinmetz Memorial Lecture, the presence of an increasing number of concerned citizens who kept abreast of educational developments demystified any notion of a subversive conspiracy theory. In other words, there was a growing number of common people, who "were ready for educational reform of a nonprogressive variety"[383], thus leading to a whole revaluation of the progressive education movement. It is in this context that at the beginning of the second half of the century, a set of works appeared (Lynd's

---

[377] Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 339.
[378] Op. Cit., p., 339.
[379] Op. Cit., p., 339.
[380] Fuller, H. (1951) The Emperor's New Clothes, or Prius Demendat. *The Scientific Monthly*, 72, pp., 32-41, p., 33.
[381] Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 339, footnote, nº 7.
[382] Op. Cit., p., 339, footnote, nº 7.
[383] Caswell, H. (1952-53) The Great Reappraisal of Public Education. *Teachers College Record*, LIV, pp., 12-22.

Quackery in the Public Schools; Bestor's *Educational Wastelands,* Hutchins's *The Conflict in Education*, Woodring's *Let's Talk about our Schools*, and Smith's *The Diminished Mind*) from which Bestor found material as "probably the most persistent and effective of these critics"[384]. Bestor's thinking reveals four crucial aspects; namely: "a theory of education, a conception of the historic role of the public school, a notion of the 'great subversion' of the American education, and a proposal for reform" [385]. According to Bestor, the school does not have the obligation "to meet the common and the specific individual needs of youth"[386], stressing that the major objective of education rests on intellectual training, in other words, the deliberate cultivation of the ability to think. Furthermore, for Bestor, although to think might not be life's major objective, it should be the central purpose of school, adding that the school should not be held responsible for what should be the responsibility of other social institutions (for instance, the family), stressing that many of the underlying notions of life adjustment education are a veiled way of stating that the school must assume responsibilities that the family was not able to meet[387]. According to Bestor, the supporters of life adjustment education ignored the primordial role of the school in the intellectual training of the masses, denouncing the statistical index of 60% mentioned in the Prosser Resolution as an antidemocratic percentage, given the fact that it stemmed from the principle that the majority of people were incapable of being able to benefit from that intellectual training. Bestor argued that the division of the school population, as referred to in the Prosser Resolution, highlighted the power of destiny in determining the social function that a subject would perform, with the privileged places in society occupied by the select few[388].

Life adjustment educators, "in their effort to reach out to a new population of students and to attune the curriculum directly to the many activities that children and youth will need to perform as members of society"[389] not only delegated, to second level, the intellectual development of young people, but also, in some instances,

---

[384] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 222.

[385] Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 344.

[386] Bestor, A. (1952) Life Adjustment Education: A critique. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, 38, pp., 413-441, p., 415.

[387] Op. Cit.

[388] Bestor, A. (1953) Anti-Intellectualism in the Schools. *New Republic*, 128, pp., 11-13.

[389] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 224.

perceived such intellectual development as being confined to a very small number of young people, who wanted to go to college. The reaction against life adjustment education increased and the movement revealed its inability to meet the needs of an increasingly demanding society. Thus, "unable to mount a counterattack in sufficient force to overwhelm the enemy, life adjustment education quickly began to lose credibility first with the intellectual community and ultimately with the general public as well"[390].

However, the greatest blow was still to come. On October 5, 1957, the Soviet Union launched the first earth-orbiting satellite, Sputnik. That was the final straw. For the North American people, the delay in conquering space as opposed to the Russians, was more than a mere preoccupation, it was a humiliation. According to Cremin, "when the Russians launched the first space satellite in the autumn of 1957, a shocked and humbled nation embarked on a bitter orgy of pedagogical soul-searching"[391].

Quite naturally, "the road to prosperity, social reform, and even national security (…) was tied not to adjustment to existing conditions, but to intelligent action"[392]. Moreover, the social efficiency movement, which as has been noted was the most potent influence on life adjustment education, "instead of a reconstruction of the existing curriculum for general education"[393], opted for its substitution. The scapegoat of the North American social crisis, of the inoperability and the inefficiency of the educational system (as opposed to the rigorous system of the Soviet Union) was the soft model of life adjustment education. The criticism was not long to follow, from right wing critics, (who wanted a return to the basics), discipline center academic scientists (who claimed that the knowledge that we teach is not real knowledge), and scientific curriculum makers and cold war warriors (who said that we must prepare scientists and technologists). One of the most notable in the forefront of the criticism was Rickover (Vice Admiral and the father of the atomic submarine) for whom the North American identity was under threat—one of the leitmotivs that had preoccupied education since the end of the nineteenth century. Rickover wrote:

---

[390]Op. Cit., p., 225.

[391] Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 347.

[392] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 226.

[393] Op. Cit., p., 225.

> Our schools are the greatest 'cultural lag' we have today. When I read official publications put out by the men who run our educational system—booklets such as Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth, or Education for All Youth—I have the strange feeling of reading about another world, a world long since departed if it ever existed at all. I sense the kindly spirit, the desire to make every child happy, the earnest determination to give advice on every problem any young person might ever meet in life—and withal so complete a misunderstanding of the needs of young people in today's world that it frightens me. If I speak out against this mistaken concept of what twentieth-century American education must be, I do so out of no desire to find fault with those who misread the demands of the times from anxiety for the future of our children[394].

According to Rickover, Russia represented a major military threat to the United States, which had committed the mistake of underestimating the educational advances in Russia[395]. Rickover's perspective was centered not only on the lack of meaning that life adjustment had conferred to the education of the nation, but also on Dewey's ideas, which had legitimized a soft educational system and even a perversion of the concept of equality that reigned in American schools. Rickover believed everyone was to blame; however, the change and the reforms, which were inevitable, could not be left in the hands of the professional educators:

> The mood of America has changed. Our technological supremacy has been called in question and we know we have to deal with a formidable competitor. Parents are no longer satisfied with life adjustment schools. Parental objectives no longer coincide with those professed by the progressive educationists. I doubt we can again be silenced[396].

Rickover, who was of the opinion that "we have at present no clear-cut educational philosophy with firm objectives; scholastic achievements are too low and there is urgent need for some kind of machinery to set national standards which may serve

---

[394] Rickover, H. (1959) *Education and Freedom*. New York: E. P. Dutton, pp., 23-24.
[395] Op. Cit.
[396] Op. Cit., p., 190

local communities as a yardstick"[397], believed in education as an issue that is related to society as a whole, explaining that the motive which led him to contribute to educational matters rested on the desire to contribute to a better educational system:

> Let me at the outset explain once more why, despite an extremely heavy work schedule, I devote nearly all my leisure time to research, and to writing and speaking on education. The manner in which the question usually is put to me reveals a certain mistrust, even antagonism, as if there must be some ulterior motive behind this kind of after-hours work. Educationists are more blunt; they just tell me to 'mind my own business and go back to building submarines'. I concern myself with education for the same reason other busy men and woman give their time freely to other kinds of civic activities. The motive is simply a desire to contribute to the betterment of our society[398].

Rickover, moreover, added that the Congress could not evade its responsibilities in the reform which was increasingly becoming more urgent for the educational field, especially since "Congress has rightly been called the 'potent and omnipresent teacher'"[399]. The idea of change leaked through all the pores of society. "Civilization has reached the point where the frontier lives in the mind itself. Americans must conquer knowledge as formerly they conquered the wilderness"[400]. According to Rickover, change meant a "massive upgrading of the scholastic standards of our schools" that "will guarantee the future prosperity and freedom of the Republic"[401], through the reorganization of the schooling institutions, as well as through the deductions obtainable from English education, although he maintained that a genuine school system which combines "the ideals of universal education and of scholastic excellence" [402] should be devised:

---

[397] Rickover, H. (1963) *American Education– A National Failure. The problem of our schools and hat we can learn from England*. New York: E. P. Dutton, p., 3.
[398] Op. Cit., p., 3.
[399] Op. Cit., p., 306.
[400] Op. Cit., p., 307.
[401] Rickover, H. (1959) *Education and Freedom*. New York: E. P. Dutton, p., 15.
[402] Op. Cit., p., 31.

> 1 Elimination of 'ability to pay' from public education; retention of 'ability to learn'; separate secondary schools. 2 Highly qualified teachers to whom much freedom is given in their work and whose influence on all aspects of education is great, notably in setting scholastic standards through national examinations. Total absence of nonteaching school principals and administrators. 3 The use of government grants as a means of raising national standards in education, by making acceptance of standards and of inspection to check on standards a condition for awarding grants. 4. National examinations leading to national diplomas designed to permit great variety in selection of test subjects, yet clear-cut indication on the diploma of the type of examination taken and passed. Cooperation of all interested parties in setting up examinations and great care in evaluating them[403].

According to Rickover, with the process of Americanization having been completed, the schools could now concentrate "on bringing the intellectual powers of each child to the highest possible level"[404]. According to Kliebard, "unlike 1917, when the nation saw skilled workers as the key to prosperity and security, the mood was swung to the intellectual, particularly to the scientists, mathematicians and engineers, as the key to world preeminence"[405]. For this to happen, "at different levels of civilization, different degrees of popular education are needed". Rickover further criticized the problematics of school knowledge ("apart from life adjustment fallacy so prevalent among American educationists, our schools seem unable to concentrate on training young minds because of partiality for so-called 'useful' knowledge"[406]), stressing education as a mechanism crucial for the consolidation of democracy understood as a growing force that "never reaches perfection, (…) [or] ever find its objectives"[407]. Moreover, according to Rickover, many of the personalities had made a difference in the North American society or had studied in Europe, or had been in Europe or else had maintained very close relations with individuals and institutions in Europe.

However, the attacks on the educational system were not merely rhetorical. A year after the launch of the Sputnik, more precisely, on September 2, 1958, Congress

---

[403] Rickover, H. (1963) *American Education– A National Failure. The problem of our schools and hat we can learn from England*. New York: E. P. Dutton, p., 308.
[404] Rickover, H. (1959) *Education and Freedom*. New York: E. P. Dutton, p., 31.
[405] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 228.
[406] Rickover, H. (1959) *Education and Freedom*. New York: E. P. Dutton, p., 24.
[407] Op. Cit., p., 24.

approved the very famous piece of federal legislation called The National Defense Education Act, in which Congress stated "that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women"[408], adding that the defense of the nation "depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles". According to Kliebard, the document was fundamentally concerned with curricular revision in mathematics, science and foreign languages "with additional attention given to strengthening guidance services, an outgrowth of the increasing concern about identifying talented students"[409]. Furthermore, Congress (besides warning that "the massive amount of money involved did not fall to professional educators"[410]) "accepted the verdict of the academic critics that educators had foisted a soft intellectually puerile curriculum on American schools"[411].

Certainly, the National Defense Education Act demarcated the end of an era in the curricular field and the beginning of another, in which the control of the curriculum went from its "traditional locus in the professional education community to specialists in the academic disciplines"[412], so that one can clearly identify an effort to "replace the academic subjects as the basic building block of the curriculum"[413] and even "the longstanding emphasis on local efforts at curriculum change was replaced by a pattern of centrally controlled curriculum revision"[414]. In fact, Congress, for the first time, voted to pass massive amounts of money to schools (remember that education is funded at a local level). For the first time, the Congress approved major national funding for curriculum development, not to establish universities, but for curriculum development. There was the necessity of having more people scientifically trained in curriculum development. Thus, scholarships were established at universities[415], and Congress gave huge amounts of money (which were controlled by the National Science Foundation that had been created in 1950) to the universities to develop a standardized curriculum based on the disciplines. The government funded the

---

[408] *National Defense Education Act* (1958) Public Law 85-864, 85th Congress, September, 2.
[409] Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 228.
[410] Op. Cit., p., 228.
[411] Op. Cit., p., 228.
[412] Op. Cit., pp., 228-229.
[413] Op. Cit., p., 229.
[414] Op. Cit., p., 229
[415] One must highlight here that Michael Apple went to a school as a National Defense Education Act Fellow. He was fund by this program.

development of the teacher-proof curriculum, creating economic incentives in the school districts that bought the material (the government would pay 80% of all costs), a strategy that proved cheaper than the textbooks.

