PART III

CURRICULUM IN THEORY

WILLIAM H. SCHUBERT

Curriculum in theory is an intriguing phrase compared with the oft-used term of curriculum theory. Curriculum in Practice (Part I), Curriculum in Context (Part II), and Curriculum in Theory (Part III) interact in complicated ways. Curriculum in theory may connote assumptions implicit or explicit in curriculum practice or context. Practice embodies theoretical assumptions that may differ from tenets espoused by practitioners or policymakers. Theory might be intentional, guided by research or political power that takes the form of policy justification. Theory could be envisioned as personal constructs embodied by those who influence curriculum, and the notion of embodied theory is related to feminist and pragmatic discourses. Personal constructs or implicit assumptions can only be known partially and are in a state of change and development, if not conscious revision via experience and reflection (Bateson, 1990). The seriousness of the latter is the deepest of human ponderings, as Dewey (1934) depicted in reverie that belies a quest for certainty (Dewey, 1929). Perhaps the theory-practice problem is an organism-action phenomenon, theory being the deep structure of an organism and the organism's action being practice (Schubert, 1982). Herein lies a continuous dialogue of reflective mindfulness and bodily action. Dewey (1916) declares meaningful experience as theory in practice: "No experience having meaning is possible without . . . thought" (p. 145). A thoughtful eclectic in and on action, in a Deweyan vein, is captured by Schwab's (1971) emphasis on the eclectic art of practical inquiry when he asserts that "the incongruity of theory and practice cannot be corrected by fundamental change in either one or the other . . . the incongruity can be adjusted by mutual accommodation" (p. 494).

For more than 30 years, scholars in curriculum studies have offered alternative conceptions of curriculum in theory that focus on lived texts (curricula) through perspectives of history, politics, race, gender, phenomenology, poststructuralism (deconstruction and postmodernism), autobiography or biography, aesthetics or the arts, theology or religion, institutions (school curricula, teachers, and students), international perspectives, and more (see Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995). Within these curriculum discourses, advocates of critical theory focus on injustices in curriculum and the need for theory to expose injustices, to advocate praxis (theory-based activism), and to overcome injustices in cultural, economic, and political contexts. Other theoretical standpoints for the investigation of complex meanings of curriculum have proliferated in recent decades including phenomenological curriculum theory, narrative inquiry, and postmodern perspectives.

Personal theory and critical theory (Schubert, 1986) constitute alternatives to analytic theory and normative theory, which have dominated much of past curriculum theory. Analytic theory
is usually descriptive and based on scientific, empirical studies. Each of which is assumed to add a piece to the larger puzzle of a domain or problem of inquiry. Normative theory is prescriptive in that it provides justification for positions or policies based on values advocated. Both are dominant in the first half-century of the curriculum field, though roots of curricular-oriented alternative theoretical postures are evident in the history of progressive thought (Schubert, 2004). Also pervasive was atrophetological functioning that let economic, cultural, and political winds dictate policy, while harboring implicit, if not explicit, theory in the assumptions to which curriculum in practice and curriculum in content can be traced.

As we consider curriculum in theory, we must be willing to see contemporary curriculum theorists as scholars who sometimes need to distance themselves enough from practice and context to theorize both practice and context as curricula in a larger social sense. When immersed in daily workplace pressures, it is difficult if not impossible to see alternative possibilities. Whatever is occurring influences outlooks of those involved, shapes their interpretations of the present, and projects their imagined futures. This pertains to practice and context that are, in fact, natural curricula that comprise the synaptic texts that shape human identity and concomitant political action (Pinar, 2006), as contrasted with conventional views of curriculum theory as assumptions, prescriptive or normative theory, that support the knowledge authorities determine to be worth learning and/or the related research-based constructs that lie behind development, dissemination, and design.

A key question then becomes not only what is worth knowing and why, but also how it benefits or harms all publics it touches. That is the necessary challenge for unlocking the assumptions of practice and context that drive the curriculum, thereby controlling students' lives. The question is whose assumptions are employed as much as it is what assumptions. Voices of dissent historically have been many and diverse, though often overlooked and silenced, in both the larger political realm and in curriculum discourse. My aim in this introductory essay is to stimulate the imagination of readers who pursue the chapters that follow, I urge you to compare the ideals of inquiry, progressivism, and theory with the realities of history, policy, and practice portrayed in chapters in Part III. These chapters stimulate reflection on the predilections advanced above, and authors push our thinking, individually and collectively, to reimagine curriculum in theory. Whitehead (1938) states, "Philosophy begins in wonder. And in the end, when philosophic thought has done its best, the wonder remains." I suggest that this newer wonder, however, is more sophisticated and takes us a greater distance when informed and shaped by the public intellectual and policy perspectives evoked by the chapters that follow.

In Chapter 19 on curriculum inquiry, I argue for an integration of form and substance of inquiry, and I note strengths and limitations of paradigmatic conceptualization. I suggest emergent, eclectic forms of curriculum inquiry that include practical inquiry, curriculum evaluation, decisionalist perspectives, hidden curriculum, critical theory, curriculucultural teaching, action research, reconceptualist theorizing, and curriculum history. I conclude by portraying a range of contemporary venues of inquiry and questions that emerge from considering them. This broadening of the scope of curriculum inquiry, which has steadily increased over the past 30 years, pertains to methods of inquiry and the topics that should be considered curricular. It raises a central question of whether or not curriculum inquiry should be limited to schools and geared toward research that improves the mission of schools, thus of state or corporate educational policy. What if theorizing reveals that test scores and grades are flawed indicators of a well-educated person? Are the only beneficiaries of such a limited version of curricular success those who gain from the perpetuation of extant tests and standards as legitimized creators of social hierarchies?

In Chapter 28, Short discusses curriculum policy with a particular focus on school policy and practice. Short helps us wonder about contradictions between the logic of transformation and the mandates for complacency and the ideal of a democratic and free inquiry. I feel certain that he would want to encourage wonder about Dewey's distinction (1938) between education in society writ large and schooling, both as places where education and/or miseducation might take place. Questions about curricular policy must turn on the choice of how to view curriculum makes, policymakers, policy analysts, and shapers of public ethos and personal identity. Are they primarily those in official capacities or are they part of a power elite who fashion the acceptance and perpetuation of identities and social commitments that support their own power and acquisition? Are policy analysts those designated as in universities, or are they public intellectuals who are widely known for their social criticism? Is it irresponsible for curriculum scholars to move their concern from total attention to schools represented to the whole sphere of concern with the ways multiple dimensions of a society or the world influence rituals and actions, or is it a highly responsible response to engage in the wider value base of dominant society as a curriculum that influences outlooks and practices, how will they build a meaningful critique of the competitive ethos (Nicholls, 1989) as an impediment to democratic education? How will they explore Dewey's (1933) contention that the best of progressive education cannot occur in an acquisitive society? Expanding conceptions of curriculum policy, Enns, in Chapter 21, presents a hidden policy that often guides rules of participation, decision, and action in schools. This policy creates facts within schools (i.e., connoisseurs of research within research systems, books to which school systems turn, and international professional organizations in which they participate). This research could be considered a sedentary recognition instantiation of Schwab's (1971) advocacy of practical and eclectic inquiry that is situational, or it could be criticized as research leading to policy that is expedient to the demands of mandates from larger political and economic entities. Much depends on the question of whose interests are served and whose are neglected. Do strategic plans of large school systems and even larger political entities facilitate or obstruct practical deliberation at the local school or classroom level? Moreover, do systemswide curriculum policymakers embody the intellectual worthwhilness to achieve the perspective of an increasingly liberal education? Each situation is different and the leadership of some school systems may come close to this ideal, while that of others may fall markedly short. Readers should be challenged to ponder the extent that policy deliberation and formulation is based on strong liberal education relative to their specific situations.