As previously noted, this curriculum development disconnected the curriculum from theory. Curriculum theory could do what it wanted, but the major impulse, the discipline of education, no longer had curriculum workers like Rickover in the military field (advocating that we must return to science and technology), right wing critics (saying that we must return to the basics) or people in psychology, like Bruner, who talked about the process of education (teaching the disciplines and teaching them by discovery).

In September 1959, thirty-five scientists, scholars and educators gathered for ten days at Cape Cod, for the Woods Hole Conference, organized by the National Academy of Sciences, to debate how education in science could contribute to the development of primary and secondary schools. In essence, the conference participants, aware that a new era was dawning, had as their central objective analyzing how scientific knowledge should be enforced in the country. The said conference was divided into five work groups, each with an issue to debate: (1) the sequence of a curriculum; (2) the apparatus of teaching; (3) the motivation of learning; (4) the role of intuition in learning and thinking; and (5) the cognitive process in learning. Bruner, besides being Chairman of the Conference's Executive Committee, also participated in one of the work groups—the cognitive process in learning—with Begle, Cole, Friedman, Inhelder, Page, and Steinbach. From each of these study groups would emerge a final finding, which, just as expected, did not reach a consensus on matters as complex and as polemical as these. Notwithstanding the claim of having benefited from the contributions of Cronbach, Page, Zacharias, among others, it is on the basis of these work documents and the many comments by the various participants, that Bruner, in the position of Chairman, elaborated a document that would come to be known as "The Process of Education". Bruner described the spirit of the Woods Hole Conference in the following manner:

Physicists, biologists, mathematics, historians, educators and psychologists came together to consider anew the nature of the learning process, its relevance to education, and points at which current curricular efforts have raised new questions about our conceptions of learning and teaching. What shall be taught, when and how? What kinds of research and inquiry might further the growing effort in the design of curricula? What are the implications of emphasizing the structure of a subject, be it in mathematics or history—emphasizing it in a way that seeks to give a student as quickly as possible a sense of the fundamental ideas of a discipline?[416]

Bruner, for whom "each generation gives new form to the aspirations that shape education in its time"[417], stressed that the main preoccupation of the specialists, in the educational field, continues to be the problematics of knowledge ("What shall we teach and to what end?"[418]). According to Bruner, "there was relatively little work by American psychologists during the first four decades of this century on the manner in which the student could be trained to grasp the underlying structure or significance of complex knowledge"[419]. For Bruner, it was extremely important to understand the meaning of the structure of a subject, not only because "to learn the structure, in short, is to learn how things are related"[420], but also because it acts as an incentive for the students in the process of learning. Furthermore, given the fact that, "the construction of curricula proceeds in a world where changing social, cultural and political conditions continually alter the surroundings and the goals of schools and their students"[421] and since a profound understanding of the structure of a subject permits a comprehensive understanding of the knowledge therein implicated, then "good teaching that emphasizes the structure of a subject is probably even more valuable for the less able student than for the gifted one, for it is the former rather than the latter who is most easily thrown off the track by poor teaching"[422].

In short, Bruner, who argued that any act of learning "over and beyond the pleasure it may give (…) should serve us in the future"[423], stressed that "the curriculum of a

---

[416] Bruner, J. (1960) *The Process of Education. A Searching Discussion of School Education Opening New Paths to Learning and Teaching*. New York: Vintage Books, pp., 2-3.
[417] Op. Cit., p., vii.
[418] Op. Cit., p., vii.
[419] Op. Cit., p., 6.
[420] Op. Cit., p., 7.
[421] Op. Cit., p., 8.
[422] Op. Cit., p., 9.
[423] Op. Cit., p., 17.

subject should be determined by the most fundamental understanding that can be achieved of the underlying principles that give structure to that subject"[424]. Therefore, Bruner added, "teaching specific topics or skills without making clear their context in the broader fundamental structure of a field of knowledge is uneconomical in several deep senses"[425], due to three main reasons: a) it becomes extremely hard for the student to make generalizations; b) there is little reward in terms of intellectual excitement; c) the "knowledge one has acquired without sufficient structure to tie it together is knowledge that is likely to be forgotten"[426].

All of this changes the approach to curriculum. The curriculum is not made. It is purchased. Furthermore, it is cheap, allowing you to do anything you want, because the government is paying for it. However, it is important to stress that in this period (from the late 1940s to around 1957 or 1960) during which the curriculum workers were losing all their power, one person kept his writings intact: Tyler and the people behind behavioral objectives. In fact, the only one inside the curriculum field who was truly powerful was Tyler, because he served as the voice of scientific curriculum-making and rational curriculum-making. He had given birth to the basic principles of curriculum and instruction. The problematics of knowledge, which emerged at this time, poured into the disciplines, these being the ideal site for knowledge construction and maintenance.

The two most important books essential for understanding the curriculum in the United Sates are Tyler's *Basic Principals of Curriculum and Instruction* and Bruner's *Process of Education*, which is not even about curriculum. However, an issue was emerging. Neither Bruner, who struggled for the schooling of the structure of the disciplines, nor Tyler, who argued that knowledge was to be found in the disciplines of knowledge, could answer the following question: What would the structure of the disciplines be?

In an effort to resolve this question, at the beginning of the 1960s, Phenix published *Realms of Meaning*[427] which would become a major reference for thinking about

---

[424] Op. Cit., p., 31.
[425] Op. Cit., p., 31.
[426] Op. Cit., p., 31.
[427] Phenix, P. (1964) *Realms of Meaning. A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

knowledge. Phenix held three degrees from Princeton (in Theology, Philosophy and Physics) although he was largely recognized as a philosopher. At the time, he was a professor at Columbia teaching "Ways of knowing"[428]. Of all the people involved in the discipline-centered education, Phenix was the major theorist. The book *Realms of Meaning*, which greatly influenced the curriculum field, should not be understood as a proposal that reinforces Tyler's ideology. On the one hand, we have Tyler with scientific curriculum making, and on the other hand, we have Phenix with the discipline-centered view, and both came together. Phenix would later become known as the great theorist of the disciplines.

According to Phenix "it is not easy to sustain a sense of the whole. (…) All too commonly the teacher teaches a particular subject or unit within a subject without any reference to its relationships to other components of the curriculum"[429], adding that the students "may study one subject after another with no idea of what a growing fund of knowledge and skill might contribute to an integrated way of life"[430]. As a result, Phenix criticized the fact that both the teachers as much as the students "are prone to take the curriculum as they find it, as a traditional sequence of separate elements, without ever inquiring into the comprehensive pattern within which the constituent parts are located"[431]. However, "since education is the means of perpetuating culture from generation to generation"[432], Phenix argued that "the special office of education is to widen one's view of life, to deepen insight into relationships, and to counteract the provincialism of customary existence—in short, to engender an integrated outlook"[433]. To give substance to such an integrated outlook, a unitary philosophy of the curriculum was necessary, due to a combination of factors, from which Phenix highlighted four: "(1) a comprehensive outlook is necessary for all intelligent decisions about what shall be included and excluded from the course of study; (2) because a person is essentially an organized totality and not just a collection of separate parts, the curriculum ought to have a corresponding organic quality; (3) society, as well as individual persons, depends upon principles of community;

---

[428] Michael Apple attended this course taught by Phenix at Columbia University.
[429] Phenix, P. (1964) *Realms of Meaning. A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, p., 3.
[430] Op. Cit., p., 3.
[431] Op. Cit., p., 3.
[432] Op. Cit., p., 3.
[433] Op. Cit., pp.,3-4.

corporate life, like the life of each individual, requires some overall plan; (4) a comprehensive concept of the structure of learning gives added significance to each of the component segments of the curriculum"[434].

In fact, according to Phenix any consideration of the curriculum directed towards a broad education allows consideration of both the human nature as much as of knowledge, since the notions underlying educational phenomenon include people's actual philosophy and their means of attaining knowledge. The human being has the power to experience meanings, which implies that all human experience is determined by a pattern of meanings. Thus, education, for Phenix, is one of the processes of constructing these meanings. Hence, Phenix believed that "the modern curriculum should be designed with particular attention"[435] to the sources of what is "meaningless in contemporary life"; in other words, the curriculum should be planned so as to oppose skepticism, depersonalization, fragmentation, and rapid transformations. Consequently, education was considered as the constant search for meaning, and the objective of a certain philosophy of the curriculum consisted in the analysis of the nature of that same framework of meanings, in other words, the mapping of the realms of meaning. According to Phenix there are six crucial patterns of meaning:

> (1) *Symbolics*, comprises ordinary language, mathematics, and various types of nondiscursive symbolic forms, such as gestures, rituals, rhythmic patterns, and the like. (…) These symbolic systems in one respect constitute the most fundamental of all realms of meaning in that they must be employed to express the meanings in each of other realms. (2). *Empirics*, includes the sciences of the physical world of living things, and of man. These sciences provide factual descriptions, generalizations, and theoretical formulations and explanations, which are based upon observation and experimentation in the world of matter, life, mind, and society. (3). *Esthetics* contains the various arts, such as music, the visual arts, the arts of the movement, and literature. Meanings in this realm are concerned with the contemplative perception of particular significant things as unique objectifications of ideated subjectivities. (4). *Synnoetics* embraces what Michael Polanyi calls "personal knowledge", and Martin Buber the "I-thou" relation. The novel term "synnoetics" which was devised because no existing concept appeared adequate to the type of understanding intended, derives from the Greek *synnoetics*, meaning "meditative thought", and this turn is compounded of *syn*, meaning "with", or

---

[434] Op. Cit., p., 4.
[435] Op. Cit., pp.,5.

"together", and *noesis*, meaning "cognition". Thus synnoetics signifies "relation insight", or "direct awareness". It is analogous in the sphere of knowing to sympathy in the sphere of feeling. This personal or relational knowledge is concrete, direct, and existential. It may apply to other persons, to oneself, or even to things. (5). *Ethics*, includes moral meanings that express obligation rather than fact, perceptual form, or awareness of relation. In contrast to the sciences, which are concerned with abstract cognitive understanding, to the arts, which express idealized esthetic perceptions, and to personal knowledge, morality has to do with personal conduct that is based on free, responsible, deliberate decision. (6). *Synoptics*, refers to meanings that are comprehensively integrative. It includes history, religion and philosophy. These disciplines combine empirical, esthetic and synnoetic meanings into coherent wholes. (…) Historical interpretation comprises an artful re-creation of the past (…); Religion is concerned with ultimate meanings, that is, with meanings from any realm whatsoever (…) Philosophy provides analytic clarification, evaluation, and synthetic coordination of all the other realms through a reflective conceptual interpretation of all possible kinds of meaning in their distinctiveness and in their interrelationships[436].

In essence, Bruner established the problematics (teach the disciplines, but teach them by discovery) that put together the discipline of knowledge with progressive education. But this was rhetorical. In other words, even if you agree with Bruner, you still need to know what the structure of the disciplines is. We need the skeleton of the disciplines. According to Bruner, the disciplines are like a skeleton, and we add more flesh to the bones as more improvements are made. This logic that Bruner proposed raises two questions: What is the structure of the disciplines? and another that was not asked by Bruner, What is the pedagogic structure of the discipline? For example, what is the structure of physics or the structure of history, and which theories underlie these? If we just follow these question, this might not be the wisest approach to teaching. There must be a logic of teaching (pedagogy) that is not limited to following the disciplines' own internal logic. So, Phenix, answered these two questions by claiming that teaching a discipline of knowledge may require that one change the structure a little bit to make sense to the students.

However, this leads to another serious problem: the knowledge explosion. There are hundreds of disciplines: Which does one teach? Does one teach physics, and chemistry, and biology? Does one teach sociology, psychology, anthropology, and

---

[436] Op. Cit., pp., 6-7.

social geography? How does one determine the realms of meaning since there are ways of knowing, and the disciplines are grouped around ways of knowing. So, for instance, empirics involves biology, physics, and chemistry. It makes no difference which one is taught. What is important is the way of knowing and not necessarily just the facts.

Nevertheless, Phenix, with his *Realms of Meaning* solved one problem. Taking the structure of the disciplines into consideration, there was also the need for something to operationalize Phenix's logic, which would come about with the National Education Defense Act. Through this act, the federal government guaranteed 80% of the expenditure needed for the adoption of that which would come to be known as Teacher-proof material, a strategy that would come to enjoy a massive following on the part of schools, considering that it was much more economically viable than textbooks. Through the National Defense Educational Act, *Realms of Meaning* colonized the field of the classroom. Undoubtedly, it was the National Defense Educational Act which prevented Phenix's ways of knowing from straying outside of the boundaries of a theoretical framework. Phenix's *Realms of Meaning* was the primary curriculum book for a long period of time.

The period from 1947, right after World War II, until 1970 was the most transformative period in the history of curriculum after the era of Bobbitt and Charters. It is important to notice the ideological umbrella that was formed. It included scientific curriculum making, of which Tyler was the major spokesperson, along with the behavioral objectives curriculum, a return to testing, discipline-centered curriculum movements (a return to the disciplines of knowledge), right wing and reactionary sentiments to remove any progressive elements, and cold-war warriors like Rickover. All of this was not simple rhetoric. For example, the National Defense Education Act, which grew out of these ideologies was enacted at the federal level. The major movement for prepackaged material started here and people in curriculum—except for Tyler—had no power. In essence, the National Defense Education Act operationalized *Realms of Meaning* can only be understood as part of a long history of events. We must bear in mind that there were separate tendencies in curriculum research and that they all came together in particular ways. After World War II, there was a rebirth of scientific curriculum making with Tyler, and he was the

only one who could have done that, given his prestige in the sciences, the prestige due to his association with the University of Chicago, and also as a tester, and he was someone who worked for progressive education. So he was the eagle of the field. For all of these reasons, the Sputnik surprise and consequent panic was only the tip of the iceberg. Sputnik was not important in itself. It was part of a combination of events that helped bring about reforms in the curricular field.

Nevertheless, in this period of transformation, another name comes to the foreground: Schwab. Schwab, a biologist, already had power because he was connected with the biological sciences curriculum bureau project. He was also connected with the discipline-centered movement and in Chicago he had appointments in both sciences and education. Actually, he became powerful in part because he was seen to be different from the other curriculum people given his identity as a real scientist. Therefore, Schwab was regarded as one who was allowed some margin to maneuver in order to put his ideas to the test. For Schwab the major issue was not really knowledge. In fact, he took for granted what knowledge is. According to him knowledge is in the disciplines. His first work was on the discipline-centered curriculum, then he started to think more generally about the curriculum. And it was in reaction to some curriculum theorists that he started writing the work *The Practical* because he was so angry with the 'nonsense' that he found in curriculum theory. According to Schwab, the existing curriculum theorization led to three main observations:

> (1) The field of curriculum is moribund. It is unable, by its present methods and principles, to contribute significantly to the advancement of education. It requires new principles, which will generate a new view of the character and a variety of its problems. (2) The curriculum field has reached this unhappy state by inveterate, unexamined, and mistaken reliance on theory. On the one hand, its has adopted theories (from outside the field of education) concerning ethics, knowledge, political and social structure, learning, mind and personality, and has used these borrowed theories theoretically, i.e., as principles from which to "deduce" right aims and procedures for schools and classrooms. On the other hand, it has attempted construction of educational theories, particularly theories of curriculum and instruction. (3) There will be a renascence of the field of curriculum, a renewed capacity to contribute to the quality of American education, only if curriculum energies are in large part diverted from theoretic pursuits (such as the pursuit of global principles and comprehensive patterns, the

search for stable consequences and invariant elements, the construction of taxonomies of supposedly fixed or recurrent kinds) to three other models of operation. These other modes, which differ radically from the theoretic, I shall call, following the tradition, the *practical*, the *quasi-practical*, and the *eclectic*[437].

According to Schwab "the radical difference of the practical from the theoretic mode"[438] was "visible in the fact that it differs from the theoretic not in one aspect but in many: it differs from the theoretic in method. Its problems originate from a different source. Its subject matter is of a distinctly different character. Its outcome is of a different kind"[439]. If the result of the theoretical is knowledge (the general or universal concepts that are taken to be true, guaranteed and motivators of trust), the result of the practical is the decision, the selection and the orientation towards a possible action. The decisions are never eternally true, valid and credible, being applicable only to the specific case in which they were thought of. Moreover, if the object of theoretics is always taken to be universal and pervasive, the object of the practical is always considered as concrete and particular, and is treated as indefinitely susceptible to circumstance and consequently open to unexpected transformation.

With regards to the quasi-practical, Schwab believed that it implies two major issues: on the one hand, it allows for the making of intelligent and happy choices in the instruction of a heterogenous group. Thus, the practical orientation for an increasingly heterogeneous group entails passage through the quasi-practical. The appropriate methods are "the methods of the practical per se but with heavy special emphasis on the cherishing of diversity and the honoring of delegate powers"[440]. Thus the quasi-practical is a method of deliberation. This deliberation is a process that is difficult and time consuming, as well as unsatisfying, since one cannot guarantee it will be complete, even though one has to ensure that quasi-practical decisions are not confused with the directives, be it by those who elaborate them or by those who translate them into practice, into action. On the other hand, the quasi-practical is

---

[437] Schwab, J. (1978) The {Practical: A Language for Curriculum. In I. Westbury and N. Wilkof (eds) *Joseph Schwab, Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education, Selected Essays*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp., 287-320, p., 287.
[438] Op. Cit., p., 288.
[439] Op. Cit., p., 288.
[440] Op. Cit., p., 294.

furthermore related with the organic complicity between the different school organisms, the educational community and the educational system.

The eclectic mode of operation recommended for the curriculum field "recognizes the usefulness of theory of curriculum decision, takes account of certain weaknesses of theory as ground for decision, and provides some degree of repair of these weakness"[441]. Whether utilized eclectically or not, Schwab continues, "theory has two major uses in decision making". First, "theories are used as bodies of knowledge; second, "the terms and distinctions which a theory uses for theoretical purposes can be brought to bear practically"[442]. However, Schwab argued that the theory had weak points (the content and the objects of theories are inevitably incomplete), but that such fragilities could be resolved by the eclectic mode of operation in two ways: "first, eclectic operations bring into clear view the particular truncation of subject characteristic of a given theory and bring to light the partiality of its view; Second, eclectic operations permit the serial utilization or even the conjoint utilization of two or more theories on practical problems"[443].

In fact, an open rupture with what was occurring in the field of the curriculum was not noted in Schwab. If there is in him a clear problematization of the theoretical fallacy into which the curriculum field had arrived (which leads him to call attention to the necessity of greater acuity in relation to the practical field as a space for deliberation), the fact is that in none of the points of his thesis (practical, quasi-practical or eclectic) does Schwab problematize the disciplines as sources of knowledge. In other words, he begins with the principle that knowledge is poured into the subjects, criticizing the excess of theoricity, an excess which in fact led people outside the field of education to theorize about it. Thus, with some difficulty, one may place Schwab among those who opposed the positivism and behaviorism that determined the rhythms of the majority of classrooms throughout the country. Although Tyler was obviously the dominant spokesperson of the curriculum field there was also a reactionary anti-positivist, anti-science and anti-behaviorist movement. These counter-hegemonic movements, which were viscerally opposed to the dominance of the discipline-centered material, the dominance of behavioral

---

[441] Op. Cit., p., 295.
[442] Op. Cit., p., 296
[443] Op. Cit., p., 297.

objectives, the dominance of tests and the dominance of Tyler, emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It is to them that we turn our attention to next

4.4 The Geneseo Conference

Nothwithstanding the fact that the behaviorist movements and those centered on subjects succeeded in constructing and controlling a certain curricular hegemony, especially in the 1950s and at the beginning of the 1960s, the truth is that the period dominated by the 'Tyler Rationale' bore testimony to significant resistance. However as we noted before, Tyler himself rejected the idea of a Tyler rationale. In fact, other people converted his approach to centralize authority in the process of curriculum development. Thus, although Tyler did not exclude the participations of teachers in the intricate process of curriculum planning, other scholars recommended that teachers take a more central role in curriculum development. Thus, and by way of example, the works of Sharp[444], Spears[445], Corey[446], Hopkins[447], Pritzkau[448], Miel[449], among others, should be regarded as an integral part of a specific opposition which was already emerging in the curricular field against the fundamentalism of the exclusively rationalistic principles which determined the curriculum. Although it is impossible to regard these oppositional positions as a movement in the true sense of the word (similarly, there is no record of there having ever existed any intention of it becoming a movement), the fact is that they assumed clearly divergent/distant positions with respect to the *status* quo, in clear opposition to the reductive notion of the curriculum as the mere expression of previously established objectives and emphasizing the function of the teacher as primarily and always the stimulation of the

---

[444] Sharp, G. (1951) *Curriculum Development as the Re-education of the Teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.
[445] Spears, H. (1951) *The Teacher and Curriculum Planning*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
[446] Corey, S. (1953) *Action Research to Improve School Practices*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
[447] Hopkins, L (1954) *The Emerging Self in School and Home*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
[448] Pritzkau, P. (1959) *Dynamics of Curriculum Improvement*. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
[449] Miel, A. (1964) *Changing Curriculum. A Social Process*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, INC.

learner. In other words, the teacher was "the key figure in the process of guiding children in their experiences"[450].

Spears, for whom "the term curriculum has been somewhat elusive for the teacher"[451], presented sixty-two curricular premises/postulates dealing with curriculum meanings, foundations, study and administering and focusing on "the teacher, for it is well recognized that no school program is going to succeed unless teachers have had an active part in its planning"[452]. The teacher is perceived as having direct interference in the phenomenological and psychological field relationship of the child and adult[453], decisively contributing to the construction of the required behaviours so that the individual person may live well in society. That which was happening in the classroom was not exactly a reflection of what had been predetermined. On the contrary, and in the words of Pritzkau, each classroom should be seen as a laboratory or center for handling ideas. In this way, "each classroom would become an 'idea' room for the purpose of promoting quality with respect to the learning experiences of children"[454]. Such a notion emerged as one of the sixty-two postulates proposed by Spears, for whom "the true value of knowledge studied and skills required is the subsequent use of them by the learner in life situations"[455]. This perspective implied that that which Sharp called the reorientation of the teacher's work would require a re-education of the teacher, in which "a process that must be worked through"[456]. The feeling that change was needed became very obvious in the face of a curriculum formed around, among other aspects, textbooks and the disciplines[457], and seemingly insensitive to the increasingly obvious transformations in society. It is in this context that the action research conducted by Corey[458] emerged and ought to be understood. It adressed the following three major aspects: (1) the effect that the new technologies provoked in the daily life of people; (2) the role of the

---

[450] Sharp, G. (1951) *Curriculum Development as the Re-education of the Teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press, p., 2.

[451] Spears, H. (1951) *The Teacher and Curriculum Planning*. New York: Prentice-Hall, p., 5.

[452] Op. Cit., p., 3.

[453] Hopkins, L (1954) *The Emerging Self in School and Home*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

[454] Pritzkau, P. (1959) *Dynamics of Curriculum Improvement*. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, pp., 31-32.

[455] Spears, H. (1951) *The Teacher and Curriculum Planning*. New York: Prentice-Hall, p., 27.

[456] Sharp, G. (1951) *Curriculum Development as the Re-education of the Teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press, p., 4.

[457] With this regard *Vide*: Miel, A. (1964) *Changing Curriculum. A Social Process*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, INC, pp., 1-14.

[458] Corey, S. (1953) *Action Research to Improve School Practices*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

school in a culture which was in the midst of profound change; (3) the need for teachers and other educational agents to continuously evaluate their performance in order to improve their practices. Corey demonstrated deep confidence in the necessity of change, a change that would bring prominence to those who found themselves concerned with daily school practices. Individually or in groups they must act creatively and constructively identifying the practices that need to be transformed according to the needs and demands of the contemporanean life. Moreover they should not hesitate in trying out these 'new' practices, and carefully gather data to assess their worth[459].