In Chapter 22, Hansen, Anderson, Frank, and Nieuwovar augment the vision of progressive education to its larger status as an intellectual and social movement. Instead of emphasizing progressive educators primarily affiliated with colleges of education and schools, they insightfully focus on philosophical underpinnings of progressiveism from Ralph Waldo Emerson, Jane Addams, W. E. B. Du Bois, and Dewey. These exemplars challenge us to experience the educational process as unsettling, imaginative, transformative, and revolutionary, holding a capacity to continuously overcome itself. The authors challenge us to wonder about other diverse and neglected sources that could help us more fully comprehend experience progressive theory and practice. They raise salient questions about sources of progressive teaching and learning. For instance, Emerson, Addams, Du Bois, and Dewey were public intellectuals who represented racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and gender diversity. They each engaged in practical work for social justice through institutions not primarily identified by governmental or corporate interests. This makes one wonder if the ideal of intellectuals as sanctioned watchdogs of public policymakers, as imagined of the possible, has long been on the discard pile. It makes us see more hope in the activist mobilization of solidarity of individuals and collaborations for social justice than in large and long-established institutions.

In Chapter 23, Frank examines the focus on an interpretative social history of curriculum since 1950, according to which schools have taught and continue to teach. The time period was selected for contemporary relevance and because it has been treated less frequently than earlier curriculum history. The authors reveal implicit theoretical positions embedded in school policy and practice and encourage us to see a change in the debate over curriculum, wherein conflict between student-centered and discipline-centered curriculum is being replaced by a concern for students' compliance and the ideal of a democratic and free inquiry. The authors powerfully portray what policymakers have made of practice. They encourage us...
to wonder about the possibility of finding openings that could move beyond the dominant indicators of curricular success, such as standards and test scores. As they reflect on what curriculum has wrought in schools, they warn that we may reach the end of curriculum, much as society at large may be moving toward the end of work.

Despite the decision to confine the theory sections of this handbook to the past 50 years, it is necessary to understand the precedent for what has transpired in recent years. Null, in Chapter 24, presents essential background information that enhances reflection on William Pinar's Chapter 25. His review of the legacy and the modern reflections of curriculum development and curriculum making aids understanding of the roots of curriculum in science, psychology, educational foundations, and curriculum's kinship with educational administration. Wedded to the state, school administration must fit within the parameters of state deliberation expectations. The question is whether the state controls the development or the elaboration of curriculum for the ends of elite private interests. Is participatory democracy possible and open to all sectors of society? Does curriculum development, even deliberation, naively facilitate the interests of politicians and those who manipulate their strings?

In Chapter 25, Pinar sketches a journey of curriculum theory since 1950 from informing curriculum development as an institutionalized service for schools and government to curriculum theorizing that attempts to understand curriculum as social practice. He spurs us to wonder if institutionalized curricular practice has promoted national or corporate power more than personal development or social reform. Such wondering has compelled many curriculum scholars to explore ways in which multiple contextual forces actually are curricular, or that shape identities. Perhaps curriculum scholarship has broadened to incorporate the purpose of the shaping of character. Should curriculum scholars be confined to studying schooling any more than chemistry scholars should be confined to government chemistry laboratories? Does not some group of scholars need to address how we form identities, commitments, and social actions through schooling and through the multiplicity of social, environmental, and cultural forces that continuously reconstruct us? I suggest that this should be a primary task of curriculum scholars.

While the chapters in Part III point to several productive areas of wonder, one dimension that emerges is how to keep alive the central curriculum questions of what is worthwhile and who benefits, when forces of national power and globalization attempt to silence progressive education, complex forms of inquiry, and diverse theoretical perspectives. Further, we might wonder if state-sponsored schooling, when in league with corporate and private wealth, is in the public interest. Or should we look elsewhere for education that is genuinely public? Are those questions soluble, as is central to Dewey's advocacy, given his faith in human beings? Such is a faith that, sagaciously, Greene's both respects from her pragmatist roots and criticizes from her existentialist. She warns that while we should work toward integration of apparent opposing views, as Dewey pursues throughout the corpus of his work, we need simultaneously to recognize, adjust to, and live with contradiction and ambiguity. She makes me wonder if there is not an air in Dewey that is too passive, too male, and too White in his assumption that all problems can be resolved by human intelligence and that all opposites can and should be integrated. At the same time, I would not want to dispense with Dewey's remarkable integration of inappropriate dualisms, and I feel Greene would agree. Moreover, I trust that we can find more to fill the void that has increased hope. Olech 1964 expresses a quality of hope that balances the mundane and the sublime, the oppressive and the liberating tensions with which we must learn to live:

I like the Roman god, Janus, the god of gates and doors, those responsible for the policy of education have to look in two directions at the same time. They should look toward society, serving, helping, and willing to change. Again they should look away from all the temptations of our restless and bewildered times. They must ask themselves, "How can the schools help young people, not only to cope with the social demands of our age, but to secure a corner in mind and soul, or an inner sanctuary, where the fugitive impressions of life recede before the quiet majesty of that which we may call 'the Abiding'"? (p. 6)

Should curriculum theorists not look beyond the functioning of schools to curricula embedded in influential messages promulgated not only in any given culture, but also in the increasingly dominating world culture? Should they not look to the daily demands of such forces in the education of us all, both in and out of schools? Should they not simultaneously try to grasp something more abiding, whatever that may mean? As you peruse the chapters in Part III and reflect upon those from Parts I and II, I hope that your wondering will be refreshing, stimulating, and edifying. I hope the reader will intensify perspectives on the dynamic interaction and integration of theory and policy in curriculum contexts and practices. Moreover, I hope it enables the perception that curriculum in theory, context, and practice continuously complicates the identities, commitments, and social action of multifarious life journeys and life stories.

Notes
1. I acknowledge deep appreciation to Ann Lynn Lopez Schubert for her reading and conversation that has enhanced my understanding of multiple sources of the complex interactions of theory, context, and practice in curriculum.
2. See the 2001 autobiographical-biographical film of Maxine Greene by Markie Hancock.
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In this chapter, curriculum inquiry is conceived as thought, study, and interpretation used to understand curriculum, which is characterized as experiential journeys that shape perspectives, dispositions, skills, and knowledge by which we live. Curriculum inquiry inevitably must consider a multitude of questions that have perplexed educators throughout history, for example, what is worthwhile, why, when, where, how, and for whose benefit (Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, & Carroll, 2002, pp. 525–526).