Thus, it is possible to note that during the golden period of the discipline-centered movement, there were already signs of a profound coming to terms with the curriculum as a socially dynamic field: "although the school reflects its society, it still has the responsibility to raise that society to better things"[460]. In essence, the necessity for teachers to play a more active role in curriculum development was beginning to gain strength, thereby increasing the opposition to the highly structured division of knowledge played out in the curriculum. Despite the fact that some of the discipline-centered theorists were not concerned about social efficiency, their resistance to this conceptual fundamentalism, which was centered on a rationality based in social efficiency and effectiveness, stretched to other sectors of society. Their struggle led to the emergence of many critical voices, as is demonstrated by the work of Packard[461], Whyte[462], Mills[463] and even Ellison[464], who in a notable novel denounced the miserable conditions for many African-Americans. Thus, the analysis of this problematic issue should be contextualized in a wider social picture.

It is important to understand that the profound social crisis in the U.S. during the 1960s had its roots in conditions at the end of the nineteenth century[465]. In the words of Urban and Wagoner, "the 1960s appeared to be a time of genuine fracturing in

---

[459] Op. Cit.
[460] Spears, H. (1951) *The Teacher and Curriculum Planning*. New York: Prentice-Hall, p., 38
[461] Packard, V. (1957) *The Hidden Persuaders*. New York: David McKay.
[462] Whyte, W. (1956) *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
[463] Mills, C. (1951) *White Collar. New York*: Oxford University Press.
[464] Ellison, R. (1952) *Invisible Man*. New York: Random House.
[465] Although, as is defended by Goldman, the events of the 1960s and the 1970s were in fact an extension of certain events which occurred in the second half of the 1940s, the fact is that certain social problems like segregation infuse North American history. *Vide*: Goldman, E. (1956) *The Crucial Decade : America, 1945-1955*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

relations between America's young people and their elders"[466]. The 1960s "were a period of cultural and political change unique in American history"[467], a period "when a major social revolution occurred"[468]. The post-war emerging society, unable to provide reasonable life perspectives to the less endowed classes, denied them the present and mortgaged their future. However members of these disadvantaged classes were not willing to accept these conditions, especially since they had helped defend the nation's interests in World War II under the banners of democracy and social justice. Curiously, while World War II managed to create a war economy "that convincingly ended the decade-long Great depression"[469], the fact is that "America's schools emerged from the war showing more continuity than change"[470], thus cementing traditional patterns. In fact, according to Spring, "black leaders were concerned that the ending of the depression had not resulted in any significant increase in employment opportunities for the black people"[471].

In a society still marked by segregationist patterns, by an oppressive educational system supported by traditional values, growing opposition to the Vietnam War and the preeminent danger of a nuclear conflict, social disenchantment was increasingly explosive, naturally taking on a practical expression. It is in a context such as this that one must understand, for instance the students' revolt, which helped bring to the forefront America's true conditions and endangered its foreign image,[472]. The country was collapsing into what years before Myrdal[473] had called the American dilemma, expressing a profound paradox between the democratic ideals that the nation defended and the stigma of the racism that ran through the country.

Notwithstanding the late recognition afforded to the 14th Amendment in 1954 by the "historic and controversial Supreme Court decision Brown *v*. Board of Education

---

[466] Urban, W. & Wagoner, J. (2000) *American Education. A History*. Boston: McGrawHill, p., 313.
[467] Button, H. & Provenzo, Jr., E. (1983) *History of Education and Culture inAmerica*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, INC, p., 316.
[468] Ignas, E. & Corsini, R. (1979) *Alternative Educational Systems*. Illinois : F.E. Peacock Publishers, INC, p., 111.
[469] Urban, W. & Wagoner, J. (2000) *American Education. A History*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, p., 279.
[470] Op. Cit., p., 283.
[471] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, p., 142.
[472] President's Committee on Civil Rights (1947). *To Secure these Rights. The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
[473] Myrdal, G. (1944) *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

of Topeka, which declared segregated public education unconstitutional"[474], the American nation would be confronted by the problem of segregation in the Rosa Parks case on December 1, 1955, and the later Montgomery Boycott which was to stretch through the following year, but also in the controversy surrounding Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1957. Seventy years after Homer Plessy, "had been arrested for refusing to ride in the 'colored' coach of a train as required by Louisiana Law"[475], which led the Supreme Court to deliberate on the notion "separate but equal", recognized by the case Plessy *vs.* Fergusson[476], and after Oliver Brown's daughter "was denied the right to attend a white elementary school within five blocks from her home"[477] leading the Supreme Court, pressured by the collapse of "America's foreign image during Cold War" [478] tensions and on the basis of important social studies by Clark[479] and Myrdal[480] to determine the lack of constitutionality of racial segregation, opposition to the politics of integration persisted (and words can hurt as much or even more than actions[481]). There are many reports of resistance against the abolition of segregation. In a report submitted to The United States Commission on Civil Rights, alarming rates of segregation,within public institutions are denounced. The document clearly underlines the fact that seven years after the Supreme Court decision the segregation problem had hardly changed in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia[482]. The well-known *Coleman Report*, which involved 4000 schools and about 60,000 students, detected a clear gap between the results achieved by Whites and Blacks and highlighted the fact that such results tend to improve when Black youths are enrolled in the same schools as White students born in families that guarantee

---

[474] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, pp.,146-147.

[475] Spring, J. (1986) *The American School, 1942-1985*. New York: Longman, p., 297; Hessong, R. & Weeks, Th. (1991) *Introduction to the Foundations of Education*. New York: MacMillan Press, p., 195; Strike, K. (1982) *Educational Policy and the Just Society*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, p., 191; Urban, W. & Wagoner, J. (2000) *American Education. A History*. Boston: McGrawHill, p., 298.

[476] Blaustein, A. & Ferguson Jr., C. (1957) *Desegregation and the Law: The Meaning and Effect of the School Segregation Cases*. New York: Rutgers University Press.

[477] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, p., 147.

[478] Op. Cit., p., 141.

[479] Clarck, K. (1952) The effects of prejudice and discrimination. In Helen Witmer & Ruth Kotinsky (eds.) *Personality in the Making: The Fact-finding Report of the Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

[480] Myrdal, G. (1944) *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

[481] With regards to the reactions of the White community to the politics of racial integration in Texas, *vide*: Bullock, H. (1970) *A History of Negro Education in the South from 1619 to the Present*. New York: Pareger.

[482] The United States Commission on Civil Rights (1962) *Civil Rights U.S.A.; Public Schools Southern States*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

them great educational support[483]. The report further stated equality of opportunity as an American dream and universal education as the social tool to accomplished the said 'ream'. However as the report highlights for poor families education is a handicap race and too many millions are ill motivated at home to learn at school[484]. Another important document that reveals persistent segregation persistence appears in Jencks *et al.*, for whom the inequality of opportunities in schools was notorious and which assumed many forms: (1) "resources are unequally distributed"; (2) "some people have more chance than others to attend school" and (3) "some people are denied acess to the curriculums of their choice"[485]. They add that "America spends far more money educating some children than others. These variations are largely explained by where a student happens to live and how much schooling he gets"[486].

In the end, and just as Spring describes it, even for states that adhered to the stipulations of the Supreme Court, "in many areas there was considerable resistence and attemps to evade compliance"[487]. However, and according to Ethridge "the Brown decision was not really about schools. It was about first class citizens" for it established a basis for decisions about human rights such as "the right to equal educational opportunity; the right to sit at a public lunch counter and be served; the right to ride in the front as well as the back of a bus; the right to be treated at a hospital; the right to swim and play in a public park; the right to sleep in a public inn; the right to vote and have that vote counted; the right to equality in employment practices; the right to run for and to hold public office" [488]. In fact, and as is stressed by Button and Provenzo, we "believe that changed schooling has changed society in the last quarter century or more: we know that those changes have been slight. The answer to George Count's question, 'Dare the school build a new social order?' has been that it was dared, but that it was not done. […] The effort must and will

[483] Coleman, J. *et al.* (1966) *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington: Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

[484] The problem of poverty in America (1964) *The Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

[485] Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972) *Inequality. A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books, p., 37.

[486] Op. Cit., p., 29.

[487] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, p., 157.

[488] Ethridge, S. (1974) Brown *vs.* Topeka: Twenty Years Later. Two Perspectives. Perspective 2. In D. Della-Dora & J. House (eds.) *Education for an Open Society*. Washington. ASCD, pp 1-27, p., 27.

continue, but having reflected upon the last quarter century of effort, we admit our disappointments"[489].

The 1960s saw worrying levels of social instability, perpetrated as much by the Civil Rights movements, as by the students' and teachers' revolts. The Civil Rights movement that witnessed the arrival of Martin Luther King, "from the Montgomery Boycott as a national figure in the civil rights movements"[490], began to gain significant visibility. It can be traced from the executive order N 8802 issued by Roosevelt, in 1941, which protected social equity in industries related to military forces. The 1960s was a decade which bore witness to the production of legislation in the defense of human rights. Thus, if the Civil Rights Act of 1960 "isn't worth the paper it's written on"[491], that of 1957 "is historically important because it was the first civil rights legislation since 1885 [and] provided for the establishment of a Civil Rights Division to the Department of Justice"[492]. After arduous conquests undertaken in the American South, in which there was ample opportunity to the reveal to the world its peaceful dimension largely inspired by the philosophy of Gandhi, the Civil Rights Movement, in a daring political strategy (and this is one of the various complex contexts which should be considered *seriously* when accounting for Martin Luther King's 1968 assassination), headed for northern parts of the country. For the national and the international memory, among various happenings, two assumed significant relevance: one occurred in Birmingham where "commercial areas [...] still had segregated drinking fountains and public facilities"; the other occurred on August 28, 1963, when 200,000 people, led by Martin Luther King Jr., marched on Washington, protesting the oppression of the Black population. Here King shook the conscience of the *least attentive* members of American society with the famous "I have a Dream" speech. In November 1962, Kennedy was assassinated, and Johnson, a "master of congressional strategy"[493], was able to introduce on January 31, 1964, civil rights legislation to the congressional agenda. On June 19, Congress approved what

---

[489] Button, W. & Provenzo, Jr, E. (1983) *History of Education and Culture in America*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, INC, p., 315.
[490] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, p., 166.
[491] Marshall, T. *Apude* Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, p., 170.
[492] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, p., 169.
[493] Op. Cit., p., 175.

would be known as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, "one of the most significant pieces of social legislation in the United States in the twentieth century"[494].

From among the individuals who greatly distinguished themselves in the crusade against segregation, one of the most notable is Paul Robeson, a figure whose philosophy, in conjunction with that of Ghandi, greatly influenced Martin Luther King. Despite having been a well-known singer, actor, law school graduate and athlete, it was in the struggle against racism and poverty that Robeson became not only a point of reference for the whole world, but also a force against McCarthyism. A polyglot, and a charismatic, powerful and eloquent figure, he would be remembered for his performances in *Othello* in 1930 and 1943 (earning him the Donaldson Award for outstanding lead performance). However, his public admiration for what was the then U.S.S.R, his connections with the then Eastern bloc of Europe, his explicit support for the liberation of African countries, and the fact that he increasingly represented a voice against segregation and exploitation in the United States of America, led to special surveillance from the FBI[495]. His voice was directed at the more privileged, at the working class and, above all, at the American racial system: "I am a Negro. The house I live in is in Harlem—this city within a city, the Negro metropolis of America"[496]. For Robeson, the character of the nation should be determined not by the rich classes but by the common people, believing that change was possible. He proclaimed, "freedom can be ours here and now […] we have the power to achieve that goal".[497]

The Civil Rights crusade should not be dissociated from the student activist movement. In fact, "one catalyst of the student protests of the 1960s was the southern Civil Rights Movement, and can be dated from February 1, 1960, when four black students sat down at a segregated coffee counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, and asked to be served"[498]. This movement associated itself with the Black cause—"white

---

[494] Op. Cit., p., 176.
[495] In fact, the Robeson's case is today a public document, made available by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of about 3000 pages. The alleged "FBI HQ File 100-12304 Section: 1, Paul Robeson, Sr.", despite having many censured paragraphs, offers unshakeable evidence of the far-reaching effects of MacCarthysm in the United States of America.
[496] Robeson, P. (1971) *Here I Stand*. Boston: Beacon Press, p., 1.
[497] Op. Cit., p., 74.
[498] Button, H. & Provenzo, Jr., E. (1983) *History of Education and Culture in America*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, INC, p., 322.

and black students joined together to promote the movement"[499]—finding within the human rights movement the impetus for its own demands. Among other things, the student activists fought against oppressive, traditional and segregationistic educational systems which were closed within themselves, against a society wasting possible solutions, and against the drama of the Vietnam war. The facts were being revealed and in September of 1964 at the University of California, Berkely, an explosive dispute began over a seemingly minor incident"[500]. Upon seeing their right to free political expression denied, the students activists movement—in which Sávio[501] is highlighted –denounced the university as a machine of repression which handled the students "as raw material"[502]. The indignation and the struggles of these young people cannot be dissociated from the larger North American social picture. In the words of de Urban and Wagoner, "the objection to the Vietnam War by young people and the increasing numbers of adults who followed their lead became so widespread that by 1968 President Johnson chose not to run for reelection". For Chomsky[503], the student movement was very important and must be understood as part of a wider social movement which included the Women's movement and other social movements which disturbed a 200-year-old lie and which tried to destroy the historically established social apparatus.