Integration of Form and Substance

Curriculum inquiry too often has committed a grievous error of separating form and substance. Graduate programs regularly have separated substantive courses from those on research methodology; a bifurcation replete in texts used in such courses. Antedotes to this simplistic and unnatural separation have attempted to integrate method or form with substance of inquiry (Green, Camilli, & Elmore, 2006; Iger, 1988/1997; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; Short, 1991). These state-of-the-art treatments simultaneously present substantive examples and varieties of inquiry: philosophical, historical, arts based, comparative, survey, quasi-experimental, ethnographic, and case study. They blur boundaries among inquiry, theory, method, and practice since each inextricably influences the others. In Short’s (1991) portrayal of forms of curriculum inquiry, for example, authors name and explicate genres within an integration of their substantive interests and methodological orientations. Forms of inquiry were not construed as research recipes, but as precedent to draw upon to fashion inquiry for particular needs. Short (1991) recognizes “that the forms of inquiry... are suited to only certain kinds of curriculum questions and that other kinds of questions are important and need to be addressed by other appropriate forms of inquiry” (p. 333). This need for eclectic integration of form and substance was clearly anticipated by Dewey (1929) and is manifest throughout the *Handbook of Research on Curriculum: A Project of the American Educational Research Association* (Jackson, 1992a).

The curriculum division (Division B, initially entitled Curriculum and Objectives) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) has moved dramatically from preoccupation with empirical-analytic research in the 1960s and 1970s to recognize an array of inquiry postures in recent decades. Renowned *Curriculum Studies* in 1982, Division B reflected the expanding character (Schubert, 1988, 1989; Short, Willis, & Schubert, 1985) of the curriculum field. Today, scholarly work in curriculum inquiry includes imaginative combinations of ethnography (Janesick, 2003), narrative or story (Chardin & Connolly, 2000), autobiography (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001), artistic criticism (Fisler, 1991), biography (Kirkland,
phenomenological hermeneutics (van Manen, 1997), revisionist history (Spring, 2006), speciﬁc essay (Schubert, 1991), critical theory (Youyou, 2005), ideological analysis (Apple, 1979/2006), feminist studies (Latour, 1991), postmodernist renditions (Doll & Gough, 2002), cultural studies (Edgerton, 1993), and more—as well as the formerly dominant studies (experimental, quasi-experimental, survey, policy analysis, analytic philosophy, and traditional history).

The blending of genres has diminished the anachronistic alienation between proponents of quantitative and qualitative research, based on realization that quantities and qualities are relevant to any problem or phenomenon. The term interpretive (Piantanida & Garman, 1998) often connotes eclectic inquiry and issues of representation of research (Garman & Piantanida, 2006). While scholarly papers continue to be the dominant mode of representation, curriculum inquiries explore artistic portrayals, installations, ﬁctional renditions, theatrical expressions, multimedia displays, and forums that depict multiple voices in communities researched.

Today's curriculum scholarship seeks complicated understandings and multiple meanings of personal and public identity, modes of human association, and contextual relationships in many societal venues, as well as the nature and effectiveness curriculum delivery in schools (the dominant interest of past curriculum inquiry). Such inquiry often includes complex integrations of salient factors that shape human lives and outlooks: culture, language, socioeconomic class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, body and appearance, religion or belief, mass media, ecology, globalization, imperialism, and more. These factors are increasingly perceived as curricula in their own right, not just forces that inhibit or facilitate curriculum for schools.

Given this expansion of curriculum inquiry, how can the cascading diversity of curriculum inquiry be conceptualized? This query points to the need to deeply examine and clarify philosophical assumptions that continuously reframe inquiry postures. The complexity of this challenge has been addressed through paradigms.

**PERCEIVING CURRICULUM INQUIRY THROUGH PARADIGMS**

A paradigm is a lens or orientation through which the world is seen, explored, understood, and negotiated. For instance, Bernstein’s (1976, 1991) work on restructuring social and political theory has unleashed such paradigms as differential types of curriculum inquiry (empirical-analytic, hermeneutic, critical, and postmodern) relative to interests served, social organization, and modes of rationality (Schubert, 1986, p. 181). In education, paradigms have been seen as existing simultaneously, vying for recognition rather than as a progression of advancement (Schubert & Lopez, Schubert, 1991).

Empirical-analytic inquiry serves technical interests (e.g., designing instructional materials, developing a curriculum, testing for results) and requires the social organization of workplace hierarchies to accomplish its tasks of production and accountability for predicted outcomes (as done in industry, business, corporate planning, and technology). Key dimensions of its mode of rationality assume that success rests on achievement of control and relative certainty and that low like propositions exist and can be applied and tested. Empirical-analytic rationality ﬁts the dominant press in school to demonstrate accomplishment of standards by meeting goals as revealed on standardized tests. This assumes that standards of knowledge, skill, and disposition can be deﬁned objectively and that items on tests credibly indicate the extent to which the standards have been met.

Hermeneutic inquiry originates in the Judaic tradition of text interpretation, wherein subsequent generations of scholars (before the printing press) wrought interpretive commentary on religious texts. Metaphorically, text (in phenomenological literature) can be any idea or event that is transformed by exchange of ideas over time. Or a text can be perspectives embodied within persons, continuously transformed via interpersonal encounter. Thus, the interest served is practical—that is, deriving situational meaning and insight that improves decision and action in actual states of affairs. The social organization of hermeneutic inquiry is interaction among persons and situations. The mode of rationality acknowledges humans as subjective beings who construct understanding through interactions. Each contribution to such paradigms is situational and contingent, a role for paradigms in the form of cultural norms encapsulated in a goal-implementation-evaluation (test) model. Many curriculum scholars, however, want to keep alive Dewey’s (1916) admonition to enable meaning and direction to evolve in educational situations, rather than to devise packages for implementation of imperialist agendas that beneﬁt the few.
We turn now to examples of neo-Deweyan curriculum inquiry (beginning in the 1960s) that still hold relevance for educators. Dewey's mandate, often devised without democratic participation by curriculum scholars, local school leaders, teachers, or students. These attempts include practical inquiry, curriculum evaluation, existentialist perspectives, hidden curriculum, critical theory, counter culture teaching, and democratic pedagogy. The following chapter explores new theoretical, existential, and curriculum history. As we consider each, it is interesting to ask how they focus on meanings of educational experience in student lives, often leading to exploration of contexts of student life outside of school and how the latter raised powerful questions about whose interests were served. Moreover, it is germane to ask how dominant forces in policy and practice helped or hindered local and situational interests, including teacher-learner relationships.

**Practical Inquiry**

Joseph Schwab's (1987, pp. 287–383) perusal of a practical and eclectic inquiry of professional and policy education published between 1969 and 1973 were hailed by Jackson (1992b) as "a stirring critique of the field of curriculum" and "how its deficiencies might be rectified" (p. 28). Schwab (1978) argued that curriculum inquiry was moribund due to its preoccupation with the theoretical or empirical-analysis. To remedy the situation, he urged a paradigmatic shift to the practical-hermeneutic. Drawing upon Aristotelian (see McKeown's 1932) ethical categories, in 1969 (revised in 1970), he criticized anecdotical inquiry as having a formal cause in a state of mind that focuses on commonalities decontextualized from situations, and he advocated practical inquiry that takes actual states of affairs as problem sources. He called for replacement of the material cause of theoretical inquiry (law-like generalizations) with situational insights from practical inquiry. Further, Schwab (1978) argued that the efficient cause or method of practical inquiry should be deliberation via interaction with phenomenon under inquiry, rather than detached induction and hypothetical-deduction of theoretical inquiry that neglects the plethora of nuances that create situations. The final cause or end of practical inquiry was action and decision evaluation by a Deweyan attention to consequences, based on moral and political effects, affects, and side effects. Schwab (1979) decried the theoretical end of knowledge qua publication and the whoring of researchers after scholarly acceptability. Schwab (1978) did not offer practical inquiry as mere muddling through; rather, he offered it as inquiry steeped in eclectic awareness of a broad and deep liberal education. In 1971, Schwab (1978) clarified three ecletic arts to guide decision and action in educational affairs: matching theories with contextual dilemmas, tailoring and combining theories to fit situational needs, and development of a repertoire from the "anticipatory generation of alternatives" (p. 315) of those embedded in situations. The latter enhances decision akin to Thelen's (1960/1972, p. 208–209) action inquiry and Schön's (1983, p. 56) reflection in action Smyth (1986). Schwab (1983) advocated that practical inquiry and eclectic arts be used in curriculum inquiry to monitor dynamic interactions among curricular components (teacher, learner, subject matter, and milieu) and subsequently (1983) called for curriculum professors to enact teams of teachers and administrators to do this in schools. Schwab (1978; especially the 1970) encouraged the development of a curriculum that depicted deliberative processes within extant situations to serve as precedent. Moreover, he (1978, p. 367) pushed curriculum inquiry into the society at large by depicting classroom milieu as the mere tip of societal milieu, such as culture, social class, religion, material acquisition, and more. To investigate such milieus would require marshaling of resources from many disciplines. The deliberative tradition continues to be developed (Block, 2004; Bradeen, 1998; Reis, 1978, 1999).

**Curriculum Evaluation**

Also in the 1960s and 1970s, a new breed of curriculum evaluation emerged, deriving mentorship from Ralph Tyler and his evaluation team (Alkin, 1942; E. Smith, & Tyler, 1942) in the Eight Year Study, which was published in five volumes between 1933 and 1941. This study offered variated examples of curriculum evaluation to compare students who experienced progressive education with those who were educated traditionally. In an attempt to comprehensively portray intellectual, affective, social, and other consequences of progressive education based on interest, choice, and participatory democracy, this bold experiment greatly augmented curriculum inquiry with a repertoire of scientific and artific forms of inquiry. Based on meticulous analysis of Eight Year Study documents, Kreid and Bullock (1967) have reconstructed fragments of character and events into stories that help readers surmise the meaning of a key phrase that embodies the Eight Year Study, "with adventurous company," which they consider emblematic of the experimental venture (Kreid and Bullock, 1967, p. 224). They derive from this study that school reformers should keep experimentation and exploration alive through significant inquiry by teachers in all dimensions of the educational process. Teachers, so engaged, can be said to be involved in continuous professional development, labeled by Kelley (1951) as a workshop way of learning. It was this way of learning that the most experimental teachers took to their own students through integrated and core curricula. They engaged students in personal and public reflection—imagining and pursuing their aspirations—and, in a far cry from teacher hierarchies that merely produce lessons or units of the make-it-take-it variety.

Curriculum evaluation, as an emergent area of study, chased the progressive ideal implicit in the Eight Year Study by focusing on complexities of the educational process. Cronbach (1965), involved in the Eight Year Study, as a doctoral student of Tyler's, designated evaluation for course improvement. This moved evaluation far beyond a mere rating of students, schools, educational products, projects, and personnel to engagement in the educational process. It blurred distinctions between process and content in curriculum (Parker & Ruben, 1966), reflecting the core of Dewey's crusade against dualisms. To account for the complexity of evaluating curricular situations, Stake (1967) argued for tripartite focus on antecedents, transactions, and outcomes—with prescriptive, descriptive, and normative dimensions of each—and later developed responsive evaluation or a kind of participatory democracy among stakeholders in evaluation settings (Stake, 1971). Anticipating participatory evaluation, L. Smith and Geoffrey (1968) collaborated to illustrate a researcher and a teacher inquiry into-together to understand and improve curriculum in a classroom. Stufflebeam (1971) identified complexities via a four-part focus on content, process, product, and evaluation. Descendants of these efforts expanded evaluation into inquiry that looked for educational and social significance, not mere statistical significance, in illuminative (Hamilton, McDonald, King, Jenkins, & Parlett, 1977), qualitative (G. Willis, 1978), imaginative (Blacker, 1979/1994), and naturalistic (Guba & Lincoln, 1981) studies of curricular phenomena. Current perspectives on qualitative inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) evolved from this evaluation literature (see Fraser & Houghton, 1982; Taylor & Cowley, 1972).

**Existentialist Perspectives**

Harper (1955), often regarded as the initiator of existentialism in educational theory, moved Ulrich (1953) to advocate that education focus on "the great events and mysteries of life: birth, death, love, tradition, society and the group, success and failure, salvation, and anxiety" (p. 225). While curriculum scholars of the pre-1960s had emphasized the importance of the arts for students, they rarely drew upon them for curriculum insights, until Greene (1965) artistically showed how literature provides existential insight into the complex relationship between the public school and private vision. By continuing to draw works of literature, art, and philosophy, Greene (e.g., 1973, 1978) originally brought existential perspectives to curriculum inquiry with distinct originality, encouraging imaginative re-creation of identities, public system, and possibilities that make meaning amid the absurdity, tragedy, uncertainty, and angst of existence. Pritzker (1970) also provided existential insight by emphasizing authentic education. Focus on how to exercise freedom and take responsibility for its consequences matches the existential inquiry as a quest to create a life via teacher-learner relationships, not merely the design of school activities.

Thus the inhibiting and liberating forces of life (history, geography, culture, psychology, society, politics, economics, religion, and more) could be seen as curricula, and curriculum inquiry became a struggle to understand and contribute within such forces. The complexity of such struggle is depicted in Hrubec's (1966) insight that the depths of such inquiry are too complex and unsettling to result in traditional curricular packages. To envision the splendor of wonder that the above entails, Hrubec (1966) called for curriculum inquiry through multiple languages—not just the technical and scientific, but the political, ethical, and aesthetic. Technical and scientific languages relate primarily to the empirical-analytic paradigm, while political,
Building critical perspectives, as did others such as Michael F. O’Young (1971), Pierre Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Antonio Gramsci (1971), and Paul Willis (1977). For instance, showed through critical ethnography how schools spur hegemony, resistance, and contestation to perpetuate the working class in England. Of inestimable import, these scholars added powerful questions to the curriculum inquiry lexicon: Whose knowledge? Whose interests? Who benefits?

This critical work involves memory of social reconstructionists in progressive education, especially Dewey’s (1933) critique of acquisition values and Garcia (1932) during schools to change the social order. Harold Rugg’s (1929–1932) reached past educators (understanding their reliance on textbooks) to students themselves through his own textbook series for secondary school social studies. He directly encouraged students to question injustice and to change, including their roots in capitalist society. When sales reached about 1.4 million texts and 2.7 million workbooks (Winter, 1968, p. 91), conservatives took notice, and Rugg sustained virulent attacks by Hearst newspapers and others who promoted “trained, impervious, inarticulate, and anti-American, triggering expurgation of their use. Nevertheless, Rugg’s curricular materials stand as one of the most successful influences of the social reconstructionist movement (Kliebard, 1986/2004, pp. 167–173) by taking critique directly to students, as did counterculture teachers in the 1960s.