This complex social picture greatly tarnished the foreign image of the country and, in this context, the media, in general, and television, in particular played a crucial role. Television showed the nation (and the world) shocking images of the Vietnam War[504]. Its power transformed "the local into the national"[505] and this, in turn, into the international, turning these social conflicts into a "battle of public images"[506]. While "the precise impact of television on education (...) cannot be determined"[507], it is clear it contributed to the formation of a radical critical mass. The United States could not,

---

[499] Op. Cit., p., 322.

[500] Rippa, A. (1988) *Education in a Free Society. An American History*. New York: Longman, p., 331.

[501] Sávio was a common young boy and a philosophy scholar. *Vide* Button, H. & Provenzo, Jr., E. (1983) *History of Education and Culture in America*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, INC, p., 322; Rippa, A. (1988) *Education in a Free Society. An American History*. New York: Longman, p., 331.

[502] Rippa, A. (1988) *Education in a Free Society. An American History*. New York: Longman, p., 331.

[503] Chomsky, N. (1992) *Chronicles of Dissent: Interviews with David Barsamian- Noam Chomsky*. Monroe: Common Courage Press.

[504] Manchester, W. (1974) *The Glory and the Dream: A Narrative History of America, 1932-1972*. Boston: Little Brown.

[505] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman, p., 161.

[506] Op. Cit., p., 161.

[507] Button, H. & Provenzo, Jr., E. (1983) *History of Education and Culture in America*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, INC, p., 320.

in any way, ignore the critical thinking and sentiment that the international community was beginning to formulate about the internal situation of the country. However, the various administrations, including Kennedy's, revealed dubious stances as far human rights were concerned. In fact, the devotion of the various administrations to apartheid was largely concerned with the conquest of the Cold War against the then CCCP[508]. Thus, both education, in general, and curriculum, in particular, would not be immune from this social turmoil. That a radical, critical, and socially ethical curriculum approach was so necessary to the redevelopment of a more vigorous and vital curriculum field can be found in a report published in 1966 by Goodlad, Von Stoephasius and Klein. In this report they denounced the lack of balance in the curriculum as one of the greatest challenges facing educators. They admitted that the lack of balance in the curriculum was due to three problems: (1) compared with Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and Biology, the Social Sciences, Humanities, Health and Physical Education were of a relatively inferior level in terms of both intensity and performance; (2) "many subjects that could be part of the curriculum [were] not included. Many social sciences, for example, are left out or included only peripherally; and (3) the school curriculum [had a piecemeal quality as a result of] adopting several programs that [were] prepared independently of each other" [509]. As one can see, this report of problems within education, in general, and curriculum, in particular, could not be taken as example of what was happening in the larger society. This is arguably one of the reasons why Huebner, MacDonald, Michael Apple, and others felt it was so urgent to bring the 'outside in'. Social dissatisfaction was spreading and the expressive critical voices were multiplying throughout various social sectors, particularly through music of Bob Dylan, Joan Baez and Pete Seeger. Thhe belief in the necessity for an 'open education' was beginning to crystallize, a belief which broke free of the obsolete schemes of a traditional education and which implied, among other things a strong interaction between the students, the curricular activities centered on the students, the flexibility of spaces, the scope and the relevance of the topics dealt with, most importantly, a radical break from the existing *status quo*, in which everything was to be conducted in perfect order to reach a previously determined objective. At the forefront of this movement in favor of an

---

[508] Spring, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine*. New York: Longman.
[509] Goodlad, J., Von Stoephasius, R., Klein, M. (1966) *The Changing School Curriculum*. A Report From the Fund for the Advancement of Education. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, pp., 105-106.

open education, were the voices of many educators, writers and journalists including Dennison, Friedenberg, Goodman, Henry, Holt, Illich, Kohl, Kozol, Leonard, McLuhan, Roszack and Silberman who associated themselves with the struggle against the alienation of the youth perpetuated by an irrelevant pedagogy. This group, labeled the Romantic critics, the Radical critics or even the Radical Reform movement (already dealt with in this chapter), was opposed to what was understood as the depersonalization of the youth. A new direction in the schools was mandatory as was the need to prevent the schools from compartmentalizing knowledge, from continuing to be an important force of alienation, and from being insensitive to differences between young people[510]. They advocated that teachers should place the emphasis of their work on the individual interests of the children and be able to mold the previously determined curriculum according to these interests[511], resorting to various strategies to captivate the interest of the students[512].

Silberman[513], although on a smaller scale, performed a study on schools that was similar to the one Rice had done at the end of the nineteenth century, having noted the existence of a mindless pedagogy distanced from the interests of children. In the words of Van Til, "even young people from privileged backgrounds protest unreality in the curriculum"[514]. The antipathy directed towards the school was thus evident and Goodman denounced the compulsory trap created in the educational system, defending, along the lines of Dewey's thinking, the classroom as a community, a notion which was similarly upheld by McLuhan and Leornard, for whom "the time is coming, if it is nor already here, when children can learn far faster in the outside world than within school-house walls"[515]. The idea that "ideally, the polis itself is the educational environment"[516]was thus established, especially since "the monkish and academic methods which were civilizing for wild sheperds create robots in a period of

---

[510] Friedenberg, E. (1962) *The Vanishing Adolescent*. New York: Dell Publishing.
[511] Holt, J. (1969) How Children Fail. In R. Gross & B. Gross (eds.) *Radical School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster, pp., 59-77.
[512] Holt, J. (1970) *What do I do on Monday?* New York: Dutton.
[513] Silberman, C. (1970) *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education*. New York: Random House.
[514] Van Til, W. (1970) Editorial. Curriculum for the 1970's. *Phi Delta Kappan*, LI (7), pp., 345 and 356-357, p., 345.
[515] McLuhan, M. & Leonard, G. (1969) Learning in the Global Village. In R. Gross & B. Gross (eds.) *Radical School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster, pp., 106-115, p., 106.
[516] Goodman, P. (1969) No Processing Whatever. In R. Gross & B. Gross (eds.) *Radical School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster, pp., 98-106, p., 103.

high technology"[517]. The criticism against a compulsory educational system is still apparent in Illich[518], who believed education should be the responsibility of society and not schools since schools are controlled by the government and serve the interests of a minority, and in Roszack[519], who appealed to the necessity of eliminating the restrictions and the conformism of the schooling institutions. Likewise Dennison, called attention to an alternative program—'first street school'—for children of the less privileged classes and from families of reduced economic income who had been labeled as having learning and behavioral difficulties[520]. This model was influenced, above all by Neil's ideas, who argued for schooling that was "radical and experimental, [without] grades, [without] graded report cards, [without] competitive examinations"[521].

The school was seen as an institution, which made men and women more vulnerable[522], and Henry contended that "the function of education has never been to free the mind and the spirit of man, but to bind them"[523]. It inhibits creativity while stimulating competitiveness and hatred between children. Henry, for whom "what we see in the kindergarten and the early years of school is a pathetic surrender of babies"[524], referred to a hidden curriculum with a profound power for the (de)construction of culture transmitted in the schools[525].

The existence of a hidden curriculum in schools is also dealt with by Kohl, for whom the most important things in schools did not occur during the lessons. He observed that "Everything important in the classroom is happening between lessons"[526]. Kohl added that the "teacher must make mistakes"[527]; in other words, "when a teacher claims he knows exactly what will happen in his class, exactly how

---

[517] Op. Cit., p., 100.
[518] Illich, I. (1971) *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row.
[519] Roszack, Th. (1969) *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition*. New York: Anchor Books.
[520] Dennison, G. (1969) *The Lives of Children*. New York: Random House.
[521] Dennison. G. (1969) The First Street School. In R. Gross & B. Gross (eds.) *Radical School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster, pp.,227-246, p., 228. Parentheses mine.
[522] Henry, J. (1965) *Culture against Men*. New York: Vintage Books.
[523] Henry, J. (1969) In Suburban Classrooms. In R. Gross & B. Gross (eds.) *Radical School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster, pp., 77-92, p., 77.
[524] Op. Cit., p., 81.
[525] Henry, J. (1965) *Culture Against Men*. New York: Vintage Books.
[526] Kohl, H. (1988) *36 children*. New York: Plume, p., 26.
[527] Op. Cit., p., 24.

the children will behave and function, he is either lying or brutal"[528]. According to Kohl, "most textbooks […] protect the pure image of the teacher"[529]; the textbooks are for teachers, not for students. Actually, textbooks, homework, plans and so forth, are in Kohl's mind, strategies that teachers use (and that the system gave) to protect themselves.

Without wanting to minimize the work of the previously mentioned authors, the fact is that Kozol[530] played a pivotal role in furthering the movement, not only for the brilliant work which won him the National Book Award in 1968, but also by the controversy surrounding his dismissal as teacher for the simple reason that he chose to analyze a poem by Hughes *Ballad of the Landlord* in one of his lessons. For Kozol, students were victims of a profoundly oppressive and bureaucratic educational machine, and of the system's punitive pedagogy. He exposed the racial and social differentiation between teachers and students as the motive for the divide that existed between them. Kozol attempted furthermore to attract the attention of the public to the problem of minority rights and to the distancing of society with regards to the needs of children.

One is quite right to observe that this movement takes up some of the ideas and the practices proposed by Dewey as well as some of the theoretical and practical educational concepts offered by Horton in the 1930s. The romantic critics movement brought a breath of fresh air to society, in general and to the educational field, in particular, by exposing a combination of radical positions and solutions (on the basis of practices lived by the authors themselves). However, there is also a certain continuity with the projects and practices produced by Dewey and Horton[531], a legacy which would later be taken up by a group of intellectuals, among them Michael Apple. However, the romantic critics movement was not a homogenous group. For some, the free schools were something pure, impartial, neutral, and impermeable to the political and social contexts. For others, the free school strategy was beyond the problems of pedagogy; in other words, it was to be understood as a political act that

---

[528] Op. Cit., p., 24.
[529] Op. Cit., p., 24.
[530] Kozol, J. (1967) *Death at an Early Age: The Destruction of the Hearts and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
[531] By way of mere example, it is noteworthy that proponents of the *Highlander Folk* project included Herbert and Judith Kohl.

would help to transform society, since schools, in themselves, did not possess the means for such radical revolution. In a study undertaken by Graubard[532], he emphasizes that the majority of the free schools had no explicit political orientation and that the major issue of these radical schools should be the manner with which they relate to the wider social and political contexts with the purpose of participating in the implementation of a radical social alternative. One of the voices which was raised against this apolitization attempt was Kozol's[533], for whom, while certain free schools spoke of their love for children with no economic needs, many children went hungry and lived in miserable conditions. Fundamentally, for Kozol, the social meaning of school could not be looked for in the school itself, but in society. As we were able to verify, one should not, as Michael Apple puts it, understand "that period of the middle 1960s without reading Herb Kohl, Jonathan Kozol, Jules Henry, Paul Godman— people known as the romantic critics"[534]. Furthermore, it was in this era that people in the United States began to have more explicit contact with the work of authors like Marcuse, Habermas, and Ellul. The latter, influenced by the thinking of Marx, denounced the influence of technology on the economy, highlighting the fact that "techniques appear as the motive force and the foundation of the economy"[535]; while also warning[536] that the human dimension must not be eradicated from the technical apparatus. Criticism of the technological apparatus is similarly expressed by Harrington, for whom, the culture of poverty was beginning to sharpen under the pressures of modern technology[537]. An effective freedom would only be possible for the Black community if there were a massive attack directed at the culture of poverty, and in this, education was not an innocent bystander. Years later, Bowles and Gintis[538] would come to argue that the capitalist system is not a simple technical process, it is also a social process. In essence, science, despite tracing limits, does not eliminate desires[539].