Counterculture Teachers

Several teachers became well known in the 1960s, through first-person books that revealed curriculum they built with students, eschewing prepackaged curricula (e.g., Ashton-Warner, 1963; Dennison, 1969; Holt, 1964; Kolb, 1968; Kozel, 1967). Earlier exemplars of such efforts were Summerhill School in England (Neill, 1960) and Hylandar Folk School (see Horton, Kohl, & Kolb, 1990), a seeded for radical political efforts such as the civil rights movement in the southern United States. These narratives, not unlike those of women progressive educators of an earlier era (e.g., Hill, 1923; Lewis, 1926; Pratt, 1924, 1948), are precursors of autobiographical curricular inquiry.

Despite the popularity of these success stories, a large-scale study of American educational practice by Silverman (1970) revealed a general crisis he characterized as mindlessness. This is reminiscent of recent idealization of just few Mayer Roole’s (1989) search for humanistic progressive practices 80 years earlier. Rice (1989) toured, observed, and interviewed in many schools across America, reporting that he found an abundance of “rote learning, mindless teaching, administrative ineptitude, political chicanery, and public apathy” (Cremin, 1988, p. 227). Initially hopeful of finding meaningful teacher-learning relationships, Rice (1913) became disenchanted with the state of affairs in schools and called for scientific management to assure efficiency. Both the compelling calls of disgruntled teachers (often discussed as romantics by critics from academe) and direct admonitions from Freire (1970) and Illich (1970) to radically revamp education stimulated rethink curricular relevance (see Van Til, 1972).

Teacher Action Research

In England, Lawrence Stenhouse (1970) and colleagues engaged teachers in reflective curriculum deliberation. This work took pronounced form at the University of East Anglia in the Humanities Curriculum Project, which has been compared with the Eight Year Study (G. Willis et al., 1995), and coupled university-based curriculum professors with teachers in classrooms to mutually understand and respond to curricular dilemmas and possibilities. Inservice education of teachers was continuous and became known as the teacher-as-researcher movement: it was practiced daily, not merely on designated professional development days (see May, 1982), and has spread throughout the United Kingdom and to other parts of the world (see Goodyear-Smith, 1999; Haidt & Hopkins, 1985; Stenhouse, 1985). Its postmodern variations have been explored by Kemmis (1991), while its international scope is represented by McTaggart (1997), and its practical detail can be seen in teacher research on literacy genres (Pappas & Zecker, 2001), Such work is reminiscent of, too, of collaborative research in America by Miln (1946) and Corey (1953), who oversaw the action research label that traces back to origins in Dewey (1929).

Reconceptualist Theorizing

A new force in curriculum inquiry, identified by Macdonald (1971), inspired conferences that
began in 1973 and brought together scholars from the radical periphery of curriculum studies. Calling them "reconceptualists," Pinar (1975) contrasted them with both traditionalists (whose inquiry focused primarily on development of curriculum for schools) and conceptual empiricists (whose work was marked by empirical-analytic inquiry appropriated from natural, psychological, and social sciences). Under the aegis of reconceptualists, Pinar advanced curricular as a more method of inquiry (see Pinar, 1975; Pinar & Grumet, 1976). Instead of treating curriculum as a noun, the verb curricular connotes an autobiographical struggle to understand how one's past, present, and anticipated future shape one another, Marsh and Willis (2003) succinctly defined curricular as "the autobiographical process of individuals examining the course of their own experience" (p. 366). Curriculum inquiry thus became a central theme of educational experience rather than a commodity delivered by schools. It became the theorizing and enacting of one's life and responsibilities in the world. Some saw curriculum theory as a search for reality of meaning (Phenix, 1964), as a prayerful act (Macdonald, 1995), and as transcendence (Huebner, 1999).

From the mid-1970s, curriculum inquiry evolved in many directions that scholars began to eschew any label (including reconceptualist) that tended to homogenize their diversity. Kliro (1980) identified diverse embers that were reshaping the field: an organic view of nature, individuals as creators of knowledge and culture, existential base of method, preconscious experiences, new sources of literature, theory, and higher levels of consciousness; means and ends that include diversity and pluralism; political and social reconceptualization; and new language forms. Scholars continued to expand the range of curriculum discourse communities to include historical, political, racial, gender, phenomenological, postmodern, biographical, autobiographical, aesthetic, theological, international, and institutional texts (Pinar et al., 1995). The institutional text dealt with curricular development, teachers, and students in schools, which was the newly exclusive concern of curriculum inquiry from the 1980s through the 1990s. Those concerned with matters of institutional text (now one of many discourses in curriculum inquiry) are challenged to learn about and simultaneously occurring curricula in the many societal discourses that diversely influence any given students' life.

Curriculum History

Curriculum has been criticized as ahistorical, suscep-tible to winds of political and economic forces, and relegated to perpetual rediscovey due to unawareness of precedent. While some educational histories reveal aspects of curricular history (e.g., Cremin, 1981), the first book on curricular history in the United States was written by Mary Louise Seguel (1966); and in 1977, a group of scholars formed the Study of Curriculum History (SSCH), doubting inspiriting contributions to less historicism in subsequent years (see Kridel, 1989). Panoramic curriculum histories provided perspective on scholarship and practice (Franklin, 1986; Klebold, 1986/2004; Kridel, 2000; Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980; Schubert et al., 2001; Tanner & Tanner, 1990; G. Willis, Schubert, Bullough, Kridel, & Holton, 1993). Also, curriculum history has a lengthy tradition in the United Kingdom and Europe (e.g.,Connell, 1968; Goodson, 1988; Hamilton, 1990; Popkewitz, 1987; Reit & Walker, 1975; Wentworth, Hopman, & Rieparks, 2000). In many countries there exists a legacy of nonpanoramic curriculum history that deals with particular events, individuals, groups, and issues. Varieties of curriculum history are featured in the work of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies and its several national affiliates.

Some curriculum history holds immense faith in schools as principal sites for perpetuating and refining democracy (e.g., Davis, 1976; Tanner & Tanner, 1996, 1975/2007; Wraps, 1994). Extending this faith, some scholars (e.g., Hicken, 1993, 2004; Wraps, 1999) criticize radical curriculum inquiry (e.g., critical theory and reconceptualist theorizing) for not giving due recognition to past contributions of progressive reform. Some, in particular, criticize the distance radical curricularity establishes between curriculum scholarship and school reform, implying that little productive is offered by ideological critique (e.g., Apple, 1979/2004), cultural studies (e.g., Giroux, 2000; McLaren, 1996), and curricular (e.g., Miller, 2005; Pinar 2004). Those critical of distance themselves offer a counter interpretation, asserting that official policy is controlled by a nexus of power (corporate, government, military) that negates hope for progressive practices through large-scale policy reform. Thus some argue that for curriculum inquiry to inform practice it must originate in the lives of teachers, students, parents, local schools, and communities that strive to add meaning and direction to their lives. Still other scholars highlight democratic schools (Apple & Beane, 2006), small schools (Ayers, Klonsky, & Lyon, 2006; Meic, 1995), and popular pedagogies (Giroux, 2004) that have grown from local schooling. Critics suggest that curriculum inquiry must be relevant to the millions of students who daily go to schools as they then exist, arguing that we cannot wait for the ideal, noting that every tower theorizing and critique do not help present needs. In a study of 20 years of the radical, scholars Bergamo curriculum conferences reveals that more presentations were about teacher education than any other topic (Kridel, 1999). Such teacher education, though diverse, did not focus on packaged, standardized, or even systematic solutions; rather, it sought to engender a sense of agency, meaning, and democratic contribution among teacher educators, assuming that they would share this with teachers who would craft similar experiences with their students. This seems strikingly similar to Dewey's (1916) progressive democ- racy and to the Eight Year Study; a similar ethos was recently expressed by Henderson (2001) as democratic inquiry artistry.

The nemesis of such work, as others contend, is that governmental and corporate forces use schools and mass media to sponsor curricular initiatives that serve elite, not democratic interests (Chomsky, 2004a, 2004b, 2003a, 2003b; McNamara, 2005). Therefore, there is advocated that curriculum inquiry seek to understand and make known the myriad curricula that shape new generations. An interpretive historical perspective on this process since 1950 can be seen as a patchwork of turning points (Marshall, Sears, Allen, Roberts, & Schubert, 2007) or a postmodern pastiche of changing curriculum thought and practice (vectors), analogous sociocultural events (varied tales), and curricular practices from key curriculum scholars (visitors), and excerpts from key books and articles (primary documents). Such interpretation helps cast in bold relief contemporary venues of curriculum inquiry.

Contemporary Venues of Curriculum Inquiry

Recent curriculum inquiry has continued to offer bases for the intended curriculum as a delimitation of overt topics to cover. However, it has added substantially to uncovering other subtle, powerful, and covert influences within, for example, the taught, experienced, embodied, hidden, tested, null, and outside curricula. An exhaustive treatment of work done in each of these venues is not possible here; only key illustrations are cited or discussed. This review suggests diversity of contemporary curriculum inquiry that is being explored, focusing both directly on schooling and indirectly on other emerging foci.

Intended Curriculum

The intended curriculum, explicit goals to shape the outlooks and capacities, had been the primary focus of curriculum inquiry from its inception to the 1960s, and it persists today. Ralph Tyler (1949), drawing from experience as Research Director of the Evaluation Staff in the Eight Year Study, formulated four heuristic topics that have guided curriculum developers and researchers for half a century: (1) purposes, for inquiry, touch to Tyler's dam (Tyler, Schubert, & Lopez Schubert, 1986). Many curricu-lar scholars and developers disregarded Tyler's (1949) admonitions to consider alternative philosophical and psychological perspectives, as well as tendencies towards purposes from societal, individual, and disciplinary perspectives. Neglected, too, is his emphasis on learning experiences as more relevant than activities or content because a learning experience is the complicated and dynamic "interaction of the
learner and external conditions in the environment" (Tyler, 1949, p. 63). The significance Tyler (1949, 1977) attributed to nonschool experiences and students' development outside of school lives as a basis for curriculum organization is derived from progressive roots. Further, his reminder that the four questions should not be used in the order presented in his text, but according to situational needs (Tyler, 1949, p. 126) is often lost in the propensity to seek recipes. Hence, only the shell of Tyler's message (known as the Tyler rationale) remains in too many central offices of schools, state departments, ministries of education, federal bureaucracies, and corporate headquarters. Left behind was his emphasis on careful attention to context and nuance in student lives.

A progressive criticism of intended curriculum in any society is that it promotes what educational authorities, representatives of the dominant societal powers, decide should shape the minds of the masses. The curriculum development tradition persists today through intended curriculum generated in governmental and corporate educational offices. It is perpetuated by professional organizations and publications that serve school administrators a diet of "how-to" remedies to meet mandates of governmental and corporate entities. Curriculum scholars have responded to such forces with attempts to inspire curriculum leaders to inquire reflectively to improve curriculum, often reinstating Tyler's omitted advice and adding their own recommendations based on contemporary research and theory curriculum development or design (Brubaker, 2004; English, 1988, 1999; Heibert, 2005; Pinson; 2004; Posner & Rotnitsky, 2006; Wiggins & McTighe, 1998). Even though such sources intend to resist corporate-minded efficiency and enrich considerations, resultant inquiry for planning is often streamlined and separated from grassroots involvement of teachers, students, parents, and community. Henderson and Kessom (2004) have led attempts to transform simplistic solutions through postmodern, critical hermeneutic, and pragmatic perspectives that forge practical wisdom.

Taught Curriculum

That the taught curriculum often differs from the intended has been realized for many years. When Goodlad, Klein, & Associates (1970) looked behind the doors of classrooms in the post-Sputnik curriculum reform era, they found that the ways teachers taught were incommensurate with the intent of reform packages. However, inquiry remained to explain if differences between taught and intended curricula were due to teacher misunderstanding of guidelines or to creative insubordination (Goodlad & Associates, 1979), later indicating the importance of ambivalence and the disadvantages of a curriculum that values superficial coverage more than depth (Goodlad, 1984). The taught curriculum can often be uncovered when teachers share their stories (Carter, 1993; Caujan, 1993; Goodson & Hargreaves, 1996; Miller, 1992; Schubert & Ayers, 1992; Wilkore & Nordin, 1991). Through first person accounts, teachers reveal inquiries into taught curricula (e.g., Apple & Beane, 2006; Ayers, 2001; Beane, 1999; Michie, 1999). Scholarly inquiries of taught curricula have been interpreted via a range of artistic renditions, such as the following: educational criticism or literary nonfiction (Gore, 2003); teachers' personal-practical knowledge that shapes curriculum (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; He, 2003); philosophical and interpretive discourses on teaching as a call, vocation, and art (Hansens, 1995, 2001); historical interpretations of teaching (Kandel, Bullock, & Shaker, 1996); narratives of teaching (Bullough, 2001; Nicholls & Hazard, 1992); and portraiture of educational situations (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997).

Experienced Curriculum

Partially through Dewey's (1916, 1938) emphasis on experience, authors of synoptic texts on curriculum development have hailed curriculum as an experiential process. Casewell and Campbell (1935) define curriculum as "all the experiences children have under the guidance of teachers" (p. 69), and B. Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1957) call curriculum "a sequence of potential experiences... for the purpose of disciplining children and youth in group ways of thinking and acting... The curriculum is always, in every society-representation of society as people think, feel, behave, and do" (p. 3). The enacted curriculum (Snyder, Bolin, & Zumnalez, 1992) includes the intended and taught; moreover, its complexity involves a combined impact of all contributors: teachers, students, parents, policymakers, subject matter, and milieu within schools. The experienced curriculum expands attention to thoughts, meanings, and feelings of students as they encounter it, as indicated by Eriksen and Shultz (1992) and by Nicholls and Thackston (1995), who sought reasons for learning of students and teachers. The experienced curriculum also focuses on the meeting of personal and practical lives of teachers (Connelly & Clandinin, 1992, 1998) as well as meanings derived from multicurricular contexts (Phillip, He, & Connolly, 2005). That teachers can become aware of such matters is evidenced through inquiries into lived experiences of relationships among teachers, students, parents, and others (van Manen, 1991, 2002). Several such inquiries appear in the journal, *Phenomenology and Pedagogy*, between the years of 1980-1999.