---

[532] Graubard, A. (1972) *Free the Children*. New York: Random House.
[533] Kozol, J. (1972) *Free schools.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
[534] Apple, Michael (2000) Michael W. Apple: Revisiting and Revising a Curriculum Tradition. In J. Marshall, J. Sears & W. Schubert (eds.) *Turning Points in Curriculum. A Contemporary American Memoir*. Ohio: Prentice Hall, pp., 81-86.
[535] Ellul, J. (1964) *The Technological Society*. New York. Vintage Books, p., 149.
[536] Op. Cit.
[537] Harrington, M. (1962) *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York: Macmillan.
[538] Bowles, S. & Gintis, S. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America. Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books, INC Publishers.
[539] Krutch, J. (1970) A Humanistic Approach. *Phi Delta Kappan*, LI (7), pp., 376-378.

As we discussed in the first part of this chapter, it was in the profound struggle against the *status quo* that Jackson published his work entitled *Life in Classrooms*, and which leads us to disagree not only with the line of thought formulated by Kohlberg (for whom Jackson "invented the term 'hidden' or 'unstudied' curriculum to refer to 90 percent of what goes on in classrooms" [540]), but also with Eggleston's perspective (for whom "the 'hidden' curriculum was identified by Jackson" [541]).

Discussion of the hidden curriculum emerged not only in the works of the romantic critics, but also in some of the research by Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman, and Smyth, Jr [542], Huebner[543], Macdonald[544] and Shane[545]. The social instability expressed in the revolts taken up by the civil rights movement and by the students, and in the powerful criticism of the various sectors of North American society led certain defenders of the disciplinary doctrine to reconsider some of their stances. Phenix and Schwab, great theorists of knowledge based in the subjects, significantly altered their positions in response to the student movement of the 1960s. Phenix saw that a curricular approach fundamentally supported on the subject could lead to curricular fragmentation that would become insensitive to certain social issues[546]. Despite holding curricular

---

[540] Kohlberg, L. (1970) The Moral Atmosphere of the School. In N. Overly (ed.) *The Unstudied Curriculum*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 104-127, p., 104.

[541] Eggleston, J. (1977) *The Sociology of School Curriculum.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, p., 15.

[542] Bellack, A., Kliebard, H., Hyman, R., Smyth, Jr., F. (1966) *The Language of the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University. For these historical curriculum scholars, the rules of the language game of teaching confirm the existence of common elements that underlie much of the teaching game. According to them, pupils and teachers follow a set of implicit rules with few deviations.

[543] Huebner, D. (1966) Curriculum Language and Classroom Meanings. In J. MacDonald (ed.) *Language and Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 8-26, p., 26. Huebner, another mythical curriculum figure stressed that the "present curricular language is much too limited to come to grips with the problems, or rather the mysteries, of language and meaning of the classroom".

[544] Macdonald, J. (1966) The Person in the Curriculum. In H. Robisnon (ed) *Precedents and Promise in the Curriculum Field*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, pp., 38-52, p., 41. This towering curriculum figure argued that "the curriculum is contrived in the sense that it is neither the immediate real world of student, nor is it the real world of the social creators of the meanings, symbols, and skills which make up the substance of curriculum".

[545] Shane, H. (1968) The Curriculum in Confrontation with Tomorrow. In R. Beck, P. Meadows, H. Shane & J. Saylor (eds.) *Curriculum Imperative: Surviving of the Self.* Department of secondary education: University of Nebraska, pp., 33-46, p., 39. In a speech delivered at the J. Galen Saylor Conference, he envisaged education as a phenomenon in collision with the future and warns, not only that "we have moved from yesterday to tomorrow virtually bypassing today", but also that, in the decade of the 1970s, profound transformations were expected in the role of the school "as an agency for selecting children for social and economic advancement".

[546] Phenix, Ph. (1969) The moral imperative in contemporary education. *Perspectives on Education*, Vol. II, p., 13.

notions similar to those of Tyler[547], after considering the issues of the student movement, Schwab noted that "our students are man and woman without a country"[548]. He added, "our students are almost entirely deprived of proper curricular occasions, especially sufficiently early occasions, for discovery, essay, and exercise of their competences with respect to form and structure, coherence and cogency, evidence and argument, recovery and formulation of meaning"[549]. The notion of change was gaining ground, as expressed by Fantini and Weinstein, for whom "the big mistake most schools have made is in showing reluctance to meet the child in his home territory"[550]. In fact, and according to Crary, education has to become more appropriate for the disadvantaged and "the educator's commitment is to produce thinking, well-informed, healthy, happy democratic American citizens"[551]. According to Metcalf and Hunt, "the kind of educational relevance that would help and require young people to examine their most basic assumptions about the kind of world that exists, and how they proposed to change the world from what it is into something preferable"[552]is what was needed.

In the midst of all this instability and complex difficulties, and despite the 1960s having enriched the curricular field[553], it would only be in the 1970s that the field

---

[547] Schwab, J. (1970) *The Practical: A Language for Curriculum*. Center for the Study of Instruction. Washington: National Education Association. In a footnote on page 38. Schwab says that "it will be clear from these remarks that the conception of curricular method proposed [in the book] is immanent in the Tyler rationale. This rationale calls for a diversity of talents and insists on the practical and eclectic treatment of a variety of factors. Its effectiveness in practice is vitiated by two factors. First, its focus on 'objectives', with their great ambiguity and equivocation, provides too little of the concrete matter required for deliberation and leads only to delusive consensus. Second, those who use it are not trained for the deliberative procedures it requires".

[548] Schwab, J. (1969) *College Curriculum and Student Protest*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, p., 41.

[549] Op. Cit., p., 40.

[550] Fantini, M. & Weinstein, G. (1969) *Toward a Contact Curriculum*. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'irth, p., 6.

[551] Crary, R. (1969) *Humanizing the School. Curriculum Development and Theory*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, p., 5

[552] Metcalf, L. & Hunt, M. (1970) Relevance and Curriculum. *Phi Delta Kappan*, Volume LI (7) pp., 358-361, p., 359.

[553] Beyond some of the events already highlighted, it is noteworthy that it is in this decade that the following contributions emerged: Brameld, Th. (1961) *Education for an Emerging Age*. New York: Harper & Row; Passow, A. (1962) *Curriculum Crosswords*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia Univeristy; Maccia, G. (1962) *An Educational Theory Model: General Systems Theory*. Occasional paper. Center for the Construction of a Theory in Education; Maccia, E. (1063) *An Educational Theory Model: Information Theory*. Occasional paper. Center for the Construction of a Theory in Education; Beauchamp, G. (1964) *The Curriculum of Elementary School*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, INC; Crosby, M. (1964) *Curriculum Development of Elementary Schools in a Changing Society*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company; Oliver, A. (1963) *Curriulum Improvement. A Guide to Problems, Principles and Procedures*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company; Inlow, G. (1966) *The Emergent in Curriculum*. New

would make a significant change. Although for some like Reafferty, it was a mistake to continue to foster the right to equal opportunity from among the "mishmash known as 'social sciences'[554], for others, there was real need for curricular reform, not only due to the rapid transformations in society, but above all due to the fact that "the content taught is most classrooms is not relevant to the lives of the learners"[555]. A profound transformation was essential, that is to say, there were no need for more of the same but precisely for more of the different[556], which is aware that schooling "is not a unitary process from the beginning to end"[557]. It is this notion of transformation with regards to schools, in general, and the curriculum, that instigated the following statement in the 1971 ASCD Yearbooks *Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling*[558] calling for "the abandonment of the apolitical analyses of the past"[559] and an "attempt to explain more effectively the forces at work in schools"[560]. "The bureaucratic model along with its behavioristic and technological refinements", according to Kliebard[561], "threatens to destroy, in the name of efficiency, the satisfaction that one may find in the intellectual activity". It was still in that year that Michael Apple published *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict*[562], already dealt with at the beginning of the previous chapter. A theory of and investigation in the curriculum field was therefore important to provide answers for certain questions such as: "how can we conceptualize the process of instruction? [and] what actually goes on during an

---

York: John Wiley & Sons INC; Neagley, R., & Evans, N. (1967) *Handbook for Effective Curriculum Development*. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall.

[554] Rafferty, M. (1970) *Classroom Countdown. Education at the Crossroads*. New York: Hawthorn Books, INC, p., 16.

[555] Burns, R. & Brooks, G. (1970) The Need for Curriculum Reform. In R. Burns & G. Brooks (eds.) *Currilum Design in a Changing Society*. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, pp., 3-18.

[556] Frymier, J. & Hawn, H. (1970) *Curriculum Improvement for Better Schools*. Ohio: Charles Jones Publishing Company.

[557] Dreeben, R. (1970) Schooling and Authority: Comments on the Unstudied Curriculum. In N. Overly (ed.) *The Unstudied Curriculum*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 85-103, p., 86.

[558] Haubrich, V. (ed.) *Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling*. Washington. ASCD. However, it is important to stress that the conference of 1969 and of 1970 of the ASCD had already caused some controversy. At the former, "in Chicago experienced confrontation tactics by militant white and black proponents of black concerns"; in the latter "in San Francisco saw the emergence of a radical caucus that met at conferences until its demise a few years later". With this regard, *vide*: Til, W. (1986) ASCD and social forces. In W.Van Til (ed.) *ASCD in retrospect*. Alexandria: ASCD, pp., 43-51, p., 49.

[559] Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E. (1975) (eds.) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, p., 16.

[560] Op. Cit., p., 16.

[561] Kliebard, H. (1971) Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory. In V. Haubrich (ed.) *Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling*. Washington. ASCD, pp., 74-93, p., 91.

[562] Apple, Michael (1971) The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 35.

instructional sequence?"[563]. Although it is not an easy task, an attempt at constructing a specific curricular theory was made, one that would describe the complicity between the school, society and culture, thus attempting to initiate (or rather, continue) the arduous process of social transformation. In fact, it is in this context that we find the contributions of, among others, Goodlad and Klein[564], Purpel and Belanger[565], Ford[566], Greene[567], Bellack[568], Vernon Haubrich and Michael Apple[569], the conference of Rochester[570] and the problematic attempt at the systematization of the field proposed by Pinar, as already discussed at length in the previous chapter.

However, from among the highly varied attempts at transformation and from the search for new approaches for the curricular field which took place in the 1970s, we should highlight the publication of two books which, in our opinion, would come to serve as benchmarks for the field: the ASCDs' *Schools in Search of Meaning*[571] and Bowles and Gintis' *Schooling in Capitalist America*[572]. In the latter, which took seven years to write, the authors carry on with some of the ideas of the romantic critics. They argued that the free school movement would transform itself "into a powerful progressive force"[573]. They rejected any notion that schools are independent of society [...] which clearly places schools in their social and economic context"[574] . They stressed that "U.S. education is not monolithic"; in other words, "schools do different things to different children"[575]. In addition to reinforcing that the genesis of social repression and inequality is clearly found in the structure and functioning of the capitalist economy, Bowles and Gintis, stressed that "the educational system serves— through the correspondence of its social relations with those of economic life—to

---

[563] Macdonald, J. (1971) The Nature of Instruction: Needed Theory and Research. In R. Leeper (ed) *Curricular Decision Concerns in a Revolutionary Era*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 105-107, p., 107.