Embodied Curriculum

The notion of embodiment derives from diverse sources, historical and contemporary: aesthetic, pragmatic, hermeneutic, feminist, and more. Broady (1989) identified uses of schooling that appear as embodied curriculum aesthetic gleaned from disciplinary genres in everyday understanding of texts. The aesthetic of Eisner (1979/1994), problem-solving, and interdisciplinarity or intimate palette of educational imagination that enables enlightened criticisms of educational situations (Uhrmacher & Matthews, 2005). Illustratively, Barone (2000, 2001) writes literary nonfiction based on complex artistic awareness to capture more enduring outcomes of learning than those indicated by test scores, grades, and other basal indices of recitation that dominate assessment today. This cognitive praxis (Eisner, 1992) is similar to, though politically different from, the critical aesthetic of Greene (1988, 1995, 2001), who sees imagination as an embodied dialectic of freedom—a realm for public spaces.

Johnson (1987) shows how the pragmatic tradition can be extended by perceiving mind as embodied. Likewise, the progressive history of integrated and core curriculum embeds attention to the multitude disembodied, externally imposed curricula, replacing it with the growth of personal and public meaning. Dewey (1902) learned to see this in the lived curriculum of children engaged in natural transactions in his Laboratory School at the University of Chicago. Likewise, Hopkins calls for integration (1937) of emerging selves, not lifeless subjects, in experiencing democracy (1941) of both school and home (1954). Albery (1935) wanted to move core curriculum beyond more traditional projects that combined subjects to self-development embodied in contributions to human problems. Pinar (1979), an intellectual descendent of Albery, aesthetically imagined curriculums as a core of curriculum inquiry, a reading and writing of the self in relation to the world (Graham, 1991; Grumet, 1980; Pinar & Grumet, 1976), extrapolated to multicultural theorizing by Edgerton (1995). Through hermeneutic phenomenology (van Manen & Levering, 1996), curriculum inquiry as curricular return to children who seek to understand secrets of their sense of self, intimacy, privacy, and connectedness. From feminist and anthropological inquiry, embodied curriculum is captured in the phrase "composing a life" (Bateson, 1989), and is related to women and teaching as bodyscapes by Grumet (1988). Based on a legacy of literature on autobiography, women, and teaching, Miller (2005) perceptually complicates embodiment with multiple curricular voices that critique and imagine worlds. This multiplicity of embodied curricula can be interpreted as significantly different from the ideal of problem-solving and transactions that can be read in the corpus of Dewey's work. In Greene, Miller, Grumet, and others one finds more of a tragic sense and a complicated diversity of possibilities for being in the human condition.

Hidden Curriculum (Revisited)

The pioneering inquiry on hidden curriculum by Jackson, Freire, Anyon, Apple, Giroux, Jane Rolland Martin, and Elizabeth Vallance, among others (see Giroux & Purpel, 1983) inspired exploration of multifarious dimensions of society—that is, what is taught and learned from the following dimensions of life: race (Ladson-Billings, 2005; Watkins, 2001), class (Anyon, 2004), gender (Ellsworth, 1997; Miller, 2005), culture (Giroux, 2000; McLaren, 1996), ethnicity (Nieto, 2004; Sleeter, 2005), language (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2002; Valdes, 1999), ability (Kinsel, Steinberg, & Gresson, 1997), religion or belief (Noddings, 1993; Sears, 1998), place (Callejo Perez, Rain, & Slater, 2004). sexual orientation (Sears, 1992), age (Lesko, 2001), technology (Bowers, 2000; Provenzo, Brent, & McCluskey, 2005), globalization (Apple,
Enneway, Singh, 2005; Everest & Prakash, 1998; McLaren & Faramandpour, 2004; Willinsky, 1998), and more. Such inquiries inevitably seek to know whose messages are perpetuated and who benefits from or is hurt by them.

**Tested Curriculum**

What is tested and why? Who benefits from the testing? How does testing sort society into a variety of levels of opportunity? Spring (1989) has long criticized society as society's sorting machine. Testing is the universal joint in that machine, having been criticized as measured lies (Kincheloe et al., 1997), official knowledge (Apple, 1999), standardized mandates (Ommen, 1999), and traditions (McNeil, 2000). Berliner and Biddle (1995) have argued that the crisis in education was manufactured for political and economic benefit of a few, and resulting injustices of such practices have been tagged with the adjective shame (Kosol, 2005; Selden, 1999). Despite reams of scholarly critiques of test scores, policy makers (state, federal, and corporate) buy test scores as the "profit margin" indicator of curricular success. Page (2003) provocatively referred to the federal government as another special interest group with which educators must deal, providing sustenance for the perception that government policy represents the interests of the wealthy few, not those of educators, students, or the general public.

**Null Curriculum**

Commodification of curriculum in tests and state standards makes topics not represented on tests seem unnecessary, which highlights a blatant need to inquire into what Eisner (1979/1984) calls the null curriculum. This term refers to the material that is minimized or excluded due to priority and budget. Capabilities for art, science, social, pragmatic, phenomenological, spirituality, kinship, integrity, and lifelong learning are all too well-touted as valuable; yet, widely used achievement tests measure none of them.

Thus, the test-driven, teacherless, or no emphasis at all, especially in social contexts where students receive low scores due to poverty, racism, and oppression. Thus, one could argue that the testing industry is built upon a network of assumptions about inquiry that creates methodologies of control or colonization (Tubisi Smith, 2001), thereby creating docile acceptance of the sorting machine (Spring, 1989).

**Outside Curriculum**

The hidden, null, and tested curricula make context a necessary and neglected site of curriculum inquiry (Ayers, 2004; Chard, 2005; Cornbleth, 1990). We undeniably are shaped by contexts of culture, ecology, geography, history, community, language, mass media, the Internet, families and homes, peer groups, workplaces, hobbies or avocations, and more. Just as school curriculum has intended, taught, embodied, hidden, tested, and null dimensions, so do curricula outside of school. To explore these outside curricula, one might use a backdrop of backpedal curriculum inquiry, beginning with a given societal disposition (e.g., the joy of shopping, aspiration to wedding, unquestioned loyalty to tertiary institutions), faith in mass testing, desire for a popular body type), and then reconstruct paths of influence that have formed it. Such pathways would reveal a plethora of nonschool influences (outside curricula), as well as school-based ones, to provide ample precedent for a more complete picture of the multiple curricula that shape us (see Cremin, 1976; Schubert, 1981, Tyler, 1977).