[564] Gooddlad, J. & Kein, M. and Associates (1970) *Behind Classroom Doors*. Ohio: Charles A. Jones.

[565] Purpel, D., & Belanger, M. (1972) (eds.) *Curriculum and Cultural Revolution: A Book of Essays and Readings*. Berkeley: McCutchan.

[566] Ford, N. (1973) *Black Studies: Threat or Change*. New York: Kennikat Press.

[567] Greene, M. (1973) *Teacher as a Stranger*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, INC.

[568] Bellack, A. (1973) What Knowledge is of Most Worth? In R. Hyman (ed.) *Approaches in Curriculum*. New Jersy: Prentice-Hall, INC, pp., 101-120.

[569] Haubrich, Vernon & Apple, Michael (1975) *Schooling and the Rights of Children*. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

[570] Pinar, W. (1974) (ed.) *Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution and Curriculum Theory. Proceedings of the Rochester Conference*. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

[571] Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E. (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD.

[572] Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976) *Schools in Capitalist America. Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books, INC Publishers.

[573] Op. Cit., p., 251.

[574] Op. Cit., p., 251. Parenteses mine.

[575] Op. Cit., p., 42.

reproduce economic inequality and to distort personal development"[576], a position which as we will discuss in the next chapter was later contested by Michael Apple[577].

The first, *Schools in Search of Meaning*[578], forewarned of something about to happen, and what would later emerge in 1976 in Geneseo. Although, a lack of equilibrium can be found between the introductory text and the contributions made by the texts of the authors, it is obvious that all "were educators in search of meaning [conscious that] the meaning of school in America societry is the other side of the coin"[579]. Conscious that the history of North American schooling was immersed in the midst of profound criticism, and having as point of departure not only some of the works which were being published in the field, *The Coleman Report*, Jenks's *Inequality*, Goodlad's *Behind Classroom Doors*, among others, but also three fundamental issues: "(1) that the schools no longer appear to mean what most of us hoped they would mean in America society; (2) that the development of relevant personal meanings in schools is a precarious and doubtful endeavor; and (3) that the search for meaning in our professional lives and activity should be a function of all educators"[580], Huebner, Zaret, MacDonald, Mann and Michael Apple proceeded to analyze the field, conscious that "most of the curriculum talk is confused about modes of valuing and motives for talking"[581] and that "the moral and political modes must be emphasized"[582], although the meaning of the school "cannot be totally reduced to political terms"[583]. For them, the school should be seen as a liberating force[584], and teaching should be a commitment to helping others to develop their possibilities, which could only be achieved if the children were not deprived of certain meanings, of their memories, life experiences and desires[585]. According to Zaret, the "schools are a set of meanings, but only those meanings that preserve the *status quo*, perpetuating

---

[576] Op. Cit., p., 48

[577] *Vide* Apple, Michael (1990) *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Also, Apple, Michael (1995) *Education and Power*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

[578] Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E. (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD.

[579] Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E (1975) Introduction. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 1-5, p., 1.

[580] Op. Cit., pp., 1-2.

[581] Op. Cit., p., 4

[582] Op. Cit., p., 4.

[583] Op. Cit., p., 5.,

[584] Zaret, E. (1975) Women/Schooling/Society. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 38-50, pp., 48-50. A concept which, according to the author herself, is based on the thought of Paulo Freire.

[585] Huebner, D. (1975) The Recreative and the Established. In Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E. (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 27-37.

realities of the social order as perceived, structured, and defended by the dominant group"[586]. From among these meanings, she added, there is a notable inbalance between woman and man. This notion is also reiterated by Mann, for whom the interest of the dominant class in the schools is verifiable in the "control of ideology, control of knowledge and control of training"[587]. He further noted that educators suffer from the myth of ideology reform, an ideology which transmits the fallacy that it is possible to cause profound social change in the structure of class without transforming that same structure. According to Mann, education was marked by contradictions: (1) "the fundamental problems in schools are best explained and acted upon in terms of an analysis of contradictions within schools; (2) the contradictions within schools are manifestations of the contradictions in society in general; (3) and the larger society constitutes the conditions for change within the schools"[588]. Such contradictions are also remarked upon by MacDonald as "(a) work, (b) power and (c) language"[589]. He claimed such contradictions originate from the attempts to find an answer to the following question: "In whose interest is the activity of the school?"[590]. This problematic issue of both power and language is also dealt with by Michael Apple, who links it to the ethical dimension which is intrinsic to the educational process. For Michael Apple, labels such as "slow learner, discipline problem, poor reader"[591] are produced in the daily school practices. These labels, which ultimately should be interpreted as "rhetorical devices"[592], are not neutral, but instead express specific class-oriented judgments of worth and stigmatize the students that are labeled. According to Michael Apple, the proof that such labeling is not neutral act but has a profound moral and political vein is that "these labels are massively applied to the children of the poor and ethnic minorities much more so than the children of the more economically advantaged and politically powerful"[593]. In essence, there is an appeal to a critical conscience that would denounce, be it the commonsense categories

---

[586] Zaret, E. (1975) Women/Schooling/Society. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 38-50, p., 38.
[587] Mann, J. (1975) On Contradictions in Schools. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 95-115, p.,97.
[588] Op. Cit., p., 96.
[589] MacDonald, J. (1975) The Quality of Everyday Life in School. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 78-94, p., 88.
[590] Op. Cit., p., 88.
[591] Apple, Michael (1975) Commonsense Categories and Curriculum Thought. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 116-148., p., 129.
[592] Op. Cit., p., 130.
[593] Op. Cit., p., 131.

that cross over into and determine the daily practices, or the fact that "the curriculum field has been much too accepting of forms of thought that do not do justice to the complexity of inquiry and thus the field has not really changed its basic perspective for decades"[594]. The conservative notion of schools is also referred to by Burton, who in a textual style, already seen in Greene[595], discussed the problematic of sexuality in schools.

The dice had been thrown and, on October 7 and 8, 1977 at the State University College of Arts and Science in Geneseo, a Conference entitled *Curriculum Theorizing since 1947: Rhetoric or Progress?*[596], which would be published a year later in *Curriculum Inquiry*[597], organized by Rosário & Demarte, was held. As the actual title suggests, three decades after the mythical and legendary conference of Herrick and Tyler, held at the University of Chicago in October 1947, one we have already referred to, it was necessary to analyze the progress—be it stagnation or retrogression—in the field of curricular theorization. Tyler, after telling the story "both 'inside' and 'outside'"[598] of the field and sketching a brief historical outline of the field from Thorndike and Judd to Dewey, Bobbitt, Charters, and Bode up to the 1947 Conference—traces some of the questions that were included in the objectives of the above mentioned conference, such as "Who should be educated?"; "[What is] the nature of knowledge and knowing; of values and valuing; of interests and actions?"; "Are education objectives necessary to guide teaching?"[599]. He noted that the solutions "were far beyond the possibility of attainment at that time"[600], stressing

---

[594] Op. Cit., p., 121.
[595] Greene, M. (1971) The Arts in a Global Village. In R. Leeper (ed.) *Curricular Concerns in a Revolutionary Era*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 264-271, p., 270.
[596] Rosario, J. & Demarte, P. (1977) Curriculum Theorizing Since 1947: Rhetoric or Progress? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4).
[597] In fact, the *Curriculum Inquiry* started as a journal by a different name: *Curriculum Theory Network*. A lot of people in the curriculum field, especially critics, believe that there was no place for serious curriculum theory. After the 1947 Conference there seemed to be a gap in a field. People felt that there was no place to publish serious theoretical work. So an informal network was formed and the journal was originally mimiographed. Later, it was taken over by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and changed its name to *Curriculuim Inquiry*. Schwab and a lot of people from the left were affiliated with the journal from the beginning.
[598] Tyler, R. (1977) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory: The Inside Story. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 251-256, p., 254.
[599] For the seven aspects ennumerated by Tyler, *vide*: Tyler, R. (1977) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory: The Inside Story. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 251-256, p., 255.
[600] Tyler, R. (1977) Toward Improved Curriculum Theory: The Inside Story. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 251-256, p., 255.

that "the conference turned out to be little more than a concert—albeit a good one—in bugle playing", and that it lacked a wider, encompassing theory. In his own words:

> Today we continue to build curricula without comprehensive theory. To shift the metaphor, we are carpenters, not architects. Can we not begin to build a sound architectural theory, one that is periodically re-examined, continually tested, and able to deal intelligently and comprehensively with changes in society and in knowledge?[601]

Resuming this preoccupation, Kliebard, by means of a clear, careful and analytical approach to the issues related to the development of a curriculum theory[602], highlighted the necessity of determining both the territory which would be covered by the curricular theory and the type of theory that he regarded as adequate to do so, as well as something he called "a 'for instance'". In other words, he thought we should try to see, if in all of those years "anything has emerged that in the light of previous considerations could stand as an example of a curriculum theory"[603]. It is in this context that Kliebard, resorting to Nagel's line of thought, noted four features of theory: "(1) refers to what [Nagel] calls 'positive sciences'; (2) depends to a large extent on empirical verification for acceptability; (3) attempts to identify the factors or variables which constitute the major determinants of the phenomena that are investigated; (4) attempts to clarify what may be initially vague concepts, and thereby unpacks the nature of the problems under consideration" [604], emphasizing the latter as much more adequate for the description of the curricular field. "Since the central questions of curriculum are normative ones, in the sense that they involve choices among competing value options"[605], adds Kliebard, "the question of empirical verification comes into play only in a peripheral sense"[606], that is to say, "what is

---

[601] Op. Cit., p., 256.
[602] Diamonti, M. (1977) Yes, We Have No Curriculum Theory: Response to Herbert Kliebard. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 269-276.
[603] Kliebard, H. (1977) Curriculum Theory: Give Me a for Instance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 257-276, p., 260.
[604] Nagel *Apud* Kliebard, H. (1977) Curriculum Theory: Give me a for Instance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 257-282, pp., 262-263.
[605] Kliebard, H. (1977) Curriculum Theory: Give me a for Instance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 257-276, p., 263.
[606] Op. Cit., p., 263.

critically important is conceptual clarification"[607]. In fact, this perspective, had been already proposed by Dewey. In Kliebard's words, "the central core of Dewey's curriculum theory is neither an empirically verifiable generalization nor an experimental finding, but a metaphor"[608] and it is through the lens of this "metaphor that [he] was able to identify the crucial issues that define curriculum and so to clarify the concepts that arise from these problems"[609]. Kliebard allowed for a human base of the curricular theory, a theory that like any other, would be based on "human thought, human curiosity, human activity, and human problems"[610]. Naturally, "the scope and the substance of a curriculum theory" bases itself not so much "in the domain of the distribution of knowledge as a kind of commodity, but in considering what effects would accrue from study […] of a given domain"[611], a problematic issue that is taken up again by Michael Apple and Nancy King[612], along the lines of what Spencer, initially, and later, Michael Apple, had already proposed.