Berman (1986) supposed new curricular priorities integral to the processes of living (perceiving, communicating, loving, knowing, decision making, orienting, creating, and valuing) to replace or enrich conventional subject matters. Over 2 decades later, she consistently focused on a curriculum for being (Herman, Hulgren, Lee, Rivkin, & Roderick, 1991), which indicates that anyone's journey to refine such processes must embrace the whole of life, not merely schooling. As is also evident in work by Ayers (2005). Another approach to this wider domain of curriculum inquiry focuses on curriculum of homes, families, peer groups, mass media (e.g., the Web, videogames, television, movies), and nonschool organizations (e.g., church, sports, music, dance, museums, gangs, scouts, workplaces, Fantini & Sinclair, 1985; Schubert, 1981, 1982b). If education is the continuous reconstruction of experience (Dewey, 1916, p. 76), then it requires taking stock of one's past and present while aspiring toward possible futures; as Pinar (2004, p. 37) contends, this is an effort involving "complicated conversations with oneself... and socio-political engaging "pedagogical action... with others in the social reconstruction of the public sphere." This emphasis on both personal meanings, and social justice is as relevant today as it was at the end of the progressive era when Dewey (1930, 1938) and Boyd Bode (1938) unsuccessfully pleaded for other progressives to amend the rift between proponents of child study and social reconstruction. This rift brought the demise of the Progressive Education Association. One might consider it hopeful today that several prominent book series emphasize both pursuit of social justice and the quest for identity.

That this movement of curriculum inquiry takes an integrated look at identity and justice may prevent a repeat of the fall of progressive since proponents of both see need for unity of emphasis on school and outside curricula. The following are illustrative of this dual emphasis: Ayton (2004) and Nogueira (2003) assert that meaningful growth can only come if resources are made available for the curriculum of all children; Bowers (2001) calls for an ecological basis for teaching, learning, and community (see also Bowers & Flanders, 1999); Byrant (1998) brings philosophical perspective to tensions between a love and hate within the social and cultural histories of school subjects; Dalston (1999) investigates curricular implicit in teaching portrayed in themes; Darder (2002) interprets Freirean practices, showing love as essential to the revolutionary pedagogy; Doll (1992) extends postmodern inquiry to propose curricular visions (see also Doll & Gough, 2002) that transcend limits of the personal and political; Egan (1997) establishes theory from story, myth, culture, and history to imagine aesthetic, mythic, romantic, philosophical, and ironic constructs of development; Ellsworth (1997) explores ideological messages in hidden curricula in educational media (see also Ellsworth & Whately, 1990); Giroux (2003, 2004) sees possibility for democracy beyond the culture of fear wrought by corporate culture's war on children and indicates the need to inquire into popular culture as public pedagogy.

Greene (1992) offers literary and philosophical critiques of aesthetic education and evidence from work at Lincoln Center (Greene, 2001) that it could rekindle imaginative public spaces; He (2003) illuminates cross-cultural journeys of identity formation as curricular phenomena; books (1994) invokes into ways students and teachers can be helped to transcend racial, sexual, and economic boundaries; Jardine (1998) uses phenomenological inquiry and ecological perspectives to call for a boundless heart that opens curricular possibilities; Lather and Smithies (1997) engages women with HIV/AIDS in study of their situation, indicating the need for accessible language (Lather, 1995), fashioning cultural studies as curriculum inquiry to question government intrusions on quality inquiry that could illuminate educational possibilities (Lather, 2004); McCarthy and Dimitriadis (2000) expose globalizing pedagogies that colonize and advocate the need to resist; reading and teaching the postcolonial (see also Dimitriadis & McCarthy, 2001). McLaren (1999, 2002) inquires into learning derived from the ritual performance of schooling through study of symbols and gestures produced by political economy, advocating critical pedagogy; Olumide (1999) critiques standardized curricula and the corporate interests that prevent education from fitting non-standardized children (see also Emery & Ommen, 2004); Purpel (1989, 1999) inquires to critique the influence moral and spiritual wastelands of corporate interest on education; Prakash and Esteva (1998) reveal the postmodern and social practices of grassroots cultures, pointing to the need to escape from the formal, globalizing educational commodities; Slatter (1995) calls for a theological basis for postmodern curriculum development; Stobie and Kincheloe (1997) offer cultural studies of kindestar, uncovering corporate constructions of childhood experience; Willinsky (1998) investigates historically how children learn to divide the world through schooling devised by empires; Meier (1995) and Ayers et al. (2000) report on attempts to create meaningful contexts of growth in oppressed urban settings through small schools; Young (2003) concludes that a critical theory of learning should be at the center of all social and institutional entities; and Haggerson (2000) advocates depiction of curriculum wherever it occurs through many forms of inquiry (scientific, philosophical, phenomenological, critical, feminist, and spiritual) and multiple modes of expression (narrative, story, poetry, visual art, music, symbol, drama, autobiography, and biography).

This lengthy list of authors barely scratches the surface of the rich array of curriculum inquiries that illuminate curriculum experience in and out of school. In the face of corporate-saturated curriculum policy and practice, the
move to interpret curriculum outside of school holds a glimmer of hope in opposition to a curriculurum of world domination by an omnipotent minority that Chomsky (2000a, 2006a) sees as the prime beneficiary of current societal structures, including curriculum. Such inquiry could enlighten the creation of grassroots opportunities for personal meaning and social justice in and out of schools, as has been exemplified by Holt (1981) and Gatto (2001).

QUESTIONS FOR CONTINUED CURRICULUM INQUIRY

The expansion of curriculum away from school into multiple spheres of life has made many scholars uneasy. Some have assumed that this diminishes the democratic project that we have historically seen as the purpose of schools. What, however, if schools have become so fully institutionalized to serve affluence that the democratic project has been transformed into preparation for autocracy or oligarchy of a new corporate world? In such a case one should not ask the questions that shape our curriculum content worthy of study? What if school is a mere decoy for education of the Deweyan democratic tradition? What if engagement in educational experience that searches for meaning and direction opposes the intended curriculum of developing loyal followers? Are we in an era in which the choice is, as Chomsky (2003a) warns, hegemony or survival? If schools are largely reflections of messages that assert domination by an omnipotent majority, are they not preventative to the free pursuit of lifelong learning? What if the structures of schooling are a hidden curriculum that rejects personal and democratic construction of meaning and direction? What if dominant goals, curriculum materials, and tests are packages delivered unwittingly by minions who perpetuate the power of a globalized omnipotent minority?

Is it not the responsibility of those concerned with curriculum to find the best places to keep alive basic curriculum questions: What has shaped us? How did we become what we are? What is worth being and doing? Who do we want to become and how can we shape the journey to go there? How can we live together without continuing to destroy this planetary environment? For those involved in curriculum inquiry, I ask, How can we overcome the powerful impediments to pursue such questions? How can curriculum inquiry enable public discourse, including that of children and youths, to be centered on such questions?

NOTES

1. I acknowledge colleagues Bernard Gallegos, Isabel Nunez, and Joe Oehler for discussions on this topic.


3. For more comprehensive sources, though not categorized relative to these venues, see Marshall et al., 2006; Pikar et al., 1995; Schubert et al., 2002, and especially Short's Curriculum Inquiry and Related Scholarship: A Searchable Bibliography of Selected Studies, which is an electronic bibliography that is updated regularly (http://education.college.edu/edcure/ circd/min.html).

4. The listing of a scholar's influence in one or more of these venues is an interpretive act, and it is not intended to classify the scholar, only to say that the work cited indicates influence brought to that venue.
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