The problematization of curricular theorization is delved into further by Greene who focused "on the part the artistic-aesthetic might play in contemporary curriculum"[613]. Greene, referred to by Huebner as "an ambassador"[614], saw the curriculum "as a number of provinces of meaning, each one associated with the kinds of experiences available to young people of different biographies, different locations in the social world"[615]. The exploration of the limits and the specificity of such provinces of meaning cross over the aesthetic dimension. Similar to Kliebard's notions, Greene wrote that "aesthetic theory probably springs from the human necessity to make aesthetic choices"[616], and aesthetic experiences "involve us as existing beings in pursuit of meanings"[617]. In other words, "they involve us as historical beings born into

---

[607] Op. Cit., p., 263.
[608] Op. Cit., p., 263.
[609] Op. Cit., p., 263. Parentheses mine.
[610] Op. Cit., p., 260.
[611] Op. Cit., p., 261.
[612] Apple, Michael & King, Nancy (1977) What Should Schools Teach? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 341-358.
[613] Greene, M. (1977) The Artistic-Aesthetic and Curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 283-296, p., 283.
[614] Huebner, D. (1977) Response to Maxine Greene. The Artistic-Aesthetic and Curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 296-301, p., 297.
[615] Greene, M. (1977) The Artistic-Aesthetic and Curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 283-296, p., 287.
[616] Kliebard, H. (1977) Curriculum Theory: Give me a for Instance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 257-282, p., 260.
[617] Greene, M. (1977) The Artistic-Aesthetic and Curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 283-296, p., 293.

social reality"[618]. Thus "they must be *lived* within the contexts of our own self-understanding, within the contexts of what we have constituted as our world"[619]. Fundamentally, the vision of art and aesthetic experience "involve(s) an exploration of the questions arising when people become self-reflective about their engagements with art forms"[620] and are affected by the comprehension that is established in relation to reality. It is this human dimension to theorization, drafted by Greene, that led Kliebard to reiterate the normativity of the curricular theory. Thus, and in agreement with Kliebard, although "we can come up with examples of applied fields, say engineering"[621] it is with great difficulty that one accepts "the fact that curriculum is an applied field of philosophy or any of the traditional foundations areas"[622]. Such a notion would later be contested by Diamonti, for whom curriculum theory is not theoretical, "it is purely applied theory"[623]. It is interesting that the position upheld by Tyler may still be identified here, a fact that confirms the complexity of his thought. On the one hand, it reiterates that "we may have to rely on some kind of systematized knowledge, modes of organizing experience, concepts that are useful, that can help to guide the practical enterprise of designing an educational program"[624]; on the other, there is clear similarity with the line of thought elaborated by Greene when faced by the Talent Project. This indicates his preoccupation with the relevance of the kind of knowledge that is transmitted, and his criticism when the students involved with said project did not find any sense in what they had learned at school and some of the teachers failed to understand that which they taught.[625]. It is this and other positions adopted by Tyler, to which we have referred before, that should make us pause and reflect carefully upon the Tyler rationale. Tyler was not a mere mechanicist or a simple technicist.

Distancing himself somewhat from this line of thought, Jackson, after highlighting the existence of positive and negative critical postions and after stressing that,

---

[618] Op. Cit., p., 293.
[619] Op. Cit., p., 293.
[620] Op. Cit., pp., 288-289.
[621] Kliebard, H. (1977) Discussion. Kliebard, H. Curriculum Theory: Give me a for Instance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 277-282, p., 277.
[622] Op. Cit., p., 277.
[623] Diamonti, M. (1977) Discussion. Kliebard, H. Curriculum Theory: Give me a for Instance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 277-282, p., 277.
[624] Tyler, R. (1977) Discussion. Kliebard, H. Curriculum Theory: Give me a for Instance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 277-282, p., 278.
[625] Tyler, R. (1977) Discussion. Greene, M. The Artistic-Aesthetic and Curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 301-309, p., 306.

sometimes, it is very difficult to separate "the wheat from the chaff"[626], mentioned that more than the isolated vision of the critics is needed to aid us in the comprehension of what is right or wrong in the schools. As Jackson noted, we "must also look at the broader context of public opinion and social attitudes within which those writings achieve credibility. Nor must we be solely concerned with the truth of what is written, for what people believe to be true is a force of its own even though it later may be proven false"[627]. Justifying his position on the basis of his almost twenty-five years of experience, Jackson tried to maintain a neutral position ("I have witnessed sharp attacks from both extremes [left and right] of that ideological spectrum"[628]) that would later prove to be difficult to maintain, as is proved by the light banter exchanged with Michael Apple[629].

In opposition to the technological legacy that dominated the field, Michael Apple and Nancy King stress that "a number of sociologists and curriculum scholars, influenced strongly by the sociology of knowledge in both its Marxist (or neo-Marxist) and phenomenological variants, have begun to raise serious questions about the lack of attention to the relationship school knowledge and extra-school phenomena"[630]. The major objective of Michael Apple and Nancy King was to interpret and define whose meanings—explicit and implicit—are learned and distributed in the schools[631]. The analysis of this issue, according to the authors, besides having to be sensitive to the relation between school and cultural capital, to the power of the hidden curriculum, to the negotiated meanings and to the practices of common sense in the school or in evaluation, must above all focus on three major issues. These include: (1) "a description of the historical process through which certain social meanings became *particularly* school meanings and thus have the weight of decades of acceptance behind them"; (2) "empirical evidence, from a study of kindergarten experience, to document the potency and staying power of these

---

[626] Jackson, P. (1977) Beyond Good and Evil. Observations on the Recent Criticism of Schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 311-329, p., 312.
[627] Op. Cit., p., 312.
[628] Op. Cit., p., 313.
[629] In this regard *vide, Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 331-340, e pp., 358-369.
[630] Apple, Michael & King, Nancy (1977) What do Schools Teach? *Curriculum Inquiry,* Volume 6 (4), pp., 341-358., p., 341.
[631] Op. Cit., p., 343.

particular social meanings"; and (3) "the questions of whether piecemeal reforms, be they oriented humanistically or in other directions can succeed"[632].

Ultimately, this conference decisively defined the field and incorporated the perspectives expressed at the Conference of 1947, a "turning point in a field"[633] and a more aesthetic and political approach to the curriculum field. It also uncovered deep divisions in the field as was made obvious by the debates documented[634] between Jackson, Huebner and Michael Apple. For Huebner, an understanding of the field implied, not only having to "deal with Heidegger [...] with the Marxian orientation [...] with neo-hegelianism [... and] with analytical philosophy"[635], but also having to admit that Holt and Friedenberg—despite having decisively contributed to the field— would end up falling by the wayside and that their "criticisms lost their impact"[636]. But for Jackson, it was mandatory to know how to establish limits with the tools used in the approaches to the field, which many did not do in their desire to maintain a neutral position. Clearly denouncing problems which had their roots in the past ("I'm willing to go along with the Michael F. D. Young crowd to some extent"[637]) and getting personal even though he claimed he was not referring to Huebner, Jackson retorts:

> I do know enough about some of the people who are using this line, which in now called neo-Marxism, or what I'd prefer to call Marxoid, a Marxoid line of thought. I don't think they're testing the boundaries of the truth of that doctrine. They are indeed prisoners of a doctrine. Perhaps we all are. But maybe as prisoners it's our job to find out where the edge of the cave is and know that there is another perspective[638].

---

[632] Op. Cit., p., 343.

[633] Rosario, J. & Demarte, P. (1977) Foreword. Curriculum Theorizing Since 1947: Rhetoric or Progress? *Curriculum Inquiry,* Volume 6 (4), pp., 249-250, p., 249.

[634] *Curriculum Inquiry,* Volume 6 (4), pp., 331-340; pp., 361-369.

[635] Huebner, D. (1977) Discussion. Jackson, P. Beyond Good and Evil. Observations on the Recent Criticism of Schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 331-340, p., 332.

[636] Op. Cit., p., 334.

[637] Jackson, P. (1977) Discussion Jackson, P. (1977) Beyond Good and Evil. Observations on the Recent Criticism of Schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 331-340, p., 336.

[638] Op. Cit., p., 335. If we take into considerstion that in 1971 Michael Apple publishes *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict* and in 1976 Bowles & Gintis published *Schooling in Capitalist America*, and when faced by the established debate, one easily determines at whom was the criticism of Jackson directed.

Despite disagreeing with Jackson's position that "responsive criticism is the only appropriate kind"[639], Michael Apple not only reiterated that it is "unethical to criticize people from an elitist position"[640] but also, and without any worries of being labeled, defended the neo-Marxist approach. According to Michael Apple, the neo-Marxist approach "is support for a certain way of looking at the world that is fruitful, that enables us to seek 'truth' […] and it is the very search connections that makes it potent"[641]. Drawing somewhat on Dewey's notion that schools create an artificial atmosphere, just as Huebner had previously proposed, Michael Apple argued that schools "are not merely people sorting institutions"[642]; in other words, as we already indicated in the previous chapter, schools are caught in the intersection of knowledge forms which they produce but which also relate to other social institutions. Defending the work of Bowles and Gintis as a good point of departure, although "sometimes historically inaccurate and overstated"[643], Michael Apple distanced himself from the romantic position of Illich ("I am not an Illich supporter. I think he's incorrect. You don't do away with schools and then put the kids on a repressive labor market"[644]) and also from the dark periods of the Stalinist history, highlighting the neo-Marxist condition as a constant process, as discussed in the first chapter.

Although "the cynical note"[645] advanced by Jackson, "that the main function of educational research is to advance the careers of educational researchers"[646] should be noted (I have denounced this publically, despite the resulting animosity of some colleagues of mine), the fact is that the Geneseo Conference effectively marked a significant turn in the curricular field. It served as the passage from an approach that was based in the disciplinarization of knowledge to another, more aesthetic and politically compromised one. On the one hand, participants at this conference saw clear evidence of the consolidation of a neo-Marxist approach in the midst of the constant problematization of the legitimacy of the knowledge transmitted in schools—

---

[639] Apple, Michael (1977) Discussion, Jackson, P. Beyond Good and Evil. Observations on the Recent Criticism of Schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 331-340, p., 336.

[640] Op. Cit., p., 336.

[641] Op. Cit., pp., 336-337.

[642] Op. Cit., p., 337.

[643] Apple, Michael (1977) Discussion, Apple, Michael & King, Nancy. What do Schools Teach? *Curriculum Inquiry,* Volume 6 (4), pp., 361-369, p., 362.

[644] Op. Cit., p., 363.

[645] Jackson, P. (1977) Discussion, Apple, Michael & King, Nancy. What do Schools Teach? *Curriculum Inquiry,* Volume 6 (4), pp., 361-369, p., 366.

[646] Op. Cit., p., 367.

the very essence of the curriculum. On the other hand, they saw that the already fragile dogma of of neutrality surrounding the approaches to the field was no longer tenable. In fact, it was Jackson himself who confirmed the impossibility of neutrality and the existence of partiality. In fact, the justification for Jackson's title compromises his theory. His confession speaks for itself:

> Originally, the title of the paper that you saw on your program was called "The hidden curriculum and criticism of schools", and I changed the title after a long deliberation. [...] but I gave up the title "Hidden curriculum" because I've decided I'm not going to use that word anymore in my own writing. And the reason is that it's been used by people that I don't want to be associated with[647].

While the 1947 conference did not meet the expectations of those who had organized it, despite the participation of a complex and diverse group of researchers, when it is analyzed two decades later, we find that it clearly exceeded its objectives.

In fact, beyond increasingly gaining strength, the problematic of the knowledge transmitted in schools and the need to problematize the schools as vehicles of social transformation, the Geneseo conference provided the movement with a conscience and created a research approach in the curricular field, which rests on work from the previous century by Parker, Dewey, Bode, Counts, Rugg, Horton. The ideological movement of some of the contemporary curricular researchers must be understood as being a part of this line of thought, and from among those, Michael Apple stands out. Three years after the Geneseo Conference, he shook the field with the publication of *Ideology and Curriculum*, a book which was begun in the late 1960s and early 1970s and in which are included *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict*[648] and *Commonsense categories and curriculum thought* [649]. These criticize the curriculum as the field of ideological and cultural compromises, as mortgaged to economic

---

[647] Jackson, P. (1977) Discussion Jackson, P. (1977) Beyond Good and Evil. Observations on the Recent Criticism of Schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6 (4), pp., 331-340, p., 336.

[648] Apple, Michael (1971) The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

[649] Apple, Michael (1975) Commonsense Categories and Curriculum Thought. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD, pp., 116-148.

interests. They draw from the thought of Williams and Gramsci, among others, making the neo-Marxist approach much more powerful and accurate, as well as constituting one of the points of reference of the course of Michael Apple in the field of social politics, in general, and curricular politics, in particular, which will be the focus of the next chapter. In fact, *Ideology and curriculum* is the confirmation of the proposed turn that the field so desperately needed, with roots in the publication of *Schools in Search of Meaning*[650]*,* and in the Geneseo conference[651], as well as in work from the end of the nineteenth century.

---

[650] Macdonald, J. & Zaret, E. (1975) *Schools in Search of Meaning*. Washington: ASCD.
[651] Rosario, J. & Demarte, P. (1977) Curriculum Theorizing Since 1947: Rhetoric or Progress? *Curriculum Inquiry,* Volume 6 (4).